

CHAPTER III

PART 1 - EXPULSION

This chapter (3:22 to 6:4 in standard translations) has 12 PAR-SHAs. The first [3:22-24, erroneously assigned by translators to end their Chapter 3] is not the coda of the Eden story; it sets the stage for the Cain/Abel confrontation.

EXPOSITION [3:22-24]

22. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM SAID: SINCE THE A-DAM HAS BECOME LIKE (THE) ONE OF THEM
(WHO QUESTS) TO KNOW GOOD AND (ITS) BAD
NOW ELSE HE WILL EXTEND HIS EFFORTS AND TAKE ALSO OF THE TREE SUSTAINING LIFE
AND EAT AND LIVE INDEFINITELY.

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים VA-YOH-MER Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM (Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM SAID): This phrase appears four times in Scripture. Two have addressees (3:13-14); in 2:18 and here, it reveals His rationale for intervening.

וְהִנֵּה HEIN (SINCE): HEIN is not "behold" (*translators who read HEIN as a shortened HI-NEI made the same error in NUMBERS 31:16*) but "since", justifying what follows to the reader (cf. GENESIS 27:11; EXODUS 6:12, 30).

הָאִדָּם הָיָה HA-A-DAM HA-YAH (THE A-DAM HAS BECOME): The switched word positions, הָיָה הָאִדָּם HA-YAH HA-A-DAM, would accentuate a change *in him* (cf. EXODUS 4:16; LEVITICUS 13:49; DEUTERONOMY 23:15). HA-A-DAM HA-YAH, accentuated by consecutive Pashta cantillation marks on these words, underscores a shift relative to others (cf. GENESIS 10:9; DEUTERONOMY 24:22; JUDGES 11:1; KINGS I 5:1).

כְּאַחַד מִמֶּנּוּ K'A-CHAHD MI-MEH-NOO (LIKE [THE] ONE OF THEM): The polytheistic tinge perturbed many. Textual comparisons to the deity use the singular כְּמִנִּי KA-MOH-NEE (LIKE ME - cf. EXODUS 9:14; ISAIAH 40:25; JEREMIAH 49:19) or the NA-CHASH's כְּאֱלֹהִים KEI-LO-HIM (LIKE E-LO-HIM - cf. 3:5; ZECHARIAH 12:8, PSALMS 77:13 [14 in the Hebrew]). The root "Shin-Vav-Heh" ("even/par" - cf. HOSEA 10:1; PROVERBS 26:4; LAMENTATIONS 2:13) would also do. Most Hebrew scholars posited a celestial cadre but that is כְּמִנּוּ KA-MOH-NOO (LIKE US - cf. GENESIS 34:15; DEUTERONOMY 5:23; ISAIAH 14:10) and no such host is intimated here [that the Israelites would intuit this is unfounded conjecture]. *Those claiming HA-YAH (WAS) indicates an altered A-DAM who had been "like others" offer a bewildering interpretation with no clue what this former type was; for such deficiencies, the text uses אֵינֶנִּי EI-NEH-NOO (HE IS NOT [ANY LONGER] - cf. GENESIS 5:24, 31:2; LEVITICUS 13:34; JEREMIAH 31:15). The claim that several divine avatars are implied is dubious; the "Trinity" is not multiple beings but three facets, which begs the question: which of them had the A-DAM become?*

The meaning of MI-MEH-NOO is contextual. If His "concern" was about one man, "like one of us" does not fit. If it is "from/of them" (cf. EXODUS 19:21; NUMBERS 14:12; DEUTERONOMY 20:19), the "plural problem" dissolves but it should be כְּאַחַד K'EH-CHAHD ("as one" - cf. ISAIAH 65:25; ECCLESIASTES 11:6; EZRA 2:64). The construct AH-CHAHD points to one distinguished by position, qualification - or singled out (cf. GENESIS 49:16; JUDGES 16:7; OBADIAH 1:11 and NUMBERS 16:15 for contrasting usage of both). The A-DAM was compared to another in his community.

לָדַעַת LA-DA-AHSS: This infinitive is shaped by a preceding verb, adverb or noun [*in PROVERBS 1:2, it continues the introduction*]; here it follows the past perfect of "to be", a combination whose English is an awkward "has become like [the] one of them [who quests] to know". The NA-CHASH chafed at the A-DAM's slow learning pace and accessed the formerly forbidden tree to achieve his own proficiency, forcing the A-DAM to abandon an orderly regimen and "become like the one of them".

טוֹב וְרָע TOHBH VA-RA (GOOD AND [ITS] BAD): See Exposition 2:9.

פֶּן V'A-TAH PEN (NOW ELSE): PEN after A-TA (NOW) does not have its probabilistic sense ["lest"]; it means "otherwise", the speaker intent on preventing something undesirable (cf. SAMUEL II 12:28, 17:16; ISAIAH 28:22). A contingency is still a risk but the "Psiq" [vertical line] separating these words tells us this is not chance emergence.

יָדוּ יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ YISH-LAHCH YA-DOH (HE WILL EXTEND HIS EFFORTS): ETH modifying YA-DOH ["his hand"] points to physical extension (cf. GENESIS 19:10; JUDGES 3:21; ESTHER 9:10). Its omission here implies a further objective (cf. EXODUS 22:7; SONG OF SONGS 5:4; ESTHER 3:6). This may seem self-evident - His concern was the A-DAM's longevity, not his nourishment. But the same was true of the first tree (3:6), yet this phrase is not used there. Its inclusion here directs the reader's attention to the next phrase, which clarifies the A-DAM's possible motivation.

... וְלָקַח גַּם V'LA-QAHCH GAM... (AND TAKE ALSO...): GAM (ALSO) makes this act supplemental to the first [not a relapse], only plausible if it, too, was forbidden - *but it was not*. The alternative - it was forestalled due to the first trespass - inspired much tortuous speculation defending the absurdity that the key to life was accessible to an ignorant man but denied to one who had "knowledge of good and bad". *If this was moral awareness, it makes no sense; if "loss of innocence", that ludicrous medievalism that "tasting sin" internalized "evil impulses", early readers knew desires and drives are crucial survival mechanisms (cf. YOMA 69b; SANHEDRIN 91b; B'REISHITH RABBAH 9:7; TANCHUMA B'reishith 7). The mandate to be fruitful and multiply could not otherwise be fulfilled [and hardly sinful if blessed by E-LO-HIM {1:28}].* The superfluous GAM between the verb and prepositional phrase tells us the concern was the A-DAM's reaching for this tree while also taking from the Tree of Knowledge. *To make sure readers got this, the Masoretes discarded the standard "Mapakh-Pashta" on V'LA-QAHCH GAM [or the more precise "Pashta-Munach-Pashta-Qatan" for the entire phrase] in favor of consecutive major tropes. Even a "Pashta-Pashta" pair was insufficient; the stronger "Y'thibh" on GAM [cf. ESTHER 1:9] emphasizes that the acts would be simultaneous.*

וְתִי לְעֹלָם VA-CHAI L'OH-LAHM (AND LIVE INDEFINITELY): We are not told why this is undesirable, a lacuna filled by expositors who failed to grasp the real issue: if eternal life was within man's reach, it was not exclusively under divine control, a heresy no Israelite would entertain. Also unexplained is why barring the A-DAM from the garden was necessary - the consequences of his first offense would make a prohibition against eating of the second tree adequate. If the first tree was still restricted, he apparently respected that - and would observe a ban on the second; if he did not, that would be the cause for expulsion. Finally, why eat from this tree now if he had not done so before (*he was free to do so [2:16], a point made by some Hebrew commentators*)? His eating from the first was scant rationale for prohibiting the second if there was nothing intrinsically wrong with it. The few who tackled these questions had very limited success. {L'OH-LAHM here is not "eternal/forever" but an indefinite or inordinately long time (cf. EXODUS 19:9, 21:6; KINGS I 2:33; NEHEMIAH 2:3; Exposition 2:9 - ETZ HA-CHA-YIM}.

On "becoming like the one of them", abandoning his approach "to know good and bad" and opting for the tree, the A-DAM opened the floodgates, for others might become curious about the second tree. They knew its purpose (Exposition 2:9); would it prolong human life? {*Everlasting life is not a Scriptural motif [the ISAIAH 25:8 reference to "death swallowed up" is a mistranslation]; it was an attribute of pagan gods that erroneously came to be seen as something man forfeited through sin.*} But what was good for trees may not be for humans, perhaps even harmful (*a qualm the woman had about the Tree of Knowledge - see 3:6*) or no advantage gained but the possibility of positive results was too attractive to a handful willing to take the risk - which might compel the A-DAM to do the same or forfeit his position. If nothing was gained from this tree or if it induced harm, this would not be mentioned. But it was beneficial - and *suppressed!* - the reason not understood by interpreters but obvious to early readers.

Biblical societies had physicians (cf. GENESIS 50:2; EXODUS 21:19; JEREMIAH 8:22), their efficacy anyone's guess but a garden "graduate" with superior knowledge would displace them. That he could also *prolong* life would enable him to amass not just wealth but political power. Early readers were familiar with the nearly universal mode of valuable information kept a closely guarded secret within a small circle of initiates, a practice continued even in

advanced societies well into the 19th century until a professional scientific community broke these shackles. The dangers inherent in this kind of social imbalance were what Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM averted.

23. Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM DISPATCHED HIM FROM THE GARDEN OF EDEN
TO DEVELOP THE LAND FROM WHICH HE WAS TAKEN.

וַיִּשְׁלַחְהוּ VA-YI-SHA-L'CHEI-HOO (AND [HE] DISPATCHED HIM): Eviction is הִשְׁלִיךְ HISH-LIKH (CAST OUT - cf. LEVITICUS 1:16; JOSHUA 10:11; ECCLESIASTES 3:5), הִדְרִיחַ HEHG-LAH (DROVE OUT/DEPORTED - cf. KINGS II 24:14; JEREMIAH 29:1; ESTHER 2:6), הוֹצִיא HOH-TZEE (REMOVED - cf. GENESIS 19:12; EXODUS 3:10; SAMUEL II 12:31) or נִשְׁלַח NA-SHAHL (DISLODGED - cf. DEUTERONOMY 7:1, 22; KINGS II 16:6). The root "Shin-Lamed-Cheth" connotes displacement, its contours dictated by origin, destination [or both] and sometimes a mission (cf. GENESIS 37:14; JOSHUA 8:9; JUDGES 18:2). Expositors also missed that no reason is given for this exit; the text relates activities the A-DAM will now pursue and his origin. Only *Toldoth Yitzchak* [R. Z. Kaidashowitz, 1937 - Poland] correctly surmised that the A-DAM was not dismissed but assigned a role outside Eden (cf. GENESIS 37:14; NUMBERS 13:3, 31:6; in *SAMUEL I 19:15*, the parties expect to return) but all he could do with this was ascribe a devious motive to Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM - He tricked A-DAM into leaving, then blocked his re-entry.

לְעֵבֶל אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה LA-A-BHOHD ETH HA-ADA-MAH (TO DEVELOP THE LAND): Those seeing repetition of the "punishment" (3:6) were misled by this phrase in 2:5 and a similar one in 2:15 (*the latter part of the A-DAM's mandate upon his second placement in the garden, not at all comparable to this verse*). Nor can they explain how this augmented the A-DAM's burden (3:17-19); imposing it on his "transfer" adds nothing to the narrative and had no bearing on his access to the tree. *The critical schools cannot advance a second author with an alternative version; they can impute two creation stories but not two Eden stories.* When these words refer to farming or associated activities, ETH is omitted (cf. EXODUS 1:14; ISAIAH 30:24; PROVERBS 12:11). Its inclusion here points to the development of the land and its inhabitants (cf. GENESIS 4:12; SAMUEL II 9:10) - and does not accord with banishment.

מֵאֲשֶׁר לָקַח מִן־הָאֲדָמָה A-SHER LOO-QACH MI-SHAHM (FROM WHICH HE WAS TAKEN): This is not the "stuff he was made of"; SHAHM (THERE) is a location (see 2:8 - VA-YA-SEHM SHAHM). Early readers intuited [based on the restrictive adjectival pronoun A-SHER (WHICH) - cf. EXODUS 3:5; NUMBERS 1:17; JOSHUA 1:6] that he was the sole member of his community who had been in Eden, now returning with knowledge and skills.

24. HE OSTRACIZED THE A-DAM AND CAUSED TO DWELL FROM THE EAST OF THE GARDEN OF EDEN
THE (MOST) ACCOMPLISHED AND THE RAVAGE(S) OF THE TURMOIL(S) THAT CAUSE UPHEAVALS
(IN ORDER) TO PRESERVE THE PATH OF THE TREE OF LIFE.

וַיִּגְרֶשׁ VA-YI-GA-REHSH (HE OSTRACIZED): Banishment is הִגְלָה HEG-LAH (EXILED - cf. KINGS II 16:9; JEREMIAH 39:9; ESTHER 2:6), דָּחַק DA-CHAH (DROVE OUT - cf. ISAIAH 11:12; JEREMIAH 49:36; PSALMS 35:5) or הִדְרִיחַ HA-DOHPH (THRUST - cf. NUMBERS 35:20; JOSHUA 23:5; JEREMIAH 46:15). The root "Gimel-Reish-Shin" denotes a ruptured relationship (cf. EXODUS 10:11; JOSHUA 24:18; JUDGES 9:41; KINGS I 2:27). This did not augment his exit (*else it would be appended to the previous verse*); he was ostracized from his erstwhile students. *Some commentators were perturbed by a second expulsion and contrived suggestions, still infecting some societies, that presume women naturally subservient to men, so protocols shaping men's lives automatically apply to their women, who lack independence or freedom; these savants thus did not find it odd that the woman is not mentioned in this Parsha, even though she was as much affected as her husband. These are not biblical outlooks, as we have noted (cf. behavior of the woman in this entire narrative and GENESIS 24:57, Ch. 31; JUDGES Ch. 4, 13, 16; RUTH Ch. 1-4). In verse 23, only the A-DAM is made to leave, since only he was expected to work now. A second ouster that applied to both should follow but that requires a plural verb, standard in biblical texts (cf. EXODUS 2:17, 10:11) even if there is one primary actor (cf. EXODUS 6:13), or a singular verb for the lead subject, followed by phrases identifying others to whom it applies (cf. KINGS II 23:4). The second verb here is also singular - there is a distinct possibility only the A-DAM was ejected.*

וַיִּשְׁכֵּן VA-YASH-KEIN (AND CAUSED TO DWELL): "He placed/stationed/set" are וַיָּשֶׁם VA-YA-SEHM (cf. GENESIS 33:2; JOSHUA 8:12; JUDGES 16:3), וַיִּתֵּן VA-YEE-TEIN (cf. GENESIS 41:43; NUMBERS 3:9; CHRONICLES I 6:33) and וַהֲקִים V'HEI-QIM (cf. JOSHUA 5:7; JUDGES 2:18; KINGS I 14:14), respectively. Only Ellicott [19th century England] correctly translated it "caused to dwell" but did not realize the difficulty with this, both for his interpretation and standard ones. The root "Shin-Koph-Nun" is used for human [and occasionally animal] habitation (cf. GENESIS 9:27; JUDGES 5:17; JEREMIAH 23:6) or His Immanence (cf. EXODUS 24:16; NUMBERS 9:17), not celestial beings or any presence whose purpose is protection or obstruction.

מִקְדָּם לְגַן־עֵדֶן MI-QEH-DEM L'GAN EIDEN (FROM THE EAST OF THE GARDEN OF EDEN): Sentries are stationed פָּתַח PEH-THAHCH ([AT THE] OPENING - cf. GENESIS 18:1; EXODUS 28:36; JOSHUA 8:17), מוּלֵּ MOOL (FACING - cf. EXODUS 18:19; NUMBERS 8:2; JOSHUA 8:33) or לְפָנָי LI-PH'NEI (IN FRONT - cf. JEREMIAH 7:24; EZEKIEL 2:10; HOSEA 3:1). MI-QEH-DEM is as in 2:8, an easterly diffusion away from the garden.

A מַלְאָךְ MA-LAKH is not always an angel; it can be a human (GENESIS 32:4; NUMBERS 20:14; JOSHUA 6:17) or a natural force (GENESIS 24:7; EXODUS 14:19; KINGS II 19:35). The Greek translation ["angelos" - "messenger"] derives from that action frequently accompanying angelic missions. A bearer of tidings is a מְבַשֵּׂר M'BHA-SEIR (PRECURSOR - ISAIAH 41:27) or מוֹדִיעַ MOH-DEE-YA (INFORMER - DANIEL 8:19). MA-LAHKH is the masculine of M'LA-KHAH (see 2:2-3), which refers to "craft/task/occupation/work" or a project. The MA-LAHKH is the agency which sees a M'LA-KHAH through. Each is therefore associated with an objective. Portrayals of angelic hosts ready to be dispatched or singing praises are post-biblical and their inclusion with other celestial actors stems from the spurious notion that prophetic images corresponded to real beings. Thus, the awesome Seraphim are nothing more than imposing variations of a שָׂרָף SA-RAHPH, a serpent or reptile capable of injecting venom that were called "burners" {the literal meaning} because these induced extremely high temperatures often leading to debilitating illness and even death (cf. NUMBERS 21:6; DEUTERONOMY 8:15; ISAIAH 14:29). These are no more celestial than other animals inhabiting oracular visions (JEREMIAH 4:7; EZEKIEL 1:5-28; DANIEL 7:1-8). The same is true of the cherubs, introduced here for their *one and only appearance* in the Old Testament.

הַכְּרֻבִים HA-K'ROO-BHIM (THE [MOST] ACCOMPLISHED): This should be וַיִּשְׁכֵּן כְּרֻבִים VA-YASH-KEIN K'ROO-BHIM (AND HE CAUSED TO DWELL CHERUBS - cf. JOSHUA 4:19; SAMUEL II 18:1; CHRONICLES II 33:14). The ETH and "Heh" prefix indicate they were known, though they are the *only real cherubs* in Scripture; the others are in prophetic visions (cf. EZEKIEL Ch. 10), metaphors (cf. SAMUEL I 4:4; KINGS II 19:15; ISAIAH 37:16) or artistic representations (cf. EXODUS 25:18; KINGS I 6:23; CHRONICLES I 28:18 - these always inside structures, never symbolic guardians). Scenes of chubby winged toddlers were inspired by the similarity of K'ROOBH to the Aramaic K'RABH-YA ["childlike"], a 4th century etymology inconsistent with terrifying sentinels intimidating trespassers. Neither of these was meant here; the root "Kaph-Reish-Beth" is a transposed cognate of "Reish-Kaph-Beth", both conveyances [*consonantal shifts occur at times - e.g. שִׁמְלָה SIM-LAH and שַׁלְמָה SAL-MAH {"garment" - cf. DEUTERONOMY 22:5/EXODUS 22:8}*], although K'ROO-BHIM are reserved for Him, hence their wings (SAMUEL II 22:11 - MA-LA-KHEEM ["angels"] are *never winged* (in Jacob's dream, they need a ladder to ascend or descend - GENESIS 28:12)). Cherubs were Y-H-W-H's "chariots", not His carriers but vehicles for disseminating His teachings [*the symbolism of the cherubs on the Ark of the Covenant, primed to spread the "Torah" it contained*]. This was the task of HA-K'ROO-BHIM, the "Heh" prefix indicating the most accomplished. They were to spread eastward in the direction opposite of that taken by their former mentor, now separated from them and back in his homeland [*although Eve may have commuted between settlements*]. The "cherubic" assemblage had to adapt to a new environment. The last chapter recorded new conditions and tools made available because of transpired events (3:14-21); this group was given a different template.

וְאֵת לַהֲטֹת הַחֶרֶב הַמְתַּהַפֵּקֶת V'ETH LA-HAHT HA-CHEH-REHBH HA-MITH-HA-PEH-KHETH (AND THE RAVAGE(S) OF THE TURMOIL(S) THAT CAUSE UPHEAVALS): Many Hebrew expositors realized that "A flaming/flashing sword turning/whirling", perhaps wielded by the cherubs, is an untenable reading and tried to sustain accepted

interpretations with text modifications. They had but to consult the punctuation; the Masoretes, obviating the ambiguity caused by both noun [CHEH-REHBH] and gerund [MITH-HA-PEH-KHEHETH] prefixed with an indicative "Heh", placed a "Mahpakh" on LA-HAHT and "Pashta" on HA-CHEH-REBH, detaching them from the gerund - and ruling out this scenario. MITH-HA-PEH-KHEHETH modifies the LA-HAT - there was no sword! ETH denotes another direct object of the verb וַיִּשְׁכֵּן VA-YASH-KEIN, one that can be made to dwell. The "Vav" joins it to the first noun, which it complemented, but it functioned independently (cf. EXODUS 39:33-43), not manipulated by the cherubs (*weapons in hand are explicitly so described - cf. NUMBERS 22:23; JOSHUA 5:13; CHRONICLES I 21:16*).

That the LA-HAT was also "caused to dwell" troubled some Jewish writers (*a "flash/blaze/flare" is too ephemeral to reside*) besides the fact that the only other LA-HAT (EXODUS 7:11) seems to have a completely different meaning. *If part of a protective screen, it would be a לֶהָקֵה LE-HA-BHAH (BLAZE - cf. NUMBERS 21:28; JUDGES 13:20; OBADIAH 1:18), שֵׁלֶקֶת SHAL-HEH-BHEHETH (TORCH - cf. EZEKIEL 21:3; JOB 15:30; SONG OF SONGS 8:6), בָּרָק BA-RAHQ (LIGHTNING - cf. EXODUS 19:16; JEREMIAH 10:13; EZEKIEL 1:13 - sometimes written בָּקָק BA-ZAHQ {EZEKIEL 1:14}) or a powerful אֵשׁ עֹמֵד A-MOOD EISH (PILLAR OF FIRE - cf. EXODUS 13:21; NUMBERS 14:14; NEHEMIAH 9:12). Equally puzzling is the text passing up stronger expressions (לִשְׂרֹף LI-S'ROPH [TO BURN - cf. EXODUS 32:20; JOSHUA 8:26; JEREMIAH 7:31], בֹּעַר BOH-EIR [AFLAME - cf. EXODUS 3:2; DEUTERONOMY 4:11; JEREMIAH 20:9], אֶשֶׁן A-SHAHN [SMOKE - cf. EXODUS 19:18; JOSHUA 8:20; JOEL 3:3], צָרוּב TZA-ROOBH [SCORCHED - cf. LEVITICUS 13:23; EZEKIEL 21:3; PROVERBS 16:27]) in favor of the more innocuous "gleam/flash/glow", the usual take of LA-HAT. Its verb differs from other "burnings/fiery consumptions" in that all ten occurrences are not processes but outcomes - useless charred remains (cf. DEUTERONOMY 32:22; ISAIAH 42:25; MALACHI 3:19 - *any flames present are only agents causing these devastations* [cf. JOEL 1:19, 3:3; JOB 41:13]). LA-HAT here was not an instrument but a resultant.*

CHEH-REHBH is not the object of the verb but of an implied preposition. *If it was swung about, it would not have a "Heh" prefix; as the noun is also prefixed, any "sword" would revolve or rotate on its own and readers would know it intrinsically spun about.* The root "Cheth-Reish-Beth" means "dry" (cf. EXODUS 14:21; LEVITICUS 7:10; JUDGES 6:37), extended to "waste and desolation" (cf. LEVITICUS 26:31; ISAIAH 44:26; EZEKIEL 26:19) and to a tool of devastation, a CHEH-REHBH (SWORD) parallel to the Aramaic "Cho-rahbh" ["attack/smite"] and the Arabic "Har'b" ["plunder/battle"]. Its biblical applications are not limited to the physical; chimeric projections can also devour (cf. LEVITICUS 26:25; JEREMIAH 2:30; NAHUM 2:14), especially when divinely imposed (cf. DEUTERONOMY 28:22; ISAIAH 34:6; JEREMIAH 12:12) - and the only way this passage can be read {*as it was by R. S. Hirsch - 19th century Frankfurt*}. The CHEH-REHBH did not twirl, spin, gyrate or move in a spiral path. Those would be מִתְגַּלְגֵּל MITH-GOH-LEIL (ROLL - cf. GENESIS 43:18; NUMBERS 22:31; SAMUEL II 20:12), סוֹכֵר SOH-CHEIR (TRAVEL ABOUT - cf. ISAIAH 23:2; JEREMIAH 14:18; EZEKIEL 27:36), מִסְתַּבֵּב MIS-TOH-BHEHBH (REVOLVE - cf. KINGS II 8:21; SONG OF SONGS 3:3; ECCLESIASTES 1:6) or הִתְפַּתֵּל HITH-PA-TEIL (TWIST - cf. GENESIS 30:8; DEUTERONOMY 32:5; PROVERBS 8:8). The root "Heh-Peh-Koph" is not "turn" but "overturn", physically (cf. GENESIS 19:21; EXODUS 10:19; JEREMIAH 23:36) or conceptually, changing minds (cf. EXODUS 7:15, 17; LEVITICUS 13:3; SAMUEL I 10:6). The verb here is reflexive, the object's angular momentum powering upheavals as it moves. *The barley cake whirling through the camp (in the soldier's dream - JUDGES 7:13) upends all in its path; likewise, Elihu (JOB 37:12) laments the stratagems of the unscrupulous that reverse people's attitudes.* This historical mechanism is then elucidated.

לִישְׁמֹר לִישְׁמֹר ETH DEH-REHKKH ETZ HA-CHA-YIM (TO PRESERVE THE PATH OF THE TREE OF LIFE): Segregation measures are מִגֵּן MA-GEIN (SHIELD - cf. GENESIS 15:1; JUDGES 5:8; HOSEA 4:18), דוֹחֵה DOH-CHEH (REPEL - cf. MICAH 4:6; PSALMS 35:5; JOB 6:13), הִדּוּף HA-DOHPH (REPULSE - cf. LEVITICUS 26:36; DEUTERONOMY 6:19; PROVERBS 21:6) or מִעוֹז MA-OHZ (BULWARK - cf. JUDGES 6:26; ISAIAH 17:9; NAHUM 3:11). LI-SH'MOHR is to keep intact (cf. EXODUS 22:6; NUMBERS 8:26; SAMUEL II 15:16), like Old English "to keep", preserving the item [not "guarding"]. It was not the tree that was preserved but the road leading to it, as noted in the Talmud (cf. SIFRI DEUTERONOMY 40:14; MIDRASH RABBAH LEVITICUS 9:3) and by Jewish interpreters who correctly deduced that a conceptual "way" was to be perpetuated (cf. EXODUS 16:28; JUDGES 2:22; MICAH 7:5).

This Tree of Life is not the one in the previous PAR-SHA; that one needed no preservation, being itself a source of vitality, nor was there a road leading to it. This one is that of PROVERBS 3:18 and its road was preserved by history's upheavals. Anticipating Schumpeter's "creative destruction" in the realm of economics and Toynbee's "challenges to civilizations" history model, Scripture confirms that setbacks are what inspire humans to overcome divisions, solve problems and foster progress and dedication to biblical ideals, a canon the cherubs took with them out of Eden.

This account departs radically from traditional ones but those only make sense if the garden remained a cherished destination; in fact, it is never mentioned again (*other than in prophetic allusions which do not reference a real location*) - Canaan became Scripture's "destination". More to the point: if He could plant a garden, He could surely uproot it [*only a pagan fable would presume a garden so unique there could be but one*] and avert the elaborate measures to isolate it. No biblical personage hints at a return to this idyllic region [*the supposition that it was obliterated by the Flood does not explain why it was never recreated*] nor was anything ever said about its being a goal to reward compliance with His Torah - that was always framed as a peaceful and prosperous existence in the Promised Land.

DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

When the A-DAM, like the NA-CHASH, used the Tree of Knowledge to gain insights, Y-H-W-H E-LO-HIM again intervened to impede his obtaining knowledge of key biological processes. Relieved of his duties, the A-DAM was dismissed from the garden, dispatched to his homeland, and isolated from his former pupils. The most accomplished of these were relocated east of the garden, their progress now shaped by ever-changing trials.