

as early as the second century BCE. The Greek preposition *kat*, “opposite, over against,” was used to translate the phrase in Genesis in the Septuagint, around 250 BCE. Since the Greek translation (most likely made in Alexandria) represents a Jewish understanding of the text at the time of the translator, it is likely that the shift in meaning had occurred by then.

These late meanings of *neged* that evolved as part of a complicated extension of earlier uses and a remapping of its semantics and applications gave rise also to the senses “hostile” and “legal adversary.” They may not be read back into a story written about a thousand years before in a much earlier form of Hebrew. Such backreading results in an anachronistic comprehension of what was meant.

Hebrew underwent significant changes after 586 BCE, when Jerusalem was destroyed and its elite groups of temple officials, royal administrators, and scribes were deported to Babylonia. The evolved form of the spoken language that emerged as a literary language circa the first century CE is usually referred to as Rabbinic, Tannaitic, or Mishnaic Hebrew even though it was in use before there were Tannaim, rabbis, or the written Mishnah. Hillel and Jesus and Paul may have read and studied biblical Hebrew, but when speaking to their followers and fellow Jews, shopping in the market, and conversing about religious ideas, if they spoke in Hebrew, and not Aramaic or Greek, they spoke this evolved form of the language. See E. Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Leiden: Brill, 1982, pp. 87–146; M. Bar-Asher, “Mishnaic Hebrew: An Introductory Survey,” *Hebrew Studies* 40 (1999): 115–51.

18. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987, p. 391.

19. The difference between the two words involves a slight change in the point of articulation of the middle consonant on the hard palate. The different pronunciations arose to distinguish between the significantly different types of kin referred to by the original *neged*. In other words, when used to refer to descendants, *neged* became *neked*. From Rabbinic through Modern Hebrew, *neked* refers to a direct descendent of the third generation, a grandchild.

Chapter 12. The First Lady

1. See E. Bloch-Smith, *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs about the Dead* (= Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 123), Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992; G. Barkay, “Tombs and Entombment in Judah during the Biblical Period” (Hebrew), in I. Singer, ed., *q̄brym wmnhgy qbwrh b'rš ysr'l b't h'tyqh* (*Graves and Burial Customs in the Land of Israel in Antiquity*), Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhaq Ben Tsvi, 1994, pp. 96–164.

2. T. H. Gaster, *Myth, Legend and Custom in the Old Testament*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, pp. 21, 330 (where the literature covering the history of this proposal and arguments both for and against it are cited). S. N. Kramer continued to cham-

pion this interpretation in *History Begins at Sumer* (third revised edition), Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981, pp. 141–47.

3. According to some Sumerologists, this particular myth is both humorous and pun-filled, but apparently not with regard to the rib = life equation. See K. Dickson, “Enki and the Embodied World,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 125 (2005): 505.

4. H. Goedicke, “Adam’s Rib,” in A. Kort and S. Morschauser, eds., *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985, pp. 75–76.

5. This citation from *Bereshith Rabbah* is excerpted from one of the harshest descriptions in rabbinic literature of disadvantages accruing to women as a result of Hawwa’s actions. For an extensive discussion of the larger text in the context of rabbinic culture, see J. R. Baskin, *Midrashic Women: Formations of the Feminine in Rabbinic Literature*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2002, pp. 65–73.

6. L. B. Arey, *Developmental Anatomy*, Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1954, pp. 332–35; K. L. Moore, *Clinically Oriented Anatomy* (third edition), Baltimore, MD: Williams and Wilkins, 1992, pp. 149, 297, 313. Hypospadias occurs in one out of five hundred newborn males. A similar, readily observable raphé is found along the join where the two parts of the hard palate meet in the roof of the mouths of both males and females. This may be checked with a mirror.

7. S. F. Gilbert and Z. Zevit, “Congenital Human Baculum Deficiency: The Generative Bone of Genesis 2:21–23,” *American Journal of Medical Genetics* 101:3 (July 2001): 284–85. Information from this publication combined with data from a lecture that I presented to the Catholic Biblical Association in 2004 were worked into a humorous treatment of the story of Hawwa’s origin. See J. Kaltner, S. L. McKenzie, and J. Kilpatrick, *The Uncensored Bible: The Bawdy and Naughty Bits of the Good Book*, New York: HarperOne, 2008, pp. xi–xiii, 1–11.

8. This midrash also occurs in a slightly different formulation in *Bereshith Rabbah* 18:2, where it is quoted in the name of R. Levi, the teacher of R. Joshua, and where the language has been changed: “and not from the hand . . . and not from the foot . . . but from the place which is modest [*mimmeqōwm šehūw’ šānūwa’*] in man. Even when man stands naked, that place is covered.” Here R. Joshua’s midrash has been combined with that of R. Hanina. My late colleague Eliezer Slomovic drew my attention to R. Joshua’s midrash after perusing a very early draft of this chapter.

A thematically similar interpretation is found in Thomas Aquinas (1224–74) but to a different end: “It was right for the woman to be made from a rib of man. First, to signify the social union of man and woman, for the woman should neither use authority over man, and so she was not made from his head; nor was it right for her to be subject to man’s contempt as his slave, and so she was not made from his feet. Secondly, for the sacramental signification; for from the side of Christ sleeping on the Cross the Sacraments flowed—namely, blood and water—on which the Church was

established” (from *Summa Theologica*, Question XCII, third article, cited in L. A. Bell, *Visions of Women*, Clifton, NJ: Humana Press, 1983, p. 106).

9. CAD, s.v. *ṣēlû*; Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez*, p. 54. The Ge'ez word for rib is *gabo*.

10. The Arabic consonant *d* sometimes corresponds to Hebrew *ṣ*. This sense for the Arabic is confirmed by another Hebrew cognate, the verb *ṣāla'*, “to limp,” which refers to a type of hobbling gait involving lateral deviation from the direction of movement.

11. For comments on the methodology of this lexicographic analysis within the broader discussion of the semantics of dead languages, see P. Fronzaroli, “Componential Analysis,” *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 6 (1993): 79–86; J. H. Hospers, “Polysemy and Homonymy,” *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 6 (1993): 117–21.

12. Similar circumlocutions are attested in Hittite. The vulva is referred to by an expression that translates literally as “what she has below,” while the penis is referred to by one word that translates as “manhood” and another as “stem” or “stalk.” See H. A. Hoffner, “From Head to Toe in Hittite: The Language of the Human Body,” in J. E. Coleson and V. H. Matthews, eds., *Go to the Land I Will Show You: Studies in Honor of Dwight W. Young*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996, p. 249.

13. A number of the passages cited below in the chapter are difficult with regard to both their syntax and lower critical issues; commentaries should be consulted.

14. See also Ugaritic *yd*, “hand” with the sense of “penis,” in M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartin, *Die keilalphabetische Texte aus Ugarit*, Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1976 (hereafter *KTU*), 1.10:III.7; 1.23:33; 1.24:8, and *ʾuṣb't*, “finger,” with the same meaning in *KTU* 1.10:III.8.

15. M. Delcor, “Two Special Meanings of the Word *yd* in the Hebrew Bible,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 12 (1967): 234–40; S. Paul, “The ‘Plural of Ecstasy’ in Mesopotamian and Biblical Love Poetry,” in Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, M. Sokoloff, eds., *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995, p. 593 n. 30.

16. Z. Zevit, “Syntagms in Biblical Hebrew: Four Short Studies,” in G. Geiger and M. Pazzini, eds., *En pāsē grammatikē kai sophiā: Saggi di linguistica ebraica in onore di Alviero Niccacci, ofm*, Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2011, pp. 397, 402. The asterisk before the word indicates that it is a reconstructed form based on attested forms with prefixes or suffixes and slightly different patterns of vowels.

17. This noun, occurring only once in the Bible, is derived from the root *b-w-ṣ*, “to be embarrassed, ashamed.” In Deuteronomy 25:11 it appears in a form that may be either plural or dual with a possessive pronominal suffix. It could be translated as “his testicles” (if dual) or “his genitals” (if an abstract plural). It is a stretch to render it “penis.” Martin Luther rendered it *Scham*, “shame,” in the singular. The Samaritan Pentateuch reads *mbśrw* in this passage that may refer to “his meat.” See the next word on the list. I thank Mordechai Rotenberg of the Hebrew University for reminding me of this word (private communication, March 11, 2008).

18. See also Ugaritic *bšr*, “meat, flesh” with the sense “penis” in *KTU* 1.24:9. It refers to female genitalia in Leviticus 15:19.

19. In a form derived from the base **yarekāh* or **yerēkāh*, it occurs once in the singular (Gen 49:13) and twenty-seven times in the dual absolute—for example, Exodus 26:23; 36:28; Ezekiel 46:19—and construct to indicate distance or remoteness, for example, Judges 19:18; 1 Samuel 24:4; Isaiah 14:15; Amos 6:10; Jonah 1:5. Although the masculine dual, referring to “hips” or “loins,” occurs twice (Exod 28:42; Song of Songs 7:2), this is rare. The dual of **hālāš*, *hālāšayim* is used for this more commonly, a total of ten times—for example, Isaiah 5:27; 32:11; Jeremiah 30:6. The word *hālāšayim* is also used figuratively, referring to the male source of virility (Gen 35:11; 1 Kings 8:19; 2 Chr 6:9), but not specifically to the penis. (The asterisk above indicates that this form of the word has been reconstructed by scholars on the basis of other attested forms.)

Such observations lead A. T. Reisenberger to conclude that “side” was the primary meaning of *šēlaʿ* and that the noun indicates that the woman was created as the man’s equal. Reisenberger is the first contemporary scholar of whom I am aware to question the rib meaning of *šēlaʿ*, but her conclusion as to what it means is inexact. See A. T. Reisenberger, “The Creation of Adam as Hermaphrodite and Its Implications for Feminist Theology,” *Judaism* 42:4 (1993): 449, 451–52.

20. The word *yārēk* may refer to female genitalia in the prescriptive ritual of the “cursing waters” ordeal (Num 5:21, 22, 27), but the details of what happens to the woman suspected of adultery as a consequence of that ritual are far from clear.

21. This interpretation of the expression was first ventured by S. Gevartz, who supported it with his provocative suggestion that the term *gīyd hannāšeh* (Gen 32:33)—usually taken as a reference to the sciatic nerve or a muscle in the thigh—may contain a pun between the sound /nš/ in *nāšeh*, “sinew,” and words for man—in Hebrew, *ʿenōš*; in Ugaritic, *bnš*; and in Aramaic, *ʿenāš*—and that the term referred to penis, that is, the “sinew of the male.” See S. Gevartz, “Of Patriarchs and Puns: Joseph at the Fountain, Jacob at the Ford,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 46 (1975): 52–53.

22. Among pre-classical Greeks, some myths attest to the notion that it was possible to be born from various parts of the male body: head, thighs, and knees. An underlying idea seems to have been that “seed” was located either in body cavities or in parts of the body filled with fluid or with marrow. See R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 174–84. In Hittite, an Indo-European language connected both to Greek and to Sanskrit that was used in what is now central Turkey, the word *genu*, connected etymologically to English *genus*, means both “knee” and “penis.” The notion may have also originated from the observation of extraneous limbs or attached birth—Siamese twin—phenomena in which it appears that one body part or even a whole body grows out of another part. This is referred to technically as *polymelia*.

23. The human system involves increased blood flow into the corpora cavernosa, two tubes of spongy tissue that extend the length of the penile shaft.

24. Gilbert and Zevit, “Congenital Human Baculum Deficiency,” p. 284. See also S. Sisson and J. D. Grossman, *The Anatomy of Domestic Animals*, Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953, p. 604; H. Scheibeitz and H. Wilkins, *Atlas Radiographic Anatomy of the Dog and Cat* (third edition), Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1978, pp. 66–67; D. P. Sarma and T. G. Weilbaeher, “Human *os penis*,” *Urology* 35 (1990): 349–50.

25. My daughter called me one evening to share a story about my then three-year-old grandson. Earlier that evening, while bathing, he examined his penis closely, looked up to her, and commented, “You know, Eema, my penis doesn’t have a bone.” Could the etiological story have its roots in a similar conversation that took place three thousand years ago?

26. Genesis 6:20; 7:3, 9, 16; Leviticus 3:1, 6.

27. For bonobos, see Frans B. M. de Waal, “Bamboo Sex and Society,” *Scientific American* (March 1995): 82–83, available at <http://www.songweaver.com/info/bonobos.html> (viewed June 26, 2009). For the western gorilla, see Wildlife Conservation Society, “Unique Mating Photos of Wild Gorillas Face to Face,” *Science Daily*, February 13, 2008, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/02/080212134818.htm> (viewed July 12, 2012).

28. Monkeys were known only as rare, exotic imported animals (1 Kings 10:22). They were most likely imported either overland from Lower Egypt or via the Red Sea trade routes.

29. Robinson Jeffers portrayed male animal–female human sex as a mystical union in his powerful poem “Roan Stallion.” Jeffers’s stark, powerful, and somewhat unsettling work may be used imaginatively to try to grasp intuitively how such unions may have been understood by Greek mythographers when thinking religiously, not raunchily.

30. Hennie J. Marsman, *Women in Ugarit and Israel: Their Social and Religious Position in the Context of the Ancient Near East*, Leiden: Brill, 2003, pp. 707–8.

Chapter 13. Why “Therefore”?

1. Technically, the first italicized Hebrew word in the passage should be vocalized as *ya’azob*, indicating a short o-*qāmaṣ*, as in the Hebrew text, where it is bound with the following noun: *ya’azob-’īyš*. I transliterate it as a freestanding form for the sake of convenience.

2. M. Shevack, *Adam and Eve: Marriage Secrets from the Garden of Eden*, New York: Paulist Press, 2003, p. 196. For the complete homily, see pp. 193–200.

3. Calvin, *Commentary on Genesis*.

4. Rashi’s “incest” interpretation is prompted by eisegetical comments in the Babylonian Talmud, edited about four centuries before his time: