

## Course Reading

Trible, Phyllis. "Episode Four: Human Sexuality (2:21-24)." Excerpted from *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, 94-102. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

### Restrictions on Copyrighted Material

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship or research. If electronic transmission of reserve material is used for purposes in excess of what constitutes "fair use" that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

No Further Transmission or distribution of this material is permitted.

speak directly, it exercises the power to name without being challenged or corrected by God. And what it decides comes to pass. From total passivity the earth creature has moved to active responsibility.<sup>15</sup> Yet through it all this creature has not found a fitting companion.

Indeed, episode three tantalizes. Yahweh announces one agenda only to precede immediately to another without explanation or apology. Then God disappears, and it is left to the narrator to conclude that the divine promise remains unfulfilled. Meanwhile, God's pursued agenda increases the stature of the earth creature, even to the point of replacing God in the action, and yet it leaves the earth creature unfulfilled. Power over creation has not alleviated human loneliness. As for the animals, their close identity with the earth creature has only heightened the differences between humanity and zoology. The animals disappoint rather than delight. Enclosed by negatives, their positive portrayal remains ambiguous—no doubt a foreshadowing of things to come. In fact, this entire episode is a foreshadowing. By contrast and juxtaposition, it prepares not only for the advent of disobedience in scene two, but also for the fulfillment of Eros in episode four of scene one.

#### *Episode Four: Human Sexuality (2:21–24)*

If no companion for the earth creature is found among the animals, there is another possibility: the creation of human sexuality. This divine act will alter radically the nature of *hā-'ādām* and bring about new creatures so that female and male together become the one flesh that is wholeness rather than isolation. With the creation of sexuality, episode four completes the development of Eros and concludes the first scene of the story. This unit has a circular design, similar to the three preceding episodes. The word *flesh* (*bāsār*) delineates the boundaries. It occurs once at the beginning, once at the end, twice in the middle, and nowhere else in the entire story. Encompassed by this circular design are four sections that correspond in form and content to episode three. In the first two sections, Yahweh God is the subject of active verbs. In the last two, the deity does not appear at all; rather, the earth creature speaks and the narrator comments.

And Yahweh God caused a deep sleep to fall upon *hā-'ādām* and, while it slept, took one of its ribs and closed up flesh at that spot.

And Yahweh God built the rib which he took from *hā-'ādām* into woman [*iššā*] and brought her to *hā-'ādām*.

And *hā-'ādām* said:  
This, finally, bone of my bone  
and flesh of my flesh.  
This shall be called woman [*iššā*]  
because from man [*iš*] was taken this.

Therefore, a man [*iš*] leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his woman [*iššā*] and they become one flesh.

(2:21–24)

Like episode one but unlike episodes two and three, the deity does not speak in this concluding unit. Similarly, the portrayal of the earth creature as totally passive at the beginning of episode four recalls its depiction in episode one. Yahweh God, who first animated dust to form *hā-'ādām* and then put it in a garden and delegated to it work, responsibility, power, and speech, now returns this creature to a state of inactivity, indeed, of unconsciousness: “and Yahweh God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the earth creature” (2:21a). This return to the beginning, however, is not regression but progress. Out of it comes the material for a new creation: “and while [the earth creature] slept, Yahweh God took one of its ribs and closed up flesh at that spot” (2:21b).<sup>16</sup>

New images of deity emerge. God is anesthesiologist and surgeon. By administering an anesthetic sufficient for the operation to come, Yahweh God causes a deep sleep in the creature. Immediately the deity removes a section of its body and then, concluding successfully this surgery, “closed up flesh at that spot.” The entire procedure is quickly and efficiently executed. In the very next sentence the images of deity shift to architect, designer, and builder: “and Yahweh God built the rib which he took from the earth creature into woman” (2:22a). This work is

also accomplished swiftly so that in the next line Yahweh acquires still another image: the divine matchmaker brings the woman to the earth creature (2:22b).

Just as these opening verses of episode four expand the images of God in the story, so they develop the life of the earth creature in new ways. To be sure, the creature is totally passive here, as it was throughout episode one; yet this passivity, operated upon by God, results in new life through a unique creative act. All the other creations have originated from the earth, a material that is given, not created, in the story. In episode one Yahweh God formed *hā-'ādām* from *hā-'ādāmā* (2:7); in episode two Yahweh God caused every tree to grow from *hā-'ādāmā* (2:9); and in episode three Yahweh God formed the animals from *hā-'ādāmā* (2:19). The same material indicates physical, perhaps psychic, rapport between humanity, botany, and zoology. They share common ground, even though they are distinct and separate creations. Yet they are not equal creations. The earth creature is central, prior both in order and in responsibility and power; the plants and the animals are made for its sake so that the earth creature stands over them in a hierarchy of harmony. It tills the garden, with freedom to eat of every tree save one; and it names the animals, with power to determine their existence. Hence, the earth creature has dominion over the plants and the animals—over everything that comes from *hā-'ādāmā* and even over the earth of the garden.

Strikingly, the creation in episode four does not come from *hā-'ādāmā*; the word *earth* never appears. Instead, at the beginning of this unit the creative act comes out of the earth creature itself. Thus, the creature functions here precisely as the earth functioned in episode one. And the two episodes contain yet another parallel: the use of dust from the earth and rib from the earth creature. As specific parts of whole entities, these substances are fragile and require processing before creatures come into being. As Yahweh shaped dust and then breathed into it to produce the earth creature, so now Yahweh takes out the rib and then fashions it into woman.

Built of raw material from the earth creature, rather than from the earth, the woman is unique in creation. Her uniqueness is further indicated by the matchmaking activity of Yahweh God,

who “brought her to *hā-'ādām*” (2:22b). Although the words “Yahweh brought . . . to the earth creature” are repeated from episode three (2:19), they carry a radically different meaning here. In the preceding episode, after God formed the animals from the earth, the deity brought them to *hā-'ādām* “to see what it would call each one and whatever it called each one, that was the name” (2:19bc). In other words, the earth creature was specifically given dominion over the animals through naming. Similar power was granted over the plant world by the infinitive phrase “to till and to keep” the garden (2:15). By contrast, in episode four no purpose at all is stated in Yahweh’s bringing of the woman to the earth creature, whose very body has now been changed because of her. Specifically, God does not give *hā-'ādām* power over the woman. Hence, the omission of any infinitive clause of purpose in this episode further contrasts the relationship of the earth creature to the woman with that of the earth creature to the earth, to the animals, and to the plants. She does not fit the pattern of dominion that the preceding episodes have established. She belongs to a new order that will by itself transform the earth creature. Having made the proper introduction by bringing her to *hā-'ādām*, the divine matchmaker withdraws from the pericope and the earth creature takes over, a pattern that first appeared in episode three.

In becoming material for creation, the earth creature changes character. Whereas the making of the plants and the animals were divine acts extrinsic to the earth creature itself, the making of the sexes is intrinsic. Indeed, this act has altered the very flesh of the creature: from one come two. After this intrinsic division, *hā-'ādām* is no longer identical with its past, so that when next it speaks a different creature is speaking. To be sure, continuity exists in the oneness of humanity, but here stress falls upon the discontinuity that results from sexual differentiation. For the first time *hā-'ādām* employs direct discourse. Its language is the poetry of Eros; its subject, female and male:

And *hā-'ādām* said,

This, finally, bone of my bones  
and flesh of my flesh.

This shall be called woman [*'išā*]  
because from man [*'iś*] was taken this.

Surrounding the poem and also occurring at its center, the feminine pronoun *this* (*zōt*) unmistakably emphasizes the woman whose creation has made the earth creature different. Only after surgery does this creature, for the very first time, identify itself as male. Utilizing a pun on the Hebrew word for woman, *'iššā*, the earth creature refers to itself by the specific term for man as male, *'iš*. Sexuality originates in play, just as humanity did at the beginning of the story. The unit *'iš* and *'iššā* functionally parallels *hā-'ādām* and *hā-'ādamā*. Occurring at the beginning and the end of scene one, puns encircle Eros to give fulfillment and harmony through the delight of words.

With the advent of sexuality, the word *hā-'ādām* acquires a second usage in the story. In episodes one, two, and three it designated one creature who was sexually undifferentiated (neither male nor female nor a combination of both).<sup>17</sup> After God operates on this earth creature, to produce a companion, its identity becomes sexual. The surgery is radical, for it results in two creatures where before there was only one. The new creature, built from the material of *hā-'ādām*, is female, receiving her identity in a word that is altogether new to the story, the word *'iššā*. The old creature transformed is male, similarly receiving identity in a word that is new to the story, *'iš*. At the same time, the basic word for humanity before sexual differentiation, *hā-'ādām*, now becomes a sexual reference so that it is used frequently, though not exclusively, for the male. With this altered meaning, the retention of the word *hā-'ādām* allows for both continuity and discontinuity between the first creature and the male creature, just as the rib allows for both continuity and discontinuity between the first creature and the female creature. The story itself builds ambiguity into the word *hā-'ādām*, an ambiguity that should prevent interpreters from limiting it to one specific and unequivocal meaning throughout. Furthermore, the ambiguity in the word matches the ambiguity in the creature itself—the ambiguity of one flesh becoming two creatures.

But no ambiguity clouds the words *'iššā* and *'iš*. One is female, the other male. Their creation is simultaneous, not sequential. One does not precede the other, even though the time line of this story introduces the woman first (2:22). Moreover, one is not the opposite of the other. In the very act of distinguishing

female from male, the earth creature describes her as “bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh” (2:23). These words speak unity, solidarity, mutuality, and equality.<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, in this poem the man does not depict himself as either prior to or superior to the woman. His sexual identity depends upon her even as hers depends upon him. For both of them sexuality originates in the one flesh of humanity.

In the last two cola of the poem to Eros appear its only two verbs: *call* and *take* (2:23). They have already appeared earlier in scene one. Indeed, the verb *call* (*qr'*) occurs three times in episode three with reference to the naming of the animals (2:19, 19, 20). Even as other parallels between episodes three and four have thus far highlighted the uniqueness of the creation of human sexuality, so likewise does a comparison of this verb in its two settings. *Call* appears first in episode three as part of that infinitive phrase which episode four omits, though it repeats verbatim the first part of the sentence to which the phrase belongs: “and Yahweh God brought . . . to the earth creature” (2:19, 22). With the bringing of the woman to the creature, episode four stops. By contrast, episode three, which reports the bringing of the animals to the creature, continues with the reason, “to see what it would call each one” (2:19). In the sentences that follow this infinitive phrase (2:19, 20), the verb *call* is joined to the noun *name* (*šēm*), and this complete activity of *calling the name* becomes the way in which the earth creature establishes power over the animals. The verb *call* by itself does not mean naming; only when joined to the noun *name* does it become part of a naming formula. The existence of such a formula is attested further in passages outside this particular story that belong, nevertheless, to the same literary tradition.<sup>19</sup> For instance, in Genesis 4 we read (RSV):

[Cain] built a city, and *called the name* of the city after the *name* of his son, Enoch (4:17).

And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son and *called his name* Seth (4:25).

To Seth also a son was born, and he *called his name* Enosh (4:26a).

At that time men began to *call upon the name* of the Lord (4:26b).

In these traditions, the act of naming, which can mean either power over an object or recognition of the object, requires the noun *name* joined to the verb *call*. Alone, the verb *call* does not signify naming. Although this naming formula appears in episode three of our story to signify the power of the earth creature over the animals, it does not occur in episode four. The earth creature exclaims, "This shall be called 'iṣṣā." The noun *name* is strikingly absent from the poetry. Hence, in calling the woman, the man is not establishing power over her but rejoicing in their mutuality.

The word *woman* ('iṣṣā) demonstrates further that the issue is not the naming of the female but rather the recognition of sexuality. 'iṣṣā itself is not a name; it is a common noun, not a proper noun. It designates gender; it does not specify person. Moreover, this word appears in the story *before* the earth creature "calls" it: the narrator reports that "Yahweh God built the rib which he took from the earth creature into a woman ['iṣṣā]" (2:22). Thus, the creature's poem does not determine who the woman is, but rather delights in what God has already done in creating sexuality:<sup>20</sup>

Bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh;  
This shall be called 'iṣṣā  
because from 'iṣ was taken this.

The phrase "taken from" requires investigation also. Does it indicate a derivative existence for woman? Some have claimed that it does, maintaining also that derivation means subordination: in being taken from man, woman is subordinate to man.<sup>21</sup> But that interpretation falters when the function of the phrase "take from" is examined throughout the story. Within episode four itself this phrase occurs three times, twice in prose and once in poetry (2:21, 22, 23). In prose the verb (*lqh*) is active; in poetry, passive. All three occurrences pertain to the woman, whose creation comes in stages. First, while the earth creature slept, Yahweh God "took one *from* its ribs" (2:21). Second, "Yahweh God built the rib which he *took from* the earth creature into woman" (2:22). As we have seen, the rib is raw material, comparable to dust from the earth. It requires processing before

the woman is created. Clearly in the prose account, then, it is the raw material, not the woman herself, that is taken from the earth creature; furthermore, the earth creature is not the man. The difference in the third occurrence of the phrase "taken from" is poetic license: ". . . 'iṣṣā because from 'iṣ was taken this" (2:23). Here the phrase joins 'iṣ and 'iṣṣā to produce a pun, not to give information about the creative process (nor about philology). And the meaning of this pun is the similarity of woman and man, not the subordination of woman to man. Paradoxically, to be taken from man is to be differentiated from him while being bone of bone and flesh of flesh. Differentiation, then, implies neither derivation nor subordination. The poetic usage of the phrase "taken from" argues, in fact, for the mutuality of woman and man.

Investigation of this phrase outside of episode four confirms the contention that it does not indicate subordination. Twice in Genesis 3 the passive voice of the verb is used for the earth creature in relation to the earth. The first usage occurs in poetry: "till you return to the earth, for *from* it you were *taken*" (3:19). The second usage occurs in prose: "therefore, Yahweh God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the earth *from* which he was *taken*" (3:23, RSV\*). As 'iṣṣā is taken from 'iṣ, so hā-'ādām is taken from hā-'ādāmā (cf. 2:7). Yet hā-'ādām is never portrayed as subordinate to the earth. On the contrary, the creature is given power over the earth so that what is taken from becomes superior to. By strict analogy, then, the line "this shall be called 'iṣṣā because from 'iṣ was taken this" would mean not the subordination of the woman to the man but rather her superiority to him.

Yet the practice of determining the nuances of a given word from its usages elsewhere in a text may mislead as well as enlighten. The meanings gleaned from such a procedure must fit the particular context in which the word being studied appears. Since the context for this statement concerning 'iṣṣā and 'iṣ is the preceding line, "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh," the connotation of woman's superiority is inappropriate. The relationship of this couple is one of mutuality and equality, not one of female superiority and certainly not one of female subordination.<sup>22</sup> Nowhere in this entire story is subordination a connota-

tion of the phrase “taken from.”<sup>23</sup> Finally, woman is not derived from man, even as the earth creature is not derived from the earth. For both of them life originates with God. Dust of the earth and rib of the earth creature are but raw materials for God’s creative activity. Truly, neither woman nor man is an autonomous creature; both owe their origin to divine mystery. Differentiation from the earth, on the one hand, and from the man, on the other, implies neither derivation from them nor subordination to them:

This, finally, bone of my bones  
and flesh of my flesh.  
This shall be called *’iššā*  
because from *’iš* was differentiated this.  
(2:23)

Although episode four expands images of God and develops further the life of the earth creature, it focuses upon woman. In her Eros finds fulfillment. Making her entrance in the last episode of scene one, she is the culmination of the entire movement, in no way an afterthought. The process that creates her is shrouded in mystery; Yahweh God makes certain that no one shall witness it. Put into a deep sleep, the earth creature is neither participant, spectator, nor consultant for this climactic event. Indeed, the earth creature does not even know in advance that she is coming. Her arrival is suspenseful, since God’s promise of a companion did not materialize once before. This mystery and suspense yield surprise and delight. Thus it is that the transformed earth creature utters a poem upon meeting woman. She is unique. Unlike all the rest of creation, she does not come from the earth; rather, Yahweh God *builds* the rib into woman. The Hebrew verb *build* (*bnh*) indicates considerable labor to produce solid results.<sup>24</sup> Hence, woman is no weak, dainty, ephemeral creature. No opposite sex, no second sex, no derived sex—in short, no “Adam’s rib.” Instead, woman is the culmination of creation, fulfilling humanity in sexuality. Equal in creation with the man, she is, at this point, elevated in emphasis by the design of the story.<sup>25</sup> With her creation Eros reigns. “Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his woman and they become one flesh” (2:24, RSV\*).

This narrative report concludes episode four, even as a narrative report ended episode three. Indeed, the structure of these two units (2:18–20, 21–24) has been parallel throughout. Each is divided into two distinct parts, with Yahweh God controlling the action of the first part and then withdrawing altogether in the second. Moreover, in the first part of each pericope *hā-’ādām* is object: for it, Yahweh forms the animals in episode three; from it, Yahweh takes raw material to build the woman in episode four. And both units conclude with the deity bringing the newly made creatures to *hā-’ādām*. But, as we have seen, episode three contains an infinitive clause here that episode four omits, and this omission indicates a crucial difference in meaning. The latter parts of these two episodes begin with *hā-’ādām* speaking. In episode three the speech is indirect; in four, direct. In three it is prose; in four, poetry. In three, it asserts dominion through naming; in four, it exalts communion through punning. After the speech of *hā-’ādām*, each episode closes with a narrative comment. In three that comment is downbeat: no fit companion did the earth creature find among the animals. In four, it is upbeat: man and woman become one flesh. The conclusions of both episodes return to the themes of their beginnings. Actually, the parallels in design and vocabulary between these two episodes highlight their differences. What the creation of the animals cannot do for the earth creature, the creation of sexuality can. Loneliness, then, is overcome not by something other than humanity but by distinction within one flesh. Sexuality is the recognition not of division but of the oneness that is wholeness, bone of bone and flesh of flesh.<sup>26</sup> No fit companion among the animals gives way to the one flesh of female and male.

With the conclusion of episode four, the poetry of the earth creature yields to the silent communion of man and woman. This communion is protected from intruders through the distancing of third-person narration, which describes for us but does not allow us to witness. “Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his woman and they become one flesh” (2:24, RSV\*). The description employs the explicitly sexual terms *’iš* and *’iššā* that have just been introduced into the story. To this vocabulary the narrator adds the terms for parental roles, achieving a juxtaposition of relationships: man and

woman contrast with father and mother. Each couple is a unit of equality—one, the equality of creation; the other, the equality of roles. Interestingly, however, parents are not part of God's creative activity. They appear in the story as adjuncts to the creation of woman and man. In other words, sexuality makes father and mother possible; parental images are subordinate to and dependent upon sexual images. Roles, then, are secondary at best; they do not belong to creation.

In this description only the man is identified with father and mother; the woman continues to stand alone. Her uniqueness and independence as a human creature remain intact, and her prominence in the design of the story persists. To her the man comes. Though called "his woman," she is not his possession but rather the one in whom he finds fulfillment. She is gift—God's gift of life. The man does not control her; he moves toward her for union. Her advent has transformed the earth creature into a sexual being. Thus, in the design and content of the story she is elevated as the one to whom he must cleave.

The man's movement toward union with the woman involves its opposite: separation from the parents. Leaving and cleaving are interrelated: "Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his woman" (RSV\*). The result of this convergence of opposites is a consummation of union: "and they become one flesh." No procreative purpose characterizes this sexual union; children are not mentioned. Hence, the man does not leave one family to start another; rather, he abandons (*zb*) familial identity for the one flesh of sexuality.<sup>27</sup> Beginning with the one flesh of the earth creature, episode four has described the creation of two sexual beings from it: woman and man. From one comes two; from wholeness comes differentiation. Now, at the conclusion of the episode, this differentiation returns to wholeness; from two come the one flesh of communion between female and male.<sup>28</sup> Thus is Eros consummated.

Not only does one flesh complete the cyclic composition of episode four, but it also completes the cyclic composition of the entire first scene. The creation of humanity, sexually undifferentiated in episode one, finds its fulfillment in the creation of sexuality in episode four. With it the development of Eros is completed, and the first movement of the narrative concludes.

Yet rest does not come;<sup>29</sup> over against Eros stands Thanatos. And the movement from Life to Death is by way of disobedience. At the very center of the story, scene two reverses the direction to lead to Death. But this turning point is not totally surprising. A forbidden tree; animals that do not fit; the withdrawal of God; the increasing power and freedom of human creatures—all these aspects of Eros now become the occasion for disobedience.

## EROS CONTAMINATED

### SCENE TWO: THE TURNING POINT OF DISOBEDIENCE (GENESIS 2:25—3:7)

Located at the center of the narrative, scene two is shorter than the surrounding scenes. This brevity juxtaposes the turning point of the story with the two opposing movements. Disobedience comes through a single decision and a single act, whereas both the development (2:7–24) and the disintegration of Eros (3:8–24) require a gradual process. Repeating the words *both* and *naked*, the cyclic design of scene two opens (2:25) and closes (3:7) in third-person narrations about the man and the woman. With accompanying descriptions, these words constitute an inclusion of contrast between the before and the after of disobedience.<sup>30</sup> While parallel in subject matter, the two parts of this inclusion differ in length, the end being twice that of the beginning. Enclosed by these narrations of nakedness, the scene of disobedience itself also begins (3:1) and ends (3:6) with third-person narrations, though they are parallel neither in length nor in subject matter. The beginning, the introduction of the serpent, is brief; the end, the very act of disobedience, much longer. Similarly, at the center of this scene a dialogue between the serpent and the woman develops from one question to more lengthy speeches. Initiating and concluding this conversation, the serpent surrounds the woman. Her speech stands at the heart of this center scene.

Overall, then, two designs interlock in scene two: three concentric circles of form, and sometimes of content, converge upon the center, as their length progresses from short units that lead to the center to longer units that proceed from it. The center

*Eros* contrasts sharply with Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), and with Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death* (New York: Free Press, 1973), pp. 150–75.

3. For a different structural analysis, with corresponding differences in meaning, see Jerome T. Walsh, "Genesis 2:4b–3:24: A Synchronic Approach," *JBL* 96 (1977): 161–77.

4. Ironies persist throughout Gen. 2–3. Cf., e.g., Edwin M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 81–84. One recent literary-critical study of the phenomenon of irony is Wayne C. Booth, *A Rhetoric of Irony* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974). Since it is limited to "stable irony," however, Booth's discussion is not as helpful as it might be.

5. I choose not to translate the word *nephesh*, which connotes the totality of the "self." Cf. Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), pp. 10–25.

6. Cf. Terence E. Fretheim, *Creation, Fall, and Flood* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969), pp. 70–71.

7. For the translation of *hā-'ādām* as "the earth creature," I am indebted to Professor Prescott Williams of Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Tex. Cf. "the earthling" in Adrien Janis Bledstein, "The Genesis of Humans: The Garden of Eden Revisited," *Judaism* 26 (1977): 190; also in E. A. Speiser, *Genesis, AB* (New York: Doubleday, 1964), p. 16. On the four occurrences of the word *'ādām* without the definite article (Gen. 2:5, 20; 3:17, 21), see Ernest Lussier, "Adham in Genesis 1, 1–4, 24," *CBQ* 18 (1956): 137–39; also Speiser, *Genesis*, p. 18.

8. To avoid any suggestion of sexual differentiation in the earth creature before episode four (Gen. 2:21–24), I use the neuter pronoun "it."

9. Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 79–80.

10. On Gen. 2:10–14, see U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, Pt. I (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), pp. 114–21.

11. Cf. Marcuse's distinction between labor and work, *Eros and Civilization*, pp. 212–21; also Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 79–174.

12. Scholarly attempts to explicate the phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" are legion. See W. Malcolm Clark "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2–3," *JBL* 88 (1969): 266–78 and the bibliography cited there.

13. Exod. 18:4; Deut. 33:7, 26, 29; Ps. 33:20; 115:9–11; 121:2; 124:8; 146:5. Cf. Clarence J. Vos, *Women in Old Testament Worship* (Amsterdam: N.V. Verenigde Drukkerijen Judels and Brinkman-Delft, n.d.), p. 16.

14. Cf. Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 103–43.

15. Cf. David Tobin Asselin, "The Notion of Dominion in Genesis 1–3," *CBQ* 16 (1954): 277–94.

16. Though I retain the traditional translation "rib" for the Hebrew word *šēlā*, I do not regard that meaning as sacrosanct. The word may indicate "side" rather than "rib"; see Koehler-Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), p. 805.

17. Elsewhere I have proposed an interpretation of *hā-'ādām* as androgynous until the differentiation of female and male in Gen. 2:21–24 ("Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," *JAAR* 41 [1973]: 35, 37–38. I now consider that description incorrect because the word *androgyny* assumes sexuality, whereas the earth creature is sexually undifferentiated. To understand the earth creature as either humanity or proto-humanity is, I think, legitimate.

18. See Walter Brueggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gen. 2, 23a)," *CBQ* 32 (1970): 532–42.

19. Tribble, "Depatriarchalizing," p. 38.

20. Although I have retained the traditional reading "she shall be called" (so RSV), this Hebrew verb may also be rendered in the present tense: "she is called." The latter translation is indeed preferable in this context, since it connotes simple recognition without an act of determination (cf. Isa. 54:5; Prov. 16:21).

21. See Fretheim, *Creation, Fall, and Flood*, pp. 78–79; Eugene C. Bianchi and Rosemary R. Ruether, *From Machismo to Mutuality* (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), pp. 12–13.

22. *Contra* Walsh, "Genesis 2:4b–3:24: A Synchronic Approach," p. 174, n. 32.

23. Cf. Vos, *Women in Old Testament Worship*, p. 17.

24. The verb *bnh* is used of towns, towers, altars, and fortifications as well as of the primeval woman (Koehler-Baumgartner, *Lexicon*, p. 134). In Gen. 2:22 it may mean the fashioning of clay around the rib (Ruth Amiran, "Myths of the Creation of Man and the Jericho Statues," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 167 [1962]: 24–25).

25. See John L. McKenzie, "The Literary Characteristics of Gen. 2–3," *Theological Studies* 15 (1954): 559–60; cf. John A. Bailey, "Initiation and the Primal Woman in Gilgamesh and Genesis 2–3," *JBL* 89 (1970): 143; Claus Westermann, *Genesis, Biblischer Kommentar 1/4* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), p. 312.

26. *Contra* Norman O. Brown, *Love's Body* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), p. 84.

27. *Contra* Cassuto, *Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, p. 137; but cf. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, p. 172.

28. Westermann, *Genesis*, pp. 316–17. For different views, cf. von Rad, who claims that "one flesh" signifies progeny (*Genesis*, p. 82), and Hermann Gunkel, who holds that the phrase means sexual intercourse (*Genesis, Handbuch zum Alten Testament* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1902], p. 10).

29. Cf. Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, p. 56.

30. On inclusion, see Chapter 1, n. 61.

31. Gen. 2:25, then, serves a double function: (1) the epilogue to episode four of scene one and (2) the prologue to scene two.

32. On the connotation of defenseless in the word *naked* (*ārōm*), see Good, *Irony in the Old Testament*, p. 83, n. 3.

33. For some scholars the word *ārūm*, along with other words and themes, indicates a sapiential milieu for Gen. 2–3; see Luis Alonso Schökel, "Sapiential and Covenant Themes in Genesis 2–3," in *Studies*