SNAKES AND LADDERS: MIND GAMES IN GENESIS 2 AND 3

I.G.P. GOUS

ABSTRACT

Biblical scholars often live in a kind of in-between world, where they are seen as either too scientific for the faith community, or not scientific enough for the world of science. They gain wonderful insights, but have no-one to share them with. Genesis 2-3 is a point in case. Church doctrine expects this text to be historically true, while modern minds see it as a pre-scientific, historically impossible story. The interpretations by biblical scholars help understand the flow of thought and the use of motifs which are not necessarily understood by current readers of the text. However, questions regarding the truth and meaning of the passage still remain. In an attempt to escape from the impasse, insights on the architecture of belief by a clinical psychologist, Jordan Peterson, are used to demarcate domains of understanding in the world. The world as a place of things is explored by using the formal methods of natural science, while the world of action is the world of value, and is explored by using techniques of narrative. Seen in this manner, ancient myths, such as those found in Genesis 2-3, need not be taken as outdated portrayals of ideas which can be discarded, but as dated yet still valid, even universal truths, to be found in human minds then and now, and still enabling us to cope with real life issues.

UPS AND DOWNS

Once upon a time there was a pastor who loved the Lord very, very much, but who loved the game of golf almost as much. Whenever he could find the chance in his busy schedule, he played a round of golf.

After three weeks of non-stop and really exhausting ministering to his very conservative flock, he could not take it any more, and so he sneaked away, on a Sunday morning of all days, to play a round of golf in a nearby town. Fate, or Whoever, has a wicked sense of humour though, and so it came to pass that the pastor hit a perfect shot – his first ever hole-in-one. There he stood, laughing and crying – overjoyed at having hit the perfect stroke, but devastated at not being able to fill it in on his score card or not being able to tell anyone about it.

Maybe it is just me, being 50-something, or maybe it is a much wider phenomenon – when you enter into academic study of the Bible, it almost always results in wonderful experiences and insights, but you also end with no-

one to share it with. You become too scientific for the community of faith, and you are not scientific enough for the community of science.

There are many ways to handle this situation. Some biblical scholars start to live in a kind of schizophrenic state, where faith and science rarely interact. Others become an absolute expert on almost nothing, e.g., the use of the *yod* in Judith. Then there are those who quit the church and faith community, and focus on more tangible aspects of the biblical sciences. Only rarely do people manage to balance the paradox.

THE INTERPRETATION OF GENESIS 2 AND 3 AT SIXES AND SEVENS

The interpretation of Genesis 2 and 3 is almost a perfect example of the point in question. According to Von Rad (1976:74), the story of paradise and the fall has received a great deal of attention since the advent of critical science in theology, and its exposition has always vigorously contradicted the traditional exposition of the church. He also states that there is perhaps no other Biblical text which is so inflexible with regard to the confused mass of stalled questions regarding the so-called original state and the fall of humankind into sin (1976:75; see also Westermann 1976:26-39).

Brueggemann (1982:41) agrees when he says: "No text in Genesis (or likely in the entire Bible) has been more used, interpreted, and misunderstood than this text. This applies to careless, popular theology as well as to the doctrine of the church". He then mentions that the interpreter needs to clear away a heap of interpretational rubble before he or she will be able to hear what the text really has to say. According to him, there are at least five major misunderstandings of the text:

1. The first misunderstanding is that Genesis 2 and 3 is a decisive text for the Bible and that it states the premise for all that follows. To the contrary, says Brueggemann: it is an exceedingly marginal text with no clear reference to it in the rest of the Old Testament.
2. The second misunderstanding is that the text is an account of The Fall, and therefore a pessimistic view of humankind. Nothing can be further from the text, according to Brueggemann. The text deals with vocation, permission

and prohibition, and the fall is but a part of what is said.

3. The third misunderstanding is that the text is an explanation of how evil came into the world. According to Brueggemann, this text and the Old Testament is not concerned with an abstract view about evil, but rather with an existential issue regarding faithful responses and effective coping. Matters are handled pastorally, not speculatively.

4. The fourth misunderstanding is that the text is an account of the origin of death in the world, with a mechanistic connection between sin and death. According to Brueggemann, this text and the Old Testament is more concerned with responses to death. In this text it is striking that no one actually dies, and the text is much more about troubled, anxiety-ridden life.

5. The fifth misunderstanding, prevalent in popular tradition about the text, is that it is concerned with the evils brought about by sex. The serpent is a phallic symbol, and knowledge of good an evil is about sexual knowledge. This idea is strengthened by the mentioning of nakedness. According to Brueggemann, the text pertains more to relationships *per se*.

In the light of the above, what can and should be done with the text? What sense did it make for the people of those times, and what sense does it make to me, who has to live with an anciently shaped mind in modern times?

THE STORY TOLD IN GENESIS 2 AND 3

Von Rad says this text is narrative in character, not doctrinal. According to him, the story has two clearly distinguishable parts, namely Genesis 2, which concerns the paradise, and Genesis 3 which relates to the fall into sin. In this narrative, the acts of creation are only briefly mentioned. The focus is on humankind, more specifically on God's care for humankind (1976:76). The passage focuses on disorders of present life, namely shame, fear and relationships between humans, as well as the ambiguities encountered in life, such as

- death and life;
- the pleasure and purpose in work, and the difficulties of work;
- the fulfilment of having children, and the pain caused by it.

Van Selms (1973:46-78) follows a similar sequence, describing it as

- mankind receives his vocation (Genesis 2);
- mankind becomes unfaithful towards his vocation (Genesis 3).

According to van der Ploeg (1963.43-44), the text is about original sin (*de oerzonde*): the innocence before sin, with the creation of man, and the joining in marriage (*echtverbintenis*) of the man and the woman. Upon this follows a description of original sin and punishment, with the temptation, original sin and punishment as the constituent parts of this description.

All of these interpretations are run of the mill, with no groundbreaking insights. Brueggemann digresses a bit from the rest of the pack, and describes it as a drama in four scenes.

Scene 1: Genesis 2:4b-17 Placement of the man in the garden

    a) formation from clay of a creature totally dependent on God

    b) planting of garden

    c) identification of two trees

    This is preparation of the main part, where

    a vocation is given (15),

    permission is given (16), and

    prohibition is given (17).

    These three stand in balance. Popular theology focussed only on the last, and neglects the other two, says Brueggemann.

Scene 2: The formation of a "helper".

Scene 3: Disruption of the garden.

Scene 4: Judgement and expulsion.

According to Brueggemann (1982:51) the agenda of the narrator is probably to communicate how to live with the creation, in God's world and on God's terms. It appears to be a reflection on what knowledge does to human community. It does not attempt to make obscurantism and ignorance an act of fidelity, but it strives to stress that the recognition and honouring of boundaries lead to well-being. In this he follows Mendenhall, who sees it as a wisdom critique of the excessive use of knowledge in royal context as a tool of power and a capacity to control. Unchecked human autonomy leads to alienation and death, such as the way David manipulated matters to get Bathsheba. The serpent is the

embodiment of autonomous theological thinking, which describes God as a paper tiger, an idle threat, and a literary hypothesis. The text wants to stress that humankind has the freedom to enjoy and exploit life, the vocation to manage, all contained within the prohibition and boundaries set by God, says Brueggemann (1982:51-52).

In a thorough discussion of Genesis 2 and 3, in the light of all the Old Testament and extra-biblical creation traditions, Van Dyk (2001:92-111) points to the origin of the text as stemming from or edited by the J_1 or J_2 redactor, in its final form, most probably from exilic times. According to van Dyk (2001:108-109), the message of the passage is that God created humans and that he cares for them. Being in exile and having lost their country, the message is that God will re-create a place for the exiles to stay. Palestine will be the new Garden of Eden where the people are able to settle anew and live in prosperity (compare Isaiah 51:3), says van Dyk.

To convey this message, van Dyk refers to the use of well-known myths of the time, such as the royal garden, the rivers which irrigate the garden, the mythical trees in the garden, the walls and gate around the garden and the cherubs guarding the garden. He concludes with a discussion about myths and truth, and says that in the light of the fact that myths convey truths, they need not refer to historical truth in order to be authoritative. Therefore no harmonisation between the biblical creation accounts and science is necessary. The theological implications and message are important, and not correspondence with current scientific knowledge (van Dyk 2001:111; see also Kraus 1982:148-151).

All of these interpretations are masterful strokes, I would say, but why do they not make it onto the scorecard of the ordinary believer? Why do believers still want every word to be historically true in order to feel secure in their belief? Similarly, why do these interpretations not make it onto the scorecard of church doctrine? Church doctrine seems to be only interested in wanting this passage to be historically true in order to substantiate original sin, in order that the death, resurrection and redemption by Jesus Christ becomes a necessity (Westermann 1976:37-39, McKeown 2008:38-39). On the other hand, neither does it make it onto the scorecard of modern humankind. It will be used in cartoons about a naked Adam and Eve, with fig leaves (and with side comments

that it was a trick by Adam to use clothing that will itch so much that Eve will have wanted to remove it soon), an apple and a snake, but really, to believe in a talking snake, an apple changing the whole course of history ... ideas fine for immature, pre-modern man, but for us today this is not acceptable or on par, because we actually know better. These extremes are an either-or dichotomy, and never the twain shall meet, it seems.

THE UNIVERSAL QUESTION

The reason why scholarly interpretation of biblical texts in general and Genesis 2-3 in particular does not make it onto the scorecards of believers and sceptics alike, may be because we also approach matters in a way that does not lend itself to be heard and to make a difference. Scholarly study of the texts may need to attempt a new course to escape this impasse.

There is an upside and a downside to standing downstream of a long history of interpretation. The upside is that one may have the privilege to stand on the shoulders of giants, which may be a greatly enriching experience. The downside is that one tends to look in exactly the same direction as those giants, and may be blind to or miss a whole universe of possibilities. The creativity specialist Arthur Koestler (1959) once said: "Every creative act involves a new innocence of perception, liberated from the cataract of accepted belief". In similar vein Alvin Toffler (1971) wrote: "The illiterate of the 21st century will not be those who cannot read and write, but those who cannot learn, unlearn, and relearn". However, new and creative insights are not always fruitful, productive or valid, as Gilbert Ryle (1982:64) once warned: "Dreamers of dreams may be pathfinders; but they may be mere vagrants. Of those who depart from the pavements, only a few are explorers: the rest are mere jaywalkers". Even when attempting a new course, one should at least still try to stay on course; otherwise even the perfect stroke may not count.

A starting point in attempting to get out of the perceived impasse is to see that in spite of some differences in approach, it is clear that commentators agree that the text is about the human predicament in general, and the difficulties encountered in trying to live a meaningful life amongst everyday challenges. At least most people will agree that this common human predicament is universal

to all peoples of all ages, and as such it may appeal to all peoples.

However, the packaging of this universal human predicament in a garden story is clearly time-bound. People from biblical times might have understood it without too much explanation, but the history of interpretation and use of the passage, indicate that the packaging obscured the meaning or meanings of the passage and at the same time, conceded possible benefits to many people who read the passage through the ages. Today expectations and reactions range from people who want to believe that every word is literally true, to people who outright reject it as outdated and flawed (Lucas 2001:131-136). The challenge to reconcile the claim of absolute historicity and current acceptability is huge, and needs a fresh approach. Westermann (1976:39) wrote:

> Darum ist nicht nur eine grundlegende Revision der kirchlichen Sündenlehre notwendig, es wird dann auch möglich, den Gegensatz zwischen dem, was die biblische Urgeschichte und dem, was die naturwissenschaftliche Erforschung der Anfänge des Menschengeschlechts sagt, abzubauen. Dass das Phänomen der Sünde oder des Bösen als ein menschheitliches Phänomen in einem Jahrtausende dauernden Prozess geworden ist und dass es in seinem anthropologischen, sozialen und psychologischen Aspekte erforscht werden kann, braucht nicht mehr im Gegensatz zu dem theologischen Aspekt gesehen zu werden, von dem Gen 2-3 handelt.

Therefore it might just be helpful for the sake of clarity and perspective to move to a nearby town, and like the golf-loving pastor, play a round on a distant course.

PETERSON'S MAPS OF MEANING

The views of a clinical psychologist from the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto, Jordan Peterson, helped me a great deal to look afresh at the meaning and intentions of both Genesis 1 and Genesis 2-3, as well as the similarities and differences between them. This is especially the case in that it is seen from the eyes of a person who started out from a believing point of view,

then moved to rejection of doctrine and faith, and then ended up in a position where belief is seen as something worthwhile and positive.

Peterson starts his book, *Maps of meaning: the architecture of belief*, with a lengthy description of his own life story, which is a rather interesting start to an academic work of note (1999:xi-xxii). However, in the light of the basic thesis of the book, it makes a lot of sense and it is perfectly in line with the argument he purports.

His life story was that of many a young person growing up in a church environment. He started off enthusiastically, attending sermons and catechism. He was exposed, as all children are today, to the media and peer groups. However, this started him questioning some basic tenets of belief. When he posed these questions to his minister, he received unsatisfactory answers. Thereafter he, in his own words, "stopped attending the church and joined the modern world". He then for some time sought refuge in socialism, but became disillusioned with that as well. This was due to the fact that he accepted George Orwell's critique of socialism which stated that socialists did not really like the poor, they merely hated the rich. Peterson then began to study psychology, especially the theories of Jung on myth and religion. The basic conclusion he reached was that "beliefs make the world, in a very real way – that beliefs *are* the world, in a more than metaphysical sense" (1999:xx). We live in an orderly world, and individuals and societies who flout these absolutes are doomed to misery and dissolution (1999:xx). He then describes his thesis as follows:

> The world can be validly construed as a forum for action, as well as a place of things. We describe the world as a place of things, using the formal methods of science. The techniques of narrative, however – myth, literature and drama – portray the world as a forum for action. The two forms of representation have been unnecessarily set at odds, because we have not yet formed a clear picture of their respective domains. The domain of the former is the objective world – what is, from the perspective of intersubjective perception. The domain of the latter is the world of value – what is and what should be, from the perspective of emotion and action.

He continues to expand his view of the world as a forum for action as follows:

The world as forum for action is composed, essentially, of three constituent elements, which tend to manifest themselves in typical patterns of metaphoric representation. First is unexplored territory – the Great Mother, nature, creative and destructive, source and final resting place of all determinate things. Second is explored territory – the Great Father, culture, protective and tyrannical, cumulative ancestral wisdom. Third is the process that mediates between unexplored and explored territory – the Divine Son, the archetypal individual, creative exploratory Word and vengeful adversary. We are adapted to this world of divine characters, much as to the objective world. The fact of this adaptation implies that the environment is in 'reality' a forum for action, as well as a place of things.

The world as a forum for action is just as real and important as the world of things. It is just of a different character, with different constituent elements and different ways of going about with and in it. It also has a peculiar order, which needs to be learnt:

Unprotected exposure to unexplored territory produces fear. The individual is protected from such fear as a consequence of ritual imitation of the Great Father – as a consequence of the adoption of group identity, which restricts the meaning of things, and confers predictability on social interactions. When identification with the group is made absolute, however – when everything has to be controlled, when the unknown is no longer allowed to exist – the creative exploratory process that updates the group can no longer manifest itself. This restriction of adaptive capacity dramatically increases the probability of social aggression (1999:xxi).

From these psychological points of departure, Peterson continued to analyse ancient myths. He identified in them basic themes which address fundamental, deep-seated human questions of meaning. These are about chaos, order and the shuttling between these poles. Order and predictability is what we all want, but it holds the danger of rigidity. Chaos is something we dread and fear, but it is also the origin of renewal and growth. In between these extremities, we have to

carve out our existence. Order is usually depicted as the Father, chaos as the Mother, and the Hero or Son is the one mediating between them.

These fundamental principles can be seen in ancient myths. In the Babylonian creation myth called the *Enuma Elish*, Tiamat was the creator goddess, Apsu was the father god, and Marduk was the son who conquered chaos in an epic battle. In Egypt, Osiris was the founder and ruler of the state, with his evil brother Seth as the personification of the tyrant. Isis is the wife of Osiris and queen of the underworld. Horus is the hero that overcomes evil. In the biblical creation myth in Genesis 1, the words "formless and empty" allude to mother Tiamat, while the words spoken by God create order and stability (Gous 2007:46-49).

These questions of meaning are not doctrinal questions which are to be debated, but deep-seated experiences and emotions which revolve around life and death, ultimately about survival as a human being. Therefore it is primarily handled by the sections of our brain that are concerned with survival and emotions. These parts of the brain developed before those which handle speech, and functioned and communicated without language. That is the reason why a hug or an arm around the shoulder helps more in times of deep emotional experiences than a speech or a lot of words and talking. That is also why metaphors and images serve us well, even better when we are faced with the intricacies of our human condition. However, an interesting aspect of the images is their almost dualistic nature. Not one is either good or bad:

- the Mother is a depiction of chaos, but also of renewal;
- the Father is a depiction of order and stability, but also of stagnation and tyranny;
- the Son is the hero that saves the day, but he is also vulnerable and sometimes fails.

Metaphors are thus mind-games which help us cope with a reality which is sometimes difficult to verbalise.

MAKING SENSE IN ANCIENT MINDS

All biblical texts lie beneath heaps of interpretational rubble, be it from doctrinal origin, popular belief, modern expectation or scholarly interpretation.

Often these interpretations say more about the mind of the interpreter than of the mind originally responsible for the formation of the texts, as well as the minds those texts were intended to inform or touch. It therefore makes a lot of interpretative sense to approach the texts from an angle, which in an informed and scientific way seeks to understand the kinds of existential questions and needs it links up with. The approach is scientific, but not the kind of science peculiar to the science that seeks to explain the world of things. It is a structured and disciplined way in which the world of action is explored, and which aims to uncover or create worlds of meaning.

Seen from this angle, we encounter in Genesis 2-3 some important metaphors with a universal theme, namely the garden, the water, the tree and the snake. According to Von Rad (1976:98) there is no direct Babylonian parallel to Genesis 2 and 3, but it links up with common oriental myths of creation. The author of Genesis 2 and 3 uses these common myths freely to psychologically penetrate the events he describes.

The garden is a well-known image in the Old Testament. Van Dyk (2001:96) shows the images of gardens are linked to royal gardens at the royal palace. In Genesis 2 the image of the cosmos is that of the royal garden (unlike Genesis 1 where the image of the cosmos is linked to the temple). According to Peterson (1999) this image portrays the universal idea of paradise as a place of order, which is perfectly balanced with stability. This perfect harmony of order and chaos eliminates suffering, while providing the necessities of life without work or effort. Chaos and order are integrated perfectly in the paradisiacal state. The word "paradise" is of Persian origin, referring to a walled enclosure. Ideas about this original state of bliss, often expressed in terms of the image of a garden, have been advanced by all cultures throughout time.

Water is also an important metaphor in ancient times. The water in Genesis 2-3 however, is not a raging, chaotic threat as it is in Genesis 1, but a quiet mist nourishing the barren earth. Later the abundance of water is channelled into four rivers, enabling the tilling of the land. This substantiates the view of Peterson that all of these metaphors are inherently of dual nature.

The tree in the garden has received a lot of attention in exegesis (De Villiers 2007:633-635). In Genesis 2-3 two trees are mentioned, namely the tree of life and the tree of knowledge. The image of the tree of life is linked to royal

ideology, according to Brueggemann (1982:45). Not much is known about the tree of knowledge, reference to which is found only in this passage. In wider context (according to Peterson 1999:297-300), the world tree is a well-known image. It is firmly rooted in the maternal world of chaos, but also represents potential – its branches reaching up to the heavens, which is the origin of order, but where also resides the threat of tyranny. In this sense the world-tree is a bridge between the known and the unknown, and the ingestion of the fruit of the tree is a metaphor for the assimilation of knowledge and ability. No wonder the New Testament used similar ideas regarding Jesus on the wooden cross as bridge from damnation to salvation, and the ingesting of bread and wine as a way to participate in and be changed by these events.

The snake is also an example of this (De Villiers 2007:635-637). It is an image of destruction, but also a portrait of renewal. According to Peterson (1999:295) "tree and serpent, coupled and singly, have an extensive, pervasive and detailed history as representational agents. They serve similar functions in a multitude of myths describing the loss of paradise. It appears likely – despite the initial strangeness of the presumption – that this structure is the nervous system, as it manifests itself in intra-psychic representation". He continues (1999:300): "The Edenic serpent is, above all, the unknown (power) still lurking 'inside' the nervous system, inside the 'world tree'. It is the innate capacity of the mind, its ability to generate revelatory thought, its capacity to disrupt the stable cosmos and to extend the domain of consciousness. It is curiosity that kills the cat but, equally, curiosity that guides discovery". He concludes: "The snake shares obvious – and subtle – features with the spine. Firstly the shape is similar, and secondly it shares an evolutionary history. The human nervous system is composed in part of structures as phylogenetically ancient as the reptile. The deep structures of the brain stem – the head of the spinal snake – perform activities upon which the maintenance of consciousness absolutely depends" (Peterson 1999:301).

MAKING SENSE IN MODERN TIMES

Who is the judge when faced with multiple fixed but conflicting interpretations of an age-old text, each with its own guarantor of authority? Popular theology

follows a common-sense approach, where every utterance is accepted on face value, and seen as literally true. Church doctrines follow long traditions where texts and interpretations are necessary building blocks in theological arguments. Modern scientific worldviews have very limiting boundaries of what may be taken as possible and plausible. Biblical scholarship traditions also have fixed points of view and foci on which they concentrate when interpreting texts. Each team plays over and over a predictable game on the same course. The upside of this is that there is a wealth and depth of predictable knowledge. However, order may lead to tyranny, and renewal might be rare or very difficult to attain. Furthermore, if a group decides from the inside whether they are right or not, there is not much chance for critique and renewal. It is then that a round on a distant course may become not only illuminating and helpful, and it may even provide a necessary correction.

According to Peterson, the world is too complex to manage without radical functional simplification. Meaning appears to exist as the basis for such simplification. The meaning that guides functional simplification may be usefully considered as consisting of three classes.

- The first class consists of meanings of the determinate world. These are meanings based in motivation, emotion, and personal and social identity. First class meanings are grounded in instinct and tend, at their most abstract, towards the dogmatic or ideological.
- The second class consists of meanings of the indeterminate world. These are meanings based on the emergence of anomaly, or ignored complexity. Second class meanings are also instinctively grounded, but tend towards the revolutionary.
- The third class consists of meanings of the conjunction between the determinate and indeterminate worlds. These are meanings that emerge first as a consequence of voluntary engagement in exploratory activity and second as a consequence of identifying with the process of voluntary exploration. Third class meanings find their abstracted representation in ritual and myth, and tend towards the spiritual or religious.

What Peterson's (1999) insights offer us, is to see that Genesis 2-3 speaks an age-old language that is buried deep in our humanness, a language that most of us might have forgotten, or are not even aware that it exists. It speaks in myth

and metaphor about deep-seated needs, emotions, fears and joys.

What we have in this text are literally true and real events – not the events as described, but the real needs referred to and addressed by the myths and story being told. The text is adding to dogma and doctrine, maybe not in the way it has been understood up until now, but a text telling of a God who cares for the real needs of people. The text is perfectly in line with current scientific knowledge and findings, especially with the science of the development and working of the mind. Biblical scholars, who are becoming aware of this ancient language of the mind, can translate, interpret and understand it in line with their proficiency to understand the texts in their original contexts. Buried under millennia of interpretation, Genesis 2-3 addresses fundamental truths about the human condition. Buried deep inside our own minds we have the capacity to come to grips with these truths. However, what we need are mind games to help us bypass the overly first order truths, and go back to trust. We need to go back to the naked truth.

NAKED KNOWLEDGE

When Adam and Eve achieved knowledge in a sense that forfeited trust, they became naked. With it came shame, mistrust and alienation. God approached them and clothed them again. He can do that for us if we embrace some of the old stories. Genesis 2 and 3 is too valuable for people of all aeons to remain buried under limiting interpretations. This alternative way of working with the texts mentioned above might still not satisfy either the hard-line scientist or rigid fundamentalist, but it does create an option to pursue meaning in an orderly and even scientific way. Only true science, amongst others of the biblical and cognitive variety, played away from stifling popular theology and suffocating dogmatics, can therefore free our arms to attempt a shot at the holy one – namely an interpretation of the text that really helps us to cope with life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brueggemann, W 1982. *Genesis. A Bible commentary for teaching and preaching.*
         Atlanta: John Knox.
De Villiers, G 2007. Why on earth? Genesis 2-3 and the snake, *OTE* 20:632-640.

Gous, I G P 2007. Meaning – intelligently designed. Keeping the Bible in (a modern) mind, *OTE* 20:34-52.

Jacobs, M R 2007. *Gender, power and persuasion: the Genesis narratives and contemporary portraits.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Koestler, A 1963. *The sleepwalkers: a history of man's changing vision of the universe.* New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

Kraus, H-J 1982. *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments.*Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Lucas, E 2001. *Can we believe Genesis today? The Bible and the questions of science*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity.

McKeown, J 2008. *Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans

Peterson, J 1999. *Maps of meaning: the architecture of belief.* New York: Routledge.

Rollins, W G & Kille, D A (eds.) 2007. *Psychological readings into the Bible: texts and readings.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Sanford, J A 2007. The story of Adam and Eve, in Rollins & Kille 2007:160-165.

Toffler, A. (1971). *Future shock*. London, Pan Books.

Van der Ploeg, J 1963. *Genesis.* Roermond en Maaseik: J J Romen.

Van Dyk, P J 2001. *A brief history of creation*. Pretoria: Unisa.

Von Rad, G 1976. *Genesis.* London: SCM (Old Testament Library).

Van Selms, A 1973. *Genesis (deel 1).* Nijkerk: Callenbach.

Westermann, C 1976. *Genesis 1-11*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. (Erträge der Forschung band 7).

I.G.P. Gous

Department of Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern Studies

University of South Africa

P.O. Box 392

UNISA 0003

South Africa

E-mail: gousigp@unisa.ac.za