

15

Unprocessed manuscript for circulation
to committee readers only. Not for
duplication or distribution in any form.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MAN AND WOMAN IN THE

BEGINNING AND AT THE END

by

Gerhard F. Hasel, Ph.D.
SDA Theological Seminary
Andrews University

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MAN AND WOMAN IN THE
BEGINNING AND AT THE END

Gerhard F. Hasel
SDA Theological Seminary
Andrews University

The opening chapters of Genesis (Gen 1-3) are of crucial importance for both the origins of our world and also for the origin, beginnings, and determining relationships of man and woman. As such they set the stage for a biblical concept of man's interrelationships without which any understanding of the mutuality between man and woman is impaired and one-sided.

An investigation of the status of man and woman in Gen 1-3 is warranted and mandatory on account of both the new set of questions raised with regard to the status of women in the church and the contradictory assessment of the evidence in Gen 1-3. Some interpreters claim that "man assists passively in her [woman's] creation" and that since "woman [is] drawn forth from man [she] owes all her existence to him."¹ Accordingly woman is said to exist in a state of inferiority in relation to man. Other interpreters infer from Gen 2 that woman is inferior and subordinate to man because of "the fact that she is the helper of man, and is named by him,"² Another view holds that whereas Gen 1 recognized the equality of man and woman, Gen 2 makes woman a second, subordinate, and inferior being.³ It is observed that Gen 1:26-28 "dignifies woman as an important factor in the creation, equal in power and glory with man," while Gen 2 "makes her a mere afterthought."⁴ On the other hand, there are those suggesting on the basis of Gen 1-3 that man and woman are created equal, that woman is not an after-

thought of creation and does not constitute a decline in God's creativity. To them woman as the last of all creation is its climax and culmination. Woman is the crown of creation.⁵ These contradictory views, all claiming to derive from the material in Gen 1-3, warrant a careful investigation of the evidence provided in the opening chapters of the Bible. This is all the more important because these chapters describe man's perfect state before sin and the farreaching changes introduced by sin, perpetuated since then, and grown to immense proportions.

I. MAN AND WOMAN IN GEN 1

The inspired record reveals that on the sixth day of the creation week, after everything else had been created,

God said, "Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth." And God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

(Gen 1:26, 27, NASB)

This sublime account of the creation of man is a part of the summary narrative of creation (Gen 1:1-2:3) which is complemented with more specific details about man and his setting in the following chapter (Gen 2).⁶ It expresses in most compact form the essentials of the creation of man.

The first point to be made is that the Hebrew term for "man" in these two verses is not an equivalent for the name Adam. This is readily perceived on account of the fact that "man" (אָדָם = 'ādām)⁷ is a term which includes both "male and female" (1:27). As such 'ādām (man) is a generic term for mankind.⁸

Next, it is to be stressed that in Gen 1 man is created as both "male and female" (vs. 27). There is no distinction between the sexes in terms of superiority or subordination. Man has its existence as a total and complete creature uniquely as man and woman. The full meaning of 'ādām is realized only when there is man and woman.⁹

Man has been created to live in constant communion with each other. Though male is the first creature formed (Gen 2:7), which is already implied by the mention of the term "male" before "female" in Gen 1:27, and

put into the Edenic garden "to cultivate it and keep it" (Gen 2:15, NASB), a job identified with the male (Gen 3:17-19), he is not yet the perfect and complete creature for which God aims in the creation of mankind. God's own evaluation of the situation after the creation of the male was "It is not good for the man to be alone" (Gen 2:18). Only with the creation of woman does man exist in complete and harmonious partnership and communion. With the coming into existence of both man and woman, creation is complete --a fact stressed again in Gen 2.

In the definition of mankind as bisexual the Creator established complete equality between male and female. Gen 1 knows of no superiority of one sex over the other.¹⁰ Woman is not subordinated to man. She holds no inferior place nor is her role lower than that of the male. A number of points in Gen 1 stress that both male and female are created equal, that neither is superior nor inferior to the other in creation.¹¹

It is striking that both "male and female" are created in the image of God (Gen 1:26f.). The whole man in his bisexuality, which does not so much stress the nature of man as a being with a divinely given sex drive but rather his unity and mutual communion, is created in the image of God.¹² There is no distinction in terms of superiority or inferiority. To the contrary, woman is also created in the image of God just as man.¹³ Both man and woman are thus set apart from the rest of creation as constituting a new and distinct order.¹⁴ They are equal in their distinct superiority to the rest of creation, because both share equally in the image of God.

The blessing of God is bestowed to both of "them" (בְּרִכָּה = בְּרִכָּה). The divine blessing comes to man (בְּרִכָּה) as man and woman. Both share the blessing jointly in equal manner. Both are equal in their status, since both are equal recipients of God's blessing (Gen 1:28). The "blessing"

(ברך = brk) bestowed by God upon both man and woman is the power to be fruitful and to multiply and thus to perpetuate the human species.¹⁵ The responsibility of both man and woman in the propagation and perpetuation of mankind rests in equal manner upon both.

The task of "subduing" (כבש = kbš) the earth (Gen 1:28) and of "ruling" (רדה = rdh) over the animal world (Gen 1:26, 28) is laid upon both man and woman. When God purposed to create man ('āḏām), He already designed that both should exercise the "ruling" function (1:26). The verb רדה = rdh means in Joel 4:13 "to tread in the wine-press."¹⁶ In Nu 24:19 and Lev 26:17 it is used of "to rule over" and it is employed frequently of the ruling or governing activity of the king.¹⁷ It has been suggested that the basic meaning of rdh is "to tread (down),"¹⁸ but this is hardly the meaning here. It seems that man as "the crowning work of the Creator"¹⁹ maintains his royal position in his rulership over the animal kingdom.²⁰ The exercise of rulership does not mean exploitation because this would mean to lose his divinely given position of lordship. Both man and woman have a share in this task on equal basis. Both are elevated to an equally noble status over creature and creation in their exercise of dominion over the created world. Man as male and female is God's sovereign emblem and representative on earth, summoned to maintain God's claim over the earth having received dominion over the world as a part of God's special domain of sovereignty.

In short, in Gen 1 man ('āḏām) is created last as male and female and is thus truly the crown of creation.²¹ Both man and woman share their creation in "the image of God" which lifts them above all other creatures and places them together in a special relationship to God; both man and woman find their full meaning neither in male alone nor in female alone but in their mutual relationship and communion; both man and woman receive

the divine blessing with the power to propagate and perpetuate the human species; both man and woman are given the task to "subdue" the earth and to "rule" over the animal kingdom, indicating their common position as vicegerents over God's creation. This heaping up of aspects in the creation, nature, and responsibilities of ʾādām ("man") indicates that both male and female were created by God as equals. Neither man nor woman was superior or inferior to the other; neither one was subordinated to the other. Man and woman were equals, each certainly with his own individuality.

II. MAN AND WOMAN IN GEN 2

The narrative of Gen 2:4-25 describes in more detail aspects of the carefully written and most compactly constructed creation story of Gen 1, complementing it on crucial points.²² In Gen 2:7 "the man" (hā-ʾādām) is the first creature formed²³ from the dust of the ground. God breathes into him (Adam)²⁴ the "breath of life" (nišmat-hayyîm) and "man becomes a living being" (NASB).²⁵

"The man" was taken by God and settled in the garden of Eden in order to till and to tend it (Gen 2:15). It seems that this reference refers to the male, because the tilling and keeping of the garden is an activity identified with male (cf. Gen 3:17-19).²⁶ Meaningful and complete existence can be experienced by man only in connection with work.

The divine instruction to "the man" (hā-ʾādām) not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil must have been given to both man and woman (Gen 2:16, 17), because woman refers to the divine instruction and the prohibition to eat from this one tree (Gen 3:2ff.). Since woman is included under the term hā-ʾādām in 2:16 but the report of her creation is not

given until thereafter (2:18ff.), there is here a clear indication that Gen 2:4ff. is not a separate creation account as critical scholarship maintains.²⁷ Gen 2:16, 17 obviously presupposes Gen 1:26, 27.

Woman is created after man had been engaged in the naming of the animals (Gen 2:20). A farreaching observation grew out of this experience: "There was no helper suitable for him" (vs. 20, NASB). Then comes God's pronouncement, "'It is not good for the man to be alone; I will make a helper suitable for him'," (2:18, NASB).

It is mandatory to investigate the meaning of the term עֵזֶר (cēzer) rendered as "help meet" (KJV), "helper" (RSV, NJV, NASB), "partner" (NEB, NAB) and "aid" (Speiser, Anchor Bible) as well as the idea of "fit for him" (RSV) or "suitable for him" (NAB, NASB). This investigation should clear up the matter as to whether or not these thoughts stress equality or inferiority.

The expression cēzer ("helper") has many different usages in the Old Testament. It is distinguished from the feminine noun cezrāh (עֶזְרָה) which means "help, support."²⁸ The usage of the masculine noun cēzer shows that the writer of Gen 2:18 choose a more neutral term avoiding the idea of making woman a mere "help" or "support" for man.²⁹ The translation "aid"³⁰ does not fit the meaning of the original term. The traditional translation "help meet" (KJV) is made up of two English words. The term "meet" is an archaism, meaning "adapted" or "suitable,"³¹ and has little to do with the term "helpmeet" which is a ghost word where "help meet for him" has been mistakenly read as a single word.³² To speak, therefore, of woman as a "helpmeet" in the sense that she is a mate aiding her husband in his work "is an error implying strange ignorance of the English language."³³

The noun ḥēzer ("helper") is employed primarily for God³⁴ which indicates that it does not imply inferiority or of necessity lower status. The Lord (Yahweh) is the "helper" for Israel. As "helper" God creates and saves³⁵ which shows that this term designates a beneficial relationship. It can be a personal name for a male.³⁶ In Isa 30:5 the whole people is designated as "helper." In Hos 13:9 the question is raised as to who will be Israel's "helper" when destruction comes to her. In all OT instances the term "helper" is employed in contexts which refer to a beneficial relationship. The term itself does not specify positions within relationships nor does it by itself imply inferiority. Since the term pertains to God, people, and animals (Gen 2:20) position must be determined from the context or additional content. This additional content is provided in Gen 2:18 with the word כְּנֶגְדּוֹ (kēnegdō) which means literally "like his counterpart."³⁷ The idea is that woman is a helper "corresponding to him" or "alongside him."³⁸ Inasmuch as woman is made a helper alongside and corresponding to man, she is his suitable counterpart and fitting companion.³⁹ Thus in Gen 2:18, 20 the kind of relationship which is entailed is one of equality, because the word negeḏ ("counterpart") which joins ḥēzer ("helper") indicates that woman is a suitable helper fit for man. We must keep in mind that the animals are also helpers, but they fail to fit man ('ādām). They are formed (yāṣar) from the ground ('ādāmāh) as Gen 2:19 indicates. Yet their similarity in the way they are made and out of the stuff they are made is not equality. Adam names the animals and thereby exercises power over them, but no suitable, helping counterpart is found among them for him (2:20). And thus the report moves to the creation of woman. In short, animals are helpers inferior to man. Woman is the suitable partner alongside and corresponding to man, his equal companion.⁴⁰

The account of the creation of the woman (Gen 2:21, 22) concludes the story of the creation of man. In the creation of female God Himself is the only one active just as in the creation of male. For the last creation, its climax, "the Lord God caused a deep sleep (תַּדְמָה = tardēmāh) to fall upon the man" (2:21, NASB). Aside from the description of the actual processes of the creation of woman, this sentence emphasizes unequivocally that man himself had no part whatever in the creation of woman. He neither participates nor looks on at her creation.⁴¹ He is likewise not consulted. Woman owes her origin as solely to God as does man. No distinction between man and woman is implied. Woman is equal to man as regards the one who created her. She comes forth from the fashioning hand of God as does man.

An additional parallel of equality comes to expression in the creation of man and woman from raw material. Neither man nor woman is spoken into existence. Man is made from dust (2:7); woman is made from a rib (2:21).⁴² The "rib" (צֵלָה = sēlāh)⁴³ is evidently taken from Adam not to explain something on man⁴⁴ but has reference to the nature of man⁴⁵ in relationship to each other. "The woman was created, not of dust of the earth, but from a rib of Adam because she was formed for an inseparable unity and fellowship of life with the man, . . ."⁴⁶ The creation of woman from the rib of man in no way refers to a position of subordination on her part.⁴⁷ To the contrary, it stresses woman's status as equal with man,⁴⁸ superior with man to the animals and inferior with him to God. To call woman "Adam's rib" is to misread the text which explicitly states that the extracted rib was but the raw material which God built (bnh)⁴⁹ into woman.

After the creation of woman God takes her to the man who acknowledges her equality and jubilantly cries out in the poem of 2:23:

This at last⁵⁰ is bone of my bones,
 and flesh of my flesh;
 This one shall be called woman ('iṣṣāh),
 for this one has been taken out of man ('îṣ).

The first two lines ("bone of my bones, flesh of my flesh") express joyously that finally a fitting companion and suitable partner, the "counterpart corresponding to him" (2:18, 20) is brought. Man himself stresses that his partner is of the same stuff as he is.⁵¹

The last two lines introduce for the first time the terms "man" as male ('îṣ) and "woman" as female ('iṣṣāh). This change of terminology indicates that man as male exists only in relationship with woman as female. Woman exists in correlation to man and vice versa. With the creation of woman ('iṣṣāh) occurs the first specific term for man as male ('îṣ).⁵² The linguistic pun of 'îṣ ("man") and 'iṣṣāh ("woman") in 2:23b proclaims both equality and differentiation in terms of male and female. The Genesis creation account carefully avoids any hint at inferiority or superiority. Equality between man and woman is both maintained and emphasized.

Some interpreters suggest that the phrase "this one shall be called woman" (2:23b) refers to the naming of female by male,⁵³ that thereby man has power and authority over her and that she is subordinated to man.⁵⁴ Two considerations from a careful study of the respective passages indicate that the text does not support this inference. (1) The typical biblical formula for naming involves the verb "to call" (qārā') plus the explicit object name. This is evident from the first naming in the Bible and is carried on consistently in Genesis. "And whatever the man called [qārā'] a living creature, that was its name [ṣēm]. And the man gave [qārā'] names [ṣēm] to all cattle; and to the birds of the sky, and to every beast of the field" (2:19b, 20a). In giving the animals names, first man establishes his divinely given authority and dominion as God's representative

over them (Gen 1:28) but comes to recognize that there is no suitable counterpart for him. We must keep in mind that in the OT the conferring of a name is an act of power and an assertion of ownership or some other form of control just as the giving of a new name indicates a change of state or condition, the beginning of a new existence.⁵⁵ In Gen 4:17 Cain "built a city and called [qārā'] the name [šēm] of the city Enoch, after the name [šēm] of his son." In 4:25 another son is born to Adam who "called [qārā'] his name [šēm] Seth." To Seth also a son was born "and he called [qārā'] his name [šēm] Enoch."⁵⁶ These examples demonstrate that the clause "this one shall be called woman" (2:23) does not constitute the naming of Adam's partner. This sentence has the verb "call" (qārā') but lacks the essential word "name" (šēm).⁵⁷ (2) This conclusion finds its support in the fact that the word "woman" (iṣṣāh) is not a name or proper noun.⁵⁸ It designates the female counterpart to man with the recognition of sexuality. This recognition does not constitute an act of naming on the part of man to assert power and to assume superiority over woman.⁵⁹ Man and woman are equal sexes with neither one having power and authority over the other.⁶⁰ The conception that both man and woman "become one flesh" (2:24) strengthens further the notion of the oneness and equality of both companions.

We have observed so far that Gen 1-2 emphasizes in a multitude of ways the equality of man and woman, that these chapters militate against the notions of superiority or inferiority on the part of either man or woman. There remains for us to turn to the suggestion that the creation of man before woman implies a divinely ordained subordination of woman. It is claimed that the order of sequence, man created first and woman second, establishes "the priority and superiority of the man . . . as an ordinance of divine creation."⁶¹ If this supposition were correct, it would

contradict the constant emphasis on equality. It may be assumed that the inspired writer in writing the reports of the creation of man and woman wrote in such a way that the respective aspects of the total story would not contradict each other. Indeed the order of sequence of the creation of man and woman does not imply man's superiority or woman's inferiority. It serves a different function.

In Hebrew literature the central concerns of a unit come often at the beginning and at the end of the unit as an inclusio device.⁶² The complementary narrative of creation of Gen 2:4-24 evinces this structure. The creation of man first and of woman last constitutes a "ring composition"⁶³ where the first and the last (second) correspond to each other in importance. In terms of the thinking of the biblical writer this does not mean that the first is more important or superior and the second is less important and inferior. To the contrary, the existence of the creature created first is incomplete without the creation of the creature created last as the divine declaration emphasized: "It is not good for man to be alone" (2:18). Thus as the Gen 2 narrative of creation moves to its end it moves to its climax and not its decline in the creation of woman.⁶⁴ With the coming into existence of woman, creation has reached its completion and culmination. Her creation is not an afterthought. Her creation is reported last not because the sequence and order of creation implies a status of woman secondary to man but because with the literary device of the ring composition the inspired writer attempted to indicate that man and woman are parallel and equal in position. This is supported as we have seen by (1) the content and context of the narrative of the creation of woman in Gen 2 and (2) the content and context of Gen 1 where 'ādām as male and female is truly the crown of all creation.⁶⁵

It may be parenthetically inserted that the remarkable importance of woman in the biblical reports of creation is all the more extraordinary when one realizes that the biblical account of the creation of woman as such has no parallel in ancient Near Eastern literature. It indicates the high position of woman in the OT and in biblical religion in contrast to woman's low status in the ancient Near East in general.

III. MAN AND WOMAN IN GEN 3

The remarkable position of woman as an equal of man as a divine ordinance of creation (Gen 1-2) is not maintained much longer after the entry of sin. The consequences of sin are enormous even for the harmonious relationship and delicate equality between man and woman.

It is not necessary to rehearse the story of the serpent's (Satan's) approach to the woman, their dialogue, and the woman's eating of the forbidden fruit (3:1-6a). In contemplating the tree in the middle of the garden, the woman recognizes the fruit as "good for food," namely it satisfies the physical drives. It is "a delight to the eyes," showing that the fruit is aesthetically and emotionally desirable. The tree "was desirable as a source of wisdom [haskîl]" (3:6) as the serpent had claimed (3:5). When the woman acts she is fully aware that she seeks not merely to satisfy divinely given drives⁶⁵ but to attain a higher sphere of existence, approaching that of deity; to be "like God" (3:5). Under these impressions and aspirations she takes the fruit and eats. It is striking that the inspired writer shows in the way he writes of woman's fall that the initiative and the decision to eat are hers alone without consultation with her husband, without seeking his advice or permission. In separating from her husband, she was "in greater danger than if both were together."⁶⁷

After man had joined his wife in eating of the fruit, both man and woman are one in the new knowledge of their nakedness (3:7). They are one in their hiding from the Lord God (3:8) and in their fear of Him (3:10). In the acts of disobedience man and woman have broken the harmonious relationship with their God. Nowhere is implied an inferior position of woman after sin. Both male and female experience the same loss of harmonious relationship with God and each other.

God addresses to man the first questions (3:9, 11). Finally Adam admits, "The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me from the tree, and I ate" (3:12). Here is another indication of the broken harmony between male and female and man and God. Just as shame is a sign of the disturbance of interhuman relationships and fear a sign of the disorder in divine-human relationships, so the disruption of these relationships in different spheres of existence is reflected in man's defense after sin when he puts the blame on woman and, since she was given to him by the Creator, ultimately upon God.⁶⁸ The woman, in turn, blamed the serpent and, as her husband, ultimately God (3:13).

We must now turn to the judgments of God which come in curses and punishments. The record is explicit in its emphasis that divine curses are pronounced over the serpent (3:14) and the ground (3:17); but the woman and the man are not cursed.⁶⁹ They are judged!

The declaration spoken to woman is of special concern. It consists of (1) the multiplication of pain in pregnancy and childbirth (3:16a)⁷⁰ and (2) that her husband shall "rule" over her (3:16b).

The judgment that there shall be an increase of "pain" (Ciṣṣābôn)⁷¹ during pregnancy and in childbirth can hardly serve as a sound theological argument against attempts to reduce discomfort and pain during pregnancy and

labor. Why? The same term (Ciṣṣābôn) is employed for the "toil" (RV, RSV, NASB, NAB) or "labour" (NEB) imposed on Adam with regard to the travail in making his livelihood. As man's travail in making a livelihood are reduced by inventions and technology so woman's travail in pregnancy and childbirth can be reduced by modern inventions and technological advances!

What does the troublesome statement that your husband ('îś) "shall rule over you" mean? At first sight one might be under the impression that as man's dominion and rulership over the animals is established, so woman's aspirations for a higher sphere of existence caused her to actually fall to an inferior position, equalling that of other creatures. But this means to misread the text. The inspired writer carefully distinguishes between man's ('ādām) rule over the animals and husband's rule over his wife. The Hebrew text employs two different verbs which are rendered into English (and other modern languages) by the same word. Man's rulership over the animals is expressed with the verb rdh (1:26, 28), the meaning of which is discussed already and need not be repeated. Man's rulership over his wife is expressed with the verb māšal (3:16). In over 100 usages of forms of the root mšl in the OT, there is not a single example in which a form of mšl expresses man's ruling over animals. Accordingly, by the choice of this word to express that man shall "rule" over woman the inspired writer excluded the idea of woman being reduced through sin to a position equal to animals. The verb māšal is employed a number of times with Yahweh as the subject.⁷² When used of man, it is employed of man's rulership over creation (Ps 8:7), his brothers and sisters (Gen 37:8), slaves (Ex 21:8), nations (Dt 15:6) or nations ruling another nation (Joel 2:17). Man can also "rule over" or "be in charge of" someone's possessions (Gen 24:2; Ps 105:21). The verb can also refer to "self-control," namely the ruling of oneself (Gen 4:7; Ps 19:14; Prov 16:32). A common usage is "to rule" in the political sphere.⁷³ It is obvious that

the verb māšal, being used of an activity of God, man, woman, nation, etc., has multiple nuances. It seems certain that it implies subordination. Again the context and additional content must define the nature of the subordination of woman to man.

It is a fact of nature that woman is not subordinated in intellectual, mental, emotional and other spheres of existence to man. A woman could take part in equal status with man in the public life of ancient Israel. Important women are known from the earliest to the latest period of Israel's history. Miriam could serve as a counselor to government (Ex 2:4, 7-8; 15:20, 21) and is known as a prophetess (Ex 15:20). Deborah is an Israelite heroine and served as a "judge" on equal par with other judges (Jgd 4-5). Athaliah reigned as queen over Judah for six years (2 Ki 11). Huldah the prophetess was consulted by the king's ministers (2 Ki 22:14). Isaiah's wife was a "prophetess" (Isa 8:3). Both men and women could take the Nazirite vow and dedicate and separate themselves for God (Nu 6:2). The book of Esther tells how the nation was saved by a woman. As regards God's choice of woman for spiritual and political leadership the OT provides hardly support for an inferior position of women to fulfill such tasks, though they do not appear as often as man. Women were employed by God to do a work for Him just as were men.⁷⁴

In returning to the question of the meaning of the statement that man shall "rule" (māšal) over woman, one needs to stress that this follows the statement that her "desire" (RV, RSV, NASB) or "urge" (NAB, NJV, NEBmg) shall be for her husband (3:16). This "urge" or "desire" can hardly be said to be "bordering upon disease"⁷⁵ and stress a craving more violent in woman for her husband than in man for his wife. Why? The same Hebrew term (tēšûqâh) is also used of man's "desire" or "urge" for his beloved (Song

7:11). This seems to imply that woman's desire for her husband is just as natural and strong as is the male's desire for female. On this point the OT does not appear to make a distinction between man and woman. Both seem to share the same urge. No distinction between man and woman can be maintained on this point.

In any case, the inspired writer records that the divine declaration that man shall "rule" over woman is placed within the context of the man/woman relationship in marriage. This contextual setting of the ruling of man over woman in the divine speech must never be lost sight of.⁷⁶ Note that the first part of the declaration, i.e. the multiplying of travail in pregnancy, is an experience that takes place in marriage. The second part, i.e. pain in childbirth, is likewise an experience which takes place within the sphere of marriage. The third part stresses the wife's "desire for your husband." Then, after this threefold reference to changes which are associated with the marriage institution comes the sentence, "He [your husband] shall rule over you" (3:16). The contextual setting of the marriage institution provides a crucial aid in answering the question of the meaning of the statement, "he shall rule over you." The ruling of man over woman is restricted to the sphere of marriage.⁷⁷ Accordingly this divine declaration does not apply to all spheres of woman's life and activity. This sentence cannot be used to support male domination and supremacy in all spheres of life. It is reading into this statement what the context does deny. It is eisegesis and not exegesis.

Now the sensitive questions arise with regard to the meaning of the husband's ruling over his wife. Does this ruling mean male domination and supremacy in marriage? Does this imply that the female is to be reduced to a blindly obedient slave? Does this support man's reign as a despot? Does

this include the loss of the wife's individuality, the surrendering of her will to her husband, etc.? The Bible, neither the OT nor the NT, gives any indication to answer any of these questions in the affirmative. Sin disrupted also the harmony of husband and wife. That man should rule over his wife means that the union and harmony of marriage can be preserved only by submission on the part of the one to the other (PP 58). So man is the head of the woman as the Father is the head of Christ (1 Cor 11:3). As the Father and Christ are equal and yet God is the head of Christ, so husband and wife are equal (4T 36) but the husband is the head. He is the first among equals. The submission on the part of one to the other can hardly be thought of as destroying the essence of a harmonious relationship and yet one of the two rules and is head whereas the other is in submission. The headship of the husband, his rulership in the sphere of marriage is controlled by a love on the part of the husbands which is modelled on the love of Christ for his church, giving Himself up for her (Eph 5:25). A husband guided by the divine model will love his wife as his own body (Eph 5:28). These biblical concepts destroy any false understanding of the rulership function of the husband in marriage.

The usurpation of power and authority by man over woman contrary to the divine intention and God's will is already illustrated in Gen 3. It appears to result from an increase of sin which corrupted the pattern established by God after sin vitiated man's relationship with God and each other. The inspired record reports, "Now the man called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all the living" (3:20). Adam names his wife. This is the second naming scene in the Bible. It has been shown above that the biblical formula for naming contains the verb to call (qārā') and the object name (šēm). Both elements are present. In naming his wife Adam

asserts ownership and control over her. It is an act of power which seems to reflect the corruption of a relationship of mutuality and equality. Does the inspired writer intend to express the idea that Adam, who had established his dominion and authority over animals in the act of naming them, is doing the same with the naming of his wife, establishing a supremacy fit for animals but not for his God-given equal? It is difficult not to think along these lines. That the name Eve itself has a positive connotation, because it expresses the idea of life and that she is "the mother of all the living," does not do away with her being named which faults man with corrupting a relationship of rulership built on mutual esteem and self-giving love. There is no approval of Adam naming his wife. It appears as an act that perverts the divinely established relationship between husband and wife, and significantly it is followed by expulsion from the garden of Eden (3: 22-24).

Although this act of naming the first wife appears to indicate man's usurpation of power and his claiming of authority never intended by his divinely established ruling function after the entry of sin--and unfortunately repeated in many instances and a variety of ways among OT men--the wife of the Israelite was by no means on a level much lower than man or reduced to that of a slave. An Israelite could sell his slaves (Ex 21:2-11; Dt 15:12-18) which were normally of foreign extraction, or in unusual circumstances his daughter for a limited period of time (Ex 21:7), but he could never sell his wife, even if he had acquired her as a captive in war (Dt 21:14). Under the law of Moses a husband could divorce his wife, but contrary to the custom of many nations in the ancient Near East she was protected by the letter of repudiation, which restored her freedom.⁷⁸ With regard to divorce we need to note Jesus' restriction of the Mosaic law to

infidelity only (Mt 5:31, 32; 19:9; cf. Mk 10:11f.; Lk 16:18; 1 Cor 7:10f.). Within the family circle the law commanded that equal honor be given to the mother and wife as to the father,⁷⁹ certainly indicating equality between father and mother. The book of Proverbs insists on the respect due to one's mother,⁸⁰ and the union of one man with one woman is clearly shown to be the norm, both by the absence of any allusion to the discords of polygamy and by the fully personal bond taken to exist between husband and wife. The two share the training of children and are assumed to speak with one voice (Prov 1:8f.; 6:20; etc.). The husband is urged not merely to be loyal but ardent toward his partner (Prov 5:19); a broken marriage vow is a sin against a companion ('allûp) and friend (Prov 2:17). This is a far cry from the not uncommon ancient idea of a wife as a chattel and childbearer but no companion. Far from being a cypher, the woman is the making or undoing of her husband. She is a God-given favor and boon (Prov 18:22; 19:14), indeed "her husband's crown" (Prov 12:4) or else "rottenness in his bones" (Prov 12:4). The capable wife is a model of benevolent constancy; she is a wise administrator, thrifty trader, skillful craftswoman, liberal philanthropist, and able guide whose influence and good reputation assure her a high standing in the community where what she has to say ranks as wisdom and reliable advice (Prov 31:10-30). These passages which give us a glimpse into the intimacy of family life show a very high view of woman and demonstrate that the position of the wife was not of a low nature. She was respected, listened to and loved by her husband, and treated by him as an invaluable equal.⁸¹ This is further illustrated by the mother of Samuel (1 Sa 1:4-8, 22, 23) and the woman of Shunem (2 Ki 4:8-24).

It may be in place to touch briefly on the suggestion that woman had a vastly inferior position in ancient Israel because she did not serve

as a priestess and did not offer up sacrifices in the sanctuary. It is precarious to read into this the idea that she ranked far below man in religious affairs. We need to remind ourselves for the sake of perspective that women figured prominently as prophetesses (Miriam, Huldah, etc.) and leaders in the affairs of state (Deborah, Bathsheba, Athaliah, Jezebel). Women participated fully in the religious activities revolving around the annual festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles (Booths). They are included in the phrase "all the congregation of Israel" (Ez 12:3). In prescribing of keeping the feast of Tabernacles (Booths) the daughter, maid-servant and widows are especially named (Dt 16:14). Young women came to dance before Yahweh at Shilo (Jdg 21:19-21). A woman could go to the sanctuary on new moon or sabbath (2 Ki 4:23). Although the OT gives no reason why women did not serve as priestesses, it may be suggested that the pagan concepts associated with priestesses in the ancient world are the cause why God refrained from calling upon women to serve in the sanctuary and its sacrificial rites. God may have designed to preserve Israel from Canaanite influences.⁸² Priestesses played an important role in the utterly immoral cult of the Canaanites where the sacred marriage (hieros gamos) was reenacted with priests and priestesses (and others) participating. Canaanite fertility religion became a deadly threat even without the establishing of worship in Israel with both priests and priestesses (Hos; Isa). In His divine providence God seems to have reduced possible inroads to a minimum. It should also not be overlooked that the priestly order of service at the sanctuary which prescribed certain periods of time for service at the central sanctuary did not lend itself very well for women who were considered ritually unclean for determined lengths of time during menstruation (and after childbirth). This would have interfered with the fulfillment of

regular priestly service at the sanctuary with its daily sacrifices. Under these considerations it does not seem to be a strong argument that since women in Israelite times did not serve as priestesses, they cannot serve today with changed circumstances (no Canaanite influence and no ritual uncleanness) to their full capabilities in all lines of work in the church.

IV. RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

It remains now to summarize our conclusions and to study their implications for the church at the time of the end. Gen 1 stresses, it seems unequivocally, full equality between man and woman. It is emphasized in (1) "man" ('āḏām) being created as "male and female"; (2) their creation "in the image of God"; (3) their sharing in equal manner in the divine "blessing"; (4) their common power to "subdue" the earth; (5) their mutual assignment to "rule" over the animals; (6) their common vocation to be God's vice-regents on earth (Gen 1:26, 27). These ideas point out unanimously that man as male and female is created equal, lower than God but superior to everything else.

The more extensive story of the creation of man and woman in Gen 2 does not stand in tension or opposition to this picture, but corroborates the compressed statements of Gen 1, complementing them with additional details. That woman is created to be man's "helper" (Cēzer) expresses both a beneficial and harmonious relationship between man and woman. Only woman is a suitable partner alongside and corresponding to man; she is his equal companion (2:18, 20). As God is man's superior helper and animals are man's inferior helper, so woman is man's equal helper. Woman owes her creation as solely to God as does man who, although created first, is neither consulted in her creation nor participates in any way in her creation. Her creation from Adam's rib indicates the inseparable unity and fellowship of

life between male and female as well as her status as equal with man (2:21). The jubilant outcry, "This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh," (2:23a) expresses man's recognition that finally there is a fitting companion equal to him. The fact of Adam's creation before Eve's does not at all imply any superiority on his part. The inspired writer, in reporting the creation of man at the beginning (2:7) and that of woman last (2:18-25), used the inclusio device of a ring composition where the first and the last are parallel and equal in position.

With the fall of man and the entry of sin into the world (Gen 3) the complete and total harmony between God and man, man and man/woman, and man and world is disrupted. The particular term chosen by the inspired writer to express the idea of the divine declaration that man shall "rule" (māšal) over his wife (3:16) indicates that she is not reduced to a slave or an animal to be "ruled" (rādah) over as animals (1:26, 28). The context of Gen 3:16 amply indicates that the sphere of woman's submission is restricted to the marriage relationship. To maintain a harmonious union in marriage during the era of sin God designed that while husband and wife remain equal, he should "rule" over her or be the head of a relationship of equals as the Father is the head of Christ in the relationship of the equality of a triune God (1 Cor 11:3). The husband's rulership is modelled on the self-giving love of Christ for the church (Eph 5:25, 28), which militates against any usurpation of powers and claims of authority over woman (Gen 3:20) which is against the divinely established order but which has been extended into virtually all spheres of life and activity. It is part of the extension and increase of sin but not a part of the divine order which itself is to function only in the marriage relationship as the context of Gen 3:16 appears to indicate clearly.

In addition to the important observation that the rulership of man over woman is valid only in the sphere of marriage, it has been observed, if our careful investigation has not misled us, that the husband's ruling function is not a part of God's perfect creation but a result of sin. The implications of these observations are of immense significance for the task of the proclamation of the gospel of God's remnant church. If the plan of salvation and the message of the gospel are concerned with the reproduction of the image of God in men under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth⁸³ and on the basis that Christ in His life and death has achieved even more than recovery from the ruin wrought through sin,⁸⁴ is it then not the responsibility of the church as God's instrument to bring about the reproduction of the image of God in man, to restore harmony between God and man, to establish equality and unity where there is now inequality and disunity? Would this not involve among many things a restoring of and establishing of equality between men and women in such spheres of life and activity where the divine declaration of man's rulership over his wife and the wife's submission to her husband (Gen 3:16; Eph 5:22ff; 1 Pet 3:1ff.) does not apply? Furthermore, does the urgency of the task and the shortness of time not require the full utilization of all of our manpower and womanpower resources, which includes the full participation of women, also in the lines of ministerial activity? If "in Christ" or in the church there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free man, neither male nor female (Gal 3:28), does this oneness and equality not call for a united effort to finish the task where all, both "male and female" (3:28) participate in full equality of responsibilities and privileges in all lines of work in order to hasten the coming of our beloved Lord and Savior Jesus Christ?

FOOTNOTES

¹E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), p. 173; cf. S. H. Hooke, "Genesis," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. by H. H. Rowley and M. Black (London: Th. Nelson, 1962), p. 179.

²John A. Bailey, "Initiation and the Primal Woman in Gilgamesh and Genesis 2-3," JBL, 89 (1970), 143; cf. A. van den Born, "Frau," Bibel-Lexikon, ed. by H. Haag (2nd ed.; Einsiedeln: Benzinger Verlag, 1968), col. 492; Claus Westermann, Genesis (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), pp. 315f.

³Eugene E. Maly, "Genesis," The Jerome Bible Commentary, ed. by R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1968), p. 12, concludes that "woman's existence, psychologically and in the social order, is dependent on man."

⁴Elizabeth C. Standon, The Woman's Bible (New York: European Publ. Co., 1895), I, 20. Cf. Elsie Adams and Mary L. Briscoe, Up Against the Wall, Mother (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1971), p. 4; Sheila D. Collins, "Toward a Feminist Theology," Christian Century (Aug. 2, 1972), p. 798.

⁵So Bailey, JBL, 89 (1970); 150; John L. McKenzie, "The Literary Characteristics of Gen. 2-3," Theological Studies, 15 (1954), p. 559; Walther Eichrodt, Das Menschenverständnis des Alten Testaments (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1947), p. 35, and others.

⁶The assessment of traditional liberal scholarship that there are two different creation accounts which manifest "irreconcilable" contradictions (so H. H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament [New York: Harper & Row, 1963], p. 18 and many others cannot be maintained. The difference in the usage of divine names is best explained on account of the different semantic aspects associated by each (see M. H. Segal, The Pentateuch [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967], pp. 32, 103ff.; U. Cassuto, The Documentary Hypothesis [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961], pp. 15-41). The difference of style is paralleled by the commonplace stylistic differences in extra-biblical ancient Near Eastern texts (see Kenneth A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament [Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968], pp. 116, 117). The supposed differences in the conception of God are overdrawn (see Y. Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960], p. 207; E. J. Young, Introduction to the Old Testament [3rd ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964], p. 51). The alleged difference in the order of events, namely that the animals were created before their naming and after the creation of man (Gen 2:19), vanishes on the basis that the word "formed" in Gen 2:19 can equally well be translated "had formed," because the perfect tense of the Hebrew verb does double duty for both past tense and pluperfect (see G. C. Aalders, A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch [London: Tyndale Press, 1949], p. 44; G. L. Archer, Jr., A Survey

of Old Testament Introduction [Chicago: Moody Press, 1964], pp. 118f.; Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament, 118 n. 19).

⁷See on this term esp. E. Lussier, "Adam in Gen 1:1-3:24," CBQ, 18 (1956), 137-139; S. Amsler, "Adam le terreux dans Genèse 2-4," Revue de Théol. of Phil., 2 (1958), 107-112; J. de Fraine, Adam et son lineage (Paris, 1959); J. Jeremias, "'Aḏām," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964), I, 141-143; F. Vattioni, "La sapienza e la formazione del corpo umano (Gen 1:26)," Augustianum, 6 (1966), 317-323; C. Westermann, "אָדָם 'ādām Mensch," Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann (München: Kaiser, 1971), I, 41-57.

⁸There is no difference of opinion on this point among interpreters.

⁹Maly, Jerome Bible Commentary, p. 11.

¹⁰Eichrodt, Menschenverständnis, p. 35, speaks of the "noteworthy equality between man and woman before God . . . in that she is designated by God as the equal supplementation of man [Gen 2:18], in that she is also created in the image of God whereby she has part in the special place assigned to man over against nature."

¹¹E. G. White, Testimonies for the Church (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1948), III, 484: "When God created Eve, He designated that she should possess neither inferiority nor superiority to the man, but that in all things she should be his equal. The holy pair were to have no interest independent of each other; and yet each had an individuality in thinking and acting" (1875).

¹²Despite the clarity of language in Gen 1:26, 27, the opinion has been revived recently (Phyllis Trible, "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," JAAR, 41 (1973), 36) without reference to earlier supporters (such as F. Schwally, ARW, 9 (1906), 172ff.) that first man (Gen 1:26, 27) was androgynous, a single hermaphrodite being. However, the rendering in 1:27c is "male and female created he them ('ōtām)" militates against this view. This theory also militated against by the usage of the terms "male" (zākār) and "female" (nēqēbāh) which denote later in the Pentateuch not the adjectives "male" and "female" but concretely the male and female parts of the species (Gen 17:10ff.; Ex 12:40; Jer 17:1; etc.). Cf. W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), II, 12b n. 2.

¹³It has been inferred from the phrase "in the image of God He created him" (1:27b) that the "him" (אִישׁ = 'ōtō) "excludes the idea that also woman had a part in the image of God and the rulership of the world" (J. Böhm, "Wieviel Menschen sind am letzten Tage des Hexaëmerons geschaffen worden?" ZAW, 34 (1914), 33). In actual fact is the antecedent of the "him" ('ōtō) the collective noun 'ādām in 1:27a and is thus a grammatical singular which should be understood as its antecedent in the collective sense. The plural "them" (אִנְשֵׁי = 'ōtām) in 1:27c refers to the bisexual expression "male and female," so that the singular-suffix and the plural-suffix each have their proper grammatical form and refer to the same idea. Cf. W. H. Schmidt, Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift (2nd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), pp. 145 n. 1, 147 n. 1.

¹⁴E. G. White, "All heaven took a deep and joyful interest in the creation of the world and of man. Human beings were a new and distinct order. They were made 'in the image of God,' and it was the Creator's design that they should populate the earth" (RH [Feb. 11, 1902], quoted in ABC, 1081).

¹⁵Westermann, Genesis, p. 221; C. A. Keller and G. Wehmeier, "ברך brk pi, segnen," Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT, I, 369.

¹⁶W. L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1971) p. 333.

¹⁷Cf. 1 Ki 5:4; Pss 110:2; 72:8; Isa 14:6; Ezk 34:4.

¹⁸H. Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes, Gen 1, 26-30," TZ, 21 (1965), 481-483.

¹⁹E. G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1958), p. 44.

²⁰Westermann, Genesis, pp. 221, 222.

²¹Note the similarity of expression between E. G. White who calls man "the crowning work of the Creator" (PP, p. 44) and a recent writer who states that "male and female [man] are indeed the last and truly the crown of all creatures" (Tribble, JAAR 41 [1973], 36).

²²See above n. 6.

²³Commentators have often suggested on the basis of the word "formed" (יצר = yצר) in 2:7 that the creative activity is like the one of a potter (so Gunkel, Procksch, Köhler, Humbert, etc.). It is, however, hardly correct to maintain that the verb yצר implies in a special way the memory of the potter's craft and God as potter because the term "dust" (עפר = cpr) does not allow it. The specific word for "clay" or "mud" is homer (המר; with B. Jacob, Cassuto, Vriezen, Westermann, W. H. Schmidt).

²⁴In Gen 2 hā-ʾādām ("the man") is not often used in a collective sense but as a general description of the first male. Cf. Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (2nd ed.; Newton, Mass.: C. T. Branford, 1970), p. 406, and many others.

²⁵Westermann, Genesis, p. 283: "Man is created as a נפש חיה. A 'living soul' is not put in his body. Man is understood as a unity in his being made alive. An understanding of man as consisting of body and soul is excluded." Vriezen, An Outline of OT Theology, p. 407: "This infusion of the breath [of life] by God does not mean that man has received a divine soul or spirit."

²⁶So correctly with Tribble, JAAR, 41 (1973), 35, against Westermann, Genesis, p. 301.

²⁷See above n. 6.

²⁸Cf. Ps 60:13; 108:13; Isa 10:3; Holladay, Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon, p. 270.

²⁹Schmidt, Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift, p. 200; Westermann, Genesis, p. 309.

³⁰So poorly E. A. Speiser, Genesis "Anchor Bible" (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1964), p. 15.

³¹S. R. Driver, The Book of Genesis (3rd ed.; London: Nelson, 1904), p. 41.

³²Webster's New World Dictionary.

³³Driver, Genesis, p. 41.

³⁴Ex 18:4; Dt 33:7; Ps 20:3; 33:20; 115:9-11; 121:2; 124:8; 146:5; Dan 11:34

³⁵Ps 121:2; 124:8; 146:5; Dt 33:7, 26, 29.

³⁶1 Chr 4:4; 12:10; Neh 3:19.

³⁷L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1958), p. 591; Holladay, Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon, p. 226.

³⁸So Speiser, Genesis, p. 17.

³⁹L. Köhler, Old Testament Theology (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957), p. 246 n. 103, translates appropriately "a partner who suits him."

⁴⁰Man is created by God in such a way that he requires mutual help. The writer of Eccl expresses this concept as follows: "For if either of them falls, the one will lift up his companion. But woe to the one who falls when there is not another to lift him up" (4:10, NASB). Man cannot fulfill his purpose except in mutual support.

⁴¹This point is made correctly by J. G. Thomson, "Sleep. An Aspect of Jewish Anthropology," VT, 5 (1955), 421-435.

⁴²Though the raw material itself is not identical, this does not do away with the fact that male and female are made from a divinely chosen raw material.

⁴³It has recently been supposed that "the reference to the rib has probably its ground in a Sumerian play upon words" (so now Westermann, Genesis, p. 314, following J. B. Pritchard, "Man's Predicament in Eden," RevRel, 13 (1948/49), 15). Attention has thus been drawn to the creation of the goddess Nin-ti whose name can mean both "lady of the rib" and "lady who makes live" because the word ti in Sumerian means "rib" and also "to make live" (S. N. Kramer, History Begins Sumer [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959], p. 146; D. J. Wiseman, Illustrations from Biblical Archaeology [London: Tyndale

Press, 1958], p. 9). However, the fact that "rib" and "life-making" is verbally linked in Sumerian whereas in Hebrew the words for "rib" and "to make alive" have nothing in common indicate that it is hardly possible that the reference to the rib in the biblical creation story has its origin in Sumerian mythology. This is further strengthened by the fact that the themes of the story of the creation of woman and the Sumerian myth "Enki and Ninhursag" have virtually nothing in common (cf. ANET, pp. 37-41).

⁴⁴There is no scholarly agreement what the conception of creation from the rib means. It has been suggested that "rib" was a euphemism for the birth canal which is lacking in males (so J. Boehmer, "Die geschlechtliche Stellung des Weibes in Gen. 2 und 3," Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, 79 [1939], 292). It has been asserted that the "rib" explains the existence of the navel in the first man (so P. Humbert, Etudes sur le récit du Paradis [Neuchâtel, 1940], pp. 57f.) or answers the question why the ribs cover the upper but not the lower part of the body (so G. von Rad, Genesis [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961], p. 82) or that man can continue to live even at the loss of a rib (so O. Procksch, Die Genesis [3rd ed.; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1924], ad loc.).

⁴⁵So correctly Westermann, Genesis, p. 314.

⁴⁶C. F. Keil, The First Book of Moses (Genesis) (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1949), I, 89.

⁴⁷With Schmidt, Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift, p. 201.

⁴⁸E. G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 46: "Eve was created from a rib taken from the side of Adam, signifying that she was not to control him as the head, nor to be trampled under his feet as an inferior, but to stand by his side as a equal, to be loved and protected by him." Tribble, JAAR, 41 (1973), 37: "The rib means solidarity and equality."

⁴⁹The common verb bnh is employed in the OT for various kinds of activities which involve "building" (cf. R. Hulst, "בנה bnh bauen," Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, I, 325-327). It is employed only one more time (of 376 times total occurrence) of creative activity in the OT (Amos 9:6). It is a term expressing creative activity in Hebrew as its Akkadian cognate bānû which is the regular term describing the "creation" of human beings (W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, Atra-ḫāsis The Babylonian Story of the Flood [London: Clarendon Press, 1969], p. 57; cf. Wolfram von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1959], p. 103) and its Ugaritic cognate bny which means "to create, procreate" (U. Cassuto, Genesis [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961], I, 134).

⁵⁰The common rendering of "now" for ha-pa'am is hardly sufficient. It should be translated as "at last" with NEB, NAB, NJV and Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon, p. 295.

⁵¹Cf. W. Reiser, "Die Verwandschaftsformel in Gen 2, 23," TZ, 16 (1960), 1-4; W. Brueggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gen 2:23a)," CBQ, (1970), 532-542.

the blame upon his wife, and thus upon God Himself."

⁶⁹Against Schmidt, Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift, p. 216, who speaks of a "Fluchwort gegen den 'Menschen'" in Gen 3:17-19.

⁷⁰The translation "your pain in childbearing" (RSV, NJV, NASB, NAB) captures admirably the meaning of the Hebrew idiom which is "a parade example of hendiadys" (Speiser, Genesis, p. 24). A hendiadys is a literary and idiomatic method whereby two formally co-ordinate terms, either verbs, nouns, or adjectives, are joined by "and" to express a single concept in which one of the components defines the other. The literal text would read "your pangs and your childbearing."

⁷¹A kindred noun is employed for the second time the word "pain" appears in 3:16, namely Coṣeb ("pain") which derives from the same root Cṣb (Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon, p. 280).

⁷²1 Chr 29:12; 2 Chr 20:6; Pss 22:29; 59:14; 66:7; 89:10; 103:19; Jdg 8:23.

⁷³Gen 45:8, 26; Jos 12:2, 5; Jdg 8:22, 23; 9:2; 14:4; 15:11; 2 Sa 23:3; 1 Ki 5:1; Isa 3:4, 12; 14:5; 16:1; etc. Cf. J. A. Soggin, "מָשַׁל mšl herrschen," Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, I, 930-933.

⁷⁴To deduct superiority on the part of man on account of statistics (women functioned not as often as man) is precarious.

⁷⁵So Keil, The First Book of Moses, p. 103.

⁷⁶Paul also speaks of the wife's submission to their husbands (Eph 5:24) but qualifies immediately to avoid misunderstanding that they should love their wives as Christ loved the church (5:25) and as they love their own bodies (5:28).

⁷⁷E. G. White, Testimonies for the Church, III, 484, interprets that Adam should rule over Eve in terms of the husband/wife relationship in the home in the following way: "But after Eve's sin, as she was first in the transgression, the Lord told her that Adam should rule over her. She was to be in subjection to her husband, and this was part of the curse" (*italics mine*). In Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 58, she writes, "They [Adam and Eve] would have ever been in harmony with each other; but sin had brought discord, and now their union could be maintained and harmony preserved only by submission on the part of the one to the other. . . she had fallen into temptation by separating from her companion, contrary to the divine direction. It was by her solicitation that Adam sinned, and she was now placed in subjection to her husband."

⁷⁸Dt. 24:1ff.; 23:13ff.; cf. Mt 5:31, 32; 19:1-9.

⁷⁹Ex 21:17; Lev 20:9; Dt 21:18-21; 27:16.

⁸⁰Prov 19:26; 20:20; 23:22; 30:17.

⁸¹R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961), p. 40.

⁸²See particularly M. Lühr, Die Stellung des Weibes in Jahwe-Religion und -Kult (Leipzig, 1908); C. J. Vos, Woman in Old Testament Worship (Kampen: Kok, 1968); Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Newton, Mass.: Branford, 1970), p. 412 n. 2.

⁸³E. G. White, Desire of Ages, p. 671.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 25.

Finished Sept. 4, 1973.