

JHH Weiler

New York University School of Law, the USA

e-mail: weilersoffice@nyu.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-9655-8417

THE MOTHER OF ALL LIVING: RE-READING THE STORY OF EVE (AND ADAM)

Abstract

This is a re-reading and retelling of the story of Eve and Adam. It argues that the action of Eve was at one and the same time Ascent – completing our creation as humans with moral agency, a condition for meaningful *Imitatio Dei* – and Fall – giving an additional nuance to Original Sin – not merely disobedience but rejection of the very meaning of humanity and liberty offered by the Holy One Blessed Be He. We owe, thus, to Eve the richness of our human existence – with joy and sorrow, with freedom to do good but potential to be sinful, in an eternal search for sanctification and salvation.

KEYWORDS

Genesis, creation, Adam and Eve, moral agency, original sin, garden of Eden, the fall, *Imitatio Dei*

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE

Księga Rodzaju, stworzenie, Adam i Ewa, działanie moralne, grzech pierworodny, ogród Eden, upadek, *Imitatio Dei*

I. WHY RE-READING

The point of departure is, and must be, that the Bible as a whole and the Pentateuch, in particular, are texts, based on and infused with a patriarchal *Weltanschauung*. It is in many ways an anti-feminist text. No apologetics can or should obscure this reality. Given the huge influence of the Bible on Western civilization it accounts for many of the attitudes which prevailed and still prevail in our societies, including secular societies (which is most of Europe). Since the Pentateuch is in large part Nomistic, this *Weltanschauung* has also permeated into language and into law. The most striking example of this Biblical prejudice, disconcerting, is that Revelation at Sinai and the Covenant were addressed to men (Ex. 19:15).

For the secular and scientific readership, this is not a particularly troubling or at least not an unexpected issue. The Bible, great literature as it might be, is the product of human minds and human hands. Human minds and human hands are located in specific historical, social and cultural contexts just as, say, we find in the Iliad and Odyssey. As such it reflects the cultural habits and moral sensibilities of such contexts. And since these, across time and across space, have been predominantly patriarchal, there is nothing to marvel that they are reflected in the Biblical narratives.

The religious reader, however, is faced with a dilemma. In its most classical form, it presents itself when contemporary moral sensibilities find themselves at odds with Biblical normativity. It is a dilemma which, as is well known and endlessly explored, does not lend itself to easy solutions. If we are to automatically prefer our contemporary sensibilities and displace Biblical normativity when such a conflict presents itself, we are, willy nilly, giving proof to the Lockian and Freudian proposition: It was not God who created men and women, but it is men and women who created God both as a means for giving meaning to one's life as well as to use the alleged divine authority to legitimate human-made norms and moral propositions.

One of the classical attempts in religious thinking to resolve this classical dilemma is the notion that the Almighty endowed His (his? her?) human creations with the faculty to discern between good and evil and as such these determinations are part of the revealed creative design. But grant me that this is far from a perfect solution and is persuasive mostly to those already convinced. It may work well when there is no explicit revealed Biblical norm. The non-religious might just shrug and say, often condescendingly: "If you wish to imbue, say, Kantian autonomous ethics with a transcendental divine aura, may your god bless you." But we know the limitations to this solution and particularly two: First, when religious authorities grapple with finely balanced moral dilemmas they oftentimes resort to the authority of the decisor who is sometimes said to be guided by divine inspiration. And, second, what does one do when our God given faculty of moral discernment conflict with *explicit* Biblical normativity?

The dilemma is perhaps more acute for observant and pious Jews than it is for Christians because a great many of the conflicts between explicit Biblical norms and contemporary moral sensibilities derive from the Law of Moses (Nomos) which, in Christian faith was fulfilled through Jesus, and became obsolete under the New Covenant. But when it comes to Patriarchy and gender equality, the New Testament can be, as is well known, as challenging as the Old Testament. When we read in Gen. 1:27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" – (a radical statement of equality), we almost immediately find: "[Y]our desire shall be for your husband and he shall rule over you." (Gen. 3:16).

Or when St Paul teaches in Galatians 3:28: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." – (another radical statement of equality) – we find, by the same Paul: "As in all congregations of the Lord's people, Women should remain silent in the churches, They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission, as the Law says." (Cor.14:33-35).

The fundamental statements of equality become thus exceptions which prove the rule – statements which were subsumed, forgotten, and twisted, but with little impact on the ensuing civilization including within religious civilization.

How, then, does the religious reader, or should the religious reader, understand, *Imitatio Dei* – the wish (and command) to walk in the ways of the Lord – when these ways seem to clash with contemporary moral sensibilities? Do I follow my divinely endowed faculties of moral discernment, or the logos of Biblical narrative? Or put differently, how should one read these morally challenging texts?

Let me reassure and reader who has endured my text so far: I am not about to offer some ingenious original solution to this dilemma. Indeed, I would suggest that like similar challenging dilemmas (such as the tension between the religious belief in an Omniscient God which suggests determinism, and another foundational religious belief in free choice and moral agency) the very need of grappling with these issues is the lot of *homo religiosus* and is part of the phenomenology and experience of the life of the faithful.

Instead, I want to suggest an additional way (and of course, here too, I make no claim to originality) of framing the dilemma and propose that in this very framing there is a seed if not of a solution but at least of a different way of thinking about the issue. In order not to transgress on interreligious sensibilities my analysis henceforth will be limited to my reading and understanding of the so-called Old Testament.

Whether through the living and inerrant word of God or through human creation divinely inspired, the Biblical narrative emerged as a normative text given at a specific historical moment and addressed to a human community existing at that moment. In many ways, not least in the understanding of the very notions of the Divine, of Holiness and the Sacred it was a revolutionary message eventually

reduced to Scripture. The very ontology of Abrahamic Monotheism – *One God, Transcendent* (yet immanent in His creation and at moments of revelation) and *Covenantal* was new, antithetical to previous experiences (consider the experience of religion of the Israelites in Egypt), and extremely challenging (consider the speed and ease with which, when Moses disappeared up the Mountain, a Golden Calf was created). Abrahamic monotheism is revolutionary. Abrahamic monotheism is hard. Abrahamic monotheism often goes against human natural desires and instincts. Go too fast and the Covenant is destined to failure as forty years in the desert demonstrated.

So, for example, we find in Exodus elaborate Nomos on the right way to handle slaves in full contradiction with the very message of exodus from slavery to liberty in the very same text. The slavery rules may be enlightened, perhaps, compared to then-contemporary practices, but sanctioning slavery nonetheless. It might have been just too much to expect a slave mentality to change overnight or even over forty years...¹ Animal sacrifice, a fairly primitive manner (in my view) of relating to the Almighty might fall into the same category. Limited in Mosaic Nomos in the manner, time, and place it could happen but not excluded until the fall of the Temple. In some ways the clash between the grand statements of principle such as we saw in Genesis and Paul and the subsequent retreat from them in detail is but an example of the clash between the eternal ideal and the art of the possible. This should not be a recipe for an easy dismissal of any nomistic norm which does not appeal to us by regarding it as historically contextual. But the fact that both types of norms are scripturally valid imposes a constant hermeneutic imperative towards reconciliation. Religious authorities over the millennia have recognized such and acted, explicitly or *sub silentio*, in this manner. The claims made on both sides of this divide (orthodoxy v progress) to be more authentically ‘scriptural’ are hard to justify. As long as both positions are taken with the good faith and the good Faith of honoring the almighty and walking in his way, and not as camouflage for pre-religious commitments, both may be considered the “living word of God”.

This very hermeneutic tension between the grand principle and its specific actuation in time and place – both of which have significant normative weight – almost cries for, even mandates re-exploration, re-interpretation, and re-harmonization. One can do such in a more “conservative” manner or a more “liberal” manner, but no one can escape such if the Biblical narrative is not to descend into an archeological artifact.

In this essay, I will not explore the clash of explicit norms but focus on narrative within which are embedded social and spiritual sensibilities as we saw in

¹ And indeed, pious church-going slave holders in the American Southern states and in South Africa relied explicitly on such texts to legitimate (and assuage their consciences, perhaps) the practice as divinely permitted – disregarding in the process endless authoritative interpretations which indicated that the Exodus law was not relevant to contemporary conditions.

the two examples I brought above from the story of creation and the revelation at Sinai. My focus will be on the narrative of Adam and Eve seeing how fundamental they have been in instilling patriarchal sensibilities – Eve, a woman, the author of Original Sin, the temptress of Man, the precipitator of the Fall.

For the dwindling community of the faithful, who regard the Bible as containing eternal wisdom and some pithy transcendental truths, it is possible and, in my view, necessary (and I am certainly not the first, second, or third to suggest this) to see below the surface a much more nuanced *Weltanschauung* to the standard patriarchal stereotype, a worldview which privileges the role of women in unexpected, *and decisive*, ways.

Nota bene: This is not to say, “if you only read carefully, it is not a patriarchal text.” It is. But a focus on these below-the-surface readings enables us to discover or highlight not simply that women played a much more decisive role than would appear (and not simply underscoring so-called female virtues like care, love and support, the usual patriarchal apologetic) but also a deeper understanding of the underlying Biblical theology.

Put starkly, I will argue that Eve’s transgression, and transgression it was, was not only a Fall but also, at one and the same time, an Ascent. And that it is to Eve that we owe the completion of human creation (or the creation of humans) as moral agents, defining our humanity and a condition for *Imitatio Dei* within the Abrahamic Monotheism that the Bible ushered forth.

II. THE HUMAN SUBJECT AS *HOMO RELIGIOSUS*

Only fools – and there are quite a few of them – take a literalist approach to Genesis and the creation narrative and regard it as a source of, say, physical or geological knowledge. One may believe that the world was created by the Almighty or hold that it is impossible to understand the emergence of human consciousness in Darwinian terms,² without calculating the date of creation, to some 5781 years ago or taking as literal truth the sequence or duration of creation and evolution of our universe.³

² Cf. T. Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature is Almost Certainly False*, New York 2012. While effectively undermining Darwinian explanations of the emergence of human consciousness, Nagel is careful to distance himself from a religious explanation for creation and human consciousness.

³ More often than not, analytical philosophers and materialistic scientists assume that the scientific truth is a single concept of human truth. However, there is a reality in the world, which came into being, that is not material. For example, as Thomas Nagel has convincingly demonstrated, it is impossible to explain, by analytical tools of material science, the formation of the human mind. See T. Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature*

The premise of this essay is that the story of Adam and Eve is like an overture to the ensuing Genesis narrative and folding into it, *inter alia*, an invitation for reflection on two fundamental issues: The biblical view of what it means to be a human being in this world and, in turn, what it means to be a religious human being.⁴

Adam and Eve are minor characters in Genesis, a book dominated by the grand epic of the House of Abraham – a narrative with the grandeur and span of an Iliad or an Odysseus. Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Noah pass before our eyes or ears in quick succession, a pre-history – rapidly told – to a narrative which finds, from a literary perspective, its rhythm once Abraham sets on his way from Mesopotamia to Canaan, that is, the Land of Promise.

And yet, for all its paucity of detail and paper-thin characterization, their story is and has been rooted deep in Western Civilization. In part, this is because of its overt, almost vulgar, etiology. Want to know why birth giving is so painful? Why we hate and fear serpents? Why, for most, making a living is so tough – you have a story, a culprit, a reason.⁵

For most of us these answers are unsatisfactory, a disappointing etiology. In dismissing these answers, we should acknowledge that the metaphysical yearning, and often despair, behind the questions to which the surface narrative gives the unsatisfactory answers, is as searching today as it was at the beginning of time. We should also acknowledge that a text that is timeless and meant to speak to all, will, by necessity, have to speak in multiple voices and nuances. The surface of the text is just that: Its surface.⁶

is Almost Certainly False, New York 2012. In this respect, consider also Luigi Giussani's cogent discussion of human reason and openness to the totality of reality from a Christian perspective in *The Religious Sense* (transl. by J. Zucchi), Montreal/Kingston 1997.

⁴ To some extent, the use of the word "religious" in the biblical context is admittedly anachronistic, because the existence of the divine was taken as a given in antiquity, and, accordingly, for the biblical mind, the notion of secularism or atheism was inconceivable. Here, I use the word "religious" in the relational sense – the religious human being not only recognizes the existence of the divine but takes the attunement to that dimension of reality as constitutive to one's own existence. For the category of secularism, consider C. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, London/Cambridge, Mass. 2018.

⁵ H. Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History* (transl. by H. Carruth), New York 1964.

⁶ My approach to the Bible, at least in this essay, resonates with Leon Kass's "wisdom-seeking" approach which examines biblical texts in a philosophical spirit. Consider L. R. Kass, *The Beginning of Wisdom: Reading Genesis*, Chicago 2003, esp. pp. 1–21, where he explains his interpretive approach. Among the normative analyses of the Eden story, one may want to consider the following: I. Kant, *Conjectural Beginning of Human History*, (in:) L. W. Beck (ed.), *On History: Immanuel Kant* (transl. by L. W. Beck, R. E. Anchor and E. L. Fackenheim), London/New York 1963, pp. 53–68; M. Wyschogrod, *Sin and Atonement in Judaism*, (in:) F. E. Greenspahn (ed.), *The Human Condition in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, Hoboken 1986, pp. 103–128; S. A. Geller, *The Garden of the Self*, (in:) *Sacred Enigma: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible*, London/New York 1996, pp. 157–67. For an overview of the story of Adam and Eve in the Bible

The deep rootedness of the story of Adam and Eve in our culture and civilization is, thus, not to be found in its direct, expressed etiology. After all, we do not have to give any purchase to the world of the jealous, capricious, lecherous Gods and Goddesses of Greek Mythology, to accept that the very best of Sophocles or Euripides contain deep reflections on the human condition. It is in that sense that the opening chapters of Genesis – the story of the first transgression (The Fall and Original Sin in the Christian tradition) makes a claim on our collective consciousnesses.

In its broad outline, the story will be remembered by most. We first learn of the creation of the universe and the positioning of man and woman within it. We then learn of the specific and explicit imposition of the very first normative command: “And God commanded the human ...of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you must not eat of it!” (Genesis 2:17).

Transgression – The Fall – inevitably follows and with it punishment: The banishment from the Garden of Eden into the world as we know it. A world in which the very gift of life is mixed with the pain of birth, the sorrows of existence, and inexorable death – Paradise Lost.

It is worthwhile recalling the majestic text *in extenso* not simply because of its inimitable grandeur as a literary text but also because in the narrative of this well known story are hidden tensions and suggestions which simply cry out for exegesis – the stuff of lawyers – which, in turn, may yield challenging results.

After completing the creation of heaven and earth, of night and day, of fauna and flora and of all other living creatures, Genesis 1 continues:⁷

²⁶And God said, Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness: let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, over the whole earth and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth. ²⁷So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. ²⁸Then God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it ...” ²⁹And God said, “See, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree, whose fruit yields seed; to you it shall be for food . . .”

Let us note for future reference two important elements in this fragment from the narrative of Genesis 1:

- The divine design for the creation of man – male and female – was that he and she would be in God’s image, after God’s likeness. It was that which God wished.
- The text also suggests that even in their “Pre-Fall” period, they were blessed with the capacity to procreate.

and in Jewish and Christian sources, see G. A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*, Louisville 2001.

⁷ I have emphasized in **bold** those phrases which will be picked up later in the analysis.

Genesis 2 retells the story and complicates things.

⁴This is the story of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens, ⁵before any plant of the field was in the earth and before any herb of the field had grown. For the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground. ⁶But a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground. ⁷And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being. ⁸And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there He put the man whom He had formed. ⁹And out of the ground the LORD God made every tree grow that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge, good and evil.

And then:

¹⁶And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden you may freely eat: ¹⁷but from the tree of the knowledge, good and evil, you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die." ¹⁸And the LORD God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him." ¹⁹And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was its name. ²⁰So Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper comparable to him. ²¹And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in its place. ²²Then the rib which the LORD God had taken from man, He made into a woman, and He brought her to the man. ²³And Adam said:

"This is now bone of my bones
And flesh of my flesh:
She shall be called Woman,
Because she was taken out of Man."

²⁴Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh. ²⁵And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

There are some marked differences in the narrative of Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. In interpreting these differences I eschew, respectfully of course, the temptation to resort to the documentary hypothesis of biblical criticism or to the equally intriguing analyses of comparative religion and culture as a way of reconciling the differences. I do so because those approaches examine the text, more often than not, from the outside and do not privilege it with any inherent normativity. It may be very interesting to find out if it really was William Shakespeare who wrote *King Lear*. But I am more interested in the play itself regardless of its true historical author.

Thus, I shall follow the traditional approach of treating the text of Genesis as a coherent composition, even if the result of an inspired redactor, and as such, the whole puzzling *economie* of which must be regarded as part of its message. It is the hermeneutics of the great medieval Sages of Spain and North Africa which will inform much of my discussion – a hermeneutic which, whilst profoundly respectful of the text, is by no means literalist.⁸

One traditional way, then, of reconciling Genesis 1 and 2 is to regard Genesis 2 as simply a more detailed description of the general story stated in the first chapter, recapitulating some elements but then continuing to give more detail in relation to one aspect, namely, the creation of the human species. Though not without textual difficulties this approach is plausible enough. Note, for example, the natural way in which the first four verses of Genesis 2 follow the narrative of Genesis 1. Thus, if in Genesis 1 we read simply, “So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them,” in Genesis 2 we find the more elaborate tale of how that came about.⁹

Important to this way of reading is not to regard Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 as alternatives but as complimentary. Thus, for example, it would be an aberration to this approach to argue that the notion that humans were designed in the image of God no longer applies to the tale in Genesis 2 because it is not there explicitly stated.

The transgression and punishment follow in the painfully cryptic prose of Genesis 3:

¹Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said to the woman, “Has God indeed said, ‘You shall not eat of every tree of the garden?’” ²And the woman said to the serpent, “We may eat from the fruit of the garden’s trees; ³but from the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God has said, ‘You shall not eat it, nor shall you touch it, lest you die.’” ⁴And the serpent said to the woman, “You shall not surely die. ⁵For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” ⁶And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave to her husband with her, and he ate. ⁷Then the eyes of both of them

⁸ My approach is thus holistic and philosophical: I seek to explore the existential values embodied in biblical texts according to their inherent logic and principle. For similar approaches with different levels of sophistication, consider, e.g. H. S. Kushner, *Book of Job: When Bad Things Happened to a Good Person*, New York 2012; T. F. Kensky, *Reading the Women of the Bible: A New Interpretation of their Stories*, New York 2013; M. Halbertal and S. Holmes, *The Beginning of Politics: Power in the Biblical Book of Samuel*, Princeton 2017.

⁹ I am well aware that the chapter divisions in modern Bibles are not ancient (hence, not intrinsic to biblical literature) but are the work of Cardinal Stephen Langton, the medieval Archbishop of Canterbury. I am equally mindful that it is a commonplace of biblical scholarship to divide the first three chapters of Genesis into 1:1–2:4a (creation of the world) and 2:4b–3:24 (creation of man and woman).

were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves loincloths.

⁸And they heard the sound of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God among the trees of the garden. ⁹Then the LORD God called to Adam and said to him, "Where are you?" ¹⁰So he said, "I heard the sound of You in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; and I hid myself." ¹¹And He said, "Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree of which I commanded you that you should not eat?" ¹²Then the man said, "The woman whom You gave to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I ate." ¹³And the LORD God said to the woman, "What is this you have done?" The woman said, "The serpent deceived me, and I ate."

¹⁴So the LORD God said to the serpent: "Because you have done this, you are cursed more than all cattle, and more than every beast of the field; on your belly you shall go, and you shall eat dust all the days of your life. ¹⁵And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel."

¹⁶To the woman He said: "I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; In pain you shall bring forth children; your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you."

¹⁷Then to Adam He said, "Because you have heeded the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree of which I commanded you, saying, 'You shall not eat of it': "Cursed is the ground for your sake; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life.

¹⁸Both thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you, and you shall eat the herb of the field. ¹⁹In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for dust you are, and to dust you shall return."

²⁰And Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living.

²¹Also for Adam and his wife the LORD God made tunics of skin, and clothed them.

²²Then the LORD God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of us, to know good and evil. And now, lest he put out his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever"²³ – therefore the LORD God sent him out of the garden of Eden to till the ground from which he was taken. ²⁴So He drove out the man; and He placed cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to guard the way to the tree of life.

III. THE EDEN STORY—TWO NORMATIVE CHALLENGES

Even the most perfunctory reading of these texts reveals some deep problems. I am interested mostly in the normative ones, two in particular. Foremost among them in my view is the following: Adam and Eve are put in the garden and forbidden from eating from the tree of knowledge, good and evil. At face value, then, they are deprived of a deontological sensibility. They lack the knowledge of good and evil which, in all our legal and moral systems, is a condition for culpable

behavior. If they could not tell the difference between right and wrong, why such fierce, uncompromising and eternal punishment for their transgression? Are not Adam and Eve, prior to eating from the tree of knowledge, the ultimate example of, say, a child or the insane not having the ability to distinguish good from evil? Where was their *mens rea*? Would any human judge mete out such punishment? Could we not, echoing Abraham, wonder “Shall not the Judge of all the earth Himself not do justice?” (Genesis 18:25).

Accentuating the problem is the fact that the prohibition is hardly part of, say, some notion of natural law. We can find Cain culpable even if he was not explicitly commanded not to kill, because we may attribute to the human condition – post Adam and Eve(!) – the ability to discern that murder is wrong. But the wrongness of eating from the forbidden tree does not have quite that moral sharpness. It is at most about obedience for the sake of obedience, about authority rather than moral discernment.

The second major normative challenge is the following. It is another grand principle of justice that there must be proportionality between crime and punishment. Does, in this case, the punishment fit the crime? What was so grave in the transgression to merit such profound a punishment? They stole a cookie from the cookie jar. A slap on the hand perhaps, not eternal punishment, life imprisonment. It is not, to my mind, self-evident what was so awful in their transgression to merit such an overwhelming punishment. It requires explanation.

There are other difficulties too. Is there, to mention but one, not a problem with the statement “for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die” (Genesis 2:17). Is not the serpent on to something when he tells the woman that this will not come to be? Was he not, after all, proven right? These are obvious questions for which I claim no originality but still worth revisiting.¹⁰

And, to mention another, if it is God’s fear that having eaten from the tree of knowledge, man will now eat from the tree of life and live forever (suggesting that even in the Garden of Eden he was not destined for immortality), in what sense is the notion of “to dust you shall return” (Genesis 3:19) so dramatic? Adam was created, we were told, from soil and presumably, his preordained death would return him to that same soil.

We could prolong the list, but the key to all these fundamental questions lies in the first two: The apparent tension between deontological innocence and terrible punishment. Resolve that, and all the others lose much of their bite. And these two questions, in turn, are germane to the two fundamental issues announced in

¹⁰ For the serpent in the Garden of Eden and its background, see J. Day, *From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1–11* (LHBOTS 592), London/New York 2013, pp. 35–37. On the motif of serpent in the Hebrew Bible, consider, e.g., K. R. Joines, *Serpent Symbolism in the Old Testament*, Haddonfield 1974. See also R. W. L. Moberly, *Did the Serpent Get It Right?*, “Journal of Theological Studies” 1988, Vol. 39, pp. 1–27.

the opening of this essay: What, in the biblical view, is it to be a human being, and what is it to be a religious human being?

IV. THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE – WHAT KNOWLEDGE?

One of the most traditional ways to deal with the first problem is to recast the meaning of the knowledge which the tree of knowledge would bestow.¹¹ In this reading it was carnal knowledge (or rather the knowledge of carnal knowledge) which came with the fruit of the tree and not deontological sensibility at all.¹²

It is a reading that makes a lot of textual sense. The reaction of these two humans upon eating the forbidden fruit supports this traditional rendering: They suffer sexual embarrassment and clothe themselves. The word “knowledge,” simpliciter, is, after all, one of the most common expressions of carnality in the biblical text. So why not the tree of knowledge as the fountain of carnality? Endearingly, as soon as they are out of the garden the first thing we learn of them is that they indulged their newfound knowledge of carnality. Immediately following the narrative of Genesis 3, we find in Genesis 4:1: “And Adam knew [!] Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD.” Finally, the serpent as a phallic symbol is one of the most celebrated clichés of a genre, but even clichés can have some relevance.¹³

The interpretation based on carnal knowledge may find support from a different part of the narrative too. Don Isaac Abarbanel (1437–1508), invoking another audacious traditional interpretation, invites the reader to regard the famous dialogue with the serpent as an inner dialogue within women centuries before Freud. If we follow this line, it would seem that the woman understands that she is forbidden from eating from that tree; that she can differentiate between right and wrong; that she does possess a moral sensibility. Indeed, that is why the serpent, or her inner voice, needs to tempt her.¹⁴

¹¹ See, e.g., remarks on Genesis 2:9 by R. A. Ibn Ezra (1089–1167) in his expanded commentary on Genesis.

¹² For more on this, see, e.g. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus: A Book on Ritual and Ethics*, Minneapolis 2004, pp. 188–89.

¹³ I understand the verb “to know” in Genesis 4:1 in the simple past tense. Other readers may take this verb as indicating a pluperfect sense, namely, that Adam “had known” his wife in the Garden of Eden before the expulsion. Consider, e.g., Rashi (1040–1105) on Genesis 4:1. See also N. M. Sarna, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis*, Philadelphia 1989, pp. 31–32.

¹⁴ It should be noted that the identification of this serpent with Satan – the notion that recurs in the history of biblical interpretation – is not attested before the first century BCE. In the text itself, the serpent appears to be simply a clever animal that tempts the human. See G. von Rad, *Genesis: Revised Edition* (transl. by J. H. Marks), Philadelphia 1972, p. 87; Sarna, *The JPS Torah*

If this is so, the knowledge bestowed by the tree must be of a different nature, hence the turn to the erotic. This interpretation also solves our major dilemma. If woman is imbued with deontological sensibility, understands that she is being tempted to do something forbidden, and nonetheless commits the transgression, then at least in part the principal problem of the narrative of explaining a punishment of someone innocent of deontological sensibility is resolved.

But it is neither an easy nor an entirely persuasive resolution because it is so easy. Above all it prevents the deeper reflection attendant on the original formulation of conundrum, namely why should Eve (and Adam) be held culpable in our eyes if they lacked the knowledge of good and evil, foundational to moral agency. The turn to carnality avoids the issue, rather than resolves it.¹⁵

V. EVE'S ACT – THE FALL AND THE ASCENT

We noted already the original divine design in Genesis 1 that the newly created male and female would be in the image of God:

So God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

Genesis 1:27

Now turn again to Genesis 3. God has just confronted Adam, Eve and the serpent with their transgression. Their punishment is meted out to them. And then, we read:

Then the LORD God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of us, to know good and evil. And now, lest he put out his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever" – therefore the LORD God sent him out of the garden of Eden to till the ground from which he was taken.

Genesis 3:22–23

But, surely, was it not God's intention that man be "as one of us?" After all, man was created, unlike any other creature, "in the image of God?" Consider further: In their "pre-transgression" existence in the Garden of Eden, in what sense could that essential distinction between man and all other creatures manifest itself? Man and woman walked naked like the beasts, ate like the beasts and, presumably, procreated, or were designed to procreate, like beasts, functionally,

Commentary: Genesis, 32. Consider also J. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*, London/Cambridge, Mass. 1998, pp. 98–100.

¹⁵ Consider, e.g. J. Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*, Fortress Press 1992, which forcefully argue, *inter alia*, that the story of Genesis 3 does not revolve around the theme of sex.

without erotic love. Their sentinel world was beast-like and, indeed, it is not clear in what sense it could be said that they fulfilled or were able to fulfil the further design of Genesis 1:

“Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”
Genesis 1:28

It is that “beast-like” quality that indicates a first way out of the conundrum.

They were like the beasts in one further sense. Though they had not yet eaten from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, they did have an animal-like inchoate normative sensibility, albeit rooted in authority and obedience. I can, after all, teach my dog to obey me; as any animal lover knows; should the dog disobey me, by say, opening the cupboard in my absence to reach for his treat, it is clear from his behavior at the moment of “transgression” and when discovered later, as he slinks away, that he has a sense of infraction.

But my anger upon discovering the animal’s transgression should in no way be confused with moral outrage. And any desert given in response makes sense in behavioristic or sentinel, not moral, terms. I might say “Bad Dog” but I do not, thereby, attribute moral agency to the dog. It would be more appropriate though less practical, to reproach him with “Disobedient Dog”.

It is the same with our young children. They know when they have done something “bad” by taking a cookie out of the jar when mommy or daddy said they should not. But we would never attribute to a four-year-old moral sensibility let alone moral agency.

So we can sharpen our question even further: In the “pre-transgression” existence in the Garden of Eden, in what sense could it be said that humans manifested their creation in the image of God?

The answer is – he and she – hardly did. How, after all, could a creature which has no moral agency be seen to be in the image of God?

Now you might object and insist that the very fact that Eve felt she was doing something wrong shows at least an inchoate moral sensibility, and hence moral agency. I already objected to this line of argument by suggesting that in that case we would have to attribute moral agency to my dog and my four-year-old child. But I would like to add two additional arguments.

First, moral agency is not exhausted or achieved by the ability to distinguish between good and evil. It is also coupled with two additional elements, namely, the realization that one has a choice, that one is autonomous and has the freedom to choose between good and evil. Freedom, external and internal, is essential to the very ontology of moral agency, as it is part, in the biblical view, of the notion of Truth.

And second, this freedom, this choice, must be accompanied, to realize moral agency, with an understanding of one’s responsibility, external and internal, for

one's exercise of such choice, responsibility to make the choice, and to take ownership over the consequences of such.

It is the combination of all three factors, which enables us to hold persons accountable, morally for their actions.

Finally, I want to add an epistemic point. How is one to 'learn' moral agency? To make it part of one's self-understanding as a human being created in the image of the Almighty? Francis Bacon and Abraham Joshua Heschel in different ways remind us that there is a difference of knowing love, by reading about it in a book, or actually falling in love, the difference between cognitive and experiential knowledge, a realization which would seem obvious to those holding to virtue theory of moral behavior.¹⁶ It is the difference between understanding moral agency and becoming a moral agent.

With all this in mind, allow me to offer an alternative reading of the Eve and Adam narrative. When Eve approaches the tree of knowledge she has potentialities but these potentialities were not yet realized. As we already noted before, Genesis 1 is an overture – sketching the themes and outcomes of the creation which then come to be re-told in greater details in the subsequent chapters. On this reading, it is only upon and through transgression, when God in Genesis 3 says “Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil” (v 22) that potentiality becomes reality and creation of man in the image of God is realized. *Nota Bene*: As I see it, they have “become one of us, to know good and evil” not because of some quality of the fruit they ate as if it contained some magic serum (after all the Tree was not prohibited to the animals) – but rather by the very act of reaching out and disobeying. Even if they were to spit the fruit out, they would have acquired the knowledge of good and evil.

Surprisingly, reconstructing the story in this way has considerable textual fidelity. The reconstructed story may run as follows.

Man and woman are created by God as creatures which in some ways are distinct from other living things but at first that distinction is not apparent. It is a mockery of language to suggest that man and woman can be in God's image without a realized moral agency, which is indispensable to be able to fulfil God's commands other than in a behaviorist sense as I train my dog to sit when I so command. Likewise, the transgression itself, without a prior ability to distinguish between good and evil, is of limited moral significance.

Maimonides mocks those humans, whether innocent infants or rabbis who should know better, whose obedience to God is prompted by behaviorist condi-

¹⁶ F. Bacon, *Francis Bacon: The Major Work*, B. Vickers (ed.), Oxford 2008; A. J. Heschel, *God in Search of Man*, Philadelphia 1956, esp. pp. 5–6, 249–56; A. J. Heschel, *The Prophets*, New York 1962, pp. xiii–xix, 23–26, 51–57.

tioning of reward and punishment. In that sense Maimonides is not Aristotelian but a religious Kantian.¹⁷

But it would be a self-negating design to create them, *ab initio*, programmed to obedience and disposed always to choose good over evil for that would just as much negate their distinctiveness as humans. A ‘human’ so programmed would be acting merely *deus ex machina*. To manifest the particularity of their distinction, the sense in which they were created in God’s image, they would, like Him in the act of creation, albeit of course in an altogether more limited sense, have to perform a truly autonomous act. The nascent human – like a child becoming an adult and about to obey (or disobey) his or her father and mother not merely based on authority, awe and obedience, but as a result of understanding and internalizing the objective moral value of the parents’ teaching – has to live and experience the moment of realization that he or she has a choice, that it is in their hand, to obey or disobey and to learn the responsibility for one’s actions which follows.

A woman, who shortly and as a result of her actions is to become and to be named Eve (or *Chava* in Hebrew), the mother of all living, stands before the tree of knowledge. God’s Serpent, her inner self, reaches out and impels her to her full human vocation – to live and self-understand herself as a moral agent, in the rich sense described above, to realize, to complete, her creation in the image of God. The woman debates within her inner self.

Transgression? Perhaps. But she is, too, reaching out to her humanity, to her destiny, to the very divine design in which she was created. At the moment of her reaching out to the forbidden fruit she becomes a full moral agent. Acting from her own sovereign existence, able to decide to do or refrain from doing not because someone of authority told her such, but because it is her autonomous decision.

The threat of death has little power for the life she lives has little attraction. The Garden of Eden is no paradise when one does not have the human faculties to understand when one has not tasted from the tree that makes one wise. Put differently, paradise is lost long before they are banished from the garden. It is lost at the moment the woman becomes wise and realizes what a tasteless life she and her man were leading in the Garden of Eden. Reaching out to the tree of knowledge means that one has to be banished from the Garden of Eden since the human condition can only find realization in a world in which moral choices have to be made, and in which distinctions can be drawn. And through those choices and distinctions, life, as a gift of God, attains its meaning: Sorrow is a necessity if

¹⁷ See, e.g. M. Maimonides, *Commentary on the Mishnah*, New York 1981, Sanhedrin chapter 10, introduction. Consider also M. Halbertal, *Maimonides: Life and Thought* (transl. by J. A. Lindsay), Princeton 2015, esp. p. 349ff. George Y. Kohler points out a striking phenomenon in modern intellectual Judaism: “The more Kantian a Jewish philosopher is orientated, the more interest in the thinking of Maimonides he usually displays.” See G. Y. Kohler, *Reading Maimonides’ Philosophy in 19th Century Germany: the Guide to Religious Reform*, New York 2012, pp. 249–307.

we are to appreciate joy; transgression as a sign of autonomous will is a necessary condition to be able to subdue in a real, autonomous sense our will to the will of God; death is that which enables us to appreciate life. But even more so – it is only the autonomous individual, uniquely separated in his or her self-understanding from the living species as a whole (the sense in which we are part of the whole, but also understand ourselves as unique) that enables us to understand death as a personal thing. Yes, it happens to the entire species, but the species does not die. To the autonomous individual, death is one's personal destiny and in many ways dominates the whole of life. When Eve eats from the tree, God's warning is fulfilled: She does indeed discover death and understand it as a personal fate.

Eve's act may be the Fall, but it is too the Ascent through which our humanness, creatures created in His image, can emerge. This reading may be considered as a humanistic, secular rendition of the text. That is an egregious mistake. This reading is of profound religious significance too. Only by having the ability, external and internal, to say No to God, does our Yes to God become meaningful. God would not want it otherwise.¹⁸

It may also be considered a modernist reading of the text – modern in that profound and tragic sense of the modern condition: Accepting Choice over Fate in situating ourselves in the world. It may be. But if that is so, modernity began at the very moment when Eve reached her hand to pick the fruit. And modernity, in that sense, is rooted as much in a religious worldview as it is in a secular worldview. For it all depends on the telos of our human existence. It is said in the Jewish tradition: "All is in the hand of God, except the awe of God" (BT Berakot 33b). Autonomy, thus, is not only the precondition of modernity in an anthropocentric secular worldview. It is also the condition for realizing the most profound telos of the theocentric worldview – to be in this world, and try to walk in His ways. To be able to say a meaningful Yes to God, one must be able to say No too. In this read-

¹⁸ As John Paul II puts it: "Religious freedom, which is still at times limited or restricted, remains the premise and guarantee of all the freedoms that ensure the common good of individuals and peoples. It is to be hoped that authentic religious freedom will be granted to all people everywhere... On her part, the Church addresses people with full respect for their freedom. Her mission does not restrict freedom but rather promotes it. *The Church proposes; she imposes nothing*. She respects individuals and cultures, and she honors the sanctuary of conscience..." (John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio* – On the permanent validity of the Church's missionary mandate, 7 December 1990; the emphasis is in the original). Cited 28 October 2020. http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_07121990_redemptoris-missio.html. Consider also Pope Benedict XVI's following remarks: "The right to religious freedom is rooted in the very dignity of the human person, whose transcendent nature must not be ignored or overlooked... Without the acknowledgment of his spiritual being, without openness to the transcendent, the human person withdraws within himself, fails to find answers to the heart's deepest questions on life's meaning, fails to appropriate lasting ethical values and principles, and even fails to experience authentic freedom and to build a just society" (Benedict XVI, Message for the Celebration of the World Day of Peace, 1 January 2011). Cited 28 October 2020. http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/messages/peace/documents/hf_ben-xvi_mes_20101208_xliv-world-day-peace.html.

ing, we are touching on one of the most profound statements of Genesis on the human condition – the individual as a moral agent, sovereign in his or her choices, a condition necessary for the monotheistic worldview. It is a lesson in ontological liberty – a liberty which lies at the very understanding of what it is to be human in the world of the Creator.¹⁹

VI. FROM *HOMO* TO *HOMO RELIGIOSUS*

We may now return to our second major normative dilemma, the seeming discrepancy between crime and punishment. What was so profoundly wrong in the action of Adam and Eve which merited the drastic consequent punishment?

Simply to say that they disobeyed God is a shallow and unsatisfactory reply. The biblical normative system ordained by the Almighty for us humans is, as are most normative systems guiding human behavior, differentiated. Eating meat on a Friday (when that norm still existed) is surely a lighter infraction than, say, violating the sanctity and confidentiality of the confession or, for that matter, murdering an innocent.

The norm in question here – as a hook on which to hang Original Sin – seems puzzling at least for two reasons and cries out for reflection. First, it appears arbitrary. No explanation is given to Adam and Eve to suggest to them, why this prohibition; why this tree and fruit among all others. Second, it appears, too, as trivial. How important might it appear to them to steal this particular cookie from the jar, full of so many other cookies? And yet the violation of this apparently arbitrary *and* trivial interdiction was met with immense punishment. We have, thus, to explore in what way this apparently arbitrary and trivial command and subsequent transgression turn out to be of fundamental importance. Mere disobedience simply does not do the trick.

Here is another way of stating this puzzle. Should not the first direct prohibition by the Almighty have been, for example, “you shall not murder”?

The answer to this question is an emphatic No. Understanding why it must be such an emphatic No will also help clarify the deep significance of the apparently arbitrary and trivial nature of the prohibition on eating the fruit.

Let us, indeed, consider for a moment the second transgression of humans in the biblical narrative, the murder of Abel by Cain. As mentioned above, we are not told that the Almighty ever expressly commanded humans – “you shall

¹⁹ Consider J. Y. Jindo, *On the Biblical Notion of the ‘Fear of God’ as a Condition for Human Existence*, “Biblical Interpretation” 2011, Vol. 19, No. 4–5, p. 433–53. The biblical category Jindo discusses in this article – namely, the fear of God – resonates with what I call *Nomos* in the present article.

not murder.” And interestingly Cain never protests “You never told me this was wrong.” Cain is a ‘post-Eden’ human. The moral law (for some Natural Law) was imprinted in human consciousness as part of the act of creation. It is part of being a human being.²⁰ Moral agency contains the innate knowledge of good and evil and the knowledge that as humans we have the choice to follow one or the other. God does not need to command us not to kill because that is imprinted in us as part of our human condition and comes together with the assumption of moral agency. Yes, we find “you shall not murder” in the Decalogue. But we would never accept someone to say: “I do not believe in God and therefore I am entitled to murder.” Our answer would be “You are human and as such you may not murder.”

Instead, it is the apparently arbitrary and trivial prohibition of not eating from that tree which helps us understand the difference between all humans, and those who are religious. The difference between *homo* and *homo religiosus*. The difference manifests itself in three interrelated facets:

First, unlike the inbuilt and innate prohibition on killing rooted in moral law, which is part of our ontology as human beings, the prohibition on the forbidden fruit – which is then replicated again and again throughout the Hebrew Bible – is an invitation to a special relationship between God and humans. As a human, religious or atheist, one is bound by the moral law. But only *homo religiosus* is bound by a normativity the only justification for which is Revelation.

Second, it presents a vision of human liberty which, indeed, distinguishes *homo religiosus* from those who are not. It does not make them necessarily better, but certainly different. Consider the following again: The animals could eat everything their heart desires, their animal nature impels them to eat. Only humans are bound by a law of God which restricts what they may eat. If they were to eat, like the animals everything their heart desires, their nature impels them to eat, they would in effect be slaves to their material human existence. This ‘revealed’ law which has no sense except that it comes from the Almighty, a transcendental truth, is the Biblical view as to what makes them truly free, what makes them human, as distinct from animals, in the eyes of the Creator.

The enormity of the transgression is thus that in rejecting that particular command Eve was rejecting the very offer of humanity, of human ontology. Ascent and Fall in the same act. In one and the same act affirming even establishing our humanity and rejecting it.

But that is who we, humans are. Beings in which material baseness and spiritual elevation live and struggle side by side.

Eve, the Mother of all living.

²⁰ See Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From its Beginning to the Babylonian Exile* (transl. and abridged by M. Greenberg), Chicago 1960, pp. 296–297.

REFERENCES

- Anderson G. A., *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*, Louisville 2001
- Bacon F., *Francis Bacon: The Major Work*, B. Vickers (ed.), Oxford 2008
- Barr J., *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*, Fortress Press 1992
- Benedict XVI, *Message for the Celebration of the World Day of Peace*, 1 January 2011). Cited 28 October 2020. Online: http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/messages/peace/documents/hf_ben-xvi_mes_20101208_xliv-world-day-peace.html
- Day J., *From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1-11* (LHBOTS 592), London/New York 2013
- Geller S. A., *The Garden of the Self*, (in:) *Sacred Enigma: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible*, London/New York 1996, pp. 157–167
- Giussani L., *The Religious Sense* (transl. by J. Zucchi), Montreal/Kingston 1997
- Gunkel H., *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History* (transl. by H. Carruth), New York 1964
- Halbertal M., *Maimonides: Life and Thought* (transl. by J. A. Linsider), Princeton 2015
- Halbertal M. and Stephen H., *The Beginning of Politics: Power in the Biblical Book of Samuel*, Princeton 2017
- Heschel A. J., *God in Search of Man*, Philadelphia 1956
- Heschel A. J., *The Prophets*, New York 1962
- Jindo J. Y., *On the Biblical Notion of the 'Fear of God' as a Condition for Human Existence*, “Biblical Interpretation” 2011, Vol. 19, No. 4–5, pp. 433–453
- John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio – On the permanent validity of the Church's missionary mandate*, 7 December 1990; Cited October 28, 2020. Online: http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_07121990_redemptoris-missio.html
- Joines K. R., *Serpent Symbolism in the Old Testament*, Haddonfield 1974
- Kant I., *Conjectural Beginning of Human History*, (in:) L.W. Beck (ed.), *On History: Immanuel Kant* (transl. by L. W. Beck, R. E. Anchor, and E. L. Fackenheim), London/New York 1963
- Kass L. R., *The Beginning of Wisdom: Reading Genesis*, Chicago 2003
- Kaufmann Y., *The Religion of Israel: From its Beginning to the Babylonian Exile* (transl. and abridged by M. Greenberg), Chicago 1960, pp. 296–297
- Kensky T. F., *Reading the Women of the Bible: A New Interpretation of their Stories*, New York 2013
- Kohler G. Y., *Reading Maimonides' Philosophy in 19th Century Germany: the Guide to Religious Reform*, New York 2012
- Kugel J., *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*, London/Cambridge 1998
- Kushner H. S., *Book of Job: When Bad Things Happened to a Good Person*, New York 2012
- Maimonides M., *Commentary on the Mishnah*, New York 1981
- Milgrom J., *Leviticus: A Book on Ritual and Ethics*, Minneapolis 2004

-
- Moberly R. W. L., *Did the Serpent Get It Right?*, "Journal of Theological Studies" 1988, Vol. 39, pp. 1–27
- Nagel T., *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature is Almost Certainly False*, New York 2012
- Sarna N. M., *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis*, Philadelphia 1989
- Taylor C., *A Secular Age*, London/Cambridge, Mass. 2018
- von Rad G., *Genesis: Revised Edition* (transl. by J. H. Marks), Philadelphia 1972
- Wyschogrod M., *Sin and Atonement in Judaism*, (in:) F. E. Greenspahn (ed.), *The Human Condition in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, Hoboken 1986