

Text- and Reception-Historical Reflections on Transmissional and Hermeneutical Techniques in Genesis 2–3*

MICHAELA BAUKS

Introduction

In this article I will examine the ways in which the first interpretations of the Bible, dating from the time of the Second Temple, influence the study of internal fractures and crosscurrents in Gen 2–3. Some years ago, D. Carr argued that “the ‘intratextual’ complexity of Genesis spilled over into later readers’ ‘intertextual’ interaction with it. The term ‘intratextual’ denotes interactions of various layers of Genesis with texts now standing within the same book. ... [S]uch fractured intratextuality in the book then becomes a frequent focus of early Jewish intertextual interaction with Genesis.”¹ First, the study of fractures can illuminate our understanding of the methodological value of reception history for the biblical text. Second, it helps to reconstruct how each new version evaluates the tradition. Dealing with “addition of a redactional layer, or textual reproduction of an oral performance, the writer transforms the tradition she or he uses [independently], even as she or he purports to reproduce it.”² In his most recent, important study about literacy in the ancient Near East, Carr emphasizes that:

* I would like to thank Antje Arend for assiduously revising my English manuscript.

¹ David CARR, “Intratextuality and Intertextuality: Joining Transmission History and Interpretation History in the Study of Genesis,” in *Bibel und Midrasch* (ed. G. Bodendorfer and M. Millard; FAT 22; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998), 97–112; cf. IDEM, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 12–15.

² CARR, *Reading*, 12; for the whole literary process of text making within an oral culture, see Susan NIDITCH, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 10–11; David CARR, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 159–73; Karel VAN DER TOORN, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), esp. 5, 76–77, 110–41.

Israelite authors had been trained from the outset to write by building on templates provided by earlier texts [from an authoritative curriculum]. ... [They] have added to, recombined, and otherwise revised elements of the Israelite textual-educational tradition. ... Yet such sources generally were not incorporated in written form, nor did editors juggle multiple copies of manuscripts in the process of producing their conflated text. It is possible that a scribe may have worked with a given manuscript on occasion. ... Nevertheless, well-educated scribes often could write out a verbatim, memorized form of an older authoritative text, so faithfully reproducing it that its borders and clashes with other material would still be visible in the final product.³

Carr defends an oral-written model of textual production, which explains how the different traditions continued without the system of the Jerusalem palace-temple in the time of the exile. In his view, the (post)exilic period “would have been a key occasion when scribes would have augmented and revised earlier tradition, when the tradition demanded a re-representation and recasting.”⁴ Because there was no access to written copies of the older traditions, “they could work from memory in building a new standard Israelite literature.”

K. van der Toorn presents the scribal modes of ancient text production as techniques like transcription, invention, compilation, expansion, adaptation, and integration. He states that “the transformation of speech into scripture was not a mechanical recording in writing of the oral performance” and “that the part the scribe plays in wording of the text increases in proportion to the distance between the oral performance and the product in writing”⁵ – therefore, the scribe gives his version and produces a new text, not so far from a (wo)man of letters inventing a story. In our context we have to do with another mode: the compilation of different traditions of creation. We have to ask: Are there expansions? Which types of expansions are there? Can we identify glosses in the margins, *Fortschreibungen* or *relectures*, expansions at the borders of the text, intratextual expansions, and revisions performed in the course

³ CARR, *Writing*, 159. When a cuneiform tablet was broken, the scribes sometimes added the technical remark “broken” as in KAR 4 (VAT 9307), 1:44-46 (cf. K. HECKER, *Ein zweisprachiger Schöpfungsmythos*, in TUAT III/4 [CD-ROM], 2005, 607).

⁴ CARR, *Writing*, 168. The sociohistorical problems of this time and the cultural and geographical diversity of the “Yahweh adoring” groups are multiple; see John KESSLER, “Persia’s Loyal Yahwists: Power, Identity and Ethnicity in Achaemenid Yehud,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 91–121, who favors the model of a “charter group” that dominated the social, political, and religious institutions and retained loyalty to its own milieu of origin (101). Behind this group he sees the returnees of the Babylonian *golah* community characterized as “Persia’s loyal Yahwists” (105–6).

⁵ Cf. VAN DER TOORN, *Scribal Culture*, 111.

of a new edition?⁶ The most evident case of expansion is a repetitive resumption (*Wiederaufnahme*) of phrases signaling the return to the narrative flow.⁷

The consequences for literary-critical research are obvious: most examples of literary growth would not be the result of conflation but rather the result of redaction or compilation.⁸ Carr interprets redaction “in a broad sense of the word ... often seamless expansions of earlier copies of a given work through addition of traditions and transitions.”⁹ Therefore, a new issue concerning the link between redactional and transmissional history must be discussed.

I. Intratextual Interactions in Genesis 2–3 (MT and LXX)

Recent studies argue that the “well-composed narrative” of Gen 2–3 is either the result of a redactional process¹⁰ or based on different oral traditions.¹¹ The

⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 125–28.

⁷ Van der Toorn underlines that it “is not always easy to decide whether the scribe responsible for the expansion wished to signal his intervention in the text by deliberately creating a bracket, or whether the bracket was extant even before the insertion as a way of linking two textual blocks. In the second time the repetitive resumption served as a kind of catch-line” (*Scribal Culture*, 130).

⁸ Editorial activity was empirically examined on the basis of cuneiform texts and Judaic manuscripts by J. Tigay, who reconstructed transmissional techniques like the combination of oral traditions, conflation of several documents, accumulation of revisions and recensions, glosses (e.g., assimilations); see the four contributions of Tigay in Jeffrey H. TIGAY, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985). CARR, Reading, 20–21; VAN DER TOORN, *Scribal Culture*, 138–39, and Wolfgang OSWALD, “Moderne Literarkritik und antike Rezeption biblischer Texte,” in *Lesarten der Bibel: Untersuchungen zu einer Theorie der Exegese des Alten Testaments* (ed. Helmut Utzschneider and Erhard Blum; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006), 199–209.

⁹ David CARR, “No Return to Wellhausen?” *Bib 86* (2005): 107–14, here 112. He continues: “The more one works with documented examples of literary growth both outside Israel and in early Judaism (e.g. Qumran), the more clear it becomes just how rare conflation is and how difficult it would be to reconstruct the prehistory of later versions of such texts if we did not have manuscript attestation of their prestiges. Conflation is the exception, not the rule.”

¹⁰ For different propositions for a supplementary model, cf. Reinhard G. KRATZ, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (UTB 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 254; Christoph LEVIN, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 83; Markus WITTE, *Die biblische Urgeschichte: Redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Genesis 1,1–11,26* (BZAW 265; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998), 151–66; David CARR, “The Politics of Textual Subversion: A Diachronic Perspective on the Garden of Eden Story,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 577–93; Henrik PFEIFFER, “Der Baum in der Mitte des Gartens: Zum überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Ursprung der Paradieserzählung (Gen 2,4b–3,24), Teil I: Analyse,” *ZAW* 112 (2000): 487–500; Jan C. GERTZ, “Von Adam zu Enosch: Überlegungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Genesis 2–4,” in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog* (ed. M. Witte; BZAW 345/I; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 215–36.

unified look becomes possible because both “traditions” and “streams” presented in Gen 2–3¹² – namely, the topic of “creation” as well as the topic of “paradise” – have to be classified as etiological. The etiological character implies that the idea of a complete trend reversal from a positive original state to a negative present state can be excluded because etiologies always explain a present state retrospectively.¹³ Etiologies are easy to recognize, and because of the fact that they are used regularly when dealing with final clauses of narratives, etiologies are indicators of originally independent parts that have been added secondarily.¹⁴

Consequently, the topics “creation” and “paradise” have to explain their purpose – the purpose they had not in the primitive state but rather in the present state of humankind; the anthropogony explains the changed relationship between man, woman, and snake. The paradise narrative emphasizes the changed relationship of humans to the garden of God as well as to God himself. The combination of the two topics leads to a prime example of theological anthropology.

While C. Westermann defines the aspect of guilt and punishment as the hermeneutical center,¹⁵ Carr, in contrast, proceeds on the assumption of a

¹¹ Cf. Erhard BLUM, “Von Gottesunmittelbarkeit zu Gottähnlichkeit: Überlegungen zur theologischen Anthropologie der Paradieserzählung,” in *Gottes Nähe im Alten Testament* (ed. Gönke Eberhardt and Kathrin Liess; SBS 202; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004), 9–29; Konrad SCHMID, “Die Unteilbarkeit der Weisheit: Überlegungen zur sogenannten Paradieserzählung Gen 2f. und ihrer theologischen Tendenz,” *ZAW* 114 (2002): 21–39; Jean-Louis SKA, “Genesis 2–3: Some Fundamental Questions,” in *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History* (ed. K. Schmid and C. Riedweg; FAT II/34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 1–27.

¹² For discussion of the different models, cf., e.g., BLUM, “Gottesunmittelbarkeit” and recently Trygve N. D. METTINGER, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 2–3* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 1–11, and Paul KÜBEL, *Metamorphosen der Paradieserzählung* (OBO 231; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 1–67. I personally prefer an approach that starts from the literal consistency of Gen 2–3 without negating the complicated formation of the text. Nevertheless, considering the coherent storyline, the literal development of this complicated formation cannot be reconstructed in all stages (see the contribution of D. Carr in this volume).

¹³ See Konrad SCHMID, “Loss of Immortality: Hermeneutical Aspects of Genesis 2–3 and Its Early Receptions,” in Schmid and Riedweg, *Beyond Eden*, 58–78 (plus bibliography).

¹⁴ TIGAY, “Introduction,” in IDEM, *Empirical Models*, 1–20, esp. 12; cf. Isac L. SEELIGMANN, “Ätiologische Elemente in der biblischen Geschichtsschreibung,” in Isac Leo Seeligmann, *Gesammelte Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. E. Blum; FAT 41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 77–118.

¹⁵ Claus WESTERMANN, *Genesis 1–11* (3rd ed.; BKAT I/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983), 73–77, 263–64, 266–67; cf. recently Martin ARNETH, *Durch Adams Fall ist ganz verderbt: Studien zur Entstehung der alttestamentlichen Urgeschichte* (FRLANT 217; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 98–117, beginning his analysis also with the curses.

primary anthropogony. With the help of the “paradise lost” motif, used with the subversive and critical intention of wisdom traditions, this anthropogony substitutes alienation for the initial intimacy with God. “Already this change is implicit in the shame, hiding, and blaming described in the interrogation scene” (3:8–13).¹⁶ Moreover, it is striking that before “the fall,”¹⁷ the primordial man in the garden is not the center of attention because the garden motif is present in Gen 2 as well. Consequently, Carr considers the widely expanded “well-watered orchard” theme to be a first addition, with the purpose of preparing for the narrative of Gen 3.¹⁸ The first statement made about the humans before they themselves become actors is the “bridge-verse,” 2:25, which will be at the center of the following discussion.

1) Fractures and Duplicates in Genesis 2–3

In addition to the change of perspective, from the anthropogony with God as subject to the narrative of paradise as a relationship drama, the following seams are worth mentioning: first, the planting of the garden, which is mentioned twice, in Gen 2:8–9 and 2:15; second, the two trees in the middle of the garden in 2:9; third, the double ending in 2:23–24 and 3:23–24; and finally, the striking name etiology of the woman in 3:20.

The first two duplicates have been invalidated philologically. E. Blum’s analysis of Gen 2:8 sees the verse as a proleptic summary. The first part of this summary develops in v. 9 and the second part in v. 15.¹⁹ Together, both parts form “die nachdrückliche Einführung des Bühnenbildes,” in opposition to the end of the story in Gen 3:23–24 (cf. the inclusion with Gen 2:8–9, 15).²⁰

¹⁶ CARR, “Politics,” 587–88 (with bibliography). Cf. KRATZ, *Komposition*, 253–54.

¹⁷ T. Krüger states that there is no reason to speak about a “fall.” The human being was created with a limitation of lifetime. The serpent’s promise that the humans will be like God (v. 6) after they have eaten from the tree, is redundant because in Gen 1 the humans are created as *imago Dei*. The story of Gen 2–3 explains the process of becoming adult or growing up, and part of this process is to achieve knowledge of good and evil. Krüger’s colleague K. Schmid convincingly shows that Gen 2–3 deals not with the loss of immortality but with the humans’ attempt to gain it. See Thomas KRÜGER, “Sündenfall? Überlegungen zur theologischen Bedeutung der Paradiesgeschichte,” in Schmid and Riedweg, *Beyond Eden*, 95–109; cf. SCHMID, “Loss,” 60–63.

¹⁸ CARR, “Politics,” 580.

¹⁹ BLUM, “Gottesunmittelbarkeit,” 18 with n. 18, referring to SKA, “Genesis 2–3,” 7–8 (with bibliography).

²⁰ GERTZ, “Adam,” 228, mentions the analysis but interprets it in a source-critical way, without taking into account that a summary prolepsis in v. 8 is absurd because, chronologically, this prolepsis is dated by him before vv. 9, 15.

The harmonizations of the LXX are to be understood in the same sense. The LXX defines Eden (in 2:8) as a location:²¹ “And Lord God planted a Garden in Eden”²² and adds ἔτι, “again” in v. 9. Acknowledging that the earth had already produced a tree (see Gen 1:12), the LXX further shows a tendency to internal harmonization with the first creation narrative in Gen 1.²³ The repetition of the name Eden in v. 15 is omitted (differently in *Tg. Onq.*). Instead, *ὃν ἔπλασεν*, a relative clause, is added. Because this relative clause mentions the human, it refers back to vv. 7–8 and, therefore, continues the plot after the parenthetical note in Gen 2:10–14.

The different names of the trees can be seen as another syntactic feature of the Hebrew language, called split coordination.²⁴ Apart from v. 9, where the different names are mentioned one after another, these names are used alternatively, according to the context. This syntactic feature serves the purpose of explaining that not only the tree of life but also the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is placed in the middle of the garden.²⁵

It seems that the Greek translators did not understand the Hebrew construction. Consequently, the LXX divides Gen 2:9 into three different kinds of trees: trees for pleasure, a tree of life in the middle of the garden, and a tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Contentwise, this division results in a fuzziness in Gen 3:3. The last tree is followed by the infinitive construction τοῦ εἰδέναι γινώσκόν, which describes it ironically as “the tree of knowing but about which little is known.”²⁶

The other two groups of verses are best described not as real duplicates but rather as formal inconsistencies. With regard to genre, Gen 2:24 should be de-

²¹ Cf. also *Tg. Onq.*: “in a region of pleasantness in the time of the beginning” (The Targum of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch, Vol. 1: Genesis and Exodus [trans. J. W. Etheridge; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2005], 38.

²² Susan BRAYFORD, *Genesis* (SEPT; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 228; cf. Martin RÖSEL, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 62.

²³ So Brayford in opposition to Rösel. Referring to Plato, Rösel differentiates the ideal creation in Gen 1 from the material creation in Gen 2.

²⁴ The two direct objects of the clause are separated by an intervening location expression. They determine both trees; see firstly Andreas MICHEL, *Theologie aus der Peripherie: Die gespaltene Koordination im Biblischen Hebräisch* (BZAW 257; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 1–22; cf. BLUM, “Gottesunmittelbarkeit,” 20; SKA, “Genesis 2–3,” 10–11; METTINGER, *Eden Narrative*, 22.

²⁵ SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 31–32; cf. IDEM, “Loss of Immortality,” 64. Gertz points out that this philological discovery does not prove the originality of the phrase but that it can also be based on a reduction including the tree of life (GERTZ, “Adam,” 228; cf. KÜBEL, *Metamorphosen*, 88–89). Nevertheless, this explanation invalidates the old complaint of the duplicate and, therefore, the existence of more than one literal source in this verse.

²⁶ BRAYFORD, *Genesis*, 229; cf. John W. WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 26–27; RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 63.

scribed as an etiological note.²⁷ This verse is either the culmination of the (Yahwistic) story (see Schmidt; Westermann; Carr²⁸) or a supplement (Schüle²⁹) to the story that begins in v. 18. This story is about the creation of a helper for the human and needs to be divided into plot (v. 19aα, 21–22), naming and rating of the animals (v. 19abβ–20a), and finally naming and rating of the woman (23a–b). Metanarratively, Blum describes the function of 2:24 as “eine kurze Digression von der erzählten Welt in die Wirklichkeit der Rezipienten.”³⁰ Formally, his point of view is based on the use of *על-כן* and the tense. Substantially, it is based on the motif of the parent-child relationship, which is explicitly mentioned in Gen 3:20.

Because of its poetic parallelism, Gen 2:23 is also worth mentioning and might be seen as a (first) ending. With regard to the content, this verse emphasizes the absolutely positive result of the creation of humans in an almost hymnic way.³¹ The verse sets this positive creation in contrast to the previous creation of the animals (v. 20). It seems as if this verse was originally an independent element of tradition, for the following two reasons: First, the word *אִשׁ*, actually used for the pun, does not appear anywhere else apart from 2:24 and 3:6. Second, in vv. 21–22, the word *עצם*, “bone,” is used instead of *צלע*, “rib.” Because of its use of the word *בשר*, mentioned not only in the preceding but also in the following verse, this verse is embedded in its present context. So, different traditions merged into one text. In v. 24, the phrase *על-כן*, which is a typical indicator of an etiological expression, complements the consequences of the affinity between man and woman for the present time in the form of a sapiential statement. It is all about the description of a primeval relationship (“ursprungsmythische Bezogenheit”) that surpasses each and every blood relationship.³²

²⁷ Cf. Robert ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Harper Collins, 1981), 30–31.

²⁸ Werner H. SCHMIDT, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift: Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Genesis 1,1–2,4a und 2,4b–3,24* (3rd ed.; WMANT 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), 203; WESTERMANN, *Genesis 1–11*, 317; CARR, “Politics,” 585–87.

²⁹ Andreas SCHÜLE, *Der Prolog der hebräischen Bibel: Der literar- und theologiegesehichtliche Diskurs der Urgeschichte (Genesis 1–11)* (ATANT 86; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2006), 171–72.

³⁰ Erhard BLUM, “Die Stimme des Autors in den Geschichtsüberlieferungen des Alten Testaments,” in *Historiographie in der Antike* (ed. Klaus-Peter Adam; BZAW 373; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 107–29, here 113.

³¹ Cf. CARR, *Writing*, 30; SCHÜLE, *Prolog*, 171.

³² Cf. BLUM, “Gottesunmittelbarkeit,” 19; IDEM, “Stimme,” 112–13; SCHÜLE, *Prolog*, 173.

Because the Greek is unable to duplicate the Hebrew wordplay of $\Psi\text{אי} - \text{השן}$ in v. 23, it is omitted in the LXX.³³ The word ἀνῆρ (v. 23) is in v. 24 substituted for ἄνθρωπος ,³⁴ the standard translation for אדם , “human,” and is followed by a possessive pronoun: “She is called woman because she was taken from *her* husband.”³⁵

Concerning the MT of 2:22–24, it must be assumed that narrators or compilers used traditional material to integrate their opus into the stream of tradition and to legitimize it with recourse to literary standards and conventions.³⁶ Furthermore, the etiology in v. 24 introduces a new textual understanding: the aphorism in v. 24 reinforces the naming and rating of the woman (v. 23) but leads to a new statement, pointing out the ideal relationship between man and woman. The LXX emphasizes the MT by using the word ἄνθρωπος (instead of $\text{ἀνῆρ} - \text{אי}$), which applies the equality of the first human couple to all humankind. The creation narrative ends with a final statement of the narrator.³⁷ The addition of שניהם ³⁸ at the end of the verse highlights not only the connection to v. 25 but also the unity or the equal standing of man and woman. In terms of the whole composition, it is worth mentioning that a tightness is introduced as a result of v. 24. This tightness points out the ideal relationship of the couple, derived from the redefinition of interpersonal relationships that appears in the curses and in real life. Genesis 2:24 also serves to link the creation and paradise narratives.

Verse 25 introduces a new passage that includes the unity of man and woman retrospectively in its use of שניהם (cf. already v. 24 in LXX). Semanti-

³³ The result of this translation is that the justified $\text{כי} / \text{ὅτι}$ remains unexplained (cf. RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 71; BRAYFORD, *Genesis*, 234). Therefore the pun is reintroduced in the neologism ἀνδρίς , which corresponds to ἀνῆρ , “man,” by Symmachus.

³⁴ LXX has three of names for man: ἄνθρωπος ; Adam as proper noun (undetermined; see Gen 2:16, 19–25 etc.; cf. RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 50); and ἀνῆρ .

³⁵ Translated by WEVERS, *Notes*, 34.

³⁶ Cf. Jeffrey TIGAY, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 162–63; Tigay describes the textual growth of the epic as a “gradual progression of the transmission process ... from free adaptation of sources to minimal adaptation” (IDEM, “Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives,” in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 21–52, esp. 44–45); cf. Claus WILCKE, “Formale Gesichtspunkte in der sumerischen Literatur,” in *Sumerological Studies in Honour of Thorkild Jacobsen on his Seventieth Birthday*, June 7, 1974 (AS 20; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1976), 205–316. See further TIGAY, *Evolution*, 40–44, 248–49; VAN DER TOORN, *Scribal Culture*, 125–30.

³⁷ WEVERS, *Notes*, 35. An insertion is presented by the Syr., *Tg. Neof.*, and Sam., which is not commented upon by RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 72; BRAYFORD refers to the Platonic idea of original androgyny of humans (Genesis, 235).

³⁸ The reconstructed quotation of Gen 2:24 in 4Q416 III, 1 [+ 4Q418 X, 5] does not show space enough for the addition; cf. J. STRUGNELL et al., *Sapiential Texts, Part 2: Cave 4.XXIV* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 125.

cally as well as conceptually, this passage also looks ahead to ch. 3 (see ערום, *infra*).

Another inconsistency can be seen in 3:20: After the curses,³⁹ a new topic follows, namely, the naming of the woman. Verse 20 seems misplaced and appears to fit better at the end of the anthropogony. Again, there is a wordplay (כל-חיה – חיה) that serves the purpose of a name etiology. It should be noted that this wordplay is not only mentioned but also intensified in the LXX (Ζωή, μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ζώοντων): the omitted finite verb form in the Greek translation might be intended to generalize the statement in a nominal, mnemotechnic verse. According to such a reading, the woman becomes “die Frau als Leben schlechthin zum überzeitlichen Prinzip.”⁴⁰

H. Seebass makes a suggestion about the compositional function of 3:20 that implies narrative consistency. He is of the opinion that the function of the verse is to connect 2:18–25 with 3:1–21 and to point to 4:1. After the intimate relationship between the humans (שנייהם in 2:25; 3:7) has been destroyed by the man’s subterfuge (3:12) and God’s judgement (3:14–19), 3:20 deals with the positive progress of human life despite the upcoming transformations.⁴¹

What follows is the motif of clothing in 3:21. This motif must be seen in connection with 3:7; 2:25 and before the last passage, which deals with the sending and the banishment from the garden, finishes the narration with a double inclusion. J.-L. Ska emphasizes that the verbs שָׁלַךְ and גָּרַשׁ in vv. 23–24 are not used as synonyms describing a double expulsion but rather have a climactic character. The verses explain the plot in two different perspectives: while Gen 3:23 confirms the destination of the humans – see the inclusion with 2:7 – v. 24 connects the loss of the garden with consequences for the relationship with God.⁴²

In sum, the Greek translation is not interested in harmonizing inconsistencies, which are the result of the use of etiological sayings. Likewise, in the Greek translation, Gen 2:23–24 and 3:20 stick out as traditional elements. Beyond clear cross-references in Gen 2 and 3, both narrative traditions (i.e., the

³⁹ Concerning the curses, see WITTE, *Urgeschichte*, 87, 162–63, who defends the unity of the passage (without 3:14a and 18b as redactional insertions that refer to Gen 1:25, 29); cf. ARNETH, *Adams Fall*, 98–117, defending a post-P dating of the additions.

⁴⁰ RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 98; cf. BRAYFORD, *Genesis*, 245–46; LEVIN considers 3:20–21 to be the original “proto-Yahwistic” end of the anthropogony (cf. 2:19, 20, 22), which forms a bridge to 4:1 in the final text (Jahwist, 83–84; cf. WITTE, *Urgeschichte*, 156, with n. 26).

⁴¹ See BLUM, “Gottesunmittelbarkeit,” 24: “Der Mensch *kann* erst hier seine Frau als Mutter aller Lebendigen bezeichnen, weil er es erst seit den Gottesworten verstehen kann. Und er verleiht den Eva-Namen *gerade* hier, weil dieser Name gegenüber den vorausgehenden Todesworten die Zukunfts- und Lebensperspektive der neuen Existenz zum Ausdruck bringt.”

⁴² Cf. SKA, “Genesis 2–3,” 13, citing Blum and others. In contrast ARNETH, *Adams Fall*, 140–47, definitely points out the correspondence to Gen 2:8, 15; 3:22–23 but considers the verse as a later addition (cf. 2:10–15; pp. 134–35). See *supra*, nn. 30–32.

creation and the paradise narratives) are connected by the bridge verse 2:25 in both MT and LXX. Formally, it is striking that the oldest Greek sources attached Gen 2:25 to 3:1–24.⁴³ In the Hebrew manuscripts, in contrast, the verse forms the end of Gen 2.⁴⁴ This phenomenon might testify to an older Hebrew text tradition than the one that is presented in the MT. In this older text tradition, Gen 2:25 might be a fitting prelude to the story that follows. Further, it might also highlight an incoherence in the bridge verse, which superficially combines the “creation account” with the rest of the story.

In the preceding discussion of the origins, composition, and interpretation of Gen 2–3, the editorial bridge verse in Gen 2:25 has not been the center of attention.⁴⁵ In the following part, I will examine not only the verse’s relevance for intratextual and intertextual observations but also its impact on the understanding of the whole narrative. The focus of the discussion will be the topos of nakedness. As does Carr,⁴⁶ I will emphasize the development from intimacy to alienation as a central pattern of the narrative. This development takes place in the motifs of shame, hiding, and blaming (see 3:8–13).

2) *The Bridge Verse 2:25 as a Key for the Global Comprehension of Genesis 2–3*

Genesis 3:1 can be seen as a classical element of a Hebrew narrative.⁴⁷ Contentwise, the verse refers back to the creation of the animals (2:18–20). In light of the scene of enlightenment (3:7) and the scene in which the humans receive clothing from God before their expulsion (3:21), Gen 2:25 seems to connect the topic of the creation with the topic of temptation in Gen 3:1. Benno Jacob interprets 3:21 as

Schlüssel zur ganzen Paradiesgeschichte. Die Bekleidung ist mehr als Schutz gegen Kälte oder eine Zier. Sie ist das erste und unerläßliche Merkmal einer menschlichen Gesellschaft und für das sittliche Gefühl das Zeichen, das den Menschen äußerlich vom Tier un-

⁴³ WEVERS, Notes, 36; BRAYFORD, Genesis, 236; more carefully, RÖSEL, Übersetzung, 72, because grammatically *ðé* in 3:1 introduces a new paragraph. See ARNETH, Adams Fall, 120–22, defending the beginning of the narrative at 2:25 for compositional reasons.

⁴⁴ WEVERS, Notes, 36.

⁴⁵ Cf. SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 33, and ARNETH, Adams Fall, 120–22.

⁴⁶ *Supra*, n. 16.

⁴⁷ Cf. the grammatical analysis of Walter GROSS, “Syntaktische Erscheinungen alt-hebräischer Erzählungen,” in Congress Volume: Vienna, 1980 (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 32; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 131–45, esp. 140–41, who argues that the form of the verb *w-x qatal* provides background information that introduces the story (or at least this paragraph). But the construction can also be a cross-reference to the animals (2:16–17), which makes it possible that the story begins in 2:25; cf. Michaela BAUKS, *Die Welt am Anfang: Zum Verhältnis von Vorwelt und Weltentstehung in Gen 1 und in der altorientalischen Literatur* (WMANT 74; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997), 80, with nn. 98–99, 85 (and bibliography).

terscheidet. Rang und Würde werden durch Unterschiede in und an der Kleidung kenntlich gemacht, daher die Würde selbst als Kleid bezeichnet werden kann.⁴⁸

By referring to the importance of the motif of nakedness and clothing for the whole composition, Jacob has pointed out an important aspect of the narrative. However, his sequential reading of Gen 2–3 has forced a moralistic understanding of the narrative. Because in the context of a primeval narrative (“Urstandserzählung”) the word “nakedness” is used in connection with the word “shame” or “dishonor,” a sexual (or moralistic) connotation seems inevitable at first glance. At the beginning of the narrative, the human couple is not aware of their sexuality, which is the reason why they do not feel ashamed of their nakedness.⁴⁹ The connection between sexuality and the divine prohibition to eat from the tree of knowledge (Gen 2:16–17) seems to be inevitable. After man and woman had eaten from the tree, they realized that they were naked and tried to cover their nakedness with the much-cited fig leaf (3:7).

However, there are not sufficient reasons for a sexualized reading. The claim that there might be a relation between being naked and feeling ashamed⁵⁰ (בוש, *hitpa'el*) is not convincing. It is doubtful that reciprocity is indicated by שנייהם, which emphasizes the unity of man and woman. Still, בוש in the *hitpa'el* indicates a simple reflexive use of the verb.⁵¹ Likewise, the

⁴⁸ Benno JACOB, *Genesis* (Stuttgart: Calwer 2000), 124; cf. Friedrich HARTENSTEIN, “Und sie erkannten, dass sie nackt waren ...” (Gen 3,7): Beobachtungen zur Anthropologie der Paradieserzählung,” *EvT* 65 (2005): 277–93.

⁴⁹ Cf. WESTERMANN, *Genesis* 1–11, 331; Alexandra GRUND, “Und sie schämten sich nicht ...” (Genesis 2,25): Zur alttestamentlichen Anthropologie der Scham im Spiegel von Genesis 2–3,” in *Was ist der Mensch, dass du seiner gedenkst?* (Psalm 8,5): Aspekte einer theologischen Anthropologie (ed. M. Bauks, K. Liess, and P. Riede; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2008), 115–22, here 119 with n. 33 (with bibliography).

⁵⁰ The combination of nakedness and shame occurs in Gen 2:25; Isa 20:4; 47:3; Mic 1:8, 11; Nah 3:5 in a broader semantic context; cf. Victor P. HAMILTON, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990), 181 n. 14.

⁵¹ For the discussion of a reciprocal or reflexive sense of the verb, see Jack M. SASSON, “*w'elō' yitbōšāšū* (Gen 2,25) and Its Implications,” *Bib* 66 (1985): 418–21, saying that the “translation implies the pair did not have the potential to find blemishes with each other because they did not perceive anatomical, sexual, or role distinctions within the species” (420). He translates: “They did not embarrass each other” (419–20); cf. HAMILTON, *Genesis*, 181; Bruce K. WALTKE and Michael P. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 431. Others prefer a simple reflexive comprehension; cf. Paul JOÜON, “Notes de lexicographie hébraïque,” *Bib* 6 (1926): 74–75 (cf. the ancient versions). He argues that the *hitpa'el* is a reflexive conjugation of the intensive verb stem and that the sole example for this use of *hitpa'el* with reciprocal meaning is testified for the verb רעה (often + פנים). Cf. the study by Hans-Peter ADAM, who puts the focus on a change of status (deprecativ connotation) of *hitpa'el* (without mention of בוש): “A (Socio-) Demonstrative Meaning of the Hitpa'el in Biblical Hebrew,” *ZAH* (forthcoming); thanks to Udo Rüterswörden for the hint and to the author, who made the paper accessible to me before it was published.

fact that in figurative speech the verb ידע (“to know, to realize”) may stand for the act of sexual intercourse⁵² is not sufficient to prove a connection between the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and sexuality in Gen 2–3.⁵³ To put the focus on sexuality leads to an inappropriate, narrow reading of the narrative.⁵⁴ In Gen 2–3, sexuality and the knowledge of good and evil do not have anything to do with each other.⁵⁵

Gen 2:25 is the first and the only verse that describes the state of the human beings in the garden before the “fall.” Hence, nakedness and the fact of not feeling ashamed are highlighted.⁵⁶

Grammatically, Gen 2:25 refers to the foreground of the narrative, as the *wayyiqtol* form of הָיָה shows. The result is that Gen 2:25 introduces a qualified description of the human.⁵⁷ In a subsequent parenthesis in 3:1, the snake is introduced (*w-x hyh NS*).⁵⁸ In the temptation scene, the snake continues the plot with another *wayyiqtol*, “and it spoke: ...,” which introduces the direct speech.

The function of Gen 2:25 is to prepare for the reversal in Gen 3:7 (the humans’ realization that they were naked, as a consequence of the realization of good and evil). Although the curses at the end of the text (Gen 3:14–16) indicate a reduction of the paradisiacal state, they are ambivalent. The reason is that, on the one hand, there is the effort and the pain of life, but on the other

⁵² Not until Gen 4:1 is the sexual relationship of the couple explicitly mentioned. However, this relationship is presumed in the traditional name etiology, 3:20, when the man names the woman “mother of life,” corresponding to the curses. The relationship of sexual intercourse for ידע is often deduced from 1 Sam 19:35–36 (Barsillai misses תַּעֲרֶיךָ in the last years of his life, v. 36); cf. Dirk U. ROTTZOLL, “Die Schöpfungs- und Fallerzählung in Gen 2f., Teil 1: Die Fallerzählung (Gen 3),” ZAW 109 (1997): 481–99, esp. 486–87, with reference to Diethelm MICHEL, “Ihr werdet sein wie Gott: Gedanken zur Sündenfallgeschichte in Genesis 3 (1988),” in IDEM, *Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte alttestamentlicher Texte* (ed. A. Wagner et al.; TB 93; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007), 93–115, esp. 101–2; recently GERTZ, “Adam,” 235, and KÜBEL, *Metamorphosen*, 161. But this reading is contested by SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 27–28; GRUND, “Scham,” 118.

⁵³ Cf. ARNETH, *Adams Fall*, 126–27, concerning the discovery of the ethical-religious personality; cf. GRUND, “Scham,” 116–17.

⁵⁴ Critically CARR, “Politics,” 588; SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 27–28, with n. 39.

⁵⁵ Cf. Umberto CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Part I: From Adam to Noah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998), 137.

⁵⁶ SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 33; IDEM, “Loss of Immortality,” 60–61; see also JACOB, *Genesis*, 123–24, who, however, came to other conclusions; further Hermann GUNKEL, *Genesis* (3rd ed.; HKAT I/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 14–15; differently WESTERMANN, *Genesis* 1–11, 318.

⁵⁷ Cf. Rüdiger BARTELMUS, *HYH: Bedeutung und Funktion eines hebräischen “Allerweltswortes”* (ATSAT 17; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1982), 120–23, 137–38 (esp. Gen 2:25 and 3:1); cf. BAUKS, *Welt am Anfang*, 71 n. 40, 73–91.

⁵⁸ Differently, GROSS, “Syntaktische Erscheinung,” 139–41. According to Gross, the function of הָיָה in 3:1 lies in background information about the past, without determining if it is before or simultaneous to the preceding foreground (141).

hand, they have gained insight into the knowledge of good and evil.⁵⁹ This ambiguity characterizes the signification of בּוֹשׁ, describing the state of being ashamed as something that belongs to a social but not to a moral category.⁶⁰ Because it is generally agreed that nudity is a symbol of a particular social status such as captivity or poverty, the state of not being ashamed circumscribes a suspended social distinction. “They were not ashamed” means that the ranking between creature and creator is not yet delimited.

3) Genesis 2:25 MT in Its Closer Context

According to Carr, Gen 2:19–23 should be considered to be attempted solutions.⁶¹ After the first attempt, the creation of animals as helpers in the garden, failed, the second attempt, the creation of woman, was successful and resulted in the celebration of the woman (2:23). The undifferentiated human being becomes now two individual human beings, אִישׁ – אִיִּשָּׁה, “man and woman.” The man is not called אִישׁ in the rest of the narrative (with the exception of 2:24; 3:6). The narrative of creation ends with an etiological epilogue (2:24). Subsequently, the focus turns to the garden story, with the thematic profile of v. 25. Carr considers the verse to be a “later redactional extension [which] depicts [the humans] as naïve and childlike before the expulsion from the garden.”⁶²

On a purely linguistic level, the text gets a special connotation from the pun on עָרוֹם, “naked” (2:25) and עָרוֹם, “crafty, prudent,” which is used as an attribute of the snake in the following verse (Gen 3:1).

Most translations of the Bible translate עָרוֹם with the sense of “smart” or “intelligent” (KJV: “subtle”; NRSV: “crafty”), which is actually a secondary meaning. Proverbs⁶³ in particular contains many examples of positive statements about the cleverness of wise men.⁶⁴ Furthermore, the story of David us-

⁵⁹ Cf. SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 33.

⁶⁰ Gordon J. WENHAM, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987), 71. He proposes to translate psychologically with “they were unabashed” or “they were not disconcerted” and underlines further that the verb “does not carry the overtones of personal guilt that English ‘shame’ includes. Hebrew can speak of ‘shame’ triggered by circumstances completely extrinsic to the speaker.” For a semantic analysis, cf. Michaela BAUKS, “Nacktheit und Scham in Gen 2–3,” in *Zur Kulturgeschichte der Scham* (ed. Michaela Bauks and Martin F. Meyer; Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2010), 3–8.

⁶¹ CARR, “Politics,” 584–85.

⁶² CARR, “Politics,” 582.

⁶³ Cf. Gerhard VON RAD, *Weisheit in Israel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), 116–17; cf. Herbert NIEHR, “עָרוֹם, ‘ārûm,” *ThWAT* 6:387–92, esp. 388, 390.

⁶⁴ Again, the snake’s intelligence is understood as contra divine wisdom and the snake is interpreted as the incarnation of the Egyptian god Renenetet (cf. Manfred GÖRG, “Die ‘Sünde’ Salomos,” *BN* 16 (1981): 42–59, esp. 50–53, and NIEHR, “‘ārûm,” 389.

es עָרוֹם in a different, but not a negative, sense.⁶⁵ The LXX shows that Gen 3:1 is disambiguated, but in a positive way. The comparative has been changed into the superlative and instead of the standard translation for עָרוֹם, πανούργος, “smart,” the word φρόνιμος appears with an absolutely positive connotation.⁶⁶ That implies that the Greek translators understood this part in a positive way.

The pun, including two homonymous adjectives,⁶⁷ leads to the connection of nakedness with wisdom. The Greek text, unable to copy the pun, underlies the sapiential meaning because of the diction of φρόνιμος. Therefore, the verse implies not only the aspect of shame but also a further aspect that is dealt with in v. 7: “Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made loincloths for themselves.”

The first step toward realizing the distinction between good and evil refers to the humans’ own nakedness. As explained above, in the Old Testament, nakedness does not stand for sexual shame or any kind of individual feeling but rather for a symbol of social ranking or vulnerability.⁶⁸ So, one could interpret the verse as saying that the human couple realize that they have become vulnerable.⁶⁹ The serpent’s promise, “you will be like God,” is understood in another way.⁷⁰ It seems that for Eve, knowledge is more important than anything else (3:6). And when they have achieved knowledge, both man and woman recognize their difference from God. They realize the ambivalence of human existence. While in the original state the human beings live in a kind of cocoon (called paradise), they gain autonomy from their creator and progress because of the so-called fall. The knowledge gained is a reduced one. By the use of a detailed description of the tree in Gen 2:9, the LXX has already prepared us for disappointment concerning the knowledge gained after eating of the forbidden tree. In this description, knowledge is limited to “what is to be known of good and evil,” instead of an absolute knowledge restricted to God.⁷¹

⁶⁵ See SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 34–35, and NIEHR, “*‘ārūm*,” 389. Schmid points out the dubiousness of the snake in Gen 3:1, but does not discern a clear pejorative importance of the adjective in this place.

⁶⁶ Gen 41:33, 39; cf. RÖSEL, Übersetzung, 90; the supposition that LXX has introduced a pejorative reading is incorrect (so NIEHR, “*‘ārūm*,” 392).

⁶⁷ For this reason, 2:25 uses עָרוֹם / *pl.* עָרוֹמִים and not the more common form עִירָם (cf. 3:7, 10, 11).

⁶⁸ See HARTENSTEIN, “Und sie erkannten,” 286–87.

⁶⁹ It is interesting that the passion or the greed of the woman does not apply to the other human but rather to the tree of knowledge, which means that a term that does actually have a sexual connotation is interpreted in a sapiential way.

⁷⁰ The LXX mentions the plural “gods” and refers to hypostasy.

⁷¹ From the perspective of a synchronic reading of Gen 1–3, the concept of *imago Dei* rather echoes a particular correspondence between the state of the human being and the state of God; cf. KRÜGER, “Sündenfall,” 97.

But what does the expression “feel shame” in 2:25 refer to? In fact, the word “shame” itself is not repeated within the text. What does appear in the text is the *sensation* of feeling ashamed. This is evident not in the use of fig leaves as a preliminary costume (3:7) but rather in the following verses (3:8–12). The human beings hide themselves from God (3:8) and when he confronts them, they explain their hiding with the anxiety about their nakedness (3:10). After that, God asks where their new knowledge comes from. Why does the human being suddenly know about his nakedness? Once again, the translation “vulnerability” fits and makes sense. When God confronts the human being with the responsibility for his deeds, the human being responds with a subterfuge, namely with an accusation, which thereby emphasizes the ambivalence of his deeds: He turns out to be unable to differentiate between good and evil because he does not really understand what has happened to him. He no longer feels confident of his status. It is interesting that the word “shame” or “feeling ashamed” has been replaced here by the word “fear” or “anxiety” (ירא). Both words refer to the same anthropological phenomenon of imminent loss of honour or, to express it in the terminology of the primeval history, of being ashamed.⁷²

After the quantum jump the human being has made, he seems to be aware of the ambivalence of reality, which leads to anxiety.⁷³ His previously reputable but now fallen position⁷⁴ is emphasized, but it seems as if the feeling of shame is equal to the anxiety of vulnerability.⁷⁵ This would mean that the upcoming shame refers to knowledge, rather than primeval nakedness, as an ambivalent sensation.

Notably, at the end of the episode, God himself made clothes for the human beings, after the curses and before he banished them from the garden (3:21). Here we can also find an implicit pun (an assonance) on the word בוש,

⁷² Cf., for the concept, Jan ASSMANN, *Herrschaft und Heil: Politische Theologie in Ägypten, Israel und Europa* (Munich: Beck, 2000), 133–34.

⁷³ Differently, SCHÜLE, *Prolog*, 175, who sets the development of the awareness of shame parallel to physicality (see also p. 356). Additionally, the sense of responsibility develops in the text. In my view, the text does not allow that kind of interpretation because בוש is not mentioned again in ch. 3.

⁷⁴ Cf. Horst SEEBASS, “בוש *bôš*,” *ThWAT* 1:568–80, esp. 571; BAUKS, “Nacktheit,” 3–7.

⁷⁵ Cf. SCHÜLE, *Prolog*, 177: “Eigentümlich an Gen 3 ist, dass das positive Bild menschlicher Weisheit in seinen unterschiedlichen Facetten durchweg vor dem Hintergrund dessen entworfen wird, inwiefern die Menschen sie noch unvollkommen besitzen oder welchen Preis sie dafür bezahlen müssen. [Denn:] Zum einen gibt die göttliche Weisheit dem Menschen immer mehr vor, als dieser – der Geschöpf und eben nicht Gott ist – zu realisieren in der Lage ist. Die Weisheit wird dem Menschen notwendig zur Anfechtung, weil er hinter ihr zurückbleibt. Daran schließt weiterhin die Frage an, wie der Mensch eigentlich damit umgeht, dass er gemessen an der Weisheit, die er hat, unvollkommen ist ... und mit eben diesem Problem ist der Mensch tatsächlich auf sich gestellt.”

“be ashamed” (2:25) and לָבַשׁ “to clothe someone” (3:21).⁷⁶ As for the word “shame” in 2:25, the words “to clothe someone” do not refer to the physical and naked appearance of the human being but rather to his ambivalent status, his knowledge of his fallibility and his vulnerability. In a last act, God gives him a “protective shield,” the first cultural achievement,⁷⁷ which demonstrates God’s indomitable sense of solidarity with the humans.

To speak etiologically, the narrative does not develop the evolution of human consciousness of sexuality. The main focus of Gen 2–3 is the awareness of the difference between creature and God.⁷⁸ In this process, the serpent plays the role of a *deus ex machina* in a formal way. Having gained knowledge before human beings, the serpent is presented as a more-lucid character. In the development of sapiential patterns (the motif of the tree of knowledge; the pun עָרִים / עָרוּם), Gen 2:25 is the key verse, the reversal point and the engine of the story. In 2:25 and 3:7, man and woman are presented as a unity (שְׁנֵיהֶם). The first moment of disunity appears in 3:12, which is about Adam’s evasion. The main opposition becomes visible in 3:8, as the human beings feel ashamed first in front of God and only secondarily in front of each other. Genesis 2–3 may be read as an etiology of human shame in front of God, a story of alienation between creator and creature.

In the preceding part, I have sought to clarify the ways in which Gen 2–3 can be interpreted when we start our reading with the verse linking the two-fold narrative of anthropogony and paradise lost. The function of 2:25 is striking because this verse is the hermeneutical melting pot for the whole story. In the following part, I will examine the ways in which the deuterocanonical literature of the Second Temple period interprets the narrative. We have already seen that the Greek translation was able to manage some incoherencies with little expansions, resulting in a better linking of divergent motifs. I am convinced that the later reception reflects comprehensive strategies that were commonly used at the time of the formation of biblical literature. The addi-

⁷⁶ HARTENSTEIN, “Und sie erkannten,” 283; cf. KÜBEL, *Metamorphosen*, 82–86.

⁷⁷ Cf. Gen 4:15 and SCHMID, “Unteilbarkeit,” 35–36.

⁷⁸ Knowledge and eternal life are divine characteristics from which human beings are excluded, which is emphasized by the narrator in v. 22 by an almost royal discourse (see Horst SEEBASS, *Genesis I: Urgeschichte Gen 1,1–11,26* [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996], 130) or in a kind of internal monologue (cf. Gen 1:26). James BARR, *The Garden Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), esp. 57–61, points out that 3:22 means that only the first divine characteristic was attained. Due to the fact that with the new knowledge, immortality was almost gained, the expulsion from Eden became inevitable (4). Differently Bernard M. LEVINSON, “The Seductions of the Garden and the Genesis of Hermeneutics as Critique,” in *The Right Chorale: Studies in Biblical Law and Interpretation* (FAT 54; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 40–47. For him Gen 2–3 is “a sharp polemic against Near Eastern traditions that identify ‘life’ with immortality. . . . Instead life can only be gained through moral and historical action in the community” (46–47).

tions, omissions, and transpositions of motifs from one context to another must be regarded not only as testimony for a new stream of tradition but also as an essential part of the transmission of traditional cultural and theological items.

II. Main Topics in the First Reception of Genesis 2–3

When the Torah acquired canonical status during the Hellenistic Age, the narratives and legal texts needed to be interpreted. But the texts were not only quoted and then explained, as is the case in the commentaries on prophetic texts (*pesharim*); rather, we find interpreters' allusions to the biblical text in the process of explaining their teachings. It is striking that the story of the "fall" was not very important or influential in the Second Temple period.⁷⁹ Apart from the Enochic literature and the book of *Jubilees*,⁸⁰ we have only a few examples of rewritten versions of Gen 2–3 and even fewer sources dealing with our specific topic.⁸¹ M. Bernstein points out that the pattern of the material from Qumran conforms to what we should expect based on other Second Temple literature. It is striking that the topics of creation and the garden of Eden only appear in liturgical, didactic, or legal material and that these topics are insinuated rather than retold.⁸² It seems as if the telling of the story is not the motivating factor *per se* behind the choice of topic. The rewritten texts

⁷⁹ Eibert J. C. TIGCHELAAR, "Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other Texts Found at Qumran)," in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 37–62, esp. 50; cf. Jacques T. A. G. M. VAN RUITEN, "The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature," in *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian traditions* (ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 3; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 34–62, esp. 34, with a list of the allusions to the creation of the human being in the parabiblical texts. Only the rewritten Pentateuch, *Jub.*, and *Gen. Apocr.* count as longer works, but unfortunately the first and the latter do not have transmitted traces before the flood narrative.

⁸⁰ It is possible that the fragmentary text of 1Qap Gen, which starts in cols. V to XXII with the consecutive hebrew letters א, ב, and ג and rewrites Gen 5–15, was originally preceded by fifteen or seventeen sheets dealing with the beginning of Gen; for a discussion, see Florentino GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "Man and Woman: Halakhah based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in LUTTIKHUIZEN, *Paradise Interpreted*, 95–115, esp. 96–97.

⁸¹ See the list of texts in VAN RUITEN, "Creation," 34–35.

⁸² See also Moshe J. BERNSTEIN, "Contours of Genesis: Interpretation at Qumran: Contents, Context, and Nomenclature," in *Studies in Ancient Midrash* (ed. James L. Kugel; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 57–85, who states "that Noah and Abraham are the characters most frequently alluded to, and that the Flood and the Akedah are the most commonly cited incidents. ... Creation and the Garden of Eden appear only in the liturgical, didactic, or legal material and are alluded more than retold" (81).

allude to Genesis in a cursory way or they range in the shape of the canonical text from narrative to commentary, liturgy, or wisdom.

The references to Gen 2–3 are very selective. In the following section, I will examine which patterns are selected and which are not. Further, I consider whether the intratextual interactions of the narrative are reflected in the first reception of Gen 2–3.

1) *Ben Sira*

When Ben Sira retells the creation according to Gen 1–3, he remarks positively that the knowledge of good and evil is a gift of God and that the time of life is limited (Sir 17:1–2; 41:4):

- Sir 17:1 The Lord from the earth created humankind, and makes each person return to earth again.
 2 Limited days of life he gives them, with power over all things else on earth.
 3 He endows them with a strength that befits them; in God's own image he made them.
 4 He puts the fear of humans in all flesh, and allows them power over beasts and birds. ...
 7 With wisdom and knowledge he fills them; good and evil he shows them.
 8 He puts into their hearts the fear of him, showing them the grandeur of his works.⁸³

Verse 7b is definitely an allusion to Gen 2:17 and 3:5, 22, which implies that wisdom and knowledge are not human accomplishments but gifts given from God. Like *imago Dei* (Gen 1:26; cf. Sir 17:3) and *dominium terrae* (Gen 1:28; cf. Sir 17:4), wisdom is seen as a divine order. Death is not a punishment but an anthropological precondition (Gen 2:7, 19; cf. Sir 17:1). Ben Sira records no prohibition and skips the story of the “fall” (+ serpent);⁸⁴ he also avoids the motif of nakedness and shame. He does not know original sin or punishment by imposed mortality. The topic of fear has a positive connotation: as animals fear the human beings, human beings fear God. In 15:14, Ben Sira states “that human beings from the time of their creation have enjoyed freedom of choice”⁸⁵ and attests to a very positive image of the sage.⁸⁶

⁸³ Patrick W. SKEHAN and Alexander DI LELLA, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 276–77, 279 (for the text-critical problems in v. 8b). It is commonly admitted that the book is dated in the first quarter of the second century B.C.E. (*ibid.*, 8).

⁸⁴ Concerning the responsibility of a woman for the entry of the sin in the world, Sir 25:24 is an allusion not to Gen 2–3 but to the wicked woman of Prov 7 (cf. 4Q184); cf. John J. COLLINS, “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 31–32, with reference to John R. LEVISON, “Is Eve to Blame? A Contextual Analysis of Sirach 25:24,” *CBQ* 47 (1985): 617–23. See also SCHÜLE, Prolog, 167–68: “Wo Sirach Weisheit vom Gesetz Gottes her bestimmt sieht, ... beide Größen in Gen 2 + 3 in einen spannungsvollen Gegensatz” treten (cf. the prohibition of 2:17 and the sanction of 3:22).

⁸⁵ For Hebr. אָדָם (cf. Gen 6:5; 8:21), see the commentary of COLLINS, *Interpretations*, 34. On MS A, see SKEHAN and DI LELLA, *Ben Sira*, 267: MS B adds “and he puts him into the

The motif of God endowing the first humans with knowledge and wisdom is also found in several Qumran texts.⁸⁷ The texts point out the God-given knowledge and avoid the pattern of the primordial human's (Adam's) disobedience.⁸⁸ In our context it is striking that the rewritten texts show similar strategies regarding the selection and use of biblical material, a similar interpretative approach, and sometimes a similar poetic style. They have preferences for topics from originally independent verses, as for example marriage practices or the formula of the curses.⁸⁹ In view of the parallels between texts, E. Chazon presumes a kind of "independent retelling ... utilizing exegetical methods and motifs which were commonplace in their cultural milieu."⁹⁰

While additions are often supposed to clarify problems that emerge in the biblical story itself, omissions can attest to a particular point of view in order to serve particular purposes. We can thus speak of "narrative exegesis."⁹¹

hand of his kidnappers," but di Lella omits this verse (verbal resemblance of 15:14b), which does not make sense in this context; Georg SAUER retains the full text: "Am Anfang, als Gott den Menschen erschuf, gab er ihn hin an die Macht seiner Begierde. Und gab ihn hin an die Macht seines Wollens" (Ben Sirach [ATD.A 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 131).

⁸⁶ Concerning 4Q416 2 III, 15–IV, 13, with some very fragmentary references to Gen 2:18–20, 24 and 3:16, see Michaela BAUKS, "Knowledge, Nakedness, and Shame in the Primeval History of the Hebrew Bible and in Several Texts from the Judean Desert," in *The Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Kristin de Troyer, Armin Lange, and Shani Tzoref; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [in press]).

⁸⁷ In the festival prayer 4QDibHam (4Q504) 8 I, 4–14 and the fragmentary 4QMedCreat (4Q303–305); 4QPar of Gen and Exod (4Q422) 1 I, 6–12. Only the first and the third text refer to the prohibition that led to the fall; cf. COLLINS, *Interpretations*, 35–36, and Esther Glickler CHAZON, "The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays* (ed. Judith Frishman and Lucas van Rompay; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 13–24, esp. 15. Cf. also 4QInstruction (4Q423 1, 2 I); cf. BAUKS, "Knowledge."

⁸⁸ TIGCHELAAR, "Eden," 49–51, 56–57, however, finds this pattern in 4Q303 (4QMedCreat A), 4Q305 (4QMedCreat C; cf. Collins, above, n. 87) and in 4Q422 (4QPar of Gen and Exod, frag. I), 4Q504 (4QDibHam^a) frag. 8, recto, and 4Q423 (4QInstruction^c) frag. 2, 1–4 (for the latter texts, see also CHAZON, "Creation and Fall," 23–24). Tigchelaar qualifies these texts as reworkings and not as rewritings of the biblical account: "i.e. texts which are based upon biblical texts, but have revised the text of what we now consider to be the Bible to a smaller ('re-worked') or larger ('re-written') extent" (49–50).

⁸⁹ Cf. 4QInstruction, 4Q416 2 III, 19–IV, 6 (see BAUKS, "Knowledge").

⁹⁰ CHAZON, "Creation and Fall," 23.

⁹¹ Ida FRÖHLICH, "'Narrative Exegesis' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther Glickler Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 82; cf. George J. BROOKE, "Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts of Qumran," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 201–20, esp. 212–13.

2) *Book of Jubilees*

The best example for rewriting Gen 1–3 can be found in the book of *Jubilees*,⁹² which shows the connection between nakedness and shame in a particular way. In *Jubilees*, nakedness is an important pattern for apologetic reasons, related to disapproval of the Hellenistic competitions held in the gymnasium constructed by the high priest Jason at Jerusalem. Neither the context of sexuality nor the context of failure is the focus of the text. We have instead a shift to cult and rules of purity, which refers to the topic of the adapted approximation to God.⁹³

Jubilees is an excellent example of the rewritten Bible,⁹⁴ as it retells the biblical account from the creation to Sinai. Like a synthesis of Gen 1 and 2, *Jub.* 2–3 integrates contradictions in the two biblical accounts of creation either with important omissions (cf. Gen 2:4–17; 3:8–13) or with interpreting additions and rearrangements (cf. *infra*).

After the animals, Adam is created as male and female on the sixth day of the first week (*Jub.* 2:15). On the six days of the second week, all animals are brought to Adam in order to be named by him (3:1–3). Subsequently, the woman's creation is told a second time (3:4–5, 8 as explanation; cf. 2:14).⁹⁵ The notice of her creation is introduced by the following words: "He knew her

⁹² The Hebrew original was translated into Greek, which became the basis for the Latin and Ethiopic versions. Only the Ethiopic version is complete; cf. James C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Scholars Press, 2001), 13–17, for the textual history; cf. Klaus BERGER, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSRZ II/4; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981), 285–98. *Jub.* was probably written after the accession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the inception of the Maccabean Revolt (James C. VANDERKAM, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* [Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977], 246). See Jacques T. A. G. M. VAN RUITEN, "Eden and the Temple," in Luttikhuisen, *Paradise Interpreted*, 63–94, with a helpful synopsis of Gen 2–3 and *Jub.* 3.

⁹³ Historically, this concept would clearly dissociate from Hellenistic rituals in the gymnasia (cf. *Jub.* 3:31: "For this reason it has been commanded in the tablets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves"). Cf. BERGER, *Jubiläen*, 336 ad 16a; 337f ad 27c; and VAN RUITEN, "Eden," 78, with reference to 1 Macc 1:13–14; 2 Macc 4:13–15; VANDERKAM, *Book of Jubilees*, 20–21, 31–32; and IDEM, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 245.

⁹⁴ James C. VANDERKAM, "Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees," in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (ed. James C. VanderKam; JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 276–304, esp. 277 n. 6, with references to Geza VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2nd ed.; SPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1983), 67–126. VANDERKAM gives a definition: "Works of Rewritten Bible are very closely related to the biblical text which they represent, but they do not explain it ... in commentary fashion – that is, by clearly separating the biblical text from its exposition" ("Biblical Interpretation," 297).

⁹⁵ VanderKam points out that the woman was created with the man but rests "latent" – so the man called her rib; cf. IDEM, *Book of Jubilees*, 30; cf. VAN RUITEN, "Eden," 74–75, with n. 16.

and then said to her: ‘This is now bone ...’ (3:6). Although sexuality is implied from the beginning, the first sexual intercourse takes place before the human couple enters the garden in the first week and is also a matter of discussion after they have left the garden.⁹⁶

It is striking that the statement about nakedness and shame (Gen 2:25) is omitted after an almost literal quotation of Gen 2:23–24. Instead of the quotation of Gen 2:25, the text continues with a reflection on the arrival in the garden: because of their impurity, both man and woman are brought into the garden of Eden only after a short period of time.

The garden of Eden is described as “the holiest in the entire earth. And every tree which is planted in it is holy” (3:12). The holiness of the garden demands special purity rules, which are resumed in the following verses: “For this reason the law of these days has been ordained for the one who give birth to a male or a female. She is neither to touch any sacred thing nor to enter the sanctuary until the time when those days for male or female are completed” (3:13–14).⁹⁷ With regard to Lev 12, *Jub.* 3:8–14 describes a first halakah referring to every Jewish woman who gives birth to a child.⁹⁸

The text continues, saying that both man and woman spent seven years working for God in the garden of Eden (3:17). Speaking methodologically, the commentator’s aim was to find an etiological explanation for an unexplained law in Leviticus. The etiology has its roots in the narratives of the creation. Genesis 1–3 as well as Lev 12 are interpreted mutually.⁹⁹

The next section (*Jub.* 3:15–16) is a permutation of an allusion to Gen 2:25:

⁹⁶ Cf. VAN RUITEN, “Eden,” 76–77. It is not convincing that Berger assumes that sexuality is first presupposed in *Jub.* 3:34 (cf. Gen 4:1); BERGER, *Jubiläen*, 339.

⁹⁷ Quoted after VAN RUITEN, “Eden,” esp. 87 (emphasis omitted) on the basis of the translation of the Ethiopic text published by James C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Jubilees I–II* (CSCO 510–511; Leuven: Peeters, 1989). See also Jacques T. A. G. M. VAN RUITEN, *Primaevial History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis I–II in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000), esp. 89–111.

⁹⁸ Cf. 4Q265. Here, the same connection is made between the Eden story and Lev 12; see Esther ESHEL, “Hermeneutical Approaches in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Frishman and van Rompay, *Book of Genesis*, 1–12, esp. 10–11; GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, “Man and Woman,” 111–14.

⁹⁹ For halakhic-etiological exegesis, see ESHEL, “Hermeneutical Approaches,” 10–11, who cites *Jub.* 3:8–14 as an example of a text that has rules from Lev 12 included in its interpretation of Gen 1–3. The aim of the inclusion is to explain the origin of the purification that is required of a parturient after the birth of a child with the preparatory period of Adam and Eve before their entry into the Eden sanctuary.

We gave him work and were teaching him [how] to do everything that was appropriate for working [it]. While he was working [it], *he was naked, but he did not know it nor was he ashamed*. He would keep the garden against birds, animals and cattle.¹⁰⁰

It seems here that nakedness and shame are presented in much the same way as our reading of the MT of Gen 2:25 (“he was naked, but he did not understand it”). *Jubilees* 3:15b implies that the man has control over the animals in the holy place. Adam is described as a protector of the garden, and the idyllic life is interrupted by the serpent (3:17). Unlike the preceding paragraphs, the following statement is a simple quote from the biblical text. 3:21–22 contains a more important amplification:

3:20 So she took some of it and ate [it]. 21 She [Eve] first covered her shame with fig leaves and then gave it to Adam. He ate [it]; his eyes were opened and he saw that he was naked. 22 He took fig leaves and sewed [them]; thus he made himself an apron and covered his shame.¹⁰¹

In *Jub.* 3, nakedness is realized in two steps. First, the woman shows a sensibility for her nakedness. Second, the man follows her example, eats the fruit, and perceives his nakedness as well. After this scene, *Jubilees* omits the passages of the biblical text dealing with human disobedience discovered by God.

In the book of *Jubilees*, the description of the man’s action is more detailed. The more-detailed description corresponds to the more-important role the man has as future priest. *Jubilees* emphasizes that Adam covers his nakedness. In the final scene, God curses not only the serpent but also the man and the woman. Afterwards Adam and Eve get clothes and are banished from the garden. Here, the text is a kind of abstract from the biblical original (*Vorlage*). However, the following paragraph, *Jub.* 3:26–31, contains a large addition:

26 He [God] made clothing out of skins for them, clothed them, [] and dismissed them from the garden of Eden. [] 27 On that day, as he [Adam]¹⁰² was leaving the garden of Eden, he burned incense as a pleasing fragrance – frankincense, galbanum, stacte, and aromatic spices – in the early morning when the sun rose on the day *when he covered his shame*.¹⁰³ On that day the mouths of all the animals, the cattle, the birds, everything that walks and everything that moves about were made incapable of speaking because all of them used to converse with one another with one language and one tongue. 29 And he dismissed from the garden of Eden all the animate beings that were in the garden of Eden. All animate beings were dispersed – each by its kind and each by its nature – into the place[s], which had been created for them. 30 But of all the animals and cattle he permitted Adam alone to cover his shame. 31 For this reason it has been commanded in the tab-

¹⁰⁰ VAN RUITEN, “Creation,” 88 (emphasis added).

¹⁰¹ VAN RUITEN, “Eden,” 89–90 (emphasis added).

¹⁰² Several MSS attest Adam, others a 3ms pronoun. The subject is not evident. For discussion, see BERGER, *Jubiläen*, 337.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 337–38 translates “Blöße” (bareness).

lets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves.¹⁰⁴

The author of *Jubilees* emphasizes the covering of the nakedness (cf. 3:16, 21–22, 30–31). The statement in 3:16 is a modification of Gen 2:25 and refers to Adam alone (“He was naked . . . he was ashamed”). The addition of “but he neither knew it” points out Adam’s innocence regarding his nakedness. This sentence definitely refers to his own nakedness but might also refer to the nakedness of his wife.¹⁰⁵

Jubilees 3:21–22 is a quotation of Gen 3:6–7 containing some modifications. It says that after eating the fruit, the woman first covered her shame and then gave the fruit to Adam. It is only mentioned that the eyes of the man were opened, before “he saw that he was naked and took fig leaves.” The next scene deals with a short version of the curses followed by *Jub.* 3:27–31, which is a second “halakah regarding the covering of nakedness.”¹⁰⁶ The statement in 3:26 gives the impression that the covering of nakedness is related to the departure from the garden.¹⁰⁷ The statement is repeated in 3:30 to distinguish the man from the animals. In an etiological way, *Jub.* 3:31 explains: “For this reason it has been commanded in the tablets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves.” Nakedness becomes a cultural marker.

In the process of rewriting, both additions and omissions are important. The unifying character of omissions aims at harmonizing different traditions. Furthermore, omissions are used to remove the negative connotation of the “fall” and the expulsion in light of the tradition that Eden is God’s sanctuary.¹⁰⁸ *Jubilees* 3 uses parts of the biblical text, especially the topic of nakedness and traditional verses dealing with marriage practices and curses. The additions create a new context that represents a particularly Jewish view.¹⁰⁹ The expansions of extrabiblical passages often have the same authority as biblical sections.¹¹⁰ The bridge verse 2:25 is not attached to the etiologies that

¹⁰⁴ Cf. VAN RUITEN, “Eden,” 92–94 (emphasis added).

¹⁰⁵ In the view of BERGER, *Jubiläen*, 337 ad 21: Adam does not recognize Eve’s nakedness.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. IQS VII, 12 concerning the punishment of nakedness in the community and BERGER, *Jubiläen*, 337 ad 22.

¹⁰⁷ VAN RUITEN, “Eden,” 78, 80; IDEM, *Primaeval History*, 95–98.

¹⁰⁸ See VAN RUITEN, “Eden,” 75–79.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. for details BAUKS, “Knowledge.”

¹¹⁰ E.g., the important role of angelic beings known from the Enochic traditions (infra); cf. VANDERKAM, “Biblical Interpretation,” 299 and 326–31 (with synopsis of the patterns). He gives a series of examples for creative rendering of the biblical account: for solving textual problems, expansions by inserting haggadic and other elements that are drawn from extrabib-

deal with the relationship of man and woman but is interrupted by the halakic additions. Genesis 2:25 introduces the following sequence of eating and the discovery of nakedness.

3) *First Enoch (Book of Watchers)*

The Enochic traditions of *1 Enoch*¹¹¹ focus on the eschatological judgment that will not only separate but also reward the righteous as well as the evil. Furthermore, the traditions deal with admonitions. However, *1 Enoch* is not an example of a rewritten text but rather a reflection on earlier authoritative religious texts that are included in the canon.¹¹²

Although the story of paradise lost (Gen 2–3 MT) is missing in *1 Enoch*, the story of the giants and the daughters of men (Gen 6:1–4) substitutes for the biblical telling of the “fall” somehow (cf. the Shemihazah myth in *1 En.* 6:1–7:1 [4Q201; 202; 204]).¹¹³ While the “fall” in Gen 3 effects the human awareness of knowledge, the “fall of the angels/watchers” in *1 En.* 6–7 effects their physical and lustful cohabitation with human women. As a result it should be said that in Genesis, the “fall” does not result in the development of a moral sense as it does in *1 Enoch*.¹¹⁴ At best, Gen 2–3 can be interpreted as a hidden intertext of *1 En.* 6–7. *Jubilees* 2:2 also knows about the existence of angels, which can be explicitly seen in the plural verbal forms of Gen 1:26 and 3:22–24 and which are deduced from an interpretation of Gen 1:3 as being the “spirit of God.”¹¹⁵ While *1 En.* 6:2 belongs to the watchers’ interven-

tical sources to the scriptural framework; expansive interpretations and sermonic elaborations add the *Tendenz* of the writer.

¹¹¹ Pre-Maccabean paratextual literature, transmitted in Ethiopic, Greek, and Aramaic, dated to the early second century B.C.E. Tigchelaar dates *1 En.* 1–36, on palaeographic evidence, to the beginning of the second century B.C.E. For the several stages of growth, see TIGCHELAAR, *Eden*, 38–39; cf. Loren T. STUCKENBRUCK, “The ‘Angels’ and ‘Giants’ of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections of the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–77, esp. 362–63; and Michael A. KNIBB, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982). Cf. VANDERKAM, “Biblical Interpretation,” 283, with n. 17; 306, with n. 4, 309–26).

¹¹² Cf. VANDERKAM, “Biblical Interpretation,” 277–78, with n. 2.

¹¹³ Cf. 4Q201 III (4QEn^a ar) = 1 En 4:4–8:1; 4Q202 II (4QEn^b ar) = 1 En 5:9–6:4 + 6:7–8:1; 4Q204 II (4QEn^c ar) = 1 En 6:7. For more details, cf. VANDERKAM, “Biblical Interpretation,” 283–86; Michaël LANGLOIS, *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d’Hénoch: Etude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrán (LD; Paris: Cerf, 2008)*.

¹¹⁴ A survey of the topics is presented by VANDERKAM, “Biblical Interpretation,” esp. 283–86; see also William R. G. LOADER, “Attitudes towards Sexuality in Qumran and Related Literature – and the New Testament,” *NTS* 54 (2008): 338–54, who investigates the function of the myth of the watchers as an etiology of wrongdoing resulting from intermarriages.

¹¹⁵ Cf. VANDERKAM, “Biblical Interpretation,” 298.

tion on earth, which has to do with sexual desire, *Jub.* 4:15 and 5:5 explain this intervention as the result of a divine commission that implies a teaching of humans that will degrade. Both violence and evil on earth are explained as having a superhuman cause.¹¹⁶

There is another context in which we can find clear allusions to Gen 2–3: in *1 En.* 32:3–6 and in the narration of Enoch’s cosmic travels (*1 En.* 17:1–36:4).

First Enoch 32:3–6¹¹⁷ reads as follows:

3 I passed by the paradise of righteousness, and I saw from afar trees more plentiful and larger than these trees, differing from those – very large [and] beautiful and glorious and magnificent – and the tree of wisdom,¹¹⁸ whose fruit the holy ones eat and learn great wisdom.

4 That tree is in height like the fir, and its leaves, like those of the carob, and its fruit like the clusters of the vine – very cheerful; and its fragrance penetrates far beyond the tree.

5 Then I said, “How beautiful is the tree and how pleasing in appearance.”

6 Then [Gabriel], the holy angel who was with me, answered, “This is the tree of wisdom from which your father of old and your mother of old, who were before you, ate and learned wisdom. And their eyes were opened and they knew that they were naked [עֵרְשָׁלִיִּי],¹¹⁹ and they were driven from the garden.”¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ VANDERKAM, “Biblical Interpretation,” 329. He underlines that *Jub.* 3:17–29 includes that Adam and Eve fall into sin by eating of the tree.

¹¹⁷ The detail is attested in 4Q206 [4QEn^c ar frag. 3–4]; see BAUKS, “Knowledge.”

¹¹⁸ TIGCHELAAR translates here with “knowledge” (“Eden,” 40); cf. Randy A. ARGALL, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 32–35. He translates in the same way: “and I saw ... the Tree of Wisdom, whose fruit <the holy ones> eat and learn great wisdom” and comments that God gave the angelic beings access to the tree “and, by eating from it, they ‘learn great wisdom’ and communicate this to Enoch. The content of the ‘great wisdom’ then, is the angelic explanations of the other visions” (33).

¹¹⁹ Cf. fragments of the *Tg. Yer.* and *Tg. Neof.* ad Gen 2:25 (and 3:7) and for further remarks, BAUKS, “Knowledge,” n. 57.

¹²⁰ Translation of George W. E. NICKELSBURG, *1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Augsburg: Fortress, 2001), 320 (with underlined words attested in the Qumran manuscripts); cf. Ephraim ISAAC, “1 Enoch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Garden City, 1983), 5–89, esp. 28; TIGCHELAAR, “Eden,” 58–59. Nickelsburg’s commentary is based on the compilation of the Aramaic traditions in 4QEn^c (4Q204) with Greek and Ethiopian additions (concerning the preservation of the Aramaic text, cf. GARCÍA MARTINEZ and TIGCHELAAR, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* vol. I (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 412–21. For the limits of this kind of reconstruction, cf. the review of Michael A. KNIBB, “Interpreting the Book of Enoch,” *JSJ* 33 (2002): 437–50, esp. 442–43. Cf. recently the collation and translation of Michaël LANGLOIS, “*Livre d’Hénoch* (4QEnoch^c ar) 4Q206,” in *La Bibliothèque de Qumran: Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, Vol. 1: Torah – Genèse (ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand, and André Paul; Paris: Cerf, 2008), 67–77, esp. 71 (4Q206 frag. 1 col. XXVII = 1 Enoch 32:3, 6; 33:3–34:1).

The larger context of *1 En.* 28:1–32:2 is an admonition of the sinners and a comforting of the righteous in view of the day of judgment. The last segment of Enoch’s journey is a long introduction that leads to the climax in 32:3–6. This passage also includes a description of the fragrant tree of wisdom or knowledge.¹²¹ The significant difference between *1 Enoch* and Gen 2–3 is that in the former, the tree is not specified as the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Moreover, the tree is interpreted in a positive way. The eating of the tree does not result in death but in great wisdom. As in *Jub.* 3, we do not find any reference to the tree of life (Gen 2:9; 3:22). The tree of life is only mentioned in *1 En.* 24:2–25:7, where it is described as a forbidden tree on the seventh mountain in the northwest that is waiting for the great judgment, after which it will be transplanted to the holy place and will be given to the righteous people. Then, those righteous people will live a long life on earth (*1 En.* 25:4–6).¹²² But in the last vision of Enoch, only the tree of knowledge is mentioned.

In *1 Enoch*, the relationship between knowledge and sin/nakedness/shame is completely omitted.¹²³ The reference to Enoch’s old father and mother, who ate from the tree and gained wisdom, is interpreted positively. The word “nakedness” is only mentioned in a simple quotation from Gen 2–3, without any comment or interpretation. The first human beings had access to knowledge but could still live in the garden. The reasons for being banished are not explained (*1 En.* 32:6).¹²⁴ Enoch, however, has to go to the garden but does not eat from the tree. As a result, great wisdom is given to him by interpreting angels, and Enoch has to write his book to transmit the acquired knowledge to the righteous people (*1 En.* 82:1).¹²⁵

Concerning the positive interpretation of wisdom as a gift from God, *1 Enoch* might be influenced by the second biblical description of paradise in Ezek 28:2–7, 17. There, the king of Tyre has received wisdom from God, but he loses this wisdom as punishment for his arrogance. Furthermore, the topic

¹²¹ So NICKELSBURG, *1 Enoch*, 322–23.

¹²² Cf. n. 119 and the comments of ARGALL, *1 Enoch* and *Sirach*. TIGCHELAAR and others speak about two paradises representing an attempt to harmonize the differing biblical traditions of Gen 2–3, Ezek 28, and Isa 14 (“Eden,” 44).

¹²³ I do not understand why NICKELSBURG speaks in this context of the tree “with which the first parents’ sin is associated” (*1 Enoch*, 327). This is an example of *eisegeisis*.

¹²⁴ The biblical story of the “fall” is another reintroduction into the younger version of Enoch traditions, to *2 Enoch* in the Slavic translation, of a Greek text, situated at Alexandria in the first century C.E., that knew the older Ethiopian *Enoch*. See Christfried BÖTTRICH, *Das slawische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ 5/10; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2003), 811–12, who dated the book to a Jewish-Hellenistic diaspora context in the years before the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem. For the complicated textual transmission of the text see *ibid.*, 788–99.

¹²⁵ Cf. ARGALL, *1 Enoch* and *Sirach*, 34–35.

of sexuality is omitted. Finally, sexuality has been transferred to another context, namely the Shemihazah myth, as an important rewriting of Gen 6:1–4.¹²⁶

III. Reflections on Intratextual Observations in Intertextual Processes

Having compared the MT of Gen 2–3 with the LXX, one crucial point of discussion remains: is the MT of Gen 2–3 a largely unified narrative that includes some fractures as a result of its compilation from traditional topics? The application of literary criticism has led to our identification of some doublets and fractures. Most striking are the formal ruptures created by the etiologies in Gen 2:23–25 and 3:23–24.

The Greek version of Gen 2–3 preserves the verses as more-or-less independent etiological elements without seeking to better integrate them into the flow of the narrative. This kind of integration is realized through the omission of the second mention of Eden in Gen 2:15. Instead, the LXX adds a relative clause concerning the man as created being, which refers back to vv. 8–9 and continues the plot after the garden description of Gen 2:10–14 without interruption. In MT as in LXX, we cannot speak of a repetitive resumption because v. 15 includes a process already in action when the function of the man in the garden is added. The fuzziness of the different trees is focalized in Gen 3:3 LXX on the tree of knowledge. The very relative value of this tree is further anticipated by the addition.

Because puns are a major challenge for translators, it would be difficult to integrate vv. 23–24 into the methodological reflection on the literary growth of the narrative.

The case of Gen 2:25 is mysterious and difficult to evaluate. The Hebrew syntax and the arrangement of the text in some manuscripts relate the verse to Gen 3:1–6, while the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in 3:1 LXX grammatically introduces a new paragraph (see supra n. 43). Verse 25 becomes the reversal point of Gen 2–3.

In what ways was the narrative transformed in the first reception history? M. Bernstein has pointed out a transformation of literary genre: Gen 2–3 has mostly been taken into a liturgical, didactic, or legal context.¹²⁷ In particular, the basic etiological structure that characterizes the biblical narrative gives reasons for doing so. Therefore, it is not surprising that the quotation of Gen

¹²⁶ The relationship of *Jub.* to other apocryphal writings is a main point of discussion. Since Milik, it has largely been assumed that *Jub.* depends on *1 En.* 1–36 and that it is part of the proto-Essene writings and dates prior to the Essene split with the Maccabean rulers. Cf. James VANDERKAM, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” in VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon*, 305–31.

¹²⁷ See above, n. 82.

2:23–24 in *Jub.* 3 is followed by a halakah on purity rules for women, who differ from men in physical disposition and function. Genesis 2 serves as an etiology (*Ursprungsbegründung*) for the legislation, transmitted in Lev 12, which was obligatory in the time of the Second Temple. A second etiology refers to the rejection of nakedness in terms of the cult. In the background, we can see a direct polemic against Hellenistic rites, which were politically enforced in the mid-second century in Jerusalem and finally led to the Maccabean revolt. In *Jub.* 3, the focus is put on Adam's nakedness, with Adam corresponding to the future priest. Nakedness is here related not to the seduction scene but to a legal context: when the human being follows the instructions concerning the ritual performance of a religious sacrifice, he must be dressed (*Jub.* 3:27; cf. Exod 20:26; 28:42). Clothing is one way in which human beings are distinct from animals, but it is also the key qualification that allows human beings to meet God. The fact that man and woman realize their nakedness one after the other leads away from the anthropologically determined conclusion that the narrative deals with premature asexuality. The relationship of the human being (especially of the man) to God is at the center of this rewritten text.¹²⁸

The topic of exclusion and prohibition from the tree of life (Gen 3:22) is very complex. Notably, the topic of exclusion is connected not to the topic of immortality but to that of wisdom. *Jubilees* 3:26–31 introduces the distinction between human being and animal. As a result of the exclusion, which takes place after the humans disobey the prohibition, quite literally quoted in *Jub.* 3:17–20, the created order is separated into animals, which are naked and speechless, and human beings, who are not only dressed but also qualified for meeting God (3:26–31). *First Enoch* 32:5–6 describes the search for wisdom with the help of a tree that has a positive connotation. But it is said that the first humans (*Urelternpaar*) first gained wisdom, then realized their nakedness, and finally were expelled from the garden after they had eaten from the tree. Again, the consequences of wisdom are not commented upon. At the beginning of the book (*I En.* 6; the Shemihazah myth), the loss of direct access to wisdom is related to the rebellion of the watchers (cf. Gen 6:1–4). The tree of wisdom is presented in an extremely positive way. But it is striking that it is described not only as desirable for humans but also as accessible to them (cf. Sir 17:5–7, without mention of the tree). In Ben Sira, the fear mentioned in Gen 3:10 MT is transformed into the animals' fear of the humans and the humans' fear of God. Wisdom is considered a gift.

¹²⁸ In 4Q416 III, 19–IV, 6, Gen 2:24 and 3:16 serve as an explanation for the aspect that women are subordinated to their fathers and their husbands. Furthermore, and in adaptation to the regulation of vows of Num 30:6–15, women are only partly responsible. The established law is explained primevally and the addressee is encouraged to follow God's law. Cf. BAUKS, "Knowledge."

Focusing on the grammatical construction of the split coordination of Gen 2:9, which has not been understood even in the LXX, it is noticeable that the reception introduces a clear separation. The tree in the middle of the garden becomes the tree of knowledge, which is the center of attention. The tree of life, as well as the question of immortality, is either secondary or completely omitted. Referring to the genealogy of Adam, *Jub.* 4:30 contains a short note that includes premature death in connection with the abuse of the tree of knowledge and the announced penalty. In *1 En.* 24, the tree of knowledge appears in a completely different context: for the righteous, it includes the prospect of permanent access at the end of all days.

In postbiblical texts, the double inclusion in Gen 3:23–24 does not appear consecutively. The message of 3:23, which deals with the original function of the human beings, appears similarly in *Jub.* 3:26–30. In *1 Enoch*, however, it is transferred to a completely new context (Gen 6:1–4).

The motif of nakedness is understood to mean missing knowledge. Unskilled people or animals are often characterized as “missing knowledge” (*Jub.* 3:30). To sum up, the term “nakedness” does not have a sexual connotation in the context of wisdom.¹²⁹

Jubilees 3:6–7 quotes Gen 2:23–24, indicating that the idealized relationship between man and woman as described in Gen 2:24 also appears in *Jubilees*. *Jubilees* 3:8–14 and the different treatment of hygiene regulations for man and woman might include the contrast of the unified existence of the two (שְׁנֵיהֶם) in Gen 2:25 and its betrayal – the resulting separation – in Gen 3:12.

The bridge verse, Gen 2:25, is worth mentioning because not only in the LXX but also in *Jub.* 3, this verse is separated from the anthropogony and belongs to the narration that follows (cf. Gen 3). In both texts, a seam or fracture can be assumed.

In general, then, we can conclude that the cited examples of early Jewish interpretation confirm the presence of fractures in the text, which can help us to reconstruct the process of literary formation. The ancient interpreters were not preoccupied with this process, but they remembered and reacted to incoherencies in these texts even if they solved these incoherencies differently.

We can observe a certain fidelity in the use of the independent etiological scheme in Gen 2:23–24 LXX and 3:20 LXX. We have examples of *Fort-schreibung* and *relecture*, e.g., in the case of the trees, which are split into two different narratives about Enoch’s cosmic travel (*1 En.* 32 and *1 En.* 24–25). *Jubilees* 3 contains intra- and intertextual expansions and revisions, such as halakic instructions referring to biblical legal texts. Further, we have cases of omission, as, e.g., with the seduction scene, the tree of life, etc. All of these

¹²⁹ For this topos, cf. *Jub.* 3:34, an allusion to Gen 3:20 that is directly followed by Gen 4:1. Sexuality is reported in *Jub.* before the humans enter the garden (cf. *Jub.* 3:6 added to the quotation of Gen 2:23: “He knew her”).

adaptations, expansions, and revisions ultimately create a new literary work that integrates different traditional modules.

It remains to examine whether the transmission history of Gen 2–3 should be described as an oral or as a literary redactional process. Looking at transmission- and source-critical models, it becomes evident that, despite their methodological differences, the fragmentation of the textual elements is identical. Therefore, both approaches take either the topic of the creation or the topic of the “fall” as a basic pattern for literary evolution. It is also possible to take a unified narrative as a the basis for both topics, looking at the ways in which it has been enriched by particular motives, as for example with the paradise geography or the tree of life.

In defense of a more sublime literary model,¹³⁰ it seems to me that the strong interconnection between the motives for creation and paradise requires the assumption of a complex oral transmission history. A compiler or editor organizes the given traditions, adds redactional bridge verses with a high degree of interpretation (as shown in Gen 2:25), and combines the traditions into a literary narration. If we assume a holistic narrative, which means that both the topic of creation and the topic of paradise/“fall” already coexisted in oral form, we must take into account that the compiler/editor has made more-important modifications to incorporate the traditional narrative into the larger literary context. Consequently, the question depends on whether we examine Gen 2–3 individually or whether we take the larger context into account. In this particular case, such a study would include Gen 2–4, the complete primeval history, or the whole book of Genesis, even addressing the question of the Hexateuch.¹³¹

¹³⁰ I am convinced that the reconstruction of scribal practices and formation of literature in the last years has to be integrated to a greater extent into the study of redactional and editorial processes.

¹³¹ Cf. the discussion of whether the non-P material is older than P and whether there was a separate redaction within the non-P material. See the contribution of David Carr in this volume.