

THE GARDEN OF EDEN ACCOUNT: THE CHIASTIC STRUCTURE OF GENESIS 2-3

ROBERTO OURO

Villa Aurora Theological Seminary
Florence, Italy

Introduction

While theologians such as Derek Beattie have attempted to uncover the meaning of Gen 2-3, a satisfactory and definitive answer has remained elusive.¹ In addition to traditional historical-critical methodology (source criticism), scholars have employed many other approaches including religiohistorical, social, psychoanalytical, and feminist approaches, as well as several structuralist, semiotic, and literary models.²

¹D.R.G. Beattie, "What is Genesis 2-3 About?," *ExpTim* 92 (1980-1981): 8-10.

²For example: (1) redaction history: J. Vermeulen, "Le récit du paradis et la question des origines du pentateuque," *BTFTh* 41 (1980): 230-250;

(2) contemporary articles: K. Holter, "The Serpent in Eden as a Symbol of Israel's Political Enemies: A Yahwistic Criticism of the Solomonic Foreign Policy?" *SJOT* 1 (1990): 106-112; A. Gardener, "Genesis 2:4b-3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality of the Religious History of Pre-Exilic Israel?" *SJT* 43 (1990): 1-18;

(3) wisdom: G. E. Mendenhall, "The Shady Side of Wisdom: The Date and Purpose of Genesis 3," in *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of J. M. Myers*, Gettysburg Theological Studies 4, ed. H. N. Bream et al. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974), 319-334; F. Festirazzi, "Gen 1-3 e la sapienza di Israele," *RivBib* 27 (1979): 41-51;

(4) king ideology: W. Brueggemann, "From Dust to Kingship," *ZAW* 84 (1972): 1-18; M. Hutter, "Adam als Gärtner und König (Gen 2,8.15)," *BZ* 30 (1986): 258-262;

(5) land ideology: M. Ottosson, "Eden and the Land of Promise," in *Congress Volume*, Jerusalem 1986, ed. J. A. Emerton et al., VTSupp 40 (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 177-188;

(6) temple ideology: G. J. Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: Academic Press, 1986), 19-25;

(7) religio-historical articles: I. M. Kikawada and A. Quinn, *Before Abraham Was: The Unity of Genesis 1-11* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1985), 31-82 (Mesopotamian and Hellenistic material); H. N. Wallace, *The Eden Narrative*, HSM 32 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) (Ugaritic material); K. Jaros, "Die Motive der heiligen Bäume und der Schlange in Gen 2-3," *ZAW* 92 (1980): 204-215 (archaeological material);

(8) social approach: J. Guichard, "Approche 'matérialiste' du récit de la chute: Genèse 3," *LV* 131 (1977): 57-90; J. Oosten and D. Moyer, "De Mytische omkering: Een analyse van de sociale code van de scheppingsmythen van Genesis 2.4b-11," *AnthVer* 1 (1982): 75-91;

(9) political approach: J. M. Kennedy, "Peasants in Revolt: Political Allegory in Genesis 2-3," *JSOT* 47 (1990): 3-14;

(10) psychoanalytical approach: E. Drewermann, *Strukturen des Bösen: Die Jahwistische Urgeschichte in exegetischer, psychoanalytischer und philosophischer Sicht*, Paderborn

If the traditional historical-critical methodology is correct in positing that there are two different Creation accounts,³ written by different

theologische Studien 4 (München: Schöninghaus, 1977);

(11) feminist approaches: P. Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 72-143; M. Bal, "Sexuality, Sin and Sorrow: The Emergence of the Female Character: A Reading of Genesis 1-3," *PT* 6 (1985): 21-42; S. Lanser, "(Feminist) Criticism in the Garden: Inferring Genesis 2-3," *Semeia* 41 (1988): 67-84;

(12) structural and semiotic studies: R. Couffignal, "Guides pour l'Eden: Approches nouvelles de Genèse II,4-III," *RevThom* 80 (1980): 613-627; D. Patte and J. F. Parker, "A Structural Exegesis of Genesis 2 and 3," *Semeia* 18 (1980): 55-75; O. Davidsen, "The Mythical Foundation of History: A Religio-Semiotic Analysis of the Story of the Fall," *LB* 51 (1982): 23-36; W. Vogels, "L'être humain appartient au sol: Gn 2.4b-3.24," *NRTh* 105 (1983): 515-534; E. J. van Wolde, *A Semiotic Analysis of Genesis 2-3*, *Studia Semitica Neerlandica* 25 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1989);

(13) rhetorical, semantic, and literary models: H. C. White, "Direct and Third Person Discourse in the Narrative of the Fall," *Semeia* 18 (1980): 91-106; T. E. Boomershine, "The Structure of Narrative Rhetoric in Genesis 2-3," *Semeia* 18 (1980): 113-129; J. T. Walsh, "Genesis 2:4b-3:23: A Synchronic Approach," *JBL* 96 (1972): 161-177; R. C. Culley, "Action Sequences in Genesis 2-3," *Semeia* 18 (1980): 25-34; G. W. Coats, "The God of Death: Power and Obedience in the Primeval History," *Int* 29 (1975): 227-239; D. J. A. Clines, "Theme in Genesis 1-11," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 483-507; P. D. Miller, *Genesis 1-11: Studies in Structure and Theme*, JSOTSup 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978); D. S. Moyer and J. G. Oosten, "The Ambivalent Gardener: The Animal and Vegetable Codes of Genesis 2:4 to 9:9," *Anthropologica* 21 (1979): 118-127; A. J. Hauser, "Genesis 2-3: The Theme of Intimacy and Alienation," in *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*, ed. D. J. A. Clines et al., JSOTSup 19 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 20-36; I. M. Kikawada, "A Quantitative Analysis of the 'Adam and Eve,' 'Cain and Abel' and 'Noah' Stories," in *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of F. I. Andersen's Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. E. W. Conrad and E. G. Newing (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 195-203; B. D. Naidoff, "A Man to Work the Soil: A New Interpretation of Genesis 2-3," *JSOT* 5 (1978): 2-14; M. Casalis, "The Dry and the Wet: A Semiological Analysis of Flood and Creation Myths," *Semiotica* 17 (1976): 35-67; D. Jobling, "Myth and Its Limits in Genesis 2:4b-3:24," in *The Sense of Biblical Narrative II: Structural Studies in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup 39 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 22-24; idem., "A Structural Analysis of Genesis 2:4b-3:24," *SBLSP* 1 (1978): 61-69; idem., "The Myth Semantics of Genesis 2:4b-3:24," *Semeia* 18 (1980): 41-59.

³Traditionally, the historical-critical method divides the first three chapters of Genesis into three separate narrative accounts: Gen 1 and 2 are presented as two different and even antithetical Creation accounts, while Gen 3 is understood to be an account of humanity's fall. In addition, it is generally accepted that Gen 1-3 is attributed to two different literary sources: the Priestly (P) source for the redaction of Gen 1 and the Jahvist (J) source for the redaction of Gen 2-3. For further bibliographical references on Gen 1-3 from the viewpoint of the historical-critical method, see C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, trans. J. J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 74-76, 80-93, 178-181, 186-197 [from 1848 till 1969]; see also G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, WBC (Waco: Word, 1987), 1-2, 41-44 [until 1986]. Current scholarship also continues to support the idea of two separate creation accounts. See, for example, H. P. Santmire, "The Genesis Creation Narratives Revisited: Themes for a Global Age," *Int* 45 (1991): 366-379; W. Park, "Why Eve?" *SVTQ* 35 (1991): 127-135; A. van den Branden, "La création de l'homme et de la femme d'après le document Jahviste," *BeO* 32 (1990): 193-208; Ch. Cohen, "Jewish Medieval Commentary on the Book of Genesis and Modern Biblical Philology, Part I: Gen 1-18," *JQR* 81 (1991): 1-11; J. Kselman, "The Book of Genesis: A Decade of Scholarly Research," *Int* 45 (1991): 38-92.

authors and which are differentiated from the narrative of the Fall, then a study of the accounts should reveal incoherence and linguistic, literary, and thematic inconsistencies among them.⁴ On the other hand, if both accounts were composed by the same author, then it should be possible to find coherence, concordance, and linguistic, literary, and thematic consistencies between them.⁵ This article argues the latter position: that Gen 1 is the sole Creation account, properly so called, in Genesis; that Gen 2-3 constitutes another account, here referred to as the Garden of Eden Account (GEA); and that these two accounts form a textual unity that is best explained as the composition of a single author and/or editor.⁶

Exegetes and literary critics believe the place to begin an evaluation of Gen 2-3 is the text as a whole (*Geschebensbogen*).⁷ Beattie noted that an important reason for the diversity of interpretation is the presence of too much *derash* (philosophical and midrashic exegesis) and too little *pesbat* (philological and literal exegesis) in modern scholarship.⁸ Thus his analysis shows the necessity of coming closer to the Hebrew text by giving greater attention to its linguistic and literary characteristics. Building on Beattie's approach, the purpose of this article is to present the literary structure of Gen 2-3 by considering the Hebrew text of Gen 2-3 as one complete textual unit. The article's hypothesis is that the literary, linguistic, and thematic unity of the Hebrew text of Gen 2-3 indicates authorship and/or redaction by a single hand.

Exegetical Implications of Genesis 2:4 for the Literary Structure of Genesis 2-3

The *locus classicus* divides Gen 2:4 into two separate verses with each assigned to a different author. However, an attentive reading of modern exegetical literature reveals that there is less consistency in the interpretation of Gen 2:4

⁴For example, Westermann, 190, finds in "Gen 2-3 repetitions, lack of agreement, lack of balance, gaps in the line of thought, contradictions. One could not expect anything else." These he attributes to "the many-sided process of the formation of this text."

⁵See R. Ouro, *El Relato del Huerto del Edén: Estructura Literaria de Génesis 2-3 y Relación Lingüística con Génesis 1* (Entre Ríos, Argentina: River Plate Adventist University Press, 1997); cf. J. B. Doukhan, *The Genesis Creation Story* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1978); D. Garret, *Rethinking Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991); and W. H. Shea, "The Unity of the Creation Account," *Origins* 5 (1978): 9-38; idem, "Literary Structural Parallels between Genesis 1 and 2," *Origins* 16 (1989): 49-68.

⁶See R. Ouro, "Linguistic and Thematic Parallels Between Genesis 1 and 3," *JATS* 13, n. 1 (2002): forthcoming; see also n. 5 above.

⁷Westermann, 189-192; see also F. Garcia Lopez, "De la Antigua a la Nueva Critica Literaria del Pentateuco," *EstBib* 52 (1994): 11-22.

⁸D. R. G. Beattie, "Pesbat and Derash in the Garden of Eden," *IBS* 7 (1985): 62-75.

than has been suggested previously.⁹ For instance, T. Stordalen indicates that the parallel Sumerian or Akkadian texts present an initially *negative* framework of the world before creation. By way of contrast, however, Gen 2:4b seems to give a *positive* framework of the world before the creation of humanity.¹⁰ While there is no external evidence that indicates that Gen 2:4b is the beginning of a new account, if such evidence were in existence it would indicate that the new account begins in Gen 2:5. Therefore, the only way to read Gen 2:4b as an original part of Gen 2-3 would be to consider it a dependent sentence, which would be in accordance with the *locus classicus*.¹¹ In that case, the syntactical features found in Gen 2:4b-7 would be accepted.¹²

On the contrary, however, Gen 2:4b indicates that the reader *is* aware of some *other* previous account.¹³ T. Stordalen maintains that the only obvious evidence in Gen 1-3 is that we have *two different and successive accounts*—Gen 1 and 2-3.¹⁴

In Gen 2:4, the heavens and earth appear together in a chiasmic antithetical construction that produces a perfect transition between Gen 1 and 2-3:

A heavens and earth (2:4a)

A' earth and heavens (2:4b)

G. J. Wenham notes the antithetical chiasmic structure of v. 4 in the MT:¹⁵

A heavens

B earth

C created (*hibbār'ām*)

C' made (*'āśōt*)

B' earth

A' heavens

⁹See, e.g., Kikawada and Quinn, 60; Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 49, 55-56; Wallace, 23, n. 1; 59, n. 39; Van Wolde, 72-73.

¹⁰T. Stordalen, "Genesis 2:4: Restudying a *locus classicus*," *ZAW* 104 (1992): 168.

¹¹Cf. O. Loretz, "Schöpfung und Mythos. Mensch und Welt nach den Anfangskapiteln der Genesis," *SBS* 32 (1968): 276-283.

¹²To read 2:4b as a dependent sentence of v. 7, with two complete verbal sentences between them (vv. 5 and 6).

¹³Stordalen, 169.

¹⁴Ibid; see also N. M. Sarna, *Genesis*, JPS Torah Commentary (New York: JPS, 1989), 16; and H. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1978). Cassuto, for example, has made a clear distinction between Gen 1 and the story recorded in Gen 2-3. He argues that Gen 1 relates "The Story of Creation" and Gen 2-3, more precisely Gen 2:4-24, is part of the "Story of the Garden of Eden," which stretches to the end of Gen 3 (1:7, 71, 84-94, 159, 169-171).

¹⁵Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 46.

An exegesis of Gen 2:4 leads us to the following exegetical implications:

1. With regard to Gen 2-3, the most important implication is that the GEA is not an account of Creation centered on the heavens and the earth as in Gen 1, but rather the narrative focuses on the earth and its inhabitants (i.e., humans, animals, and plants) some time after their creation.

2. Consequently, Gen 2-3 presents a new story that is the *account of the origin of evil and death* (Gen 2:9, 16-17; 3:1ff.), while Gen 1 *focuses on the origin of goodness and life* (Gen 1:4, 10ff.).

3. The importance of the Gen 2-3 narrative lies in its introduction of the origin of evil in the world. Without this account, the basic postulate of the Gen 1 Creation account (i.e., the essential kindness of the divine Creator and the goodness of his original creation; cf. Gen 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31) would be incomprehensible.¹⁶

4. The second narrative, Garden of Eden account, which begins with 2:5, contains the formula *terem yib^syeh* ("was not yet").¹⁷ A review of parallel ANE texts indicates that this formula could not serve as a significant exegetical indicator in the Creation narratives. The presence of this expression does not indicate that it was originally an exclusive characteristic of the stories of Creation. Rather, the evidence suggests that this formula was simply a narrative technique applied to different texts, often in stories of primordial times.¹⁸ However, the *literary function* of this formula seems to be fixed. The purpose of the formula is to expose a negative situation and to define certain deficiencies (or problems) that will be covered (or resolved) in the narrative. This literary function is so stable

¹⁶See Sarna, 16.

¹⁷Stordalen, 175-176; see also A. P. Ross, *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988), 76.

¹⁸While this formula may not be present in many of the ANE Creation myths (it is absent in "Enki y Ninnmah" and KAR 4; G. Pettinato, *Das altorientalische Menschenbild und die sumerischen und Akkadischen Schöpfungsmythen* [Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1971], 69-73, 74-81; and even in several minor texts included in A. Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of the Creation* [Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1942], 52-54 [2 texts], 60-64 [4 more texts]), the formula does appear in other origin myths (which should not be classified as Creation myths, though they do contain Creation episodes) such as *Lugal-e* (see Pettinato, 86-90, 91-96), *The Sumerian Flood Story* (see lines 47-50, introducing a new subsection, see also M. Civil in *Atra-Hasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*, ed. W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969], 141), the *Atra-Hasis*, and in Hesiod (for *Atra-Hasis*, see *ibid.*, 42-43; for Hesiod, see H. G. Evelyn-White, *Hesiod: The Homeric Hymns and Homericica* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977], 497; cf. Kikawada and Quinn, 37). The same is true for several Egyptian texts and others used by Westermann (60-62). Of course, the formula still appears in actual Creation accounts such as the *Enûma Elish*, the *Eridu Story of Creation*, and in Philo of Byblos. For a detailed exhibition of all the texts, see Heidel, 8, 50, 66.

that expressions of the formula can reappear *verbatim* in the later account. In this way, at least in several ANE texts, the formula gives specific information about the topic of the narrative it introduces.¹⁹

The Chiastic Structure of Genesis 2-3

A study of the GEA reveals a carefully built chiasmic structure that begins with an introduction (the creation of man), referred to in the antecedent account of Gen 1 and which directly links both accounts. Immediately in section A, God places the created man in the Garden of Eden. From this point, the account increases in intensity, from God's command to humanity to care for the garden in section B to the climax of the account—humanity's disobedience to the divine command. This instance of disobedience serves as the center of the antithetical chiasmic structure (C). From this climax, the account decreases in intensity with the appearance in section B' (the first antithetical turn) of the consequences of the transgression—the discovery, the test, and the divine judgment. The GEA concludes in section A' with the total decrease of intensity—the created humanity is expelled by God from the Garden of Eden—which recalls the beginning of the account, but with the opposite effect. The literary structure of Gen 2-3 reveals a chain of events that are assembled together like a puzzle extraordinarily designed by its author. The linguistic pieces of the Hebrew text come together exactly.

The Garden of Eden Account The Chiastic Structure of Gen 2-3 (I)	
C The Disobedience of Human Beings in the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:1-7)	
B Divine Commandment and Organization of Human Life (Gen 2:16-25)	B' Divine Judgment and Reorganization of Human Life (Gen 3:8-21)
A The Placement of Man in the Garden of Eden (Gen 2:5-15)	A' The Expulsion of Man from the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:22-24)

¹⁹T. Stordalen, "Man, Soil, Garden: Basic Plot in Genesis 2-3 Reconsidered," *JSOT* 53 (1992): 8-9.

A || A':

The Placement of Man in the
Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:5-15)

||

The Expulsion of Man from the
Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:22-24)

Genesis 2:5-6 forms a poetic introduction with the following meter: 3 + 3, 3 + 2, 2 + 3, 2 + 3, 3 + 3.²⁰ Based on this formulation of the Hebrew text, the GEA will be analyzed using the methodology of literary microstructure or microsection. A microstructure or microsection is a literary and linguistic fragment of the Hebrew text that embraces one or several verses of the narrative in the same section or in antithetical sections and can be presented in the account in parallel panels (e.g., ABAB') or in antithetical chiasm (e.g., ABB'A').

Before analyzing the antithetical chiastic structure between A || A', we will consider the microstructure in parallel panels that embraces section A.

Microstructure in Parallel Panels of Genesis 2:5-15

A₀ there was not yet any plant of the field, rain, or man to work the ground (2:5)

A₁ streams from the earth watered the whole surface of the ground (2:6)

A₂ God formed man of the ground (2:7)

A₃ God planted a garden in Eden and made trees grow (2:8-9)

A₁' a river flowed from the Garden of Eden (2:10-14)

A₂' the Lord God put the man in the Garden of Eden (2:15)²¹

The general situation of the earth, as described in Gen 2:5-6, was undoubtedly a situation of *terem yih'yeh* ("not yet productive"). Genesis 2:5-6 presents the scenario for the first event that takes place in 2:7—*wayyiser yhw' 'elohim* ("the Lord God formed").²²

Section A of Gen 2:5-15 is structured around a triad of significant elements: *vegetation, water, and humanity*. The absence or lack of existence of the three elements is recorded in v. 5. Likewise, v. 6 notes the existence of water on earth, while v. 7 describes man's creation from the earth, and vv. 8-9 acknowledge the existence of vegetation in Eden. Finally, vv. 10-15 repeat the same elements by means of synonymous parallelism. Thus, the

²⁰G. B. G. Ray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (New York: KTAV, 1972), 221-222.

²¹All scriptural texts are taken from the NIV.

²²W. R. Bodine, "Linguistics and Philology in the Study of Ancient Near Eastern Languages," in *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*, ed. D. M. Golomb (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 51-54.

emphasis on water is central to the meaning of the term ēden ("Eden"), suggesting a place where there is an abundant supply of water.²³ Its verbal root $\text{*}^c\text{dn}$ means primarily "to give an abundant supply of water," and, secondarily, "to enrich, to prosper, to make exuberant."²⁴

Genesis 2:10-14 serves as an interlude (thus interrupting a series of consecutive imperfections), located between Gen 2:8(9) and 2:15 (the key verses of section A). This interlude passage describes the geographical location of Eden, showing the garden to be the source of water for the surrounding countryside. Recent data suggest that the physical description of the account is authentic.²⁵

Now we will analyze the antithetical sections A||A', the antithetical chiasmic microstructure of Gen 2:8, 15||Gen 3:22-24 that constitutes the thematic, textual, literary, and linguistic limits of the GEA.

*Antithetical Chiasmic Microstructure of
Genesis 2:8,15 || Genesis 3:23-24*

A₄ the Lord God planted a garden in Eden in the east, in which he put the man he had formed (2:8)

A₅ the Lord God took the man (2:15a)

A₆ and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it (2:15bc)

A₆' the Lord God banished him from the Garden of Eden to work the ground from which he had been taken (3:23)

A₅' after he drove the man out (3:24a)

A₄' he placed cherubim on the east side of the Garden of Eden to guard the way to the tree of life (3:24bc)

1. *The antithetical microsections A₄||A₄'* In A₄, the Lord God is presented as the one who planted a garden in Eden in the east, where he "put" (*wāyyāšēm*, Qal imperfect of the verb *šām*) the man he had formed. Microsection A₄' presents a clear antithetical parallelism in which the divine name does not appear. The verb "to place" (*wāyyāšēn*, Hiphil imperfect of the verb *šākan*) appears

²³This etymology leans on Gen 13:10: "Lot looked up and saw that the whole plain of the Jordan was well watered, like the garden of the Lord"; see Cassuto, 108.

²⁴For an analysis of the diverse proposals of the etymological meaning of the Hebrew terms ēd (2:6) and ēden , see D. T. Tsumua, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2*, JSOTSup 83 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 94-116, 123-136.

²⁵E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, AB (Garden City: Doubleday, 1964), 19-20; cf. E. A. Speiser, "The Rivers of Paradise," in *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, ed. R. S. Hess and D. T. Tsumura, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 175-182.

synonymous to that of *wayyāsēm* (“put”) in 2:8 and *wayyannahēbū* (“put,” lit. “caused him to rest”) of 2:15. The term *miqqedem* (“east”), describing the geographical location of the Garden of Eden, appears in both 2:8 and 3:24bc. Additionally, the same expression, *gan-ēden* (“Garden of Eden”), appears in construct relation in 2:8 and 3:24bc. Finally, the usage of the direct object particle offsets the terms *et-hakērubīm* (“cherubim,” 3:24bc) and *et-hāādām* (“man,” 2:8).²⁶ In 3:24, God places the action on the cherubim, instead of on the man as in 2:8.

2. *The antithetical microsections A₅||A₅'*. In A₅, the Lord God “took” (*wayyiqqah*, Qal imperfect of the verb *laqah*) the man, while in microsection A₅', the divine name does not appear and the verb “to drive out” (*waygāres*, Piel imperfect of the verb *gāras*) is antithetical to the verb “to take” (A₅). Additionally, *et-hāādām* (“the man”) is prefaced with a particle of direct object, indicating that in both A₅ and A₅' the man is the one on whom the direct action occurs—“to take” in the first case and “to drive out” in the second.

3. *The antithetical microsections A₆||A₆'*. Again an antithetical parallelism is created when the divine name is absent from A₆, but appears in A₆' (this construct is an inversion compared to microsections A₄ and A₅). The verb “to put” (*wayyannahēbū*, Hiphil imperfect of the verb *nūah*) is synonymous to the verb *sūm* (“to put”) of microsection A₄, while the verb “to banish/to send forth” (*wayyāsāl' hēbū*, Piel imperfect of the verb *sālah*) (A₆' is antithetical in idea and content to the verb *wayyannahēbū* (“to put”) (A₆). The phrase “a garden in Eden” (*gan-b'ēden*) appears in A₆ and the same construct relation “Garden of Eden” (*gan-ēden*) in A₆'. The verb “to work/to till” (Qal infinitive construct of the verb *ābad*) also appears in both A₆ (*l'obodāh*) and A₆' (*la'abōd*).²⁷

Before continuing with the analysis, we should point out that the same verb “to take care/to keep” (*sāmar*)²⁸ is in the Qal infinitive construct in A₆

²⁶That the entrance of the Garden of Eden was guarded by “cherubim” (*kērubīm*) is an indication that it was viewed as a sanctuary. Akkadian *karibi* were the traditional guardians of holy places or temples in the ANE, see G. J. Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” in *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, ed. R. S. Hess and D. T. Tsumura, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 401. Two *kērubīm* on top of the ark formed the throne of God in the inner sanctuary (Exod 25:18-22), pictures of *kērubīm* decorated the curtains of the tabernacle and walls of the temple (Exod 26:31; 1 Kgs 6:29), and two others guarded the inner sanctuary in Solomon's temple (1 Kgs 6:23-28).

²⁷This verb appears for the first time in Gen 2:5 in the same verbal form, Qal infinitive construct.

²⁸F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1951), 1036; W. L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 377; E. Klein, *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English* (Jerusalem: University of

(*šōmrāb*) and in A₄' (*lišmor*). In the former, the reference is to the Garden of Eden; in the second it refers to the way to the tree of life. This aspect, although in different antithetical microsections, constitutes a linguistic element that supports the linguistic and literary unity of the sections and of the account.

*Antithetical Chiastic Microstructure of
Genesis 2:5d,7a || Genesis 3:23b*

A₇ There was no man to work the ground, so the Lord God formed the man from the dust of the ground (2:5d,7a)

A₇' to work the ground from which he had been taken (3:23b)

The terminology used in Gen 3:23b is identical to that employed in Gen 2:5d, 7a. This chiastic microstructure is important to the structural unity of the GEA. The use of the same verb “to work/to till” (*la^abōd*, Qal infinitive construct of the verb *abad*) and the same noun *et-hā^adāmā* (“ground”) appear in both Gen 2:5 and Gen 3:23 (sections A||A') along with a particle of direct object, thus indicating that “the ground” is the object on which the direct action of “to work/to till” occurs. In the first case (2:5) the man’s absence is noted, while in the second case the man’s presence “to work/to till” the ground replaces the lack of work found at the beginning of the account.²⁹ A strong thematic and linguistic parallelism also exists between “the Lord God formed the man of the ground” (2:7a) and “the ground from which he [the man] had been taken” (3:23b), where “the ground from which he had been taken” is a clear thematic reference to “the man formed [taken]” by “the Lord God out of the ground.”

*Antithetical Chiastic Microstructure of
Genesis 2:9 || Genesis 3:22*

A₈ the Lord God made all kinds of trees grow out of the ground that were pleasing to the eye and good for food. In the middle of the garden were the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (2:9)

A₈' the Lord God said, “Man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to eat from the tree of life and live forever” (3:22)

The terminology used in Gen 3:22 is similar to that employed in Gen 2:9.

Haifa, 1987), 668; E. Jenni and C. Westermann, eds., *Diccionario Teológico del Antiguo Testamento* (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1985), 2:1232-1237. It is interesting that both the man’s placement in the Garden of Eden and his expulsion are registered twice in sections A and A'.

²⁹Cassuto, 173, considers Gen 2:5 to be a text that advances to Gen 3:23; see also N. Wyatt, “When Adam Delved: The Meaning of Genesis 3:23,” *VT* 38 (1988): 118-119.

Four carefully defined parallelisms between A and A' become evident: (1) the presence of the divine name in A₈ and A'₈; (2) a thematic antithetical parallelism between human access (A₂) and denial to the tree of life (A'₂), (3) an antithetical parallelism between the *tree* of the knowledge of good and evil (A₃) and the *knowledge* of good and evil (A'₃), and (4) the thematic antithetical parallelism between "good for food" (A₄) and "he must not be allowed to reach out his hand and eat" (A'₄).

These analyses demonstrate the thematic and content unity, in addition to the literary and linguistic coherence already described, that relate Gen 2 with Gen 3 and thus suggest the work and redaction of a single author.³⁰ It is significant that the same divine name, *yhwh* ^ʿ*lōhīm* ("Lord God"), appears both at the beginning (2:5, 7-9) and at the end of the GEA (3:22-23), thus striking a telling blow to traditional source criticism's attempt to separate Gen 2 (the second account of the Creation) and Gen 3 (the account of humanity's fall) into distinct documents and accounts. A literary analysis demonstrates the lack of evidence for this traditional historical-critical position, while a structural analysis confirms the unity of composition in Gen 2 and 3.

The Garden of Eden Account The Chiastic Structure of Gen 2-3 (II) A A'	
The Placement of Man in the Garden of Eden (Gen 2:5-15)	The Expulsion of Man from the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:22-24)
A ₄ - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh</i> ^ʿ <i>lōhīm</i>) - "put" (<i>wayyāšēm</i>) - "the man" (^ʿ <i>et-hā-ādām</i>) - "garden in Eden" (<i>gan-b^c-ēden</i>) - "in the east" (<i>miqqedem</i>) (2:8)	A' ₄ - - "he placed" (<i>wayyāskēn</i>) - "cherubim" (^ʿ <i>et-hak^rrubīm</i>) - "Garden of Eden" (^ʿ <i>gan-ēden</i>) - "on the east" (<i>miqqedem</i>) (3:24bc)

³⁰For a further study of the techniques that unify the text, see H. van Dyke Parunak, "Oral Typesetting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure," *Bib* 62 (1981): 162-163. Parunak indicates that the patterns of the superficial structure not only divide the text into segments, but they also establish the internal unity of those segments. He distinguishes two different techniques: (1) the panel (used to describe the unity of "ABC" or "CBA") of a structure contains a summary of the material that it developed more completely than others, e.g., the table of contents or the summary of a text; and (2) the presentation of different categories of information about one or more topics. Parunak indicates that already chiastic or alternating [in parallel panels] structures can unify the material in one or another of these ways; see also F. I. Andersen, who previously underlined the unifying force of the chiastic structure (*The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 231 [The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1974], 119-140).

<p>A₅</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh ʾlōhīm</i>) - "took" (<i>wayyiqqah</i>) - "the man" (<i>ʿet-hāʾādām</i>) (2:15a) <p>A₆</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - "put" (<i>wayyannahū</i>) - "garden in Eden" (<i>gan-bʿēden</i>) - "to work it" (<i>lʿobʿdāh</i>) (2:15bc) <p>A₇</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "to work" (<i>laʿbōd</i>) - "the ground" (<i>ʿet-hāʾdāmā</i>) - "The Lord God formed the man from the dust of the ground" (2:5d,7a) <p>A₈</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh ʾlōhīm</i>) - "good for food" (<i>wʾtōb lʾmʾkāl</i>) - "the tree of life" (<i>wʿēs haḥayyim</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (<i>wʿēs hadaʿat tōb wārāʿ</i>) (2:9) 	<p>A₅'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - "he drove out" (<i>waygāresʿ</i>) - "the man" (<i>ʿet-hāʾādām</i>) (3:24a) <p>A₆'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh ʾlōhīm</i>) - "banished" (<i>wayšālʿhēhū</i>) - "Garden of Eden" (<i>miggan-ēden</i>) - "to work" (<i>laʿbōd</i>) (3:23) <p>A₇'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "to work" (<i>laʿbōd</i>) - "the ground" (<i>ʿet-hāʾdāmā</i>) - "[the ground] from which he [the man] had been taken" (3:23b) <p>A₈'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh ʾlōhīm</i>) - "He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take from the tree of life and eat" (<i>wʿattā pen-yislah yādo wʾlāqah mēʿēs haḥayyim wʾākāl</i>) - "knowing good and evil" (<i>lādaʿat tōb wārāʿ</i>) (3:22)
--	--

B || B':

Divine Commandment and Organization of
Human Life (Genesis 2:16-25)

||

Divine Judgment and Reorganization of
Human Life (Genesis 3:8-21)

In Gen 2:16, an inflection takes place with the verb "to command" (*wayšaw*, Piel imperfect of the verb *šāwā*) that interrupts a series of consecutive imperatives of the preceding section and marks the beginning of a new antithetical section B||B' that is different from the literary and linguistic terminology and content found in A||A'. The infinitive absolute is used to give emphasis to the antithesis, so that v. 16 is antithetical to v. 17. In addition, the infinitive absolute puts a much stronger accent on the idea contained in the associated verb.³¹

³¹See W. Gesenius–E. Kautzch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, trans. A. E. Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), 113; see also Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Subsidia Biblica 14 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 2:420-432; B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake:

*Antithetical Chiastic Microstructure of**Genesis 2:16 || Genesis 3:8*

B₁ the Lord God commanded the man, “You are free to eat from any tree in the garden” (2:16)

B₁' the man and his wife heard the sound of God as he was walking in the garden and they hid among the trees of the garden (3:8)

The beginning of section B (Gen 2:16) and the beginning of the section B' (Gen 3:8) present a marked antithetical contrast, both linguistically and thematically. In Gen 2:16, God's presence in the garden does not produce fear in the man. God and humanity were together face to face among the trees in the garden. However in Gen 3:8, when the man and his wife “heard” (*wayyis̄m^cú*, Qal imperfect of the verb *sāma*) “the sound of the Lord God as he was walking in the garden,”³² it brought fear to them. Their response was to “hide” (*wayyithabbe^c*, Hithpael imperfect of the verb *hāba^c*) from God's presence “among the trees of the garden” (*b^etoḳ^c ēḥagān*, the same Hebrew expression of construct relation found in Gen 2:16). It is precisely here, in Gen 3:8, that God reappears after being absent from the narrative. The absence is similar to God's lack of presence in section C (the apex of the chiasm).

*Antithetical Chiastic Microstructure of**Genesis 2:16-17 || Genesis 3:11b*

B₂ the Lord God commanded the man (2:16a)

B₃ “You are free to eat from any tree in the garden, but not from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil” (2:16b-17a)

B₃' “Have you eaten from the tree, which I told you not to eat from?” (3:11b)

B₂' “that I commanded” (3:11b).

1. *The antithetical microsections B₂ || B₂'* In B₂, the verb “to command” (*šāwá*, **ṣwh*, Piel imperfect *wayšaww*) appears for the first time and is

Eisenbrauns, 1990), 580-597; C.H.J. van der Merwe, J. A. Naudé, and J. H. Kroeze, *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 157-162.

³²*Qol* (“the sound”) is probably used here to refer to the sound of steps walking; see 2 Sam 5:24; 1 Kgs 14:6; 2 Kgs 6:32; 11:13. The verb *mithallākē* (“walking,” Hithpael participle of the verb *hālak*), used here to describe the movement of the divine, is a type of Hithpael that suggests repetitive and habitual acts; see E. A. Speiser, “The Durative Hithpael: A Transform,” *JAOs* 75 (1955): 118-121, esp. 119; W. A. Ward, “Notes on Some Semitic Loan-words and Personal Names,” *Or* 32 (1963): 421, n. 5. The same term is used to describe the divine presence later in the tent sanctuary in Lev 26:12; Deut 23:14; 2 Sam 7:6-7. The Lord God walked in Eden as he subsequently walked in the tabernacle. This suggests that in Gen 2-3 the Garden of Eden was seen as an archetypal sanctuary.

repeated again in B_2' . The usage of the word in B_2' is in the Piel perfect-suffix *šiwwītikā*, recalling the same idea as in 2:16. The same Hebrew phraseology and verb appear a third time in Gen 3:17b (^ʾšer *šiwwītikā*, Piel perfect-suffix). It is significant that this verb also appears repeatedly in relationship to God's commands to Israel at Sinai. In texts such as Deut 5:31, the noun (*mišwā*) appears in the feminine singular from the same verbal root *šwh (cf. Deut 6:1-2, where the word appears in a noun feminine singular and in the Piel perfect form *šiwwā*[6:1], in a noun feminine plural, and in the Piel participle form *mešawwekā* [6:2] respectively); and in Deut 5:32-33, the verb appears in the Piel perfect verbal form *šiwwā* in both verses. This antithetical parallelism is also marked by the presence of the divine name in Gen 2:16 and its lack in 3:11.

2. *The antithetical microsections $B_3 || B_3'$* . In the microsections $B_3 || B_3'$, an antithetical parallelism, referred specifically to the particle of negation, appears in 2:17a as *lō* and in 3:11 as *l'bilti*, where it is especially associated with the verb "to eat" (^ʾakol *to* ^ʾkel, Qal infinitive absolute-Qal imperfect [2:16b] in B_3 and the same verb ^ʾkol ^ʾakaltā in the Qal infinitive construct-Qal perfect [3:11] in B_3'). In $B_2::B_3::B_3':B_2'$, not only are similar linguistic terms and structures repeated, but in Gen 3:11 the same idea, content, and theme are repeated.

*Antithetical Chiastic Microstructure of
Genesis 2:20 || Genesis 3:9*

B_4 the man gave names to all the livestock (2:20)

B_4' the Lord God called the man (3:9)

The antithetical chiastic microstructure $B_4 || B_4'$ is defined by the verb "to give name/to call" (*qārā*³³, which appears in the Qal imperfect *wayyiqrā*^ʾ in Gen 2:20; in v. 19, it also appears two times in the Qal imperfect). Here the man is the main character of the narrative. God brings the animals he has created to the man for him to name (2:19). The man give names "to all the livestock" (*l'kol-hab'hemā*, a term that is composed of two nouns—masculine singular construct—feminine singular—in construct relation). In B_4' , the verb "to give name /to call" appears a second time in the same verbal form (Qal imperfect *wayyiqrā*^ʾ), but now the Lord God is the main character of the narrative. Thus in a perfect antithetical parallelism, it is God who calls the man to appear (B_4'), but antithetically it is the man who gives names to all the livestock (B_4).

³³BDB, 894; Holladay, 323; Klein, 590; TWOT, 2:810-811; Jenni and Westermann, 2:839-849.

*Microstructure in Parallel Panels of
Genesis 2:23-25 || Genesis 3:20-21*

B₅ the man said, “She shall be called ‘woman,’ for she was taken out of man” (2:23)

B₆ the man and his wife were both naked, and felt no shame (2:25)

B₅' Adam named his wife Eve because she would become the mother of all the living (3:20)

B₆' the Lord God made garments of skin for Adam and his wife and clothed them (3:21)

1. *The antithetical microsections B₅||B₅'*: The parallel panels found in this microstructure are significant to section B||B'. In microsection B₅, three Hebrew terms appear as fundamental linguistic elements: the man (who serves as the central character of the narrative), “to call/give name” (*yiqqāre*[~], Niphal imperfect of the verb *qārā*[~], cf. vv. 19-20), and “woman” (*isṣā*[~], due to her origin from “man” *is*[~]).³⁴

It is significant that initially the man does not name the woman in the same sense that he names the animals. A different formula is not only used, but more importantly the man must name himself before naming the woman. In fact, the name that he gives to her, *isṣā*[~], is the name used in Gen 2:22 by God when he forms the woman and brings her to the man. Therefore, the man, when he renames himself, comes into conformity with the name given to the woman (*is*[~], *isṣā*[~]). However, in B₅' the man again names the woman, this time in the same way that he named the animals.³⁵ In B₅', the verb “to call/give name” (*wayyiqra*[~], in the Qal imperfect, which is the common verbal form of the GEA; in B₅, it appears in the Niphal imperfect) appears again. The man continues to play the central character of the narrative by again naming the woman, calling her

³⁴In the existent relationship between *ādām* (“man”) and *dāmā* (“ground”), as in the case of *isṣā*[~] and *is*[~], the feminine mark “ā” forms a play on words. The element of origin is also present in both etymologies: man (*ādām*) is formed of the ground (*dāmā*) (cf. 2:7; 3:23). Woman (*isṣā*) is formed/taken of the man (*is*[~]). This etymological relationship reaches its climax when man returns to the ground in death and when man meets with the woman to create life. Tribble points out that the unity of *is*[~] and *isṣā*[~] is functionally parallel to *ādām* and *dāmā* (98). Jobling indicates that the narrative exploits the relationship between *ādām* and *is*[~] because the man must name himself before he can name the woman. He notes that *ādām* is used in Gen 2 until the crucial point where the man names the woman, then he is called *is*[~]. Thus the man is basically being renamed in conformity with the name given to the woman (“The Myth Semantics,” 41-49). Meier notes that non-Canaanite languages also preserve the grammatical possibility of such a play on words (S. A. Meier, “Linguistic Clues on the Date and Canaanite Origin of Genesis 2:23-24,” *CBQ* 53 [1991]: 19-21).

³⁵Jobling, “The Myth Semantics,” 46-47.

ḥawwá (“Eve”) due to the divine judgment and reorganization of human life as a result of humanity’s disobedience to the divine command. It appears that the *Atra-Hasis* Epic of Old Babylonian mythology presents a thematic and literal parallel to Eve’s name (“the mother of all living”).³⁶ However, it should be noted that this parallel exists only as a contrast between the OT and parallel ANE texts; there is a significant difference between Gen 3:20 and the parallel texts of the ANE. While in the *Atra-Hasis* Epic the one who receives the honorary name is the creative Mami, in the OT it is the created one, the first woman, who receives the name. Therefore, the Hebrew Bible presents a completely antimythical function to the Mami goddess.³⁷

2. *The antithetical microsections B₆||B₆’*: Microsections B₆||B₆’ are characterized by the antithetical phrases: “the man and his wife were naked” (B₆) and “made garments of skin for Adam and his wife and clothed them” (*wayyalbisēm*, as a complementary concept to “garments”) (B₆’). The second part of this parallel antithesis presents God as the central character of the narrative and makes him the action of the verb “to make” (*wayya’as*, Qal imperfect of the verb *’asá*, cf. Gen 3:1). Adam and his wife appear as passive subjects for whom God made garments and then “clothed them” (*wayyalbisēm*, Hiphil imperfect–suffix of the verb *lābas*, a causative form). It is significant that the word used for *’ôr* (“skin”) forms a construct relation with “garments” (*kotenôt*, a noun feminine plural construct–noun masculine singular) and that the term “skin” specifically refers to the skins of animals related to the construction of the sanctuary, the system of

³⁶According to Kikawada, a word-by-word comparison of the expression “mother of all the living” in this Babylonian Epic shows that the honorary name of the goddess Mami (*belet-kala-ili*, “Mrs. of all the gods”) followed the same formula as the name “Eve”:

panami mami nisassiki
inanna belet kala ili
lu šumki

Formerly we call her Mami;
now, “Mrs. of all the gods”
really that will be her name (I 246-48)

(“Two Notes on Eve,” *JBL* 91 [1972]: 33). The formula for this new name, “x of all the y,” corresponds to the one used to designate Eve the “mother of all the living.” It is also used for other personal names, such as *bunu-kala-ili* (“one Nobleman [?] of all the gods”) that contain the formula “x of all the y,” where “x” = “one Nobleman [?],” “y” = “the gods,” and the qualifier “of all” (*kala* or *kali*, a cognate of Hebrew *kol* “all” or “totality”). Consequently, Mami and Eve are derived from the same formula; see H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965), 127; W. von Soden, *Akkadische Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965-1981), 127a, 138b, 427a for similar names (e.g., *bin-kali-šarri*). See also in this list the last of the powerful kings of the Old Akkadian period (Kikawada, “Two Notes,” 34).

³⁷Kikawada, “Two Notes,” 35.

sacrifices, and the cultic rites.³⁸ Moreover, accounts of the ordination of the priests describe Moses' clothing them in their tunics.³⁹

The play on words of "naked" ("were both naked," 2:25) and "crafty" ("now the serpent was more crafty," 3:1) has been studied by F. Landy.⁴⁰ It is significant that B₆ ends with the word ^c*rūmmūn* ("naked"), while the following section (C), which is the central section and the narrative nucleus of the GEA, begins with the use of the word ^c*ārūm* ("crafty"). This aspect, among others already mentioned, demonstrates the relationship and literary and linguistic correspondence between Gen 2 and 3, linking them together.

The primary meaning of the Hebrew word ^c*erwā* ("nakedness," in its several forms) is clear.⁴¹ The word does not refer at all to sexuality, but rather to a defenseless state of abandonment, devoid of possessions or power.⁴² For

³⁸For example, Gen 27:16; Exod 25:5; 26:14; 29:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19; 39:34; Lev 4:11; 7:8; 8:17; 9:11; 16:27; Num 4:6, 8, 10-12, 14; 19:5; 31:20.

³⁹Exod 28:41; 29:8; 40:14; Lev 8:13.

⁴⁰F. Landy, *Paradoxes of Paradise* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 220ff.

⁴¹In Job 1:21 and Eccl 5:14 the image of a child, who comes naked into the world and returns to death naked (i.e., missing all possessions), is used. A similar image is used in Hosea, where reference is made to a robbed woman who is stripped of her clothes and is naked as in the day she was born (2:3). In Job 22:6; 24:7, 10, the word is used to refer to the spoil and nakedness of the poor (cf. Isa 58:7 and Ezek 18:7, 16). The image is used metaphorically with relationship to the underground world in Job 26:6. In Amos 2:16, the hero will escape naked, robbed of his weapons and power; while in Isa 20:2-4, the term refers to prisoners who go naked into captivity (cf. Deut 28:48). In Mic 1:8, it refers to one robbed and naked in affliction. 1 Sam 19:24 refers to the intent of Saul to capture David by using Samuel's prophetic gift. Successive messengers are conquered by the Spirit of God and they prophesy. Saul also succumbs to this power and he prophesies before Samuel, remaining naked for a whole day and night. Only in Ezek 16:7, 22, 39; 23:29 does some sexual shade appear. But even here the essential meaning is that of a destitute, robbed, and vulnerable woman.

⁴²J. Magonet, "The Themes of Genesis 2-3," in *A Walk in the Garden*, ed. P. Morris and D. Sawyer, JSOTSup 136 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 43; see also R. M. Davidson, "The Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning: Genesis 3," *AUSS* 26 (1988): 122-123; and J. A. Bailey, "Initiation and the Primal Woman in Gilgamesh and Genesis 2-3," *JBL* 89 (1970): 144-150. In Ugaritic, two terms related to the Hebrew ^c*erwā* ("nakedness") are ^c*rw* ("to undress" or "to destroy") and ^c*ry* ("naked/uncovered"). They do not refer to sexuality, but rather to a defenseless state and abandonment without possessions or power, similar to that of the corresponding Hebrew word:

KTU 1.14

umt'[*krt.*] ^c(?)*rw*t.
bt'[*m*] *lk. itdb.*

The family [of Kirta] was
denuded/destroyed
the house of the king perished (see
context: KTU 1.14 I 10-25)

the first time the human couple are able to see themselves through the eyes of God, and they perceive their weakness, fragility, and dependence (Gen 3:7).

*Antithetical Chiasmatic Microstructure of
Genesis 3:9-19⁴³*

B₇ The Man's Sin

The Lord God asked the man, "Where are you?" He answered, "I heard you in the garden and was afraid because I was naked; so I hid." God said, "Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree that I commanded you not to eat from?" (3:9-11)

B₈ The Woman's Sin

The man said, "The woman you put here with me gave me fruit from the tree and I ate it" (3:12)

B₉ The Serpent's Sin

The Lord God said to the woman, "What have you done?" The woman said, "The serpent deceived me and I ate" (3:13)

B₉' The Serpent's Judgment

The Lord God said to the serpent, "Because you have done this, you are cursed above all livestock and all wild animals! You will crawl on your belly and eat dust all the days of your life, and I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel" (3:14-15)

B₈' The Woman's Judgment

To the woman he said, "I will greatly increase the pain of childbirth. Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you" (3:16)

B₇' The Man's Judgment

To Adam he said, "Because you listened to your wife and ate from the tree, the ground will be cursed; you will reap it through painful toil all the days of your life. It will produce thorns and thistles, and you will eat the plants

KTU 1.16 II

⁸⁹*km.nky.t.tgr[h]*

like a strong-room's (lit. "treasury") (let)

⁹⁰*km.skllt [—]*

gate (be),

⁹¹*rym.lbl [sk]*

like an enclosure's [bare without [covering]

J.C.L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), 97; see also G. Del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaán* (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1981), 289, 314.

⁴³Van Dyke Parunak, 164.

of the field. You will do this until you return to the ground from which you were taken; you are dust and will return to dust” (3:17-19)

1. *The antithetical microsections B₇||B₇*: This antithetical chiasmic microstructure completes and closes section B' of the GEA. It is fundamentally characterized by the divine judgment and the reorganization of human life after humanity's disobedience to the divine command and the entrance of sin in the earth. In B₇, the man hears God's voice in the garden and is afraid (an expression of his sin). B₇' is characterized by the description of God's judgment on humanity: “cursed is the ground because of you; through painful toil you will eat of it all the days of your life.”

2. *The antithetical microsections B₈||B₈*: The microsections B₈||B₈' describe the woman's sin, given in the man's words, and the divine judgment as an exact antithetical parallelism. While B₈ is characterized by the man's answer to God's questions, in which man displaces his sin onto the woman, his partner,⁴⁴ B₈' contains the description of God's judgment on the woman (e.g., “pains,” “childbearing,” “and “with pain”).⁴⁵ It is interesting that the verb *harbā'arbeh* (“to increase”) appears in the verbal form of the Hiphil infinitive absolute–Hiphil imperfect of the verb *rābā'*, with a similar linguistic formula to the verb *ākol to'kel* (“to eat”) (2:16) and *mōt tāmūt* (“to die”) (2:17) in the antithetical section of B. Although in this case the verbs appear in the Qal infinitive absolute–Qal imperfect, the verbal forms are more common.

3. *The antithetical microsections B₉||B₉*: Finally, the antithetical microsections B₉||B₉' describe the serpent's sin, given in the woman's words, and the divine judgment as a precise antithetical parallelism. B₉ is characterized by the woman's answer to God's question, in which she places the blame for sin on the serpent (i.e., “the serpent deceived me and I ate”). B₉' describes God's judgment of the serpent (i.e., “cursed, . . . you will crawl on your belly and you will eat dust”). In 3:17, God curses the ground as an indirect punishment on humanity. In 3:14, he curses the serpent directly.

Thus the account of humanity's disobedience, which arises in the Garden of Eden, falls at the center of the narrative. In a precise way, section C (Gen 3:1-7) reveals that humanity's disobedience (i.e., their sin, which was the origin of evil in the world) is the narrative nucleus of the antithetical chiasmic

⁴⁴Remember that previously he had said of her: “This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh . . . and they will become one flesh” (2:23-24, NIV).

⁴⁵The Lord God appears again in the Garden of Eden after Adam and Eve's sin to begin a legal process of judgment and reorganization of human life. With relationship to the judgment of the woman and the use of Hebrew terms *is'boḥ* (“pain/toil”), *māṣāl* (“to rule over”), and *t'sūqā* (“desire”) that appear in Gen 3:16, see, e.g., BDB, 780-781, 605, 921-922; Holladay, 280, 219, 396; and Davidson, 127-129.

structure of Gen 2-3 and the word *wā'okel* ("and I ate") is the point of return for the antithetical chiasm of the GEA as a whole.⁴⁶

The Garden of Eden Account The Chiasmatic Structure of Gen 2-3 (III) B B'	
<p>Divine Commandment and Organization of Human Life (Gen 2:16-25)</p> <p>B₁</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh 'elohim</i>) - "the man" (<i>'al-hā'ādām</i>) - "tree in the garden" (<i>'ēš-hagān</i>) (2:16) <p>B₂</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "commanded" (<i>wayšaw</i>) - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh 'elohim</i>) - "the man" (<i>'al-hā'ādām</i>) (2:16a) <p>B₃</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "not" (<i>lō'</i>) - "to eat" (<i>tō'kel</i>) - "from the tree" (<i>ūme'ēš</i>) (2:16b-17a) <p>B₄</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - "gave names" (<i>wayyiqrā'</i>) - "the man" (<i>hā'ādām</i>) (2:20) <p>B₅</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "the man" (<i>hā'ādām</i>) - "shall be called" (<i>yiqqārē'</i>) - "woman" (<i>'iššā'</i>) (2:23) <p>B₆</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - "naked" (<i>'arūmmim</i>) - "his wife" (<i>w'is'to</i>) - "the man" (<i>hā'ādām</i>) (2:25) 	<p>Divine Judgment and Reorganization of Human Life (Gen 3:8-21)</p> <p>B₁'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh 'elohim</i>) - "the man" (<i>hā'ādām</i>) - "trees of the garden" (<i>'ēš-hagān</i>) (3:8) <p>B₂'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I commanded you" (<i>šiwwiti'ka</i>) (3:11b) <p>B₃'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "not" (<i>lō'bilti</i>) - "to eat" (<i>'akol 'akāla'</i>) - "from the tree" (<i>h'min-hā'ēš</i>) (3:11b) <p>B₄'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh 'elohim</i>) - "called" (<i>wayyiqrā'</i>) - "to the man" (<i>'el-hā'ādām</i>) (3:9) <p>B₅'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Adam" (<i>hā'ādām</i>) - "named" (<i>wayyiqrā'</i>) - "Eve" (<i>hawwā'</i>) (3:20) <p>B₆'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Lord God" (<i>yhwh 'elohim</i>) - "garments" (<i>kotenoi</i>) "clothed them" (<i>wayyalbisēm</i>) - "his wife" (<i>ū'is'to</i>) - "Adam" (<i>'ādām</i>) (3:21)

⁴⁶Walsh, 171.

*The Disobedience of Human Beings in the
Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:1-7)
Antithetical Chiasmic Microstructure of Genesis 3:1-4*

- C₁ The serpent, who was more crafty than any of the wild animals the Lord God had made, said to the woman, “Did God really say, ‘You must not eat from any tree in the garden?’” (3:1)
- C₂ the woman said to the serpent, “We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden, (3:2)
- C₂' but God did say, ‘You must not eat or touch the fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden or you will die” (3:3)
- C₁' The serpent said to the woman, “You will not die” (3:4)

1. *The antithetical microsections C₁ || C₁'*: The antithetical parallelism between microsections C₁ || C₁' is marked by the nouns “serpent” and “woman,” and the verb “to say.” The serpent is the main character of both microsections.⁴⁷ In C₁, the negative particle *lō*[−] (“not”) appears in connection with *kōl* (“all,” “any”; a noun masculine singular construct) that is used as a formula to express absolute negation (e.g., “you must not eat from any tree in the garden” [3:1]).⁴⁸ In C₁', the expression “you will not surely die” (*lō*[−] *mōt t' mutūn*) is the same expression that appears in 2:17 (*mōt tāmūt*) in Qal infinitive absolute–Qal imperfect but without the negative particle, thus demonstrating that the serpent repeats God’s words but with a total negation of the divine command.⁴⁹

⁴⁷The common Hebrew term used for “serpent” is *nāḥās* (e.g., Num 21:7-9; Deut 8:15; Prov 23:32; it appears 31 times in the OT). There is possibly a connection between *nāḥās* and *n'ḥōšet* (“bronze”) in Num 21:9, where Moses makes a “bronze snake” (*nāḥās n'ḥōšet*). This connection with the word “bronze” suggests that the serpent had a brilliant and luminous appearance that attracted the woman’s attention. Another more sinister connection can be seen between the noun *nāḥās* and the verb *nāḥas* (“to practice divination, to observe signs,” Gen 30:27; 44:5,15; Lev 19:26; Deut 18:10). This verb appears 11 times in the OT, always in the Piel form. The noun with which *nāḥās* is related means “divination” (*nāḥas*; Num 23:23; 24:1). The formula of divination in the ANE frequently included procedures that imply a serpent; see V. P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 187; cf. K. R. Joines, *Serpent Symbolism in the Old Testament* (New Jersey: Haddonfield House, 1974), 2-3, 22; G. Contenau, *La Divination chez les Assyriens et les Babyloniens* (Paris: Payot, 1940), 222.

⁴⁸GKC, 152b; Joüon and Muraoka, 2:606. The serpent’s first words should be considered a surprise expression. The serpent exaggerates the prohibition of God excessively, seeking to convince the woman that God did not allow them access to any tree of the garden (Hamilton, 186; see also Walsh, 164; cf. A. Schoors, “The Particle *kī*,” *OTS* 26 [1981]: 271-273).

⁴⁹In the OT, the judge often expressed the death sentence through the use of a solemn formula. For the use of this formula, see Gen 2:17; 20:7; 1 Kgs 2:37, 42; 2 Kgs 1:4, 6, 16; Jer 26:8; Ezek 3:18; 33:8, 14. Two examples include Saul’s conclusion of the judicial process of

2. *The antithetical microsections* $C_2||C_2'$: Nevertheless, the antithetical parallelism that comprises 3:1-4 is $C_2||C_2'$. As opposed to the previous microsection, the woman is the main character and the serpent the passive. In 3:2, an antithetical parallelism appears in conjunction with 3:1, 4 with the reversal of the words "woman" and "serpent." In addition, an antithetical parallelism occurs with the phrases "we may eat fruit from the trees in the garden" (3:2) and "you must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden" (3:3).⁵⁰ The word *btok* ("in the middle") appears in many biblical passages and, especially in Gen 1 and 2, means "in the middle, in the center of a space or geographical place."⁵¹ In this context, it specifically refers to the geographical location of the garden of Eden, a meaning confirmed by the Ugaritic term *tk*.⁵² However, the expression "in the middle of the garden" (*btok-hagan*) not only indicates the space and/or geographical location of the

Ahimelech with the sentence "You will surely die" (*mot tamut*, 1 Sam 22:16). An identical sentence was proclaimed against Jonathan by Saul after Jonathan was pronounced guilty (1 Sam 14:44). See P. Bovati, *Re-Establishing Justice: Legal Terms, Concepts and Procedures in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup 105 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 360-361.

⁵⁰In Ugaritic, the term *gn* ("garden") is cognate to the Hebrew word *gan*. It appears in KTU 1.6 I 4:

[*tlit*]^q*gn.zr^cb.*
thrt.km.gn.ap.lb.

[she harrowed] her collar-bone,
She ploughed (her) chest like a garden

Gibson, 74; see also Del Olmo Lete, 223. The literature of the ANE also contributes distant parallels with relationship to the food of plants or some edible substance and to the subsequent concession of life. Thus in the Epic of *Gilgamesh*, Utnapishtim gives a plant to Gilgamesh that Gilgamesh calls "The Man that Ended up being Young in Old Age." He then proclaims: "I will eat and in this way I will return to my youth" (ANET, 96). However, a snake ate the plant while Gilgamesh took a bath. In the same way, the Akkadian Myth of *Adapa* shares the topic of lost immortality. Anu offers Adapa the bread and food of life. Adapa rejects this offer, because he thinks that it is a trick, designed not to increase his wisdom but to kill him (ANET, 102). Here, the Hebrew Bible presents this theme in a different way from the neighboring people, from an *antimythical* perspective. Mythology supports the idea that life is obtained through a plant or a tree, or through bread and water. Scripture, however, presents the reason for death as being due not to a lack of access to the tree of life, but to the first couple's sin in the garden; see B. S. Childs, "Tree of Knowledge, Tree of Life," *IDB* 4, 697. The idea that the life is of God and not of the tree of life is also emphasized in Gen 2:9, where God placed the tree of life in the middle of the garden; see P. Watson, "The Tree of Life," *RestQ* 23 (1980): 235.

⁵¹See, e.g., Gen 1:6; 2:9; 9:21; 15:10; 18:24, 26; 19:29; 23:6, 9-10; 35:2; 37:7; 40:20; 41:48; 42:5.

⁵²In Ugaritic also, the term *tk* ("in the middle of, between") is a preposition; cf. KTU 1.3 III 26 (Gibson, 49; see also Del Olmo Lete, 184):

atm.wank²⁶ibgyb.
btk.gry.il.spn

Come and I myself will search it out
within my rock El Zephon

tree that the man and the woman should not eat of, but also the exact center of the GEA from a literary and linguistic perspective (section C).

*Microstructure in Parallel Panels of
Genesis 3:5-7*

C₃ for God knows that when you eat of it (3:5a)

C₄ your eyes will be opened, (3:5b)

C₅ knowing good and evil (3:5d)

C₃' she took some and ate it, gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it (3:6cde)

C₄' their eyes were opened (3:7a)

C₅' they realized they were naked (3:7b)

1. *The antithetical microsections C₃ || C₃'*: The parallel microsections C₃ || C₃' are marked by the verb "to eat" (*wayyo^o-kal*, Qal imperfect of the verb *ʾākal*), the central word of the GEA, which, in C₃', is fully captured by the usage of the verb "to eat" and with the appearance of the man and woman as the main characters of the narrative. *The narrative nucleus of the GEA of Gen 2-3 is humanity's sin caused by eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil* ("She took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it"; 3:6cde).

2. *The antithetical microsections C₄ || C₄'*: The antithetical parallelism C₄ || C₄' is characterized by the phrase "your eyes will be opened" in C₄; but in a perfect antithetical parallelism, the serpent's prediction is fulfilled when "the eyes of both of them were opened" (C₄').

3. *The antithetical microsections C₅ || C₅'*: Finally, in microsections C₅ || C₅', the antithetical contrast settles on the verb *yāda^c* ("to know"), following the same line of content, literary, and linguistic thought found in C₄ and C₄' ("your eyes will be opened . . . , then [they] were opened"). Microsections C₅ and C₅' ("knowing And they knew") record the fulfillment of the serpent's prediction, but undoubtedly in a sense very different than the man and woman expected. In C₅, humanity was introduced to good and evil—or more exactly to evil, because they already knew the good from their relation to the divine and to the "good" creation ("it was good," Gen 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25; "it was very good," Gen 1:31).⁵³

⁵³For an analysis of the "tree of life" in the ANE literature and in the Hebrew Bible, see E. J. James, *The Tree of Life* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 67-79. The second tree that receives a special emphasis in the GEA is *ʿēš hada^c at tōb wārā^c* ("the tree of the knowledge of good and evil"). Scholars have proposed a series of theories about the meaning of this second tree, from sexual or omniscient knowledge to cultural or ethical knowledge. W. M. Clark proposes that "the knowledge of good and evil" indicates *moral autonomy* ("A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2-3," *JBL* 88 [1969]: 266-278). This theory is based on several OT texts, where "good and

However, microsection C₅' in antithetical parallelism, finds humanity naked, one of the consequences of their disobedience.

The Garden of Eden Account The Chiastic Structure of Gen 2-3 (IV)	
C The Disobedience of Human Beings in the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:1-7)	
<p>C₁</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "the serpent" (<i>wʿhannāḥās</i>) - "said" (<i>wayyoʿmer</i>) - "to the woman" (<i>ʿel-haʿisšā</i>) (3:1) <p>C₂</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "we may eat" (<i>noʿkel</i>) - "fruit" (<i>mipri</i>) - "from the trees in the garden" (<i>ʿēḥagān</i>) (3:2) <p>C₃</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "eat of it" (<i>*kolkem</i>) (3:5a) <p>C₄</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "your eyes" (<i>ʿēnekem</i>) - "will be opened" (<i>wʿnipqʿhū</i>) (3:5b) <p>C₅</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "knowing" (<i>yoḏʿē</i>) - "good and evil" (<i>ṭob wāʿā</i>) (3.5d) 	<p>C₁'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "the serpent" (<i>hannāḥās</i>) - "said" (<i>wayyoʿmer</i>) - "to the woman" (<i>ʿel-haʿisšā</i>) (3:4) <p>C₂'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "you must not eat" (<i>loʿ toʿkʿlū</i>) - "fruit" (<i>ūmipri</i>) - "from the tree that is in the middle of the garden" (<i>haʿēḥ s̄er bʿtōk-hagān</i>) (3:3) <p>C₃'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "ate it" (<i>watoʿkal</i>) - "ate it" (<i>wayyoʿkal</i>) (3:6cde) <p>C₄'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "the eyes of both of them" (<i>ʿēneʿ s̄nēbem</i>) - "were opened" (<i>watipāqahna</i>) (3:7a) <p>C₅'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "they knew" (<i>wayyēḏʿu</i>) - "naked" (<i>ʿērummim</i>) (3:7b)

Conclusion

The literary analyses performed in this study provide evidence of the deep unity of the Hebrew text of Gen 2-3. The antithetical chiastic structure of

evil" is essentially a legal formula to articulate a judicial decision (e.g., Gen 24:50; 31:24, 29; Deut 1:39; 1 Kgs 3:9; 22:18; 2 Sam 13:22; 14:17; 19:35; Isa 5:20, 23). In conclusion, this interpretation appears to give the best meaning of the "knowledge of good and evil" in Gen 2-3. What humanity has been prohibited from is the power of deciding what is good and evil. This is a decision that God has not delegated to human beings; see also G. von Rad, *El Libro del Génesis* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1977), 107-108. This interpretation agrees perfectly with Gen 3:22: "And the Lord God said, "The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil." The man has become a god because he has become his own center, the only reference point for his moral guidance. When the man tries to act in an *autonomous* way, he attempts to be similar to the divinity. This is evident because the man can consent to all the trees of garden except to one (cf. Hamilton, 166.)

the Garden of Eden account (GEA) demonstrates the thematic, structural, literary, and linguistic unity of the different structural levels of this narrative. This deep unity indicates that Gen 2-3 is the work of a single author who used consistent patterns of thematic, literary, and linguistic terminology to describe what happened to the earth and its inhabitants some time after their creation. Consequently, Gen 2-3 presents a *new narrative—the account of the origin of evil and death*—in contrast to the Gen 1 account, which focuses on the origin of goodness and life.

The literary analyses performed in this study provide evidence of the deep unity of the Hebrew text of Gen 2-3, both in its literary structure and in its though content. The antithetical chiasmic microstructures and the parallel panel microstructures demonstrate that the GEA of Gen 2-3 comprises one literary unity. The attempt to dissect the text, attributing its components to multiple sources, is based on the presupposition of its internal incoherence. The demonstration of internal coherence in the literary structure of the GEA challenges the historical-critical tradition regarding Gen 2-3 and favors the interpretation that it comes from a single hand.