

Equality From the Start: Woman in the Creation Story

by Gerhard F. Hasel

The first three chapters of Genesis are of crucial importance for both the origins of our world and for determining relationships between man and woman. Without these chapters, any understanding of the mutuality between man and woman is impaired and one-sided.

An investigation of the status of man and woman in Genesis 1-3 is justified by new questions about the status of women in the church and by contradictory assessments of the evidence in these chapters. 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 be inferior to man. Other interpreters say 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 Genesis 1 recognizes the equality of man and woman, Genesis 2 makes woman a second, subordinate and inferior being.³ It is observed that Genesis 1:26-28 “dignifies woman as an important factor in the creation, equal in power and glory with man,” while Genesis 2 “makes her a mere afterthought.”⁴

Others, however, suggest on the basis of Genesis 1-3 that man and woman are created

Gerhard Hasel took a doctorate in biblical studies at Vanderbilt University and teaches at the Theological Seminary at Andrews University. His 1972 book, Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in Current Debate, was published by Eerdmans.

equal, and that woman is not an afterthought of creation. 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 Genesis 1-3, warrant a careful investigation of the evidence. This is all the more important because these chapters describe both man’s perfect state before sin and the far-reaching changes introduced by sin.

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. (Genesis 1:26, 27, NASB)

This account is part of the summary narrative of creation (Genesis 1:1-2:3) which is complemented with more specific details in the rest of chapter 2.⁶

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. “Man” (*’ādām*) includes both “male and female” (1:27). It is a generic term for mankind.⁷

It should be stressed that man is created as both “male and female.” There is no distinction between the sexes in terms of superiority or subordination. Man exists as a complete creature uniquely as man and woman. Indeed, the full meaning of *’ādām* is realized only when there is

man and woman.

Man has been created for communion. Though the male is the first creature formed (Genesis 2:7), and put into the Edenic garden “to cultivate it and keep it” (Genesis 2:15, NASB), he is not yet a perfect and complete creature: “It is not good for the man to be alone” (Genesis 2:18). Only with the creation of woman does man exist in complete and harmonious partnership and communion.

In the definition of mankind as bisexual, the Creator established complete equality between male and female. Genesis 1 knows of no superiority of one sex over the other.⁸ Woman is not subordinated to man. She holds no inferior place nor is her role lower than that of the male.

It is striking that both “male and female” are created in the image of God (Genesis 1:26f.). The whole man in his bisexuality—here the stress is not so much on a divinely given sex drive as on unity and mutual communion—is created in the image of God. There is no distinction in terms of superiority or inferiority.

“Both man and woman share in their creation in ‘the image of God’; both find their full meaning in mutual communion. They are equals, each with his or her own individuality.”

The blessing of God is bestowed on both of “them”; it comes to man (*’ādām*) as man and woman. It is a “blessing” that empowers them to be fruitful and to multiply and thus to perpetuate the human species. The responsibility of both man and woman in the propagation and perpetuation of mankind rests in equal manner upon both.

The task of “subduing” the earth (Genesis 1:28) and of “ruling” over the animal world (Genesis 1:26, 28) is also laid upon both man and woman. Man as “the crowning work of the Creator”⁹ maintains his royal position in his rulership over (not exploitation of!) the animal kingdom.¹⁰ Both man and woman are elevated to an equally noble status in their exercise of dominion over the created world.

In short, in Genesis 1 man (*’ādām*) is created

male and female. Both man and woman share their creation in “the image of God”; both find their full meaning in mutual relationship and communion; both receive the power to propagate and perpetuate the human species; both are to “subdue” the earth and “rule” over the animal kingdom in their common position as vicegerents over God’s creation. They are equals, each with his and her own individuality.

The narrative of Genesis 2:4-25 adds detail to the story of Genesis 1, complementing it on crucial points.¹¹ In Genesis 2:7 “the man” (*hā’ādām*, or Adam)¹² is the first creature formed from the dust of the ground. God breathes into him the “breath of life” and “man becomes a living being” (NASB).

God puts “the man” in the garden of Eden in order to till and to tend it (Genesis 2:15). This reference, it seems, refers to the male, because the tilling and keeping of the garden is an activity identified with male (cf. Genesis 3:17-19).¹³ Meaningful and complete existence can be experienced by man only in connection with work.

Woman is created after man had been engaged in the naming of the animals (Genesis 2:20). A far-reaching 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 important to investigate the meaning of the term *’ēzer* rendered as “helpmeet” (KJV), “helper” (RSV, NJV, NASB), “partner” (NEB, NAB) and “aid” (Speiser, Anchor Bible). It is just as important to investigate 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 *’ēzer* (“helper”) has many different usages in the Old Testament. It is to be distinguished from the feminine noun *’ēzrah* which means “help, support.” The writer’s choice of *’ēzer* for Genesis 2:18 shows, indeed, that he was avoiding the idea of making woman a mere “help” or “support” for man.¹⁴

The noun *’ēzer* is employed in the Bible primarily for God,¹⁵ which indicates that it does

not imply inferiority. The Lord is “helper” for Israel. As “helper” he creates and saves.¹⁶ In Isaiah 30:5 the whole people is designated as “helper.” In Hosea 13:9, the question is raised as to who will be Israel’s “helper” when destruction comes to her.

In all Old Testament instances “helper” has to do with beneficial relationships. The term itself does not specify positions within relationships nor does it by itself imply inferiority. Position must be determined from the context or additional content. In the case of Genesis 2, additional content is provided in verse 18 with the word *k^enegdô*, which means literally “like his counterpart.” The idea is that woman is a helper “corresponding to him” or “alongside him.”¹⁷ Inasmuch as woman is made a helper alongside and corresponding to man, she is his suitable counterpart and fitting companion.

The account of the creation of the woman (Genesis 2:21, 22) concludes the story of the creation of man. In the creation of the female God alone is active: “the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man” (2:21, NASB). Man himself has no part whatever to play. He neither participates nor looks on.¹⁸ He is likewise not consulted. Woman owes her origin solely to God. She is equal to man as regards the one who created her.

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).¹⁹ The “rib” evidently points to the relationship of man and woman 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, . . .”²⁰

The creation of woman from the rib of man, far from referring to a position of subordination on her part, stresses woman’s status as equal with man,²¹ 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 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 last²² is bone of my bones,
and flesh of my flesh;

This one shall be called woman

for this one has been taken out of man.

In the first two lines (“bone of my bones, flesh of my flesh”) the man expresses joy at having received a fitting companion and suitable part-

“The creation of woman from man’s rib, far from referring to subordination on her part, stresses her equality with man.”

ner, the “counterpart corresponding to him” (2:18, 20). He stresses that his partner is of the same stuff as he is.

The last two lines introduce for the first time the terms “man” as male (*’iš*) and “woman” as female (*’iššāh*). This change of terminology indicates that man as male exists only in relationship with woman as female, and vice versa. With the creation of woman occurs the first specific term for man as male. The linguistic pun of *’iš* (“man”) and *’iššāh* (“woman”) in 2:23b proclaims both equality and differentiation in terms of male and female. There is no hint at inferiority or superiority.

Some interpreters suggest that the phrase “this one shall be called woman” (2:23b) refers to the naming of female by male, and that, therefore, man has power and authority over her. But the text does not support this inference. 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* a living creature, that was its *name*. And the man *gave* names 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 (Genesis 1:28) but comes to recognize that there is no suitable counterpart for him. We must keep in mind that in the Old Testament 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.²³

But 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” but lacks the essential word “name”²⁴ Moreover, the word “woman” (*iššāh*) is not, in fact, a name or proper noun. It designates the female counterpart to man with the recognition of sexuality. This recognition naming is not an assertion of power and superiority over woman.²⁵ Man and woman are equal sexes with neither one having power and authority over the other. The conception that both man and woman “become one flesh” (2:24) strengthens further the notion of the oneness and equality of both companions.

But what about the suggestion that the creation of man before woman implies a divinely ordained subordination of woman? It has been claimed that the order of sequence establishes “the priority and superiority of the man . . . as an ordinance of divine creation.”²⁶ In fact, this supposition is not correct. 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. The complementary narrative of creation of Genesis 2:4-24 evinces this structure. The creation of man first and of woman last constitutes a “ring composition”²⁷ 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 or 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 the Genesis 2 narrative moves to its climax, not its decline, in the creation of woman. 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.

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 Old Testament and in biblical religion in contrast to woman’s low status in the ancient Near East in general.

Woman’s remarkable position as an equal of man 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 in detail the story of the serpent’s approach to the woman, their dialogue and the woman’s eating of the forbidden fruit (3:1-6a). To the woman, the fruit is “good for food,” able, that is, to satisfy the physical drives. It is “a delight to the eyes,” or aesthetically and emotionally desirable. It is “desirable as a source of wisdom.” When the woman acts, she is fully aware that she seeks not merely to satisfy divinely given drives but to attain a higher sphere of existence, approaching that of deity (3:5). Under these impressions and aspirations, she takes the fruit and eats. It is striking 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 is “in greater danger than if both were together.”²⁸

After man has joined his wife in eating of the fruit, both 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 both have broken the harmonious relationship with their God. An inferior position of woman after sin is never implied.

God addresses the first questions to man (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 man’s defensiveness after sin is a sign of disruption of these relationships. The man puts the blame on woman and, since she was given to him by the Creator,

ultimately upon God. The woman, in turn, blames the serpent and, as her husband, ultimately God (3:13).

On what happens next the record is explicit. Divine curses are pronounced over the serpent (3:14) and the ground (3:17); but the woman and the man are not cursed. They are judged!

The judgment on woman is of special concern. She will suffer multiplied pain in pregnancy and childbirth (3:16a)²⁹ and her husband will “rule” over her (3:16b).

What does the troublesome statement that the woman’s husband (’iš) “shall rule over you” mean? At first sight, it might seem that woman’s aspiration for a higher sphere of existence has caused her actually to fall to an inferior position, equalling that of other creatures. But this is to misread the text. The writer carefully distin-

“It must be remembered that the husband’s ruling function is not a part of God’s perfect creation but a result of sin.”

guishes 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). Man’s rulership over his wife is expressed with the verb *māšal* (3:16). In over 100 usages of forms of the root *msl* in the Old Testament, there is not a single example in which it 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’s being reduced through sin to a position equal to animals.

The verb *māšal* is employed a number of times with Yahweh as the subject.³⁰ When used of man, it is employed of man’s rulership over creation (Psalm 8:7), his brothers and sisters (Genesis 37:8), slaves (Exodus 21:8) and nations (Deuteronomy 15:6), or of nations ruling another nation (Joel 2:17). Man can also “rule over” or “be in charge of” someone’s possessions (Genesis 24:2; Psalm 105:21). The verb can also refer to “self-control,” or the ruling of

oneself (Genesis 4:7; Psalm 19:14; Proverbs 16:32). A common usage is “to rule” in the political sphere.³¹

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 to man in intellectual, mental, emotional and other spheres of existence. A woman could take part in equal status with man in the religious and political leadership of ancient Israel. Miriam served as a counselor to government (Exodus 2:4, 7-8; 15:20, 21) and was a prophetess (Exodus 15:20). Deborah served as a “judge” on equal par with other judges (Judges 4-5). Athaliah reigned as queen over Judah for six years (2 Kings 11). Huldah the prophetess was consulted by the king’s ministers (2 Kings 22:14). Isaiah’s wife was a “prophetess” (Isaiah 8:3). Both men and women could take the Nazirite vow and dedicate and separate themselves for God (Numbers 6:2). The book of Esther tells how the nation was saved by a woman. Women were employed by God to do a work for Him just as were men.³²

In returning to the meaning of the statement that man shall “rule” over woman, one needs to stress that this follows the statement that her “desire” (RV, RSV, NASB) or “urge” (NAB, NJV, NEB, margin) shall be for her husband (3:16). (The same Hebrew term is also used of man’s “desire” or “urge” for *his* beloved [Song of Solomon 7:11]. Both man and woman have a natural and strong desire for each other.)

What deserves notice is this: the divine declaration that man shall “rule” over woman is placed within the context of the man/woman relationship in marriage. Travail in pregnancy, pain in childbirth and the wife’s “desire for your husband” all take place in marriage. After this threefold reference to changes in 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 understanding what this means. The ruling of man over woman is restricted to the sphere of marriage.³³ It does *not* support male domination and supremacy in all spheres of life.

What is the meaning of the husband's ruling over his wife? Does it mean male domination and supremacy in marriage? Does it imply that the female is to be reduced to a blindly obedient slave? Does it support man's reign as a despot? Does it mean the loss of the wife's individuality, the surrendering of her will to her husband? Neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament gives any indication of saying yes to any of these questions. Yet sin disrupted not only the harmony of man and God but also the harmony of husband and wife. Harmony in marriage can be preserved only by submission on the part of the one to the other. So man is the head of the woman as the Father is the head of Christ (1 Corinthians 11:3). As the Father and Christ are equal and yet God is the head of Christ, so husband and wife are equal but the husband is the head. He is the first among equals, and is controlled by a love modeled on the love of Christ for his church (Ephesians 5:25).

That man does usurp power and authority over woman (contrary to God's will) is already illustrated in Genesis 3. The 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. It has been shown above that the biblical formula for naming contains the verb to *call* and the object *name*. Both elements are present here. In naming his wife Adam asserts ownership and control over her. But there is no approval of Adam's naming his wife. It is an act that perverts the divinely established relationship between husband and wife. Significantly, it is followed by expulsion from the garden of Eden (3:22-24).

In spite of this perversion, however, the wife of the Israelite was by no means on a level much lower than that of man, nor was she reduced to slavery. Though an Israelite could sell his slaves (Exodus 21:2-11; Deuteronomy 15:12-18), he could never sell his wife, even if he had acquired her as a captive in war (Deuteronomy 21:14). Within the family circle, the law commanded that equal honor be given to the mother and wife as to the father.³⁴ Proverbs insists on the respect due to one's mother,³⁵ 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 per-

sonal bond taken to exist between husband and wife. The two share the training of children and are assumed to speak with one voice (Proverbs 1:8f.; 6:20; etc.). The husband is urged not merely to be loyal but ardent toward his partner (Proverbs 5:19); a broken marriage vow is a sin against a companion and friend (Proverbs 2:17). This is a far cry from the not uncommon ancient idea of the wife as chattel and childbearer but not companion.

Far from being a cypher, the woman is the making or undoing of her husband. She is a God-given favor and boon (Proverbs 18:22; 19:14); indeed she is "her husband's crown" (Proverbs 12:4) or else "rottenness in his bones" (Proverbs 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 (Proverbs 31:10-30). All of this shows a very high view of woman.

Some suggest that woman had a vastly inferior position in ancient Israel because she did not serve as a priestess in the sanctuary. But 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).

Although the Old Testament gives no reason why women did not serve as priestesses, it may have been to preserve Israel from Canaanite influences.³⁶ Priestesses played an important role in the utterly immoral cult of the Canaanites. Canaanite fertility religion became a deadly threat even without the establishing in Israel of worship involving both priests and priestesses. In His divine providence, God seems to have reduced possible inroads for Canaanite immorality to a minimum. And it should also be remembered that the priestly order of service prescribed certain periods of time for service at the central sanctuary. This did not lend itself very well to women's serving, since they were considered ritually unclean for determined

lengths of time during menstruation and after childbirth.

In view of 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.

It remains now to summarize our conclusions and to study their implications for the church at this time. Genesis 1 stresses full equality between man and woman. Genesis 2 does not stand in tension or opposition to this picture, but corroborates the compressed statement of Genesis 1, complementing them with additional details. That woman is created to be man's "helper" 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).

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 entry of sin into the world (Genesis 3) the complete and total harmony between God and man, man and man/woman, and man and world is disrupted. But the divine declaration that man shall "rule" (*māšal*, not *rādah*) over his wife (3:16) indicates that she is *not* reduced to a slave or an animal. And the context of Genesis 3:16 indicates that the sphere of woman's submission is restricted to the marriage relationship.

It must be remembered, too, that the husband's ruling function is not a part of God's perfect creation but a result of sin. This has implications of immense significance for the task of proclaiming the gospel. If salvation is concerned with the reproduction of the image of God in men under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth,³⁷ is it then not the responsibility of the church precisely 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 equality between men and women in spheres of activity where the divine declaration of man's rulership over his wife and the wife's submission to her husband 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 in ministerial activity? If "in Christ" there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free man, neither male nor female (Galatians 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?

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. E. 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.
2. John 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.
3. Eugene 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."
4. Elizabeth 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.
5. So 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.
6. The 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 extrabiblical 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*, 118n. 19).

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

8. Eichrodt, *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."

9. E. G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Mountain View, Calif.; Pacific Press, 1958), p. 44.

10. Westermann, *Genesis*, pp. 221, 222.

11. See above n. 6.

12. In Genesis 2 *hā'ādām* ("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.

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

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

15. Exodus 18:4; Deuteronomy 33:7; Psalms 20:3; 33:20; 115:9-11; 121:2; 124:8; 146:5; Daniel 11:34.

16. Psalms 121:2, 124:8, 146:5; Deuteronomy 33:7, 26, 29.

17. So Speiser, *Genesis* "Anchor Bible" (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1964), p. 17.

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

19. Though 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.

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

21. E. 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."

22. The 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.

23. The change of the name Jacob to Israel (Genesis 32:29) indicates his new existence and implies the nature and mission of the bearer. The assigning of the new names to Daniel and his three companions (Daniel 1:7) establishes the authority and power of the Babylonians over the exiled youths.

24. At times the verb "call" is absent in the naming but the essential noun "name" is always present (cf. Genesis 32:29).

25. With Tribble, *JAAR* 41 (1973), 38.

26. Keil, *The First Book of Moses*, p. 89. Cf. above notes 1-4.

27. Term used by Muilenburg, *JBL*, 88 (1969), 9.

28. E. G. White, *The Story of Redemption* (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald, (1947), p. 31.

29. The 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 coordinate 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."

30. 1 Chronicles 29:12; 2 Chronicles 20:6; Psalms 22:29; 59:14; 66:7; 89:10; 103:19; Judges 8:23.

31. Genesis 45:8, 26; Joshua 12:2, 5; Judges 8:22, 23; 9:2; 14:4; 15:11; 2 Samuel 23:3; 1 Kings 5:1; Isaiah 3:4, 12; 14:5; 16:1; etc.

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

33. E. 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*."

34. Exodus 21:17; Leviticus 20:9; Deuteronomy 21:18-21; 27:16.

35. Proverbs 19:26; 20:20; 23:22; 30:17.

36. See particularly M. Löhr, *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.

37. E. G. White, *The Desire of Ages*, p. 671.