

CHAPTER 6

The Disappearance of Paradise

by Fritz Guy

***The Fall**—The Scriptures describe the first human couple as deliberately rejecting the authority of God (Gen. 3:1-6; Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:21-; 22). As a result of this disobedience, God's original order became distorted with woman becoming subject to man. Genesis 3:16 predicts what will happen in this falling away from the divine plan, rather than specifying the divine will for women.*

God's creativity provided a perfect environment for human flourishing and fulfillment, and it was an ideal setting for a love story. The natural surroundings were a botanical garden where plants and trees provided both aesthetic pleasure and nutritional sustenance. Water was abundant; and animals, birds, and fish constituted a marvelous ecological system. The first human being regarded his sexual counterpart with immediate recognition and lyrical ecstasy. The beginning could not have been better.

According to the first of Scripture's two Creation stories (Gen. 1:1,2:4a; 2:4b-25), God surveyed all that had come into existence by divine power and “saw that it was very good” (1:31). The second story explains what the words *very good* meant: human existence

flourishing and fulfilled in a variety of positive and creative relationships—with other persons, with the world, and with God.

But the description doesn't sound very much like the world in which we actually live. The reality we know—including both humanity and nature—is radically different from the reality we read about in Genesis 2. The sequel in Genesis 3 tells why this is so: What began as “the Creation love story” turned out to be “a love story gone awry.”¹ It is the story of the dissolution and disappearance of paradise, the disruption and distortion of created reality. As a result of human willfulness, the story explains, everything in the human world becomes disordered—the harmony of animal and human reality, the complementarity of the human genders, the earth's fertility and fruitfulness for human pleasure and benefit, and the longevity of individual human beings. Thus at the very beginning of the interaction of God and humanity that is the content of Scripture, the story of love, life, and ecstasy become the story of estrangement, death, and agony.

It is a story that carries profound theological significance and enormous existential power. For it discloses the fundamental nature of human reality—not just the reality of the remote human past but also the reality of every human present. In this story we see our own reality, ourselves—our ideal possibilities, our true vulnerabilities, our underlying temptations—much more clearly than may be comfortable.

So we owe it to ourselves to reread and rehear the story again and again—listening to it anew, if we can, with open ears that can discern fresh meanings; and learning what went wrong, and what is wrong, with our human existence. One of the things that is wrong is the relationship of women and men—a relationship that was designed to be the full expression of the human image of God, a relationship that became instead the exercise of domination and the experience of submission. This distortion of gender relationships—what it means to be male and female in the image of God—may not always be evident to men, who in many ways seem to benefit from it, but in other, less obvious ways are profoundly damaged by it. Yet it is almost always evident to women, for whom the term “sexual harassment” identifies only some of the more obvious symptoms of disordered gender relationships.

As we open ourselves to the story again, however, we need to be very clear about our goal. It is not to produce a new interpretation or a re-interpretation, feminist or otherwise, but simply to read carefully with clear eyes and to listen receptively with attentive ears, and then to reflect on its meaning for our own existence. We do not assume in advance the outcome of our reading, listening and reflecting—either that it will be a confirmation of what we have previously believed, or that it will be a disconfirmation. We do not, in other words, have any ideological ax to grind. We have no agenda but to see and hear the story, and to perceive and understand its significance.

To facilitate our perception and understanding of the story however, we need to remember that it was first written in Hebrew¹ and that some of our familiar translations may reflect the cultural assumptions and inevitable biases of the persons—almost always male—who did the translating. Here the work of some women scholars may be illuminating.² Listening to the story with the help of their feminine ears may enable us to discern some nuances that masculine ears alone tend to miss.

The Duality of Gender

While the first Creation story says simply that humanity was created in the image of God and in the duality of male and female (Gen. 1:27), the second Creation story says explicitly that this duality was essential to humanness. What the first, solitary human needed was a partner—not an assistant, a subordinate, or an ornament, but a companion corresponding to his own nature. They were to be partners in human flourishing and fulfillment, and in transcendence over the rest of the natural order that was their environment and home. Together in that setting they were to bear and to be the human image of God, and thus to nurture the world for God, so that its history would be the realization of the divine intention. Therefore it was “not good” (Gen. 2:18) for “the human” or “the earthling” (although a little awkward, these are more accurate translations of the Hebrew text here than “the man”) to be alone.

Evidently the duality of human gender was designed to be much more than the physiological means of populating the earth.

For, on the one hand, sexual reproduction is obviously not peculiar to humanity. And, on the other hand, God could surely have invented some other, asexual means of reproduction for the human species. As the first Creation story suggests by talking about the image of God and human gender in the same breath, and the second confirms by talking about the creation of the first woman, gender differentiation was designed to provide the psychological, social, and spiritual means of being the divine image, of being fully human—which requires the complementarity and mutuality of male and female humanity.

Hence the poetic excitement of “the human” (or “the earthling”) when he recognizes his counterpart and companion:

*This, finally, is bone of my bones
and flesh of my flesh.
This shall be called Woman,
because she was differentiated from Man (Gen. 2:23).³*

There is no reference here to reproducing the human species or populating the earth; the exclusive focus of attention is the fulfillment of humanness in and through this duality, relatedness, and complementarity. What the creation of animals could not do for the human, the creation of sexuality did. For the intention of sexual differentiation is not division or even distinctiveness, but rather “the oneness that is wholeness.”⁴

As the Sabbath is the goal of the creation of the world in the first Creation story, so the companionship of man and woman is the goal of the creation of humanity in the second story.⁵ And as the world would not have been complete without the creation of the human, so humanity would not have been complete without the creation of the woman.

The Encounter

The essential complementarity and mutuality of human gender differentiation is reflected even in the way the love story went wrong. The prominence of the woman's role indicates that she was not at all inferior or subordinate to the man.

In the dialogue with the serpent, the woman, who is not named “Eve” until later in the story (Gen. 3:20), revealed the intelligence, individuality, and freedom of spirit of a person created in the image of God. Indeed, she functioned as “the spokesperson for the human couple,”⁶ both of whom were included in the serpent's argument. When the serpent says, “You will not die,” “Your eyes will be opened,” and “You will be like God” (Gen. 3:4,5, NIV), it uses the plural forms for *you* and *your*. The woman hears the serpent speaking, engages it in theological conversation, and considers the promised result of eating the fruit.

So we can readily understand—even if we do not agree with—the claim that “the woman's dialogue with the reptile should not be considered a blot on her character but rather a comment on her intellect.”⁷ However that may be, the woman here is the first of a number of biblical women who are anything but passive—women such as Sarah, Rebekah, the Hebrew midwives in Egypt, Deborah, and Huldah. And it is perhaps significant that the Hebrew scriptures personify wisdom as a woman (Prov. 8).

Here in the Genesis story, it is clear that the man followed the woman's lead:

*She took from [the tree],
and she ate;
and she also gave to her man [who was] with her,
and he ate (Gen. 3:6).*

In a surprising contrast to most of the narratives in Hebrew Scripture, and to most of our own experience of male behavior, in this case the man is anything but a “patriarchal figure making decisions for his family.” Instead he apparently “follows his woman without question or comment.... He does not theologize; he does not contemplate. . . .” More like a sheep than a shepherd, he simply takes the fruit and eats. His involvement is “an act of acquiescence, not of initiative.”⁸ The story indicates that of the two, she was the more perceptive, thoughtful, and analytical one. Prominence and initiative are not, of course, to be confused with virtue. The point here is simply that the woman was the man's full partner, not merely a useful assistant.

A later scene in the story shows that the woman was fully accountable for her primordial expression of human willfulness. Like the man, she had insisted on acting as if she were God, unwilling to affirm the limitation of her role symbolized by the command not to eat of the fruit of a particular tree: “they were not to use their freedom and dominion to decide the nature of good and evil.”⁹ The woman as much as the man denied the fundamental dependence of humanity on deity; she as much as he pretended to be independent in regard to existence as well as moral authority.

On the other hand, the story does not make the woman accountable for the man's sin, although the man tries to put the blame on her. It is curious that so many Christians throughout history seem to have accepted the man's self-serving reasoning instead of listening carefully to the story. Early in the third century, for example, Tertullian spoke to all women in words addressed figuratively to the first woman: “You are the one who plucked the fruit of the forbidden tree, you are the first who deserted the divine law; you are the one who persuaded him whom the Devil was not strong enough to attack.”¹⁰ Poetic license is one thing; distortion is something else. In the actual story, “activity and passivity, initiative and acquiescence”¹¹ are both modes of willful disobedience. This is a useful point to remember, especially when, as is usually the case, the gender roles are reversed.

Why then does Paul write (in Rom. 5:12-21, for example), as if it were the man's sin, not the woman's, that counted? Probably because Paul, in a style of scriptural interpretation that was common at the time, was drawing a comparison and contrast between (a) the solution to the problem of human willfulness and (b) its beginning. The fact was that God had become incarnate in and as a male rather than a female human being. Perhaps the reason was that a woman would not have made so clear and dramatic a revelation of God in the role of a vulnerable servant, since women were, and in many places still are, simply *expected* to be both vulnerable and servant. Whatever the reason, God did “become” in the form of a male, so Paul quite understandably took Adam rather than Eve, and rather than both Adam and Eve, as the counterpart to Jesus the Messiah.

So the reference to Adam in analogy to Jesus is entirely

understandable in the light of their common maleness, even though gender was not the main point of the original story, the incarnation of God in human form, or Paul's comparison of the two. Significantly, although our English versions refer both to Adam and to Jesus as "one man," Paul did not use the specific Greek word for "male" (*aner*, from which we get the prefix "andro-") but always the general word for "human being" (*anthropos*, from which we get words like *anthropology*).

At the same time that it shows the intelligence and initiative of the woman, the story of the disappearance of paradise also shows that she was no more the *ultimate source* of human disobedience than was the man. The presence of the serpent is a reminder of the power of temptation in human experience.¹² Human willfulness is perverse, but in the beginning, at least, it was not *sheer* perversity. It was occasioned by external enticement presented in a strategy intended to mislead. And the conversation between the serpent and the woman is a reminder of the possibility of questioning the limits of human freedom, and of the attractiveness of the immediate consequences of willfulness. The fruit of the tree was indeed beautiful to look at, and there was every reason to suppose it would be delicious and nourishing.

The Consequences

As the woman and the man were both involved in the willful disregard of the divinely established order, so they both experienced the immediate consequences of their willfulness. The story proceeds:

*The eyes of both were opened,
and they knew they were naked;
and they sewed leaves together
and made for themselves clothes (Gen. 3:7).*

The first consequences of willfulness were insecurity and shame. The man and the woman had been created both vulnerable and accountable, but that paradox would have been no problem if they had acted willingly instead of willfully—if, in other words,

they had accepted the reality of their dependence on a reality outside themselves instead of denying it. Insecurity is guilt's distortion of vulnerability; shame is guilt's acknowledgment of accountability. The shame was occasioned by the sexuality of the man and the woman; its underlying dynamic and fundamental cause was their guilt. As the apostle would later say that “the sting of death is sin” (1 Cor. 15:56), so with the disappearance of paradise the shame of sexuality was guilt.

The next consequences were estrangement and fear. For both the man and the woman, awareness of the presence of God became a reason not for rejoicing or worshipping but for hiding among the trees. The hiding, the story says explicitly (Gen. 3:8) was not from each other, but from God. They had been embarrassed by their sexuality, but they could solve that problem with clothing. They were terrified by their guilt, and they tried to solve that problem by pretending they didn't exist.

Next came defensiveness, evasion, and blaming—phenomena that are painfully common in all our lives. When God addressed “the human,” he answered as spokesperson not for the couple (as the woman had done) but only for himself:

*I heard your voice in the garden,
and I was afraid because I was naked,
and I hid myself (Gen. 3:10).*

But the evasive maneuver didn't work. It only increased “the human's” vulnerability to God's interrogation:

*Who told you that you were naked?
Have you eaten from the tree
of which I commanded you not to eat? (Gen. 3:11).*

The question of accountability could not be avoided, but “the human” tried anyway:

*The woman whom you gave
to stand with me—
she gave me [fruit] from the tree,*

and I ate (Gen. 3:12).

This was not a morally admirable performance on the part of the human. He blamed the woman directly and God indirectly. He pictured himself as the victim of circumstances: the woman gave him the fruit; what else could he do but eat it?

For her part, the woman did little better. She ignored the man, and she didn't explicitly blame God. She blamed only the serpent, which of course God had created in the first place:

*The serpent tricked me,
and I ate (Gen. 3:13).*

Thus the story portrays a certain consistency of defensiveness, alienation, and self-justification. By blaming the woman, the man had placed himself in opposition to her; and by blaming the serpent, the woman placed herself in opposition to the natural world. They both admitted their actions, but not their responsibility.

Thus paradise, which was defined not primarily by its beauty, as is often supposed, but by the relationships that constituted the essence of humanness, disappeared. Their willfulness had placed the man and woman, who constituted the whole of humanity, in opposition to God, to animal life, and to each other. That changed the whole human world.

The New Reality

Paradise was dissolved by human willfulness, and God acknowledged its disappearance by giving a three-part description of the new reality. It was an announcement of judgment; but it was a description of inevitable consequences, not a prescription of punishment. The participants in the dissolution and disappearance of paradise were addressed individually in the order of their involvement.

The serpent, once considered the most intelligent of animals, would be regarded as the most disreputable—a curse symbolized by its prone posture and its diet of dirt (Gen. 3:14). Its offspring would, furthermore, be the object of permanent human hostility: it

would, so to speak, strike at humanity's heel, but humanity would strike back at the serpent's head (Gen. 3:15). Heard through Christian ears, this part of the story was the first hint of a Redeemer who would ultimately deliver humanity from the guilt and the consequences of its willfulness. Even without the benefit of this Christian retrospection, the serpent would epitomize the disordered relationship between human and animal reality. "A power struggle prevails between the animal world and the human world, each striking to kill the other."¹³

The woman, whose life began in the joyous realization of sexual and gender complementarity, would now live in a world of discomfort and disillusionment, in which her very sexuality would be a source of suffering. There would be more toil and more pregnancies, more work and more children:

*I will greatly increase your toil
and your conceptions;
with your toil
you will produce children (Gen. 3:16a).*

The idea of increased pain in childbirth, conveyed by most English translations in a tradition that goes all the way back to the Septuagint, is hardly justified by the actual words of the Hebrew text here.¹⁴ For one thing, the word translated "toil" in both instances (*issabon*) is the same word that occurs in the next verse, in which the man was told that "in toil" he would eat the products of the ground (Gen. 3:17, see NKJV). So it is likely that in God's comment to the woman it also meant hard, difficult work. For another thing, the word translated "conceptions" (*heron*) "shows a tendency to be more associated with the initiation of pregnancy rather than with its duration or conclusion."¹⁵ It is a totally different word from the more common and general one (*yalad*) that appears at the end of the couplet above and means "to produce children" (and is used of the role of men as well as women in the reproductive process). So what God is saying to the woman is that her life will be filled with both demanding work and frequent pregnancies.

But even worse for the overall existence of the woman was the fact that her erotic desire, the legacy of the Creation love story,

would now be the means of her domination and exploitation:

*But for your man will be your desire,
and he will rule over you (Gen. 3:16b).*

The woman's predicament—her new, now distorted relationship to her man—yields new sexual, psychological, and spiritual dynamics:

As the man in creation joined her, so she continues, even at the place of judgment, to desire him. ...At this turning point, distinctions within one flesh became oppositions. ... Division followed, yielding "opposite sexes."... Yet . . . she still yearns for the original unity of male and female.... Thus she lives in unresolved tension. Where once there was mutuality, now there is a hierarchy of division.... Hence the woman is corrupted in becoming a slave, and the man is corrupted in becoming a master.¹⁶

The situation can be summarized in three alliterative lines:

*The woman wants a mate and she gets a master;
She wants a lover and she gets a lord;
She wants a husband and she gets a hierarch.¹⁷*

It should be recognized by every reader and hearer of the Genesis story, however, that this male supremacy “is neither a divine decree nor the female destiny. Both their positions result from shared disobedience. God describes this consequence but does not prescribe it as punishment.”¹⁸ Yet the assertion of male domination and prerogative is obviously a transcultural consequence of human sin. It has been suggested that there may be “something akin to a congenital flaw in males that makes it all too easy for them to assume that they have a right to dominate women.”¹⁹

Whatever biochemical or genetic factors are involved here, in most cultures boys are taught that to be competent and successful as a male is to be in control, or at least to appear to be in control.

Since no one is in *fact* in control all of the time, there is a consistent and pervasive need for a great deal of compensatory behavior—namely, exerting control over anything that *can* be controlled—in order to maintain the illusion that one is a competent, successful male.

At the same time, there is a negatively corresponding tendency in women, similarly “akin to a congenital flaw,” that makes it all too easy for them to acquiesce in their subordination, and to avoid any attitude or action that might threaten their relationships with men. This is “a very seductive temptation indeed, for it so very easily masquerades as virtue. After all, don't Christians see self-sacrificing servanthood and the desire to maintain peace and social unity as fruits of the Holy Spirit?”²⁰ Furthermore, women's resistance to men's domination of them seems, to both women and men, perilously similar to the sort of denial of human limitations that was humanity's fundamental moral problem in the first place. For in most known cultures, girls are taught that to be an acceptable, successful woman is to please others, and thus to take responsibility for the quality of interpersonal relationships.

Because of these characteristic tendencies of men and women, resulting from nature or nurture or, most likely, both, it is a common experience that when a woman refuses to *be controlled* by a man, she is accused of wanting to *control him*. For it seems, from the man's point of view, that he is dominated by anything that, or anyone who, refuses to be dominated by him, and thus frustrates his desire to dominate—that is, to be in control.

No Reproof

Might it be, however, that the dynamic of male dominance and female subservience was intended to correct the dynamic of the woman's initiative and the man's passivity in the garden? The answer is clearly No.

In the first place, the story offers no hint whatsoever that this was the case. The profound and powerful words addressed to the woman do not include any sort of reproof for her initiative. “No objection is raised to the fact that she, as woman or wife, took the freedom to instigate action and invite her husband to follow her.

Nowhere in the text is there an indication that she is taken to task because she failed to abide in her place within a presumed authority structure.”²¹ The text says simply,

*She took from [the tree],
and she ate;
and she also gave to her man [who was] with her,
and he ate (Gen. 3:6).*

In the second place, all the rest of the three-part statement of judgment is a description of things that have gone wrong in the created order as a result of human willfulness. It is a catalog of problems to be addressed, not solutions to be perpetuated. It would be remarkably odd if the prediction that “he shall rule over you” (Gen. 3:16b) were the one positive item in a long list of negatives. There are some other ways, however, in which the statement to the woman is indeed different from the statements to the serpent and the man. As grim as the prediction addressed to the woman is, it is significant also for the words it does not include. There is, for example, no accusation addressed to the woman, nothing beginning with “Because you have....” Nor is the woman said to be the object of a “curse,” as are the serpent and the ground—although, of course, the woman is affected in the mutual hostility between the serpent and humanity, just as the man is affected by the earth's reduced productivity.²²

Like the woman, the man would experience sustained discomfort and disillusionment. The earth, from which he was created, would resist his efforts to derive his food from it. Its plants would often be useless and mischievous thorns and thistles, making the man's existence a lifetime of hard labor. In the end would come the man's own dissolution and his reunion with the earth. In the beginning he was differentiated from the earth by the breath of God that made him a living person. Now he would find his destiny in the dirt of death. Thus the curse on the ground became the man's own curse. Another ideal relationship in the paradise of the Creation love story became a frustration of human flourishing and fulfillment.

All of this was the consequence of the human's willful

disobedience—his choice to follow the example of his woman rather than obey the command of his Creator. Here again, what is said makes all the more important what is unsaid. The man was plainly irresponsible: he failed to obey an explicit command of God. He “listened to”—that is, he took as his guide for action—the example and invitation of the woman rather than the divine instruction. But in no sense was the man “accused of failing to control the woman.”²³ There was no suggestion that that was his role, his responsibility, or his right.

Changed Relationships

The effects of human willfulness on the various kinds of relationships were devastating. The relationship between animals and human beings changed from ecological rapport and compatibility to all-too-common fear and belligerence. The relationship between the man and the woman changed from ecstasy, companionship, and complementarity to estrangement, domination, and competition. The relationship between vegetation and human existence changed from satisfying production to painful toil. The relationship between the earth and humanity changed from creative source to inevitable dissolution. Human existence, intended to be an everlasting flourishing and fulfillment, had become a fatal illness.

But the story is not quite finished. The description of the consequences of human willfulness is followed by the announcement of a final symbolism. The divine response to humanity's separation of itself from God is the separation of humanity from the source of existence represented by the tree of life. With stunning irony, the story quotes God as saying:

*See, the human has become like one of us,
knowing good and evil (Gen. 3:22).*

Like God? What is going on here? “Helpless creatures, then-lives shattered by strife, discord, and enmity, are hardly candidates for divinity.” So God's speech “mocks the serpent and convicts the couple through the incongruity of the promised and the actual. They

expected divinity but disaster came.”²⁴ Created in the image of God, their choice to act as if they *were* God brought results that showed how *ungodlike* they actually were. Their intended “dominion” in God’s world had shriveled to a struggle for survival against earth, plants, and animals. Still bound together emotionally and sexually, they distrusted each other. The man had given his woman the name Eve, which evoked the idea of life, because he expected her to become “the mother of all living” (Gen. 3:20); but because of their partnership in willfulness, she became also the mother of all dying.

So the story ends with the inevitable divine judgment:

*Now, lest he reach out his hand
and take also from the tree of life,
and eat, and live forever . . . (Gen. 3:22b).*

The statement is suspended in midsentence, completed not with words but with the act of expelling the human from the garden and making sure that he cannot return to the tree of life. “Estranged from each other, the man and the woman are banished from the garden and barred forever from the tree of life.”²⁵

Paradise was gone. Human willfulness had made an ontological as well as a moral difference. It changed the way humanity was. Having distanced itself from the Creator by hiding among some of the trees of the garden, humanity was now kept at a distance from the tree of life in the middle of the garden.

The Good News

Nevertheless there was still some very important good news. The disappearance of paradise was not God’s last word about humanity and humanness. Apart from the tree of life, humanity could not finally evade death; but human existence was to be graced with the possibility of counteracting some of the other effects of turning away from the Source of life.

Divine grace is surely evident, for example, in the acquisition of knowledge that enabled human beings eventually to domesticate some kinds of animals so they became peaceful instead of ferocious; to invent machinery that made work less exhausting and less

hazardous; to develop new agricultural methods and new strains of plants to yield more food with less effort; to employ biology, chemistry, and physics in resisting otherwise fatal diseases.

And divine grace is just as surely evident in every family, church, and society where transformed gender relationships enable women and men to enjoy the mutuality and complementarity of authentic sexuality, to experience the openness and vulnerability of true intimacy, and to appreciate differences as potential enhancements of their humanness in and as the image of God. The result of this grace is neither the immediate restoration of paradise nor the recreation of the perfect love story; but, in spite of the pervasiveness and depth of the distortion of gender relationships as a consequence of sin, the possibilities of divine grace in human lives must not be underestimated.

For God's grace ensures the possibility of human existence and fulfillment far closer to the one pictured in the story of Creation than we usually realize. It is the existence that would have been the common experience of women and men if paradise had not disappeared. And it remains an essential vision and relevant ideal for women and men who want to grow and flourish as the human image of God.

Dr. Fritz Guy is well known in Adventism as a scholar, teacher, pastor, and administrator, and has been described as one of the finest systematic theologians in the denomination. He has taught at Loma Linda University and the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan, and is currently University Professor of Theology and Philosophy at La Sierra University in Riverside, California, where he enjoys the winter warmth.

1. Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen, *Gender and Grace: Love, Work and Parenting in a Changing World* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity, 1990), p. 43; Phyllis Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, *Overtures to Biblical Theology*, 11 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), pp. 72-143.
2. See, in addition to Van Leeuwen and especially Trible, also Carol Meyers, *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (New York: Oxford, 1988), pp. 72-121.
3. Translation of biblical texts are supplied by the author in consultation with modern versions and scholarly commentaries on Hebrew texts.
4. Trible, p. 103.
5. See Claus Westermann, *Genesis: A Practical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 21.
6. Trible, pp. 108, 109.
7. Meyers, p. 92.
8. Trible, p. 113.
9. Van Leeuwen, p. 43.
10. Tertullian, *De cuitu feminarum*, in *The Fathers of the Church*, 40 (Westminster, MD: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1959), p. 118.
11. Trible, p. 114.
12. See Westermann, p. 22.
13. Trible, p. 125.
14. See Meyers, pp. 99-109.
15. Meyers, p. 102.
16. Trible, p. 128.
17. Carol Caster Howard, quoted without a documented source in Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles: What the Bible Says About a Woman's Place in Church and Family* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985), p. 229.
18. Trible, p. 128.
19. Van Leeuwen, p. 45.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
21. Bilezikian, pp. 54, 55.
22. See Trible, p. 126; also Bilezikian, p. 54.
23. Trible, p. 129.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 136.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 139.

