

GENESIS II-III

“WHEN WAS CREATION COMPLETED?”

I remember my childhood days, when my father was reciting on Friday evening the Qiddush, the blessing for the Sabbath-evening meal. He would start with the last verse of the first chapter of Genesis. First, he would whisper: *וַיְהִי-עֶרֶב וַיְהִי-בֹקֶר*, and then aloud in ashkenazic tune: *יּוֹם הַשֵּׁשִׁי*: “the sixth day”, immediately followed by the three opening verses of the second chapter:

31 יּוֹם הַשֵּׁשִׁי: 2:1 וַיְכַלּוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל-צְבָאָם:
 2:2 וַיְכַל אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה
 וַיִּשְׁבֹּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִכָּל-מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה: 2:3
 וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת-יּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ כִּי בּוֹ שָׁבַת
 מִכָּל-מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר-בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשׂוֹת:

As a child I wasn't alert to the problems this text presents. And so were my primary school teachers, who were eager to convey to me the idea of the six-days creation and of the seventh day rest, on which the fourth commandment of the Decalogue is founded: *כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת-יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ אֶת-הַיָּם וְאֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר-בָּם וַיִּנַּח בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי עַל-כֵּן בֵּרַךְ יְהוָה אֶת-יּוֹם הַשָּׁבַת וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ* (Exod 20:11). This is widely translated as: “For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but rested the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and consecrated it” (NRSV). In fact, the formulation of

the Decalogue, as given in Exodus 20 is simple: God created everything in six days, and in the seventh day he rested: *וַיִּנַּח*¹. Unfortunately, the Genesis story has no *וַיִּנַּח*, “he rested”; it has *וַיִּשְׁבֹּת* and *שָׁבַת* instead, verbs meaning “cease”, “stop”.² However, more developed instructions regarding the obligatory rest on the seventh day do occur in Exod. 23:12, where the verbs *שָׁבַת* and *נוּחַ* occur in the same verse: *שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲשֶׂה מַעֲשֶׂיךָ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי תִשְׁבֹּת לְמַעַן יִנוּחַ שׁוֹרְךָ וְחֲמֹרְךָ וַיִּנְפֹּשׂ בּוֹ-אֲמָתְךָ וְהַגֵּר כִּי-שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי נִשְׁבַּת וַיִּנְפֹּשׂ* (NRSV). This is reasoned in Exod 31:17: *כִּי-שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי נִשְׁבַּת וַיִּנְפֹּשׂ* (NRSV). This is reasoned in Exod 31:17: *כִּי-שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי נִשְׁבַּת וַיִּנְפֹּשׂ* (NRSV). This is reasoned in Exod 31:17: *כִּי-שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי נִשְׁבַּת וַיִּנְפֹּשׂ* (NRSV).

Having all these in mind, particularly the Decalogue, translators adapted Gen. 2:2-3 rendering the verb *שָׁבַת* in terms of “rest”. KJV: “... the sixth day.

2:1 Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. 2:2 And on the seventh day God ended the work

which he had made, and he *rested* on the seventh day from all the work that he had made. 2:3 And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it God rested from all his work which God created and made.”

This is followed by modern English translations, such as RSV, NRSV ASV, etc.³ In order to make matters explicit, verse 2 puts the verb עשה in the pluperfect: “he had made”, *i.e.*, in the previous days, not on the seventh day. Clearly, a interpretive translation. A similar position was adopted by most modern translations.

Nevertheless, the ambiguity apparently remains. Is the sixth day the end of the creation, as stated in Gen 1:31-2:1, or on the seventh day, as declared by Gen 2:2?

The problem is solved in the harmonizing text of the Samaritan Pentateuch which has in verse 2: ויכל אלהים ביום הששי מלאכתו אשר עשה וישבת ביום השביעי מכל מלאכתו אשר עשה, “and God ended on the *sixth* day the work which he had made, and he *ceased*⁴ on the seventh day from all the work that he had made”. Such also was the Hebrew version that the author of the Septuagint had before his eyes when he rendered the phrase in verse 2 as “on the sixth day”: καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐποίησεν καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἐποίησεν, “on the sixth day”, in agreement with the previous statement (Gen 2:31). It is this wording that Philo of Alexandria, the Jewish philosopher of the first century CE, quoted in his

Legum Allegoria 1:2. This very reading is also mentioned in the 2nd century CE Jewish hermeneutical compilation Mekhilta (section בא, § xiv): וזה אחד מן הדברים שכתבו לתלמי המלך, “this one of the thirteen readings written for Ptolemy the King”, in order to avoid confusion. In other words, second century Judaism was aware of the Septuagint different rendering, but declared it intentional change. “The sixth day” as the conclusion of the Creation is also the way how the Book of Jubilees 2:1 describes the primeval history: “in six days the Lord God finished all His works and all that He created, and kept Sabbath on the seventh day...”⁵ The same may be said about the Peshitta: סעלג אלמא כטלח שלטלח כדום, ויבגו ס אלו אלעט כטלח שלטלח כדום, ויבגו כטלח שלטלח כדום, ויבגו, with the exception that in addition to its opting for “the sixth” day, it interprets וישבת as “rested”. This is in line with the Jewish Aramaic Targums, which have already adopted this harmonization rendering וישבת as ונח (Onqelos, Pseudo Jonathan), ואתניה (Fragment Targum), both being forms of the verb נוה, “rest”.

Recently, many portions of Jubilees have been discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, revealing the original Hebrew text, which confirms the Ethiopic translation as far as our passage is concerned (4Q216, col 7):

1. [וביו]ם הששי את כל חי[ת...].
2. עשה את האדם זכר ונק[בה...].
3. ובחיה ובכל הרמש ה[רומש...].
4. המינים האלה עשה ב[יום...].
5. אשר בשמים ובארץ [...].

6. השבת אשר שבת ב[ו...]
 7. עשויים ששת ימים[...]
 8. ונשבותה ביום הש[ביעי...]

1. [On the] sixth [da]y [he made] all the animals [...]
2. he made man male and fem[ale...]
3. over the animals and over all the creeping (animals) that [creep...]
4. he made these kinds on [the...]
5. there is in the heavens and on the earth [...]
6. the Sabbath on which he rested [...]
7. they were made in six days [...]
8. and we cease (from work) on the sev[enth] day⁶

In his *Quaestiones hebraicae in Libro Geneseos*, Jerome acknowledges that the “Hebrew” has “the seventh day” for “the sixth day”, being aware of the Septuagint version,⁶ but in his Vulgate he translated: *conplevitque Deus die septimo opus suum quod fecerat et requievit die septimo, ab universo operesuo quod patrarat*, using the pluperfect.

The rabbis mentioned in the sixth century CE collection of homilies, *Genesis Rabba* (ch. 10, §8) have discussed intensively the subject, trying to conciliate the contradiction by asserting that “the seventh day” includes the Sabbath-eve, which falls on the evening of the sixth day. Accordingly, the Creation had been completed on the sixth day, all right, and the following “and God ceased from all the work” remains unharmed. The very existence of the discussion attests at the rabbis’ awareness of the unhappy MT

display, but altering the holy script was unthinkable to them.

To conclude this section: Both branches exhibit the seventh day as God’s rest day. None of them conceives it otherwise. It is the cumbersome MT formulation that the translations attempt to transform into a clearer presentation, adequate to their way of conveying ideas.

*

Verse 4 opens a sort of recapitulation of the Creation: *אֵלֶּה תּוֹלְדוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ בְּהִבְרָאָהּ*, “These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created. In the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens”.

I am afraid the translation “generations” of *תּוֹלְדוֹת* is misleading the modern reader, for whom “generation” means all of the people born or living at about the same time, while in our context, the progeny of “earth and heavens” is meant, *i.e.*, what God made “earth and heavens” produce at the Creation.⁷

As far as textual arrangement of this opening verse is concerned, I would like to draw your attention to two locutions. One is *יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים*, which appears here for the first time. It is literally rendered in all versions as “the Lord God”, as it is everywhere in the Bible. The only exception is the Septuagint, which, in its quest for systematization omits *יְהוָה* when God’s actions in the process of creation

is involved, rendering the locution as \acute{o} $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ alone: verses 5, 7, 9, 19, 21; 3:22. In all other cases, the full $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ \acute{o} $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ is employed.⁸

The second one is the uncommon sequence $\text{אָרְצָא וְשָׁמַיִם}$, “earth and heavens”, the inverse order of שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ , when creation is involved: 1:1, 2:1, 14:19, etc. The versions restore the order: $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\acute{o}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\gamma\eta\nu$ says the Septuagint, שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ is the formula of The Samaritan Pentateuch, *caelum et terram* is the Vulgate’s rendering and the Peshitta has the same order: ܫܡܝܝܢ ܘܥܪܘܿܬܐ . Only Onqelos follows the Masoretic order (or shall I say “disorder”?). Interestingly enough, the Jewish Aramaic translation known as “Codex Neofiti 1” of the Vatican Library restores the usual order too: שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ . To be sure, שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ occurs in the MT once more, in Ps 148:13. The Septuagint accepts this inverted order, because it is not related to Creation: $\text{הוֹדוּ עַל־אֲרָצָא וְשָׁמַיִם}$, “his glory is above earth and heaven”: η $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\sigma\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\gamma\eta\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\acute{o}\upsilon$.

Now we are told that God planted a garden in Eden and placed there the man whom he (had) formed (v. 8). After a long description of the garden and its rich surroundings, we are informed again that God placed the man in the garden, with one additional piece of information: God appointed man on tilling and guarding it (v. 15): $\text{וַיִּקַּח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם וַיִּנְחֵהוּ בְּגֶן־$ $\text{עֵדֶן לְעַבְדָּהּ וּלְשִׁמְרָהּ}$, “The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it” (NRSV).

If one takes לְשִׁמְרָהּ in its original sense, “to guard it”, then he may wonder, why the story is silent with regard to the question from what the garden is to be guarded, like in the case of Jacob’s engagement to Laban in Gen 30:31: צֹאנֶךָ אֶשְׁמֵר , “I shall guard your flock”. This is clear to the reader, who is acquainted with the dangers of wild animals for the flock. Remember $\text{וְגַר זֵאֵב עִם$ לְכַבֵּשׁ , “and the wolf shall live with the lamb” (Isa 11:6) as a vision of an ideal world. In fact, the natural arrangement demands that wolves do not live *with* lambs; they eat lambs, as dictated by the food-chain rule, Therefore Laban’s flocks require guardians. As far as the garden of Eden is concerned no such protection seems necessary. Therefore the Rabbis sought for an answer that might take the edge off the problem; they gave the phrase a non-literal course: $\text{לְעַבְדָּהּ זֶה תְּלִמוּד וְלִשְׁמֵרָהּ אֵלּוּ מִצְוֹת}$, i.e., לְעַבְדָּהּ means to study the Torah; וּלִשְׁמֵרָהּ means to fulfill the commandments (Sifre on Deuteronomy, tract. עֵקֶב, ch. 11). This same idea is expressed by the so called Jerusalem Targumim: $\text{לְמַהוּי פְּלַח בְּאוֹרֵי תִיָּה}$ $\text{וּלְמִיטֵר פִּיקוּדוּי}$, “in order to labor in his Torah and keep his commandments”.⁹

In fact, the verb שָׁמַר also means “to keep” something, e.g., $\text{הֲשָׁמֵר אָחִי אֹנְכִי}$, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” (Gen 4:9). Therefore the very use of the verb שָׁמַר presents no problem. What does present a problem is the use of the feminine suffix in both verbs, $\text{לְעַבְדָּהּ וּלְשִׁמְרָהּ}$, referring to a masculine noun as object: גֶּן , “garden”. Indeed, גֶּן is masculine, as attests e.g., גֶּן נְעוּל , “a locked garden” (Canticles 4:12), and therefore we should expect the masculine

suffixes: לְעֵבְדוֹ וּלְשֹׁמְרוֹ. Noteworthy is the Samaritan Pentateuch which displays the same feminine suffix, reinforced by the oral tradition: *lēbāda wlišmārā*. It plainly supports the Masoretic Text and renders irrelevant the suggestion of some modern scholars to emend the vocalization into לְעֵבְדָה וּלְשֹׁמְרָה, with a masculine suffix.¹⁰ Why “noteworthy”? Because the Samaritan Pentateuch is infinitely more regular than the Masoretic Text as far as “correct” Hebrew is concerned (see below, part 4).

It is not an easy task to explain the feminine suffix of both Masoretic and Samaritan traditions. Perhaps they had in mind the quite frequent feminine form גַּנָּה, e.g., וְכַגְנָה אֲשֶׁר־מִים אֵין לָהּ, “like a garden which has no water” (Isa 1:30): וְנִטְעוּ גַנּוֹת וְאָכְלוּ, “they shall plant gardens and eat their fruits” (Jer 29:5). etc. Both examples display גַּנָּה as a feminine noun, with the feminine suffixed referent לָהּ and פָּרְקִין. Surprisingly, the same גַּנָּה occurs in Amos 9:14 with the masculine suffixed referent: וְעָשׂוּ גַנּוֹת וְאָכְלוּ אֶת־פְּרִיָהֶם, “they shall make gardens and eat their fruit”.

So: are גַּנָּה and גַּן masculine or feminine? Apparently both. It is worth noting that גַּן in the erotic description of Cantic 4:1-12 occurs metaphorically as a representation of a women, apparently a virgin (v. 12): גַּן נְעוּל אַחֲתִי כְלָה גַל נְעוּל מְעֵין חֲתוּם, “A garden locked is my sister, my bride, a garden locked, a fountain sealed”. Which is paralleled by the feminine גַּנָּה in the metaphoric description in 6:11: אֶל־גַּנֹּת אֶגְזוּ: יִרְדְּתִי לְרֵאוֹת בְּאֲבִי הַנְּחַל לְרֵאוֹת הַפְּרִיָהָה הַגָּפְן הַגִּצ

וְהַרְמָנִים, “I went down to the nut orchard, to look at the blossoms of the valley, to see whether the vines had budded, whether the pomegranates were in bloom”.

Of course, I refer to the first hemistich of 4:12: גַּן נְעוּל אַחֲתִי כְלָה, as the second one has גַל נְעוּל מְעֵין חֲתוּם. This is another *Kopfschmerz*, since it seems to repeat the first גַּן נְעוּל, by force of *parallelismus membrorum*, arbitrarily changing גַּן into גַל. Indeed, some manuscripts of the MT do display גַן נְעוּל מְעֵין חֲתוּם in the second hemistich as well. This version is in line with the Septuagint, which has κήπος, “garden” in both cases, and with the Vulgate *hortus*, and the Peshitta ܡܘܨܝܢܐ. This may indicate that the Masoretic Text is mistaken, and therefore BHK, BHS and BHQ recommend to emend to גַן נְעוּל in this case too. However, Jewish medieval commentators, reluctant to emend the text, unanimously connect גַל נְעוּל with Joshua 15:19: גַּלְתַּי מִיָּם, “springs of water”, which parallels perfectly the following חֲת מְעֵין. If not an apologetic approach, this may be a perfect case of *parallelismus membrorum*, which repeats an idea for stylistic reasons.¹¹

*

Before we proceed to the next chapter, I would like to bring to your attention God’s generous permission to Adam to enjoy eating of the fruits of the garden – with one exception (vv. 16-17): מִכָּל־עֵץ־הַגָּן אָכַל: תֹּאכַל וּמֵעֵץ הַדְּעֵת טוֹב וְרָע לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ כִּי בַיּוֹם תֹּאכַל וּמֵעֵץ הַדְּעֵת טוֹב וְרָע לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ מוֹת תָּמוּת, “You may eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not

eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die”. The interdiction is accompanied by a severe warning, in fact a threat: מות תָּמוּךְ, “you shall die”.

Except that the threat is not implemented, when God’s command is transgressed. Adam did eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but did not die “the same day”. Perhaps, considering the mitigating circumstances, lack of ability to discern between good and evil, which made Adam to succumb to temptation, God changed his mind concerning the capital punishment and preferred a different penalty.

In order to harmonize the passage with the outcome of chapter 3, the second century CE translator of the Bible into Greek, Symmachus, renders the expression as θνήτoς ἔσῃ, “you shall be mortal”. Jerome praised this rendering in his *Quaestiones*: “melius interpretatus est Symmachus *mortalis eris*”, although in his Vulgate he said *morte morieris*, “by death you shall die” whose ablative *morte* may be a subtle allusion to liability to death, very much in accord with the Septuagint rendering: θανάτω ἀποθανεῖσθε in the dative. Much more overt is the rendering of the Jewish Aramaic translation known as Pseudo-Jonathan: תהי חייב מיתה, “you shall be liable to death”. תהי חייב מיתה is a Mishnaic legal term for a person who commits a transgression that involves capital punishment. It does not require immediate execution, which is left to the decision of the Sanhedrin, the supreme court.¹³

But, before getting to the transgression, chapter 2 makes a long detour in order to bring into focus the element that made the transgression possible: the creation of the woman, whom the serpent tempted in the first place. Verse 18 displays God’s thoughts about the solitude of the man he had created; verses 19-20 exhibit the efforts to find a companion for the man, which led to the creation of the woman. The details of the creation of the woman here, after being already related in ch. 1:26-30, intend to show her rôle in the drama of the primordial sin, and thus, to justify the postponement of the capital penalty.

The man is overwhelmed by her apparition and exclaims: זאת הפעם עָצָם מְעַצְמֵי וּבִשָּׁר מִבְּשָׂרֵי לְזֹאת יִקְרָא אִשָּׁה כִּי מֵאִישׁ לָקְחָהּ זֹאת, this is translated in the NRSV as: “This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called Woman, for out of Man this one was taken”. “At last” is a strange way to render the rather unfortunate occurrence of the adverb הַפְּעֵם, which means: “now” (= KJV). הַפְּעֵם looks out of place in this context. Nevertheless it is present in the Samaritan Pentateuch, it is rendered in all versions with no exception. Luther was realistic when he took הַפְּעֵם not as an adverb of time, but as an intensifier: “Das ist *doch* Bein von meinem Bein und Fleisch von meinem Fleisch...”. The homiletic Jewish Aramaic Targum according to codex Neofiti of the Vatican Library makes an explicative digression, taking הַפְּעֵם adverbially, as elsewhere: הָדָא זִימְנָא וְלֹא תוּב תַּתְּבְּרִי אִיתָתָא, “this time

but never again will a woman be created from a man as this one was created from me". When it comes to her generic name: תָּלוּאָה לְקַחָהּ זֹאת, "this one shall be called Woman, for *out of Man* this one was taken", the Samaritan Pentateuch has a more equilibrate formulation: כִּי תָלוּאָה לְקַחָהּ זֹאת, i.e., "for *out of her Man* this one was taken". By its resort to the possessive pronoun a connection with the following verse is established, stressing the ties between man and wife (v. 24): על כֵּן יֵעֹזֵב אִישׁ אֶת אָבִיו וְאֶת אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ. Its version is shared by the Septuagint: ἐὰν τὸ ἄνδρὸς ἀντὶ ἧς. And even Onqelos, the official Jewish Aramaic Targum says: אַרְי דֵּא מִבְּעֵלָה נְסִיבָא דֵּא, "for from *her husband* is she taken". And so is the Book of Jubilees (3:6): "because she was taken from *her husband*".

The chapter ends with the idyllic image of the happy couple, unconscious of their nakedness. וַיִּהְיוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם עֲרוּמִים הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׁשׁוּ, "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed". As nakedness is a central issue in the following narration, it is only natural to position this verse at the turning point of the plot.

ENDNOTES

1 The Deuteronomy Decalogue gives a different reason: וַיִּזְכֹּרְתָּ כִּי־עֲבָדְךָ הָיִיתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם: וַיִּצְאָךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִשָּׁם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה וּבְיָד נְטוּיָה עַל־כֵּן צִוָּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־יְמֵי הַשַּׁבָּת, "Remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the LORD your God brought you out from there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore the LORD your God commanded you to keep the Sabbath day" (5:15).

2 HALOT s. v.

3 Only JPS remains faithful to the MT: "And on the seventh day God finished the work that He had been doing, and He *ceased* on the seventh day from all the work that He had done. And God blessed the seventh day and declared it holy, because on it God *ceased* from all the work of creation that he had done."

4 Translated in the Samaritan Aramaic Targum as ובטל, "he ceased". A. Tal, *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic*, Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 2000, s.v.

5 The Book of Jubilees is an apocryphal composition which re-tells the stories of the Bible, as a chain of clusters of fifty years (= jubilee), extending from Genesis 1 to Exodus 19. It was assumably composed in the second century BC in Hebrew, then translated into Greek and probably Syriac, and later, from Greek in other languages, all of them being lost. Only the Ethiopic translation was known (wherefrom the above passage was translated into English). In his introduction to his English translation of the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees, James C. Vanderkam considers many of Jubilees readings as changes introduced into the text which: "... could be characterized as problem-solving. Genesis-Exodus has raised many difficulties for readers over the centuries; Jubilees shows that they troubled expositors more than two thousand years ago": J. C. Vanderkam, *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO, 510: Scriptorum Aethiopicorum, 87. Leuven: Peeters 1989.

6 F. G. Garcia Martinez & E. J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition*.

Leiden-NewYork Köln: Brill, 1997), pp. 460-61.

7 Et consumavit deus in die sexta opera sua, quae fecit. pro diee sexta in hebraeo diem septimam habet. artabimus igitur Iudaeos, qui de otio sabbati gloriantur, quod iam tunc in principio sabbatum dissolutum sit, dum deus operatur in sabbato, complens opera sua in eo et benedicens ipsi diei, quia in illo uniuersa compleuerit. P. de Lagarde, *Hieronymi Quaestiones Hebraicae in Libro Geneseos*. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1868, p. 4.

8 “A body of men, animals or plants having a common parent or parents and constituting a single degree or step in the line of descent from an ancestor”. P. B. Gove *et al.* (eds.), *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary of the English Language*. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster Inc., 1961.

9 M. Rösel, “Die Übersetzung der Gottesnamen in der Genesis-Septuaginta” in D. R Daniels *et al.* (eds.), *Ernten was man sät*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991, pp. 357-77.

10 Onqelos, however, keeps its literal translation: למפלחה ולמטרה.

11 R.S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1-11, Textual Studies and Critical Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 127.

12 So Rashi, Ibn Ezra and others. The relation of גָּלָעוּלָּא מִיָּמֵי תּוֹרָה is put forward as a logical alternative by Franz Buhl *et al.*: *Wilhelm Gesenius’ hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament...* 17. Auflage. Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1915, s.v.

13 *E.g.*, Mishna. tract. Sanhedrin, *passim*.