

## CHAPTER 2

### PART 1 – THE A-DAM SITUATED IN EDEN

#### EXPOSITION [2:4-6]

#### 4. THESE (WERE) OUTCOMES (OF) THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH AS THEY UNDERWENT CREATION DURING THE MAKING (BY) Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM OF EARTH AND HEAVEN.

אֵלֶּה EI-LEH (THESE): Often prefixed with a ׀ ("Vav" ["and" - GENESIS 10:1; NUMBERS 3:1]), when it is not (GENESIS 6:9; NUMBERS 2:32), the subject matter following it diverges from what preceded it.

תּוֹלְדוֹת THOH-L'DOHTH (OUTCOMES - root "Yud-Lamed-Daled" ["birth"]): It is not limited to one generation (cf. GENESIS 11:27) but exclusive to human progeny or deeds and always introductory. *"Generations" is דּוֹהַר-וֹהַת DOHR-OHTH (GENESIS 17:7; EXODUS 3:15; JUDGES 3:2); "accounts/story" is סֵפֶר/מִדְרָשׁ SEH-PHER/MID-RASH (GENESIS 5:1; CHRONICLES II 24:27).*

בְּהִבְרָאָם B'HEE-BO-R'AHM (AS THEY UNDERWENT CREATION): This was originally בְּבִרְאָם B'BHO-R'AHM; the "Heh" is small because it was not in the original text but inserted to remove an ambiguity arising from a creation order - A-DAM followed by the animals and then the woman - strikingly different from Chapter 1, where the animals preceded the simultaneous creation of man and woman. B'BHO-R'AHM can be "When He created them" or "While He created them", unclear if the process followed their appearances or accompanied them. The "Heh" makes it the latter; what follows transpired during the "days" of Chapter 1. Despite scholars' claims, accepted by many traditionalists with their own rationales, this is not another creation story. Those who insist it is must treat both versions as separate narratives. The second has one creation period - nothing to motivate a Sabbath, a key biblical theme not just missing but negated! Did naïve redactors miss this fatal defect, one that also eluded early readers? An excision of three verses, removing nothing of great import, would surely have occurred to them!

בְּיוֹם עֲשׂוֹת B'YOHM AH-SOHTH (DURING [HIS] MAKING): AH-SOHTH connotes completion of something extant (see 1:7 - VA-YAH-AHSS). B'YOHM ["Sh'va" vowel on the "Beth"] is a day known by an event or one that recurs (cf. GENESIS 2:17; LEVITICUS 13:14; NUMBERS 28:9); preceding a gerund, like here, B'YOHM references a day or time whose occurrences are then elaborated. *When Moses erected the tabernacle בְּיוֹם כְּלִיַּת B'YOHM KAH-LOHTH (THE DAY [HE] FINISHED - NUMBERS 7:1), Scripture then relates what that entailed. This "day" is a period encompassing a process now set forth.*

Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM: The name "Yud-Heh-Vav-Heh" also implies attributes when paired with another name. This "making" melded the physical and cerebral. *The multiplicity of His names was one factor inspiring the Documentary Hypothesis. Imagine future historians stumbling on a biography of Lincoln in which he is also called President, Great Emancipator, Commander-in-Chief, Congressman, "rail-splitter" and Honest Abe, whereupon they sagely pronounce the work a composite of seven sources, matching the degraded standards that pervade the "discipline" of biblical scholarship.*

אֶרֶץ וְשָׁמַיִם E-RETZ V'SHA-MA-YIM (EARTH AND HEAVEN): Man is now His focus, hence Earth is first [see 1:1]. This is not another creation story; it reports outcomes of His creatures' deeds within an independent "day".

#### 5. NO PRODUCE FIELDS WERE YET ON EARTH NOR HAD FIELDS OF GRASS SPROUTED FOR Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM HAD NOT DIRECTED ANY (OF) THE RAIN AND NO (CAPABLE) MAN (WAS) PRESENT TO CULTIVATE (ANY REGION) OF THE EARTH.

The consensus that earth had no vegetation yet (*prompting ingenious hermeneutics reconciling that with 1:11-12*) stems from failure to distinguish אֶרֶץ or אֲדָמָה E-RETZ/A-DA-MAH (EARTH/LAND/GROUND) from שָׂדֵה SA-DEH (FIELD). The text does not suggest there was no growth anywhere, though probably in inhospitable regions - jungles, rainforests, deserts and tundra; what had not appeared were fields, tracts cultivated by humans (cf. LEVITICUS 25:34; DEUTERONOMY 20:19; RUTH 1:1).

הַשָּׂדֵה SEE-ACH HA-SA-DEH (FIELD PRODUCE): This low growth (like shrubs and bushes - cf. GENESIS 21:15; JOB 30:4 - not trees) is usually a stand-alone noun; here, it is “*field shrubbery*” - cultivated plants.

בְּאֶרֶץ טָרָם יִהְיֶה בְּאֶרֶץ TEH-REM YI-H'YEH BA-A-RETZ (NOT YET BEING ON EARTH): TEH-REM denotes a stoppage or interruption of events or a progression by an unrelated intrusion (cf. GENESIS 19:4; EXODUS 12:34; JOSHUA 3:1 - not always the case if it is prefixed [cf. EXODUS 10:7; PSALMS 90:2]), not applicable here (or the grasses in the next phrase); rather, it indicates that the cited circumstances impeded man's progress. Communities were confined to certain locations and stagnant conditions, with no prospect of improving their lives or expanding their habitats.

לֹא הִמְטִיר LOH HIM-TEER ([HE] RAINED NOT): HIM-TEER is directed rain (cf. KINGS I 15:1; PSALMS 72:5 [6 in the Hebrew] - in PSALMS 147:8, rain is “prepared” for designated areas, while for the תַּצְעִיר CHA-TZEER of wild animals, it simply descends; in GENESIS 7:4, His intent to inundate the offending regions was proclaimed by אֲנֹכִי מִמְטִיר AH-NOH-KHEE MAHM-TEER [I WILL RAIN], whereas water falling randomly is גֶּשֶׁם GEH-SHEM [GENESIS 7:12]). He did not direct rain because there were no cultivated fields.

וְאָדָם אֵין V'A-DAM A-YIN (AND NO MAN [WAS] PRESENT): The exegesis that “there was no man” to appreciate or use rain requires אָדָם כִּי אֵין אָדָם KEE EIN A-DAM (FOR NO MAN [was] - cf. GENESIS 39:11; KINGS I 8:46; CHRONICLES II 6:36) or וְלֹא הָיָה אָדָם V'LOH HA-YAH A-DAM (AND THERE WAS NO MAN - cf. EXODUS 20:2). The switched conjunctions [KEE and “Vav”] show the phrases do not express causality but parity of conditions. The text implies no man was available (cf. EXODUS 17:7; NUMBERS 13:20; MICAH 7:2) with the knowledge and skill to work the soil. This means humans existed, a challenge to conventional interpretations that emerged in urban settings from those so detached from the soil they did not grasp what these words truly mean. A statement that there was no rain would not resonate with ancient inhabitants of the Levant; they received little precipitation and relied on irrigation systems, a mechanism broached in the next verse.

לַעֲבֹד LA-A-BHOHD (TO WORK): Why work was needed is unexplained; it is not included in the sketch of man's nature (1:26), his blessing (1:28) or the consequences of his trespass (3:17-19). Only in the next chapter (3:23) is tillage mandated. [3:22-24 follows this chapter after a full separation. Chapter 4 then begins after a minor separation. The 3:22-24 PAR-SHA precludes the Cain and Abel story; it is not the end of the Eden episode.] Traditionalists who contend the “days” in Chapter 1 were like ours must concede that only the first stirrings of flora emerged on the third day, less than 72 hours until the A-DAM's appearance; how much growth took place that the text bemoans the lack of rain or man's labor (v. 5)? Those who impute a miraculous dimension posit supernatural interventions Scripture resorts to only if unavoidable or thematically essential (like the plagues [EXODUS Chapters 7-11] or the sea crossing [EXODUS Chapter 14]) but scrupulously avoids in this survey that eliminated all echoes of pagan myth.

## 6. STEAM WOULD RISE FROM THE GROUND AND IRRIGATE ALL SURFACES OF THE LAND.

וְאָד יַעֲלֶה V'EID YA-A-LEH (STEAM WOULD RISE): EID is not “water/stream/flow/well/fountain”; “mist/vapor” are closer but would be נִשְׂאִים N'SEE-IM (CLOUDS - cf. JEREMIAH 10:13; PSALMS 135:7) or קִיטָר QEE-TOR (FUME - cf. GENESIS 19:28; PSALMS 148:8) - and the past tense “went/came up” is wrong. If this was a rain substitute, the passage is unnecessary (see V'A-DAM A-YIN above); if a soil hydration preparatory to man's formation, it would be ascribed to Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM הִעֲלָה HEH-EH-LAH, “{He} raised” - cf. NUMBERS 8:3; SAMUEL I 12:6; KINGS I 9:15] and strange that He siphoned up moisture only to let it settle back down. The only other EID [יָקוּ מִטָּר לְאָדוּן] YA -ZOH-QOO MAH-TAR L'EI-DOH (JOB 36:27)] is rendered “They distill [cluster] rain from His vapor” but that is מֵאֲדוּרֵי MEI-EI-DAV. The “Lamed” prefix precludes this interpretation, for EI-DOH is singular and ZAH-QAQ connotes pouring or condensation, not vaporization. The present continuous YA-A-LEH (WOULD RISE - cf. EXODUS 40:37; KINGS I 3:4; JOB 1:5) chronicles steam rising from geysers and condensing to water.

V'HISH-QAH ETH KOL P'NEI HA-A-DA-MAH (AND IRRIGATE ALL LAND SURFACES): HISH-QAH refers to liquid consumed by men (cf. GENESIS 24:18; NUMBERS 5:24), animals (cf. GENESIS 24:14; EXODUS 2:17) or absorbed by soil (cf. DEUTERONOMY 11:10; ISAIAH 27:3 - not preparatory to His “fashioning” man). P'NEI (FACES OF - see 1:2, P'NEI HA- MA-YIM) takes this out of the universal mode - the EID did not disperse over the planet - but the inclusive KOL (ALL - see 2:1, VA-Y'KHOO-LOO) expands it to all land patches irrigated by thermal springs. P'NEI does not reflect an object but its relationship to the observer [*in GENESIS 31:5, Jacob refers to Laban's demeanor, not his appearance*]. This phrase describes tracts of A-DA-MAH (areas of human habitation [see 1:25], hence not the expected אֶת הָאָרֶץ ETH HA-A- RETZ [THE EARTH/GROUND]) that were so watered and around which hominids gathered. The few regions yielding vegetation, with fish from rivers, provided minimum subsistence for bands of A-DAM.

### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

In the sixth creation day, the E-LO-HIM of rules and order, coupled with the innate Y-H-W-H, fabricated a new human type. No cultivated fields or fodder ranges existed; man did not know agriculture or animal husbandry. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM did not direct rain systematically nor were humans capable of framing water transport channels. Settlements clustered around geysers spouting steam that condensed into water then used for irrigation, a condition hindering man's proliferation.

### EXPOSITION [2:7-9]

7. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM FUSED THE MAN, (WHO WAS MADE FROM) SOIL FROM THE GROUND,  
BY BLOWING INTO HIS NOSTRILS, INFUSING (THE CAPACITY FOR) VIBRANT SPEECH.  
THE MAN BECAME A VIGOROUS PERSON.

וַיִּצְרֶהּ VA-YEE-TZEHR ([HE] FUSED): “Formed/fashioned” is wrong; the root "Tzadiq-Reish" is “press together”. A narrow path is צָר TZAHR (NUMBERS 22:26). Egypt is called מִצְרַיִם MITZ-RA-YIM because, in the biblical period, almost all its population settled along the Nile. TZAHR is also an “oppressor” (ESTHER 7:6). A יִצְרֶהּ YOH-TZEIR fuses substances (or collects them - cf. AMOS 7:1) - here within a man. The traditionalists’ “special creation” vanishes once this verse is read properly, as do the multiple authorship theories.

הָאָדָם HA-A-DAM (THE A-DAM): The ה "Heh" indicates a known person. Those reading a second creation story must explain how the text so designates someone not yet introduced [the A-DAM in verse 5 cannot serve; it is his absence that is there lamented]; it should be a generic אָדָם A-DAM. To traditionalists, he is the fellow from 1:26-27 but this leads to problems in ensuing passages. A “Heh” can also single one out of a group [*A battlefield refugee is הַפְּלִיטָה HA-PAH-LEET (GENESIS 14:13); one predator swooping down from a band is הַעֵיט HA-A- YIT (GENESIS 15:11; ISAIAH 18:6)*], in this verse, one A-DAM out of a population selected for His special attention.

מִן־הָאֲדָמָה A-PHAR MIN HA-A-DA-MAH (SOIL FROM THE GROUND): Telling us the A-DAM was made from soil requires a preposition-noun order, מֵעֶפְרָה הָאֲדָמָה MEI-A-PHAR HA-A-DA-MAH (cf. NUMBERS 19:17), just מֵעֶפְרָה MEI-A-PHAR (cf. ISAIAH 29:4; JOB 5:6) or the better הָאֲרֶץ מֵעֶפְרָה MEI-A-PHAR HA-A-RETZ (... THE EARTH - cf. GENESIS 28:14; EXODUS 8:12; ISAIAH 40:12), with the more suitable קֶרֶן QOH-RATZ (SCULPT - cf. JOB 33:6) or עֵצֶב AH-TZABH (SHAPE/FASHION - cf. JEREMIAH 44:19; JOB 10:8). The Israelites knew man was made of the same stuff as other creatures. In Chapter 1, Scripture related the origins of flora (1:11, 12) and fauna (1:20, 21, 24) but with A-DAM, plunged right into his abilities and destiny, nothing about source or makeup. Nor can second creation story partisans explain this lacuna, which seems redressed here but the animals are also so described (v. 19). This A-DAM (1:26-27) was already A-PHAR MIN HA-A-DA-MAH [*an appositive phrase*]; the object of VA-YEE-TZEHR is not soil but the A-DAM, like other creatures (cf. ECCLESIASTES 3:20) but upgraded. Had this been his manufacture, the

text would use חֹמֶר CHOHO-MEHR (CLAY - cf. ISAIAH 45:9; JOB 10:9). Passages pronouncing man to be A-PHAR express mortality (cf. PSALMS 104:29; JOB 7:21), not composition.

וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נְשֵׁמַת חַיִּים VA-YEE-PACH B'AH-PAV NI-SH'MAHTH CHA-YIM (AND BLEW THROUGH HIS NOSTRILS VIBRANT SPEECH): This is not “the breath of life” - the “Heh” prefix [HA-CHA-YIM - cf. SAMUEL I 25:29; JOB 33:30] is missing! CHA-YIM modifies NI-SH'MAHTH (root "Nun-Shin-Mem" - “blow”, cf. SAMUEL II 22:16 ISAIAH 30:33; JOB 37:10), exhalation over vocal cords producing speech (cf. JOB 27:3-4, 32:8) - Scripture would not record other aspects of creation and neglect the one that made man unique. *When the bard exhorted כֹּהֵל הַדְּבָרָה KOHL HA-N'SHA-MAH to praise Him (PSALMS 150:6), he did not call on “all breathers/souls” [“souls “would not have the HA prefix and “breather” is נוֹשֵׁם NOH-SHEIM] but those capable of speech. נִשְׁמַת־מִי NI-SH'MAHTH MEE (JOB 26:4, 33:4) is rendered “Whose spirit/breath” but context makes it obvious Job asked, “Whose discourse issues from you?”. PROVERBS 20:27 declares נֵר יְהוָה נְשֵׁמַת אָדָם NER Y-H-W-H NI-SH'MAHTH A-DAM, translated “A lamp of the Lord is man’s spirit” [NER is a receptacle; its light is שֶׁלֵּהָבֶת SHAL-HEH-BHETH [TORCH - SONG OF SONGS 8:6], לָהֵב LA- HAHBH [BLAZE - cf. JUDGES 13:20] or לֶבֶת LAH-BAHTH [FLAME - cf. EXODUS 3:2]]; this passage’s theme (v. 26-28) concerns measures taken by rulers - His gift of speech a tool for wise officials. אֲנִי עָשִׂיתִי U-N'SHA-MOHTH A-NEE A-SEE-THEE (ISAIAH 57:16) rendered “The souls I made/The life breath I gave” distorts it. OH-SEH (MAKE) implies an existing entity completed or finished, not created (BA-RA-THEE) or brought into existence (HOH-TZEI-THEE - see 1: 24); the prophet lamented that speakers He made subverted this gift. The other words for speech - דִּבְרוֹר DEE-BOOR (words spoken or ideas conveyed - DEUTERONOMY 1:1), אֹמֵר OH-MER (see 1:3) and דוֹבֵב DOH-BHEIBH (movement of lips forming words - cf. SONG OF SONGS 7:10), all frame spoken content or describe the speaker. N'SHA-MAH is physical sound production. The phrase is not possessive but adjectival, a lively נְשִׁימָה N'SHEE-MAH (see 1:2 - V'ROO-ACH E-LO-HIM). Depictions of His injecting life into man are untenable. If A-DAM was created last, he was not the first to draw a breath; readers knew the animals preceding him gulped air. The critical school is no better off; his being imbued with the “breath of life” contradicts the biblical doctrine that blood carries life (DEUTERONOMY 12:23). The intensive VA-YEE-PACH (root "Yud-Peh-Cheth" - cf. JEREMIAH 4:31; PSALMS 27:12; PROVERBS 6:19) is strong propulsion [breathing moves air in and out], a burst through the nostrils that made a heritable physiological change.*

וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנַפְשׁ חַיָּה VA-Y'HEE HA-A-DAM L'NEH-PHESH CHA-YAH (THE A-DAM BECAME A VIGOROUS PERSON): If man was created last, the animals were already NEH-PHESH CHA-YAH (1:20); those asserting he was first must contend with the grammar - VA-Y'HEE (see 1:3) and the dative "Lamed" prefix to NEH-PHESH indicate eventual development - and reversed order [the other creatures were only created for his use (v. 19)]. Onkelos [Aramaic] translates this וַהֲוָה בְּאָדָם לְרוּחַ מְמַלְלָא “Va-ha-vahss B'A-dam L'roo-ach M'ma-l'la” - “And there was [put] in A-DAM a speaking wind”. Curiously, the four times this phrase appears in Chapter 1 (v. 20, 21, 24, 30), he translates it חַיָּתָא נַפְשָׁא “Naph-sha Cha-y'tha” (“Living Being”). Onkelos frequently departs from the literal but his total revision here is odd. We speculate it was his translation of NI-SH'MAHTH CHA-YIM but a copyist, working with only the Aramaic text, surmising A-DAM's creation preceded his receiving the power of speech, reversed the positions of the phrases. Onkelos understood this verse as we do! NEH-PHEHSH CHA-YAH is thus a "living being" who surpassed his precursors (see 1:20, 24). *Some construe this to mean A-DAM was created as an adult, not an infant incapable of fending for itself. If he was a “Special Creation”, this is superfluous; if he had parents, it is absurd.*

Most translations echo the King James “And man became a living soul”. This made sense in Stuart England but not to the Hebrews; the idea of a “self” apart from the body gained traction in the West when the Greeks brought it from India, where this concept, indispensable for a soul transmigrating paradigm, justified a caste hierarchy still central to Hindu belief. There are no such Scriptural representations. *The companion conjecture that, as it also says nothing of an “afterlife”, the Israelites lacked this tradition is nonsense. Every group they encountered had such beliefs. Israel’s religious leaders were not shy about alien tenets they found repugnant but there are no recorded efforts to expunge this idea. College catalogues contain guides to courses of study and sections extolling the rewards of a university experience - not a word about its economic benefits. But for most students, that is their primary, if not only, consideration. There may be subtle clues but anything explicit would be gauche - knowledge is pursued “for its own sake”. Scripture promises neither prosperity nor salvation - it instructs. Any teleology*

is beyond human understanding, hence omitted. Passages affirming benefits of compliance or consequences of disobedience are addressed to the nation, not individuals. *The point is not reward but that resources be available for Israel to fulfill His mandate; when it neglects its obligations, it risks forfeiting these assets. The later prophets foresaw its political power restored so it could pursue its covenantal imperatives, not for material comfort or "salvation".* There is therefore no articulation of personal "reward" or "punishment" but some kind of augmented afterlife is anticipated; transition is assumed but unmentioned because it does not concern us - our sole interest is fulfilling His charges. *The phrase also rules out any pretense of "adoptionism"; this individual A-DAM received no status elevation – he remained the same mortal as his companions.*

-----  
 The Garden of Eden, backdrop for the rest of the PAR-SHA, became a proverbial archetype, an opulent abode lost through sin and recast as the reward for the righteous and premised on its being His gift and generosity His purpose. None of this is in the text [prophetic allusions are purely symbolic]. Were that the intent, *וַיַּעַשׂ לָוֹ* VA-YAH-AHSS LOH (AND HE MADE FOR HIM - cf. EXODUS 37:2; JONAH 4:5; NEHEMIAH 13:5 - or a variant) would appear somewhere in the narrative.

8. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM PLANTED A GARDEN IN EDEN FROM THE EAST  
 AND PUT (IN CHARGE) THERE THE MAN WHOM HE HAD FUSED.

גַּן GAN (GARDEN): Traditionalists should be troubled by this drastic retreat, the hardy explorer and conqueror (1:28) becoming a diffident gardener, while the two-narrative proponents must explain why the world's sole inhabitant needed an isolated garden. GAN is an enclosure/retreat (cf. KINGS II 25:4; SONG OF SONGS 4:12), the feminine GA-NAH/GI-NAH used when the focus is on what takes place in it (cf. ISAIAH 1:30; ECCLESIASTES 2:5; ESTHER 1:5) or its products (cf. NUMBERS 24:6; ISAIAH 1:29; AMOS 9:14 - not always the case when it is in construct form [cf. DEUTERONOMY 11:10; KINGS II 21:26]). It is *not a residence*; early readers would no more live in a garden than we would. *The יוֹשֶׁבֶת בְּגַנִּים YOH-SHEH-BHETH BA-GA-NIM (GARDEN DENIZEN - SONG OF SONGS 8:13) spent her leisure time there, as adduced from the plural GA-NIM [a domicile would be singular] and the gerundial YOH-SHEH-BHETH rather than TOH-SHEH-BHETH (cf. GENESIS 23:4); יוֹשֵׁב אֶתְלֵים YOH-SHEIBH OH-HO-LIM (TENT DWELLER - GENESIS 25:27) does not allude to Jacob's habitat but his introversion.* Some ventured that He first gave A-DAM a taste of the harsh world from which the garden would shelter him; nothing in Chapter 1 or in this passage suggests any reason for such a dichotomy.

בְּעֵדֶן B'EI-DEN (IN EDEN): Its name ("delight/pleasure") was presumed to reflect the region's character, although verse 5 flatly stated that no such place existed. The feminine עֵדְנָה ED-NAH is "rejuvenation" (Sarah [GENESIS 18:12] was not posing a question [the verb is past tense]; she was astonished to experience a flow again); Eden was a fertile plain. From 2:10 and 15, we infer its name is generic. Its location was known to the ancients but became obscured as areas outside their settlement territory, if not trade destinations, lost significance. It was not the area's name later. EI-DENs elsewhere in Scripture are other regions; nor do those in prophetic allegories conflate with this Eden.

מִקְדָּם MI-QEH-DEM (FROM THE EAST): This is not "in the east/eastward" but "from the east" (cf. GENESIS 11:2, 12:8, 13:11). A temporal meaning (PRIOR) is negated by *וַיִּטֵּעַ* VA-YEE-TA (HE PLANTED) in the incomplete past, rather than the completed *נָטַע* NA-TAH (cf. NUMBERS 24:6; DEUTERONOMY 20:6; ISAIAH 5:7).

וַיִּשֶׂם VA-YAH-SEHM SHAHM (AND PUT [IN CHARGE] THERE): "Placed/put" is not wrong but this VA-YAH-SEHM is "put in charge" (cf. DEUTERONOMY 1:13; ESTHER 3:1) of Eden - not just the garden. SHAHM (THERE) modifies its preceding noun, EI-DEN, and always denotes a location, not what is found there (cf. GENESIS 28:11; LEVITICUS 16:23). Had it meant the garden, it would be *בּוֹ* BOH (IN IT - cf. LEVITICUS 8:6; CHRONICLES II 4:6) or *בְּתוֹכָוּ* B'THOH-KHOH (WITHIN IT - cf. GENESIS 28:12; EXODUS 25:8; KINGS II 4:13).

אֲשֶׁר יָצַר A-SHER YA-TZHR (WHOM HE HAD FUSED): Apart from some tortuous exegetics, most consider this redundancy a stylistic grace note. The Masoretes disagreed; the Merkha-T'bbeer that should punctuate VA-YAH-SEHM SHAHM (AND HE PUT THERE) is replaced by Zaqeif-Qatan, making the verse's last four words a cohesive

accusative clause [only *Haameq Dabhahr* {R. N Berlin – 19th century Lithuania} saw this but gave it a mystical twist]. The time elapsed from when the A-DAM was infused with speech until his move to Eden was likely many years, during which he sired speakers in various regions. This A-DAM He fused was the one stationed in Eden.

9. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM MADE SPROUT FROM THE GROUND  
EVERY TREE THAT (STIMULATES) INTEREST AND GOOD AS (A) FOOD SOURCE  
AND A LIFE (GIVING) TREE IN THE MIDST OF THE GARDEN  
AND A TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND THE BAD

מִן־הָאֲדָמָה ... וַיִּצְמַח... VA-YATZ-MACH... MIN HA-A-DA-MAH ([HE] MADE SPROUT FROM THE GROUND): If the trees matured prior to the A-DAM'S arrival in Eden, this should follow the first half of verse 8. Those presuming that happened erroneously attribute the choppy syntax and superfluous “from the ground” to “biblical style”; rather than the generic מִן הָאֲרֶץ MIN HA-A-RETZ (FROM THE EARTH - cf. GENESIS 2:6; EXODUS 3:8; ISAIAH 55:10) or omitting origin (cf. JUDGES 16:22; JEREMIAH 23:5; JOB 38:27), the text associates the growth with אֲדָמָה A-DA-MAH (see 1:25). Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM did the “sprouting”; cultivation was the A-DAM's task. If the trees emerged spontaneously, it would read הוֹצִיא הוֹצִיא HOH-TZEE (BROUGHT FORTH - see 1:11), הִקִּים HEI-QIM (RAISED - cf. ISAIAH 14:9; EZEKIEL 34:29; PROVERBS 30:4) or שָׁתַל SHA-THAHL (IMPLANTED - cf. JEREMIAH 17:8; EZEKIEL 17:22; PSALMS 1:3).

כָּל־עֵץ KOL ETZ (EVERY TREE): The dearth of plants and grass (v. 5) meant trees were also wanting - but not mentioned. The Israelites knew that trees alone would not sustain the A-DAM and, if they were the only things there, it was a פַּרְדֵּס PAHR-DEIS (ORCHARD - cf. ECCLESIASTES 2:5; SONG OF SONGS 4:13; NEHEMIAH 2:8). This is the only biblical garden with trees; when not identified by kind, they are עֲצֵי־יַעַר A-TZEI YA-AHR (TREES OF THE FOREST - cf. ISAIAH 7:2; EZEKIEL 15:2; SONG OF SONGS 2:3) or עֲצֵי הַשָּׂדֶה A-TZEI HA-SA-DEH (TREES OF THE FIELD - cf. LEVITICUS 26:4; ISAIAH 55:12; JOEL 1:12). The Eden “garden” was an *arboretum*.

נֶחַם־מַחְדָּה NECH-MAHD L'MAHR-EH (STIMULATING INTEREST): The trees' aesthetics are noted before their nutritional value - they were not there for sustenance (biblical sequences begin with the most important or prominent) OR to be an oasis (restorative stops were not yet needed). Reading that the A-DAM was brought when the trees were saplings, knowing they were not a larder, the Israelites realized he was to foster and study their growth, which can become tedious routine. A bored A-DAM is not diligent and attentive but if his satisfaction from learning was fortified by pleasure from viewing and sampling [positive reinforcement], his appetite for education would be whetted; Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM therefore imbued the trees with qualities that elicited these, adduced from the unique juxtaposition of NECH-MAHD with a "Lamed" dative prefix to MAR-EH - the appearance itself became an object of desire (cf. JOSHUA 22:10; ISAIAH 11:3; EZEKIEL 23:16), a anticipation of Madison Avenue techniques.

וְטוֹב לְמַאֲכָל V'TOHBH L'MAH-A-KHOL (AND [A] GOOD FOOD SOURCE): Food is אוֹכֵל OH-KHEL (cf. GENESIS Ch. 41, 42) or לֶאֱכֹל LEH-EH-KHOHL (TO EAT - cf. GENESIS 24:33). Its feminine אֹכֶלֶת OKH-LAH is a stock of food (cf. EXODUS 16:15; LEVITICUS 25:6 - see 1:29-30). The "Mem" prefix makes it a “food source” (cf. HABAKKUK 1:16; CHRONICLES II 9:4) or stockpile (and feminine מַאֲכָלֶת MA-A-KHEH-LETH [KNIFE] a tool for preparing food [GENESIS 22:6]). Only those kinds of trees were there. TOHBH (GOOD) is not a judgment but used as in Chapter 1. It makes no sense to call the trees “good” if they were the only ones on the planet. *{Homilies that extol His creations whose intrinsic goodness is discernable by their appearance are based on naive views of human behavior. Foods look attractive to their consumers because of conditioning, not their innate appearance}*. They were “good for” providing food, “excellent food repositories” of varied types.

וְעֵץ חַיִּים בְּתוֹךְ הַגָּן V'ETZ HA-CHA-YIM B'THOKH HA-GAN (AND A TREE [GIVING] LIFE IN THE MIDST OF THE GARDEN): ETZ HA-CHA-YIM is translated “the Tree of Life” but the "Heh" prefix should have piqued some curiosity (also as to the Tree of Knowledge) - it should read וּבְתוֹכָם עֵץ U-BH'THOH-KHAM ETZ (AND IN THEIR MIDST A

TREE - cf. NUMBERS 16:3). The definite article implies readers were familiar with it but only the adjective is prefixed, not the noun (הַבַּיִת הַלָּבָן HA-BA-YITH HA-LA-BHAN is “the white house”, picked out by its color; בַּיִת הַלָּבָן BA-YITH HA-LA-BHAN is “The White House”, a national edifice.[These patterns are not rigorously adhered to in post-biblical Hebrew.]); this told the Israelites why the tree was there and centrally placed. “Tree” paired with CHA-YIM (not “life” but “energetic” - see 1:20) is an idiom for a source of vitality {PROVERBS extols “trees”, each an ETZ CHA-YIM without the “Heh” definite article (11:30 - a virtuous life the “fruit of a righteous {person}”, 15:4 - a “healing tongue”, 3:18 - “wisdom” or Torah [which must be constantly grasped or its benefits will not be sustained – these “trees” do not confer permanent boons])}, delivered to the other trees so they could thrive in a foreign environment. It was not there for the A-DAM.

טוֹב וְרָע TOBH VA-RA (GOOD AND THE BAD): RA is not “evil/perverse/malicious” but “broken/dysfunctional”. VA-RA (“and the bad”) should be V’RA (“and bad” - cf. LEVITICUS 27:10 - B’RA; KINGS I 3:9 - L’RA); the subsumed definite article prefix relates RA to specific forms of TOHBH (GOOD), complementary, not independent (cf. DEUTERONOMY 1:39). When E-LO-HIM turned the world over to man (GENESIS 1:26), He did not furnish instructions (*Much is made of this by atheists, who argue that a thoughtful “Designer” would do so. Behavior codes contain principles because formulators cannot anticipate myriad situations; similarly, changes and developments in nature demand creative responses. Man needs aptitude for that, not a manual*); instincts that served other creatures were not sufficiently adaptive for man’s expansion and exploitation of new territories. He needed skills and knowledge to supplement physical and mental faculties (GENESIS 1:28), an education the A-DAM was to disseminate. He first had to learn himself - and quickly. This tree gave him the ability to speedily distinguish TOHBH - what worked - from RA - what did not. Readers should not regard as fable or allegory that ingesting an arboreal substance, which the A-DAM had permission to do at this point, could do this. Natural substances can effect changes, sometimes permanent, like altering mental abilities or states of consciousness and physical ones like those induced by steroids. Certainly, His trees had such potency. They did not confer immortality! This faulty understanding resulted from a misreading of 3:22, where לְעֹלָם L’OH-LAHM is translated as “forever”. This is only when the word appears in a context dealing with the divine, where it is often reinforced with נֶעַד VAH-EHD (cf. EXODUS 15:18 - this has no English equivalent but can be approximated with “ad infinitum”). Elsewhere, it is an indefinite or inordinately lengthy time interval (cf. EXODUS 21:6) - not forever.

### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

After upgrading one A-DAM with speech, Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM planted a secluded garden at the eastern extremity of Eden, placing this A-DAM there to observe trees from all over the world but specifically endowed to elicit his interest to cultivate them and study their potential as food sources. A central tree supplied energy to the other trees from diverse regions so they could all thrive in an alien environment; another supplied enhancement to the A-DAM’s cognition, fostering his mastery of diverse subjects and swift deduction of principles.

### EXPOSITION [2:10-14]

10. (THE A-DAM DIVERTED WATER FROM) THE RIVER FLOWING OUT OF EDEN TO IRRIGATE THE GARDEN FROM THERE HE WOULD DISTANCE HIMSELF AND TRANSFORM (HIMSELF) INTO (ONE OF) FOUR HEADS.

וְנָהָרָהּ V’NA-HAHR (A RIVER): A NA-HAHR transports (cf. DEUTERONOMY 1:7; ISAIAH 2:2); אֶרֶץ Y’OHR irrigates (cf. EXODUS 8:1; JEREMIAH 46:8). A NA-HAR’s volume and speed make it unsuitable for watering a garden, which it would inundate and turn into swamp [more fitting are מַעְיָן MA-YAHN (FOUNT - PSALMS 114:8), פְּלוּגָה P’LOO-GAH (BROOK - PSALMS 1:3), אֹבְחָל U-BHAHL (STREAM - DANIEL 8:2) and מִיכַל MEE-KHAHL (CHANNEL - SAMUEL II 17:20)].

יֹצֵא YOH-TZEI (FLOWS OUT): The present continuous “comes out” indicates this river flowed before the garden was planted (otherwise this surge would be attributed to Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM, like His other interventions) and there had been plenty of rain (see v. 5 – KEE LOH HIM-TEER). Also lost on later readers [and translators/interpreters] is that rivers were

the primary arteries in the biblical era, both for migration and trade. The Israelites intuitively understood that the designation of these "rivers" made this passage a travelogue.

לְהַשְׁקוֹת אֶת-הַגֶּן L'HASH-QOHTH ETH HA-GAN (TO WATER THE GARDEN): The verb should be וְהִשָּׂקָה V'HISH-QAH (AND WATERED [as in v. 6 above. "To water" is accurate but distorts the syntax; nor would Scripture assign a motive to a river. Some see a resolution to the situation recounted in verse 5 but then rain would be the remedy]). The action must be attributed to the A-DAM, though not explicitly stated. Such lacunae, facts or events omitted when readers can infer them, are standard in Scripture. The A-DAM learned to divert water from the NA-HAR, his first technology.

וּמִשָּׂם יִפְרֹד וְהָיָה לְאַרְבַּעָה רִאשִׁים U-MI-SHAHM YEE-PA-RED V'HA-YAH L'AR-BA-AH RO-SHIM (AND FROM THERE HE WOULD DISTANCE HIMSELF AND TRANSFORM [HIMSELF] INTO [ONE OF] FOUR HEADS): A river irrigating a garden, then splitting into four is untenable. *The fourth river is the Euphrates, the third probably the Tigris, with a weak case for the second being the Nile; their sources are nowhere near each other. The Israelites knew their paths from contact with the Minoans and Phoenicians, while the Egyptians plied the Nile with trading missions beyond the Red Sea.* One river "dividing" is יִהְיֶה YEI-CHA-LEIQ (cf. GENESIS 14:15; KINGS I 16:21; JOB 38:24). YEE-PA-RED (root "Peh-Reish-Daled") is total separation, no contiguity anywhere (cf. GENESIS 13:9; PROVERBS 19:4; RUTH 1:17); if the A-DAM did the irrigation, grammar dictates YEE-PA-RED is what *he* did - distance himself. The "heads" were not river sources (no river is a headwater of another, let alone four); translators conflated "head" with "riverhead", a composite noun not found in Hebrew and precluded by the pairing of the past tense of "to be" with a dative "Lamed" prefix. When not indicating an indirect object, this preposition implies transformation or conceptual change. If immediate or abrupt, the "Lamed" is generally omitted (cf. GENESIS 19:26; EXODUS 7:19 - note that in the latter, this principle is adhered to although, when the "inversion" is mentioned in that passage [vs. 17, 20], the preposition is retained). When used with the standard וַיְהִי VA-Y'HEE, the past imperfect of "to be", it implies a gradual progression that ultimately achieves an altered condition or arrangement (cf. EXODUS 2:10). When it accompanies the completed past, וְהָיָה V'HA-YAH, it marks adjustments through a repetitive activity (cf. GENESIS 1:14, 15; 11:3; EXODUS 9:9). V'HA-YAH here points to metamorphoses continuously re-enacted, not one that produced a static situation (which would read ... וַיְהִי לְאַרְבַּעָה VA-Y'HEE L'AR-BA-AH...). The A-DAM transformed himself into a רֹאשׁ ROHSH ("leader" - cf. NUMBERS 1:4; JOSHUA 11:10; JUDGES 10:16) of settlements far from Eden, bringing knowledge he obtained in the garden and commodities collected in his travels. His persona - and name - were identified with the river that brought him.

#### 11. THE ONE (IS) NAMED PISHON IS (THE ONE) THAT ROUNDS ALL THE SANDY LAND WHERE THERE GOLD (IS).

שֵׁם הַאֲחָד פִּישׁוֹן SHEM HA-EH-CHAD PEE-SHOHN (THE ONE [IS] NAMED PISHON): The syntax assigns SHEM to the "heads" but these do not sport names - rivers do. Scriptural equivocality adds dimensions. {In GENESIS 15:3, it is unclear if Abraham is addressing Y- H-W-H or the travelers that chanced upon him. The resonance stems from the singular [v. 3] switched to plural [v. 4], then the plural [v.9] becoming singular [v. 10], a mode implying multiplicity.} PEE-SHOHN is the river and "head" the A-DAM's personage on his journey; PEE-SHOHN is "the one" from Eden (v. 10) - [solving the problem of why a major waterway is unnamed]. PEE-SHOHN took the A-DAM to Eden's outskirts and beyond.

הוּא הַסֹּבֵב HOO HA-SOH-BHEIBH (IT [IS THE ONE] THAT ROUNDS): The redundant HOO followed by a verb with a definite article prefix means SHEM does not denote a name but characteristics [Scripture often does this (cf. GENESIS 32:28); names are not necessarily designations]; that river was known by its path. *Note that the Euphrates, the only one identified by its used name, does not have SHEM attached to it.* SOH-BHEIBH is not "encircle" but "meander" (cf. ECCLESIASTES 1:6; SONG OF SONGS 3:3) - this through lands the A-DAM traversed.

אֶרֶץ הַחֲוִילָה E-RETZ HA-CHA-VEE-LAH (THE SANDY LAND): Many noted that the location of this land is a mystery; that is because CHA-VEE-LAH is not a name - a denotative ה "Heh" never prefixes a proper noun (a principle that



escaped the “scholars”; there is a land of Havilah [GENESIS 25:18; SAMUEL I 15:7] - this is not it). CHA-VEE-LAH (root "Cheth-Vav-Lamed" [SAND - cf. GENESIS 22:17; EXODUS 2:12; HOSEA 2:1]) is a sandy region.

הַזָּהָב אֲשֶׁר-שָׁם הַזֶּהב A-SHER SHAHM HA-ZA-HABH (WHERE THERE GOLD [IS]): The "Heh" prefix implies all gold is there, clearly not so. If it meant high quality gold, it should be הַטּוֹב הַזֶּהב HA-ZA-HABH HA-TOHBH (THE GOOD GOLD - cf. DEUTERONOMY 3:25; ISAIAH 39:2) and obviating the need for the first half of verse 12. This passage can only be understood by combining phrases: “that land of sand (dunes) where (special) gold is (found)”.

#### 12. THE GOLD OF THAT LAND (IS) GOOD; THERE THE GLASS (LENSES) AND CARVING STONES (ARE FOUND).

טוֹב הַזָּהָב הַהַרְצֵי הַקְּרָצִי U-ZA-HABH HA-A-RETZ HA-HEE TOHBH (THE GOLD OF THAT LAND [IS] GOOD): “Good” means it did not have to be mined or smelted; nuggets were scooped from the sand. Its purity, malleability and resistance to corrosion made gold the first metal man shaped into vessels.

שָׁם הַבְּדֹלָה SHAHM HA-B'DOH-LACH (THERE THE [LENS] GLASS): Morphological similarity to “Bdellium” led to erroneous associations with resinous substances or gems. The root “Beth-Daled-Lamed” (“separate” - cf. GENESIS 1:14; EZRA 9:1) with ה “Cheth” suffix is “separator”, like a prism; the ה “Heh” prefix makes it an instrument. *A few astute Jewish translators rendered it “crystal/lucent” {The עֵינֵי AY-NOH of B'DOH-LACH in NUMBERS 11:7 is not “color” but “appearance” [root “Ayin-Yud-Nun” - “eye”]}.* The A-DAM brought glass lenses that dispersed light - or concentrated it to ignite fire.

וְאֶבֶן הַשֵּׁהָבִים V'EH-BHEN HA-SHOH-HAM (AND THE CARVING STONE): Cognate to the root “Shin-Cheth-Heh” (“excavate” - cf. JEREMIAH 18:22; PROVERBS 23:27), this is “the carving stone”, probably obsidian, the strongest abrasive the ancients had. *Because it is usually black (EXODUS 25:7), translators confused it with onyx.*

Traversing lands abutting this river, the A-DAM gathered materials, likely helped by locals, to distribute to those he mentored: gold for utensils, a tool for fire-making and an abrasive for cutting, scraping and carving - rudimentary technology.

#### 13. THE NAME OF THE SECOND RIVER (IS) GEE-CHOHN IT (IS THE ONE) THAT ROUNDS (THROUGH) ALL THE LAND OF KOOSH.

גֵּיחוֹן GEE-CHOHN: Its basic meaning, “protrusion/bulge”, depicts the river’s course. *If the Nile, it is the sector formed by both the White and Blue Nile, which takes a sinusoidal path through KOOSH (“Ethiopia” or East Africa).* The A-DAM (and perhaps disciples) brought goods and ideas to sites thought today to be where humans first evolved.

#### 14. THE NAME OF THE THIRD RIVER (IS) TIGRIS IT (IS) THE ONE THAT FLOWS (TO) THE EASTERN (SECTOR) OF ASSYRIA THE FOURTH RIVER IT (IS) EUPHRATES.

פְּרָת PH'ROSS (EUPHRATES): This river was well known. The others are not identified by their actual names; since they were not nearby, thus unfamiliar to them, the Israelites had to be told of the direction and extent of each. The Euphrates marked their border (GENESIS 15:18; JOSHUA 1:4), so no details were needed. Scripture provided background for the A-DAM’s travels, not landmarks to pinpoint the garden’s location.

#### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

The A-DAM diverted part of Eden’s river to irrigate the garden. When leaving Eden, he embarked on the river at a distant location, concealing his origin. Transforming himself into an authority figure on each of four waterways he used, he disseminated knowledge obtained in the garden to communities he visited. Eden’s river circled a land whose sand dunes contained easily scooped gold, which he distributed for vessel fabrication. In those same regions, he obtained glass for lenses used as fire ignition tools and obsidian, an abrasive and cutting tool. The second river traversed Ethiopia. The third was his highway to Assyria and the fourth was the Euphrates.

## EXPOSITION [2:15-17]

### 15. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM PERSUADED THE A-DAM AND SET HIM DOWN IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN TO SERVE (THE COMMUNITY WITH INSTRUCTION) AND PRESERVE IT (WITH HIS GUIDANCE).

ויקח VA-YEE-QAHCH (AND [HE] PERSUADED): The radical root "Qoph-Cheth" in a transitive verb with human direct object is not physical "taking" [that is "Lamed-Qoph-Cheth" - cf. GENESIS 5:24, KINGS II 2:3-10] but entreaty or persuasion (cf. GENESIS 12:5; NUMBERS 16:1), unlike the A-DAM's first placement (v. 8).

וינחהו VA-YA-NEE-CHEI-HOO (AND SET HIM DOWN): "Put/placed" is וְהִנִּיחוֹ V'HEE-NEE-CHOH (cf. DEUTERONOMY 26:4; EZEKIEL 44:19; PSALMS 17:14). Fastidious scholars point out that VA-YA-NEE-CHEI-HOO is literally "He made him rest" (Old English for any cessation - cf. EXODUS 17:11; LEVITICUS 7:15; JOSHUA 1:15), which could only mean this marked the end of the A-DAM's traveling.

לְעִבְדָּהּ וּלְשָׁמְרָהּ L'O-BH'DAH U-L'SHO-M'RAH (TO SERVE IT AND PRESERVE IT): The typical "To dress and keep it" spawned sermons about the centrality of work and danger of idleness but a few Hebrew commentators noted that this translation cannot be correct - the verbs (with "Mapiq" points in their "Heh" suffixes) have a feminine object; GAN (GARDEN) is masculine, requiring לְעִבְדּוֹ L'O-BH'DOH (cf. JOSHUA 22:5; JEREMIAH 27:6; ZEPHANIAH 3:9) and לְשָׁמְרוֹ L'SHO-M'ROH (cf. DEUTERONOMY 7:8; SAMUEL I 19:11; JEREMIAH 31:10 - proponents of two creation stories cannot explain this discrepancy at all). Talmudic opinions (GENESIS RABBAH 16:5; SIFRE DEUTERONOMY 41:24; PIRKEI D'RABI ELIEZER 12:3) that the Scriptural compact itself was the object are problematic because of the implicit supposition that the Covenant was intended to be universal; the Genesis/Exodus narrative makes it highly unlikely the Israelites saw the A-DAM's mandate as identical to theirs. A further drawback is that the garden's protocols are stated in the verse following these words but the A-DAM had already been engaged in this. Early readers understood the garden now had new habitues [קהלה Q'HEE-LAH {COMMUNITY} and עדתה EI-DAH {CONGREGATION} are both feminine] that he was to "serve" as mentor and "preserve" as their monitor.

### 16. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM CHARGED THE A-DAM TO SAY (TO THE OTHERS): YOU (SHALL) EAT FROM ALL THE TREES IN THE GARDEN.

וַיִּצַו... עַל־הָאָדָם VA-Y'TZAV... AL HA-A-DAM (AND [HE] CHARGED... THE A-DAM): An imperative followed by a preposition (עָלָיו A-LAV [UPON HIM]) and infinitive לֵאמֹר LEI-MOHR [TO SAY]) obligates the one addressed to pass the communicate to others (cf. EXODUS 12:1-3; JEREMIAH 39:11; CHRONICLES II 19:9).

מִכֹּל... אֲכַל תֹּאכַל MI-KOL... A-KHOL TOH-KHEIL (FROM ALL... YOU SHALL EAT): Permission needs one verb (cf. LEVITICUS 11:2-22, 19:25; DEUTERONOMY 12:20-27, 14:4-20); a doubled verb obligates (cf. LEVITICUS 10:18; DEUTERONOMY 7:26, 14:22). The A-DAM and his guests were to partake - and learn - from all the trees, along with the A-DAM's tutelage.

### 17. BUT OF THE TREE (THAT IMPARTS) KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND ITS BAD (DO) NOT EAT FROM IT FOR WHEN YOU EAT FROM IT YOU WILL BE (LIABLE TO) EXECUTION.

כִּי בְיוֹם... מוֹת תָּמוּת KEE B'YOHM... MOHTH TA-MOOTH (FOR WHEN... YOU WILL BE [LIABLE TO] EXECUTION): The text does not articulate any harm or impropriety in the act. Reasons supplied by savants - to test man's discipline, to restrain him or instantiate divine authority - portray man too frail to withstand temptation or overcome innate weakness, presumptions found nowhere in Scripture. They also require the act to yield no benefit or harm, else the edict had a rationale; any shift from neutrality would negate their hypotheses, yet it is belied by the tree as a "knowledge" source and what ensued when the couple sampled it (3:6-7). MOHTH TA-MOOTH is not "You will surely die" [divine sanction (cf. EXODUS 3:20; LEVITICUS 20:5; DEUTERONOMY 18:19; AMOS 9:4)]; it is judicial execution (cf.

EXODUS 21:15; EZEKIEL 3:18 and note SAMUEL I 22:16; KINGS I 2:37; JEREMIAH 26:8) by society. Mitigation or lack of evidence might prevent its imposition but the prescribed penalty proclaims a misdeed's gravity. *When Abimelech was enjoined to return Sarah to Abraham (GENESIS 20:7), he was warned that, despite his privileged position, he would be subject to the death penalty. When Elijah alerted Ahaziah of his impending demise (KINGS II 1:4), the king was already on his death bed with fatal injuries; he was told that, if he did not repent, nothing would avert his passing. If punishment was to follow right after the act, the text would read BA-YOHH, with a "Patach" vowel and subsumed indicative "Heh" modifying the "Beth" preposition. Its "Shva" makes the phrase "when you eat... you shall be subject to execution" [see 2:4 – B'YOHH AH-SOHTH]].*

The Tree of Knowledge expedited the A-DAM's assimilation of skills and insights that served him well when his presence in scattered communities was sporadic and temporary. When disciples came to him, he mentored them using his acquired abilities. The tree had to be off-limits now lest students went "over his head" to access it and challenge him, undermining the community's equilibrium, a danger that had to be met with harsh deterrence but that retribution was to be exacted by the community at its discretion.

### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM induced the A-DAM to cease traveling and stay in Eden to host guests in the garden, supervise their education [his service] and guide their dissemination of His program [his preservation]. He then commanded him to exhort these disciples to sample all the trees to imbibe their lessons but henceforth no one, including the A-DAM, was to partake from the Tree of Knowledge; trespassers would be liable to execution by the community.

### EXPOSITION [2:18-20]

18. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM SAID: IT IS NOT GOOD THE A-DAM BEING BY HIMSELF  
I WILL MAKE FOR HIM ASSISTANCE ACCORDING (TO WHAT) CONFRONTS HIM.

If prefatory to the debut of a consort, this should follow verse 20. Those claiming verses 19 and 20 recount prior events, the default exegesis if no others preserve continuity, obscure this verse completely; it is not an encomium to marriage or companionship - all societies form conjugal models and share abhorrence of solitude. Even more sophomoric are notions of this as man's quest for a sexual partner; Chapter 1 already presented the sexes (1:27-28), while those seeing an alternate creation story here cannot seriously believe early readers would consider man's seeking a mate among other creatures as anything but surreal. Furthermore, all these abase women as created solely to help man, not a biblical sentiment and hardly consistent with the "marital bliss" ideal.

וַיֹּאמֶר VA-YOH-MER ([HE] SAID): וַיֵּרָא VA-YAHR ([HE] SAW) introduces His evaluations (cf. EXODUS 3:7; ISAIAH 59:15; JONAH 3:10). VA-YOH-MER underscores facts known to the protagonists (cf. GENESIS 3:22, 16:20; EXODUS 13:17) which induced His reaction.

לֹא טוֹב LOH TOHBH (NOT GOOD): The translations are correct but inaccurate; "not good" is not רַע ["bad"], just not up to task. *When Jethro told Moses what he was doing was "not good", he meant his success was marginal (EXODUS 18:17), like what Nehemiah told the Israelites (NEHEMIAH 5:9) and Elijah's complaint (KINGS I 19:4) that he did not measure up to his forebears. A subject LOH TOHBH functions at less than desired efficacy (cf. SAMUEL I 2:23-24; EZEKIEL 18:18).*

הֵיחֵיָהּ HEH-YOHTH ([HIS] BEING): "To be/should be/is" require לְהֵיחֵיָהּ LEE-H'YOHTH (cf. GENESIS 10:8; SAMUEL II 7:8; ISAIAH 56:6). This participle is "[his] being" (cf. SAMUEL I 22:4; EZEKIEL 22:19; ESTHER 2:12).

הָאָדָם HA-A-DAM (THE A-DAM): The translations require a generic A-DAM; the הּ ["Heh"] prefix indicates an individual. A-DAM (cf. AMOS 4:13; MICAH 6:8; MALACHI 3:8) and HA-A-DAM (cf. ISAIAH 2:22; PROVERBS 20:24; ECCLESIASTES 1:3) might seem interchangeable but Scriptural grammar is rigorous - HA-A-DAM here was a specific man.

לְבַדּוֹ L'BHA-DOH (BY HIMSELF): This is not "alone". That is יָחִיד YA-CHEED (ALONE/SOLE/SOLITARY - cf. JEREMIAH 6:26:2; AMOS 8:10; ZECHARIAH 12:10). One who is L'BHAD is singled out or separated from others (cf. EXODUS 24:2; NUMBERS 11:14; JUDGES 3:20). The A-DAM could no longer discharge his duties and obligations by himself.

אֶעֱשֶׂה לוֹ EH-EH-SEH LOH (I WILL MAKE FOR HIM): עָשָׂה OH-SEH (MAKE) is the completion or finishing of an existing entity for a purpose (see 1:7); He intended to adapt one or more beings LOH (FOR HIM) - for the A-DAM's use (cf. GENESIS 37:3; JUDGES 3:16; note DEUTERONOMY 24:1).

עֲזָרָה EI-ZEHR (ASSISTANCE): A helper is עֲזָרָה OH-ZEHR (cf. ISAIAH 31:3; JOB 29:12; LAMENTATIONS 1:7). EI-ZEHR is "aid/succor" - help given, not the one giving it. The feminine עֲזָרָה EZ-RAH is defined aid or action (cf. ISAIAH 31:1; JEREMIOAH 37:7; CHRONICLES II 28:21); EI-ZEHR is abstract or unspecified (cf. DEUTERONOMY 33:7; PSALMS 89:19 [20 in the Hebrew]; DANIEL 11:34).

כְּנֶגְדּוֹ K'NEG-DOH (ACCORDING [TO WHAT] CONFRONTS HIM): Translators of EI-ZEHR as a person had to render K'NEG-DOH as "fitting/suitable". The former is מֵאֵימָה MAHTH-EEM (cf. SONG OF SONGS 4:2), the latter רְאוּיָהּ RA-U'EE (cf. ESTHER 2:9). נֶגְדָה NEH-GED is neither; normally translated "against", it is something confronted or faced (cf. EXODUS 19:2; NUMBERS 2:2; PSALMS 16:8). Its comparative "Koph" prefix and third person singular possessive suffix (v. 18, 20) is not found elsewhere. The EI-ZEHR was to be determined by what the A-DAM was "facing".

19. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM ASSEMBLED FROM THE LAND ALL FIELD INHABITANTS AND ALL THAT FLY ALOFT  
(HE) BROUGHT (THEM) TO THE A-DAM TO SEE WHAT WILL BEFALL HIM  
AND EACH TO WHICH THE A-DAM CALLED TO BE A VIBRANT BEING THAT (BECAME) ITS DESIGNATION.

וַיִּצְרָף VA-YEE-TZER ([HE] ASSEMBLED): Those claiming these are details omitted in Chapter 1 justified apparently repetitive passages by inventing a dictum that the text often inserts short recapitulations, while those positing a second creation story are stuck with a menagerie whose sole purpose was to muster pets to alleviate Adam's loneliness. Actually, *candidates* were *assembled* for him. The root "Yud-Tzadiq-Reish" (see v. 7) implies pressing together (cf. KINGS I 7:15), so translators erroneously rendered this as "formed". When Aaron collected jewelry in a mold (EXODUS 32:4), he did not form anything (אֵלֶּה OH-THO, a singular pronoun, is not the calf [it had not yet emerged] but the mass of material). Amos [7:1] did not prophesy of His producing locust but aggregating them. Zechariah (12:1) did not pronounce His actualizing man's breath but installing "in him" passion and ambition. PSALMS 33:15 does not extol His fashioning hearts of men but uniting them. In the military domain, it means "besieged" (cf. KINGS I 8:37; DANIEL 1:1).

מִן־הָאֲדָמָה MIN HA-A-DA-MAH (FROM THE LAND): In verse 7, this follows the direct object, indicating what was "fused". Here [as in v. 9], it precedes it, indicating where it took place (cf. GENESIS 4:11; KINGS II 21:8). עֶפְרָל A-PHAR (DUST/DIRT - 2:7) is absent. Scholars may contend this is just an abridgement except that A-PHAR would be the primary ingredient, man's (and the animals') "substance". Abraham declared himself עֶפְרָל וְאֶפְרָיִם A-PHAR VA-EI-PHER (DUST AND ASHES - GENESIS 18:27, a simile permeating Scripture - cf. GENESIS 3:19; JOB 10:9; ECCLESIASTES 3:20) - not A-DA-MAH. Chapter 1 lists elements used because it deals with "creation" and 2:7 focuses on a stage in man's development. Verse 19 concerns creatures put at A-DAM's disposal, their material composition irrelevant and this phrase superfluous, a point the pundits missed.

כֹּל־חַיֵּי הַשָּׂדֶה KOL CHA-YAHTH HA-SA-DEH (ALL FIELD INHABITANTS): "Field" rules out "wild animals/beasts" (see 2:5). KOL (ALL) is contextual (cf. 2:1 - VA-Y'KHOO-LOO), determined by what follows. The plural of "animals" is חַיֵּי CHA-YOHTH (EZEKIEL 1:5); CHA-YAHTH is the construct of a class (EXODUS 23:11; ISAIAH 43:20). The correct translation is "field inhabitants". There is no ETH before this phrase, despite this class noun modified by KOL (ALL), but ETH precedes the next group, the fliers. This unusual syntax misled translators - birds are misplaced in a vignette dealing with the A-DAM's quest for an assistant, companion or mate. The field inhabitants, with a robust hominid contingent, were brought for the A-DAM's scrutiny but ETH attached only to "fliers" tells us they were brought by these aspirants, ancillary to their contemplated assistance, whether as food sources, communication devices [birds served as long-distance carriers over 5000 years ago] or other uses. This nuance is reflected in the punctuation. The opening order should be "Qadma-Moonach-Zarka-Segol-T'leeshaQetana-Qadmo-Azlo-Moonach-Moonach-R'bhee'ee"; the actual sequence, with back-to-back "Pashtahs" on HA-SA-DEH and V'ETH, makes the "fliers" clause subordinate to "field inhabitants".

Three phases ensued before the A-DAM's efforts were deemed failures and Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM shifted direction.

לִרְאוֹת מַה־יִקְרָא־לוֹ LIR-OHTH MAH YI-Q'RA LOH (TO SEE WHAT WILL BEFALL HIM): Those postulating a “naming” fail to explain how this helped; the text should read לִרְאוֹת הֵישׁ בָּהֶם עוֹזֵר אִם אֵין BA-HEM OH-ZEHR IM A- YIN (TO SEE IF THERE WAS A HELPER AMONG THEM OR NOT - cf. NUMBERS 13:20), then go directly to וּלְאֲדָם U-L'A-DAM (AND FOR A-DAM) in the next verse. *If קָוָה QOH-REI (CALL) is followed by an indirect object but without purpose for the naming, none occurred. That it bespeaks a “calling” (1:5, 10) is also tenuous, for he did not know these creatures. They came from regions he never traversed, which is why they were brought to him. The ones he knew from his travels (v. 10-14) he obviously did not deem qualified. Some caught that "what he would name them" is incorrect; the pronoun should be the plural אֹהֶם OH-THAM but even they erred in making the preposition's object an animal, rendering LOH as "it". In biblical syntax, a pronoun references its last preceding noun - LOH is “to him [the A-DAM]”!*

YI-Q'RA is also “to encounter/happen” (cf. GENESIS 24:12, 27:20; ESTHER 4:7). *The “Qoph-Reish-Aleph” cognate is used if the meeting is perceived subjectively (cf. GENESIS 49:1; DEUTERONOMY 22:6). Abraham is assured his progeny will יִקְרָא YEE-QA-REI [ENDURE] בְּיַצְחָק BH'YITZ-CHAQ (BY ISAAC - GENESIS 21:12), not that they will be “called” through him. Isaiah foresees (56:7) the shrine יִקְרָא בֵּית־תְּפִלָּה BETH T'PHI-LAH YEE-QA-REI, “becoming a house of prayer” (“Merkha-Tipcha” separating this from לְכָל־הָעַמִּים L'KHOL HA-A-MIM [TO ALL THE NATIONS] makes this the only tenable translation), not that it will be so “called” (that requires a “Beth” prefix to KOL [ALL]). The outcomes of the A-DAM's encounters He now “saw” [assessed].*

וְכָל־אֶשֶׁר יִקְרָא־לוֹ הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ תְּהִה V'KHOL A-SHER YI-Q'RA LOH HA-A-DAM NEH-PHEHSH CHA-YAH (AND EACH ONE THE A-DAM CALLED [TO BE] A VIBRANT BEING): The conventional tableau, A-DAM named animals or revealed their nature, is not supported by the text. *The syntax presents an enigma; even Rashi (R. S. Yitzchaki - 11th century France), dean of expositors, surrendered, advising readers to mentally rearrange the word sequence. We respectfully differ - biblical word order is critical. KOL A-SHER (ALL WHICH) is selective, not agglomerative [this is not always apparent (cf. GENESIS 13:1; EXODUS 20:14; PSALMS 1:3) but obvious in LEVITICUS 22:20 and DEUTERONOMY 17:1]; his first task was elimination. The future continuous YI-Q'RA [“he would call” – not QA-RA ([HE] CALLED)] indicates this was not one event but spanned a period in which he “called” individuals to specific roles. It differs from the verb in 1:5; the A-DAM subject follows both verb and indirect object pronoun, focusing on the point – he was looking for “field inhabitants” who exhibited NEH-PHEHSH CHA-YAH (not a category but a type with vitality and vigor - see 1:20, 21, 24, 30). What had set him apart (2:7 - VA-Y'HEE... paragraph 5) he now looked for in others whom he “called” to join him.*

הוּא שְׂמוֹ HOO SH'MOH (THAT [BECAME] ITS DESIGNATION): This confirms that some were promoted to be NEH-PHEHSH CHA-YAH. Conventional versions have “that is his name”, either of a singular animal or an exemplar of a type; that needs the pronoun זֶה ZEH (IT/THIS/THAT - cf. EXODUS 3:15; DEUTERONOMY 28:58; JEREMIAH 23:6). HOO (HE) adds a dimension of personality, each a potential (junior) partner.

20. THE A-DAM ASSIGNED NAMES TO ALL THE GRAZERS, TO FLIERS OF THE HEAVENS AND TO ALL FIELD DWELLERS BUT ONE (WHO COULD BECOME AN) A-DAM (WAS) NOT FOUND (TO RENDER) ASSISTANCE (COMMENSURATE) WITH (WHAT) CONFRONTED HIM

... וַיִּקְרָא הָאָדָם VA-YI-Q'RA HA-A-DAM... (AND THE A-DAM ASSIGNED...): The third YI-Q'RA in the passage is a naming (*without the redundancy of standard translations nor is it the name roster discerned through his “wisdom” opined by esoterics*). The order reverses that of verse 19 - grazers, fliers and then field inhabitants {*The A-DAM added בְּהֵי־מַחַד B'HEI-MAH (GRAZERS) himself*}; the inclusive KOL (ALL) modifies the first and third of these, forming two categories, the merged set of fliers and grazers, then the field denizens, as underscored by the punctuation. The A -DAM tested combinations from these categories to see which of his “vibrant beings”, along with permutation of those in the first set, would prove useful “blends” that he labeled to sort respective capabilities (cf. GENESIS 5:2; RUTH 4:14).

וּלְאֲדָם U-L'A-DAM (BUT ONE [WHO COULD BECOME AN] A-DAM): This word is superfluous; the text needs only a "Vav" ("and") prefix on the next word, וְלֹא V'LOH (“and not”), or for more emphasis, אַחַבֵּן AH-BHAL (HOWEVER -

cf. GENESIS 17:19, 42:21; KINGS II 4:14). Even for verbose biblical style, it is wrong - it should be V'LA-A-DAM (a Qamatz vowel on the "Lamed" - cf. EXODUS 25:7; LEVITICUS 7:37). Its "Sh'vah" makes it "and to *an* A- DAM", the dative "Lamed" indicating a "direction" to a desired outcome (see 1:11 - ETZ P'REE, 1:12 - EI-SEBH). The objective was to find an A-DAM prospect, not as a companion, but a future leader and educator to provide EI-ZEHR (ASSISTANCE) - a quest which ended in failure.

#### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

When the A-DAM could no longer discharge all his responsibilities, Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM assembled candidates to assist him. As the A-DAM had found none qualified in his vicinity or the lands he traversed, Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM brought recruits from field denizens in distant domains and awaited results of the A-DAM's interactions with them, their domesticated animals and fliers, as the A-DAM tested their ability to share his duties of education and leadership, a quest which proved futile.