

CHAPTER III

PART 4 – DE(GENERATIONS)

EXPOSITION [5:1-2]

This documents humanity's progress from when E-LO-HIM chose Adam and imbued him with His mentality. This He did for males and females, blessing them and designating them Adamites during their formative period.

5:1. THIS (IS A) TREATISE OF OUTCOMES FOR HUMANITY

WHEN E-LO-HIM CHOSE ADAM, HE PERFECTED HIM WITH THE E-LO-HIM MENTAL FACULTY.

זֶה סֵפֶר ZEH SEI-PHEHR (THIS [IS A] TREATISE): Because verse 5:3 starts a genealogy, SEI-PHEHR ("book") was presumed to be a written record incorporated into the text. This is refuted by the punctuation, for that reading requires a ZaqephGadol on ZEH (followed by Tifcha-Meircha-Ethnachta, while the absence of a "Vav" ["and"] conjunction means this is not a continuation of the prior narrative). Nominal or formal listings are always introduced with אֵלֶּהּ EI-LEH ("these" - GENESIS 36:31; CHRONICLES I 1:43), as are accounts of events or outcomes (GENESIS 2:4). Genealogies may follow (cf. GENESIS 11:27; EXODUS 6:16; RUTH 4:18) or the text may first insert qualifications (cf. GENESIS 6:9; 10:1). There are no Scriptural instances where any of these are catalogued in a SEI-PHEHR. Written recitations would be in a מְגִלָּה M'GI-LAH ("scroll" - cf. JEREMIAH 36:2; EZEKIEL 2:9) or a מִכְתָּב MIKH-TABH ("letter" - cf. ISAIAH 38:9; EZRA 1:1). Nor would any SEI-PHEHR be self-referenced with a ZEH ("this") pronoun [used only when a written record is being identified as to its content - cf. DEUTERONOMY 28:58; JEREMIAH 25:13; DANIEL 9:2]].

The root "Samekh-Peh-Reish" has a spectrum of meanings, all related to the idea of a document which compiles or arranges information (cf. cognates סִפּוּר SEE-POOR ["story" - cf. GENESIS 24:66; JEREMIAH 23:32; EZEKIEL 12:16]; מִסְפָּר MIS-PAHR ["sum/count" - cf. GENESIS 34:30; EXODUS 16:16; NUMBERS 1:2]); in a broader sense, it can be used to archive (KINGS I 14:19; MALACHI 3:16; ESTHER 6:1), transfer land (JOSHUA 18:9; JEREMIAH 32:11), provide instruction (ISAIAH 29:11; JOB 19:23; DANIEL 1:17) or direction (SAMUEL II 11:14; ISAIAH 39:1; ESTHER 8:10) and can serve as a bill of divorce (DEUTERONOMY 24:1; ISAIAH 50:1). Here, the SEI-PHEHR is qualified with the ZEH ["this"] pronoun; it does not direct the reader to literary aspects of the text but to the recorded conditions enumerated in these two verses as instrumental in the development of this line of Adam's descendants.

בְּיוֹם בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם B'YOHM B'ROH E-LO-HIM A-DAM (WHEN E-LO-HIM CHOSE ADAM): "On the day E-LO-HIM created Adam" is flat wrong; that requires a Qadma trope to B'YOHM [not its R'bhee-ee] and the second "Adam" would be the pronoun אָהוּ OH-THOH (HIM) [a point raised by HaEmeq Dabhar [R. N. Berlin – 19th cent. Lithuania], who offered a weak explanation but the only one available under conventional interpretations]. Additionally, the Choh-lom vowel [B'ROH] should be the double Qamatz בָּרָא [BA-RA]. The pundits also missed the absence of the indicative "Heh" prefix and ETH direct object indicator on both Adams in this verse. Normally, these omissions would make Adam a class noun but the narrative rules that out. The Ethnachta trope on the first A-DAM sets that clause apart; "On the day He chose an Adam" is the only translation that fits the context and punctuation (cf. SAMUEL I 17:8; EZEKIEL 21:24; ECCLESIASTES 3:18 and Exposition to 1:26-27), the text referencing the one chosen from the existing population and informing our understanding of the next clause.

בְּדַמּוּת אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ BI-D'MOOTH E-LO-HIM A-SAH OH-THOH (HE PERFECTED HIM WITH AN E-LO-HIM MENTAL FACULTY): D'MOOTH, a perceived impression or modular representation, is usually not prefixed (cf. KINGS II 16:10; ISAIAH 13:4; EZEKIEL 1:5). Only here (v. 1, 3) is the "Beth" prefix used [rather than the expected "Kaf" - see Exposition 1:26]; its meaning is not that something was made in an image but using it. This is also the only

time this “Beth”-prefixed noun is associated with A-SAH (completion or perfection of an existing entity - see Exposition 1:7), further accentuated by the singular OH-THOH pronoun. The hominids, perfected with intellectual faculties He instilled, could intelligently respond to impressions stimulated by the environment.

2. MALE AND FEMALE HE CREATED THEM

AND BLESSED THEM BY DESIGNATING THEM TO BE CALLED ADAM DURING THEIR DEVELOPMENT PERIOD.

זָכַר וַיִּקְרָא בְרָאָם ZA-KHAHR U-N'QEIBHAH B'RA-AHM (MALE AND FEMALE HE CREATED THEM): The Ethnachta trope on B'RA-AHM sets this clause apart and negates the standard interpretations. The Israelites knew that two-gender sexual reproduction was universal; why should man be different? This is not an endorsement of marriage; that would be וְאִשְׁתּוֹ יִשׁ V'ISH-TOH ["husband and wife"] used even for non-human pairing (GENESIS 7:2); the male-female dichotomy relates to physical distinctions. The verb modifying both ZA-KHAHR and N'QEI-BHAH ("male and female") should be followed by the plural pronoun אֹתָם OH-THAM (THEM - cf. GENESIS 1:27; EXODUS 1:7; NUMBERS 1:3). Singular objects of a verb with the plural possessive suffix are class nouns. Humanity's emergence is now presented; *that the text centers the narrative around males is stylistic, not androcentric.*

Cultures the world over saw their gods as magnified humans (with the added attribute of immortality, necessary to carry them from one generation to the next). This made their behaving as humans plausible, including sexual intercourse with mortals. Scripture rejects all this. Y-H-W-H [or E-LO-HIM] is an independent personality [without any human characteristics, including gender] who occasionally interacts with humans; nor would the Israelites construe these as the product of anyone's "inspiration" or religious "genius", conceits by later thinkers unable to imagine these experiences. Scripture here insists that the "creation" of man through natural means extended to both genders. Textual usage of male pronouns reflects the prevailing literary style, as do its anthropomorphisms. Adaptation of pagan myths of a god consorting with a human, even in an "immaculate" manner, would be deemed by the Israelites as pagan, something even Jewish sectarians would never dare propound.

וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם VA-YI-BHA-REHKH OH-THAHM (AND HE BLESSED THEM): Divine blessings are virtual reservoirs from which their recipients can draw (see Exposition 1:22 - *different from blessings bestowed by man*). The Moonach-R'bhee'ee punctuation on these words [*instead of Zaqef-Qatan required under conventional translations*] attach this sentence to the following one and tells us how this blessing was to become manifest.

וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמֵם אָדָם VA-YI-Q'RA ETH SH'MAHM A-DAM (AND CALLED THEIR NAME ADAM): The blessing was effected by the designation of this line as Adamites (see Exposition 1:26 - A-DAM and 2:19 - HOO SH'MOH).

בְּיוֹם הַבְּרָאָם B'YOHM HI-BO-R'AHM (DURING THEIR CREATION): This must be understood like the only other time these words are juxtaposed (GENESIS 2:4). The power His blessing embedded allowed Adamites to evolve to full potential. *Biur Yashar* [Y. S. Reggio, 18th century Italy] cited the Masoretic punctuation to support his interpretation, which contrasts with conventional readings of the proverbial "Fall of Man", a perception totally inconsistent with Scriptural portrayals and sentiments. Man continued to attain skills and knowledge but these advances were not accompanied by parallel spiritual and moral growth, a dichotomy elucidated in the remainder of this chapter.

Speculations about the long lifetimes in the following genealogy ignore the basic question: how did the Israelites perceive them? We have no reason to believe they did not take these passages literally (lifespans were later shortened - see Exposition to 6:3). Unlike long-lived pagan gods [not all were immortal], these fellows procreated and died. Their offspring, the focus of this narrative, were not kings, chieftains nor, with one exception (5:22-24), particularly pious or spiritual.

DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION [5:1-2]

This documents humanity's progress from when E-LO-HIM chose Adam and imbued him with His mental faculty. This He did for males and females, blessing them and designating them Adamites during their entire formative period.

EXPOSITION [5:3-5]

3. ADAM LIVED ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY YEARS AND RAISED (CHILDREN) WITH HIS ASSESSMENT (OF EACH) BUT (ALWAYS) IMPARTING HIS INTELLIGENCE AND HE CALLED (THE MOST ACCOMPLISHED ONE) SETH.

שָׁנָה וּמֵאָתַתְּשֵׁים וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וַיְחִי אָדָם VA-Y'CHEE A-DAM SH'LOH-SHIM U-M'AHTH SHA-NAH (ADAM LIVED ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY YEARS): Ages of individuals are normally stated as שָׁנָה ... בֶּן BEN... SHANAH (literally "son of... years" - cf. GENESIS 17:17 with both masculine and feminine; this extends to ages of animals - EXODUS 12:5). The verbal formula in this chapter (*used ten times and repeated in Chapter 11 in the Noah to Abraham lineage*), VA-Y'CHEE... SHA-NIM ("and... lived... years"), while equivalent, has a different connotation, one determined by what follows.

וַיִּזְלַד בְּדִמּוּתוֹ כְּצִלְמוֹ VA-YOH-LEHD BI-D'MOO-THOH K'TZAL-MOH (AND RAISED [CHILDREN] WITH HIS ASSESSMENT [OF EACH] IMPARTING HIS INTELLIGENCE): To record Adam's age when Seth was born and his resemblance to Adam, the first eight words in this verse would be punctuated with the Zaqef-Qatan-Meirkha-Tipcha-Ethnachta-Mahpakh-Pashta-Qatan sequence. The actual order joins these words as two clauses, each with a verb in the incomplete past; the first alludes to an activity spanning a period, while the second reports the result, with some temporal overlap (cf. GENESIS 26:12; JUDGES 17:5; CHRONICLES I 21:26). This mandates that VA-YOH-LED must be read in its broader sense of child rearing (see Exposition 3:16 – B'EH-TZEBH TEI-L'DEE BA-NIM). Adam had retreated from the community leadership that passed to his wife but stayed involved in raising his children; in these 130 years, he guided them, each according to their personalities and capabilities (see Exposition 1:26 - KI- D'MOO-THEI-NOO and cf. PROVERBS 22:6) but always imparting the divinely projected intelligence that was unique to Adamites (see Exposition 1:26 - B'TZAL-MEI-NOO). This protocol he applied to all his children, which is why K'TZAL-MOH has the pausal Ethnachta (*and note the reversed prefix order from that in 1:26*).

וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ שֵׁת VA-YI-Q'RA ETH SH'MOH SHEITH (AND HE CALLED [THE MOST ACCOMPLISHED] SETH): This is the only time in Scripture a parent names a child after the other had already done so, all the more remarkable in that the same name was given [*the notion that these acts were simultaneous is not born out by the text, nor that this naming affirmed the first*]. Based on the syntax (see above), Adam dubbed him Seth after he attained the maturity and skill to succeed him in carrying out the Adamite legacy. Seth was not born when Adam was 130 years old; rather this was the period of his education and training by Adam, after which his father conferred on him the same name his mother gave him in anticipation of his becoming their joint successor as community leader.

4. THE DAYS ADAM CONTINUED MENTORING OFFSPRING AFTER SETH ACHIEVED MATURITY NUMBERED ANOTHER EIGHT HUNDRED YEARS AND HE RAISED SONS AND DAUGHTERS.

... וַיְהִי יָמָיו VA-YI-H'YOO Y'MEI... (THE DAYS...): To record Adam's lifespan, Scripture would use עוֹד OHD (MORE/ADDITIONAL - cf. GENESIS 29:27; EXODUS 36:6; LEVITICUS 13:57 and explicit in the next verse). אַחֲרָי AH-CHA-REI (AFTERWARD - cf. GENESIS 15:14; EXODUS 3:20; LEVITICUS 13:7) introduces events that may or may not have been caused by the preceding one but the time factor is mentioned to stress not only the duration of a condition but that it informed that entire interval (GENESIS 25:11; JOSHUA 24:29; JUDGES 2:7 - not the case when the text uses אַחֲרָי A-CHAHR, which just indicates a later event [cf. GENESIS 9:28; EXODUS 18:2; NUMBERS 5:26]).

וַיִּזְלַד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת VA-YOH-LEHD BA-NIM U-BHA-NOHTH (AND HE RAISED SONS AND DAUGHTERS): Translators wrongly treat this clause and its repetitions in this chapter as biblical flourish. These genealogies serve the same purpose as in Chronicles I 14:3 and Chronicles II 24:3, providing crucial information as to the motivations of the leading actors. Here, they indicate that the transmission of cultural content from one generation to the next was repeated many times and extended to offspring of both genders. Mankind had proliferated in a burgeoning network of communities, each with its own habits and customs adapted to their environments.

5. ALL ADAM'S DAYS THAT HE LIVED WERE NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY YEARS - AND HE DIED

וַיְהִי כָל־יְמֵי אָדָם VA-YI-H'YOO KOL Y'MEI A-DAM (ALL ADAM'S DAYS... WERE): Time spans are recorded with Y'MEI, "days of" (GENESIS 5:4, 11:32; PSALMS 90:10; ECCLESIASTES 5:17). The added KOL ("all") tells us that an attribute remained constant through the whole time (cf. GENESIS 3:14, 17, 8:22; NUMBERS 6:4; JUDGES 2:7).

אֲשֶׁר־חַי A-SHER CHAI (THAT HE LIVED): This does not refer to Adam's life [*that would be redundant*]; when modified by A-SHER ("which"), CHAI is not a physical condition but an organism's faculty (cf. GENESIS 9:3; DEUTERONOMY 4:10, 12:1; SAMUEL I 20:31 and Expositions to 1:20, 1:30, 2:19 above - *The only other individual to whom Scripture applied this phrase is Abraham [GENESIS 21:7]*). No longer community leader, Adam still vigorously pursued the goals He set for him during his whole lifetime.

... שָׁנָה... שָׁנָה... SHA-NAH... SHA-NAH (... YEARS... YEARS): Repetition implies consistency (note GENESIS 23:1). *These passages are not myth, like the widespread cultural conventions that project outsized greatness, strength, wisdom, piety - and inflated lifespans - onto earlier generations. Ancestor exaltation is not a Scriptural mode, despite later infiltrations of this idea into Jewish religious literature from foreign sources.* The Israelites understood that Divine interventions manifested as exaggerated phenomena were necessary to affect situations that otherwise would have expired without resolution or successful conclusion. When the tree of knowledge was removed, mankind required long periods of sustained education and training to reach a state which enabled it to achieve the divine purpose; His intervention in this formative era provided a sustained presence of teachers, the only way to assure the transmission of culture.

וַיָּמָת VA-YA-MOHTH (AND HE DIED): We now understand the superfluous summations that may even justify those commentators opining that only the named individuals enjoyed long lives, for we now have good reason. The verbose numbering tells us that each spent an entire life as mentor, the sons, embarking on careers upon reaching maturity, striking out to replicate their fathers' accomplishments in other communities over extended regions. It also explains the constant refrain regarding the individuals' useful life after a son was born and that sons and daughters were raised throughout the time afterward. Nevertheless, when the time came, and to ensure these personages not be deified, they died like all mortals.

DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

Although Adam left the community's guidance to his wife, he was directly involved in raising his children according to their individual personalities and talents by utilizing the intellectual prowess E-LO-HIM gave him. After 130 years, his son Seth attained the maturity and skills to lead in his own right. Adam continued mentoring his other offspring for 800 years, doing this for a total of 930 years until he died.

EXPOSITION [5:6-21]

The next five PARSHAs reprise the previous one. The expositions will therefore only treat the specific names and their meanings.

6. אֶחָיוֹשׁ EH-NOSH: See Exposition 4:26.

9. קַיִן QAY-NON: Cain with a Nun suffix (see Exposition 4:1) makes a gerundial indicating one whose activity is sustained as "spearhead" of many communities (cf. LEVITICUS 1:2; DEUTERONOMY 28:22; ESTHER 9:5).

12. מְהַלְלֵאל MA-HA-LAHL-EL: The "Mem" prefix makes the embedded verb passive, negating most conventional interpretations as to this name's meaning. It is not pejorative; still used in the late biblical (NEHEMIAH 11:4) and early Talmudic eras (Mishna ABHOTH 3:1), it conveyed prestige and status. Some may argue that the passive form requires an inserted "Vav" vowel indicator (PSALMS 96:4; 113:3) and that its absence makes a hybrid active-passive verb, something like "inspiring praise to be proclaimed". This needs a "Sh'va" (cf. PSALMS 150:6; CHRONICLES I 23:5, 29:13; CHRONICLES II 20:21; 23:12); the "Patach" replacing the indicative "Heh" implies a singular personality (see

2:7 - HA-A-DAM). This is followed by a "ChataphPatach", reducing the number of syllables to three, moving the accent to the end and making the second word in this composite name, EL, the actor "heaping praise". EL is found within names (GENESIS 16:11; NUMBERS 13:13; SAMUEL I 1:20) but the Israelites would not countenance a mortal deserving of His praise. EL is here "the mighty" (cf. EXODUS 15:15; EZEKIEL 17:13; PSALMS 29:1); MA-HA-LAL-EL was acclaimed by all who mattered in every society he came into contact with.

15. יֶרֶד YEH-RED: The pundits correctly associated this name with "descent" [root "Yud-Reish-Daled" - "go down"] but did not grasp its precise connotation. Interpretations of a spiritually, morally or ethically regressing mankind or angels "falling" [this last the Israelites would deem ludicrous] would be served with גָּרַע GA-RA (DIMINISH - cf. EXODUS 5:11; NUMBERS 9:7; ISAIAH 15:2), קִיל־קוּל QIL-QOOL (DETERIORATION - cf. NUMBERS 21:5; EZEKIEL 21:26; ECCLESIASTES 10:10), נָמוּךְ NA-MOOKH (LOWERED - cf. LEVITICUS 25:25, 27:8), שָׁקַע SHA-QA (DECLINED - cf. NUMBERS 11:2; JEREMIAH 51:64; AMOS 8:8), חָלַשׁ CHA-LAHSH (WEAKEN - cf. EXODUS 17:13, 32:18; JOB 14:10) or נָפַל NEI-PHEL (FALLEN - cf. NUMBERS 24:4; JUDGES 3:25; ECCLESIASTES 6:3). YEH-RED implies deliberate movement to lower positions (cf. JUDGES 7:5, 9:36; SAMUEL I 9:27; ISAIAH 15:3); by converting an active verb to a "Segolate" noun, the text tells us something about this generation. *[It is important to bear in mind that this entire chapter expounds on the development and progress of this hominid strain [5:1-2]].* The generation "descended" when people branched off from their group ["going down"], something the text alludes to with this verb (cf. GENESIS 38:1; SAMUEL II 19:21; KINGS II 10:13).

18. חָנוּךְ CHA-NOHKH: "Educated/trained" (GENESIS 14:14; PROVERBS 22:6) or "dedicated/inaugurated" (DEUTERONOMY 20:5; KINGS I 8:63). Settlements made possible the training of youngsters, preparing them for their future. Enoch was the archetypical pedagogue, formalizing the transmission of skills and knowledge.

21. מְתוֹשֵׁלַח MEH-THOO-SHEH-LACH (v. 21): The savants tried concocting a sensible meaning for this name. Its length and record lifespan of its owner prompted attempts to relate it to his nature, events in his life or its end, which coincided with the onset of the deluge recorded in the next chapter *[the notion that this name presaged his death but only after a millennium is an absurdity only medieval doctrinaires would conjure]*. The roots scholars claim comprise this name yielded tortuous and convoluted readings. The logical approach is to treat it as one word with a prefix and suffix. The opening "Mem" makes the embedded verb passive (cf. 5:12 - MA-HA-LAHL-EL); the "Lamed" suffix points to its instrumentality (see 2:12 - SHAHM HA-B'DOH-LACH). The root "Shin-Lamed-Heh" is "to displace" (cf. EXODUS 3:5; DEUTERONOMY 28:40; JOB 27:8 and cognate to SHAH-LACH ["send"] but with a different connotation). Methuselah expanded his father's didactic activity, spreading knowledge and information, what we call culture, to all Adamites, a far more fitting interpretation than the extant lexical contortions.

EXPOSITION [5:22-24]

22. ENOCH MOTIVATED (HIS) SONS AND DAUGHTERS TO WALK WITH E-LO-HIM
(DOING THIS) FOR THREE HUNDRED YEARS AFTER METHUSELA HAD MATURED (AND LEFT).

וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ וַאֲתֵּלְכָם אֶת־הַאֲלֹהִים VA-YITH-HA-LEIKH CHA-NOHKH ETH HA-E-LO-HIM (AND ENOCH MOTIVATED WALKING WITH E-LO-HIM): This is generally taken as attesting to his righteousness, questioned by Hebrew commentators who realized this should then have been at the beginning of the PAR-SHA (opening verse 21); the syntax clearly implies he became upright when he was at least 65 years old, after Methuselah's appearance. Those who could read the Hebrew should also have been attuned to other textual nuances. This is the first use of the ubiquitous לָלַךְ LA-LEH-KHEH (TO WALK/GO [in His way] - cf. DEUTERONOMY 8:6, 19:9; KINGS I 2:3, 15:26; PSALMS 101:2 and typically an active verb) as the embodiment of virtue. *We encountered its partner, דֶּה־רֶחֶק DEH-REHKH (WAY/ROAD/PATH; see Exposition 3:24 - LI-SH'MOHR ETH DEH-REHKH...).* Hebrew law and custom has been referred to as הֵלַךְ HA-LA-KHAH [literally "{correct} walking"] from the early Talmudic period until now. The meaning of the reflexive form of this verb is discerned from

context [we already encountered one variation - 3:8]; it cannot modify a direct object and is not generally prepositional in the sense of proximity - that requires an active verb (cf. GENESIS 12:4; NUMBERS 10:32, 22:20; JOSHUA 10:24). It is accompanied by ETH only twice [the other refers to Noah - 5:9]; ETH converts a reflexive verb into one which imputes a self-motivated route toward a desired outcome [see 3:8], as can be seen from Eve's declaration [4:1]. After Methuselah's departure, Enoch taught a more elevated and refined standard to his other children.

23. (WHEN) ALL THE DAYS OF ENOCH BECAME THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIVE YEARS.

In the last six PAR-SHAs, a plural verb introduced each man's age at death (נִהְיָוּ VA-YI-H'YOO - "they became" [vs. 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20]). This verse begins with the singular נִהְיָוּ VA-Y'HEE ("it became"), noticed only by Umberto Cassuto (20th century Italy), who opined that it drew the reader's attention to the shortened lifespan, a forced interpretation in view of the traditional readings of the following verse. He was right in that the singular verb draws attention - not to the short lifetime but Enoch's activity after this point.

24. ENOCH (CONTINUED) WALKING WITH E-LO-HIM AND (THEN) WAS NOT FOR THE AUTHORITIES TOOK (AND SEQUESTERED) HIM

וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ עִתְהָאֱלֹהִים VA-YITH-HA-LEIKH CHA-NOHKH ETH HA-E-LO-HIM (ENOCH [CONTINUED] WALKING WITH E-LO-HIM): This is exactly how verse 22 starts - but adds nothing to the narrative. Scripture is occasionally repetitive regarding ritual (e. g. NUMBERS 7:12-43, 28:1-29:39), singular events (DEUTERONOMY 5:1-18) or subtle modifications (EXODUS 23:19, 34:26; DEUTERONOMY 14:21), none applicable here. *Bekhor Shor* (Joseph b. Isaac, 12th cent. France) maintained that the repeated passage forestalls inferences that Enoch's shortcomings caused his early demise, although the statement in verse 22 should be enough. Repetition indicates intensity (GENESIS 7:18; DEUTERONOMY 16:20) or continuity (EXODUS 16:21; LEVITICUS 13:45), heightened when it involves displacement (the root "Heh-Lamed-Koph" ["walk"] connotes movement toward a goal or improved situation [cf. EXODUS 19:19; SAMUEL I 2:26; CHRONICLES II 17:12]); if it refers to Enoch's disappearance, V'EI-NEH-NOO should be the verse's final word (cf. JEREMIAH 49:10; PSALMS 37:10; JOB 3:21). What we are told is that Enoch persisted in the face of opposition or resistance.

וְאֵינֶנּוּ V'EI-NEH-NOO (AND [THEN] WAS NOT): This is invariably translated "and he was not" [more accurate is "and he is not"] with no consensus as to exactly what it means. That depends on why he vanished, explained in a cryptic clause that provoked concerned discussion among Hebrew commentators.

כִּי לָקַח אֱלֹהִים KĪ LA-QACH OH-THOH E-LO-HIM (FOR E-LO-HIM HAD TAKEN HIM): Numerous Hebrew writers noted that verse 24 should precede 23 and V'EI-NEH-NOO, the previous word, is completely redundant; the text should be simply וִיקַח אֱלֹהִים (E-LO-HIM TOOK HIM - cf. SAMUEL I 17:57; KINGS II 24:12) but this is also difficult. Some savants maintain that this records his demise, others that he was launched "to heaven" like Elijah (KINGS II 2:11), both tenuous readings. If E-LO-HIM ended Enoch's life, that is נִמְתָּהוּ VA-YA-MEHTH (HE PUT TO DEATH - cf. GENESIS 38:10; SAMUEL II 14:6; JEREMIAH 41:2), נִמְתָּהוּ VA-Y'MEE-THEY-HOO (HE KILLED HIM - cf. GENESIS 38:7; SAMUEL I 17:50; KINGS I 3:24), הִכָּהוּ HEE-KAH (SMOTE - cf. EXODUS 12:29; NUMBERS 25:14; JOSHUA 11:10) or קָטַל QA-TAL (SLEW - cf. PSALMS 139:19; JOB 13:15; DANIEL 2:14, 5:30). To impute this to a verb used elsewhere with a completely different meaning is untenable; when "to take" has a human direct object, the subject is persuading another to perform one or more distinct acts (see Exposition to 2:11 - VA-YI-QACH). When Scripture does refer to the "taking" of life, it is a subjective sentiment voiced by the speaker (cf. JONAH 4:3; PSALMS 49:16). As for Elijah's exit, the passive verbs (KINGS II 2:9-10) reflect the prophet's perception of his impending departure; his actual launch was וַיַּעֲלֵךְ VA-YA-AL (HE ASCENDED - loc. cit.). His occult presence and eventual reappearance are presumed (MALACHI 3:23; CHRONICLES II 21:12); there is no such anticipation regarding Enoch.

More vexing is why he was taken prematurely. Christian commentators claim this was a righteous man's reward, sparing him death's travails while protecting him from reprisals by wicked contemporaries, an interpretation negated by the unnecessary V'EI-NEH-NOO which disrupts the syntax required for that reading (see above). Most Jewish commentators accept the Talmudic conjecture that He anticipated Enoch's moral regression and ensured that he departed this life without sin (B'reishith Rabbah 25:1). This is also belied by the syntax but has a more fundamental theological flaw - tampering with free will [*there is no other record of divine prophylaxis*] - and why did only Enoch deserve this beneficence?

Cessation or abatement is לֹא-הָיָה עוֹדֵל LOH HA-YAH OHD (WAS NO MORE - cf. JOSHUA 5:12; SAMUEL I 1:18; KINGS I 10:5), יָפֵג, YA-PHAHG (EXPIRED - cf. GENESIS 45:26; HABAKKUK 1:4; LAMENTATIONS 2:18) or נֶחַדַּךְ NEH-EH-BHAD (WAS LOST - cf. EXODUS 10:7; NUMBERS 16:33; JONAH 1:6). EI-NEH-NOO does not indicate absence or disappearance but a failure to find someone or something sought (cf. GENESIS 37:30; SAMUEL II 3:22; KINGS I 20:40), especially if the word is placed at the beginning of a sentence for emphasis, as here. Enoch ceased to be available for consultation or instruction and may have been forcibly prevented from doing so.

Whether E-LO-HIM is the deity, the courts or rulers depends on context, not always apparent in a superficial reading. E-LO-HIM occurred forty times in GENESIS before this PAR-SHA and another 20 times coupled with the name Y-H-W-H. Here (v. 22 and 24), it has a "Heh" definite article prefix; a direct object indicator inserted where such is not tenable converts to a possessive (cf. GENESIS 42:30; NUMBERS 20:17; JOSHUA 6:5) but, as noted, ETH indicates a direct object, not possible with a verb which is reflexive and connotes random walking (cf. GENESIS 13:17; EXODUS 21:19; ZECHARIAH 1:20). The "walking" of conventional translations requires לְפָנַי L'PHA-NYE (BEFORE ME- cf. GENESIS 17:1; SAMUEL I 2:35; ESTHER 2:11). A further curiosity is this same noun twice in a verse but in different forms. E-LO-HIM with a "Heh" prefix will typically appear that way each time (e. g. GENESIS 41:32; JUDGES 13:6; JONAH 3:10; ECCLESIASTES 3:14; CHRONICLES I 25:5); when it does not, different meanings must be inferred (e. g. EXODUS 18:19; CHRONICLES II 26:5). That this is the case here is buttressed by the inverted cause and effect at the end of the verse and the subject following the predicate and placed at the very end of the verse - in biblical style, this means that the second noun is not the same as its companion.

Enoch disseminated a loftier, more refined teaching after his son left; his earlier instruction now ensured by his successor, he could undertake improvements. When this came to the attention of the authorities, they feared it would interfere with their own status and lead to public dissatisfaction and instability; Enoch was therefore urged to desist. It is unlikely that, like Abel and the one done away with by Lemech (4:8, 26), he was executed; more likely is that he was encouraged to take early retirement. It was unnecessary for Scripture to record the rest of his life; this was no longer relevant, nor his passing.

Attentive readers noted the duplicate pairs: Cain fathered Enoch (4:17), great-grandfather of Lemech (4:18); another Enoch, a descendant of Seth (5:18), was the grandfather of a second Lemech. Christian commentators with little or no knowledge of Biblical Hebrew saw this as two distinct human trajectories, the wicked line of Cain contrasting Seth's righteous descendants, a fundamentally flawed reading. Hebrew scholars much more attuned to the textual subtleties understood that names do not just designate individuals but characterize them or their ambient conditions. This would be the case in foundational genealogies, especially when a pair is repeated with the same order. Each society reached a point of Enoch ("education/training" - 4:17) but improper management and guidance led to Lemech ("decline") which required remedial action, that taken by the Lemech from the line of Cain was already discussed (4:23-24). The next PAR-SHA delineates the steps taken by the second Lemech.

DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

When a mature Methuselah went out to spread his knowledge among the Adamites, Enoch began imbuing his other offspring with the moral tenets of E-LO-HIM. He did this for 300 years but when his teachings spread beyond the family, the authorities, fearing that loftier standards would be too onerous for their communities and weaken their own power, removed Enoch from his position and sequestered him for the rest of his life.

EXPOSITION [5:28-31]

28. WHEN LEMECH REACHED THE AGE OF ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY TWO HE FATHERED A SON.

וַיֵּלֶד בֶּן VA-YOH-LED BEIN ([HE] FATHERED A SON): This stark turn of phrase is found nowhere else in Scripture; the few that noted it turned to late Midrashic sources (*Midrash Aggadah Genesis 5:28:1; Tanchuma 11:5; Sefer HaYashar Breishith 16*) that saw BEIN ["son"] as cognate to Cain's בֹּנֵה BOH-NEH ("build" - 4:17) and suggested a parallel herald of this son "building" the post-Deluge world, Noah destined to be mankind's new progenitor after all other Adamites were "erased". (Some feminists see this as rabbinical male chauvinism, attributing a belief that only males can "build", a misguided conclusion. The root of בַּת BATHH ["daughter"] also had a "Nun" which was later dropped for diachronic reasons but is retained in its plural בָּנוֹת BAH-NOHTH and still present in the Arabic B'N'T). While a plausible explanation [since it is based on later recorded facts], there was no reason given or discernable how this statement here advances the narrative.

29. HE CALLED HIS NAME NOAH TO SIGNIFY THAT HE WILL LEAD US AWAY FROM OUR OCCUPATIONS AND THE DESIGNS OF OUR HANDS (AS WE DID) FROM THE LAND WHEN IT WAS WEAKENED BY Y-H-W-H

Expositors who knew Hebrew glossed over the grammar and syntax to concur with their less adept colleagues that this verse alludes to a respite from a divinely inflicted agricultural sparsity but differ as to how this relief came about. Those asserting that the earth's skimpy yield resulted from the curse put on Cain are off the mark; that was directed solely at him (see Exposition 4:11-12). Others posit that the "comfort" came from Noah's preserving mankind during the Flood; as the "comforted" did not survive the debacle, this interpretation cannot be justified. Some opine that the curse was to be lifted after Adam's passing since he brought it on; as Noah's was the first recorded birth after Adam's death, his name memorialized this transition. That would make this an automatic boost in the earth's output but the text clearly states that Noah brought the recovery. Furthermore, the impositions on the other actors in the Eden drama were permanent (3:14-16); why would Adam's not be?

A larger group adopts the view [found in late Talmudic sources] that Noah invented the plough or other tools which alleviated the drudgery of farming. They fail to explain why this is intimated so obliquely (*earlier inventions are explicitly attributed [4:20-22] and, like those, Noah's name should have memorialized his contribution and the reader spared the need to guess*). Also strange is that, as metal tools were available (4:22), it took ten generations before someone discovered this strategy to thwart the Divine will (*assuming that was possible - better tools do not guarantee better harvests. Even if cultivation now took less time so more ground could be covered, nothing would stop Him from curtailing yields*). If the text records only relief from toil, that should be stated; the earth's condition had been uniform for a millennium so that, by this time, it was the norm. Scripture had but to state that Noah's innovation reduced the need for intense labor, although we are not told the significance of this in the context of the narrative. Finally, these readings are not supported by the punctuation, which should be ZEH [Moonach] Y'NA-CHA-MEI-NOO [T'lishaQetana] MI- MA-A-SEI-NOO [Geireish] U-MEI-I'TZBHOHN [Mahpakh] YA-DEI-NOO [Pashta] MIN-HA-ADA-MAH {Qatan}.

וַיִּקְרָא לְנֹחַ NO-ACH LEI-MOHR (NOAH TO SIGNIFY): Unlike the other names in this chapter, Noah has a rationale but LEI-MOHR (TO SAY) makes it a future manifestation. As the first Lemech responded to a crisis (4:23-24), so this Lemech did likewise by designating Noah to lead the community out of its morass.

זֶה ZEH (THIS): No one remarked on the highly unusual cantillation - two disjunctive tropes, "Gershayim" and "T'lisha-G'dohla", on one monosyllabic word, the first intoned before the second to mark a major caesura in the cadence. הוּא HOO (HE - e. g. ISAIAH 51:12) can be replaced by ZEH (THIS [ONE]) but ZEH standing alone is generally pejorative (cf. EXODUS 10:7; SAMUEL I 10:27; ESTHER 7:5). The punctuation strenuously setting this word apart tells us this demonstrative pronoun has a double reference, one to a person and the other something abstract.

יְנַחֵמֵנוּ Y'NA-CHA-MEI-NOO (WILL TURN US AWAY): The root "Nun-Cheth-Mem" implies curtailment or diversion, including modified emotions, "change of heart" that Scripture extends to comforting the bereaved, erroneously assumed to be the meaning here. When "comforting" is transitive, the direct object is implied or indicated with a pronoun (cf. GENESIS 50:21; SAMUEL II 12:24; EZEKIEL 14:23); an indirect object needs a preposition [אַחֲרַי AH-CHA-REI "after/for" - cf. GENESIS 24:67; אֵל EL "to/for" - cf. SAMUEL II 10:2; אַל AL "on/for" - cf. SAMUEL II 13:39; ISAIAH 22:4; JEREMIAH 16:7 or the "Lamed" prefix "to" - cf. NAHUM 3:7; PSALMS 119:76; LAMENTATIONS 1:9]. The one time this preposition is a "Mem" ("from"), its object is the source of the comfort (LAMENTATIONS 1:2), which cannot be said of the three objects here with this prefix.

מִמְעֻשֵׁינוּ MI-MA-AH-SEI-NOO (FROM OUR OCCUPATIONS): With one exception [*The Rashi Chumash* - R. Shraga Silverstein, 20th cent. Brooklyn NY], all translate this as "from our work", which is misleading. "Work" is עֲבֹדָה A-BHOH-DAH (cf. GENESIS 29:27; EXODUS 1:14; LEVITICUS 25:39), יְגִיעַ Y'GEE-AH (LABOR - cf. GENESIS 31:42; JOB 39:16; ECCLESIASTES 12:12), עֲמָל A-MAHL (TOIL - cf. GENESIS 41:51; DEUTERONOMY 26:7; JUDGES 10:16), פְּרֻדָּה PEH-REHKH (DRUDGERY - cf. EXODUS 1:13; EZEKIEL 34:4) and קִשְׁוֹת A-BHOH-DAH QA-SHAH (HARD WORK - cf. EXODUS 6:9; DEUTERONOMY 26:6; KINGS I 12:4). Amelioration is הַקְלֵת HA-QEIL (LIGHTEN/EASE - cf. EXODUS 18:22; KINGS I 12:4; JONAH 1:5), הַשְׁקֵט HAHSH-QEIT (BECALM - cf. ISAIAH 7:4; JEREMIAH 49:23; JOB 37:17), תְּרַגְּעַתָּהּ TAR-GEE-YA (REPOSE - cf. DEUTERONOMY 28:65; ISAIAH 51:4; JEREMIAH 31:2) or שָׁכַח SHA-KHAHKH (SUBSIDE - cf. GENESIS 8:1; NUMBERS 17:20; ESTHER 1:2).

MA-A-SEH refers to acts, accomplishments or deeds (cf. GENESIS 20:9; LEVITICUS 18:3; NUMBERS 16:28). When the possessive plural MA-A-SEI-NOO has a "Yud" after the "Sin", it is collective action (cf. ISAIAH 26:12; EZRA 9:13). If the "Yud" is absent, as here, many tasks are performed independently; these would normally be מְעֻשֵׂה יְדֵינוּ MA-A-SEI YA-DEI-NOO ("works of our hands" - cf. DEUTERONOMY 2:7; ISAIAH 2:8; HOSEA 14:4) but the missing "Yud" alludes to that same word modifying the next noun and obviates the need for its duplication. The reference here is therefore to peoples' occupations (cf. GENESIS 46:33; EXODUS 5:13).

וּמִמְעֻצְבוֹנוּ U-MEI-I-TZ'BHOHN YA-DEI-NOO (AND FROM OUR HANDS' DESIGNS): Consistent with their reading of the preceding phrase, the savants hear a prayer for relief from pain and anguish, plights more succinctly called מַכְאוֹב MAKH-OHBH (PAIN - cf. GENESIS 34:25; EXODUS 3:17; ISAIAH 17:11), סְבִלוֹתֵינוּ SIBH-LOH-THEI-NOO (OUR BURDENS - cf. GENESIS 49:15; EXODUS 1:11; ISAIAH 9:3), לְחַץ LA-CHATZ (STRESS - cf. EXODUS 3:9; JUDGES 1:34; ISAIAH 19:20), עֲנִיּוֹנוֹ ON-YEI-NOO (OUR AFFLICTION - cf. GENESIS 15:13; LEVITICUS 16:29; DEUTERONOMY 26:7), דָּכָא DA-KHA (CRUSH - cf. ISAIAH 3:15; PSALMS 90:3; JOB 4:19) or יְסוּרִיִּים YI-SOO-RIM (PUNISHMENTS - cf. PSALMS 118:18; JOB 40:2), all closer to the conventional translations. I-TZ'BHOHN parallels those in 3:16-17, created devices, a reading supported by the added noun יָד YAD (HAND - cf. ISAIAH 50:11; PSALMS 115:4; JOB 10:8).

מִן־הָאֲדָמָה MIN HA-A-DA-MAH (FROM THE LAND): If conventional interpretations are correct, A-DA-MAH (LAND) should have a "Beth" prefix בְּאֲדָמָה ("on the ground" - cf. DEUTERONOMY 4:18; 21:1) or should follow the preposition אַל AL (UPON - cf. GENESIS 7:8; EXODUS 10:6; NUMBERS 11:12 - more exactly מֵעַל MEI-AL [FROM UPON - cf. DEUTERONOMY 28:21; JOSHUA 23:13; JEREMIAH 24:10]). The preposition MIN modifies both preceding nouns and thus all three form a uniform sequence. This is accentuated by the punctuation; the prepositional phrase does not follow subject and predicate (GENESIS 2:7, 4:10; AMOS 3:5) nor begin a phrase (GENESIS 4:11) but is a third element in a series.

אֲשֶׁר אֶרְרָה יִהְיֶה A-SHER EI-RA-RAH Y-H-W-H (THAT Y-H-W-H WEAKENED): If this referred solely to "the land", HA-A-DA-MAH would be punctuated with a "ZaqefGadol" or a "Qadma" [on MIN] (cf. EXODUS 8:17; LEVITICUS 20:2; NUMBERS 20:12). As it was set apart (see above), A-SHER does not have its usual sense of an identifying conjunction but establishes a condition precedent (cf. GENESIS 42:25; LEVITICUS 4:22; DEUTERONOMY 4:40, 11:27; JEREMIAH 1:2), one that emerged after the Eden incident and impacts our understanding of this verse and the next Parsha. The first Lemech verbalized the challenge he confronted (4:23); the one faced by Noah's father is inferred from his words. ZEH's cantillation creates a double entendre: "this one" – and this "idea" - will not "comfort" but "lead" us (cf. EXODUS 13:17; SAMUEL I 22:4; PSALMS 78:14) away from the acts mandated to our ancestor (see Exposition to 3:17-19), so the improvements Enoch attempted prematurely will be implemented by Noah.

The next Parsha is the last in a long chapter which began with the Eden expulsion (3:22-24) and ends with verse 6:4. Verse 5:32 begins the Parsha and runs seamlessly into 6:1. Chapter 5 is not so much a genealogy (that would open with אֵלֶּה תּוֹלְדוֹת EI-LEH TOH-L'DOHTH [THESE DESCENDANTS - cf. GENESIS 6:9, 11:10; CHRONICLES I 1:29]); SEI-PHER (5:1) indicates a narrative which details the progress of the Adamites. This path hit a bump when Enoch, trying to promote a behavior based on principles of an austere, rigorous E-LO-HIM, was frustrated by a leadership that was not ready for that (5:24). Like the first Lemech setting things right when he discerned a major social defect (4:23-24), so the Lemech who was Enoch's grandson, responding to a distressing situation in the Adamite line, invoked the more intimate and direct Y-H-W-H divine manifestation.

DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

When Lemech reached the age of 182 years, he fathered a son whom he called Noah; in doing so, he expressed the hope that this scion would lead mankind away from their mundane occupations and handiwork preoccupations as their forefather Adam expanded his workings when his land had its productivity weakened.

EXPOSITION [5:32-6:3]

32. WHEN NOAH HAD REACHED HIS FIVE HUNDRETH YEAR HE HAD RAISED SHEM, CHAM AND JAPHETH (AS HIS SUCCESSORS).

בֶּן־חַמֶּשׁ מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה BEN CHA-MEISH MEI-OHTH SHA-NAH ([ABOUT] FIVE HUNDRED YEARS): When BEN (SON) does not refer to a parent-son relation, it points to a status or condition [בֶּן מְשִׁקָּה BEN MEH-SHEQ {"steward" - GENESIS 15:2}; בֶּן הַכּוֹת BIN HA-KOHTH {"one to be flogged" - DEUTERONOMY 25:2}; בְּנֵי הַחַיִּל B'NEI HEH-CHA-YIL {"warriors" - JUDGES 21:10}; בְּנֵי־מְרִי B'NEI MEH-REE {"rebels" - NUMBERS 17:25}; בַּת־רַבִּים BATH RA-BEEM {"populous city" - SONG OF SONGS 7:5}]. When associated with an age or time passage, it suggests a stage or maturity level (cf. LEVITICUS 9:3; NUMBERS 1:3; EZRA 3:8). Noah, in a departure from all heretofore archived, is characterized as one who achieved a certain age; it does not mean he then began fathering children [they were not triplets] but, by the time he reached that age, had trained three sons to promulgate his teachings.

שֵׁם SHEM (NAME): This son disseminated intellectual pursuits, for all serious inquiry begins with names - precise labels and definitions (see Exposition to 2:20 - VA-YI-Q'RA HA-A-DAM).

חַם CHAM (WARM/HOT): This son instituted social conventions to control more visceral human deportment.

יָפֶת YA-PHEHTH (BEAUTY): The third son integrated the aesthetic into communal life.

6:1. WHEN IT CAME TO PASS THAT THOSE ADAMITES ACHIEVED PROMINENCE IN MANY COMMUNITIES (THEIR) DAUGHTERS WERE RAISED (TO SHARE THEIR EDUCATION AND LEADERSHIP).

וַיְהִי כִּי־בָּיִתָּהּ הָאָדָם לָרֹב VA-Y'HEE KEE HEI-CHEIL HA-A-DAM LA-ROHBH (WHEN IT CAME TO PASS THAT THOSE ADAMITES ACHIEVED PROMINENCE): Reading this as reporting a population explosion is belied by its linguistics. VA-Y'HEE recounts a result, HEI-CHEIL an inception (these words are never elsewhere associated [cf. GENESIS 10:8, 44:12; NUMBERS 17:11; JUDGES 20:39]). To indicate an enlarged inhabitancy, Scripture would tell us mankind פָּרוּ PA-

ROO (PROLIFERATED - cf. GENESIS 1:22; EXODUS 1:7; JEREMIAH 23:3), רָבוּ RA-BHOO (INCREASED [NUMBER] - cf. GENESIS 8:17; JEREMIAH 29:6; JONAH 4:11) or הִרְחִיב HIR-CHEEBH (EXPANDED - cf. GENESIS 26:22; AMOS 1:13; HABAKKUK 2:5). LA-ROHBH, found nearly fifty times in Scripture, is always an adjective (“great size/number”), never the infinitive expositors read here. Also noted by a small coterie is that the definite article “Heh” prefix to A-DAM cannot denote the ancestral Adam; but a class noun is not prefixed (cf. GENESIS 1:26, 2:5; EXODUS 13:5; ISAIAH 2:9) unless it is generic (cf. EXODUS 8:13; NUMBERS 5:6; JOSHUA 16:14), clearly inapplicable here.

עַל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה AL P’NEI HA-A-DA-MAH (IN MANY COMMUNITIES): “On the earth” is עַל־הָאָרֶץ AL HA-A-RETZ (cf. GENESIS 7:19; EXODUS 16:14; NUMBERS 33:55); even a regional saturation is אֶחָד עַל־פְּנֵי כָּל־הָאָרֶץ AHL P’NEI KHOL HA-A-RETZ (cf. GENESIS 11:4; DEUTERONOMY 11:25; SAMUEL I 30:16). A-DA-MAH with a definite article “Heh” prefix tells us these Adamites visited areas already settled (see Exposition 1:25 – V’ETH KOL REH-MESS HA-A-DA-MAH), while the construct P’NEI (which adds an observer’s dimension) points to interactions with their inhabitants.

וּבָנוּת יְלָדָיו לָהֶם U-BHA-NOHTH YOO-L’DOO LA-HEM (AND [THEIR] DAUGHTERS WERE RAISED): The passive tense serves no stylistic purpose other than to place the predicate object at the beginning of the sentence. The expositors provide a variety of reasons for this superfluous passage but none address this grammatical oddity. Scripture does this to impart to one group the same status and importance as those in a previous passage. The abrupt stylistic modifications in the verse opening this Parsha (5:32) tells us it is not a continuation of the genealogy laid out in the last nine but recounts Noah’s endeavor to implement his father’s wishes. To this end, he raised three sons, each one devoted to one aspect of the human psyche - the intellect, the emotions and aesthetics. *[The notion that Noah postponed fathering children until an advanced age is unfounded.]* When Noah attained 500 years of age, his sons were ready to be dispatched to other communities. *This can be inferred from the immediate continuation of verse 6:1, with no spacing in the text.* The pedagogy and guidance they inaugurated were such that, not only sons, but daughters as well were enlisted to share this didactic burden.

2. THE SONS OF THE RULERS NOTICED THE CAPABILITIES OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE ADAMITES THEY (THEN) TOOK FOR THEMSELVES WIVES FROM ALL OF THEM THAT CHOSE (TO MARRY THEM).

בְּנֵי־הַמְּלָכִים BH’NEI HA-E-LO-HIM (SONS OF THE RULERS): Attributions of divinity or celestial origin to these are spurious *[and would require the “Heh” prefix be removed - cf. JOB 38:7]*. Most Jewish expositors correctly understood these as the elite - rulers, judges and the like (cf. EXODUS 2:6; SAMUEL I 2:25; PSALMS 82:1 - *it is remarkable how many see this last as referencing supernatural beings when the context clearly indicates the Psalm is addressing judges and judiciaries. A few Hebrew writers view even the B’NEI HA-E-LO-HIM in JOB [Ch. 1 & 2] as mortals.*)

טוֹבָתּוֹת TOH-BHOHTH (CAPABLE): Beautiful women are יְפֹתֹת YA-PHOHTH (BEAUTIFUL - cf. GENESIS 12:14; SAMUEL II 13:1; KINGS I 1:3), נְאוּהָ NA-VAH (COMELY - cf. ISAIAH 27:10; JEREMIAH 6:2; SONG OF SONGS 1:5), יְפֹת־תְּאֵר Y’PHATH TOH-AHR (ATTRACTIVE - cf. GENESIS 29:17; DEUTERONOMY 21:11; SAMUEL I 25:3), נְאוּתֹת NA-OHTH (PRETTY - cf. ISAIAH 52:7; SONG OF SONGS 1:5, 2:14), נְחֻמָּה NECH-MAHD (CHARMING - cf. GENESIS 2:9; SONG OF SONGS 2:3) or יְפֹת מְרֵאָה Y’PHAHTH MAR-EH (LOVELY - cf. GENESIS 12:11; SAMUEL II 14:27; ESTHER 1:11). These “daughters” were TOH-BHOHTH - not desired for their looks but their talent and competence (see Exposition 1:4 - VA-YARH... KEE TOHBH).

וַיִּקְחוּ לָהֶם נָשִׁים VA-YI-Q’CHOO LA-HEM NA-SHIM (THEY TOOK FOR THEMSELVES WIVES): Many wrongly assumed this was by force; that is תִּפְסְוּ TO-PH’SOO (SEIZED - cf. NUMBERS 5:13; DEUTERONOMY 22:28; JOSHUA 8:23), חֹטְפוֹ CHO-T’PHOO (SNATCHED - cf. JUDGES 21:21; PSALMS 10:9) or יִשְׁבּוּ YISH-BOO (CAPTURED - cf. NUMBERS 21:1; DEUTERONOMY 21:13; EZEKIEL 30:18). *The status of women in Scripture and their role in matrimony are not as these were later imagined (cf. GENESIS 24:58, 34:7; DEUTERONOMY 22:27); even those captured in war were accorded humane treatment and had to become wives with privileges equal to native spouses (DEUTERONOMY 21:10-15). Sarah’s being interned by the pharaoh was a unique*

event more fully discussed in our Exposition to GENESIS 12:15-20. Expressions of "giving daughters in marriage" were never meant literally; the ancients shared our metaphors for a "hand in marriage" or a father "giving away the bride".

מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר בָּחָרוּ MI-KOHL A-SHER BA-CHA-ROO (FROM AMONG ALL THAT CHOSE [TO MARRY THEM]): Any thoughts that this passage also indicates abduction can be dispensed with; the root "Beth-Cheth-Reish" ["choose"] carries no connotation of coercion (cf. GENESIS 13:11; DEUTERONOMY 30:19; PROVERBS 3:31) but raises a point ignored by the commentators - however these words are read, this passage is superfluous. This problem is obviated when we recall a basic rule of biblical syntax - the subject pronoun, here indicated by the "Vav" suffix at the verse's end, refers to the last-mentioned noun. The daughters did the choosing; those who so elected, left their homes for their husbands', maintaining the custom of the bride joining her husband's family and bringing their talents and capabilities to their adopted communities. R. S. Hirsch [19th century Frankfurt, Germany] pointed out that כַּלָּה KA-LAH (BRIDE) is cognate to "whole", the daughter-in-law completing the family [see his commentary to GENESIS 11:31].

3. (BUT THEN) Y-H-W-H SAID, GODLY INCLINATIONS WITHIN ADAMITES WILL NOT PREVAIL
FOR WHEN THEY UNITE THEY REVERT TO MORTAL BEINGS
(THEREFORE) HIS DAYS WILL BE (LIMITED TO) ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY YEARS

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה VA-YOHL-MER Y-H-W-H (Y-H-W-H SAID): When there is no obvious listener, this tells us the rationale for an impending divine intervention (see 3:22 above; *this is not the case with VA-YOHL-MER E-LO-HIM ["E-LO-HIM said"] in Chapter 1 which initiates and impels events and reactions*).

לֹא יִדְוֹן רוּחִי בְּאָדָם לְעֹלָם LOH YA-DOHN ROO-CHEE BHA-A-DAM L'OH-LAM (MY [GODLY] INCLINATIONS WITHIN ADAMITES WILL NOT PREVAIL [INDEFINITELY]): One popular translation, "My spirit will not long abide in man", resulted from a faulty transcription of the Hebrew text (and would be יִשְׁאֵר YA-SHEER ["remain" - cf. EXODUS 10:12; DEUTERONOMY 28:51; JEREMIAH 39:10] or יִסְבֵּל YIS-BOHL ["tolerate/bear" - cf. ISAIAH 53:11; ECCLESIASTES 12:5; NEHEMIAH 4:11]). The King James "... shall not always strive..." is closer to the text but still misses the mark; "strive" is יִאָּבֵק YEI-AH-BHEIQ (GENESIS 32:25 - other possibilities are יִתְאַמֵּץ YITH-A-MEITZ ["struggle" - cf. GENESIS 25:23; KINGS I 12:18; RUTH 1:18] or יִרִיב YA-REEBH ["contend" - cf. GENESIS 26:20; EXODUS 17:2; DEUTERONOMY 1:12]). All extant interpretations require the punctuation sequence Mapakh-Pashta-Pashta-Qatan. By putting a Qadma on YA-DOHN and connecting ROO-CHEE BHA-A-DAM with Mahpakh Pashta, the Masoretes tell us in no uncertain terms that the subject in the sentence is "My spirit which is in man".

בְּשִׁגְמָה B'SHA-GAM (WHEN THEY JOIN/UNITE): This unusual word (appearing this once in Scripture) baffled translators, who resorted to splitting it, reading its second half as the word GAM (ALSO) and the first as a double prefix; left unresolved was its juxtaposition to HOO (HE), a coupling indicating parity or complementarity (*with numerous instances just in Genesis - 4:4, 22, 10:21, 19:38, 20:5 and more*), not the supplementarity implied here, which needs כִּי־גַם KEE GAM ("for also" - cf. GENESIS 35:17; DEUTERONOMY 12:31; JOSHUA 22:7). The more authentic B'SHA-GOM [with a Qamatz vowel under the Gimel] was discarded, since it precludes translating GAM as "also"; the pundits insisted on the less accurate version, missing its true meaning [*perhaps because it has no Scriptural analogues, although there is an Aramaic cognate, as observed by the eminent lexicographer Marcus Jastrow {19th cent. Germany, United States}*], "joined/entwined", which leads smoothly to the next two words (*and accounts for the Patach vowel under the Shin instead of the expected Segol*).

הוּא בְּשָׂרׁ HOO BHA-SAHR (HE IS [BUT] OFFSPRING): To impute moral weakness or human frailty, presumed due to the text's apparent metaphorical use of "flesh", BAH-SAHR would precede the pronoun and both would follow the conjunction KEE ("because" - cf. GENESIS 3:6, 7; EXODUS 2:2; LEVITICUS 22:7). By inserting the pronoun in the middle of the clause, Scripture harks back to the first appearance of BAH-SAHR, (2:24 - see Exposition) and is now referring to the *offspring* of the unions recorded in the last verse.

וְהָיוּ יָמָיו מֵעַתָּה וְעַשְׂרִים שָׁנָה V'HA-YOO YA-MAV MEI-AH V'ES-RIM SHA-NAH (HIS DAYS WILL BE [LIMITED TO] 120 YEARS): YA -MAV is a generic time span; a specific interval is indicated with SHA-NAH (cf. this distinction in PSALM 61:6 [7 in the Hebrew - cf. also GENESIS 7:11; LEVITICUS 25:13; NUMBERS 33:38, ISAIAH 6:1]). "His days" here is not a time limit for the population then extant, as proposed by many, but a colloquialism, like our "In my day", "That'll be the day" or "In the days of..."; in like fashion does Scripture denote an individual's lifespan (cf. DEUTERONOMY 22:19; KINGS I 15:14; ECCLESIASTES 2:23, 5:16), an occurrence in a known time period (cf. GENESIS 10:25; KINGS I 1:6; JEREMIAH 22:30) and even an abridged life (cf. ISAIAH 65:20; JEREMIAH 17:11). While typically used for a known person, the text may allude to one's "days" in the abstract (cf. ISAIAH 65:20; JEREMIAH 17:11; JOB 7:1), the only way this passage can be understood, since the pronoun references a class noun.

This passage anticipates modern insights into heredity and the workings of probability. It tells us that, no matter how well man educates successive generations and improves cultural transmissions, the longer people live, the greater the likelihood their inherent urges and desires will overcome their inclinations toward moral behavior - and this need happen only once to give the individual a taste of the forbidden or sinful which will now always influence his feelings and behavior and lead to social degeneration. Therefore, mankind was no longer blessed with the great lifespans of yore; there is nothing in the text that portends His intervention at this time.

DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

By the time Noah was five hundred years of age, he had raised Shem, Cham and Japheth. They became prominent in spreading their enlightenment to many communities. When the young men slated for leadership in those societies realized that Adamite daughters could also bring this knowledge, they arranged marriages that brought them to their communities. Nevertheless, Y-H-W-H discerned that these loftier inclinations will not prevail among most of the populace and therefore limited lifespans thereafter to one hundred and twenty years.

EXPOSITION [6:4]

4. THE CHIEFTANS HAD BECOME (PROMINENT) THROUGHOUT THE LAND IN THOSE DAYS EVEN AFTERWARD WHEN THE SONS OF THE ELITE HAD MARRIED ADAMITE DAUGHTERS AND THESE RAISED CHILDREN THESE (CHIEFTANS WHO RETAINED THEIR POWER WERE) THE PLUNDERERS OF OLD.

הַנְּפִלִים HA-N'PHEE-LIM (THE CHIEFTANS): Those reluctant to impute a supernatural or exaggerated meaning, and influenced by Christian readings of Genesis as recording man's "fall" and degeneration, applied the word's presumed root, "Nun-Pei-Lamed" ["fall"], to people who "fell" from a lofty moral and spiritual standing. "Fallen" is נִפְלִים NOH-PH'LIM (FALLEN/DEFECTORS - cf. KINGS II 25:11; JEREMIAH 6:15; PSALMS 145:14), יֹרְדֵימ YO-R'DEEM (TUMBLERS - cf. GENESIS 37:35; EXODUS 15:5; NUMBERS 16:30) or כֹּשְׁלִים KOSH-LIM (STUMBLERS - cf. HOSEA 14:2; NAHUM 3:3; MALACHI 2:8); reprobates are בָּזוּי BA-ZOO-EE (DISGRACED - cf. JEREMIAH 49:15; OBADIAH 1:2; ECCLESIASTES 9:16), רְשָׁעִים R'SHA-EEM (WICKED - cf. EXODUS 9:27; NUMBERS 16:26; ISAIAH 13:11), חַטָּאִים CHA-TA-EEM (SINNERS - cf. GENESIS 13:13; NUMBERS 17:3; SAMUEL I 15:18) or פֹּשְׁעִים POH-SH'EEM (TRANSGRESSORS - cf. ISAIAH 1:28; EZEKIEL 20:38; DANIEL 8:23). The more pervasive "fallen angels" story, a Christian adaptation of pagan myths, is a fantasy no Israelite would even contemplate.

The most popular version, that these were giants, is based on the one other text in which they appear (*twice in one verse [NUMBERS 13:33]*), where they are also called "sons of Anaq", this last word translated "huge/enormous", as in modern Hebrew. A subtlety ignored by all is that the second N'PHEE-LIM is spelled as in Genesis but the first has an extra "Yud" [*this went unobserved because later generations no longer pronounced these words differently*], incorporating the intense "Pee-el" verb form to indicate not a falling subject but one causing a fall (cf. SAMUEL I 18:25; PSALMS 37:14; DANIEL 11:12). These Nephilim, not cited elsewhere in Scripture, subjugated their neighbors

by imposing their rule and exacting tribute. How they were able to do this is clarified by the next two words in the text, B'NEI A-NAQ. If these were giants, they would be Anaqim (just as pygmy offspring are not "children of pygmies" but are pygmies themselves, nor are Zulus called "sons of Zulus"). A discussion of the many nuances embedded in the word A-NA-QIM is beyond our scope here; suffice it that the construct B'NEI ("sons of"), when not associated with an ancestor, does not indicate issue but an affinity group (e. g. B'NEI CHA-YIL [soldiers - DEUTERONOMY 3:18], B'NEI QEH-DEM [Easterners - GENESIS 29:1], B'NEI HA-M'DEE-NAH [residents - EZRA 2:1], B'NEI B'LI-YA-AHL [scoundrels - DEUTERONOMY 13:14]). In Numbers, N'PHEE-LIM who amassed wealth and power (cf. DEUTERONOMY 15:14) were aided by henchmen, like tribal chieftains or modern crime bosses (*another error made by pundits was not paying attention to the punctuation, which caused them to parse this sentence incorrectly*). The Nephilim associated with Anaqites are not those in the prepositional phrase that follows. That N'PHEE-LIM is not related to descent or falling but the root "Peh-Lamed-Aleph", best translated as "awe" or "wonder". These fellows rose to regional prominence to become objects of obeisance inspiring dread and respect (cf. GENESIS 18:14; EXODUS 15:11; DEUTERONOMY 28:59). Society's leadership by those able to convey the wisdom and lore of previous generations was being supplanted by those wielding temporal power.

הָיוּ בְּאֶרֶץ בְּיָמֵי הַהֵם HA-YOO BHA-A-RETZ BA-YA-MIM HA-HEIM (HAD BECOME [PROMINENT] IN THE LAND IN THOSE DAYS): To tell us Nephilim were present, the text would state simply אָז בְּאֶרֶץ OHZ BA-A-RETZ ([WERE] THEN IN THE LAND - cf. GENESIS 12:6, 13:7). HA-YOO BA-A-RETZ coupled with BA-YA-MIM HA-HEIM suggests a condition incompatible with the goals of the B'NEI E-LO-HIM and their wives. This is accentuated by the missing connective "Vav" at the verse's opening (*it should begin U-N'PHEE-LIM HA-YOO [AND N'PHEE-LIM WERE], with no "Heh" definite article*), telling us these acted in opposition to the B'NEI E-LO-HIM.

... וְגַם V'GAM... (AND ALSO [EVEN]...): These simple, unambiguous words nonplussed commentators, for they seem to lead into one lengthy dangling prepositional phrase extending to the verse's end, a strange way to end a chapter. Actually, it falls nicely into place. Young leadership attempted to challenge the influence of these brigands by making an alliance through marriage with the more advanced Adamites; this verse records the failure of this strategy to blunt the power of these local chieftains.

הֵמָּה HEI-MAH (THESE [WERE]): This should be הֵם HEIM (THEY - cf. EXODUS 6:27; NUMBERS 7:2; JOSHUA 9:16), referencing the last-mentioned noun. The "Heh" suffix with Qamatz vowel on the "Mem" is directional (cf. GENESIS 11:31, 12:20, 37:35); when added to a pronoun, it points to an earlier subject noun, here the N'PHEE-LIM with whom this verse began (cf. EXODUS 19:13; LEVITICUS 11:28; NUMBERS 3:9).

הַגִּבּוֹרִים אֲשֶׁר מֵעוֹלָם HA-GI-BOH-RIM A-SHER MEI-OH-LAHM (THE DESPOTS OF OLD): The punctuation ties these three words together; A-SHER ("which") is not descriptive but restrictive (see Exposition to 1:19 - V'KHOHL A-SHER....). These are not the GI-BOH-RIM early readers knew, neither valiant soldiers (JOSHUA 1:14; KINGS II 24:16; JEREMIAH 48:14) nor heroes (JUDGES 5:23; SAMUEL II 1:19; AMOS 2:16). These were the despots (GENESIS 10:8; ISAIAH 5:22) that scourged mankind A-SHER MEI-OH-LAHM ("from time immemorial" - JOSHUA 24:2; ISAIAH 46:9; JEREMIAH 2:20). Lest the reader not catch this, the appositive that follows spells it out unequivocally.

אֲנָשֵׁי הַשָּׁם AN-SHEI HA-SHEIM (PLUNDERERS): "Men of renown", the most common translation, is אֲנָשֵׁי AN-SHEI SHEIM (cf. NUMBERS 16:2; CHRONICLES I 5:24). Other denotations of prominence are נִכְבָּד NIKH-BAHD (HONORED/RESPECTED - cf. GENESIS 34:19; NUMBERS 22:15; SAMUEL I 9:6) or מְהֻלָּל M'HOO-LAHL (PRAISED - cf. SAMUEL II 22:4; CHRONICLES II 23:12). A plural construct followed by a noun with the "Heh" definite article prefix would have to be persons known to readers; the speculations of Hebrew writers who try to associate this "name" with others in various Scriptural passages are exercises in futility, for this is not consistent with textual style. A prefix to a noun not readily identifiable is not a definite article prefix but one which converts a radical root to a

gerundial adjective - "men of destruction (cf. EZEKIEL 6:6; ISAIAH 54:1; LAMENTATIONS 3:11), adding a dimension to the previous passage - strong men who, with their confederates, plundered the countryside.

DECCOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

Community leaders had already usurped power in those days, a condition which persisted even after the Adamite daughters had married sons of prominent families and these unions produced a talented and capable cadre of potential leaders. Instead, the local despots became chieftains who ruled tyrannically since time immemorial, men who despoiled all those under them in the areas they ruled.

The chapter ends on an apprehensive note. The conventional view that these verses record man's descent into sin and depravity was projected to justify expositors' interpretations. Some more inventive Hebrew writers linked terms here to similar expressions elsewhere but such connections are speculative. Scripture is straightforward, committed infractions always explicit; nor is the reader's understanding of transgressions committed taken for granted (see Expositions regarding the missteps in the Garden of Eden and in Cain's confrontation with Abel). The text does not hesitate to label vile actors and their wickedness. What we have here is a description of a social fissure. The Adamite leadership understood their task to be the furtherance of the welfare and ethical development of their communities. Others were more exploitative; those leaders used the power granted them to ensure society's stability and safety, not to promote the welfare of their charges but to enrich themselves and their confederates. This moral conflict created a crisis - and precipitated the purge coming in the next chapter.