

Digging in the Garden of Eden

Mary Phil Korsak^a

Abstract

The paper first presents the translation of Hebrew *Genesis* entitled *At the Start... Genesis Made New*. The new version belongs to the field of ethno-poetics. It intends to take today's listener/reader back in time by capturing the characteristics of the original Hebrew and expressing them through the medium of modern English. If translations may be said to reflect archaeological layers of social history, *At the Start... Genesis Made New* attempts to dig down with the purpose of reaching the deepest layer: critical analysis of terminology in the Garden of Eden story provides insights into the primitive Hebrew society that invented this particular myth more than 3,000 years ago. The paper also looks at the same story as translated in the *Revised Standard Version*, first published as the *Authorised Version* or *King James Bible* in 1661, and *The New English Bible*, published in 1961. Different world views characteristic of European society in recent centuries colours the understanding of the biblical text. The translations are affected in consequence. A comparison between the versions is revealing...

Keywords

YHWH Elohim, man/woman, ground/groundling

This paper hinges on the first book of the *Bible*, commonly known as *Genesis*, and more particularly on chapters 2 and 3, which tell a mythical story about the first man and woman and how they are expelled from the Garden of Eden. It is argued here that the myths that emerge from societies are mirror images of the societies that invent them. Translations on the other hand, whilst seeking to reflect an original text, address the societies for which they are written. Consequently, the translations of an ancient text such as *Genesis* are like so many archaeological layers of social history: they reflect the issues and attitudes of subsequent cultures. The original text and the primitive society that produced it are buried somewhere beneath. In the author's own version of *Genesis*, *At the Start... Genesis Made New (Ats)* (Korsak 1992; 1993), she has tried to dig down to the deepest archaeological layer and through the medium of translation to make the Hebrew text with its difference and distance come alive for the

non-Hebrew reader. We shall look at how this is attempted and venture the question: What, if anything, does *Ats* reveal about primitive Hebrew society?

To illustrate the above, three versions of *Genesis* are introduced. First, *Ats* is presented. As suggested above, the new version intends to take today's listener/reader back in time by capturing the characteristics of the original Hebrew and expressing them through the medium of correct, modern, but not necessarily current English. Second, by way of contrast, *Revised Standard Version (RSV)* is quoted. This translation was first published as *Authorised Version* or *King James Bible* in 1611. In its much revised form, it still remains today the best-loved version of English-speaking peoples. Third, in

^aHigher Institute of Translators and Interpreters of Brussels, Belgium

Correspondent Author:

Mary Phil Korsak, 21 avenue de l'Orée, B-1000, Belgium

contrast again, reference is made to *The New English Bible (NEB)*, written in current English. The *Old Testament* books of the *NEB* were first published in 1970.

Before proceeding further, a few words introduce the book of *Genesis*. It is a patchwork of different traditions approximately dating back to the period, 1200 to 500 BCE. The theme of the book is birth: the Greek word *genesis* means “beginning”, “origin”, and “descent”. Effectively, the book begins with the origins of the world: earth and skies are said to be “born”. The Hebrew word, *toledot*, meaning “birthings”, first used for the generation of earth and skies, is subsequently repeated to introduce successive generations of humankind. The word *toledot*, “birthings” thus comes to mean “history”. From Adam to Noah and Noah’s sons, through the cycles of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the patriarchs are “born” and “give birth”. The book ends with the Joseph story, which points to the “birth” of a people of Jacob’s stock.

Some of these concepts are strange, others have the appeal of the familiar. The birth metaphor applied to created things is a surprising but refreshing alternative to the contemporary, scientific (but none the less mythical?) “big bang”. The use of one word *toledot*, “birthings”, for the creation of the universe and for human generations suggests that the two are linked, that life moves on from creation to history, and that life is going somewhere. Through the transmission of Jewish and Christian teaching, it is suggested here that this view is largely responsible for the concept of progress that pervades Western culture. The story of Joseph situates the birth theme on a political plane: here the Deity, who guides the course of history, is represented watching over the destiny of the Hebrews, his chosen people.

Turning from these generalities to the translation *Ats*, what is new here? *Ats* applies the principles of the German translators Buber and Rosenzweig, who began working on their version of the *Bible* in the

1930s (Buber and Rosenzweig 1930).

One, this means going back to the Hebrew text and rejecting influences that stem directly from translations such as the Greek *Septuagint*, the Latin *Vulgate*, or earlier “consecrated” English versions. Two, the translator is respectful of form as well as content. For instance, the vocabulary of the source language is systematically reflected in the target language. To achieve this, each Hebrew word is carefully studied in all its contexts and the translator searches for an English word to correspond to it. As a result, when a word is repeated in the source text, the corresponding word is repeated in the translated text. The lexicographical research involved requires days, even years. Books, including lexicon, concordance, dictionary, and thesaurus, are essential but they do not provide all the answers. The author has carried words in her head and heart, hopefully waiting for a suitable English equivalent of a particularly difficult Hebrew word to surface. When pursued with care, this contextual method lends itself well to the translation of a poetic text such as *Genesis*.

Why this particular attention to form? Some observations about biblical Hebrew help answer this question. Unlike a modern language, Hebrew is close to its roots. The tri-consonantal root can be discerned in every Hebrew word. Paronyms (etymologically related words) are current and so is assonance. Furthermore, the biblical story-teller delights in word associations, wordplay, and repetitions. They serve as a mnemonic: for centuries, the *Bible* has been learned by heart, recited, and listened to. They also provide significant clues for understanding the biblical message. These linguistic characteristics are reflected in the translation: Hebrew paronyms, assonance, and wordplay are echoed by English paronyms, assonance, and wordplay. In this way, word patterns from the source text emerge in the target text. They have only too often been effaced in the translation process. The experience of the translator who sets out to recover these patterns can be compared to that of an

archaeologist unearthing and fitting together pieces from the past.

This theoretical explanation is now illustrated by examples. For practical purposes, examples are limited to the two main characters in the Garden of Eden story: the human being and the Deity. A first word pattern introduces the human being. It is formed by the Hebrew paronyms *adam* and *adama*. In *Ats*, the paronyms *adam* and *adama* are translated as “groundling” and “ground”: the paronymous link is thus maintained. This solution comes as a surprise to the listener/reader but its unfamiliarity signals that something is to be learned here. Here are the opening verses of the Garden of Eden story with the repetition of the words “groundling” and “ground” from *Ats* 2, 4-9:

On the day YHWH Elohim made earth and skies
no shrub of the field was yet in the earth
no plant of the field had yet sprouted
for YHWH Elohim had not made it rain on the earth
and there was no groundling (adam) to serve the ground
(adama)

But a surge went up from the earth
and gave drink to all the face of the ground (adama)
YHWH Elohim formed the groundling (adam), soil of
the ground (adama)

He blew into its nostrils the blast of life
and the groundling (adam) became a living soul
YHWH Elohim planted a garden in Eden in the east
There he set the groundling (adam) he had formed
YHWH Elohim made sprout from the ground (adama)
all trees attractive to see and good for eating
the tree of life in the middle of the garden
and the tree of the knowing of good and bad (*Ats* 2, 4b-9)

The text presents the human being as a ground-related being. The term *adam*, “groundling”, occurs 24 times in the Garden of Eden story, *adama*, “ground”, eight times. Furthermore, the relationship of “groundling” and “ground” is explicated; the above quotation reveals that “the groundling” is “to serve the ground” (2, 5) and that “the groundling” is formed from “the soil of the ground” (2, 7). These statements

at the beginning of the story are balanced by similar statements at the end of the story: in verse 3, 19, “the groundling” is told that it will “return to the ground”; in verse 3, 23, it is expelled from the garden “to serve the ground from which it was taken”. In summary, the word pattern observed here underscores the biblical vision of two human realities. One, human life is said to follow a cyclic pattern: the groundling comes from the ground and will return to it. Two, the groundling’s vocation to serve the ground is established from the outset, before the garden is planted in Eden. The word pattern signals that caring for the ground (independently of any toil that may or may not be attached to it), is part of the groundling’s destiny.

Is it possible to dig deeper, to discern anything older below the cultural level presented? The author looks at the two words *adam* and *adama* as she would at two pieces of unearthed pottery and observes that *adam* is a masculine noun while *adama* is feminine. At a more basic level, the words suggest that new life is drawn from feminine matter, just as the young of animals and humans emerge from the female body.

Possible significance of the word pattern, groundling/ground, has been illustrated. Another pair of words is now presented: *ish/isha*, “man/woman”. These two words are linked by assonance. The word, *ish*, “man”, occurs three times in the story, the word *isha*, “woman”, 17 times. The word *isha*, “woman”, appears in the text before the word *ish*, “man”. The words *isha*, “woman” and *ish*, “man” occur for the first time in verses 2, 21-23 (to help clarify, *adam* and *ish/isha* are added in brackets).

YHWH Elohim made a swoon fall upon the groundling
(adam)
it slept
He took one of its sides
and closed up the flesh in its place
YHWH Elohim built the side
he had taken from the groundling (adam) into woman
(isha)
He brought her to the groundling (adam)
The groundling (adam) said

This one this time
 is bone from my bones
 flesh from my flesh
 This one shall be called wo-man (isha)
 for from man (ish)
 she has been taken this one (*Ats* 2, 21-23)

In the Hebrew text, the common syllable *ish* in *isha* and *ish* points to that which is shared by the couple. The odd syllable in *isha*, expresses their difference. The contemporary English mind is perhaps not as sensitive to this kind of wordplay as the Hebrew mind. Nevertheless, thanks to a fluke, English reflects these nuances perfectly: “woman” and “man” share a common syllable and “woman” has an extra syllable. To draw attention to these subtleties, in *Ats*, a hyphen is inserted in the word “wo-man”.

In summary, the two word patterns described underscore two human relationships: on the one hand, the interdependence of the human being and the ground and, on the other, the similarity and difference that characterize the human couple.

It is important to notice that *ha-adam*, “the groundling” is a generic term. Several reasons are advanced to support this statement. One, *ha-adam* is presented as both male and female in verse 27 of the preceding chapter, chapter 1:

Elohim created the groundling (ha-adam) in his image
 created it in the image of Elohim
 male and female created them (*Ats* 1, 27)

Two, the Garden of Eden story tells that the one, *ha-adam*, falls asleep and wakes up as two, *isha* and *ish*, “woman” and “man”. Subsequently in this story, *ha-adam* refers to the human couple. For example, when *ha-adam* is cast out of the garden (*Ats* 3, 24), it is clear that man and woman are expelled together. This last observation must be modified, however. In some cases, *ha-adam* refers to the man only but then the presence of woman is always signalled: the two continue to share their “groundling” nature. The third reason is grammatical: the presence of the definite

article *ha*, “the”, before the term *adam*, indicates the presence of a common noun. The definite article is present in the Garden of Eden story up to verse 3, 17. In 3, 17, the article is dropped and Elohim addresses the man by his proper name, “Adam”.

The *RSV* and the *NEB* readings contrast with the above analysis. In both versions, *adam* is translated as “man”, *adama* as “ground”: the paronymous link, *adam/adama*, is lost here. Furthermore, two Hebrew words, *adam* and *ish*, are translated by one English word, “man”. As a result, the term “man” appears 22 times in the *RSV*, 20 times in the *NEB* (three times in *Ats*). In the *RSV* and the *NEB*, the word “man” appears in the text before the word “woman”. Comment on the significance of this is made below. Here are verses 2, 21-23 from the *RSV*:

So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man (adam), and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from the man (adam) he made into a woman (isha) and brought her to the man (adam). Then the man (adam) said,

“This at last is bone of my bones
 and flesh of my flesh
 she shall be called Woman (isha)
 because she was taken out of Man (ish)” (*RSV* 2, 21-23)

Turning now from the human being to the Deity, two divine names have already appeared in quotation from *Ats*. They are YHWH and Elohim. YHWH transliterates the four Hebrew consonants, *yod he vav he*, known as the tetragrammaton. These consonants share a common root with the Hebrew verb “to be”. The key to the pronunciation of the tetragrammaton is lost. When the Hebrew text is read aloud, Jewish tradition proposes different solutions. The reader may check beforehand to see where the tetragrammaton appears, preparing to pause for a second and observe a respectful silence. Or the tetragrammaton is read as though it were written *Adonai*, “My Lord(s)” (the name *Jehovah* is a hybrid composition which combines the consonants of the tetragrammaton with

the vowels of *Adonai*). Or again it is read as *ha-Shem*, meaning “the Name”. Whichever solution is adopted, the personal name of God is taboo, and is veiled in mystery. The transliteration YHWH in *Ats* intends to reflect Hebrew-Jewish usage.

The name Elohim is the plural form of *Eloah*, which is related to Arabic *Allah*. The ending *im* is a masculine plural ending. Elohim shares a common root with the verb, “worship”. The Hebrew name Elohim, usually translated as “God” (*RSV* and *NEB*), is maintained as such in *Ats*. This choice respectfully acknowledges the Hebrew source and preserves local colour (cf. the use of Allah in English versions of the *Koran*). The maintaining of the names YHWH and Elohim in the English text is part of the digging down process described earlier. Let us dig a little further...

The plural aspect of Elohim has been noted. And the accompanying verb? It is usually singular, as seen in the quotations. Nonetheless, a sense of plurality again appears in the following verse where YHWH Elohim refers to himself as “us”:

Here, the groundling has become as one of us (*Ats* 3, 22)

Commentators explain this usage by interpreting “us” as a plural of majesty but grammatical analysis does not bear this out. Effectively, Elohim’s plural aspect, expressed here in the pronoun “us”, is strikingly rendered in three other verses of *Genesis* (20, 13; 31, 53; and 35, 7) where the name Elohim is followed by a verb in the third person plural. It is difficult to harmonize this plural aspect with the ancient monotheistic belief that images the God of the Hebrews as a singular being. Does this suggest that the name Elohim is reminiscent of a time that is older than monotheism?

Two further observations are now made about the Deity. First, in the Garden of Eden story, divine actions are portrayed in anthropomorphic terms. YHWH Elohim plants a garden, forms the groundling from the soil of the ground, talks with it, forms the

animals as potential companions, builds the woman from the groundling’s side, walks in the garden, professes ignorance of what goes on in his absence, and sanctions transgression. The analytical, often literal, contemporary mind is led to ask: Is this true? Some readers opt for a literal interpretation. Others understand that the language of myth addresses the non-literal: the sociological, the psychological, and the spiritual.

Another aspect of the Deity concerns the connection between YHWH Elohim and what is bad. YHWH Elohim is said to know good and bad (the author’s emphasis). This is illustrated three times in the story. Verse 2, 9 tells that YHWH Elohim plants the tree of the knowing of good and bad:

YHWH Elohim made sprout from the ground
all trees attractive to see and good for eating
the tree of life in the middle of the garden
and the tree of the knowing of good and bad (*Ats* 2, 9)

In verse 3, 5, the serpent tells the woman:

you will be as Elohim knowing good and bad (*Ats* 3, 5)

The serpent’s words are confirmed by YHWH Elohim, when he says in verse 3, 22:

Here, the groundling has become as one of us
knowing good and bad (*Ats* 3, 22)

The Hebrew text raises an interesting question here: what kind of Deity is this who is responsible for introducing the knowing of good and bad into the world (the planting of the tree) and who has as a special divine attributed the knowing of good and bad (the words of the serpent and YHWH Elohim)? Again we seem to touch on something more ancient, more primitive than a wholly good image of God. The question is left open.

Where the Hebrew text states clearly that Elohim knows good and bad, the *NEB* mitigates the impact of

the God/bad connection, by translating Elohim as “gods knowing both good and evil” (3, 5) (the author’s emphasis). The plural form and small letter point to other “gods” than Elohim (the variant “God” is found in the relevant footnote). The translation “evil” affects a shift to the moral plane. Further comment on this is made below.

We have looked at certain aspects of the human being and the Deity in the Garden of Eden story. Questions are now asked about the society which invented this myth. In this respect, the so-called “curses” are revealing. They mark the turning-point at which the human couple leaves the symbolic world of the Garden for the world of everyday reality. The “curses” provide clues about the social position of woman and man in the real world. In the Hebrew text, YHWH Elohim tells the woman that she will give birth at the cost of labour, that sexual desire will attach her to her partner, and that her desire will be subject to his control. Birth, sexual desire, the control of her sexual behaviour: her place in society is bound to her life-producing capacity. Here is verse 3, 16 from *Ats*:

To the woman he said
Increase! I will increase
your pains and your conceivings
With pains you shall breed sons
For your man your longing
and he, he shall rule you (*Ats* 3, 16)

The presentation of woman as an essential source of life is confirmed in verse 3, 20, when the groundling gives the woman a new name:

The groundling called his woman’s name Life (Eve)
for she is the mother of all that lives (*Ats* 3, 20) (the author’s emphasis)

The Hebrew name *Hawwa*, here translated as “Life” (in its anglicized form “Eve”) is linked through assonance to the root *haya*, “to live” and its derivation *hay* in *qol hay*, “all that lives”. When the

wordplay is translated, the listener/reader thinks of Eve in terms of “life”: she is “life-giver” through her motherhood.

In contrast, here is the same verse 3, 20 from the *RSV* and *NEB* versions respectively:

The man called his wife’s name Eve, because she was the mother of all living (*RSV*). The man called his wife Eve because she was mother of all who live (*NEB*) (the author’s emphasis)

In the absence of wordplay, the emphasis naturally falls on the word “mother”. Whereas Eve as life-giver is not subject to moral judgement, as mother she is: she may be a good or a bad mother. Further comment is made below.

Adam, on the other hand, is told that he will labour to grow (presumably) cereals. He is responsible for food production. We are also told that at the end of life comes death. Here are the words addressed to Adam in verses 3, 17-19:

cursed is the ground for you
With pains you shall eat of it
all the days of your life
Thorn and thistle it shall sprout for you
You shall eat the plants of the field
With the sweat of your face you shall eat bread
till you return to the ground
for from it you were taken
for soil you are and to the soil you shall return (*Ats* 3,
17-19)

Life-sustaining food. Life and death. This society is concerned with survival! A hypothesis is now proposed to explain how the story arose. The members of an agricultural society turn from the cares of child-raising and the daily grind in the fields to seek a pattern and meaning for their life experience. They ask themselves: Where does life come from? How has the world come to be: the trees and the animals and ourselves? Why this mixed experience of good and bad in our lives? Where are we going? The answers to these eternal conundrums are inaccessible and their

mystery is expressed here in the symbolic language of myth. The story springs from a human situation. It assigns causes to that situation and in this sense is an aetiological story. Furthermore, the story establishes set patterns: it defines and stabilizes a series of relationships, that of the human being and the earth, of man and woman, and of the human being and the Deity.

The first and major part of this paper has presented two pairs of Hebrew words, *adam/adama* and *ish/isha* and examined their implications for understanding the Hebrew image of the human being. It has looked at two divine names, YHWH and Elohim, and used these as a starting point for observations about the Hebrew image of the Deity. Furthermore, it has proposed a hypothesis about the origins of the Garden of Eden story. It has also noted the reciprocal influence of society on text and text on society. A vast leap is now made into the twentieth century. To facilitate comparison, here also commentary is limited to conceptions of the human being and the Deity.

The Oxford Annotated Bible, which is a 1962 edition of the *RSV*, is accompanied by footnotes to guide the reader's understanding. These footnotes reveal a different world view whose beginnings can be traced back to the puritanical, patriarchal period that saw the first heroic translations of the *Bible* in the vernacular (one remembers with respect men such as Tyndale, an outstanding English scholar, who translated the *Bible* and diffused his work at the cost of his life. He was executed in 1536). In *The Oxford Annotated Bible*, the Garden of Eden story is given a title: "The creation and the fall of man". A series of footnotes are selected here in the *RSV* order of presentation.

Man is ...dust animated by the Lord God's breath or spirit. The prohibition against eating the forbidden fruit (3, 3) stresses God's lordship and man's obedience. The deep affinity between man and woman is portrayed in the statement that God made the woman from man's rib (24-25). Sex is not regarded as evil but as a God-given impulse which

draws man and woman together so that they become one flesh. The temptation begins with the insinuation of doubt (1-3), increases as suspicion is cast upon God's motive (4-5). Bodily shame (2, 25) symbolises inner anxiety about a broken relationship with God (8-13). Such anxiety leads to a guilty attempt to hide from God. This divine judgement contains an old explanation of woman's pain in childbearing, her sexual desire for her husband (i.e. her motherly impulse, cf. 30, 1) and her subordinate position to man in ancient society. Work is not essentially evil (2, 15) but becomes toil as a result of man's broken relationship with his Creator (the author's emphasis).

These notes address the moral conscience of the individual. They suggest that the Garden of Eden story is part of an ongoing sequence, which accounts for human fragility. Human nature has "fallen" from grace. Man must be aware that without God, he is nothing: he is "dust animated by the Lord God's breath or spirit". Such words as "fall", "evil", "temptation", "doubt", "suspicion", and "broken relationship" carry moral overtones. Man's toil is the "result" of his "broken relationship with his Creator". Note that the wordplay that emphasizes man's natural relationship to the ground is not apparent. The words, "prohibition", "forbidden", "guilty", "punishment", and "time of judgement" evoke a scene of trial and punishment. Through disobedience, man fails that trial.

Furthermore, divine and human relationships are presented in hierarchical order. "Lordship" establishes God at the top of the hierarchy. Man owes God "obedience". Woman's position is lower down the scale: she is in a "subordinate position to man" or was so "in ancient society". Reading between the lines, it is striking that nothing is said about divine responsibility for the good and the bad that are part of human experience. The onus of what is bad is placed on human shoulders, whence human guilt and lowliness. As one word, "man" translates Hebrew *adam* and *ish*, and the word "man" dominates the entire story: woman is made "from man's rib". "Sex", according to the notes, "is not regarded as evil". As

nothing in the story suggests that sex is evil, this concept comes from elsewhere, namely from the society the text is now addressing. A woman's sexual desire for her husband is curiously defined as "her motherly impulse". Is this to be traced back to the naming of Eve (3, 22) and the emphasis laid on motherhood?

The *RSV* translation corresponds to the world view expressed in the notes. The "Lord God" is a masculine figure at the apex of a hierarchy. The word "man" dominates the text. And the woman? Here are the words addressed to the woman from the *RSV*:

To the woman he said
I will greatly multiply your pain in childbearing
in pain you shall bring forth children
yet your desire shall be for your husband
and he shall rule over you (*RSV* 3, 16)

According to the *RSV*, she knows "pain", where Adam is subject to "toil", though the Hebrew word translated as "pain" and "toil" is the same in both cases. The *NEB* proposes a more exact translation when it repeats the word "labour": she labours in childbirth; he/they labour in the field. Nonetheless, the *NEB* is harsh on the woman:

I will increase your labour and you groaning
And in labour you shall bear children
You shall be eager for your husband
and he shall be your master (*NEB* 3, 16)

To further remark, the *NEB* first came out at the end of the nineteen sixties. Yet another world view, affected by the competitive spirit of the times, colours the translation. Note that the "master", just quoted, is given a further boost when the words "win" and "gain" translate the Hebrew verb for "eat" in verses 3, 17 and 19:

With labour you shall win your food from it (*NEB* 3, 17).
You shall gain your bread by the sweat of your brow
(*NEB* 3, 19) (the author's emphasis)

CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, this brief analysis has introduced *Genesis* as a book about life and birth. It has emphasized the close links between Hebrew language and Hebrew concepts, illustrating this by showing how the word patterns "groundling/ground" and "man/woman" underscore Hebrew understanding of human roles and relationships. It has looked at Hebrew names for God, pointing out the inscrutable nature of the tetragrammaton and, by adopting a both/and rather than an either/or approach, it has drawn attention to ancient concepts of the Deity: Elohim has both singular and plural aspects; Elohim knows both good and bad. After proposing a hypothesis about the society that invented the Garden of Eden story, it has suggested that subsequent world views revise the myth and that translations are affected in consequence.

The reference to different world views is not meant to be judgmental. One view may be as valid as another. Among competing realities, none is necessarily better. People take and make their own world views. Does this mean there is no more sacred? Translators, dig away! These tasks, creative retranslation and interpretation, maybe touch upon the sacred. They link up with the ongoing process of life.

References

- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (The Stuttgart Hebrew Bible)*. 1969. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.
- Buber, M. and F. Rosenzweig. 1930. *Im Anfang (In the Beginning)*. Berlin: Lambert Schneider.
- Chouraqui, A. 1982. *L'univers de la Bible. Tome I, Entête (The World of the Bible. Volume 1, At the Head...)*. Paris: Brepols.
- Eisenberg, J. and A. Abecassis. 1979. *A Bible Ouverte II. Et Dieu créa Eve (Opening the Bible II. And God Created Eve)*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Korsak, M. P. 1992. *At the Start... Genesis Made New: A Translation of the Hebrew Text (European Series, Louvain Cahiers, no. 124)*. Louvain: Leuvense Schrijversaktie.
- . 1993. *At the Start... Genesis Made New*. New York:

- Doubleday.
- Meyers, C. 1988. *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context*. Oxford University Press.
- Moulton, H. K. 1989. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Speiser, E. A. 1982. *Genesis. The Anchor Bible*. New York: Doubleday.
- Stanton, E. C. 1895. *The Woman's Bible. Introduction*. Edinburgh: Polygon.
- The New English Bible*. 1970. UK: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press.

The Revised Standard Version. 1973. New York and London: Collins.

Trible, P. 1973. "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 41(1):30-48.

Bio

Mary Phil Korsak, M.A. (Oxon.), lecturer, Higher Institute of Translators and Interpreters of Brussels, Belgium; research fields: Bible, translation and interpretation.