Michaela Bauks*

Intratextual Exegesis in the Primeval History – the Literary Function of the Genealogies in View of the Formation of Gen 1–11

A first lecture of the primeval history (Gen 1:1–11:32)[1] which has the function of exposition or prologue to the upcoming story of Israel is intriguing. On the one hand we have all the narratives[2] presented in Gen 1:1–4:16; 6:1–9:17 or 11:1–9. On the other hand, these narratives are sometimes interrupted by extended genealogies (4:17–26; 5:1–32; 9:17–29; 10:1–32; 11:10–23) composed of age formulas (Gen 7:6; 9,28 f.), notices of birth (4:17 ff.; 10:1 ff.) or fatherhood (5:3 ff.; 11:10 ff.) and several *toledot* formulas (2:4a; 5:1–2a; 6:9; 10:1,32; 11:10,27) which introduce a list of personal names (6:10; 9:18; 10:3–18,21–29).[3] The main point of this article is the genealogical framework with reference to several figures such as Adam, Enoch and Noah who support the ligation of the different traditions present in the corpus of Gen 1–11.

1 The genealogies in Gen 1–11

Gen 5,1: »This is the list/book/scroll of the descendants of Adam« (ספר תולדת) could be interpreted as a perfect introduction formula. However, four chapters

---

1 The end of the primeval history is object of ongoing discussion, see Jan C. Gertz, »The Formation of Primeval History,« in *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr and David L. Petersen (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012): 107–136.
2 Coats defines that »narrative is the art form, symbolic and imaginative in its representation, that combines description and dialogue in order to depict principals in a particular span of time« (George W. Coats, *Genesis with an introduction to narrative literature* [Grand Rapids/MI: Eerdmans, 1983], 4 [quotation], see furthermore 38; 47).
3 Gen 2:4b and 10:32 form an exception (see below). – Generally see Michaela Bauks, »Rhetorical Features and Characteristics,« in *Cambridge Companion to Genesis*, ed. Bill T. Arnold (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), forthcoming.

---

*Kontakt: Michaela Bauks, University Koblenz-Landau, E-Mail: bauks@uni-koblenz.de

precede this literary starting point by presenting a cosmogony and anthropogony in a narrative way. Gen 4:1,17–26 also forms a genealogical report anteceding the book of toledot. Obviously the genre has an important theological impact because the long lists of names prove that, instead of the negative reports of men within the narratives Gen 2–4, the principle of divine benediction realized by fertility and world order does not stop progressing. Furthermore, the progress of culture achieved by the seven generations in the Gen 4 list becomes important.[4] Genealogies and narratives present a kind of theological check and balance within the corpus Gen 1–11.[5]

From a literary perspective, the lists in Gen 4:1,17–26 and Gen 5 are doublets and form a perfect example for source criticism: Both lists belong to a common topic of the Ancient Near East[6] focused on the distinction in a pre-flood and post-flood humanity. Both lists present the antediluvian age that starts in Gen 4 with Cain, son of »the man« and Eve, while the second list in Gen 5 begins with Adam, the father of Seth.

The opening element of the first list in Gen 4:1,17–26 focuses on a successive generation in a vertical father-son-chain (»linear genealogy«)[7], which in v. 19 takes on a segmented or horizontal form (Gen 4:19–24): For a first time, the list names two wives of the patriarch Lamech with their sons, who represent different professions such as nomads, musicians and forgers of bronze and iron giving account of developments of human civilization (4:20–22). The beginning of the genealogical notices focuses on Cain (v. 1), which needlessly introduces the narrative of the two brothers (4:2–16) and interweaves genealogy and tale perfectly.[8] However, 4:1–2 were probably not originally part of the list starting in v. 17,[9]

---

4 Probably this structure of seven associated with cultural skills reflects the tradition of the seven *Apkallu* in the Mesopotamian lists; see Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (Waco/TX: Word Books, 1987), 110; Robert Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1977), 148–155.

5 An exception forms e. g. the extension by the song of Lamech in Gen 4,23–24.

6 See Wilson, *Genealogy*, 56–136 who presents the material, especially Sumerian and Akkadian genealogies found in royal inscriptions, Mesopotamian king lists containing compiled genealogical fragments, sometimes within an *ante- et postdiluvian* section, and including non royal, scribal and priestly genealogies. The most ANE genealogies are linear in form and do not extend ten generations; often they are related to narratives (134 f.). The preference for segmented data in the biblical literature reflects other sociological conditions, presenting a tribal instead of a monarchic concept (196).

7 See the criteria for linear and segmented genealogies and fluidity in an oral perspective in Wilson, *Genealogy*, 18–37.

8 See Jan C. Gertz, *Das erste Buch Mose (Genesis)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018), 154 ff.

9 In this way opted by Coats, *Genesis*, 61.

because v. 1 introduces the Hebrew term אדם as a noun (+ article). The personal name Adam is encountered foremost in 4:25. Gen 4:1 shares with v. 25 that only here the mother (Eve) names her son. At least the enigmatic notice of the conception of Cain with God in v. 1 should be considered as an independent tradition which was introduced into the tale as an introduction to bridge the different topics in Gen 2–4. The last verses (4:25 f.) readopt the perspective of the beginning of the chapter and conclude with an expanded birth notice of the third son, who will continue the Adamic line.[10]

The so called »Kenite list«[11] starts in 4:17 as a linear genealogy, which is extended by further details according to Lamech, the fifth generation after Cain, (»song of Lamech«, 4:23–24). Furthermore, the genealogy is bifurcated by his two wives, the real protagonists by giving birth (v. 20,22). In most birth reports of this chapter (Gen 4:1 f.,17 f.,20,22,25) procreation is described as a primary female activity (scheme: x *knew* (v. 1,17,25), she [*conceived*; cf. v. 1,17; and] *bore* [v. 1,2,17,20,22,25 and *named*; cf. v. 25] ...).[12] Moreover, birth is reported in a passive expression (»was born«; cf. v. 18,26). In the Lamech context we have also the name of a sister (v. 22b Naamah). The allusion to the conception (ידע)[13] in v. 17 links the list with the beginning (v. 1) and the end (v. 25) of the chapter.

In fact, Gen 4 is a linear genealogy extended by narrative and etiological elements, which becomes »segmented« in v. 19 (cf. 5:32) for ending again in a linear list with Enosh, son of Seth. When the principal scheme introduces the notice of birth, the genealogy is indeed not strictly patrilineal, but unexpectedly female-oriented. V. 25 is a nearly verbatim reprise of v. 17, the beginning of Cain's genealogy, but the perspective changes here from Cain to the third son of Adam, Seth. Thus, Seth is introduced as the decisive descendant of the Adamic line (cf.

---

10 See Gertz, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 25 who speaks about a new deployment (»Neueinsatz«) in v. 25 according to v. 1 and 17.

11 See Wilson, *Genealogy*, 156 f., who criticizes the supposition that these verses figure out an *oral* list of the Kenite tribe (cf. Num 24:21 f.; Judg 4:11) because the list is not segmented as it would be typical for political purposes. The primary genealogy is fitting perfectly in the tale of fratricide, therefore the chapter forms for him a literary unit.

12 See otherwise v. 17, where he [Cain] built a city and named it Enoch after his son Enoch.

13 The verb is present in Gen 2–3, too, but in a wisdom signification (»to get knowledge«). In contrast to Gertz (*Das erste Buch Mose*, 176), who proposes an immediate connection between knowledge and sexuality in this chapter, I would argue that proliferation is focused only after the expulsion report (see Gen 4:1–2) whose realization is underlined by the genealogical texts. See in detail Michaela Bauks, »Text- and Reception-Historical Reflections on Transmissional and Hermeneutical Techniques in Gen 2–3,« in *The Pentateuch. International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid and Baruch Schwartz (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2011): 139–168, esp. 149–155 with bibliography.

5:4).[14] The personal name Adam is initially encountered here in the Hebrew text.[15] Since the cultural notice emphasizing that »At that time people began to invoke the name of JHWH« seems to conclude the list in a positive perspective (v. 26),[16] the anthropologically more pessimistic line of Gen 4:17–24 corresponds to the negative view of Gen 3:1–4:16 preparing the final judgment of Gen 6:5, which justifies the flood. However, in 4:25 a new and parallel lineage to Cain begins.

The so-called ספר תולדת starting in Gen 5:1 ff.[17] omits Cain (and the tale about him) completely and focuses only on Seth, the youngest son of Adam (cf. Gen 4:26). The text is differently composed as a typical patrilineal genealogy, focused on the first born son (cf. Gen 6:10; 7:13; 9:18; 10:1; 11:1–25; 1 Chr 1:4). Other sons and daughters are mentioned only nameless, probably in order to emphasize the high rate of fertility (vv. 4,7,10,13,16,19,22,25,30), whereas the names of mothers are omitted. Explicit allusions to Gen 1:26–28 in 5:1–3 and the preference for the age formula create a strong intratextual texture between chapters 1; 5 and 6–9*.[18] As in Gen 4:25, the list takes a segmented form only at the end (5:32), which anticipates the three Noah sons mentioned also in Gen 6:10; 7:13; 9:18; 10:1,32.

The list exhibits some sort of formal fluidity[19]: partly the genealogy of Gen 5 duplicates names (with different writings) and introduces the name of Enosh, son of Seth, at the beginning, according to the chronological order (5:6; cf. 4:26). In one case the name is changed: Cain becomes Kenan, who, however, is presented in Gen 5:9,11 not as the son of Adam, but as the son of Enosh. Thus, he becomes

---

14 In this new perspective, the negativity of the fratricide and the violence of Lamech is dropped out; see Thomas Hieke, *Die Genealogien der Genesis* (Freiburg: Herder, 2003), 60–62.

15 For the Greek text see Michaela Bauks, »Die Selbstreflexivität des hebräischen Menschen in Gen 2,4b – 5,1,« in *Individualität und Selbstreflexion in den Literaturen des Alten Testaments*, ed. Andreas Wagner and Jürgen van Oorschot (Leipzig: Ev. Verlagsanstalt, 2017): 93–115, esp. 107–110.

16 See Hieke, *Genealogien*, 53 ff.

17 Cf. the toledot formulas presenting a similar construction in Gen 2:4a; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10,27; 25:12,19; 36:1,9; 37:2; Num 3:1 and Ruth 4:18.

18 For the expression »Thus all the days that Adam etc. lived« (5:5,8,11,14,17,20,23,27,31; 9:29) see also Gen 25:7 (Abraham). The age formulas differ highly in the different textual traditions; see Hieke, *Genealogien*, 67–80; Gertz, »Formatio«: 120 ff.

19 Wilson emphasizes that in Gen 5:1–5 formal fluidity has functional significance, in Gen 5:12–27 fluidity corresponds to the fact that the names involved no longer had a genealogical function (*Genealogy*, 197). However, James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington: Catholic Bible Association, 1984), 26 suggests referring to Jack Sasson, »A Genealogical Convention in Biblical Chronography,« *ZAW* 90 (1978): 171–185, that the switch of Enoch to the seventh position of the ancestors is intentional and aims to highlight his authority within the genealogy of Gen 5.

the father of Mahalalel and replaces in this function Irad (cf. Gen 4:18), who is named Jared, father of Enoch (5:18).

In addition, the sequence of the names differs significantly. Indeed, the »Kenite list« leads to Lamech, while Gen 5 focuses on his son, Noah. In fact, the genealogy anticipates the genealogical notice of Noah in Gen 6:9[20]: »These are the descendants of Noah …« which ends in v. 10 mentioning his sons Sem, Ham, and Japhet (cf. 5:32). Gen 5 omits completely the negative allusions to Lamech (4:23 f.), who even becomes the father of Noah, the rightful hero of the flood.

The so called Adam genealogy is also expanded by narrative elements: the quasi-literal quotation of Gen 1:26 f. (*imago Dei*) in 5:1b–2, the rightful conduct of Enoch (הלך hitp.; 5:22; cf. Gen 6:9), his marvelous end (v. 24)[21] and, lastly, an extended name etiology of Noah in v. 29 – these extensions highlight the three figures. As the creation report refers to the priestly traditions (*imago Dei*) and the wording of 2:4 (עשׂה/ברא), 5:3b echoes Gen 1:26 f. *and* 4:25 (non-P). It seems that P- and non-P-traditions are intermingled.

The genealogy in Gen 5 embraces ten generations from Adam to Noah. Every entry follows a more or less regular pattern that comprises three parts: a birth report of the ancestor accompanied by the age of the father, a notice of the years of life for the father after the birth, and the death report.[22] The narrative expansions to the list concern three figures: Adam is the God-like being who fathered a child in his own image and according to *his* likeness; Enoch is presented as the rightful man elected by God, who walked with God and was »taken by him« instead of living and dying like the other forefathers (vv. 5,8,11,14,17,20,27,31); Noah is highlighted by a name etiology (נחם/נוח) which explains that he will be able to invert the curse which effected human labor in a negative way. The first and second expansions allude to priestly language, the third not. Formally this list is anchored[23] in Ancient Near Eastern lists.

---

20 Hence Wenham sees the end of the *toledot* in 6:8, just before the next introductory formula »This is the toledot of Noach …« (Wenham, *Genesis*, 121 with reference to Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis I* [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1998], 249).

21 Hebrew לקח cf. 1–2 Kgs 2:3,5,9 f. (Eliah); cf. references to Enoch in Sir 44:16; 49:14; Wis 4:7–20; Heb 11:5; 1 En. 81:1–82:3; 104:12–13; see Hieke, *Genealogien*, 74 f.

22 The same formulae are used in Gen 11:10–26 (genealogy of Seth), but the summing up of the patriarch's life is omitted.

23 Probably P uses the Mesopotamian king-list-tradition in a formal sense. The number of ten generations is attested and the tenth member is occasionally the flood hero (see VanderKam, *Enoch*, 33–51; Bill T. Arnold, *Genesis* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 9–12).

2 Adam – Enoch – Noah and their literary function in the Primeval History

The following observations aim to demonstrate that the cohesion of the different traditions conflated in the primeval history is effected by three personal names (see the chart at the end of the article).

The noun אדם is encountered in Gen 1:26–28; 2–3 (22 examples), and Gen 4:1. In 4:25 the signification changes from appellative to proper name (cf. 5:1, where we have both; 5:2 noun; 5:3–5 proper name). From Gen 6:1 onwards, all the occurrences are determined nouns (19 examples up to 11:5). All in all, we have only five explicit references to the personal name in the Hebrew text (4:25[24]; 5:1,3,4,5). The function of the name in 4:25 is evident: The verse bridges to the ספר תולדת of *Adam* starting in Gen 5:1. Probably it is part of a supplementary addition to the »Kenite list« (vv. 17–24), which changes the focus from the expired lineage of Cain[25] to Adam's third son Seth, the valid descendant of the first couple of human beings. The proper name Adam is very evocative, referring etymologically back to the ground (אדמה) and blending a single figure with humankind. Otherwise, the proper name is rarely encountered: in 1 Chr 1:4 (+ Seth and Enosh), in deutero-canonical traditions such as Tob 8:8 (referring to Gen 2), Sir 24:16/24; 33:10 (together with Enoch, Seth and Noah; referring to Gen 2–3), and in Sir 49:14–20 at the end of the »praise of the fathers of old« (44:1). Furthermore, we have around ten examples in the Dead Sea Scroll Texts: notions about the כבוד אדם in CD 3:20; 1QH[a] 4:15; 1QS 4:23 and further allusions in 4Q 418 (Instruction[d]) 81:3; 4Q 423 (Sapiental Text) 8:2; 4Q 504 (Words of the Luminaries) 8:4–5 presenting Adam positively as a person who receives knowledge with the breath of life. Texts such as 4Q 511 52–9 iii 2 (Songs of the Sage); 4Q 521 (Messianic Apocalypse 8,6[26]) evoke Adam, too. Some NT references work out the Adam-Christ typology (e. g. Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 15:14,22,45), others refer to Gen 2 (1 Tim 2:13 f.) or Gen 5 (Jude 14).

---

24 LXX and Syr add »to his wife« the name of Eve; cf. Gen 4:1. In LXX the proper noun is introduced since 2:16; Tg. Neof., Tg. Ps.-J. adds the proper noun in 3:21.

25 See John Byron, *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition. Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the First Sibling Rivalry* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 123–165 about the gap in the Genesis story concerning Cain's death and its everlasting memory by the founded city.

26 George J. Brooke, »Art. Adam,« *ThWQ* 1 (2011): 48–61, esp. 58 ff. and Emanuel Tov, »Concordance of Proper Nouns in the Non-Biblical Texts of Qumran,« *DJD* 39 (2002): 229–284; 240; see Esther G. Chazon, »The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls,« in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation*, ed. Judith Frishman and Lucas van Rompay (Leuven: Peeters, 1997): 13–24, and John J. Collins, »Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,« in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids: Eisenbrauns, 2005): 29–43.

We have to assume that Adam did not become a central figure within the Hebrew Bible. The most extensive work in early Judaism is presented in the book of Jubilees, which describes Adam in an important cultic function.[27] However the figure becomes literally important for the cohesion and the composition of the primeval history in its final form: Gen 4:17–24, a perhaps originally independent list, was expanded by more genealogical material (vv. 1,25 f.) in order to be introduced in its larger literary context. Probably Adam is an evocative name, derived from the general noun for »human being« and was, in v. 25, especially selected to bridge the »Adam genealogy« with the anthropogonic tale in Gen 2–4. Gen 5 opens a serial of genealogic lists that structure the Torah texts up to Num 3.[28]

The case of *Enoch* is different.[29] This name occurs several times in OT texts. In Gen 4 the name appears three times for the son of Cain, the founder of a town named Enoch (Gen 4:16 f.). Furthermore, the name occurs in Gen 5 six times for the son of Jared (cf. 1 Chr 1:3); and lastly Ruben's son is named Enoch in genealogical and tribal notices (Gen 49:9; Ex 6:14; Num 26:5; cf. 1 Chr 5:3; in 1 Chr 1:33, son of Midian). From the three lineages in the book of Genesis two reappear in other scriptural contexts: The Enoch of Gen 5 is encountered in Luke 3:37 and Jude 14 in a genealogical context; Sir 44:16 hints at Enoch's rapture to heaven (cf. 5:24) in the »praise of the fathers of old« (Sir 44:1) together with Noah (cf. Hebr 11:5). In the Dead Sea Scrolls[30] the name refers to the son of Cain (11Q 12 [Jub] 1:10 cf. Jub 4:6–11) and otherwise to Enoch, son of Jared in Gen 5. Of course, the most important work is 1 Enoch, but the name is also used in the Book of Giants (4Q 203 8:4; 4Q 206 2:2 et. al.; before 200 BCE), in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q GenAp ar 2:22–24; 5:3; 19:25) and in the sparingly transmitted Aramaic texts of 1 Enoch within the Qumran manuscripts (4Q 201 1 I 1 [cf. 1 En 1:1]; 4Q212 1 iii 18,21,23 [cf.

---

27 See furthermore from the common era, the Apocalypse of Moses (Greek version) or Vita of Adam and Eve (Latin etc.), a fictive biography of the first parents after their expulsion.
28 Cf. Gen 5:1,32 (from Adam to Noah + his sons); 6:9 f. (Noah + his sons); 9:28 f. (Noah's death); 10:1,32 (Noah's sons; segmented list); 11:10–26 (Sem to Terach; lineal list), 27–32 (Terach); 25:12,19; 36:1,9; 37:2, and the last entry in Num 3:1–4 (post-P?). David M. Carr describes the P-version of the ancestral traditions like »a covenant-focused expanded genealogy«, which recomposes non-P-traditions (idem, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis. Historical and Literary Approaches* [Louisville/KN: Westminster John Knox, 1996], 127). – Since the 12th century BCE the proper name Adam disappeared in the West Semitic onomastica; see Richard S. Hess, *Studies in the Personal Names of Genesis 1–11* (Kevaler/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker/Neukirchener Verlag, 1993), 59–62; Arnold, *Genesis*, 81 f. with note 193.
29 See VanderKam, *Enoch*, 23–51.
30 Kelley Coblentz-Bautch, »Art. Hanok,« *ThWQ* 1 (2011): 1016–1021; Tov, »Concordance«, 251.

1 En 93:1–3]).[31] The most pieces of evidence of Enoch are encountered in Aramaic texts according to different genres.[32] They belong either to works such as 1 Enoch and Jubilees 5:8 or to »rewritten texts«[33] such as 1QGenAp within a haggadic perspective. A text like 1QapGen ar 2:19–25 qualifies Enoch as the antediluvian wise patriarch, related to the celestial *and* terrestrial world, and combines the topics of Gen 5 with Gen 6:1–4.[34] Extending the short notice of Gen 5:22–24 Enoch becomes the revealer of hidden and dangerous wisdom.[35] In 4Q204 frag. 5 ii 17–30 (1En 106:13–107:2)[36] data of Gen 4–5 are literally interwoven, when an oracle of Enoch, son of Jered (Gen 4:18), predicts the flood and announces the salvation of Noah, who is presented as son of Lamech (Gen 5:28 f.) together with his three sons.

Obviously, from the three biblical lineages[37] especially these Enoch traditions survived, which were designed in an apocalyptical or mystical tradition.[38] The originally independent traditions of Gen 4 and 5 become lightly interwoven because of their common antediluvian character. Indeed, the son-of-Ruben-tradition is absent in the early reception history.

Obviously the figure of *Noah* is the most prominent, because he becomes the extensively presented hero in the biblical flood story and the beneficiary of the first covenant (6:8–9:16). Noah is also the first wine grower (9:20) and a gardener who »shall bring us relief from our work and from the toil of our hands« (5:29),

---

31 See Michaël Langlois, »Le livre d'Hénoch,« in *La Bibliothèque de Qumran,* vol. 1: *Torah / Genèse*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Tierry Legrand, André Paul (Paris: Cerf, 2008): 83–91 (Epître d'Hénoch; 1st century BCE).
32 James C. VanderKam, »Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,« in *From Revelation to Canon. Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, ed. idem (Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000): 305–331.
33 Three – at least very fragmentary – evidences belong to lists transmitting the Hebrew genealogical tradition before the flood (4Q212 iii 23 [= 1 En 93:3 »Enoch, born the 7th in the first week«] 4Q369 1 i 10; 5Q13 iii 2).
34 See the eschatological revision in 1 En 6–36. The ancient Jewish and Rabbinic traditions become more critical: e. g. Targum Onkelos to Gen 5:24 emphasizes that Enoch died, too.
35 John Day, »The Flood and the Ten Antediluvian Figures,« in *On Stone and Scroll. Essays in Honor of Graham Ivor Davies*, ed. James K. Aitken et al. (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2011): 211–223; he refers to Enmeduranki, the Enoch of the flood story of Berose, and to Noah in Jub 4:17–26 for portraying the figure as an apocalyptic visionary and seer (219).
36 Langlois, »Le livre d'Hénoch«: 54–57.
37 Andrea Bebenbender demonstrates how the common topics (tree of the forbidden fruit 1 En 32:6; death of Abel 1 En 22:5–7; Enoch's character; watchers and human daughters; flood) are inverted in the Enoch narratives. While Genesis focuses on the human side, 1 En deals with his supranatural influences (»The place of the Torah,« in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins (Leiden: Brill, 2007): 65–80, esp. 73 ff.; cf. VanderKam, *Enoch*, 28 ff.
38 VanderKam, *Enoch*, 110–140 (1 En 1–36).

by lightening the curse of the ground that man has to work (3:17). Viticulture is considered as a positive effect of this change and a further example of progress in culture (9:20).[39] In Gen 5:29 we have a word play between נוח »rest« and נחם »to bring relief/repentance« when cultivating the ground, which alludes to the farmer topic of Gen 2–4. Further reminiscences to non-P-texts concern grief (עצבון; 3:16),[40] the suspension of the cursed ground (8:21), and the use of the tetragrammaton. Whether this specificity qualifies the verse either as a dispersed note at the end of the »Kenite list« reporting the birth of Noah[41] or as an addition effected by a final redaction (cf. 4:25 f.[42]) is still part of exegetical discussions. Like the song of Lamech the verse seems to be a (redactional) supplement giving more consistency to the final composition of Gen 1–11 (see chart).

Genealogical notices of Noah are numerous (Gen 5:29 f.,32; 6:9 f.; 9:28 f.; 10:1,32; cf. 1 Chr 1:4). They share the segmented form with Gen 11:26 (Terach; cf. Gen 4:25 Adam). The three sons of Noah constitute the three great divisions of mankind (10:1,32). Otherwise the name of Noah is alluded to in Ezek 14:14,20 (with Daniel and Job), in Isa 54:9 (the days of Noah and the flood), and in Sir 44:17 (»praise of the fathers of old«). Noah is a very common name in the Ancient Near East, known form Egyptian, Syrian, Mariote and Palestinian lists.[43] Other parallels exist with the Sumerian flood story listing between seven to ten antediluvian kings. These traditions discuss similar topics such as the primeval history and present the elements in the same order as Gen 4 and 5.[44] However, the flood hero

---

39 See Arnold, *Genesis*, 112 f. He underlines that otherwise as elsewhere in the ancient world the »arts of civilization« are not credited to gods, but explained as human achievements (cf. 4:17–22). See Michaela Bauks, »Clothing and Nudity in the Noah Story (Gen 9:18–29),« in *Clothing and Nudity in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Christoph Berner et al. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2019), forthcoming. Differently Gertz, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 291 who presumes an ambivalent meaning.

40 The rare noun עצבון »grief« is used here and in 3:16.

41 See Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 99; Carr, *Reading*, 70; Gertz, *Formation*, 123.

42 Markus Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte. Redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Gen 1,1–11,26* (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1998), 207–217; critically Jan C. Gertz, »Von Adam zu Enosch. Überlegungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Gen 2–3,« in: *Gott und Mensch im Dialog*, FS Otto Kaiser, ed. by Markus Witte (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004): 215–236, esp. 221 f.; 233–235.

43 Harald-Martin Wahl, »Noah, Daniel und Hiob in Ezechiel XIV 12–20 (21–3): Anmerkungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund,« *VT* 42 (1992): 542–553, esp. 545 f.

44 Wenham, *Genesis*, 124; 130 ff. with an excursus concerning the ages of the patriarchs and the differences in the LXX. The ages are probably symbolic, but it is not clear what they symbolize. Wenham thinks that Gen 5 »is designed to show the divine image in which Adam was created was passed on from generation to generation, and that the divine command to be fruitful and multiply (1:28) was fulfilled« (134).

has other names in Mesopotamian literature.[45] The name of Noah occurs yet in Qumran texts,[46] designing a typos of flood hero, who could be blended either with treats of Adam (1Q GenAp ar 9:3 *dominium terrae*) or with Enoch (1QGenAp ar 5:3,29).[47] Several name etiologies are transmitted according to נוח »silence« instead of נחם »bring comfort«.[48] A different name etiology in Sir 44:17 alludes to Noah who escaped from the flood representing the rest (שארית) of humanity (see 1 En 107:1; cf. Gen 5:29 LXX; Ph. QE in Gen 1:87; Leg. 3:77).

Some texts focus on the righteousness of himself and his descendants (Jub 5:1–19; 1 En 10:3; 1QGenAp 14:12–14). He becomes the prototype for Israel's repentance and conversion (Jub 5:17–19; cf. 4Q 508 2:1–3,3; 2 Pet 2:5; Heb 11:7; Tg. Ps.-J. 7,4; Sib. Or. 1:147–198; Ph. QE in Gen 2:13; Jos. Ant. 1:74; b.Sanh. 108a; Ber.R. 30:7). Rarely his sin and bareness is emphasized (cf. Gen 9:21; Ber.R. 28:8; Ph. Opif. 8). The responsibility of the flood for transgression of borders has been accorded to angels and giants (Gen 3:1; 6:1–4; cf. 1QGenAp 6:11–26; 1 En 6 ff.; Jub 5; 4Q180; 1 Pet 3:19; 2:4; Matt 25:41; Jude 6) or to the human being (Gen 3:11,16–19; 6:5–9; cf. 4Q370 1; 4Q 422 2–7:1; CD 2:14–3:1; Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 15:21 f.). 1 En 106–107, 1QGenAp 2–5 and 1Q19 3 refer to Noah's nativity in a first person report of Enoch, his great grand-father (1 En 106:7, 11 f.), or Lamech, his father (1QGenAp 2,3).[49]

Obviously the flood story is a very prominent topic in Ancient Near Eastern literature and the prominent role of its Hebrew hero, Noah, is anchored in the narrative of Gen 6–9. According to the genealogical structure of the primeval

45 Jos. Ant. I:93 identifies the flood hero Noah with the hero of Mesopotamian flood traditions refering to Berose; Nicolaus of Damas and others. Day, »Flood«: 215 ff., emphasizes the close relationship of Gen 5 with Berose's version.

46 Devorah Dimant, »Noah in Early Jewish Literature,« in *Biblical Figures outside the Bible*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998): 123–150; Dorothy M. Peters, »Art. נוח,« *ThWQ* 2 (2013): 910–914 with bibliography; Tov, »Concordance«: 274.

47 However, several extrabiblical texts present the flood hero as one of the גברים of Gen 6,4 (1QapGen ar 2:1–18; 1 En 106:1–12 according to Lamech's doubt that Noah is his son) and suggest the identity of the biblical hero with the Mesopotamian because of other name parallels (Gilgamesh and probably also Humbaba); see John C. Reeves, »Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants,« *JBL* 112 (1993): 110–115; critically noted by Ronald V. Huggins, »Noah and the Giants: A Response to John C. Reeves,« *JBL* 114 (1995): 103–110; cf. Loren Stuckenbruck, »Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.,« in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels, Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, ed. idem (Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 2014): 1–35.

48 Cf. Jub 4:28 (critically Ber.R. 25:2) or 4Q176 [Tanḥ] 8–11: 10–13 (which refer to the days of Noah, the flood and the name etiology נחם »bring comfort«); 4Q252 1:1–2:8 (a commentary on Gen 6:5–9:27* non-P); 4Q266 = CD-A 3:1.

49 James C. Vanderkam, »The Birth of Noah,« in *From Relevation to Canon. Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, ed. idem (Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000): 396–412.

history, these chapters form a long expansion within the antediluvian genealogy (cf. 5:29–32; 6:9 f.; 9:28 f. death of Noah), which introduces also several important theological topics such as the scheme of de-creation – recreation, covenant, and election.[50]

Apparently, the extended genealogical information in Gen 4 and 5 attains during the first reception history further extensions which combine biblical traditions from different book contexts. The »filling the gaps« appeals to shift from a firstly literary to a more theological relevance of the three figures.

3 The literary profile

Usually, the evaluation of the literary profile of the primeval history is oriented towards the narrative texts and topics, that were considered as »interrupted« by several genealogies.[51] Form and age of sources and redactions, the end of the primeval history and their independence from Gen 12 ff. within the non-P-stratum are part of the debate. Other exegetes[52] start with the genealogical structure, a common genre in Near Eastern traditions for presenting cosmogonical and pre-historical topics in a religious function.[53] Even in Gen 1–11 genealogies form an overarching structure which organizes the whole book of Genesis[54] and combines primeval, patriarchal and Israelite »history«.[55]

Obviously the expression ספר תולדת (5,1) marked originally the beginning of a probably independently written source which is interpolated within the P-story.

---

50 See Kathrin Gies, »Art. Noah,« in *Das Wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet* 2012 (www. wibilex.de): § 2.1.1.with chart (access 22. 10. 2018).

51 See e. g. ibid., »Formation«: 109 f. The enduring conflict concerning »the end of the primeval history« emphasizes the limits of this approach.

52 Sven Tengström, *Die Toledotformel und die literarische Struktur der priesterlichen Erweiterungsschicht im Pentateuch* (Gleerup: CWK, 1981); Wenham, *Genesis*, xxif.; Hieke, *Genealogien*, 45 f.; cf. David M. Carr, »Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited: A Synchronic Analysis of Patterns in Genesis as Part of the Torah (Part 1),« *ZAW* 110 (1998): 159–172, esp. 166. Carr emphasizes that the genealogical sections violate the chronological structure of Genesis.

53 Wilson points out that the genealogical function of (extra)biblical genealogies belongs almost to the religious sphere and lacks historical information. However, they were often used for historical reconstruction in the reception history (*Genealogy*, 197 f.).

54 In Gen 2:4a (secondary) the scheme is introduced. The LXX promotes them when it adds the term ספר in 2:4a, too, for labeling the whole scroll as Βίβλος γενέσεως.

55 The last *toledot* in Exod 6:16–25 and Num 3:1–4 are part of a post-priestly redaction for anchoring the Aaronide and Zadokide priesthood in the Tora; see Hieke, *Genealogien*, 214–233; 263 ff.; Carr, »Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited 1«: 171 f.

Wenham proposes convincingly that – in a compositional perspective – the gene-
alogy of chapter 5 ends formally in 6:9, when the genealogy of Noah starts.[56] If
this is right, Gen 5:1–6:8 would re-write the end of the story of the old world, the
world *before* the flood, which is narrated in Gen 2–4 as the story of the first man,
his multiplication up to the doom of his lineage (4:24). The story restarts in Gen
5 with a genealogy of ten patriarchs, which ends in a narrative supplement pro-
viding the delimitation of their age at 120 years (6:4). A quoted monologue of
God, reflecting the negativity of the human being in continuity with Gen 2–4,
opens the flood narrative. Perhaps the two lists are based on a common *Vorlage*
with different ambitions: the »Kenite list« is interwoven with the tale of the frat-
ricide. Instead of cultural progress,[57] the context forces one to interpret the list
as a failing lineage that leads consequently to their annihilation by the flood.
The second list is positive and culminates in figures that surpass ordinary human
behavior. Enoch is exempted from the flood by his removal from earth and Noah
is exempted by the divine advice to construct the ark. The double and conflict-
ing character of the two lists is counterbalanced by the focus on two different
patriarchs: firstly, the ambiguous Cain lineage and secondly the (Adam-) Seth
lineage. Gen 4:25 f. forms the redactional bridge and introduces the prospective
valid lineage, which will guarantee human life after the flood and start off the
postdiluvian age.

In the broader composition of Gen 1–11, Gen 5:1 affiliates a »narrative pro-
logue«, which is formed by an exposition (Gen 1) and a back-story (Gen 2–4), both
harmonized by a secondary added *toledot formula* in 2:4a.[58] This redactional verse
refers back to Gen 1 (בהבראם) and works in this way like a colophon to the priestly
account. Likewise, the verse opens with Gen 2:4b a second tale in a distant time
(ביום עשות), which ends within the »Kenite list« expanded by 4:25 f. Referring to
JHWH's veneration by Seth's son, Enosh, the destiny changes in v. 25 f. and a for-
tunate lineage of Adam is brought into the world. The overarching genealogical
structure, which starts in Gen 5:1, links the founder of humanity, Adam, with the
refounder Noah after the flood (decreation – recreation). A third *toledot formula*

---

56 See Wenham, *Genesis*, 122 f.; 145 ff.; Hieke, *Genealogien*, 89 f.; David M. Carr, »Βίβλος
γενέσεως Revisited: A Synchronic Analysis of Patterns in Genesis as Part of the Torah (Part 2),«
ZAW 110 (1998): 327–347, esp. 342.
57 See Gertz, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 179–182; Hieke, *Genealogien*, 59 f.
58 Carr, »Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited 1«: 164–169. Gertz characterizes the formula as »a carefully
placed fermata in the narrative. Having done so, the following material will appear to be an
explication of the already reported creation in the sense of a later realization that seems to ›catch
up‹ (*nachholende Vergegenwärtigung*).« (»Formation«: 114). Cf. for a critical evaluation that 2:4a
was an old superscription placed before Gen 1:1; idem, »Formation«: 115.

in Gen 6:9 focuses on Noah, who is designed as middleman from the antediluvian to the postdiluvian age. The verse is a priestly extension of the originally pre-P genealogical scroll in Gen 5, and aims at a »*gradual* stretching of the *toledot* system as it was extended to encompass ever larger amounts of non-genealogical material«.[59] This strategy was further enlarged by the final redaction, which added further *toledot formula* (e. g. 2:4a). The redaction is worked out in an intratextual perspective.[60] Although the exact process of transmission can't be reconstructed empirically because there is a lack of ancient pre-canonical manuscripts that date back to before the Qumran texts, the first examples of ancient reception history demonstrate how the traditions have developed and diversified.[61]

In fact, an old *toledot* scroll is enlarged by further *toledot* notices and other genealogical elements that conflate the different traditions inherent to the so-called primeval history. Three names, Adam, Enoch and Noah bind the different traditions together. Although the extensions in chapter 5 are generally attributed to P, several of them include a cross-over to non-P-material: e. g. 5:29 points back to 3:17 and mentions JHWH instead of Elohim.[62] Probably this addition comes from later redactors (see 2:4a) who composed the ensemble of Gen 1–11. Wenham identifies this redactor with J or non-P.[63] I agree with Wenham that some non-P-texts are responsible for the last shaping of Gen 2:4a–6:8; however I am not convinced that the ensemble was formed primarily as an independent non-P document (»source«) of the primeval history.[64] Instead of a non-P

---

59 Carr, »Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited 1«: 170.

60 »The term ›intratextual‹ denotes interactions of various layers of Genesis with texts now standing *within* the same book ... such fractured intratextuality in the book then becomes a frequent focus of early Jewish intertextual interaction with Genesis.« David M. Carr, »Intratextuality and Intertextuality – Joining Transmission History and Interpretation History in the Study of Genesis,« in *Bibel und Midrasch. Zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für die Bibelwissenschaft*, ed. Gerhard Bodendorfer and Matthias Millard (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998): 97–112; see idem, *Reading*, 12–15.

61 David M. Carr, »The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies: Actual and Potential,« in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, ed. Martti Nissinen (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012): 505–535, esp. 526.

62 The Priestly source has rare evidences for the tetragrammaton before Exod 6:2 (cf. 17:1).

63 Wenham, *Genesis*, 123 (with graphic).

64 It was Hermann Gunkel who finally prepared the ground for the composition of several story cycles instead of a single J-source in the Tora. He considered the origin of these narratives as oral traditions which were collected by the J-school (idem, *Genesis* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ³1917], lxxx–xcii. 2–4); see Thomas Römer, »The Elusive Yahwist,« in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006): 8–27, esp. 14 f.; 21.

source[65] conflated with the P-strata by a slight redactional process, which added Gen 2:4a; 4:1,25 f.; 5:29,32bβ* (Ham and Japhet) and 6:1–8, some colleagues have accounted for several independent text blocks in the primeval history, probably dated from different periods (2:4–4:24*; 6:1–4; 6:5–8:21*; 9:20–27; 11:1–10) which are tied together by genealogical notices.[66] Probably Gen 2–4 is prior to or was revised at the same time as P, but, with evidence, independently from Gen 1.[67] Equally probable is that the non-P flood-narrative was initially independent from Gen 2–4. Starting the analysis with the genealogical material, all these traditions seem to be put together during the post-exilic reworking process. They received several more or less genealogical expansions in order to harmonize the selected traditions within the overarching genealogical concept.[68]

Abstract: The article examines how an old *toledot* scroll beginning in Gen 5,1 is progressively enlarged by further notices and other genealogical elements that serve to conflate the different traditions within to the Primeval History. Three names, Adam, Enoch and Noah bind the different traditions together. Although the extensions in chapter 5 are generally attributed to P, several of them include

---

65 I think that an independant non-P source did not exist in Gen 1–11 neither in pre-exilic (e. g. Carr, *Reading*, 235–240; Gertz, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 12), nor in post-exilic time (e. g. Joseph Blenkinsopp, »A Post-exilic lay source in Genesis 1–11,« in *Abschied vom Jahwisten. Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion*, ed. Jan C. Gertz, Konrad Schmid and Markus Witte [Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2002]: 49–61; see for a post-exilic dating Eckart Otto, »Die Paradieserzählung Genesis 2–3. Eine nachpriesterliche Lehrerzählung in ihrem religionshistorischen Kontext,« in *»Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit ...«. Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen Weisheit*, FS Diethard Michel, ed. Anja A. Diesel u. a. [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996]: 167–192).

66 Reinhard G. Kratz, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments. Grundwissen der Bibelkritik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 252–262; Konrad Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments. Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008), 153–156 with bibliography.

67 Concerning a critical evaluation of a posterior dating of the non-P-texts see Gertz, »Formation«: 118 f.; Walther Bührer, *Am Anfang ... Untersuchungen zur Textgenese und zur relativ-chronologischen Einordnung von Gen 1–3* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2014), 277–354; cf. Carr, »Many Uses«: 517–526.

68 Carr prefers to speak about »second scribal coordination« because »[s]cribes coordinated written traditions with each other in a variety of ways, from copying material from another location in order to conform one textual locus with another, to other sorts of revisions (such as adding characters thought to be missing [e. g. Aaron])« cf. David M. Carr, »Data to Inform Ongoing Debates about the Formation of the Pentateuch. From Documented Cases of Transmission History to a Survey of Rabbinic Exegesis,« in *The Formation of the Pentateuch,* ed. Jan C. Gertz, Bernhard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Schiloni and Konrad Schmid (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2016): 87–106, esp. 90.

a cross-over to non-P-material: e. g., 5:29 points back to 3:17 and mentions YHWH instead of Elohim. This and other additions probably come from later redactors (see 2,4a) who composed the ensemble of Gen 1–11.

Keywords: *toledot* formula, genealogies, Primeval History, Adam, Enoch, Noah

Résumé: Cet article examine comment l'ancien livre des *Toledot* qui commence en Gn 5,1 s'est progressivement développé en reliant des traditions d'origines disparates. Des figures venant de traditions indépendantes, telles qu'Adam, Noé et Enoch, apparaissent à plusieurs reprises et deviennent des pierres angulaires de la composition de l'histoire primordiale (Gn 1–11). L'histoire de la réception dans les traditions juives de l'antiquité permet d'identifier et d'interpréter les fissures et incohérences conservées dans la forme finale des textes bibliques et de reconstituer la formation de l'ensemble.

Mots-clés: *toledot*, généalogie, l'histoire des origines, Adam, Hénoch, Noé

Zusammenfassung: Untersuchungen zur Intratextualität in der Urgeschichte zeigen das kreative Zusammenspiel der Traditionen bis in die antike Rezeption. Anhand des Toledotbuchs (Gen 5,1 ff.) lassen sich verschiedene Modi der Ergänzung aufzeigen, um die einzelnen Traditionen miteinander zu verbinden. Insbesondere die Figuren Adam, Noah und Henoch haben in kompositioneller wie theologischer Hinsicht tragende Funktion für Gen 1–11 und finden in der antiken jüdischen Rezeptionsgeschichte breite Entfaltung. Die Interpretationen der Brüche und Inkohärenzen in den antiken jüdischen Texten lassen auf die schrittweise Entstehung des kanonischen Textes schließen.

Schlagwörter: *toledot*-Formel, Genealogien, Urgeschichte, Adam, Noah, Henoch

Innerbiblical references	P: sepher toledôt (a pre-P patrilinear genealogy with 10 generations)	Redactional additions (post-P)	Non-P: Kenite list (linear genealogy)	Additions (songs, sayings, etiology)
Cf. *Gen 1:26ff.*	**5: 1** This is the list of the descendants of **Adam**. When God created humankind, he made them in the likeness of God. **2** Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them »Humankind« when they were created. **3** When **Adam** had lived one hundred thirty years, he became the father of a son in his likeness, according to his image, and named him Seth. **4** The days of **Adam** after he became the father of Seth were eight hundred years; and he had other sons and daughters. **5** Thus all the days that **Adam** lived were nine hundred thirty years; and he died.	**2:4a** These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created. (5,2)	**4:17** Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore **Enoch**; and he built a city, and named it Enoch after his son **Enoch**.	**4:1** Now the man knew his wife Eve, and she conceived and bore Cain, saying, »I have produced a man with the help of the Lord.« **2** Next she bore his brother Abel. *Segmented genealogy …*
Cf. *Gen 2:4a*		**4:1 f.**		
Cf. *Gen 1:26f.*		**Adamic lineage** (cf. **5:1–6**):	**18** To **Enoch** was born Irad; and Irad was the father of Mehujael, and Mehujael the father of Methushael, and Methushael the father of Lamech.	
		4:25 Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son and named him Seth, … **26** To Seth also a son was born, and he named him Enosh. [At that time people began to invoke the name of the Lord [YHWH].]	**19** Lamech took two wives; the name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah.	
Cf. *Num 24:21 f.; Jud 4:11*	**6** When Seth had lived one hundred five years, he became the father of Enosh. … **9** When Enosh had lived ninety years, he became the father of Kenan. **10** … **12** When Kenan had lived seventy years, he became the father of Mahalalel. … **15** When Mahalalel had lived sixty-five years, he became the father of Jared. … **18** When Jared had lived one hundred sixty-two years he became the father of **Enoch**. …		**20** Adah bore Jabal; he was the ancestor of those who live in tents and have livestock.	**4:23 f.** song of Lamech: Lamech said to his wives: »Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; you wives of Lamech, listen to what I say: I have killed a man for wounding me, a young man for striking me …«

Innerbiblical references	P: sepher toledōt (a pre-P patrilinear genealogy with 10 generations)	Redactional additions (post-P)	Non-P: Kenite list (linear genealogy)	Additions (songs, sayings, etiology)
1 Chr 1:3; Sir 44:16; 1 En; Luke 3:37; Jude 14; cf. Gen 49:9; Exod 6:14; Num 26:5; 1 Chr 5:3; 1:33	21 When **Enoch** had lived sixty-five years, he became the father of Methuselah. 22 [**Enoch** lived] after the birth of Methuselah three hundred years, and had other sons and daughters. 23 Thus all the days of **Enoch** were three hundred sixty-five years. 25 When Methuselah had lived one hundred eighty-seven years, he became the father of Lamech. ...	5:22 **Enoch** walked with God 24 **Enoch** walked with God (cf. **6:9** Noah); then he was no more, because God took him.	21 His brother's name was Jubal; he was the ancestor of all those who play the lyre and pipe. 22 Zillah bore Tubal-cain, who made all kinds of bronze and iron tools. The sister of Tubal-cain was Naamah.	4:25 ... for she said, »God has appointed for me another child instead of Abel, because Cain killed him.« 4:26b At that time ...
Gen 6:9 f. cf. Gen 6–9, 9:17–27; 10:1,32; 1 Chr 1:4; Ezek 11:14,20; Isa 54:9	28 When Lamech had lived one hundred eighty-two years, he became the father of a son; ... 30 Lamech lived after the birth of **Noah** five hundred ninety-five years, and had other sons and daughters. ... 32 After Noah was five hundred years old, Noah became the father of Shem, ... [cf. 10:31]	5:29 he named him **Noah**, saying, ›Out of the ground that YHWH has cursed (cf. **3:17**; **8:21**) this one shall bring us relief from our work and from the toil (cf. **3:16**) of our hands.‹ 5:32bβ*: + Ham, and Japheth (segmented; cf. 7:13; 9:18 f.*; 10:1–6,20,22 f.,31 f.)		Gen 6:1–4, 5–8:22*; 9:18b,20–27; 10:8–19, 21,24–30