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CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE, JUSTIFICATION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Nakedness is a phenomenon demanding recognition on the secular scene but has received little attention from biblical scholars, in spite of the fact that Scripture contains a remarkable body of pertinent material.

I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

 enumeration is the Hebrew term for "nakedness," and more specifically, "shameful exposure." This feminine noun and related words appear in significant scriptural passages and within portrayals of crucial concepts. Therefore, one objective of this study is to present a comprehensive classification of the scriptural uses of these terms.

Furthermore, the study purports to determine the Old Testament view without reading ideas into the Scriptures. The Old Testament vividly presents Scripture's distinctive view of man's nature and relationships. So, the study is restricted to "What the Scriptures say," and basically, what the Old Testament says.

In conjunction with the Scriptures, significant background materials from the ancient near east will be introduced in order to lend understanding to the laws, customs and daily life pertaining to the topic of this study. For example, presentation of the contrast between Israelite and Canaanite
religious practices is an important objective in order to present the Old Testament view of "nakedness."

An inductive word study and exposition of מִיָּדָה and related terms is a major objective of this thesis. The Garden Account (Gen. 2 and 3) has received considerable treatment by biblical theologians and commentators. However, with notable exceptions like Franz Delitzsch, מִיָּדָה seems to be generally ignored. Therefore, elucidation and synthesis through word study and exposition is an important aim.

Furthermore, an adequate treatment of the Paradise Account (Gen. 2 and 3) is essential in order to comprehend adequately the biblical attitude toward "nakedness." Therefore, sifting and arranging of relevant theological material concerned with man's initial situation and its implications is an essential aim of this study.

Finally, the overall objective of the study is to present a scripturally representative viewpoint through scholarly research that will help the Christian to face the problem of nudity in his society. This study is not a contemporary application, but does provide the biblical material or basis for such an application.

II. JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

The Early Hebrews had a characteristic horror of nudity which was definite and deeply rooted. This aversion
reached extreme proportions during particular eras of Jewish history. For example, note the prudishness of Tannaitic times which grew into a law during Amoraic days: The Shema' could not be recited in the presence of a woman with uncovered hair, because it comprised indecent exposure, when actually citation was a private matter and women were allowed to go about with uncovered heads in private.¹

Furthermore, while the Hebrew Bible does not contain a great many references to the topic of "nakedness" or exposure, the occurrences appear in pivotal passages and crucial concepts. Note some of the instances: Man and woman's relationship was characterized by "nakedness" before and after the Fall; the priests were under strict divine command not to expose their "nakedness"; sexual relationships were limited in terms of "uncovering nakedness" (Lev. 18, 20); the preceding phrase also appears in regard to Yahweh's covenant (Ezek. 16, 23); stripping of war captives was prominent in the ancient near east.

The topic of "nakedness" is seldom treated as an individual unit of study. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, for example, contains one of the rare dictionary articles on the subject. Usually, this subject is treated in a peripheral manner. Therefore, material has

been researched from larger topics which include discussions of "nakedness," such as: Marriage, Family, Sex, Man, Woman, Prostitution, Fertility Cults, Law, Customs, Archaeology.

Also, there has been no thorough word study of the Old Testament words for "nakedness." The article in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia is helpful but very brief, while Watson's A Biblical and Theological Dictionary includes a short supplementary article. The discussion of the Greek equivalents in Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament and Liddel and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon lend understanding to the words. Therefore, a thorough word study is a needed contribution in order to deal with the subject.

Two authors are particularly helpful in treating the topic of "nakedness" directly; the older one is Delitzsch. He has treated this subject in A System of Biblical Psychology and, in conjunction with Keil, throughout the pertinent Old Testament passages in the various volumes of Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. The discussions within these works are quoted time and again by other commentators and theologians when they try to treat this topic.

The other important author, Rabbi Kahana, weaves an interesting usage of 'ervə (["nakedness"]) throughout his book The Theory of Marriage in Jewish Law. Kahana points out that Kiddushin (bethrothal) causes a woman to enter the special
status of Eshet Ish, (a married woman) that is, Ervah status, and once she enters it nothing can terminate it except death or divorce. 2 A woman is considered an Ervah in marriage, that is, prohibited to the world. 3

Because a marriage directly affects the rights and harmony of the community, at least two witnesses must be involved in order to create the new status which a woman enters at marriage. This status is one of Eshet Ish, Davar Shebe Ervah. 4 Communal ramifications are so serious that if the witnesses are not incorporated in the performance of the legal act of marriage, then marriage cannot be effected. Two witnesses are needed in order for one to enter the status of Ervah or to revert to the status of Penuya (free to marry). 5

The husband's Kinyan (possession), the wife's Daath (willingness) and communal participation are absolutely necessary in order to create status. The fact is thus emphasized that more than a transfer of rights or property is concerned - the matter is not simply contractual, but a creation of status.


3Ibid., p. 75.

4Ibid., p. 38; a married woman, a thing which is forbidden.

5Ibid., p. 76.
Word study and exposition of this subject is important when viewed from the Hebrew or Old Testament perspective, for the Hebrew or Semite has had a rather unique way of looking at things. His view of the body is at variance with Western tradition and Greek thought. He does not view the body as a prison for the soul or man as an embodied soul. "The Hebrew idea of personality is an animated body, and not an incarnated soul." 6

It is within this context of thought that many explicit and implied biblical doctrines developed. To view man as an animated body specially created through the intent and design of God's hand (after His image) is to view man as an entity with the greatest worth and dignity within the cosmological order. Man is not to seek his fulfillment in flight or escape from his body, but rather to find his self-realization within his total setting. His body is not to be spurned, for it was created after the divine image, and God's promise of redemption and atonement includes the complete restoration of him in his psychic-physical union of being.

Man is a unity with a complexity of being and expression. He is not a bundle of complexities organized in some

sort of "United States." When some member of his body reacts to a situation, his whole being comes to bear on the situation. Thus it is that he is responsible for his actions. The totality of his being is involved in an action. As Pedersen has said, "The soul is thus an entirety with a definite stamp, and this stamp is transmuted into a definite will." There are no independent words for "will." For the will is not an independent force apart from the soul. "The soul is a totality; its sensations penetrate it entirely and determine its direction; the will is the whole of the tendency of the soul."^9

Some of the Hebrew nouns are particularly suited to illustrate this holistic viewpoint. קָלָם (kalām) for example, means "peace," but is based on the root verb meaning to "be complete." Thus, wholeness or completeness speaks of well-being, peace and even health. דָבָר (dāḇār) means a "word," but it also means "matter" or "thing." Words were very powerful and possessed substantialistic qualities; a man's word was a physical extension of himself. בָשָׂר (bāšār, "flesh") speaks of completeness for the Hebrew because of its intimate association with man's psyche. Any

7Ibid., p. 148.
9Ibid.
relationship assumes psychic association, but total identification must include the flesh.

Single impressions are inadequate for ancient man. He was concerned with totality. So, when he met a man he asked for the totality to which he must refer the impression he received of the man. To say, "I am Saul, the son of Kish," gives the totality image. Saul's essential character was defined in this way for men were familiar with Kish, his importance and history; "they know his soul."  

Hebrew thought was dominated by totality and movement. Problems treated in the Old Testament were problems pertaining to life rather than thought. The Hebrew's logic is not of abstraction but immediate perception, directly influencing the will. Thoughts were plans, that is, thoughts of action. And the contents of thoughts are different according to the nature and will of the soul.  

W. F. Albright has called Hebrew thought "empirico-logical."

Action and its accomplishment were considered a matter of course once the thought was fixed. The action lay in the very idea as soon as it had assumed a permanent character; therefore it was crucial to know what an idea contained and where it would lead the will. The act lived in the man as an idea and was fully present in him, so that he bore

\[10\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. } 101. \quad \quad 11\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. } 123-7.\]
responsibility for it. Idea equaled action, and the two equaled responsibility.\textsuperscript{12} A fundamental psychological conception of the Hebrew was that a complete whole is formed by (1) the image of the soul, (2) the motion of the will and (3) the carrying out of the action.\textsuperscript{13}

The link between each individual and his sinful forefathers because of which one cannot stand before the divine purity and perfection is called a "psychosomatic link" by Eichrodt (Job 14:4; Ps. 130:3; 90:7-9). There is a modern resurgence of this view which depicts man as a unity of the psychic and physical. Treatment of the patient in his needs as a "whole man" is a new concern in modern medicine, emphasizing the interdependence, integration and unity of the human complex. The eminent psychiatrist Paul Tournier is an excellent exponent of this new emphasis in doctor-patient relationships.

Contemporary society itself links the phenomenon of nudity with a wider scope of behavior, as vividly illustrated by the November 13, 1967, edition of \textit{Newsweek}. The cover carried a nude picture of Jane Fonda from the movie \textit{Barbarella} and the title "Our Permissive Society." Connection with a way of life is also emphasized by groups favoring nude psychotherapy and greater expression in the theatre.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., pp. 131-33. \textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 144.
A biblical study seems warranted when there is a sizable portion of Scripture dealing with the topic and a contemporary need to take a hard look at nudity. Thus, one objective of this thesis is to provide a comprehensive study which will provide a basis for a contemporary Christian to approach the current phenomenon.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The organization of the paper derives directly from the main objectives of the study. First, a thorough word study is necessary for an adequate consideration of the subject. This study will primarily include the two roots לָשָׁ (‘šir, "be exposed, bare") and לָשָׁ (‘arš, "be naked, bare"), their derivatives and the Greek synonyms γυμνός and ἵσχυμος. The classification of the results of the word study will be presented first, in chapter two.

Inductive study has provided the basis for the word study chapter, while a few pertinent sources have been introduced where applicable. In discussing the Hebrew roots and derivatives, the first occurrences of the terms will be vocalized, transliterated and translated. Transliteration of the Hebrew characters will follow Table I. However, transliteration and translation will not be included after the first occurrence of a Hebrew word. Hebrew vocalization will also be excluded except for irregularly pointed terms.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Table I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>א / י</td>
<td>ס / ֶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב / ב</td>
<td>י / י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג / ג</td>
<td>כ / כ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד / ד</td>
<td>ל / ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה / ה</td>
<td>מ / מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ו / ו</td>
<td>נ / נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ז / ז</td>
<td>ס / ס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ח / ח</td>
<td>ע / ע</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels (as shown with mem):</th>
<th>Table I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ה/ מ</td>
<td>מ / מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה/ מ</td>
<td>מ / מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה/ מ</td>
<td>מ / מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה/ מ</td>
<td>מ / מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה/ מ</td>
<td>מ / מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה/ מ</td>
<td>מ / מ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In discussing material from particular authors their transliteration may be used rather than the system in Table I. Retaining Kahana’s system of transliteration, for example, facilitates reference to an encyclopedia of Judaism.

Second, the exposition of the important passages cited within the word study chapter will comprise chapter three. These references deal with each important personal relationship of the ancient Hebrew and include (1) God-priest relationships, (2) man-woman relationships, (3) God-nation relationships, (4) man-to-man relationships. These areas comprise the main divisions of chapter three.

Third, chapter four discusses Genesis 2-3. This portion of Scripture is pivotal for comprehending the Hebrew or Old Testament attitude toward "nakedness." Genesis 2 and 3 present a natural dualism, but for the purposes of the paper a three point division will be used: (1) the creation of man, (2) the fall of man, (3) the covering of man.

The inductive sources used for chapter two will be discussed in the introduction of the chapter. Chapter three utilizes both inductive material, commentaries, journals, dictionaires and significant background material in order to present an exposition of the Old Testament texts cited in chapter two. Biblical studies, commentaries and theologies are the main sources for chapter four.
Bearing in mind the Hebrew view of man, the word study will lay the basis for the remainder of the study. The "whole person," the "psychosomatic approach," the "I-Thou relationship," and "personhood" are terms which approximate the Old Testament approach. "The proposition that the soul of man is flesh is indissolubly connected with the converse, i.e. that flesh is soul."\textsuperscript{14} It is from this perspective that the topic is to be viewed.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 178
CHAPTER II

WORD STUDY OF מְרֹדֵם AND RELATED TERMS

The objective of this chapter is to present a thorough word study of מְרֹדֵם and its related terms. With the Old Testament approach serving as a backdrop, this word study will form the basis of the paper. There are no comprehensive word studies which treat the major words included within this study. Therefore, these terms have been considered, reference by reference, in the original languages and in translation, with the aid of concordances, lexicons and a few pertinent dictionary articles.

Concordances which have been used extensively for inductive study include: Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible; The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, two volumes; Davidson's A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures; Hatch and Redpath's A Concordance to the Septuagint, volume one; Moulton and Geden's A Concordance to the Greek Testament.

Etymology and technical data have been included throughout the chapter which has been compiled from lexical aids. The primary lexical source for Hebrew is A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament edited by Brown, Driver, and Briggs; this work will be referred to throughout the duration of the paper as BDB. Liddel and Scott's unabridged
Greek-English Lexicon, revised by H. S. Jones, is the basic Greek tool used for etymology. A study contained in Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, volume one, has been very helpful as a Greek supplement. Lane's Arabic-English Lexicon has been consulted in preparing the background of יְדוּדָה.

Kittel's Biblia Hebraica has been used extensively for the inductive study of many of the cited biblical passages. The RSV has been the main English version used unless a notation indicates otherwise. A few collateral studies have been utilized in the preparation of this chapter and will be appropriately footnoted. Otherwise, the material contained within this chapter is either a result of inductive study or gleanings from the technical sources already mentioned.

This chapter is a summation of inductive word study, lexical data, and salient points derived from pertinent dictionary articles. Through observation and comparison, a general scheme of classification has been formulated around two Hebrew roots and their derivatives. These terms comprise the vast majority of Old Testament references to "Nakedness": (1) יְנוֹק and (2) יְדוֹר. Furthermore, the LXX generally follows this general division using the terms

---

γυμνός and ἀσχημοσύνη, respectively. This general dichotomy forms the primary divisions of the chapter, including related words or parallel terminology within the finer treatments contained in these major divisions.

רָעָה, רָעָה and רָעָה are all related roots, none of which occur in these basic forms. This paper is to concern itself, for the most part, with the far more numerous and significant terms רָעָה and רָעָה. The more general and descriptive root רָעָה will be presented first.

I. THE ROOT רָעָה

The term רָעָה (Գ), meaning "be exposed" or "bare," occurs once as a verb in the Niphal stem. Habakkuk (3:9) refers to Yahweh figuratively: "into nakedness (i.e. utterly) is thy bow laid bare, made ready." In the Odyssey (11.607) an uncovered bow, that is, one taken out of its case is referred to with the Greek noun γυμνός.

This Hebrew root has a derivative that also occurs once in Habakkuk (2:15) in reference to a person's nakedness or pudendum. Woe is pronounced upon one who would make his neighbors drunk with his wrath in order to gaze on their "shame," for Yahweh's cup would then cause such to receive shame rather than glory upon themselves.

This usage, however, is an exception to the primary thrust of רָעָה. Two far more frequent and significant
adjectival derivatives portray the thrust of the root לְני.

The Derivative לְני or לְני.

The first adjective, לְני or לְני (אָבָם or אָבָם, "naked; nakedness") is utilized in describing the cognitive state of Adam and Eve in Genesis three: they knew they were "naked" (v. 7); Adam's stated excuse for being frightened was his "naked" state (v. 10), whereupon God asked him who told him that he was "naked" (v. 11). In a more substantive use, the "naked" or ill-clad is covered by the righteous man, just as bread is given to the hungry (Ezek. 18:7, 16).

This term can be used as an abstract noun. A particularly good example is found in Deuteronomy (28:48), where it is included in the great trilogy "hunger, thirst, and nakedness." In fact, in the LXX, this is the only instance where the noun γυμνότης is used. Ezekiel's personification of Jerusalem in chapter sixteen links לְני with אָבָם (אָבָם) to form the compound expression "nakedness and bareness," that is, "naked and bare" (vv. 7, 22, 39). His elaboration in chapter twenty-three also contains this compound phrase depicting lack of clothing and adornment (v. 29). Except for Ezekiel 16:39, the LXX duplicates this expression with γυμνός and ἀσχημοσύνη.
The Derivative יְרֵד or יְרֵד.

 יְרֵד or יְרֵד (יְרֵד or יְרֵד, "naked") is the second important derived adjective of יְרֵד . This term also depicts the "naked" state of the innocent paradisaic pair (Gen. 2:25). It portrays the "naked" condition of a new infant and that of the departing soul, both of which are without possessions (Job 1:21; Eccl. 5:15, 16). Then too, the Book of Job depicts men who are so ruthless as to take an impoverished man's garment in pledge, leaving him without adequate clothing (i.e. "naked") to cover him against the elements and to serve as bedclothes during the cold of the night (22:6; 24:7, 10). Isaiah reminded his countrymen that the fast chosen by Yahweh includes the covering of the "naked" (58:7).

The use of the term "naked" in depicting an individual who is partially dressed is evident in two outstanding personal examples. The Spirit of God came upon Saul in such overwhelming power at Naioth in Ramah that he stripped off his robe and prophesied before Samuel for the duration of a day and a night, while David escaped (I Sam. 19:23-24). Second, Isaiah went about Jerusalem "naked" and barefoot for three years as an object lesson to his countrymen (20:2-4). This half-clad condition was that of the slave or impoverished person, and without obscenity Isaiah graphically pictured doom for his people.²

²Cf. Albrecht Oepke, "γυμνός, γυμνότης, γυμνάζω,"


is used in a few more references in portraying a desolate or barren condition. For example, Hosea voiced Yahweh's threat to strip Judah "naked" (2:3). When He was to rout Israel, the mightiest of the men were predicted to flee away "naked" (Amos 2:16). Micah declared his intention to go stripped and "naked" while making lamentation over the coming desolation he saw of Samaria and Jerusalem (1:8).

can simply mean that something is entirely clear or apparent to someone. Sheol is seen as "naked," that is, open or completely manifest before Yahweh (Job 26:6).

, for instance, can refer to "naked" truth.

The Synonym

The LXX is very regular in translating the Hebrew derivatives of with . Besides common use in the LXX, this term is well attested since Homer and was a favorite word of Philo. The verb "strip naked," can depict the "stripping" of the bones of their flesh (Herodotus 4.61). The middle and passive - "strip oneself" or "be stripped naked" - is common in Homer, and used mostly of warriors who


, op. cit., p. 773.
were "exposed" (Iliad 12.428). A wall can be pictured as "left bare," that is, "defenseless" (Iliad 12.399), or a person can be "stripped" or "deprived" of a thing (Plato R. 601b). So, γυμνός can include: unarmed, parts uncovered by armor or exposed parts, bare things such as a bow out of its case, stripped of a thing, lightly clad, naked facts, destitute, beardless and scalped.

Basically, the Greek word has two general thrusts that are important: (1) naked, unclad, and (2) unarmed, defenseless. This latter emphasis has a vivid example in the Hebrew word יד, meaning "let go" or "let alone"; the Syriac and Aramaic cognate means "uncover." KJV states, "And when Moses saw that the people were naked; (for Aaron had made them naked unto their shame among their enemies:) Then Moses..." (Ex. 32:25-26). This "letting go" or removal of restraint left them exposed to their enemies. Similarly, the priests were forbidden to "unbind" their heads in order to mourn by removing the turban, or they would be exposed to the displeasure of God (Lev. 10:6; 21:10). Ahaz made Judah "naked," that is, "shew lack of restraint" (II Chr. 28:19).

γυμνός is well attested in both Old and New Testaments. In the strict sense, "naked" appears as: "unclothed" (Mark

---

4Liddel and Scott, abridged edition, p. 146.
5BDB, pp. 828-829.
14:51-52); "poorly clad" or "scantily clothed" (Job 22:6; Isa. 58:7; Matt. 25:36, 38, 43; John 2:15); "without an upper garment" or "not fully clothed" (Isa. 20:2; John 21:7); "un-clothed or stripped by force" (II Chr. 28:15; Acts 19:16; Rev. 17:16).  
In a more figurative sense ἄμοιος can refer to a bare seed (I Cor. 15:37), a soul without a body (II Chr. 5:3), things exposed to God's all-seeing eye (Heb. 4:13), the carnal condition of a local church (Rev. 3:17) or of an individual (16:15) and the desolation of religious Babylon (Rev. 17:16).  
Note the expression "without the preparedness of the inner man." Philo knows a nakedness of the soul which is to perdition as well as one which is to salvation (cf. Rev. 3:17; 16:15).  

ἄμοιος and its derivatives are descriptive terms depicting barren or exposed conditions: the impoverished person without adequate clothing; a person lightly clad or one who lays aside his outer garment; one without possessions, such as the infant and departing soul; an unarmed soldier; a ravished land; the slave or captive; the mourner.  
However, only in the case of the innocent pair in the Garden is the root ἄμοιος used in regard to the dynamics of the

---

8 Oepke, op. cit., p. 775.
interpersonal relationship. This is not the case with the root הער. Therefore, the thrust of the root הער is to be compared with the root הער and its main derivative הערו.

II. THE ROOT הער

The three related roots הער, הער and הער have already been mentioned. הער (II, "arar) meaning to "strip oneself," is a parallel form of הער "אריה) and probably the least significant of the preceding roots. This root appears in three instances: (1) the Qal imperative confronts the contemporary women of Isaiah to "strip" themselves in preparation for sackcloth (32:11), a meaning which parallels ושפת (pasha), "strip off," "make a dash," "raid"; (2) the Po' stem depicts the laying bare of the foundations of Tyre by the Chaldeans (Isa. 23:13); (3) the Pilp. absolute and Hithpalp. combine to describe the utter destruction of Babylon's walls (Jer. 51:58). הער presents two adjectival derivatives: (1) הערל ("arar) "stripped" or specifically "childless," as with Abram (Gen. 15:2), and sometimes as a pronounced judgment of Yahweh (Jer. 22:30; Lev. 20:20, 21); and (2) הערו ("arar) "stripped" or "destitute," as the prayer of the destitute (Jer. 17:6; cf. Ps. 102:18).

The Verb הער

The feminine noun הער ("erwa, "nakedness") derives its basic meaning from the verb הער, meaning to "be naked,"
"bare." The verb is not used in the Qal stem in the Old Testament. יָלַי is well attested in Semitics. Cognates appear in Assyrian, Syriac, Phoenician and the Targum.\(^9\)

The Arabic cognate, ﺎَرْيَ (‘ariya), emphasizes the word's portrayal of a temporary state or condition with its medial "i" vowel, as well as the broad range of meanings this root experiences. Arabic meanings include: one who is naked or scantily clothed, a body that is bare of flesh or lean, an unsaddled horse, a person freed from a defect or an affair, withdrawal or going to a remote place, an evil or foul thing, a hard and elevated or elevated and plain tract of earth that is apparent or open, a spacious tract of land in which nothing hides or conceals or in which nothing will be hidden, the beauty of an unclad girl or unclad portions of her body, the pudenda of a woman, "the truth is naked i.e. manifest," a camel pastured alone and with no burden.

In the Old Testament the Piel stem vividly refers to "laying foundations bare," that is, "tearing down walls." The best example of this is the recorded shout of Edom over Jerusalem: "rase it! rase it!" (Ps. 137:7, RSV; cf. also Hab. 3:13). In Zephaniah’s picture of the desolation of Nineveh, he included the laying bare of her cedar work (2:14). Isaiah laments the laying bare or taking away of the covering

\(^9\)BDB, p. 788.
of Judah (22:8). Probably the most figurative usage of the Piel stem is contained in God's indictment to lay bare the secret parts of the daughters of Zion (Isa. 3:17).

The Piel stem also depicts the emptying out of a water-jar as a "laying bare by removing contents" (Gen. 24:20), and that of the money chest in the temple (II Chr. 24:11). This stem also depicts the slaying of a person as the pouring out of his soul (Ps. 141:8). This particular meaning is shared with the Hiphil stem (Isa. 32:15). Furthermore, in a much more figurative sense, the Hithpael portrays the wicked man who pours or spreads himself out like a tree (Ps. 37:35).

But the Hiphil is also used to discuss sexual offenses in the Book of Leviticus (20:18, 19). This meaning, "to make naked," is a parallel construction to the expression "to uncover nakedness" which uses the verb גלע (gala') and the noun הראה. Jeremiah pictures Edom utilizing the figure of a drunken woman who will make herself bare (Lam. 4:21; Hithp.).

This variety of uses, however, does exhibit a common denominator. The emptying of a container, utter destruction of a foundation and pouring out of a life all speak of finality and completeness of action. It is this connotation of utter and complete finality of action that is expressed by the verb and underlies the meaning of the derived nouns when speaking of "nakedness." נלא deals with complete nakedness or utter stripping.
The Noun 

Although the derived feminine noun נַעֲרָה (‘ervâ) basically means "nakedness," the majority of references deal with the more defined meaning of pudenda. This Latin plural seems to convey the thrust of the Hebrew noun better than any other translation for the purposes of this paper. It is a neuter gerundive of pudere meaning "to cause shame," "ashame." Literally, pudenda is "that of which one ought to be ashamed," and is used of the privy parts or external genital organs.10

Besides נַעֲרָה, from which נַעֲרָה derives its basic meaning, there are two important verbs of accompaniment to be considered in conjunction with נַעֲרָה. The most pertinent ones include: נֶצֶע (רֶצֶע, see), נַלְגַּה (גָלַה, "uncover, remove"), and נַגְּזַה (קָגַה, "cover"). נֶצֶע is used only a few times for volitional gazing (eg. Ham) or as a parallel construction of נַלְגַּה נַעֲרָה. נַלְגַּה usually appears with the verb נָלַג, and together they yield the literal phrase "to uncover nakedness." כָּסָה, the antonym of נָלַג, does occur a few times but in crucial examples: Ham's brothers "covered" their father's nakedness (Gen. 9); Yahweh spoke figuratively in describing His covenant with Jerusalem as "covering" her nakedness (Ezek. 16).

Personal exposure. In a few cases נַעֲרָה does refer to a man's pudenda. Probably the most vivid example is the

---

Noah-Ham incident where the complete uncovering and exposure of a man implies a most shameful exposure.\textsuperscript{11} Ham's volitional and purposeful look at his father was a severe breach in their personal relationship. The severe punishment meted out to Ham's son, as well as the blessings bestowed upon Shem and Japheth, contrastingly emphasize with great power the shameful and destructive nature that complete exposure was considered to have by the ancient Hebrews. A notable exception occurs in the LXX translation: γυμνωσίς.

Probably the most surprising place to find ἀνάρα is in the specific instructions of Yahweh to His priests.\textsuperscript{12} Moses was instructed that the priests should not ascend God's altar using steps, so that their "nakedness" would not be uncovered or exposed Niphal; (Ex. 20:23). Furthermore, short linen drawers (lit: "concealers") were to be made for the members of the Aaronic priesthood. They were to reach from the hips to the thighs and were to be worn every time they were in the tent of meeting or ministering near the altar in the holy place. This was a perpetual statute for all of Aaron's

\textsuperscript{11}This incident is the one significant exception to LXX translation. γυμνωσίς translates ἀνάρα here. However, the inclusion of the suffix -ς does seem to emphasize action or process; Cf. J. Harold Greenlee, Exegetical Grammar (Wilmore: The Seminary Press, 1958), p. 19.

\textsuperscript{12}On p. 774, Oepke points to: H. Windisch, Kommentar z. 2. Korintherbrief (1924) who recalls the cultic horror of nakedness; Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, 2, 148; Angelos, 3 [1930], 159f; John 21:7; Rev. 3:18; 16:15.
descendants. To ignore these instructions was to incur guilt punishable or deserving of death. Entering God's sanctuary with "nakedness uncovered" was a violation of the reverence due to the holiness of His dwelling.

The largest single usage of הָרָעַךְ deals with the uncovering or looking upon a woman's "nakedness," either literally or figuratively. Leviticus (18:6-19; 20:11-21) affords the greatest number of literal examples within a series of injunctions that define a man's choice of a sexual partner. These specific instructions appear among the laws for the sanctification of Israel in the covenant fellowship.¹³

Usually הָרָעַךְ stands with the verb הָלַךְ, and Leviticus 18 emphasizes this. Verses 6 through 18 contain 16 instances of the phrase. In addition, each occurrence is accompanied by the emphatic negative particle נַחֲלָ הָ: "thou shalt not uncover nakedness!..." Ezekiel makes specific reference to this passage within his great list of the sins of Jerusalem. For he points to the uncovering of their father's "nakedness" in his indictment (22:10).

In the LXX translation of Leviticus 18 and 20, οὐκ οὖν καλύφεις and ἀσκημοσύνη render the Hebrew expression נַחֲלָ הָ. οὖν is the stronger particle used in

stating a prohibition emphatically; it is "clear-cut, point-blank, negative, objective, final" and correlates with ΚΛ perfectly.¹⁴ The Greek noun ἀσχημοσύνη can simply mean ungracefulness, awkwardness or disfigurement, but in the moral sense, indecorum, obscene or disgraceful conduct. The verb ἀσχημονέω means "behave unseemly," "disgrace oneself."

According to Liddel and Scott the noun is used in Leviticus as a euphemism for αἰθωτοῦν, meaning the "privy parts" or pudenda of both men and women.

dling is a word which not only appears in a shameful frame of reference but was also used in scathing remarks. King Saul affords the classic example when he upbraided his son Jonathan: "You son of a perverse, rebellious woman, do I not know that you have chosen the son of Jesse to your own shame, and to the shame of your mother's nakedness?" (I Sam. 20:30). In fact, Isaiah uses the term as a synonym for "shame" when he refers to the Egypto-Ethiopic captives who were to be led away "...naked and barefoot, with buttocks uncovered, to the shame (dling) of Egypt." (20:4).

The Aramaic counterpart of dling appears once in Ezra 4:14, and that in the construct state. הַלְּדַּינֹת (farvat) refers to the king's "dishonor." The subjects of Artaxerxes

considered disruption within his kingdom as a personal and humiliating exposure.

National exposure. ירוה is a relational term depicting the literal phenomenon of "nakedness," while also lending itself very well to figurative usage. With nations viewed as families in relationship, all nations could be referred to figuratively with the noun. Babylon's judgment was pronounced in terms of an uncovering of her "nakedness" (Isa. 47:3). Jerusalem became despised among her neighbors because they had seen her "nakedness" (Lam. 1:8); her "nakedness" was uncovered in her harlotries with her lovers (Ezek. 16:36). Yahweh promised to uncover her "nakedness" so that they would "see all her nakedness" (ראה כל ירוה). Originally, Yahweh had spread His skirt over her and covered her "nakedness" (Ezek. 16:8). She had practiced harlotry and flaunted her "nakedness" so openly, that Yahweh turned away from her in disgust (Ezek. 23:18). The judgment of Edom which was to follow Jerusalem's fall was portrayed as the figure of a drunken woman stripping herself bare (Hithp. ירוה). Nahum promised that Nineveh would have her skirts over her face in order for the nations to look on her "nakedness" (מער: ירוה; 3:5).

The Derivative יריה

יריה (יֶרְיהָ) is a virtual twin of ירוה and appears interchangeably with ירוה throughout Ezekiel 16. This word
is used in the compound expression "naked and bare" (עָרוֹר וּבָרָא) several times throughout the chapter, emphasizing complete destitution of clothing and adornment. Figuratively speaking, this was the condition of Jerusalem when Yahweh saw her and chose her (v. 7), for she was pitied by no one and abhorred from birth. As mentioned previously, this compound descriptive phrase is duplicated in the LXX with γυναική and ἀσχημοσύνη.

In Ezekiel 23:10 הָיוֹרָה seems to equal the deportation of Samaria's population, and in this stripping she becomes a byword "among women." Such things as grain, wine, wool and flax were also viewed as blessings of God that covered the nation (Hosea 2:9). The word for "exile" is based on the verb that commonly accompanies הָיוֹרָה and literally means to "uncover" or "remove" (נָלַל).

The Compound Expression הָיוֹרָת דַּבָּר

Two specialized meanings of הָיוֹרָה still remain, one of which involves the literal phrase "nakedness of a thing" (עדות דַּבָּר) and appears in two references (Deut. 23:9-18, Heb. text; 24:1). The former reference deals with bodily cleanliness for God's people in the war camp. They were to have a special place for reliefs outside the camp where such things were covered, for the Lord walked in the midst of the camp to deliver them into the hand of their enemies,
and if He saw the "nakedness of a thing," the result would be
their shame and God's turning away from them.

This expression is also used once dealing with the
marriage relationship. If a man were to marry and then find
in his wife, he was allowed to give her a letter
of divorce (s'per ker'itat), "cutting off"; contrast Gen. 2:24). More specifically, the phrase probably
means "indecency, improper behavior" (BDB) or "shameful thing"
(Delitzsch).

The Compound Expression הָאֲדָרָה

Finally, the accusation Joseph leveled at his brothers
was that they were spies who had come to see the "nakedness
of the land" (Gen. 42:9, 12). RSV uses the more defined
meaning "weakness." The expression probably refers to Egypt's
"exposed" or "undefended parts" (BDB, p. 789; יִצְצָא, בֵּאְרַתְון).

III. CONCLUSION

always appears in a context of judgment or
shame, and can be a word for shame itself (Isa. 20:4).
Derivatives of הָאֲדָרָה describe a bare or deprived condition of
persons and things, with γυμνός correlating very well in
the LXX translation. However, its derivatives only occur in
the dynamics of interpersonal relationship in the Garden
account. After this, complete, personal exposure was
referred to with the term רָדַּה or a derivative of יָדָה. Thus, Ezekiel's description of "nakedness and barrenness" within his personification of Jerusalem included the virtual twin of יָדָה, that is, יָדָה. The term's portrayal to complete personal exposure was utilized by the prophets to declare national shame and judgment.

Two areas for further treatment of the topic remain. First is the exposition or treatment of the implications of the cited biblical passages and related Old Testament allusions. Second is a thorough investigation of the Garden account in order to fathom the Old Testament attitude. The next chapter will deal with the former.
CHAPTER III

EXPOSITION OF ירוהו AND RELATED TERMS

The thrust of ירוהו is found within personal and communal relationships. Rarely do ירוהו and its derivatives deal with the inter-personal relationship. The objective of this chapter then is an expositional treatment of the cited biblical passages using ירוהו. Related Old Testament allusions will supplement the treatment, while pertinent collateral material concerning ancient near eastern background is to be introduced.

The inductive tools cited in the preceding chapter have also been utilized in the preparation of this chapter. Commentaries other than Keil and Delitzsch either ignore this topic or in referring to the topic quote or paraphrase Delitzsch or Keil. Therefore, other commentaries are not cited in this chapter. Biblical dictionaries, journals and significant books provide background material to elucidate some of the aspects of ancient Israel's contemporary life and setting. The titles of two source books edited by James Pritchard will appear abbreviated throughout: (1) Ancient Near Eastern Texts will be referred to as ANET, (2) while ANEP will designate The Ancient Near East in Pictures. Citations from the latter work will be referred to by plate number, for the front portion of the book contains the
plates while the last section explains them according to plate numbers.

The ancient Semite was not one to compartmentalize his life. All of life was sacred; no action was "profane" and no step was "a matter of course." ¹ Ancient man was a man most religious, devoid of such dichotomies as "sacred" and "secular." Basic to his belief was an "achieved order" which had to be maintained by the cult at any cost. Therefore, this chapter begins with the God-cult relationship and then moves to the most personal and significant relationship: Man-Woman. This latter relationship lends itself well to figurative portrayals of God-nation relationships, and this in turn demands illustration of man-to-man confrontations in the ancient world. So, the chapter moves from God-priest to Man-woman relationships, and God-nation to Man-man relationships.

I. GOD-PRIEST RELATIONSHIPS

The conception of man's god determined the nature of the priesthood and, consequently, the character of the individual devotee within the religion. The knowledge of the general pattern of near-eastern religion has helped greatly to put the religion of the Hebrews into perspective. ² The


essence of this pattern which is found in the fertility cult centered in the worship of the vegetation deity who died in the autumn and was resurrected in the spring. Religious services dramatized the death of the god, his resurrection and his marriage to the mother-goddess.

The profuse references contained in Leviticus are introduced with a sharp reminder of the difference between Israel's God and standards and those of Egypt and Canaan. Monotheism and polytheism were divergent faiths in tension, accompanied by dramatic ramifications and consequences. Thus, this crucial dualism forms the basic breakdown for considering God-cult relationships.

Canaanite-Egyptian Worship. Unfortunately, some Israelites absorbed the Canaanite ways and learned to identify their God with Baal, whose rains brought fertility to the land. Usually, the origin of fertility was represented by a sexual union in which the god of fecundity was the male principle, the earth goddess the female. One good reason for the popularity of fertility myths is the seduction-motive, which makes an excellent story and appeals with special power to the imagination of the male sex, the myth-makers.3

In the Canaanite world the cycle of the seasons was believed to be intimately associated with sexual relations between gods and goddesses. These relations were momentous for the welfare of an agricultural community. For the limited size of the Syrian-Canaanite region, the country combines the greatest differences and contrasts in geography and climate. Bound as it was to the natural cycle, the subtropical climate, with its seasonal rhythm of succeeding summer drought and winter rain, gave an unmistakable stamp to Canaanite worship.

The land which the Israelites entered was dotted with major and minor shrines. Sacral sexual intercourse by priests, priestesses and other specially consecrated persons was involved in the worship. Sacred prostitutes of both sexes were to emulate and stimulate the deities who bestowed fertility. The agricultural cult stressed the common meal in which gods, priests and people partook. Wine flowed in great abundance of thanksgiving for the plenteous harvest from the vineyards. The wine also helped to induce ecstatic frenzy, climaxed by self-laceration and sometimes even self-emasculcation. These common meals were not merely for "wine, women and song"; they were a matter of life and death in which the dearest things of life and life itself were offered

5 Kraus, op. cit., p. 38.
to insure the ongoing of life. The prophet of the shrine could many times be identified by the wounds caused by ritual laceration (Hos. 6:1). The virginity of the worshipers' daughters and the life-blood of their sons were at the disposal of the deity.

The religion of Syria must always remain the focus of research in comparative Semitic religions because Syria (inclusive of Palestine) is the geographical center of the Semitic world. Like Syro-Phoenician art and architecture of the Early Iron Age, the religion of the land was a fusion of elements derived from all surrounding cultures and from all the deposits of incessant migrations in and across Syrian soil. Egyptian influence was considerable on Syria, for Egypt controlled it under the New Kingdom (1550-1170), as well as in the Middle Kingdom and the fifth and sixth dynasties. Though more political and military than social and religious, the influence in the course of 2000 years must have been extensive. Furthermore, captives carried numerous Syrian gods with them. In fact, much of the knowledge of Syrian

---


8 Ibid., p. 80.
religion of the second millennium B.C. came from Egypt, until the discoveries at Ugarit.

'Anat had a double role of health-giver and war-goddess, similar to the Assyrian Ishtar. During the Ramessid age in Egypt the goddess 'Anat appears in the role of war-goddess. Worship of 'Anat is reflected in inscriptions from the reigns of Sethos I, Ramesses II, Ramesses III and during the nineteenth and twentieth dynasties. The best representation of her is on a stele in the British Museum showing the goddess QDŠ, that is, 'Astarte as "Holiness" and accompanied by her two divine lovers Min and Reshef (=Nergal), while 'Anat is enthroned in the lower register. In her quality as goddess of war, 'Anat bears shield and spear in her left hand, and wields a battle-axe in her right hand.\textsuperscript{10}

But the extraordinary fluidity of personality and function makes it exceedingly difficult to fix the domains of the different gods or to determine relationships to each other. Physical relationships, and even sex, change with disconcerting ease. Astarte, Anath and Asherah present the most complex pattern of relationships, but all three were principally concerned with sex and war. "Sex was their primary function."\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{9}Ibid., p. 82.  \textsuperscript{10}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{11}W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 75.
The two dominant Canaanite goddesses Astarte and Anath were both virginal and fruitful. Furthermore, they are nearly always represented in iconography as naked, as is known from the many hundreds of "Astarte" plaques from the period 1700-1100 B.C.\textsuperscript{12} The Canaanite goddesses Astarte and Qudshu always appear naked in Egyptian portrayals of this age, in striking contrast to the modestly garbed native Egyptian goddesses.

Another dominant characteristic of Canaanite goddesses is their savagery, and in Egyptian sources a favorite type of representation shows the naked goddess astride a galloping horse and brandishing a weapon in her right hand.\textsuperscript{13} For some reason she massacred mankind, young and old, with heads flying in all directions. She thrilled to wade in human gore and to make jewelry out of heads and hands.

Favorite animals of the Canaanite goddess were the lion, because of its ferocity, and the serpent and the dove because of their reputed fecundity. As these goddesses were both virginal and fertile, so the gods could experience both


\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.; ANEP, pl. 479.
emasculature and fecundity, with El being a vivid example.

Pregnancy was a sign of the favor of the gods. Not only was it sought by the worshipers, but the gods were many times depicted in a triad of god, goddess and offspring. These trinities appeared throughout the ancient Near East.\(^{14}\)

In Ugaritic mythology, Asherah was uniformly considered to be the wife of El, residing at the "source of the two rivers, the fountain of the two deeps."\(^ {15}\) Her appellations include: "The Lady Who Traverses the Sea" or "The Lady Who Treads on the Sea (Dragon)", and "She Who Gives Birth to the Gods." However, one of her most common appellations was "Holiness" (Canaanite Qudšu).\(^{16}\) The "holiness of Asherah" is a term with many ancient parallels.

Asherah was the chief goddess of Tyre in the fifteenth century B.C. with the appellation "holiness" (Qudšu).\(^ {17}\) In contemporary Egypt the name Qds (Qudšu) was attached to a portrayal of a nude goddess with spirally curled locks and raised hands holding lilies and serpents. She often stood on

\(^{14}\)May, op. cit., pp. 86, 90.

\(^{15}\)W. F. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968) p. 120.

\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 121.

\(^{17}\)Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Palestine, p. 78.
a lion, her sacred animal. Many plaques ranging from about 1700-1200 B. C. have been found at sites in Palestine and Syria showing the same goddess without the lion.\textsuperscript{18}

A striking line from the "Epic of Keret" (lines 197 f.) reads, "to the holiness of Asherah of the Tyrians."\textsuperscript{19} But, according to a late Hittite tablet this "holy one" tried to seduce Baal, failed in doing so and then tried to wrongfully accuse him, a case similar to that of Potiphar's wife. Another myth is portrayed on a twelfth-century, three-story altar-house from Bethshan. The naked goddess Asherah is seated on the window sill of the third story, while two gods seem to be fighting over her on the second story. Her lion moves toward the gods from the terrace while her serpent emerges from one of the windows in order to bite the nearest god.\textsuperscript{20}

So, in the world of divinities, goddesses were many times depicted in the nude, and ANEP illustrates this. From the First Dynasty of Babylon (1830-1530 B. C.), a nude female appears above a bull carrying a double-pronged lightning-fork and the inscription with the deities' names Adad, and Shala, while a worshipper stands. In plate 542, the Egyptian

\textsuperscript{18}Albright, \textit{Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan}, p. 122.

\textsuperscript{19}Albright, \textit{Archaeology and the Religion of Palestine}, p. 196.

\textsuperscript{20}Albright, \textit{Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan}, p. 123.
sky-goddess Nut is portrayed as a nude woman arched as the heavens over the earth, supported by the upraised arms of the air-god Shu. Plate 543 pictures a disc below her mouth that represents the sun. It was believed that the sun entered her mouth at sunset, after having completed the circuit from her genital area where it had been born at day-break. A full-face representation of a nude goddess from Ugarit is contained in plate 465, while plates 470-474 picture the stark naked goddess Qudsu or Qadesh. An inscription on the last one reads, "Qadesh, lady of the sky and mistress of all gods," and comes from the New Kingdom (1550-1090 B.C.).\textsuperscript{21} Plate 479 captures a nude Syrian goddess astride a horse and brandishing a weapon (Thebes: nineteenth dynasty; 1350-1200 B.C.). The Palestinian plaques with Qudsu and her spiral locks are many times indistinguishable from contemporary plaques found in Babylonia, lending good reason to believe that the representation spread westward from Babylonia to Egypt rather than north from Egypt.\textsuperscript{22}

Part of the ritual was the goddess' search for her consort, the god. Sometimes the search took her to the

\textsuperscript{21}ANEP, pp. 304-5.

\textsuperscript{22}Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, p. 146. Note the unusual figurines from Ur. Nude female bodies with reptilian heads and slanting eyes are wearing high bitumen crowns. Breasts and genital regions are prominently displayed (4th millenium B.C.).
underworld to appear before the queen of the realm. The fertility goddesses Inanna (Sumerian) and Ishtar (Akkadian) made descents to the nether world. Both accounts reveal that the watchman, under orders, stripped the goddess of her clothing an article at a time from gate to gate until she appeared before the underworld queen stark naked. Note that the maiden of Canticles was beaten and stripped of her mantle by the city watchmen while searching for her lover (5:6-7). Yahweh promised to obstruct the search of the zonah for her lovers and prevent her from finding her paths. He was to strip her naked as did the watchmen in the above accounts (Hos. 2:8, 9).

Sometimes the ancient priest or offerer appeared before the goddess or god naked. ANEP contains several examples of such offering scenes. A vase from Warka depicts a nude male server presenting a basket of fruit and vegetables to a priestess of Inanna or to Inanna herself, while the second register shows a line of nude porters with their heads and faces shaven bearing offerings (pl. 502; ca. 3000 B. C.). An offering scene amidst two piles of corpses pictures animals ready for sacrifice and a nude offerer pouring a libation at Tello (pl. 299; ca. 2500 B. C.). A priest, completely nude and shaven, pours a libation from a spouted

\[^{23}\text{ANET, pp. 52-7, 106-9.}\]
vessel into a vase before a seated goddess at Tello (pl. 597; 3000-2500 B. C.). From Nippur, a plaque with a duplicated offering scene portrays a nude and shaven priest offering a libation from a spouted jug to a seated god (pl. 600). In a plaque from Ur, a nude priest pours an oblation before a seated god in the upper register and also makes a similar offering before the door of a temple in the lower register (pl. 603; ca. 2500 B. C.). Another contemporary scene from Ur shows a nude clean-shaven priest holding a libation vase in front of a pillar mounted on a tripod of bull's legs (pl. 605). An Akkadian representation of the water-god Ea pictures him followed by a bearded hero, nude except for a belt, who stands holding a gatepost (pl. 693; 2360-2180 B. C.).

Israelite worship. "The worship of Israel did not fall down complete from Heaven, but arose out of a keen struggle with the powerful religious forms and practices of the country."24 Many of the elements of Old Testament worship are connected in some way with Canaanite religion. However, distinctive features of Israel's worship became quite evident in the process of sifting, transforming and adoption.

The abstract noun Qdﺎ ("Holiness") assumed a very concrete usage as an appellation of Asherah, while the Aramaic

24Kraus, op. cit., p. 36.
Qudša was a title of God in Rabbinic literature. While both deities bear the same title in this respect, both do not receive the same representation. It is significant that no Astarte plaques or figurines have yet been discovered in any early Israelite levels in central Palestine. This absence is in striking contrast to their frequency in corresponding deposits of the Late Bronze and Iron II periods and demands an explanation. This phenomenon is probably connected with the aniconic character of Yahwism, which bitterly opposed human representations of all kinds. Absence of iconography was not the case on the periphery of Israel where Yahwistic tradition was not so strong and contact with non-Israelites was more frequent, (cf. eg. stratum B of Tell Beit Mirsim, ca. 1200-920 B.C.).

The pagans could easily mix their gods and identify one with another. For example, the Sumerian Inanna is connected with the Akkadian Ishtar because of similar roles. However, Yahweh was not to be connected with, or in any way identified with, other gods. His nature was radically different from all figures of pagan mythology. Note, for

26 Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, p. 114.
27 Ibid.; (cf. also, AASOR, vols. 21-22).
28 Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 119.
example, that the perfectly good name for "lord" or "master" (לְדוֹר) had been so profusely associated with the storm-god by the days of Hosea that Yahweh's designated role as "husband" was to be referred to with a different word (שָׁבָה), (Hosea 2:16).

When Yahweh appeared to Moses through the burning bush, Moses was ordered to stand barefoot because he was on holy ground. Foot wear is not included in the elaborate descriptions of the priestly garments, so it is possible that the priests ministered barefoot.\(^2\) With this exception, the Lord was worshiped in holy array (I Chr. 16:29). In fact, the high priest could not rend his clothes, let his hair hang or defile himself even for his father and mother (Lev. 21:10, 11). Aaron had to have on all the proper garments in order to approach God in the holy place (Lev. 16:4).

The priests were specifically warned about exposing their "nakedness" (נְלָי). They were not to use stairs in ascending to God's altar, for this exposed their "nakedness" (Ex. 20:23). Furthermore, a perpetual statute demanded each priest to be wearing a pair of linen drawers every time he was in the tent of meeting or ministering near the altar in the holy place, so that his "nakedness" would not be exposed.

Failure to keep the ordinances incurred guilt worthy of death.

At this point it may be well to recall some of the considerations pointed out by Delitzsch in his commentary on the Book of Exodus. For one thing, the consciousness of sin first manifested itself in the feeling of shame. Within this consciousness of shame, sin was apparent (Gen. 3:7). Also, nakedness was a disclosure of sin which could desecrate God's altar and sanctuary.\textsuperscript{30}

The consciousness of sin and guilt made itself known first in the feeling of nakedness. Therefore, those members that subserve natural secretions are especially objects of shame, for the mortality and corruptibility of the body, which sin brought into human nature, are chiefly manifested in these secretions. So, these members can be called "flesh of nakedness."\textsuperscript{31}

The organs of generation manifest the inherent capacity and creation of man for imperishable life. To associate these \textit{per se} with frailty and nakedness seems inconsistent. However, these are connected with impurities ejected by nature


\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., p. 206.
which bear in themselves the character of corruptibility. Therefore, those members of the body in which the impurity of a man's nature and the nakedness of his flesh were most apparent were to be covered in order to appear as holy before God, not because the sin of nature has its principal seat in the flesh of nakedness.32

Improper exposure to Yahweh resulted in death for an individual. Indeed, in the Old Testament, exposure to God's wrath was a constant dread (eg. I Ch. 29:8). Uzzah died touching the ark (II Sam. 6:6) and seventy men of Bethshemesh were slain for looking into the ark (I Sam. 6:19), provoking the question, "who can stand before God?" (vs. 20). Exposure of the Kohathites to holy things, even for a moment, equaled death (Num. 4:20).

When Elijah heard God's voice, he wrapped his face in his mantle (I Kings 19:13). Yahweh covered Moses' face when He passed by him so that he only saw His back (Ex. 33:23). In close fellowship with God, Moses' face became so radiant that he had to wear a veil before the people (Ex. 34:29-35).

While sacred prostitution was an integral part of ancient Canaanite worship, it was specifically prohibited in Old Testament law. Deuteronomy (23:17) declares that no Israelite could become a qedesh or qedeshoth, nor could the

32Ibid.
wages of a harlot or Sodomite be presented to the Lord. Leviticus 21 records the utmost of purity for the priests of Yahweh because He considered them to be holy. They could not marry a harlot or a defiled woman, make tonsures upon their heads, shave the edges of their beards and make cuttings in their flesh (vs. 5, 7).

II. MAN-WOMAN RELATIONSHIPS

"In fixing relationships we must remember that both in Egypt and Canaan the notion of incest scarcely existed. In fact, Phoenicia and Egypt shared a general tendency to use 'sister' and 'wife' synonymously." 33 As late as the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C., kings such as Akhenaten and Ramesses II married one or more of their own daughters. Anat herself was not only Baal's virgin sister, but his consort as well. In fact, while she was in the form of a heifer, Baal raped her in an epic "77-even 88 times." 34

Man's conception of his deity determined the character of, and standards for, the marriage relationship. In fact, it determined the entire social tone. Yahweh's unique nature demanded unique standards within the ancient setting. Some of these standards are to be considered in terms of נ"למה:

33 Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, p. 128.
34 Ibid.
Specific Laws and Customs. The largest single usage of הָיְדָע deals with the uncovering or looking upon a woman's "nakedness," either literally or figuratively. Leviticus (18:6-19) affords the greatest number of literal examples within a series of injunctions that define a man's choice of a sexual partner. These specific instructions appear among the laws for the sanctification of Israel in the covenant fellowship.\(^{35}\)

The Lord addresses Moses in the first five verses of Leviticus eighteen. Two things are prominent in these preliminary instructions. First, the people were to know that "I am the Lord your God" and, second they were not to walk in the statutes and customs of Egypt and Canaan. These two land areas and cultures were intimately familiar to the Israelites, but they were to ignore the religious standards of these societies in which they had grown up and lived. Instead, the people were to do Yahweh's ordinances, keep His statues and walk in them. In fact, His lordship is reiterated three times in addition to a promise of life to the obedient individual. The demands that follow these five introductory verses are based squarely upon God's person and nature. Therefore, the person who disobeys these commands affronts the person of God Himself! One cannot separate the Law from the

\(^{35}\)Keil and Delitzsch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 407.
Law-giver. It was His authority by which the regulations were set down.

Verses 6 through 23 contain the sexual relationships which were to be avoided by the Israelites. These regulations deal with the abominations committed by the nations before Israel's arrival. Through these practices they had defiled themselves and the land (vv. 24, 25), and as a result the land was "vomiting" out the inhabitants. Israel was to be threatened with the same punishment if she insisted upon keeping standards that were opposed to Yahweh's commands -- "I am the Lord your God."

Verse 6 introduces the individual commands of the chapter with a general prohibition: "None of you shall approach to any flesh (בָּשָׂר) of his flesh (בָּשֶׂר), to uncover nakedness" (lit.). The distinction between בָּשֶׂר and בָּשָׂר is obscure. Both are used of edible flesh. However, the expression "flesh of his flesh" depicts flesh that belongs to the same flesh as himself (Gen. 2:24), and is applied to blood relation. For example, רָעַךְ (ša'arâ) refers to blood relationship or flesh-kindred. Therefore, no one is to approach anyone near of kin to "uncover nakedness."


37 Ibid., p. 412.
To "uncover nakedness" is to have sexual intercourse. So, it may either refer to cohabitation or the marriage contract. Leviticus 18 addresses the man and specifically forbids sexual exposure of: a mother or stepmother, a sister or half-sister, a granddaughter of either mother or father, the daughter of a step-mother, the sister of either mother or father (aunt), the wife of a father's brother, a daughter-in-law, sister-in-law, a woman and daughter together or a woman and granddaughter, or two sisters simultaneously.

This passage follows through with its theme in several specific references where the reason for abstinence is stated particularly. For example, to uncover a mother's nakedness is to uncover the father's nakedness (v. 8); a man's daughter-in-law is his own nakedness and must not be uncovered (v. 10); to uncover a brother's wife is to uncover a brother's nakedness (v. 16). The other supporting expression deals more specifically with the flesh-relation: A father's sister is not to be uncovered because she is the father's near kinswoman (v. 12); a woman's daughter, son's daughter or daughter's daughter are near kinswomen (v. 17).

Usually יָרַה stands with the verb בָּלָה, and Leviticus 18 emphasizes this. Verses 6 through 18 contain 16 instances of the phrase. In addition, each occurrence is accompanied by the emphatic negative particle כִּי: "thou shalt not uncover nakedness!..." Ezekiel makes specific
reference to this passage within his great list of the sins of Jerusalem. He points to the uncovering of their father's nakedness in his indictment (22:10).

Judicial punishments. Leviticus 18 and 20 remain as the two greatest sections of scriptural material relating to the study of הָיוּ . Moreover, the intervening chapter (19), emphatically portrays the basis for the demands and severe judgments concerning הָיוּ . Several varied injunctions deal with the people's association with God, parents, neighbors, children, sojourners, slaves, handicapped individuals, the poor, offerings and agricultural practices. In fact, verse 18 sets down the Golden Rule. But, the reason and basis presented here and in 14 other places within the chapter is that "I am the Lord." Also included is the admonition, "You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy" (19:2).

Moral law rests squarely upon God's character, while a man's character and conduct are measured according to the quality of his relationship with God. Therefore, a man is directly responsible to God Himself in all of his interpersonal relationships with his fellow man, and even his relationship to his environment. Note, for example, that if a man lies carnally with a slave who is betrothed to another man, he is not to be put to death because she is not free. However, he must bring a guilt offering for himself to the
Lord, for God is the Lord of the interpersonal relationship.

No personal relationship is complete and fulfilling unless it is three-way or triangular, and includes one who is perfect. Otherwise, imperfection sets up imperfect idols, while idolatry breeds disillusionment and nihilism. Proverbs tersely states that the oppressor of the poor man insults his maker (Prov. 14:31, 17:5). Also, David's penitential Psalm declares, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done that which is evil in thy sight, so that thou art justified in thy sentence and blameless in thy judgment" (Ps. 51:4).

Leviticus 20 contains the punishments for the vices and crimes prohibited in chapters 18 and 19. It is noteworthy that the chapter begins with a condemnation of idolatry, stressing particular aspects that were in tension with Israel's covenant relationship with her Lord. This personal relationship with God is the foundation of moral law and automatically flows into and affects the relationship between parents and children. This order of progression in the chapter is significant and analogous to the order of priorities in the Ten Commandments. Note, for example, the

38 Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 426.

Ten Commandments move from the basis of one's personal relationship with God to that of one's parents, neighbor's person, a neighbor's wife (in union with his person), a neighbor's possessions, and one's reputation. All human relationships are intimately integrated with, and answer to, God Himself.

Leviticus 20 sets down a series of sentences in degrees of punishment. A man uncovering his mother's nakedness was to be put to death along with his mother (v. 11; cf. also Deut. 27:20). In fact, any couple involved in adulterous relations was to be put to death (v. 10). A man and his daughter-in-law were both to be executed (v. 12). To take a wife along with her mother to "uncover nakedness" was considered so wicked (נְפִי) that the three of them were to be burned with fire in order to purge the wickedness from Israel (v. 14) [plan, device, wickedness]. Uncovering and seeing (נַקְת) a sister's nakedness ended in death (v. 17; cf. also Deut. 27:22). Deuteronomy (27:23) particularly includes death for a relationship with one's mother-in-law.

According to Leviticus 20 (19-21), the remaining infractions call for the individuals to "bear their iniquity." In other words, those who were involved in the lesser outrages were to suffer the consequence of their actions, leaving retribution wide open to the discretion of God rather than a magistrate. For instance, childlessness was a specific
punishment mentioned in connection with a relationship involving an uncle's wife or that of a brother.

Even the patriarchal era contains a clear example of sexual impingement and punishment within a family. While Israel was on a journey, Reuben lay with his father's concubine Bilhah (Rachel's handmaid). Israel heard about it but the incident was not mentioned again until Jacob called together his sons shortly before his death in order to tell them what was to befall them in the days ahead (Gen. 49:1ff.). Reuben was the first-born of Jacob's strength, pre-eminent in pride and power. However, he was refused pre-eminence as the Covenant leader because he went up to his father's bed and defiled (למא) it (vss. 3, 4). In fact, Jacob used a poetic word that occurs very few times within the Old Testament in referring to the defilement of his bed of wedlock. This word for bed is based on a verb stem meaning to "lay" or "spread" (עשת).  

Death for adultery seems to have been a common punishment in the ancient Near East. However, while the ancient codes of law resorted to mutilation in punishment for some sexual irregularities, there is only one instance in Old

---

^40 BDB, pp. 426-7.


^42 Esp. the Assyrians; cf. ANET, pp. 180-8.
Testament law where this type of punishment is meted out for this type of offense. If during a brawl a wife tried to help her husband by grabbing his contender by his privates, she was to have her hand cut off (Deut. 25:11, 12).

Synonymous expressions of "uncover nakedness" include: "uncover his feet" (Ruth 3:4); "uncovered his father's skirt" (Deut. 27:20). Ruth's request for Boaz to spread his skirt over her is a vivid example of a Semitic custom in which the man's clothes acted as bedclothes for both himself and his wife, and symbolized the marriage union of man and wife (Ruth 3:9). Yahweh used this very picture to recall the intimate union He had made with Jerusalem: at the time of love He spread his skirt over her (Ezek. 16:8).

But Deuteronomy also refers to the custom in law and punishment: a man was not to uncover his father's skirt (22:30); the man was cursed if he did uncover his father's skirt (27:20). Among Israel's transgressions Amos included a man and his father who go into the same maiden, for God's holy name was profaned (2:7).

In the ancient world it seems that the veil signified that the woman belonged to a man as wife or daughter. The Assyrian Code stipulated severe penalties for certain classes of women who did not veil their heads while on the street. This code infers that the original intention of veiling was to signify that a woman belonged to a man, or that husbands
desired to hide a possession from the gaze of other men. A secular prostitute, an unmarried qadištu or a slave girl could not be veiled. When Tamar donned the garments and veil of the zonah in order to seduce Judah, it is most likely that she posed as a sacred prostitute. Note that when the Adullamite asked for her, he called her the רשות . (Gen. 38:21).

III. GOD-NATION RELATIONSHIPS

Deuteronomy (7:6) declares that the Israelite people were to be a people holy to the Lord and, therefore, to destroy utterly the seven nations and their worship. Israel was warned against other covenants, for involvement in another covenant was called harlotry (Ex. 34:15). When Aaron let the Israelites break loose into calf worship they became "naked" (ים ב) before their enemies. When Israel chose to play the harlot after strange gods, Yahweh hid His face from them, and their destruction resulted.

The prophets were public teachers occupied with the life of the people in terms of the covenant relationship.

---
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Accordingly, the Israelites sinned in two ways: (1) forsaking YHWH, the God of Israel, and (2) committing social wrongdoing within the covenant community. Their vivid conception of YHWH as a person in direct relation to His people made sin more of a defection from Himself than defection from the law. He was the living authority who appealed to them directly by His prophets and in their history. Prophets spoke directly from Yahweh and appealed little to external law. This conception of sin as directly against His person deepened the concept of sin, and also produced the personification of the Israelite community (cf. e.g. Hosea and Isaiah).^9

Yahweh was the only God, but He chose to become the God of Israel. The surrounding nations knew Him only as YHWH, the God of Israel. God's purpose was to reveal Himself to all flesh, but He could only reveal Himself to the nations in connection with Israel. So, He began a redemptive work in the world with Israel that was to embrace the nations and could not undo that work however Israel might sin (Deut. 32:26, 27). Therefore, later books note instances of God restraining His anger "for His name's sake," with great prophets such as Isaiah and Ezekiel included.^9

---


^47Ibid.

^48Ibid., p. 332.

^49Ibid., p. 333.
In light of these considerations, the following section of this chapter will deal with נור as it relates to the Israelite national community and surrounding national communities. The material will be arranged under two headings: (1) Israel; and (2) Israel's neighbors.

Israel. נר is a relational term depicting the literal phenomenon of "nakedness," while also lending itself well to figurative usage. Therefore, during the crucial and closing days of the divided kingdoms, this vivid term was utilized by the great prophets who were caught in the agony of the pathos of God. They were desperately trying to portray the estrangement and hurt felt by a holy God whose covenant and abundant provision had been spurned and contemptuously ridiculed by His covenant people.

The picture of a faithful wife and a faithless harlot is a vivid contrast utilized in varying degrees by the great prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea and Micah. Hosea certainly fathomed and conveyed the pathos of God in a unique manner because of his tragic relationship with Gomer. Furthermore:

To Hosea, marriage is the image for the relationship of God and Israel. This is one of the boldest con-

---

51 Ibid., p. 56.
ceptions of religious thinking. It may lack the excitement of adventure, but it has the aura of sublimity. It involves restraint, bringing with it duties and responsibilities, but it also endows with a nobility that is a synonym for eternity. Israel is the consort of God.\textsuperscript{52}

He celebrated the essence of God's relationship to Israel as love, tenderness, and nostalgia, but also wrote expressions of terrifying vehemence.\textsuperscript{53}

However, Ezekiel presents one of the clearest literary portrayals depicting Yahweh's relationship with His people in terms of the marriage relationship in conjunction with frequent references to>Email. Marriage is both demanding and intimate, and Yahweh's covenant was certainly not less than that of marriage! So, Ezekiel 16 is a vivid figurative picture of Yahweh's covenanting with Jerusalem. She was chosen while utterly destitute of clothing and adornment, having been abhorred from birth (vv. 3-7).

Yahweh cared for Jerusalem and upon her reaching maidenhood He spread His skirt over her, covering her nakedness (כוס אורות), plighting His troth and entering into a covenant with her (v. 8). He lavished her with every adornment, even royal splendor (vv. 9-14). However, rather than using God's abundant provisions for her own sanctification and the evangelization of the surrounding nations, she squandered her substance in the service of her idolatrous relationships and new loyalties (vv. 15-21).

\textsuperscript{52}ibid., p. 50. \textsuperscript{53}ibid.
Her beauty became perfect through the splendor bestowed by Yahweh, and her renown went out among the nations. However, she came to trust in her beauty and played the harlot lavishly (vv. 15-21). In all of her abominations and harlotries she forgot the days of her youth when she was "naked and bare" (עָרָם וְאֱדוֹרִים; v. 22). The Assyrians, Egyptians, and Chaldeans were specifically implicated as among her illicit partners (vv. 26, 28, 29). For political and religious intercourse were one and the same thing. Even the Philistines were appalled and ashamed of the lewd behavior of Jerusalem (v. 27). Israel had been glorified above all nations by her Lord, but she failed to continue in fellowship with Him. In other words, she had failed to remain covered.54

The basis of Yahweh's judgment of Jerusalem was (1) her idols, and (2) the blood of her children (v. 36). She had courted other lovers and had shed innocent blood in her streets. Therefore, she was to be judged as an adultress and a murderess, with all of the furious wrath and jealousy involved (v. 38). Because of the great depths of her idolatry, the Lord promised to deliver her into the hands of the heathen nations she had courted. He was to gather her lovers

54 In fact, the great Old Testament word for atonement means to cover (a denom. verb).
together, loved or loathed, and while she was surrounded by them, He promised to uncover her nakedness (גֵּלָה וַעֲרֹזִיהּ) that they would see all her nakedness (כֶּל וּעֲרֹזִיהּ; v. 37).

These lovers were to strip (פָּשִׂים) her of all adornment and leave her "naked and bare" (עָרָם וּעֲרֹזִיהּ). Jerusalem had been chosen in this condition; now she was to return to this condition of judgment, bearing her humiliation (נָשָׁה וּכָלָם; v. 52).

The intensity of this judgment was emphasized in several ways. The burning of Jerusalem's houses signified the intense judgment, while the most humiliating aspect was her exposure and punishment "before many women's eyes" (=heathen nations).55 Furthermore, the word for jealousy (פִּזְזָה) is a term that deals with the ardor of a jealous husband, the ardor of a man's zeal for God or God's zeal for His people during battle, or the ardor of anger.56 The Arabic cognate (قَانَا${}^a$) means to "become intensely red (black), with dye."57 Ezekiel has produced a brief history of his people in a moving panorama guised in the dynamics of the interpersonal

56BDB, p. 888.
57Ibid.
relationship with its attendant feelings of ardor and intensity.

Ezekiel 23 contains an elaboration of the faithlessness and judgment of God's people under the figure of two harlots who were sisters. Oholah, the elder sister, represented Samaria, while Oholibah represented Jerusalem. Lamentations also supplements the account in Ezekiel 16 dealing with Jerusalem.

Lamentations 1:8 and Ezekiel 16:36 point out an aspect of הֵרִידָה that is reminiscent of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. Yahweh promised to "uncover her nakedness" before her lovers, but Jerusalem had already uncovered herself to them. Jerusalem had foolishly uncovered herself, thinking that she would not also reap the consequences. Her nakedness became uncovered in her harlotries (Ezek. 16:36), those who honored (כָּכַב) her came to despise her because of the sight of her "nakedness," and even Jerusalem reached the point where she turned her face away in shame (Lam. 1:8). She thought she could endure a "controlled exposure," forgetting that her type of exposure was a complete exposure that contained the most volatile of repercussions. Yahweh gave her over to the completely uncontrollable consequences of her voluntary choice.

Israel's neighbors. The picture of a ravished and desolate woman was not unique to the covenant people, for the
relations between the nations were considered family relations; world-history was viewed as family-history. Edom was enjoined to exult while she was able, because the time was coming when she too would drink the same cup as Jerusalem and strip herself bare (Hithp.: רעה). Nahum's oracle points out God is a jealous God and an avenging God who does not clear the guilty (1:2, 3). Nineveh, whose countless harlotries had betrayed many nations, was to have her skirts lifted over her face by the Lord of Hosts. He promised this so that the nations would look on her "nakedness" (ברעה) and kingdoms on her shame (loquent). Isaiah heightened this poetic device when he referred to Babylon as a virgin daughter (47:1) with all the honor and respect that causes people to call her "tender and delicate" (47:1). This high place of honor was also a source of strength yielding the deference and loyalty of the other nations. This state was to be exchanged for one of reproach (חרפת), a term dealing with the condition of shame relating

---
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to sexual irregularities (cf. Ezek. 16:57; Prov. 6:3). She was careful to keep everything disagreeable at a distance and revealed in nothing but luxury.

Babylon felt secure in her wickedness saying, "No one sees me." But this queen of the kingdoms (vv. 5, 7), the virgin daughter, was to take off her robe and have her "nakedness" (ענוה) uncovered and her shame (חרפה) in full view. Her shameful conduct was to be exhibited in its true colors by One who was stronger than she. The fall from proud eminence to shameful humiliation was to be so complete for the queen that she was advised to creep away into the darkness lest someone see her in her shame (v. 5). Isaiah's portrayal of an unvanquished city in terms of an unviolated virgin was vivid, but seemingly contradictory. However, presentation of contradictory poetic images produces a vivid style that is well illustrated from Ugaritic literature and demands one's full attention.

IV. MAN-TO-MAN RELATIONSHIPS

Among the Hebrews shame was manifested in face, bearing and dress (II Sam. 13:19). Subjectively, shame was

61 ענוה; cf. Tamar and Ammon, II Sam. 13:13. Cf. also, Ezek. 16:57; Pr. 6:3.

62 Delitzsch, loc. cit.

experienced as guilt for sin (Ezra 9:6; Jer. 2:26), sense of defeat or failure (II Chr. 32:21; Jer. 9:19), a violation of one's honor and modesty (II Sam. 10:5), as embarrassment or exposure (Judg. 3:25), or simply as the result of disappointment (Jer. 2:36). Enemies often put outward marks of derision on their victims, either by exposure of their nakedness or by mutilation (Judg. 1:6-7). Exposure was particularly painful to the Hebrews (Isa. 3:17).

Shame came as a divine judgment upon sinners (Ps. 44:9) and particularly upon Israel's foes (Isa. 7:20; Jer. 46:24). The devout prays for the shame of the wicked (Ps. 6:10). "To put to shame" is a frequent Old Testament expression, and Christ's cross was the symbol of His bitter shame (Heb. 6:6; 12:2).

Thus far, man-to-man confrontations in the ancient Near East have not been discussed. Therefore, some of the specific everyday occurrences characterized by "nakedness" or "exposure" will be presented in the following discussion. Exposure of a person was either connected with very intimate occasions or

---

64 Cf. also II Sam. 13:13; I Cor. 11:6, 14.
65 Cf. also II Kings 2:17; Ezek. 36:30; Luke 14:9.
66 Cf. also I Sam. 11:2; II Sam. 10:4-5; Christ's executioners.
67 Devries, loc. cit.
68 Ibid.
extremely humiliating acts. Therefore, the following treatment will be arranged according to these two poles.

Sanctity of sex or person. Sex was so sacred and personal that Abraham insisted that his servant swear by his privates to deal faithfully with him in all that he asked for his son Isaac (Gen. 24:2-9). Israel asked Joseph to swear an oath to him in the same manner (Gen. 47:29-31). In fact, Yahweh Himself did not allow entrance into the congregation of the Lord by a man who had his male member cut off or his testicles crushed. Nor could a bastard enter it, even to the tenth generation (Deut. 23:1, 2). When the Lord spoke of the ultimate humiliation and judgment of His nation, He threatened to lay bare the secret parts (Isa. 3:16, 17).

The Book of Ezra makes a very interesting reference in regard to a king's person. The adversaries of Judah and Benjamin had failed to curb the rebuilding of the temple. Therefore, the provincial rulers surrounding Jerusalem wrote a letter to King Artaxerxes concerning the matter. One of their stated reasons for writing the letter was because it was not fitting for them to witness the king's "dishonor" ("nakedness", 4:14). This incident portrays a personal tie between the king and his realm or subjects. A stripping within his kingdom was a humiliation of his very person.
Abusive or humiliating acts. Isaiah pointed to a common shameful punishment of the ancient Semitic world when he spoke of the Egypto-Ethiopic captives which were to be led away naked and barefoot with buttocks exposed (20:4). Here is used synonymously with "shame," for they were to be led away naked and barefoot to the "shame" (עַרְוָה) of Egypt. The naked captive was a common element of Assyrian war reliefs, whether trodden under foot, mutilated, impaled or even falling from a besieged tower. In Isaiah (7:20), the complete desolation of Judah by the Assyrian armies was compared to the complete shaving of the head and pubic region of a man.

When Amos chose to represent the rout and shame of Israel's warriors, he depicted them as running away naked (2:16). Just such a scene appears on a palatte from Hierkonopolis. Underneath Nar-mer, king of upper Egypt, two naked men flee from a fortress. In another register, a bull treads on a naked warrior in front of a partially demolished fortress (ca. 3000 B.C.). Note that the confidence which Caleb and Joshua exhibited in relation to Canaan's conquest

---


70 O. J. Baab, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

71 ANEP, pls. 296, 297.
was in light of the fact that the occupants' "protection" was removed from them and the Lord was with Israel (Num. 14:9).

When David sent his emissaries to Hanun, the new king of Ammon, they were seized, half of each man's beard was shaved and their garments were cut off above their buttocks (II Sam. 10:4, 5). This humiliation (דְּלָה) was so great that it touched off a war involving Israel, Ammon and Syria.

On an occasion of war, the army of the Northern Kingdom chose to humiliate Judah. They brought back a large troop of mixed captives - "naked." The elders were horrified and ordered the prisoners to be clothed, fed and returned to their homes (II Chr. 28:15).

Over-exposure was a dangerous thing. Hezekiah was rebuked for showing the Babylonian envoys all of his house, because all that they saw would become theirs (II Kings 20:15). Even when justice was meted out in the form of a beating, an Israelite brother could not be beaten more than forty times lest he be degraded before the group (Deut. 25:3).

Actually, law breakers were hanged before God so that His fierce wrath would turn from Israel (Num. 25:4). A hanged man was cursed by God and had to be buried the same day or the land would become defiled (Deut. 21:23). Note

72 Cf. the root דְּלָה: Arabic examples include "strip" flesh from bone, leaves from trees, or bark from a tree trunk.
that all Israel was subjected to God's wrath until Achan was punished for touching a devoted thing. Also, Saul lost a kingdom when he himself became exposed to the wrath he had failed to execute against the Amalakites on behalf of God.

יהוה was a word that not only appeared in a shameful frame of reference, but it also was used in making scathing remarks. Saul affords an excellent example at this point. He had become aware of Jonathan's allegiance to David, and at a particular feast of the new moon the issue erupted. David had failed to come and Jonathan stood in defense of him. Seething with rage, Saul called Jonathan the "son of a perverse, rebellious woman," asking him if he knew he had chosen David to his own shame and to the shame of his mother's "nakedness" (I Sam. 20:30). For as long as David lived, neither Jonathan nor his kingdom would be established (I Sam. 20:31). When a group of boys wanted to rail at Elisha they called him "baldhead" (II Kings 2:12, 13).

V. CONCLUSION

God is the Lord of the inter-personal relationship, and it is His nature that has set up the guidelines for personal and communal relationships. יהוה or עלת depicts defective inter-personal relationships. Several other words are connected with improper personal exposure: humiliation (כבוד); defilement (חלל); wickedness (זונות); confusion or
incest (תכל), shameful (השל), foolishness (ה過ご), ignominy (הפור), shame (כש, קזר) and more.

Complete exposure could equal ravishment or destruction and is exactly what Yahweh meant when He threatened to lift one's skirts over her face (Jer. 13:22-26). He promised to uncover all of Jerusalem's "nakedness" (Ezek. 16:37). His threat to put her blood on a rock equaled disaster, because exposure of blood automatically brought vengeance (Ezek. 24:8). The cup of desolation gives a similar picture, for in a drunken state a person loses his inhibitions and control, leaving one uncovered for destruction.

In contrast, a proper personal or communal relationship was that of being covered. Marriage and Yahweh's covenant are referred to as פך כנסו כסה ערזא and כסה כסה נרכז. In fact, the great word for atonement (כפר) in the Old Testament means "to cover." A covering through the price of blood is the only way God can relate to man; this is what covered Israel (Ex. 12:13).

It is the Garden Account in Genesis which depicts the original and perfect inter-personal relationship. Also, it describes the deterioration of the perfect relationship. Since both of these are described in terms of "nakedness," this account is the focal point of discussion in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

MAN'S ORIGINAL PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Basically, Genesis 2:4-3:24 depicts the Creator in relation to the Created, and second, Man's relation to woman and the created order. Chapters two and three are in vivid contrast. The first describes the ideal God-man relationship "...which in turn is the basis for an ideal relationship between man and woman in marriage."\(^1\) The last chapter reveals the nature of sin and its consequences, which bring chaos into these relationships.

Man's whole life is carried by the power of God's spirit. The divine spirit creates the physical and psychical cohesion of the life of the human race in all its members. It is also the word of revelation which makes man clearly aware of his state of affairs. God's destiny for man and man's offense against that destiny are brought into the proper light, revealing his opposition to God as the united struggle of all human beings ever since they first rejected their origin. The Fall story rests on belief in an indissoluble bond linking the individual human being and the human race as a whole to God.\(^2\)

\(^1\)G. Herbert Livingston, A Commentary on Genesis (unpublished volume, Beacon Bible Commentary, Beacon Hill Press, Kansas City), p. 10 of original manuscript.  
Biological existence in begetting and procreation is not an autonomous process of natural law, working itself out only in matter, but the outward expression of an inner community of the human race, rooted in the living power of God. When the prophets reflected on men's compulsion to act in a way hostile to God they use expressions which echo Genesis three. Universal human sin is the solidarity and concrete actuality of a perverted basic attitude of human nature, the pattern and explanation of which are to be found in a primal decision.

"So far there is no good parallel to the Garden of Eden in ancient Oriental literature." There are many parallels to isolated features, such as: the early age of bliss in Sumerian literature and the Egyptian Pyramid texts; the conception of the four rivers arising in the underworld to water the earth in Egyptian, Babylonian and Greek mythology. However, there is no real parallel to the Garden of Eden in either Egypt or Mesopotamia. Probably the closest parallel is in Canaanite literature. The Epic of Baal from Ugarit refers to the "field of El, who dwells at the source of the

Ibid.  
Ibid.  


Ibid., p. 66.
two rivers, in the midst of the fountains of the two deeps.\textsuperscript{7}

Nor is there a close parallel to the Fall of Man.\textsuperscript{8} A number of myths describe man's loss of the gift of immortality, such as the "Epic of Adapa" and the "Epic of Gilgamesh." Obsolete allusions to a serpent carrying off a sacred plant appear in Sumerian religious poems of the third millennium B. C. Frazer has collected a number of these parallel myths. The closest parallel to the loss of man's innocence and his sexual seduction is found in the episode of Engidu in the Gilgamesh Epic.\textsuperscript{9}

The theme of "nakedness" is a unifying strain within the Garden Account. It appears in 2:25 in describing man's original state of innocence, while it was man's body that was covered in the conclusion of the next paragraph (3:21). Furthermore, ירדס and ירדס both mean "naked" and are similar in sound to ידה (\textsuperscript{3}arûm, "bunning"), emphasizing the beginning of the account in chapter three.\textsuperscript{10} And finally, "nakedness" is a prominent aspect of man's interrogation (vv. 7, 11).

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{8}Ibid., p. 67.
\textsuperscript{9}Ibid.
The ancient Hebrew's attitude toward physical exposure seems to have derived from the Paradise Account. Therefore, the objective of the following chapter will be to discuss "nakedness" in relation to Adam's (1) state of innocence (2) fall into sinfulness, and (3) the act of covering or propitiation. Within these three major divisions of the chapter, pertinent Old Testament ideas will be introduced in order to better elucidate the implications and applications of the Paradise Account.

There are a number of books and articles which deal with this segment of Scripture. However, the purpose of this chapter is to present the biblical view. Therefore, particularly pertinent biblical studies, commentaries and theologies comprise the vast majority of reference tools. The attempt is to comprehend the word and approach of Scripture, rather than imposing modern psychology upon the text.

I. CREATION OF THE CREATURE (Innocence)

Man is set forth as an earth creature, but God's act of inbreathing "highlights the fact that man's vitality and inner dynamic comes directly from God."\(^{11}\) Man was the crowning achievement of creation because he was the only

\(^{11}\)Livingston, op. cit., p. 11
creature possessing God's breath within him. He was "made for two worlds,"¹² and Genesis 2 depicts him in perfect harmony with both.

This section of the chapter will discuss these two aspects from the standpoint of (1) the original God-man relationship, (2) the original man-woman relationship, (3) the original triune relationship.

The Original God-man Relationship

Sin was not a necessary factor in the development of man. Man could only pass from the state of innocence into the possession of moral character by an act of self-determination, but he did not need to be sinful in order to have a conscience.¹³ In the Old Testament, doubt of God's goodness awakened the process of sin's origin: "...unbelief of the divine word, the selfish elevation of self-will above the divine will, and the presumptuous trampling upon the limits set by divine command." Only when selfishness is awakened does sensuous allurement exert its power.¹⁴

God and Adam made a covenant marked by mutual obligations. This arrangement was a necessary probation for

¹²Ibid.


¹⁴Ibid., p. 159.
mankind, for in passing a test, true character is demonstrated (cf. Rom. 8:24, 25). Further, this action was designed to bring about man's voluntary glorification of God (Isa. 43:7). "The tree...became the medium through which Adam would exercise discrimination and, by his free choice, come to know good, or evil, experientially." 

Genesis 2:15-17 contains the command that set the limits for Adam. "When God commanded the man (16) he made clear His own sovereign relationship to man and man's subordinate relationship to God. God had this right because He is Creator and man is the creature." The strongest possible command was given in regard to the forbidden tree. "Thou shalt not" is the most personal and permanent possible command. This command was also augmented by a threat of severe and certain ("surely") punishment.

**The God Ordained Man-woman Relationship**

Genesis 1:27 records the original ordination of the sexual relation of man and woman (יְזָרֵעָה). Marriage, or the primitive form of human society from which all other

---


16 Ibid.


18 Ibid.
forms of society arise, and for which man gives up the others (2:24), did not spring from the blind sway of natural impulse, but from divine institution. Its original form, furthermore, was monogamy (comp. Matt. 19:6).\textsuperscript{19}

In Israel the man dominated the family, the family being called a father's house. The importance of marriage in the lives of the Israelites is expressed in the two accounts of the creation of man. All created order was crowned by man and woman's creation, and their union received the blessing to which later generations owe their existence.

\textbf{Physical Union.} In differing expression both accounts portray man and woman indissolubly bound together. Singular and plural are used indifferently about the same being, for Man is a whole consisting of two parts, the man and the woman. Their relation is not described, but they are indispensable to each other and only when they are united do they together form a whole human being. A man leaves his father's house in order to found a new house, because in uniting himself with the woman he becomes a man, man wholly.\textsuperscript{20}

Isolation was not good for man. God therefore created one who was equal and adequate for the lonely man. Social

\textsuperscript{19}Oehler, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 148.

relationship or fellowship is basic to man's nature. Adam immediately recognized Eve's appropriateness or correspondence as his helper, for she was an intimate part of himself. From the beginning God intended marriage to be exclusive and intimate.\(^1\)

The woman was not to be simply an appendage, nor solely responsible to cling to the man. Man's responsibility was to cleave to his wife (v. 24). Marriage is to remain unbroken throughout life, for "they shall be one flesh," that is, a complete identification with each other, and they were not ashamed (v. 25).

God's "building" of the woman from the rib guaranteed the true dignity of womankind. She was not inferior, but her kinship with man was of the truest kind: she was his bone and flesh. The image of the rib conveys one of the deepest realities, that is, it "...expresses the fact that the sexes are inwardly designed for one another."\(^2\) The area of the body is also significant, indicating that she was neither head nor tail, but equal with man.\(^3\)

"When God brings her unto man, this act of his is the institution of marriage and stamps marriage as a divinely

---


willed and approved state." Etymologically, ψιν (יסנ) and την (תָּנָה) are not derived from the same root, but the similar sound of the words gives prominence to the intimate kinship of the two. "'Becoming one flesh' involves the complete identification of one personality with the other in a community of interests and pursuits, a union consummated in intercourse." Of course, "one flesh" includes the sexual connection, but something is expressed far beyond this: "...it expresses the essential unity and higher wholeness of man in man and wife." The Old Testament representation of this bond as stronger than the parent-child relationship indicates that it forms not only a bodily union (בר通知书 נָשִׁי), but also a spiritual oneness. Furthermore, conjugal cohabitation is characterized as a "knowing," indicating a moral element involving personal freedom of will and moral self-decision rather than blind impulse.

According to the biblical usage, unity of the flesh designates a unity that embraces the natural lives of two
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24 Ibid.


27 Oehler, op. cit., p. 148.
persons in their entirety. Such unity occurs in spite of the fact that they are different and remain so. However, this difference makes them dependent upon each other and "It is precisely in this interdependence that the true unity of the two persons manifests itself."28 Actually, "...sexual unity is primarily mutual sexual dependency."29

Oneness of the flesh is attained when the mutual desires of both persons lead to sexual intercourse. Emotional and intellectual interchange may create deep and lasting fellowship, but only through the willing disposal of their bodies to each other and the actual bodily contact can a union be consummated in which man and woman belong to each other.30

Flesh, in the Biblical sense, denotes not only the body but one's whole existence in this world; and the attainment of oneness of the flesh, therefore, creates a mutual dependence and reciprocity in all areas of life.31

This is one valid reason why the Old Testament does not have a specific word for the genital organs in and of themselves. Sexual desire does not simply direct itself toward the organs, but the whole body tends fervently toward the other


29Ibid.

30Ibid., p. 27.

31Ibid., p. 28.
in order to achieve an intimate union. Sex is a function of man's total self, making a separation between a person and his sexual nature impossible. Sexual desire involves the whole person as the bearer of a distinctive sexual character.  

Through a physiological act a relationship is established with another person, not with an impersonal object. The mystery of sex is the knowledge of unity between the partners, in addition to the awareness of the differences between the sexes. This man-woman tension may turn to hatred, but when it does a person turns against the one he depends on to solve the riddle of his existence. Through physical union two people understand for the first time the aim of their sexual longings. This momentous and significant disclosure makes it natural for a person to leave his parents in order to effect this union (2:24).

Unity of the flesh is a harmonious relationship in which the deficiencies peculiar to one sexual partner find their fulfillment in the other partner. If, for instance, a man treats a woman simply as an object of gratification, he thereby loses his own honor, because honor is a lustre that radiates from the whole person.

Because personal life is indivisible...sex must be practised and controlled in such a manner that the

---

32 Ibid., pp. 19, 20.  
33 Ibid., p. 46.  
34 Ibid., pp. 44-5.
other functions of the Self are not disturbed or hampered...It is necessary to establish a harmony between the various functions and appetites of the Self...Various desires of the Self affect the whole individual.  

Sex is one of the many functions of the self and should not be identified with the self's total will for existence. However, every sexual experience not only influences a person's sexuality but also the other functions of the self. Sexual knowledge can be the crowning of personal life.

Furthermore, the sexual unity is an exclusive mutual possession which the husband and wife cannot share with a third person. In Jewish Law the woman is said to enter a new status, a status of Eshet Ish, Davar Shebe Ervah. Kiddushin causes the woman to enter the special status of Eshet Ish, that is, Ervah (lit. "nakedness") status. Her status as an Ervah, not the rights of the husband, prohibits her to the rest of the world. Because of this status, "A married woman is in the category of Arayot and for this reason her receipt of Kiddushi from any other person will have no effect." The creation of a marriage simultaneously invokes

---

36 Ibid.  
38 Ibid., p. 44.  
39 Ibid., citing Eben Haezer, sec. 17, on p. 37.
two distinct relationships: (1) a prohibition of the woman to the world; (2) her permission to her husband. 40

Since this new status directly obligates third parties, the community as a whole must be directly involved in its creation. Witnesses must be incorporated in the performance of the legal act of marriage in order to effect this change of status. Husband and wife cannot establish their mutual relationship with only their affirmation because it only deals with one aspect of Kiddushin; "Kiddushin is indivisible," leaving their affirmation unacceptable, even in reference to their own mutual relationship. 41

Two outstanding features separate the marriage bond from strictly business or contractual matters: (1) the necessity of witnesses and (2) a woman's willing consent (Daath). These are necessary because a transfer of property is not the issue, but the creation of a new status affecting the entire community. At least two witnesses are necessary whether creating the status of Ervah (prohibition) or reversion to the status of Penuya (free to marry). 42

As a sexual being the woman, not her person, belongs to the man. Only when her sexuality is in question is she correctly included among the husband's goods. Divorce

40 Ibid.
41 Ibid., pp. 37-8. 42 Ibid., p. 75.
disposed of a woman's sexuality, but a man was not to dispose of her person. Otherwise, he could have killed or sold her as a slave; something which he was forbidden to do.\textsuperscript{43}

Psychic Unity. Pedersen has grasped the essence of the marriage union from this vantage point, but does so in light of the holistic concept of man's nature and relationships. He captures the thrust of the Israelite marriage from an Old Testament overview, but also points out that the Creation Accounts express the Israelite's conception of marriage.

Ba'al means the possessor or the master and expresses the man's position in the family. This title presupposes a psychic community or whole, while Ba'al designates the ruling will within it. In order for a man to become a ba'al there must be an intimate relation, and his power is exercised within its limits. This is not a term for a despot. The entire household groups itself around him, forming a psychic community that is stamped by him.\textsuperscript{44} When a man is called father the same thing is implied: kinship and authority. He is not an isolated despot, but "...the center from which strength and will emanate through the whole of the sphere which belongs to him and to which he belongs."\textsuperscript{45}


\textsuperscript{44}Pedersen, op. cit., pp. 62-3.

\textsuperscript{45}Ibid., p. 63.
The father is the strong will within the narrow circle. "He is the ba'\text{al} of his wife and she is ba'\text{al}-taken by him."\textsuperscript{46} Ba'\text{al}-taken expresses intimacy and subordination. The position of the wife within the household was that of the husband's helpmate whose foremost duty was to give him children in creating a "house" and in upholding him within his family. "She is first and foremost a sexual being,\textsuperscript{47} and as such she entirely belongs to her husband."\textsuperscript{48} Note that she receives the capital punishment for unfaithfulness, and could not evade her responsibilities by a sacred vow without the consent of the husband. Marriage laws determine right and wrong from the standpoint of the husband.

The leading principle in selecting a bride seems to have been avoidance of introduction of new and strange elements which the husband could not assimilate. In this case, she would disrupt the house and remove the children from the family characteristics of the father.\textsuperscript{49}

Even so, limits were set as to the closeness of the degree of relationship permitted, and Leviticus 18 records

\textsuperscript{46}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{47}Note: A woman is even called raham, "womb," Judges 5:30 as in the Mesha-stele 1.17; cf. Arabic far\textsuperscript{j}.

\textsuperscript{48}Pedersen, op. cit., p. 70.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., p. 64.
the prohibited female relations for the man. The reason for these regulations was not that they were unhealthy, for this is doubtful. The deeper reason is "...the intimate character of relationship as well as of marriage." Each one itself is "a deeply-rooted, all pervading psychic community, and yet so different that they cannot be united in one person." The wives of the father are the "nakedness" of the father, that is to say the feeling of shame is abolished between them; they form a psychic unity with the father, and thus have entered into a relationship with his sons, which cannot be reconciled with a new relationship, through which they are united with one of these sons, in the intimate but different relationship of a wife. This principle includes the wife of a brother and father's brother, for "...a woman bears the impress of her husband and his nearest male kin; and she cannot stand in two relationships, intimate but of a different kind, to the same man."

The Triune Relationship

Mutuality of the sexes forms the foundation of human history. No human activity can be independent of the man-woman relationship. Sex is fundamental and of divine origin (1:27-8). Therefore, it cannot be forgotten or pushed aside. Sex must be related to life religiously, and the

50 Ibid., p. 65.  
51 Ibid.  
52 Ibid.  
53 Ibid.  
54 Piper, op. cit., p. 55
biblical record expressed the possibility through monogamous marriage.  

Devotion and many disciplines are needed in order to realize the intention of God for marriage. Companionship is a more inclusive term: two personalities are to develop in companionship to their fullest, giving and receiving the utmost that both can share. Without this mutuality, marriage fails to reach its highest possibility. The statement, "It is not good for man to be alone," is true in a much larger sense than physical. Partnership of the minds furnishes quickening ideas, and two spirits provides something of the wider reality of life to which they ought to be adjusted.

However, the home is not enough to produce that unity. It must be held together by something larger than itself. That is, the remembrance of God must permeate it and hold its individuals harmoniously together, like the sun.

To advocate that the pre-fall couple was unaware of sexual desire is untenable according to Genesis 2, particularly verses 24 and 25. A much more preferable explanation is that Adam and Eve did not know "good and evil," nor that sexual...

---

56 Ibid., pp. 499-500.
57 Ibid., p. 500.
desire could also be directed towards evil ends. In this sense, they had no reason to feel ashamed at the fact that they were naked, for "...the feeling of shame in regard to anything is born only of the consciousness of the evil that may exist in that thing...."\(^{58}\)

Genesis 2 and following depicts man as originally living in a state of innocence. Originally, man maintained a pure childlike relationship with God, a life which was reflected in the relationship between man and woman.\(^{59}\) A perfectly natural harmony existed between the first persons and with nature. "In this state of spiritual innocence the purity of natural life is still possible...."\(^{60}\) Man and woman did not feel shame in spite of the fact that they were naked.

Harmony is a key descriptive word for the God-man-woman relationships portrayed in Genesis 2. Note that the honor of Israel's older heroes also depended upon harmony. "He who is filled with honour is the giver and the counsellor, the upholder of the others. His honor is throughout dependent upon the fact that he is the stronger."\(^{61}\) In the Book of Judges, "That which makes honour is first and foremost

\(^{58}\)U. Cassuto, op. cit., p. 137.
\(^{59}\)Vriezen, op. cit., p. 209.
\(^{60}\)Ibid.
\(^{61}\)Pedersen, op. cit., p. 223.
valiant deeds. "62 Though depicted in terms of wealth, Job is an excellent example dealing with the pivotal point of harmony. He acquired wealth in order to give to others and became great because he upheld the community.

This harmony is dissolved when the wealthy collects only to enjoy, possesses without giving and upholding, rules rather than counsels, demands others to give him honor without giving anything himself and becomes great by humiliating others. "The old chief gained honour by uplifting the wills, at the same time making them subservient to his own. He became great by making others great."63 The new man, first and foremost, thought of maintaining himself, while the older Israelite welcomed combat because it maintained his actual greatness.

Genesis 2 describes the original man as possessing a completely harmonious being, as well as perfect harmony with God, woman, and the created order. The inexplicable split in human nature did not yet exist. Von Rad quotes Delitzsch at this point:

Shame is the overpowering feeling that inward harmony and satisfaction with oneself are disturbed. They were not ashamed of their nakedness. Why not? Shame is the correlative of sin and guilt. They had no reason to fear that the body would show sin in them.64

---

And Lange quotes Keil:

Their bodies were made holy through the spirit that animated them. Shame first came in with sin, which took away the normal relation of the spirit to the body, begat an inclination and a desire in conflict with the soul, and turned the holy order of God into sinful enticement and the lust of the flesh.65

"Nakedness" (2:25) is the expression of perfect innocence, which in its naivete elevates the body into the spiritual personality and rule. In their state of innocence Adam and Eve were not ashamed of their "nakedness." Though naked, yet they were not so: "Their bodies were the clothing of their internal glory, and their internal glory was the clothing of their nakedness."66

In the Scripture, life, light and love are ideas which are interwoven with each other. When separated from God's love, the spirit became incapable of being the principle of life and of the glorification for the body.67 But, originally, "everything was at harmony, and man was in complete harmony with himself and with his God."68 A perfect state existed in which there was no occasion to feel shame. The story of

65Lange, op. cit.


67Ibid., p. 151.

68Lange, op. cit., p. 138.
creation ends with the pair sharing a beautiful and ideal life: naked, not ashamed, holy, innocent, the perfect creatures of a perfect God, surrounded by every evidence of His love and care.69

II. FALL OF THE CREATURE

Genesis 2 and following portrays the first couple in perfect peace with God and in perfect harmony in Paradise. This original harmonious relationship between God, man, woman and even the animal world was disrupted by man's act of disobedience. Adam's sin was his desire for independence in place of his state of dependence and subjection. He wanted to be free from his childlike relationship with God and free from true innocence. But, the punishment for that cleavage was the rupture of the relationship between man and the animal world, man and woman, man and the earth - and ultimately - such a punishment is death (symbolized in man's expulsion from the garden of Eden with its tree of life).70 The harmony between God and man was thus broken.

Genesis 3 is a masterly portrayal of seduction and its consequences, stressing one point as the central focus of all

---

70 Vriezen, op. cit., p. 209.
the rest, that is, "...that the cause of all evil, the reason for a distortion in the order of creation, was alienation from God." The passage portrays the intimate connection between the immediate concrete fact of sin and its determinative effect on history. The deep psychological understanding and shattering truthfulness to life dominates this picture of the first estrangement of Man from God. So, the passage grips the reader with his own terrified admission that here lives flesh of his flesh, from which he cannot dissociate himself as unconcerned. 72

According to verse 7, when the eyes of the two people were opened they discovered that they were "naked." Further, Adam told God that he was frightened because he was "naked" (vs. 10). God did not deny the fact, but went on to ask Adam who told him that he was "naked" (vs. 11). The following discussion will treat Man's fall and awareness of "nakedness" in terms of the appeal of the Serpent's temptation, the effects of Man's fall and the purpose of God's interrogation.

The Appeal of the Serpent's Temptation

The temptation to sin or to disobey did not exist in man, but came from an external and personal tempter. "The

---

72 Ibid.
primary aim of the tempter was to induce Eve to a sympathetic entertainment of the act of disobedience."\(^{73}\) This would constitute the true, spiritual fall, signifying the fundamental sin of pride in one's self, as opposed to God. The physical or external act was secondary and does not in fact seem to have been inherently harmful or wrong (Gen. 3:6).\(^ {74}\)

Good and evil are so irreconcilable that they are named as the two poles of human thought and experience. Isaiah (5:20) denounced as utterly perverse those who in his age confused the two.\(^ {75}\) "Good and evil" is synonymous with the phrase "all things that are on earth" (cf. Gen. 24:50; 31:24, 29); in much wisdom is much sorrow (Eccl. 1:18).\(^ {76}\) Von Rad has connected "good and evil" with our colorless word "everything."\(^ {77}\) What Adam wanted was to act independently of God on the basis of knowledge, rather than remain in the state of dependence upon God in a Father-son relationship.\(^ {78}\)

In the ancient world, "to know" always meant to be able as well. \(\text{yāa} (\text{w}d^c)\) never signifies purely intellectual

\(^{73}\)Payne, op. cit., p. 216.

\(^{74}\)Ibid.

\(^{75}\)Davidson, Theology of the O.T., pp. 205-6.

\(^{76}\)Cassuto, op. cit., p. 113.

\(^{77}\)Von Rad, op. cit., p. 83.

\(^{78}\)Cassuto, loc. cit.
knowing, but an "experiencing," a becoming acquainted with, even an ability.79 "Good and evil" or "everything" did not simply include the moral realm. Therefore, the Serpent insinuated the possibility of an extension of human existence beyond the limits set by God at creation.

"Eve was pushed into an explicit admission of her own restricted status."80 Once Eve introduced the negative aspect of God's command - not to eat - and the reason for it - "lest you die," the Tempter could proceed. Eve felt that God's command was too strict. The Tempter hastily denied that death was God's reason for prohibition, as he shifted to the question of God's "real" reasons for prohibition.81

With Eve's curiosity in full play, "...she was encouraged to defend the feeling of mistrust toward God on the basis of what MIGHT BE the divine motivation for so restricting mankind."82 God was portrayed as selfishly withholding knowledge which He already possessed, and acquisition of such knowledge would give man experience that would put him on a parity with God.

So, when the Tempter withdrew, man began to think that he would be much better off as an autocrat instead of remaining obedient to God. While the woman stood before the tree in

79 Von Rad, loc. cit.  
80 Payne, op. cit., p. 217.  
81 Ibid.  
82 Ibid.
reflection upon it, the entire scale of emotions rushed by from the sensual to the aesthetic;\textsuperscript{83} every aspect of her being was to benefit from her need for food to the enjoyment of wisdom. The temptation of Eve appealed to every aspect of her physical-psychic being; "...every function of body and soul is wrested from its original purpose and becomes embroiled in one vast confusion of its divine purpose."\textsuperscript{84}

The Consequences of Man's Fall

In a decisive event, God's plan for man in His creation was frustrated and human history came to be stamped with the brand of enmity toward God.\textsuperscript{85} There was a "falling" out of the line of development willed by God which determined the spiritual attitude of all men. Wiley sums up the immediate consequence of man's sin in two general propositions: (1) externally, it was an alienation from God and enslavement to Satan; (2) internally, it was the loss of divine grace by which man became subject to physical and moral corruption.\textsuperscript{86}

Fear before God was the sign of a disorder in man's relation to his Creator, while shame was the sign that dominated

\textsuperscript{83}Von Rad, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{84}Leupold, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 151-2.
\textsuperscript{86}Wiley, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. II, pp. 64-5.
his relation to other men. So, fear and shame were the incurable stigmata of the Fall of man.\textsuperscript{87}

The shame which Adam felt immediately following his transgression of God's command particularly relates to this thesis and is to be considered in the following section. The discussion will consider his shame in relation to his personal being, and second, his personal relationships.

\textbf{Adam's Split-Being.} Adam had been created an integrated being ("living being"). When he broke his relationship with his Creator (the Ground of his being), disorder, confusion and disintegration followed within his being and in his relations with Eve and the animal world.

Rather than divine knowledge, the first knowledge which the primal couple acquired "was the wretched and grieving realization that they were naked."\textsuperscript{88} Man and woman had come to know by experience good and evil and its guilt. Man found that he was not able to take into his life what God originally withheld from him. Scarcely was the knowledge grasped before it caused disorder in his whole inner existence, a dishonoring of his being.\textsuperscript{89} Innocence was lost and man became afraid of his "nakedness."

\textsuperscript{87}\textit{Von Rad, op. cit.}, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{88}\textit{Cassuto, op. cit.}, p. 148.
\textsuperscript{89}\textit{Von Rad, op. cit.}, p. 88.
Examination of the fall in its internal aspect reveals the birth of an evil conscience and a sense of shame and degradation. "Having lost the Holy Spirit as the organizing principle of his being, there could be no harmonious ordering of his faculties, and hence the powers of his being became disordered." Consequently, blindness of heart or loss of spiritual discernment, evil concupiscence or unregulated carnal craving, and moral inability or weakness in the presence of sin followed the disordered state.

Original sin did not reside in one member, but held dominion over the whole man. Every part of the soul was affected; no member remained in its integrity. Man reacted to his deed with bodily shame rather than a spiritual feeling of guilt. But, according to the narrator, shame is the most elementary emotion of a guilty feeling at the deepest root of human existence. It is the sign of a breach that reaches to the lowest level of man's physical being.

A terrifying picture emerged of the relationship between Adam's soul and God. The first sin (3:6) led immediately to another (v. 8) and to another (v. 12). Since the time man

90 Wiley, op. cit., p. 65.
91 Calvin, op. cit., p. 162.
92 Von Rad, loc. cit.
93 Payne, op. cit., p. 220.
grasped for what was forbidden, he has experienced a "longing
which cannot be stilled."\textsuperscript{94} This longing again and again makes
itself independent and tears apart the unity of body and
spirit, and man reacts with a feeling of shame.\textsuperscript{95} Sin is not
simply an "occasional act... always arising out of the wrong
decision of the moment, but... a perverted tendency of our
nature."\textsuperscript{96} However, the solidarity with which all men are
bound together in sin is not the extent of the Genesis
portrayal.

There is also a relentless description of the con-
sequences of this first conscious rejection of God
in the disturbance of the very foundations of
human existence, indeed, of Man's own psychical
constitution, in that abandonment of Man to the
sufferings of life in all their manifold forms is
explained by his expulsion from God's fellowship,
and the inward destruction of the creature
originally held in the will of God is displayed
in his enslavement to the power of those sinful
impulses which drive him on irresistibly through
fractricide and the shedding of blood to the
wickedness of a generation on whom the divine
judgment of the Deluge falls.\textsuperscript{97}

The self-consciousness which was attained was a reli-
gious deterioration, not moral reform. Adam and Eve's awareness
of "nakedness" depicts the loss of the unconscious dominion
of the spirit over the bodily and sensuous appearance. This

\textsuperscript{94}Von Rad, \textit{loc. cit.}, citing E. Brunner, \textit{Man in Revolt},
p. 349.

\textsuperscript{95}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{96}Eichrodt, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. II, pp. 406-7, quoting E.
Brunner, \textit{Man in Revolt}, p. 145.

\textsuperscript{97}Eichrodt, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. II, p. 404.
dominion was replaced with a conscience torn with the spirit-
flesh conflict. The flesh now lusted against the spirit.

Sin took away from the normal relation between the soul and
body, resulting in the body's cessation as a pure instrument
of the spirit which is united to God. The spiritual and natural
elements lost their point of unity. The feeling of shame
entered with the consciousness of opposition between spirit
and sensual corporeity. ⁹⁸

The tension or dichotomizing of inner and outer,
physical and spiritual life was a prominent aspect of the
fall. Through a psychic-physical act the first couple's inner
life was affected, resulting in devastating internal and ex-
ternal consequences. The Garden Account states and implies
numerous contrasts between the state of innocence and sin-
fulness, some of which are:

  good vs. evil
  honor vs. shame
  confidence vs. fear
  love vs. wrath
  blessing vs. curse
  dependence vs. independence
  internal vs. external
  community vs. isolation
  unity vs. confusion
  belief vs. unbelief
  humility vs. pride
  God's will vs. Man's compunctions
  wholeness vs. dissolution
  well-being vs. disintegration
  harmony vs. disorder

⁹⁸Lange, op. cit., pp. 230-1.
"With the consciousness of guilt there comes in a conscious though a disturbed distinction between good and evil, and the sinner has placed himself in a false independence through his own self-willfulness."  

Shame and honor find expression in the body, because they spread through the whole of the region of the soul. This unity of being can cause shame by disturbing the body.  

Originally, however, the human race became disordered physically through an ethical consequence. Sin developed from a spiritual self-disordering beginning with doubt and self-exaltation. This attitude then developed into an envious, malignant pride and unbelief which became complete in superstition and sensual concupiscence, lawlessness and seduction. Spiritual self-exaltation equaled sensual self-degradation.  

A vacuum had come into the soul of the first man be-cause of the failing of life in the spirit. So, a physically unbridled and ungoverned behavior resulted whereby the pre-dominance was given to the flesh over the power of the spirit. With the first sin came also sinfulness or the sin-ful appetite.  

In its material relation, sin is a wounding of the proper personal life, even unto death, and in con-sequence thereof, a hostile turning away from God,  

99Ibid., p. 210  
100Pedersen, op. cit., p. 242.  
101Lange, op. cit., p. 246.
a self-entanglement in the love of self and of the world, as flowing from the abuse of the freedom of the will to an apparent freedom which degenerates into bondage.\textsuperscript{102}

With some justice the Serpent called into question the threat of death. However, the point is, "...it is not indeed the simple fact of dying which is here proclaimed as the punishment of sin but the enslavement of all life to the hostile powers of death."\textsuperscript{103} Through suffering, pain, toil and struggle life wears out before its time.

However, "...the heinousness of his sin and the shame of his fall did not result in the utter destruction of his being. The unseen hand of the promised Redeemer prevented it. Thus the mystery of sin and the mystery of grace met at the gate of Eden."\textsuperscript{104}

Adam's Disordered Personal Relationships. After the fall, man no longer bore the glory of his moral likeness to God. He retained the natural image in the sense of his personality, but the glory was gone. His fall was from the high destination in communion with God, into the depths of deprivation and sin. Loss of the Holy Spirit began a life

\textsuperscript{102}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 246-7.
\textsuperscript{103}\textit{Eichrodt, op. cit.}, vol. II, p. 406.
\textsuperscript{104}\textit{Wiley, loc. cit.}
of external discord and internal misery. Domestic relations were deprived of their intended perfection.\textsuperscript{105}

According to Genesis 1, man was created in the image of God. Furthermore, this image in man was not lost or mutilated throughout the Old Testament, indicating that the image of God in man is not his state of rightness, but rather his special relationship with God.\textsuperscript{106} Man's fundamental vocation is to be God's child, and this calling was not lost by sin because it rests upon God's will and therefore founded upon the Creation.\textsuperscript{107} Complete harmony with God and creation characterized man's original state, while disharmony or disruption characterized man's sinful state.

Adam and Eve lost the full moral likeness to God. They came to know evil experientially through a break in their relationship with God. Therefore, they stood exposed to all around them, including plant, animal and spiritual world.\textsuperscript{108} The man and woman forfeited both their intimate fellowship with God and their high position in the created world.

Genesis 3 does not consider sin itself as the awakening of sexual consciousness. The consciousness of being man and woman is clearly evident in the preceding narrative.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{105}Ibid. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{106}Vriezen, op. cit., p. 208
\textsuperscript{107}Ibid. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{108}Haines, op. cit., p. 36.
\textsuperscript{109}Vriezen, op. cit., p. 209.
"The consequence of sin is, however, that not only the relationship with God is broken (man hides from Him) but also the pure natural harmony between the sexes: man feels shame."\textsuperscript{110}

Because man has eaten the fruit of the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil the natural harmony between one human being and another suffers immediately. This manifests itself in shame before each other and at the same time also in the disharmony between man and God.\textsuperscript{111}

The sexual relationship had been ordained by God (2:18, 21-3) and was good. In fact, Adam and Eve felt no shame in their "nakedness" (2:25). But their former nakedness without shame became intolerable indecency demanding to be covered. It was man's desire for power and consequent disobedience of God which infected the relationship with evil. "The impaired relationship between God and man threw the man-wife relationship into disorder."\textsuperscript{112}

The Genesis writer views the sexual relationship as the basic human relationship. The linking of an awakened sexual consciousness with a consciousness of guilt seems to recognize that all human relationships are disordered. The alienation from God has also brought with it an alienation from man. "Loneliness is the specter which haunts unredeemed humanity."\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{110}Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{111}Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{112}Simpson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 506.
  \item \textsuperscript{113}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Adam's personal relationships were harmoniously maintained through his state of innocence and honor. However, his Fall caused these relationships to be laden with guilt and shame:

The body ceased to be the pure abode of a spirit in fellowship with God, and in the purely natural state of the body the consciousness was produced not merely of the distinction of the sexes, but still more of the worthlessness of the flesh; so that the man and woman stood ashamed in each other's presence, and endeavored to hide the disgrace of their spiritual nakedness, by covering those parts of the body through which the impurities of nature are removed. That the natural feeling of shame, the origin of which is recorded here, had its root, not in sensuality or any physical corruption but in the consciousness of guilt or shame before God, and consequently that it was the conscience which was really at work, is evident from the fact that the man and his wife hid themselves from Jehovah God among the trees of the garden, as soon as they heard the sound of His footstep.114

Nakedness became a matter of shame only because of sin-burdened minds.115

Fallen man hid himself from God's gaze, and David's heart smote him after committing crime. These instances eloquently express guilt as the disturbance of a personal relationship of trust.116 Furthermore, "The

115 Payne, op. cit., p. 218.
manifold, profound troubles in human life have their root in
the one trouble of man's relationship to God."\textsuperscript{117} Therefore,
"only with broken bearing does man face his life."\textsuperscript{118}

\textbf{The Purpose of God's Interrogation}

At the time of falling, man became the object of God's
gracious search (v. 9) and interrogation (vv. 11, 13). But
note the confusion when God first called to Adam. His call
was not enough for him to see the issues clearly.\textsuperscript{119} The
blindness of sin would gladly render God mute and speechless.
It is evident that:

...while the eyes of their body were opened to see
their degraded state, the eyes of their understanding
were closed, so that they could not see the sinfulness of sin; and at the same time their hearts were
hardened through its deceitfulness.\textsuperscript{120}

With innocence lost and guilt contracted, confusion and shame
were born.

What was once Man's bliss - to walk in God's light -
has become his terror, because this light now
penetrates to the most hidden things and pitilessly
strips Man naked to appear in all his enmity toward
God before the eye of his Judge. (v. 8)\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{117}Von Rad, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 98 \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{118}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{119}Calvin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{120}Adam Clarke, \textit{The Holy Bible} (New York: Carlton and
Porter, 1830), vol. I, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{121}Eichrodt, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. II, p. 411.
Adam was much more conscious of the effect of sin than he was of his sense of the sin itself; of the sense of shame than he was of his sense of guilt. He tried to hide his sin behind the consequences, his disobedience behind the feeling of shame. During the interrogation, the occasion of sin was not referred to, but the occasion of the consciousness of nakedness.

Verse 10 contains the record of Adam's confession, made out of mistrust and fear of God. With the instinctive cunning of a guilty conscience, man tried to escape complete exposure by acknowledging part of the truth. So, Adam admitted the half-truth that he was "naked" and therefore hid from God.

God did not deny that Adam in fact did need covering, but He continued the interrogation because Adam had put fear and shame in a false causal connection. "Nakedness" was a result that needed to be dealt with, but it was not the cause of his fear. Unwittingly and insincerely Adam had acknowledged his transgression, because he admitted to a knowledge he could have acquired in only one way. Adam's awareness came from within rather than without, and God recognized the cause as a guilty conscience answering to having experienced evil.

Therefore, God pressed the interrogation in order for Adam to recognize his guilt and to force a complete confession.

Admission of the awareness of "nakedness" had been enough for the Judge to recognize the source of guilt, but was seemingly inadequate for Adam. God agreed with Adam's condition as He continued: "Who told you that you were naked?" But then He assigned the cause in the next question: "Have you eaten of the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?" (v. 11).

During the interrogation man spoke first of his emotions (fear) and of the intellectual wrestle with guilt occasioned by God's question. He tried to blame God Himself who gave him the woman. His answer was a sign of the community with one another which had been destroyed. Before God man is united in a solidarity of sin, but man does not recognize this fact. The sin which had been committed in common did not unite the two persons before God, but instead isolated them. Man betrayed the woman and the woman pointed to the Tempter because she could not bear responsibility before God.

God's questions were presented in opposite order in order to reveal clearly the order of causation. Then He pronounced a series of curses in the order in which the sins had been committed. Each curse was appropriate for every individual concerned, affecting each person in his most central function.

---
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Yahweh punishes sin by the power of destruction within it. In the laws of the spiritual world, "...sin must work to undo and destroy its perpetrator."\textsuperscript{126} Thus it is that enmity is put between the seducer and the seduced. Yahweh's judgment in the Garden possessed a profound correspondence between guilt and punishment, depicting "...the nature of sin as a turning away from the divine source of life."\textsuperscript{127}

III. THE COVERING OF THE CREATURES

The first recorded response of Adam and Eve to their awareness of "nakedness" was to sew fig-leaf aprons in a futile attempt to find recourse for a moral evil in the form of a physical covering (cf. Job 31:33). Further, their loss of innocence meant broken fellowship with God: they felt required to hide from the Divine Presence (v. 8).\textsuperscript{128}

There had been a covering within the inter-personal relationship between God-man-woman in the Garden that was removed through transgression. Adam and Eve felt this removal and tried to cover themselves. Though a covering was necessary, finally God Himself had to provide the covering for man (v. 21). Therefore, the following treatment will discuss the subject of covering first from the standpoint of

\textsuperscript{126} Eichrodt, vol. II, p. 426.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., p. 427.

\textsuperscript{128} Payne, op. cit., p. 218.
man's act of covering and second, God's act of covering.

The Creatures' Act of Covering

Man had stepped outside the state of dependence, and refusing obedience, he willed to make himself independent. Obedience was no longer the guiding principle of his life, but rather, his autonomous knowing and willing. With his new autonomy, man ceased to understand himself as creature. 129

The Paradise account provides the proper hierarchy of value in which the perversion of the original lot of man is at the center of the picture of a disturbed creation. The humiliation of the serpent reveals the degradation of all creatures, while the struggle between man and serpent teaches the disturbed harmony of their common life. All of the individual features of the account derive ultimately from the total fact of man's existence outside of Paradise, which shows him to be cut off from the divine source of life. Therefore, man is at odds with his original destiny in every circumstance of his existence. 130

With the fall, "nakedness" was deprived of spirit and became a coarse material thing. The sense of sight had been

129 Von Rad, op. cit., p. 94.
in the service of the spirit, but in the Fall the spirit became the slave of sense.

Genesis 2 depicts the original man-woman relationship as a complete union or identification of the physical-psychical-spiritual aspects of human existence. The couple's relationship was exclusive and intimate, but the union was broken into by an outside intrusive personal being, and resulted in confusion of well-being.

With the personal basis lacking in the Garden, "nakedness" became a farce. Therefore, man veiled the region below the hip, because complete nudity equaled disgrace. These parts - נוה עון and נ하여 (pudenda) - became shameful parts because "nakedness" and "flesh" which man is required to hide culminates in them. Man covered himself in order to hide from the beholding eye the sight of his honor which had been converted into shame. He was ashamed because the glory or clothing of honor of his body had been perverted into the shame of nakedness. Further, he was afraid because he had regressed from God's love and therefore had incurred God's wrath.131

The act of unveiling or unclothing arouses excitement, and indicates that the covering is meant to conceal from other people's sight what by its very nature is a secret.

Sexual knowledge involves an act of self-disclosure and self-knowledge. Such knowledge is highly personal, for only the individual can really know what his masculinity or her femininity means. Sexual mystery is a secret, the disclosure of which is solely in the hands of the two persons concerned. They are unable to share it with another and must guard against its profanation.\textsuperscript{132}

The two creatures became estranged to each other through their awareness of transgression. In their act of covering they failed to comprehend the scope and depth of the resulting psychic-physical-spiritual disturbance. Sin was first of all an affront to God's Person and needed proper propitiation.

Legalism is the result of the increasing loss of understanding for man's total culpability as a being with a sinful nature resistant to the divine holiness. "...juristic thinking triumphs over the religious condition of personal relationship."\textsuperscript{133} Doubt arises as to whether enough has been done in face of God's incorruptible holiness. "Thus those who seek protection from God's wrath under wholly inadequate coverings find themselves all the more the slaves of the sense of guilt; and the Law becomes a taskmaster from whose tyranny men can be freed only by the One who disclosed the


\textsuperscript{133}Eichrodt, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. II, p. 422.
full depth of their guilt, but also took the curse of the Law upon himself" (Gal. 3:13).  

The Creator’s Act of Covering

The flimsy devices which Adam and Eve quickly sewed together were an inadequate covering. God Himself had to clothe them with garments that represented pain, blood and sacrifice. Indeed, these garments represent the wages which sin demands: suffering, pain, toil and struggle; an enslavement of all life to the hostile powers of death by which it is worn out before its time. Even before his departure from Paradise, man saw in the spectacle of the bleeding beasts how serious his history had suddenly become.

In covering Adam and Eve God gave His approval of the sense of shame which had led the first parents to cover their nakedness. However, He provided an adequate covering which encompassed the two general aspects of man's existence: (1) utilitarian and (2) sacerdotal. Man needed adequate covering for the rigors outside of the Garden and a proper covering for his guilty soul. God's clothing imparted to the feeling of shame the visible sign of an awakened conscience and the consequent necessity for a covering of bodily nakedness.  

134 Ibid., p. 423.  
In the act of covering the man and woman, God is seen as preserver. "That means, he accepts men as those who are fallen. He does not compromise them in their nakedness before each other, but he himself covers them. God's activity keeps pace with man."\textsuperscript{137}

Man wanted to be himself but instead found himself having to fend for himself on the hard earth in a hard life. "The only sign of grace that he is given on his wanderings through life is the coat of skins he receives from God."\textsuperscript{138} "The redemption of man by Christ," says Wakefield, "was certainly not an afterthought, brought in upon man's apostasy. It was a provision, and when man fell he found justice in hand with mercy."\textsuperscript{139} Atonement began when sin began, for the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world. The gospel was preached simultaneously with the condemnation of the first sin. Furthermore, the provision far exceeded the offense, for where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. Therefore, "original sin and original grace met in the mystery of mercy at the very gate of Paradise."\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{137}Johannes von Rad, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 94, citing Bonhoeffer, \textit{Schopfung und Fall}, p. 82.
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Romans 5:12-19 regards the sin of Adam and the merits of Christ as coextensive (by one offense, all to condemnation; by one righteousness, all men to justification of life), the condemnation of the first being reversed by the righteousness of the second. Romans 5:14 declares Adam as the figure of him that was to come, so his sin cannot be disjoined from the righteous obedience of Adam the Deliverer.  

In every case, Old Testament passages dealing with atonement speak of restoration of a disturbed relationship with the personal covenant God by the removal of sin. But, no form of coercion through mechanical methods of magic is tolerated by His terrifying otherness. Punishment struck without fail any man who would pressure God. Removal came only through those methods ordained by God Himself. Their effective power was not inherent, but was due to the effect having been bestowed on them by God.

Atonement acquired an eminently personal quality. "Expiation is not a removal of sin independent of the forgiveness of sin, but constitutes one method of forgiveness." Note that the guilt of Eli's house was too great to expiate by sacrifice. This example indicates the limitations of sacrificial atonement. Apparently, an offense of open
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contempt for Yahweh could not be atoned for. It was commendable that man was ashamed and frightened, for his redemption was thus made possible.\textsuperscript{144}

A study of the Old Testament root (\textit{\textcopyright}) for atonement or propitiation provides an enlightening aspect to the covering of Adam.\textsuperscript{145} The basic meaning of the verb means to "cover." It is denominial, for it is the \textit{kofer} ("ransom," Ex. 30:12) that covers or shields a man from harm. This original meaning of "cover" is confirmed by Arabic and evident from synonyms like \textit{\textcopyright} ("cover"), while cognate languages use it in the sense of to deny or conceal a fact. Covering puts the cause of punishment out of sight and annuls its activity and influence.

In ritual atonement the covering of the sinner is regarded as a protection against the reaction of the divine holiness which would destroy him. Those drawing near, and the furniture, had to be covered by blood. Leviticus 17:11 gives probably the fullest account of the principle of atonement. Atonement was not made for sins, but for souls or persons. The blood made this atonement or covering of the persons because it contained the life.\textsuperscript{146} The atonement

\textsuperscript{144}Calvin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 162.

\textsuperscript{145}cf. BDB, pp. 497-8; Davidson, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 327-356; Payne, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 249-51.

\textsuperscript{146}Davidson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 325.
transferred to another covering object the punishment which man was due. The laying on of hands transferred the guilt from the person of the offerer to that of his sacrificial substitute (Lev. 16:21).  

The aim of kipper was to avert evil and particularly punishment. The Old Testament refers to God's wrath against sin and of the necessity for punishment to satisfy His divine justice more than 580 times. So, atonement was a covering of one's sins (Lev. 16:30) in order that God would not "see through" to the sinner (Num. 8:19; Ex. 32:30). Old Testament atonement was propitiation (placation), not simply expiation (reparation). Propitiation connotes the idea of an offended person (Person), against whose wrath the propitiatory covering is sought for protection. John Murray states:

...it is before the Lord that both the covering and its effect take place (cf. esp. 4:35; 10:17; 16:30) ...the sin, or perhaps the person who has sinned, is covered before the sight of the Lord....Sin evokes

---

147 Payne, op. cit., p. 250.

148 Note: the fundamental function of atonement to deliver one from punishment was prevalent with secular punishment. Jacob sent a present to Esau in order to appease (kipper) him (Gen. 32:20; cf. Prov. 16:14); cf. Gen. 32:21: "let me cover over his face by the present" (so that he does not see the offence, i.e. pacify him; "wife clean the face," blackened by displeasure; as the Arabs say, "whiten the face") (BDB, p. 497).

149 Payne, loc. cit. 150 Ibid., p. 249.
the holy displeasure or wrath of God. Vengeance is the reaction of the holiness of God to sin, and the covering is that which provides for the removal of divine displeasure which the sin evokes.\textsuperscript{151}

Even in instances of expiation Scripture makes it clear that what is really at stake is man's personal relationship with his offended Deity, the wrath of whom must be placated (cf. II Sam. 21:1).\textsuperscript{152}

Divine forgiveness and fellowship were only possible when the adequate kopher\textsuperscript{153} was presented. God punishes by death whether a man tries to approach Him or not (Ezek. 18:20; Deut. 21:6-9). The Sinai testament was illustrated by the sprinkling of "the blood of the testament on the assembled Israelites." This ceremony identified them with the death of the ultimate Testator (Ex. 24:6-8; cf. Heb. 9:19-21). They were literally under a covering of blood which enabled them to be heirs. And, after this initial ceremony, the annual Day of Atonement services were the regular memorial of Israel's shielding from the punishment of sin through intervening sacrificial blood (Lev. 16:16, 30). Testamental blood averts God's wrath.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{151}Ibid., p. 250, citing J. Murray, Redemption - Accomplished and Applied, p. 36.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{152}Ibid., p. 251.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{153}Note: kopher may mean a bribe, the thing that covers the eyes of the judge so that he does not punish (I Sam. 12:3 - Samuel denied participating in such an action).}
"Honor always contains two elements: greatness in one-self and greatness in one's relation to others..." (Pedersen). Further, the expression of honor and shame pervades the entire realm of the soul, for man is a psychic-physical being (a living being). Man's original or created being and his original personal relationships were in perfect balance and harmony. The original harmony of relationships was maintained by man's state of innocence. Genesis 2 describes man's original harmony of (1) being and (2) community.

The desires and actions, ideals and realities of the spiritual and bodily elements of Adam's being were at one. Therefore, the desires of the spirit and actions of the flesh were in full agreement. Not only was man's being a harmonious complex, but his personal relationships as well. Complete harmony reigned within the perfect inter-personal relationship of God-man-woman, for the character of Adam and Eve's personal relationship was based directly upon their relationship with God Himself.

Any personal relationship assumes psychic interchange but only the marriage relationship is so complete as to be called a "one flesh" union. This type of complete identification is extremely personal, exclusive and intimate. It is not simply a subjective experience, but an objective and indelible feature of the self; an ontic union with the
partner (Piper). The full psychic-physical union of man and woman can be considered a status of "nakedness" (‘ervah; cf. Kahana).

Both Genesis 2 and 3 depict the primal couple as "naked," but the former is without shame (having innocence and honor) while the latter is laden with shame before each other and fear before God (having guilt and shame). The temptation and fall of Adam and Eve embroiled the entire range of their psychosomatic beings, and explains the dilemma of man down to the present age. In fact, Paul made Genesis 3:1-24 the foundation of his theology: by one man sin entered the world (Rom. 5:12; 5:18).

Adam disobeyed a personal demand of God, affronting God's Person through an outside personal intruder. The man-woman relationship suffered immediately as a result of the defective relationship with God. Man's harmony of being and his perfect personal relationships were disordered. The flesh now lusted against the aspirations of the spirit; they "knew" they were "naked" (v. 7).

Adam and Eve realized immediately that their covering of innocence was gone and needed to cover themselves from the shame felt before each other and the fear felt before God. However, their covering was as inadequate as that of Cain. God's interrogation was necessary in order for them to see the deep psychosomatic disturbance of sin, for Adam placed
the feeling of "nakedness" and shame in a false causal relationship. Indeed, God did not compromise them in their "nakedness," but on the other hand, He provided Adam and Eve with an adequate psychic-physical covering. Only a covering that was both (1) utilitarian and (2) sacerdotal was able to adequately comprehend their psychic-physical need, and represent the provision of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

Adam was much more aware of the feeling of "nakedness" and shame than his transgression of the divine command. However, reflection on "nakedness" as an indecent exposure dictated that they had lost the unconscious dominion of the spirit over the bodily and sensuous appearance.

The Old Testament prophets echo the Garden Account in referring to man's sinfulness, and Christ appeals to the narrative in discussing the marriage relationship. Therefore, the account remains as a pivotal point of discussion for this thesis, and the personal relationships can thus be illustrated:
Figure 1. An Illustration of the Original Interpersonal Relationship (God-man-woman): The ultimate purpose of man is a harmonious triangular relationship.

Figure 2. An Illustration of the Original Man-Woman Relationship: The first man-woman relationship was characterized as "naked" but without shame (Gen. 2:25). They lived with ervah status which was enveloped and maintained by innocence.
Figure 3. An Illustration of the Disordered Interpersonal Relationship: The Serpent, as an outside intrusive personal being, broke the harmony of man's exclusive and intimate relationships. Innocence was replaced by guilt, leaving their relationship exposed. Man and woman now knew they were "naked" (Gen. 3:7).

Figure 4. An Illustration of the Remedied Interpersonal Relationship: After the transgression of their Creator's command and felt exposure, a psychic-physical covering was necessary for man in order to maintain his proper personal relationship with the woman and God.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The word study chapter, in conjunction with the Old Testament approach, has provided the basis for this study. Classification of יָרָה and pertinent terms indicated that after the Garden Account, "nakedness" involving interpersonal relationships was spoken of with יָרָה. The root יָרָה was used in a more general and descriptive sense (cf. eg. "the poor"). And, these Hebrew terms are generally differentiated throughout the LXX with equivalent terminology.

Complete exposure is depicted as shameful and disastrous. יָרָה portrays this type of exposure. This word indicates limits and bounds for maintaining the integrity of the I-Thou relationship; a relationship laden with dynamic complexities and volatile repercussions. Therefore, יָרָה or complete uncovering was enough to speak of destruction and judgment.

Elaboration of the scriptural citations and addition of related instances are included in Chapter Three. This chapter deals more specifically with shameful exposure within the context of the dynamics of personal and communal interchange. Ancient near eastern background, inductive study and biblical studies have combined to treat the relevant
categories of personal relationship: God-man; Man-woman; God-nation; Man-to-man.

The Old Testament Scriptures establish a radical contrast between Israel and Canaan which is vividly apparent in regard to "nakedness." For example, goddesses such as Qudšu and Asherah were depicted in iconography as "naked," while their greatest appellative was "holiness" (actually, the former name means "holiness"). Yahweh's greatest appellation was also "holiness," but he laid down stringent laws against "exposure" concerning His priests. Indeed, He also spoke of the breaking of His covenant as "uncovering nakedness" (Ezek. 16 and 23)\(^1\) and illicit sexual relations as "uncovering nakedness" (Lev. 18 and 20).

"Uncovered" or illicit personal relationships are referred to with many vivid terms such as, נֶּכֶל, נִנְנָה, וּלְשָׁנָה, and more. In contrast, proper relationships are viewed as "covered" relationships: נִנְה וּכְשָׁה אוֹרָה. Israel's unfaithfulness, that is, "uncovering" brought about her destruction (Ezek. 16 and 23).

It is the sexual perversions in particular which are branded in the OT as נָבֵּלָא (Gen. 34:7; Deut.

---

\(^1\)Cf. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol. I, p. 152. Note that the indiscriminate use of Canaanite models by the cult was called "harlotry" (Hos. 1 ff.). Jehu summarized the Melkart cult imported under Ahab as whoredom and witchcraft (II Kings 9:22). Note also the polemic of the prophets (Amos 2:7; Hos. 4:13 ff.; Jer. 5:7; 13:27; 23:10, 14; Micah 1:7).
22.21; Judg. 19.23 f.; 20.6, 10; II Sam. 13.12; Jer. 29.23), and it was on this point especially that Israel was aware of being different from the Canaanites (Gen. 9.22 ff.; 19.5; 20.11; 38.9f.; Lev. 18.3, 24 ff; 20.23). Attention should also be drawn to the strong feeling against any form of physical nudity (Gen. 9.22 ff.; Ex. 20.26) and the fact that the word 'nakedness' could be used to denote any illicit sexual union (Lev. 18).

Cf. further, M. Weber, Religionsoziologie III, pp. 202 ff.²

Since the Fall, when the Old Testament writers referred to the complete unveiling of the body in reference to illicit inter-personal relationships they did so with the word נַֽפֶּשׁ which always conveys a shameful connotation. The attitude of the writers rests squarely upon man's creation by God and his brief history within the Garden of Eden. In this respect, the prophets' understanding reached to the deepest level of human existence.

Through profound poetic imagery, the Garden Account portrays the basis for the biblical horror of "nakedness," and a theological discussion of the account is contained in Chapter Four of this study. Man's personal relationships suffered immediately after his personal relationship with God became defective. Disparity of spiritual-physical life resulted from man's new autonomy.

²Ibid.; cf. Oepke, "γυμνός...": "...the damned were thought of as naked. Thus in the Samaritan liturgy for the eve of the Day of Atonement the goyim will be raised naked, whereas the righteous will rise again with the clothes (?) in which they were buried."
Before the Fall "nakedness" was an expression of complete psychic-physical well-being maintained through obedience and innocence. However, after the Fall "nakedness" was an expression of guilt, and consequent fear and shame. The term "naked" is not a superficial designation of the primal couple's condition, but a comprehensive term which described their state to the deepest level of their being. Genesis 3 depicts the "naked" state of shame as one of the most elementary and deepest emotions in the human being; the sign of a breach reaching to the lowest level of man's physical being.

Psychic-physical exposure demanded a psychic-physical covering which was provided by God Himself according to the Garden Account and elaborated in the Old Testament atonement. יסוי denoted atonement or "covering." Old Testament blood sacrifice covered the people from the God who would "see through" to their person if they were without it. Also, Israel found the beneficence of God within the proper relationship. In faith these "covering objects" anticipated the ultimate covering object.

The Hebrew view of "nakedness" is not one of negativism. Rather, it is one of the profoundest arguments from the standpoint of the fullest life possible for man. The highest and most rewarding life for man is not to be found in compartmentalizing aspects of his being and existence. The full life is found in the avenues of conduct which blend all aspects
of his being and personal relationships into a harmonious unity.

Therefore, proper relationships are depicted as "covered" relationships. All of man's personal relationships on earth are to be adjusted and satisfying as they derive from a relationship with God Himself. Through God and His provision man adequately knows himself and relates properly to other persons.

Several areas can be cited for further study. One important aspect is the number of significant foreign works. Eichrodt pointed out M. Weber, *Religionssoziologie* III, pp. 202 ff. Vriezen recommended an excellent article by E. Peterson, "Theologie der Kleidung," *Universitas*, III, 1948, pp. 1409 ff. A few works dealing with the cultic horror of "nakedness" were recommended by Oepke: H. Windisch, *Kommentar z. 2 Korintherbrief* (1924) and Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, 2, 148.

Some aspects of this particular study could also receive fuller treatment. For example, much more could be done from the standpoint of etymology and comparative semitics. The scope of this thesis has had to be limited to the available Old Testament material. Furthermore, the contrast between Old Testament worship and ancient near eastern worship has had to be restricted to a few pertinent observations.
This thesis has made available the Old Testament material relevant to "nakedness." With this in hand, many modern disciplines could be appealed to in conjunction with the biblical material. Some of these fields include anthropology, sociology, psychology, psychiatry. Paul Tournier, for instance, has indicated the need for a thorough study of nudism from the perspective of psychiatry and psychology.

Rabbi Kahana’s book has been a helpful book in regard to Jewish interpretation of marriage in terms of ervah. However, post-biblical Jewish works could receive a great deal more attention in a paper which is not confined to the Old Testament view specifically.

Tournier includes a brief discussion concerning nudism in his book The Meaning of Persons (pp. 76-7), after emphasizing the fact that he speaks with caution because the topic deserves a thorough study. In this discussion, Tournier admits that at least some nudists are sincerely trying to divest themselves of the formal personage in the hope of creating a more genuine human community. They are trying to be completely honest and open before each other, even in the elementary elements of modesty.

Sincere advocates have meant nudism as a symbol of a complete divestment of hypocrisy. But Tournier has observed that the idealistic dream of an innocent society is the mark of a psychological disturbance. Nudism exercises a great
attraction to people who suffer from unconscious repressions. Tournier has observed patients who see themselves naked in their dreams, a symbol representing an inner longing to cast away their mask.

This psychiatrist also includes a brief discussion of Genesis 3:7 and 3:21, noting that God "...knew that thenceforth, in our human condition, and until the redemption of the world should be accomplished, we might no more be completely naked persons." Rather than taking man's clothing away from him, God made man a finer garment.

At this point Tournier points out the characteristic realism of biblical revelation in turning from "...the utopian dream of a life exempt from all appearance and all protection." Such an effort would be a vain attempt to isolate one's person completely from his personage. Instead, the Bible substitutes the idea "...of accepting the clothing which God himself gives us, of choosing our personage - the personage God wills us to have."

---


4Ibid: "St. Paul, after exhorting us to put off the old man, invites us to put on the new man, born of the Spirit (Col. 3:9-10). He speaks also of putting on the breastplate of righteousness, the helmet of salvation, and the girdle of truth (Eph. 6:14-6)."

5Ibid.  

6Ibid., p. 77.
The biblical revelation requires men to do everything well, including close attention to form. God is not a God of disorder (I Cor. 14:33), but One who rules in diligence (Rom. 12:8). Rather than despising decor, the Bible portrays all of nature as the splendid setting which God has provided for men's lives. Every function in the world entails its own requirements and demands observance of certain forms.  

"...to conform to them is not mere play-acting."  

Jacob Boehme has said, "The exterior is the signature of the interior."  

Man is a mystifying union of physical and psychic complexities. In the Garden he received a psychosomatic covering because he is one. The biblical approach and attitude toward "nakedness" makes an approach such as Hugh Hefner's untenable. Compartmentalizing the functions of the body is anti-biblical, anti-sex and self destructive. Such a view is essentially a denial of the dignity of one's person. The concept of the whole, integrated person and the concept of harmonious communal relationships does not allow for such a divisive view of a human being and his relationships.

---

7Ibid.  
8Ibid., p. 79.  
9Ibid.
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