

No cover
image
available

Rediscovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context

Carol Meyers

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199734559.001.0001>

Published: 2012

Online ISBN: 9780199979332

Print ISBN: 9780199734559

CHAPTER

4 Eve in Eden: Genesis 2–3

Carol Meyers

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199734559.003.0004> Pages 59–80

Published: December 2012

Abstract

The earliest Jewish and Christian communities drew on the story of Eden, among many other parts of ancient Israel's sacred literature, to help them deal with their own social and theological concerns. Biblical interpretation is as old as the formation of the biblical canon itself, and interpretations of Genesis 2–3 abound. The earliest Jewish and Christian sources, followed by the rabbinic sages and church fathers who were the leaders of post-biblical religion, interpreted and emphasized certain features of Genesis 2–3 in expressing their views of creation and gender, of sex and sin. Many of their prolific writings became authoritative for many Jews and Christians, giving their writings about the Bible a canonical status and dogmatic force of their own, influencing virtually all later interpretations of the Eden tale. Consequently, we inevitably look at it through their interpretive eyes without realizing that translations and expositions of Genesis 2–3 may distort or misrepresent the meaning and function of the tale in its Israelite context. Our assumptions about the story based on later tradition and not on the ancient Hebrew tale itself can distort our view of the Eve of Eden. This chapter presents a brief look at those traditions.

Keywords: Hebrew Bible, Eve, Eden, Jews, Christians, creation, gender, sex, sin

Subject: Early Christianity, Biblical Studies, History of Judaism

Collection: Oxford Scholarship Online

Eve is arguably the major character in the Eden story. She has a larger speaking part than her male counterpart. She is certainly the more active character—in the fateful scene where they eat of the forbidden fruit, she is the subject of five active verbs while the man is the subject of only one (“he ate”).¹ Eve is the protagonist; her perception of the quality of the fruit and her subsequent actions, and only secondarily those of Adam, are critical to the narrative plot.² Moreover, she alone has a bit part in the immediate sequel to the Eden episode, when she bears Cain and Abel at the beginning of Genesis 4; Adam has no role in that narrative except to impregnate her.

Eve's role in the biblical story is clear and twofold: Eve in Eden; and Eve as Everywoman, foreshadowed in the details of Genesis 2–3. These two aspects are best considered separately—the woman *in* Eden in this chapter, and the woman *out* of Eden in the next. The use of the pair *in-out* rather than *in-after* is deliberate,

for my emphasis is on the depiction of differences between the imagined Eden place and the reality of the outside-the-garden place rather than on a temporal contrast, which might imply a historicity to the Eden tale.

Before proceeding, I want to note that the names of the first couple do not actually appear throughout the narrative. The first woman is called “Eve” only as they are about to leave the garden (Gen 3:20). The first man is not called Adam in the Eden episode at all; his name apparently first appears near the end of the next chapter (Gen 4:25) or at the beginning of Genesis 5 (v. 1).³ However, for convenience I will occasionally use the names Eve and Adam when referring to their story or to passages that precede their being named.

p. 60 Also, I hope that this reading of the Eden tale comes close to discovering its “original meaning.” I acknowledge that the very concept of an original meaning is problematic and that other perspectives on what the story teller meant and how Israelite audiences understood this tale cannot be discounted. Still, looking at its context can perhaps take us closer to discerning its intent than would be otherwise possible. The general context of agrarian life is described in the preceding chapter, and contextual issues are integral to several points in this chapter and the next.

The Eden tale presents special challenges for determining its meaning for an Israelite audience. As one of the most familiar of biblical narratives, it is prominent in post-Hebrew Bible traditions. It has influenced post-Israelite notions of gender roles and relationships perhaps more than any other Hebrew Bible text. But is it really the biblical tale itself that has such influence? Or is it the traditions it has spawned? We must remember that these chapters antedate by hundreds of years, perhaps almost a millennium, the religious traditions that accepted them as normative statements about human nature. The earliest Jewish and Christian communities drew on the story of Eden, among many other parts of ancient Israel's sacred literature, to help them deal with their own social and theological concerns. Biblical interpretation is as old as the formation of the biblical canon itself, and interpretations of Genesis 2–3 abound.

The earliest Jewish and Christian sources, followed by the rabbinic sages and church fathers who were the leaders of postbiblical religion, interpreted and emphasized certain features of Genesis 2–3 in expressing their views of creation and gender, of sex and sin. Their comments tell us more about their world than about the meaning of this tale in its Israelite context, centuries before it became canonical. Many of their prolific writings became authoritative for many Jews and Christians, giving their writings about the Bible a canonical status and dogmatic force of their own, and influencing virtually all later interpretations of the Eden tale. Consequently, we inevitably look at it through their interpretive eyes without realizing that translations and expositions of Genesis 2–3 may distort or misrepresent the meaning and function of the tale in its Israelite context. Our assumptions about the story based on later tradition and not on the ancient Hebrew tale itself can distort our view of the Eve of Eden. Thus a brief look at those traditions is in order. (They are also discussed in the epilogue.)

The Interpretive Tradition

p. 61 An example unrelated to gender is a good place to begin. Ask yourself: What was the forbidden fruit? Ancient traditions identified it variously as a pomegranate, grapes, or a fig, among others; but chances are that, like most others, you would say apple. The dominant apple tradition probably derives from a play on words in the Vulgate (the fourth-century CE Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible), which calls the tree of knowledge (Gen 2:17) a tree of *boni* (“good”) *et mali* (“evil”). *Mali* is the genitive of *malum*, which can also mean “apple.” (One would say something like *malum malum* for “a bad apple” in Latin.) Another possibility is that Renaissance artists depicting the Eden story drew on the story of the golden apples in Greek mythology. Whatever the reason for the popular view that the forbidden fruit was an apple, it has endured. Many later writers, including Milton in *Paradise Lost*, have the first couple err by eating an apple. But the Hebrew simply says “fruit.”

Other lasting misinterpretations have become entrenched in our literary, artistic, and religious culture. It is virtually impossible for today's readers to consider the first family without preconceived notions, especially with respect to gender, that may change or distort the Hebrew tale. To be fair, the authors of those dominant postbiblical traditions were probably not concerned with how their own context may have differed from that of the Israelites in ways that would affect their reading of biblical texts. Nor did they possess our current interpretive tools. That said, it remains that the misrepresentations of the ancient interpreters with respect to gender often became the repressive norm (to be discussed further in chapter 10).

What are some prominent misconceptions in the interpretive traditions?

As already noted, Eve is not mentioned in the Hebrew Bible after the beginning of Genesis. Her first post-Hebrew Bible appearance is in the book of Tobit, a popular work of historical fiction dating to the fourth or third century BCE. (Tobit is part of the Apocrypha, which is included in Catholic and Orthodox bibles but not Jewish or Protestant ones.) In a prayer offered as they consummate their marriage, a newlywed couple recalls the first couple: “You made Adam and for him you made his wife Eve as a helper and support” (Tob 8:6). Notable is the absence of the word “sin,” given the tendency to connect Eve with sin in other early works. But Adam as the first human and Eve as a supportive helper are problematic concepts and are discussed below.

p. 62 A more explicitly negative portrayal of Eve appears in Ecclesiasticus (Sirach, or Ben Sira), an early second-century BCE Jewish work also in the Apocrypha. An apparent allusion to her appears in this verse: “From a woman sin had its beginning, / and because of her we all die” (25:24).⁴ Although it may have been a minority position at the time—for some other early sources blame Adam or the fall of evil angels and their cohabitation with women (Gen 6:1–4)⁵—Ben Sira's assertion that a woman brought sin and death into the world is the earliest example of a tenaciously dominant interpretation.

Another negative appraisal appears a century or two later in a pseudepigraphical work called the Life of Adam and Eve. This book has Eve bringing sin and suffering into the world. For example, when she seeks to relieve Adam's suffering, she asks God “to transfer his pain to me, since it is I who sinned” and asks Adam to “give me a portion of your pain, for this guilt has come to you from me” (L.A.E. 35:2–3). In another version of this work Eve proclaims: “I have sinned, O God; I have sinned, O Father of all; I have sinned against you....I have sinned before you, and all sin in creation has come about through me” (Apoc. Mos. 32:2).⁶ Although some early Jewish sources are kinder to Eve,⁷ most contain negative views.

Early Christian sources also express negative views, beginning with the New Testament: “For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor” (1 Tim 2:13–14). Not only is Eve associated with sin; her creation is viewed as secondary and, by implication, of lesser importance. (This perception is problematic, as explained below.) Augustine, the

early Christian thinker most responsible for the doctrine of original sin and arguably the most influential figure in the development of Western Christianity, blamed both Adam and Eve for the transgression. However, he focuses the blame on Eve, asserting that she is inferior to man (*City of God* 14.13) and proclaiming: “it is still Eve (the temptress) that we must beware of in any woman” (*Letter* 245.10).⁸ Augustine's ideas about female subordination, which became common in Christian religious literature, are rooted in ideas of gender hierarchy and male control assumed to have begun in Eden.⁹

p. 63

The association of the first woman with sin, sexuality, and lust continues and grows in postbiblical texts. Some rabbinic texts connect Eve with temptation, sin, and death.¹⁰ But, while most consider both Eve and Adam culpable, they focus on the Golden Calf incident as the exemplar of sinful behavior.¹¹ Christian sources in general are deeply interested in issues of sin and punishment. The serpent plays an increasingly satanic and phallic role. And the more Eve is identified as the source of sin and ↵ seduction, the more urgent becomes the need to control, subdue, and dominate her. Eve represents all women, and all women thus require subjugation by wiser and superior male figures. This powerful connection with Eve and sin is remarkable, given the absence of that word from the Eden tale. (More below about Eve and her putative sin.)

Subsequent Jewish and Christian interpretive traditions (discussed in the epilogue) show the same tendencies as the texts just cited, and many of the earliest interpretations have endured. The themes of female sin and inferiority, although not in the biblical text, have been prominent for two millennia. In addition to religious texts, Western literature and art are replete with retellings and depictions of the Eve story, endlessly expressing those themes.¹² Perhaps the most influential has been *Paradise Lost*, arguably the greatest English epic poem. Milton's recasting of the Eden tale became so influential that many of our present recollections of the biblical story—like assuming that the forbidden fruit is an apple—are based more on Milton's poem than on the biblical narrative itself. Some recent feminist critics see positive aspects of Milton's Eve.¹³ But ultimately “[Milton's] hierarchical world view led him to assume that every creature had its proper place in an elaborately descending order from God who is pure spirit, to angels, men, women, plants, and finally non-living creatures.”¹⁴ Milton saw both political rulers and husbands as God's deputies, controlling the state and the family, respectively. Adam and Eve were both created in God's image, but Eve less so: Adam's “perfection far excell'd Hers in all real dignity” (*Paradise Lost* 10:150–151).

Eve indeed has “fallen”—fallen to a negative perception in the interpretive tradition. The term Fall does not occur in Genesis 2–3 or anywhere in the Hebrew Bible; it entered the interpretive world through Greek thought. Plato describes heavenly perfections losing their wings and *falling* to the earth to be implanted in humans (*Phaedr.* 246c–d, 248c–d). The idea of *falling* from (divine) grace (Gal 5:4; cf. Rom 3:23) became a specifically Christian theological interpretation. The extensive postbiblical use of Fall is a good example of how an interpretive concept became so familiar that its absence from the Genesis story itself goes unnoticed. The term is anachronistic and thus inappropriate for discussing the Eden story in its Hebraic context. Its use at the beginning of this paragraph merely highlights how enduring are derogatory perceptions of Eve or the Eden story.

p. 64

Another example is the notion that Eve tempted Adam. This notion is not in the text of Genesis but first appears in early postbiblical sources.¹⁵ ↵ In an early third-century CE work, Eve “persuaded” Adam to eat the forbidden fruit (Tertullian, *Or.* 8.8). By the next century, she beguiles him. And it gets worse, as the words “wicked,” “temptress,” “deception,” and other pejorative terms enter theological discourse, appearing over and over again into the medieval and modern periods. A classic twentieth-century commentary on Genesis proclaims that “The one [Eve] who has been led astray [by the serpent] now becomes a temptress.”¹⁶ Neither temptation nor seduction is in the biblical text, but these words and others like them appear all too frequently in interpretations. Most Muslim commentaries also blame Eve, although she is never mentioned by name in the Qur'an, for the beginnings of sin.¹⁷

The interpretive traditions loom so large, and many of them are so well known and even authoritative, that they occlude our vision of the Eve of Genesis. Another and perhaps more insidious kind of interference with our ability to see her is the problem of translations, for most of us read about Eve in languages other than the original Hebrew. Translations are by their very nature interpretations, for no language can be rendered exactly word-for-word into another one. Judgments about nuance are always necessary, especially when a word has more than one meaning or when the syntax of the two languages differs. To be sure, good translations usually provide accurate renderings; but they can also—sometimes unconsciously—subtly change and distort the meaning of the original, especially when the culture of the translators is far removed from that of the original text.¹⁸ The process of translating the Hebrew Bible into other languages began in the same centuries that the interpretive literature of early Judaism and Christianity was forming, and the ancient translations exhibit similar bias and distortion.

Perhaps the best example is the Latin translation of the Bible, the influential Vulgate. Commissioned by Pope Damasus in 382 CE, it became the authoritative scripture of the Catholic Church. The translator was St. Jerome, a highly competent Hebrew scholar, but a man whose writings show hostility toward, and fear of, women. His misogynist views subtly influenced his renderings of passages about women; they were “such a powerful and all-pervasive influence upon him that the accuracy of his Vulgate translation itself has been affected.”¹⁹ The Vulgate has been an exceptionally important translation: it became the standard Roman Catholic Bible; and it also influenced many subsequent translations, especially ones in Romance languages. It has thus affected much of the Judeo-Christian world. The smallest and most subtle examples of antifemale bias in St. Jerome's translation can have far-reaching consequences. The matter of translation bias will figure in this chapter and the next.

p. 65

Many of the negative perceptions of Eve mentioned here were noted by Phyllis Trible, a pioneering and influential second-wave feminist biblical scholar. She lists nearly a dozen “consensus” claims about Eve—all misogynist views that are either debatable readings or are absent from the text altogether.²⁰ And she observes that, ironically, the power of traditional interpretations has led the opponents of an androcentric order no less than its advocates to misunderstand the tale.²¹ Both feminists who write off Genesis 2–3 as hopelessly misogynist and conservatives who invoke it accept gender-related dogmas they assume the text contains. Some misreadings have achieved a canonicity of their own and interfere with the ability to read Genesis 2–3 on its own, in its Israelite context, apart from later influential expositions. These obstacles are considerable but not insurmountable. By acknowledging that biblical texts were both responsive to and reflective of their own world, and by considering the conditions in that world, we can rediscover the Eve that existed before she was linked with sin and suffering. We can come closer to recovering the Israelite Eve of the Hebrew Bible before the overlay of later traditions began to form.

Genre and Setting

The enormous interest in the Eden narrative throughout the ages has not escaped feminist biblical scholars. They have rightly been concerned about the powerful and usually detrimental impact of the interpretive tradition. First-wave feminist scholars were painfully aware that biblical texts like the Eden story were barriers to securing the vote for women; second-wave feminist scholars realized that their goals of gender equality were impeded by values thought to be embedded in this tale; and third-wave feminists have highlighted its exploitative potential. For almost two centuries feminist scholars have contributed to the extensive body of scholarship on Genesis 2–3.

This deceptively simple tale clearly operates on many levels and conveys profound messages about human existence. No wonder it has attracted so much scholarly attention over the ages. A survey of all the feminist expositions, let alone of all that other scholars have written, is inconceivable.²² In joining that wide array of

p. 66

scholarship on this influential biblical episode, it would be presumptuous to claim that my (or any) analysis is the only possible approach. Rather, my aim is to consider the narrative in relation to the problems and concerns of the Israelites, the people closest in time to its emergence among the cultural productions of the Iron Age (see chapter 1, p. 15, for an explanation of Iron Age), and to suggest its meaning for them. This can be termed a “culturally cued” reading in that it connects a literary production with its context—the “realm of concrete and particular social, economic, and cultural realities.”²³ It is not a systematic study of the entire episode. Rather it begins in this chapter by looking closely at several features or passages that relate to gender roles and relationships as established in Eden. And in the next chapter it focuses on a single troubling verse (3:16) in which God sets forth the conditions of Eve's life out of Eden. In both, traditional androcentric or misogynist interpretations are contested.

Genre

Contextualizing a biblical text properly begins with a consideration of its genre, for the nature of the genre is relevant to how it is understood. What kind of literature do we have in Genesis 2–3? Several different terms are used for these chapters, and examining them helps us understand their literary character and their function in Israelite culture.

Except for the poetic verses near the end of chapter 3, the Eden tale is a narrative. Broadly speaking, it is a marvelous example of folk literature, or folklore, a term designating a culture's traditional narrations of various kinds. Genesis 3 in particular—if we can get beyond the church fathers and Milton and the array of writers who appropriated the story for their own purposes—is a story with a situation, a plot, and a resolution.²⁴ More specifically, it is a creation story or “myth.” The latter word does not mean either that these two chapters of Genesis are false or that they are recounting some quaint and antiquated story. Rather, it suggests that Genesis 2–3 is a traditional, metaphoric tale about something that was deeply important to the Israelite community in which it arose and was transmitted.

Like all peoples, the Israelites sought to understand the nature and meaning of their existence. Their interest in creation was not a scientific one but rather an existential one. Where do humans fit in the overall scheme of the created realm?

p. 67

The Hebrew Bible begins with two literary units, each addressing that question but with different focuses. The first comes in Genesis 1–2:4a, a unit formed by an *inclusio* (a literary device in which similar or identical opening and closing words or phrases frame a section). Genesis 1:1 mentions “the heavens and the earth,” and Genesis 2:4a contains the same words; together they mark the beginning and end of a literary unit. That unit is a cosmogony, describing how the world/cosmos as the Israelites observed it came into existence. It is usually attributed to priestly authors, who shaped it in the mid-first millennium BCE. Like their counterparts in Babylonia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, they crafted tales about people and god(s) that would help them understand their place in the cosmos.²⁵ The Genesis cosmogony is a true *mythos*, a story relating humans to divine action and situating them within the cosmos as it appeared to Israelite observers before the rise of modern science.

Ancient creation tales typically have a strong etiological character. Derived from the Greek word *aitia* (“cause”), an etiology (or aetiology) is an “explanation” of how things got to be the way they are. It provides the cause of a phenomenon in the natural or human world. Etiologies begin when the storytellers observe something, often but not necessarily something puzzling or problematic, in their own world and then proceed to account for it. Etiologies help prescientific people answer the perennial questions about how they fit into the natural and social worlds. Etiologies are fundamentally ahistorical and unscientific. But that doesn't mean they are untrue. They originate in the stirrings of the human imagination, not in the reasoned hypotheses of the scientist. Their truth lies in the realm of beliefs, not facts. Also, in linking causality to

divine action, mythic etiologies function as sanctions for the present order, thereby enabling people to accept the conditions of their present. This last point is particularly relevant to understanding Eve (and Adam) out of Eden.

The next unit of Genesis, which focuses on the creation of humans rather than the cosmos, is also mythic and even more etiological. This unit (Gen 2:4b–3:24, but usually referred to as Gen 2–3) too is delineated by an *inclusio*—“to till the ground” appears in 2:5 and 3:23. Usually attributed to “J” (a writer who uses *Yahweh*—Jahwe in German, hence the J—for God's name) and perhaps predating Genesis 1 by several centuries or more, it accounts for the nature of human existence as the Israelites knew it. In many cultures, including ancient Israel, narratives about “first” humans tell how conditions in the narrator's present originated in primordial time.

p. 68 For the Israelites, these mythic “events” provided an “explanation” for important aspects of their reality: mortality, male and female roles, ♀ female-male pair-bonding, and more. They accounted for the essential qualities, including the difficulties, of human existence.²⁶ The Eden story is exceptionally rich in accounting for reality; it has thus been called “a catena of nestled, densely packed etiologies, each conforming to the style and goal of genres deployed in other Near Eastern (creation) narratives.”²⁷ Indeed, the sheer number of etiological features about humans and the lack of attention to the creation of the natural world—no mention of cosmic features (light and dark; sun, moon, and stars)—make the Eden tale more of an “extended etiological narrative” than a creation story.²⁸ To be sure, animals and trees as well as humans are created in the story; but they serve the story line rather than showcase the cosmos as God's created realm. Etiological functions dominate in Genesis 2–3 as they do throughout Genesis 1–11, which focuses on primordial times.

In accounting for fundamental aspects of human existence, the Eden tale also has both archetypal and prototypal meaning. Found in folklore the world over, archetypes are the “original” version of something; their features represent features of all subsequent versions of the same thing. Qualities of all females and males, in other words, are revealed in the qualities of the first female and male according to the Israelite storyteller. Eve as mother, for example, prefigures and models the maternal role of all women (Everywoman Eve). At the same time, Eve and Adam are prototypes, presenting the roles of a specific group: Israelite women and men in their Iron Age environment. Prototypal qualities are not necessarily universal—after all, the kind of farming described in the preceding chapter and prescribed in the text is hardly a universal economic system.

The first two humans appear in a mythic account at the beginning of a longer narrative that eventually takes us into real time. Although the Eden tale is couched in temporal language because it presents human life, its characters did not exist in real time but rather, as first humans, mythically represent all humans.

Setting

p. 69 Just as the characters do not exist in real time, their Edenic locale is not the Iron Age reality described in chapter 3. Life in the real Israelite world, outside the garden, comes only at the tale's end. The narrative itself unfolds in an imagined place, a garden that would have seemed powerfully attractive to agrarians living in the unforgiving highlands of Palestine. The “garden” of Genesis 2–3 and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible ♀ is not what the word conjures up for most of us: vegetable gardens with plants and herbs in neat rows; or an array of ornamental trees and flowers with a profusion of flowers and scents. The biblical imagery associated with gardens fits neither of these images.

What then is the setting of Eden? What does “garden” connote? The Hebrew noun is *gan*. It appears forty-one times in the Hebrew Bible, and its feminine form (*gannah*) appears another sixteen times. Many of these occurrences, as we might expect, are in Genesis 2 and 3. But the word appears often enough elsewhere so

that looking at other contexts reveals the salient features of gardens for the Israelites.²⁹ The fundamental quality of gardens is revealed by the root from which *gan* and *gannah* are derived—a verb appearing eight times and meaning “to protect, surround.” Gardens are safe, protected places, surrounded by walls or fences (e.g., 2 Kgs 20:6; Isa 31:5), quite different from the open fields of Israelite peasants.

Other features of gardens in biblical texts contrast sharply with agrarian reality:

- Water in gardens comes from a variety of sources, such as fountains, wells, or streams. Supplies are plentiful and permanent—not like the unpredictable and often insufficient highland rains. In fact, abundant water was the *sine qua non* of gardens. Life in the eschatological future, as one prophet imagines, will be “like a saturated garden, like a spring of water, whose waters never fail” (Isa 58:11). Eden has four rivers, providing an unending and copious water supply, but rain in Eden is never mentioned.
- Vegetation in gardens consists of trees, none of which are the olive trees or other species important for the Israelite subsistence economy.
- A garden's trees are ornamental and grow in thickly forested groves. Sometimes they are fruitful, but their fruits are luxury fruits and not dietary staples (e.g., Num 24:6; Ezek 31:8).
- Gardens are the domains of the elite, with only the privileged—royalty or, mythically, God—having access to them (e.g., Gen 13:10; Esth 1:5; 7:8; Ezek 28:13).
- Perhaps their most important feature in relation to the Eden story is that gardens are planted (e.g., Jer 29:5), as is the Eden garden (Gen 2:8), or “made” (e.g., Amos 9:14)—but never worked. Gardens are low-maintenance spaces, sustaining growth with little or no human involvement. They resemble the contemporary concept of “permaculture,” a term for systems that are self-sustaining, or nearly so, because they follow internal mechanisms for productivity in relation to their natural habitats.³⁰ The Edenic garden similarly requires minimal human intervention, although this is not clear from English translations. God instructs the primeval person “to till it and keep it” (Gen 2:15), and “till” implies agricultural activity: digging into or plowing the soil. However, the two Hebrew verbs (*‘bd*; *šmr*) in that phrase do not denote independent actions but function together in what is called a hendiadys. In adjective-poor Hebrew, this figure of speech allows for two words joined by “and” to form a single idea—in this case, the minimal work required to maintain self-sustaining growth. Like the keepers of the royal forest in Nehemiah 2:8, the first couple watches over the Eden garden; they are keepers not cultivators. Their function is a world apart from the vicissitudes of agrarian life in the Mediterranean basin (described in chapter 3), just as Eden is of a different order than the often dry and rocky fields and pasturage of the Palestinian highlands.

In short, the Eden garden is diametrically opposite to Israelite reality. Like the royal parks of Mesopotamian culture, it is a place of pleasure for the elite, not the site of arduous peasant agriculture.³¹ Keeping this in mind, along with the nature of Genesis 2–3 as a mythic and etiological tale accounting for the harsh reality of life in the agrarian highlands, we can turn to some specific features of its language and message, especially as they relate to the first woman.

Creation of the Woman

Any consideration of female and male in the Hebrew Bible, whether deity or human, must take into account that Hebrew is a gendered language. All nouns are either feminine or masculine; and there is no neuter, as there is in German, for example. Thus some grammatically masculine or feminine Hebrew words can refer to items we would consider neutral, like grass (m.) or shoe (f.). Other terms of either gender, in referring to people, can have an inclusive or general meaning. Masculine forms are particularly problematic in Bible translations because they are sometimes rendered as masculine when the context indicates they have a collective, common-gender sense. Modern translators do not always recognize or acknowledge its neutrality or inclusiveness. But ancient audiences, hearing a masculine noun, would have known not to take it at face value.³²

- p. 71 Take, for example, the passage in the Genesis 1 creation story where God creates 'adam in the divine image (vv. 26 and 27). Older translations use "man" for this grammatically masculine word. The NRSV and other newer versions realize that God is creating all people, both female and male; and they render 'adam as "humankind," "human beings," "humans," or "people." Using inclusive language here is not a matter of being politically correct but rather of acknowledging that the term signifies generic humankind and not a (male) individual. It collectively designates human beings, differentiated from God and animals.

But what about the Eden episode, where God creates a living being from a clod of dirt, as deities do in other ancient Near Eastern creation stories? God forms an 'adam (Gen 2:7), here virtually always rendered "man" because the narrative then describes how a woman is formed from part of the 'adam. That first being would have to have been male, so the reasoning goes, if the second is female. But is that necessarily so? This is an important question because assuming male priority is so often used to privilege males—if men were created first, they must be more important. We need to look further at 'adam, first by noting a literary feature and then by addressing the issue of whether it connotes a man or a generic human.

The translation "man" ignores a striking and significant wordplay between 'adam and the substance used to form 'adam, namely 'adamah, "[arable] land," a term designating cultivable land. The creation of 'adam from 'adamah signals the integral connection between the first human's bodily substance and the cultivated ground that provides subsistence.³³ The 'adam is not created in Eden but is placed there only after the garden is created (Gen 2:8). The 'adam of 2:7 anticipates conditions outside Eden, which are hinted at in Genesis 2:5 (cf. 3:17–19, 23), a verse discussed in chapter 5. It signifies humanity as cultivators of the arable land outside of Eden: agrarians were to be of the same material essence as the soil of their fields. This agricultural connection is intensified because the human is created not just from the "ground" but rather from the "dust of the ground." "Dust" ('apar in Hebrew) is a misleading translation; the word here means loose dirt. Dense sun-baked soil had to be broken into clumps or clods (by plowing or hoeing, as noted in chapter 3) before crops could be grown. In the agricultural imagery of the Eden story those clumps of loose soil, not powdery dust, are the substance from which God forms humanity. "Clods" would better represent the Hebrew.³⁴

- p. 72 Virtually all English translations of Genesis 2:7 fail to capture the literary connection between 'adam and 'adamah. Using *earth/earthling* or *human/humus* would better capture the Hebrew wordplay. (English "human" is not the combination of *hu* with *man*; derived from Latin *humanus*, it is probably related to both *homo*, "man," and *humus*, "earth"). The translation might be:

Then God Yahweh formed the *earthling* [or *human*] from clods of the *earth* [or *humus*] and breathed into its nostril the breath of life; and the *earthling* [or *human*] became a living being.

These two words, 'adam and 'adamah, are not simply a pun; they are organically connected. And they are not mere labels; they are also signifiers of the very essence of what they designate. The use of 'adam

indicates that the essence of human life is not its eventual classification into gendered categories but rather its organic connection to the arable earth, the *'adamah*, that reddish-brown substance that can be cultivated to support life. Human life is inextricably related to that which makes life possible, arable land. Agricultural imagery shapes the details of the Eden account of human beginnings, as befits an agricultural people.

As an earth creature the *'adam* is not inherently gendered. The word *'adam* is a common, grammatically masculine biblical noun, appearing some 530 times beyond the opening chapters of Genesis. But it is not socially masculine; in none of those instances does it refer to a specific (male) individual but rather has an indefinite, generic sense, denoting a human being.³⁵ English translations routinely use “he” or “him” in sentences referring to an *'adam*, but only for grammatical agreement and not because the noun denotes a male. But what about when a male character is named Adam? As already noted, that name does not appear in the Eden episode but rather comes in Genesis 4:25 (or 5:1), which itself may be a redactional addition.³⁶ Moreover, the name Adam (like Eve and many other biblical names) is more of a symbolic label than an authentic designation of an individual. In other words, the *'adam* created by God in Genesis 2:6 likely represents a sexually undifferentiated first human. More specifically, given that the surgical procedure of Genesis 2:21–22 produces two gendered beings (Woman and Man), the prior *'adam* is androgynous.

p. 73 The concept of an androgynous first person resonates with its ancient Near Eastern context. In the dominant Mesopotamian conception, ♀ humanity originates from a single androgynous body made from clay that is the matrix for the two sexes.³⁷ A similar idea, albeit with different imagery, appears in ancient rabbinic literature.³⁸ An androgyne is a body with the nature or characteristics of male and female combined. But androgynes can be basically male and completed by the female, or basically female and completed by the male. Historically the former has dominated.³⁹ The Eden story belongs to that dominant tradition: the first human of Genesis 2:7 is androgynous and sexually undifferentiated but basically male and then becomes the male human of Genesis 2:23. At that point a Hebrew gender pair—*'iš* (“man”) and *'iššah* (“woman”)—designates the two people produced by God's surgery. This is similar to the Mesopotamian concept of humanity originating with one androgynous being (*amīlu*), thus putting the “initial emphasis on *human* in contrast to deities and animals.”⁴⁰ The essential distinctions at creation are those separating the human from the divine and from other living creatures.

The Eden account has a similar concern with those distinctions. After creating the single human (Gen 2:7), God places the human in the garden, with its magnificent trees and abundant water (Gen 2:8–15). God then instructs the person about what can and cannot be eaten (a term discussed below); with both female and male contained in this androgynous being, both are recipients of God's directives. But the creation of humanity is not yet complete. This etiological tale must account for the fact that humanity consists of female and male, alike yet not exactly the same.

Humanity, composed of two separate sexes/genders, is about to be launched; and the terminology establishes the relationship between the two. God wants the first person to have an *'ezer kenegdo*. A look at the two Hebrew words in this phrase—a noun (*'ezer*) and a prepositional phrase (*kenegdo*)—is revealing. The noun's root *'zr* means “to help.” God is typically its subject, as when Jacob refers to the “God of your father, who will help you” (Gen 49:25), although it can also denote assistance (e.g., 2 Chr 32:3). The same is true for the noun. Which is it in the Eden story? The second word in the phrase solves the problem, for *kenegdo* means “corresponding to” or “on a par with.” The two people will be neither superior nor subordinate to each other; the phrase connotes a nonhierarchical relationship. NRSV's “helper as a partner” and the New American Bible's “suitable partner” capture the sense of the Hebrew, especially because “partner” suggests that the two were once *part* of each other. “Counterpart” would be similarly apt in designating the second person as ♀ of the same essence as the first; the two complement each other. However, the phrase probably does not imply legal or social parity.

p. 74

The same can be said for Genesis 1:26–27, where God creates humanity, both female and male, in the divine image. This passage has often been heralded in support of gender equality. Already in the nineteenth century first-wave feminists cited it as affirming “the eternity and equality of sex....[with the] masculine and feminine elements, exactly equal and balancing each other.”⁴¹ However, like “counterpart,” it probably concerns sexual and gender dimorphism as a feature of humanity but does not establish social equality of gendered humans.⁴²

Back to *‘ezer kenegdo*. Yet another translation is possible, one that would retain the counterpart idea and also take into account that *‘ezer* can be derived from a Hebrew root meaning “to be strong, powerful” rather than the one meaning “to help.”⁴³ The phrase would then be translated “powerful counterpart.” Because women had considerable power in agrarian Israelite households in the Iron Age (see chapter 9), this reading is compelling.

Reading *‘ezer kenegdo* as counterpart or partner is also indicated by noting that God's first attempt at creating a second person fails (Gen 2:18–20). God first creates animals and birds, which are earth creatures created from the *‘adamah* but not counterparts. The God-human hierarchy established when God creates *‘adam* is now extended: God › human › animals/birds. Humanity has been differentiated from and stands between the creator and the creatures. And God goes back to the drawing board. To assure that the second would be a counterpart of the first, God makes one from the other (Gen 2:21).

Looking at the Hebrew terms for God's surgical procedure is instructive. But first, the translations. In virtually every rendering, God removes a “rib” from the human to make another one. The Hebrew word is *ṣela* (“rib” or “side”) and occurs some forty times in the Hebrew Bible, mostly in architectural contexts: the tabernacle texts of Exodus, and the 1 Kings and Ezekiel temple texts. In none of those other passages is the translation “rib” justified. Yet, like many of the technical architectural terms, it is used in several different ways and its meaning is unclear.⁴⁴ One usage (1 Kgs 6:34), apparently describing the two leaves of a double door, is intriguing. Used for large entryways, a double door consists of two doors, each about half the width of the door frame, each hinged to the door frame on its outer edge. The doors are identical, except that their hinges are on opposite sides. Together they form a wide door; alone they occupy only half the entryway and have no value. One by itself is only a door side, not a whole door. The imagery is remarkably apt for Eve and Adam. They are virtually the same, and their combination produces humanity; but a male or a female “side” without the other could never produce the whole.

Postbiblical sources are generally not helpful for studying Genesis 2–3, for, as already noted, their comments are often distortions or misreadings of the Hebrew text. Yet one early Jewish reading is worth noting in relation to *ṣela*. The first-century CE philosopher Philo (discussed again in the epilogue), in his treatises on creation, generally views the first man more favorably than the first woman. However, in discussing Genesis 2:21–22, he makes a remarkable statement:

What is the side [*pleura*] which He took from the earth-born man, and why did he mould the side into a woman? The literal sense is clear. For by a certain symbolical use of “part,” it is called a half of the whole, as both man and woman, being sections of Nature, become equal in one harmony of genus, which is called man....woman is a half man's body. (*Questions and Answers on Genesis* 1.25)⁴⁵

Aside from his contestable view that the first human was male, the idea of side, half of a whole, has survived in Philo's writings. His comment about equality refers to the physical body and the function of male and female in procreation, in accord with the dualistic thinking of his day (see the epilogue); but it nonetheless suggests an understanding of *ṣela* as side rather than rib.

The very next verse likewise suggests that the first human's side, and not just one skeletal piece, became the second human: “bone of my bones, flesh of my flesh.” In the Iron Age sense of anatomy, bones and flesh

p. 76

were a human's constituent pieces. The two persons produced by divine surgery are of common substances. And now that there are two humans, gender—or possibly sex—comes into view. The first androgynous being (Gen 2:7), more male than female, is now fully male; and he immediately proclaims that his counterpart is fully female: “this one shall be called Woman, for out of Man this one was taken” (2:23). He uses the words *’iš* and *’iššah* for Man and Woman.⁴⁶ Like *’adam*, the former is grammatically masculine but with maleness not intrinsic to its meaning. Appearing more than 2,000 times in the Hebrew Bible, its primary sense is to denote an individual who is representative of a group. Its male gender comes from the social context of its biblical uses, hence the typical translation “man.” It is paired in this verse with the grammatically feminine *’iššah*, which is not actually the female form of *’iš* but functions that way, with woman as the counterpart to man. The assonance of the two words helps make that connection.

These terms mark social gender. But in this case they seem to represent physical sex too because of the etiology in the following verse (Gen 2:24): men leave their parents and cling to their wives and become “one flesh.” This verse is often interpreted as referring to an original matriarchy or to the practice of matrilocal marriage (when a man joins his wife's family). However, it more likely provides closure to the creation of humanity, which began with the creation of the first human in 2:7. Now there are two humans, female and male; they are similar—one made of the other—yet different. They are now sexually differentiated so that they can (eventually, out of Eden) procreate. In sexual union they will become one flesh, echoing their original unity and sameness. The hierarchical relationship between parents and child is to be superseded by the union of a set of complementary individuals. Powerful Israelite patrilineality (see chapters 2, p. 21; 6, p. 108; and 10, p. 200) is trumped here by the procreative imperative of sexuality. This verse perhaps also functions as an etiology for pair-bonding (or marriage), with the impulse for sexual union situated in the primordial unity of the first human.⁴⁷ But the first reported sexual union does not take place in the garden. Life in Eden must first play out in a way that takes the first couple to the reality that includes procreation.

Life in the Garden

p. 77

The deed that results in the banishment from Eden has been labeled “sin” since antiquity, although that word is absent from Genesis 2–3, as already noted. It first appears in the next episode, the account of Cain and Abel in Genesis 4. The Eve–Adam and Abel–Cain tales are part of a longer etiological narrative, ending in Gen 11:26.⁴⁸ Although these two tales are typically viewed as separate episodes, they can also be viewed together as the opening section of Genesis 2–11. Together they tell the story of the first family, offspring included. And together they account for the two subsistence modes known to the Israelites: agriculture, with its small but important animal husbandry component; and pastoral nomadism (which probably had a small agrarian component and thus was not pure pastoral nomadism).⁴⁹

The agrarian mode, despite its unrelenting difficulties (described in chapter 3), is accepted as normative throughout the Hebrew Bible. But not pastoralism. Pastoralists were often perceived negatively by settled peoples of the ancient world—for good reason. Living on marginal lands, they often depended in part, and often in unwanted ways, on nearby agrarians. They sometimes competed with farmers for pasturage or stole their animals.⁵⁰ Raids by Bedouin have plagued village farmers well into the twentieth century.⁵¹ Because pastoralists were a menace to peasant farmers, they were often considered adversaries. Pastoral groups on the desert fringes of ancient Palestine (e.g., Amalekites, Kedarites, and Midianites) are characteristically portrayed as enemies in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Judg 6:3–6; Jer 49:28–32) and in other ancient Near Eastern literature. They appear as dangerous and inferior barbarians in classical literature.⁵² It is no wonder that prophetic texts contrast the wilderness habitat (“wasteland”) of pastoralists with the Eden (e.g., Isa 51:3; Joel 2:3). The subsistence mode of semi-migratory peoples is the polar opposite of Eden, with its abundant water and lush growth. Cain the wanderer (Gen 4:14) is the archetypal pastoralist.

The narratives of Genesis 2–3 and of Genesis 4 are complementary episodes that together provide etiologies for the agrarian and pastoralist subsistence modes. Neither is Edenic. The difficult life of both is etiologically portrayed as the result of human misdeeds. However, from the agrarian perspective of the Israelites, pastoralism is far less desirable. The misdeed causing the agrarian reality, disobedience, is thus less reprehensible than the truly heinous act of murder, which leads to the endless wandering of transhumants. Fratricide deserves the label “sin.” Sin comes knocking (literally “couching,” i.e., “lurking,” in Gen 4:7) at the door; Cain fails to resist its pull and is condemned to a migratory existence. Noting the absence of the word sin from Genesis 2–3 would be an argument from silence. However, because Genesis 2–3 and Genesis 4 can be considered together as the story of the first family, the first son emerges as the one to commit the first sinful deed. Later exegetes may have considered the disobedience of the first couple—especially Eve—a sin; but the biblical narrator of the primeval tales does not, nor do authors of other Hebrew Bible texts.

p. 78 If sin is absent from its vocabulary, can a key term of the Eden episode be identified? Does its language reflect a theme of great significance ↵ for the Israelites but overlooked because of the dominant focus on human sinfulness?

One way to identify a theme is to note the recurrence of a word or phrase. Repetition is one of the rhetorical ploys of ancient Hebrew narratives for drawing attention to something important. A word used repeatedly for thematic purposes is called a “key-word” or “word-motif” (*Leitwört*).⁵³ This device differs greatly from English style, which emphasizes variation in vocabulary: “Whereas English prose composition eschews repetition...ancient Hebrew prose enjoys it.”⁵⁴ Thus we don't always appreciate biblical repetition—if it is visible in English translations. But often it is not, for Hebrew roots can appear as both nouns and verbs, used together to form a repetitive pattern. A case in point is the oft-repeated term *'kl* (“to eat”) in Genesis 2–3. This is the root of the Hebrew words for both “eat” and “food,” two words that would not constitute repetition in English.

The root *'kl* appears more frequently than any other word in Genesis 2–3 except *'adam*—twenty-one times in relation to human consumption. This strikingly frequent recurrence makes eat/food a word-motif. The significance of its repetition is intensified because twenty-one is a multiple of seven, a sacred number in the ancient Semitic world. These features rhetorically signal an important theme: the Israelite concern about food. Anxieties about sufficient food supplies (see chapter 3, pp. 54–55) are given concrete form and dramatic emphasis in the frequent repetition of *'kl*, which would have had a powerful effect on its audience, as noted by the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber. In working on a translation of the Hebrew Bible into German in the 1920s, he attempted to preserve recurring terms because he recognized their dynamic quality: “The measured repetition that matches the inner rhythm of the text, or rather, that wells up from it, is one of the most powerful means for conveying meaning.”⁵⁵

p. 79 This food/eat word-motif signals a major existential issue. The importance of food is also highlighted because the very first words a human hears are about eating (Gen 2:16–17). Note too that in the Genesis 1 creation account, as soon as humans are created, their food sources are announced as part of God's blessing (Gen 1:28–29). This role of eat/food in the opening chapters of the Bible has been overlooked because of translation issues as well as the focus on other themes. Moreover, contemporary readers are generally unaware of the food anxieties of biblical antiquity. Food is a concern for us in the developed world—but because we have too much, not too little. This impedes our ability to grasp that ↵ the Israelites could not contemplate the beginning of human existence apart from concerns about food. Food and humanity are intertwined—in the Eden story as well as in biological reality.

The food/eating theme in the Eden story also advances the narrative plot, serving as a vehicle for introducing the fateful act of disobedience. In signaling the integral relationship between sustenance and survival, it prepares us for the denouement, at the end of Genesis 3, when the first humans leave Eden and

enter the real world. Their roles in that world are set forth in the etiological mandate of 3:16–19. Yet women's tasks in food production (see chapter 7, pp. 128–132) are anticipated in Eden. Both humans eat the forbidden fruit. The woman, however, is the one to hand it to the man—just as Israelite women provided edible foodstuffs to the members of their households.

What led the woman to take the fruit for herself and then the man? Her interaction with another character in the tale, the serpent, sets the stage for this disobedient act. The serpent of Eden is *not* the satanic being that it becomes in traditional interpretations, especially in Christianity and Islam (e.g., Rev 12:9).⁵⁶ (This later pejorative association is yet another of the misleading interpretive moves in traditions about the Eden tale.) The serpent character reflects the widespread human fear of snakes because of their danger to humans and animals and also because of the awe of this creature's mysterious ability to rejuvenate. The etiological outcome of the Eden story (in Gen 3:14–15) thus ends badly for the snake. God curses it and consigns it to its seemingly unnatural locomotion, slithering on the ground, and to its role as the enemy of humans.

Serpents are ambiguous creatures, with positive as well as negative elements as indicated by the term describing the serpent in the garden. It is called “more ‘*arum*” than the other animals. Like the serpent itself, the word ‘*arum* is ambiguous—it can have positive as well as negative connotations.⁵⁷ The typical translations “crafty” and “cunning” convey the negative aspects. Perhaps, because it has not yet received the negative qualities it receives in Genesis 3:15, the word for the serpent of Genesis 3:1 is better rendered “prudent” or “intelligent” as in Proverbs, where it typically appears as an antonym of someone foolish or simple (e.g., Prov 15:5). The perspicacious talking animal perceives the value of eating from the very tree declared off limits. It informs Eve that its fruit will make her “like God, knowing good and evil” (Gen 3:5) or, better, “knowing good and bad,” meaning “knowing everything”—because “good and bad” is a *merism* (a figure of speech in which opposites denote everything in-between).⁵⁸ Eating the fruit will give humans higher cognitive powers. Eve discerns the tree's gastronomic potential and esthetic qualities, and the serpent points out its possibilities for cognition.

p. 80

The serpent speaks to Eve in this scene perhaps because of her intellect. Rather than a blot on her character, her dialogue with the reptile is a function of her intellect. The biblical association of wisdom with the feminine, embodied in Woman Wisdom of Proverbs (see chapter 7, p. 138), is foreshadowed.⁵⁹ The interaction between Eve and the serpent also gives her the speaking part that, as already noted, exceeds Adam's. All told, the woman in the serpent scene of Genesis 3:1–6 “both exhibits wisdom and seeks greater wisdom.”⁶⁰ Yet in eating the appealing fruit the first couple makes a decidedly unwise move. They disobey God. The consequence is not only mortality but also the reality of agrarian life anticipated at the beginning of the Eden episode and prescribed in its closing section.

Notes

1. Noted by Rendsburg (2003), 23.
2. Hendel (1997), 160; Niditch (1993), 46.
3. Although the definite article is lacking before ‘*adam* in Gen 2:5, 20 and 3:17, many scholars understand those instances to mean “man” (not Adam); see the NRSV and Kraus (2011), 20, and n. 22. (Eve's name is discussed in the next chapter.)
4. Bellis (2000a), 80.
5. Malina (1969), 22–24.
6. Translations are by Johnson (1983).
7. Collins (2004).
8. Cited in Brown (1967), 63.
9. Stark (2007), 28–29.
10. Bronner (1994), 22–36.
11. Anderson (2009), col. 348; Reuling (2006), 331–335.
12. Summarized for the visual arts by Jefferson (2009), for music by Peterson (2009), for film by Plate (2009), and for literature

- by Swindell (2009).
13. McColgan (1994); Swindell (2009), col. 354.
 14. O'Brien and Major (1982), 95; see also Whitfield (2007).
 15. Amply documented by Higgins (1976).
 16. von Rad (1961), 87.
 17. Nickel (2009), 252.
 18. See Kraus (2011), 7–15; see also the discussion in the epilogue.
 19. Barr (1990), 122; cf. Lohr (2011), 234 and Clark (1986).
 20. Tribble (1978), 73.
 21. Ibid.
 22. For a small sample of feminist studies of Gen 2–3, see Bellis (2007), 37–56 and Brenner (1993), 39–193. For copious references to other scholarship, see two recent monographs and an older classic: Mettinger (2007); Stordalen (2000); Westermann (1984).
 23. Bellis (2007), 51; Bird (1994), 523.
 24. Niditch (1993), 3–47, 89–90.
 25. Clifford (1994) provides an overview of ancient Near Eastern creation accounts.
 26. Even if Gen 2–3 is exilic in date, as some argue, it would be addressing those same concerns.
 27. J. Sasson (2008), 498.
 28. J. Sasson (2001), 211.
 29. Examined in detail in Meyers (2012a), 146–151.
 30. Newsom (2000), 65.
 31. See van der Kooij (2010).
 32. See D. E. S. Stein (2008).
 33. Hiebert (1996), 34–36.
 34. “Clods” and “ground” often appear together; see Wächter (2001), 259–260.
 35. D. E. S. Stein (2006), 393. One exception might be the reference to a progenitor in Josh 14:15.
 36. Although *ʾadam* lacks the definite article in 3:17, it can still have an indefinite reference; see Ibid. and n. 3.
 37. Asher-Greve (2002), 11.
 38. Kadari (2006); Bronner (1994), 26–28.
 39. Gelpi (1974).
 40. Asher-Greve (2002), 21.
 41. In the *Woman's Bible*: Stanton (1895), Part I, 14–15.
 42. See Shectman (2009), 130–134; Bird (1994; 1997); Clines (1990), 41–44.
 43. Freedman (1983). See Deut 33:29, where *ʾezer* also means power rather than help.
 44. Fabry (2003), 403–404.
 45. Translation by R. Marcus (1953).
 46. These words are explained in D. E. S. Stein (2006), xxiv–xxv, 394–395.
 47. Arnold (2009), 61.
 48. Clifford (1994), 144–145.
 49. A. Sasson (2010), 15–16; see also Meyers (2012a).
 50. Gottwald (1979), 437–439.
 51. Amiry and Tamari (1989), 11.
 52. Garnsey (1999), 61–71.
 53. Bar-Efrat (1992), 212–215; Alter (1981), 92–95.
 54. Gunn and Fewell (1993), 148.
 55. Cited and translated by Alter (1981), 93.
 56. Pagels (1991).
 57. Kraus (2011), 28; Niehr (2001).
 58. Sarna (1989), 19.
 59. Day (2006).
 60. Ibid., 116.