

A Study Guide to Genesis 1-3

New Material

1. Explain the syntactical relations between Gen. 1.1 and 1.2. See commentaries in necessary.
2. What is the syntactical relations between Gen 1.1-2 and 1.3ff.?
3. What makes the phrase יום אחד unique in comparison with the rest of the days "formula"?
4. Explain the difficult translation of Gen 1.11.
5. Evaluate the verses Gen 2.3, 4, and 5 and explain the syntactic flow and relationship. Where would you delimit the unit beginning at 1.3? Why?
6. Note that in Gen 2.23 the verb לקח is in the qal passive form. See Waltke & O'Connor, §22.6; Gen 3.23; 4.24 in the present assignment. Also Ronald J. Williams, "The Passive Qal Theme in Hebrew," in *Essays on the Ancient Semitic World*, ed. J. W. Wever & D. B. Redford. 43-50. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
7. Note the hithpolel imperfect form of יתבששו (בוש) in Gen 2.25
8. Gen 3.4, תמתון has a paragogic nun. See Waltke & O'Connor, §31.7, the discussion concerning Hoftijzer's theory of "contrastivity." N.B. J. Hoftijzer, *The Function and Use of the Imperfect forms with Nun Paragogicum in Classical Hebrew*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 21. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1985.
9. Carefully translate 3.14-19 and note the parallel connectives.
10. Explain the use of the hithpael participle המתהפכת in Gen 3.24.

Old Material

Genesis 1

1.1-2

1.01 Syntax: four possibilities: [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, 11]

- a. "V. 1 is a temporal clause subordinate to the main clause in v2: 'In the beginning when God created..., the earth was without form....'"
- b. "V. 1 is a temporal clause subordinate to the main clause in v3 (v2 is a parenthetic comment). 'In the beginning when God created... (now the earth was formless) God said....'"
- c. "V. 1 is a main clause, summarizing all the events described in vv. 2-31. It is a title to the chapter as a whole, and could be rendered 'In the beginning God was the creator of heaven and

earth.' What being creator of heaven and earth means is then explained in more detail in vv. 2-31."

d. "V 1 is a main clause describing the first act of creation. Vv. 2 and 3 describe subsequent phases in God's creative activity. This the traditional view...."

1.02 Niccacci, Alviero, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, pp. 37-38.

§17. It is now clear why the following statement by Joüon (also found in most traditional grammars) needs to be revised 'Usually a narrative begins with qatal (parfait historique) and continues with wayyiqtol . . . But the wayyiqtol has become the narrative tense to such an extent that it is even used at the beginning of a narrative, or at least at a relative beginning.' Four comments can be made here.

1. Narrative never begins with qatal; initial qatal only denotes the antecedent;
2. the narrative proper begins with wayyiqtol;
3. Joüon's statement is based on the conviction that by nature wayyiqtol is not an initial form but a continuation form. This conviction cannot be discussed at the diachronic level (origin and development of wayyiqtol) because we lack the necessary data. But it seems evident to me that the synchronic level (the use of wayyiqtol in texts) is the only purely narrative form and is used both as an initial and as a continuation form.
4. Whether wayyiqtol is only used for a relative beginning or for the absolute beginning of a narrative or block of narrative cannot be considered here because of the literary-critical implications.

§18. the conclusion reached concerning the form for degree zero, wayyiqtol, and the retrospective initial form (waw-x-qatal) is important for understanding the syntax of Gen 1.1-3, a text which has been much discussed although no commonly accepted solution has been reached. . . . The grammatical analysis of the four sentences in vv. 1-2 is as follows: (a) x-qatal, (b) waw-x-qatal, (c) waw-simple noun clause (noun + prepositional phrase), (d) waw-simple noun clause (noun + participle). In view of what has already been said, then vv. 1-2 comprise the antecedent and v. 3 is the beginning of the actual narrative.

It is more difficult to determine the relationship between v. 1 and v. 2. Personally, I think v. 1 is a temporal clause. The expression *בראשית ברא אלהים* should, in fact, be understood as in the construct state with a finite verb as the 'nomen rectum': 'At the beginning of God-created . . .', in other words, 'When God began to create. . . .' I also think that vv. 1-2 comprise an independent clause as is the case when other narratives are introduced by 'antecedent' phrases (cf. §19). Accordingly, v. 1 (temporal phrase) functions as the 'protasis' while v.2 is the 'apodosis' (the terms 'protasis' and 'apodosis' are used broadly here, cf. §96). The translation then is

1. When God began to create the heavens and the earth,
2. the earth was formless and empty,
darkness was above the abyss
and the spirit of God was hovering over the waters.
3. Then God said

In vv. 1-2, then, we have four 'retrospective' forms (or forms denoting the antecedent), all noun clauses (the first two, compound, the other two simple). In terms of syntax, clauses (a) and (b) comprise the protasis (x-qatal) and the apodosis (waw-x-qatal); this means they are linked as in the 'two-elements syntactic pattern' (§105). Clauses (c) and (d) are co-ordinate with (b) and communicate contemporaneous data. All four clauses together comprise the antecedent to the narrative proper, which begins with a wayyiqtol."

1.1

1. בראשית

- a. If *בראשית* is considered to be in the construct state, then Grammatical discussions concerning the Genitive case is useful: (Williams, §498; Joüon & Muraoka, §129p³, (§137k); GKC, §128.
- b. BHS: Origen has Βρησιθ or Βαρησιθ (-σεθ), while the Samaritan Pent. has *bārāšit*. This means that BHS is trying to make a case for the definite article here, which would argue for the construct state rather than the absolute.
- c. ". . . lacks the def art in *בראשית* (lit., "in beginning") but "in the beginning" is an acceptable translation (Joüon, 137k). Omission of the def art is regular in temporal phrases and does not necessarily indicate that *ראשית* should be taken as constr (cf. Isa 46:10; Prov 8:23)." Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]
- d. Waltke, B. K., "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1-3," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (1975), pp. 222-225:

Lexical and grammatical arguments:

"An initial question to consider is whether *בראשית* is in the construct or absolute state. If the form is construct, then verse 1 {Gen 1:1} must be understood as a dependent clause. If it is in the absolute state, the traditional rendering will stand.

Two arguments have been advanced to show that the first word of the Bible is in the construct state: (a) a lexical statistical analysis of its usage; and (b) the absence of the article.

Humbert argued that of the 50 or 51 times *בראשית* is used, in all but one instance it is in the construct state. The one exception is found in Isaiah 46:10 where Isaiah says of God that He declares the end from the beginning, *מראשית*. But the exception is instructive for, as Ridderbos points out, it shows that the word can be used in the absolute state with a temporal meaning. Although it is true that the construct can occur with a verb *מראשית* never occurs elsewhere in biblical Hebrew in the construct with a verb. No other use of *מראשית* is quite like this one in Genesis 1:1. It should be noted here that in the parallel construction, Genesis 2:4, Moses used the unambiguous infinite construct rather than a finite tense form. If he really intended his reader to take *מראשית* as a construct, why did he not use this less ambiguous construction? Because of the parallel in 2:4, many scholars reprint the text to fit the theory, but in effect the need to emend the text points to the weakness of the interpretation. However, allowing the text to stand without emendation, it is the conclusion of this author that such ambiguity would be exceptional.

But what about the absence of the article? Hasel's argument has no force because both König and Heidel have shown that time designations in adverbial expressions do not need the article, Heidel stated:

Terms like *reshith*, "beginning," *rosh*, "beginning," *qedem*, "olden times," and 'olam, "eternity," when used in adverbial expressions, occur almost invariably without the article, and that in the absolute state.

More convincing that the word should be understood as an absolute is the fact that all ancient versions (LXX, Vulgate, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Targum Onkelos) construed the form

as absolute and verse 1 as an independent clause. Hasel noted that in the Greek transliterations of the Hebrew text which have come down to us, and in the Samaritan transliteration, the first word in Genesis appears to have been pronounced with the article: בְּרֵאשִׁית. He concluded, therefore, that בְּרֵאשִׁית could be used without or with the article without any difference of meaning. It is more likely, however, that the change shows that those responsible for this reading were under the impression that the absolute sense demands the use of the article and accordingly altered the oral tradition. It does supply us with additional evidence, however, that traditionally the word was understood as an absolute.

Edward J. Young, Gerhard Hasel, and others insist that the presence of the disjunctive accent *típha* proves that in the oral tradition handed down by the Masoretes, the word was understood as an absolute. Although it is generally true that words in the construct take a conjunctive accent, רֵאשִׁית appears to be in the construct state with a disjunctive accent in Jeremiah 26:1; 27:1; 28:1 and therefore the *típha* does not prove that verse 1 must be construed as an independent clause.

In sifting all the data, two facts emerge: (1) In both the Jewish and Christian tradition, the first word in the Bible was unanimously understood as being in the absolute state and the first verse was considered an independent clause. (2) Moses could not have used any other construction to denote the first word as in the absolute state, but he could have opted for a different construction to indicate clearly the construct state. It is therefore concluded that the text which has come down to us should be understood as an independent and not a dependent clause.

Syntactical arguments:

Wellhausen rejected taking verse 1 as a dependent clause because, in his words, "this complicated syntactical construction is desperate." Cassuto also rejected it because, as he said, the הִיָּה would have been omitted in verse 2 (cf. 1 Sam 3:2-4). But even though these two scholars objected to the construction on syntactical grounds, their arguments are baseless. Wellhausen is clearly mistaken because close parallels can be found to this analysis of Genesis 1:1-3 in 2:4b-7 and in the ancient accounts of creation. The structure of 2:4b-7 appears almost identical to the one proposed for 1:1-3:

2:4b Protasis: "Then Yahweh God made earth and heaven. . .

2:5-6 Parenthesis: "now no herb of the field. . ."

2:7 Apodosis: ". . . then Yahweh God formed man."

Speiser points out the similar parallel structure in *Enuma elish*:

Dependent temporal clause:

"When on high the heaven had not been named

Firm ground below had not been called by name (lines 1-2)

Parenthetic clauses:

". . . and Mummu-Tiamat, she

bore them all. (lines 3-8)

Main clause:

"Then it was the gods were formed within them." (line 9)

Moreover, against Cassuto's arguments it should be noted that the copula is often present in disjunctive clauses of the pattern waw + noun + verb. To cite but two illustrations of many:

"And Jonah went to Nineveh . . . (Now Nineveh was a great city, וַיֵּינַח הַיָּתָה יְרֵינְוֹלָה, . . ." (Jonah 3:3).

"And Yahweh said unto Satan . . . (Now Joshua was clothed, וַיְהוֹשֻׁעַ הָיָה לְבוּשׁ, . . ." (Zech 3:2-3).

It is concluded, therefore, that no objection can be raised against this interpretation on syntactical grounds.

It should be noted, however, that Speiser and Orlinsky overstate their case when they say that Genesis 2:4b and *Enuma elish* exhibit exactly the same kind of structure. It is not exact because,

for one thing, the parallelism with 2:4 is artificially achieved by dividing 2:4a from 2:4b according to the dictates of literary criticism. As will be seen, however, the parallel between 1:1-3 and 2:4-7 is exactly the same if we construe 1:1-3 as an independent clause and 2:4-7 as a literary unity.

Moreover, in 2:4b the dependent clause is clearly expressed by the infinitive construct, whereas 1:1 is probably an independent clause. Then, too, the construction of 1:1-3 is not exactly the same as in *Enuma elish*. Whereas the Babylonian myths use *enuma* (or *inuma*) and the Sumerian myths at times start with *udda* to introduce the dependent clause, they correspond only to 2:4b but not to 1:1. None of them begins with the equivalent of the בראשית ("in the beginning") of Genesis 1:1. In fact, Genesis 1:1 has no parallel in the ancient Near Eastern mythologies. Gunkel recognized long ago that "the cosmogonies of other people contain no word which would come close to the first word of the Bible." Heidel concluded, therefore, that the comparative argument in favor of considering verse 1 of the Bible as a dependent clause is dubious.

2. בָּרָא

a. "Active verbs. The qatal of action verbs is mainly used for the past, in some special cases for the present, sometimes even for the future. In the *past* the qatal is used for a unique or instantaneous action, which precedes by little (recent past) or by much (remote past) the present moment or a past moment. . . . Remote past: בָּרָא *he created*. . . ." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §112c]

b. "Completed action, expressing actions completed either in reality or in the thought of the speaker. It may be translated in English by: (1) a past tense, e.g. בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים, 'God created'" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §162]

3. בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים

a. ". . . plurals which have a singular meaning are frequently construed with the singular, especially the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis*, as in אֱלֹהִים" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §145h]

4. אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ

a. "The particle אֵת, which is rare in poetry but normal in the prose, serves to introduce a determinated substantive, pronoun or clause when in the accusative function" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §475]

b. GKC, §117a also

1.2

1. וְהָאָרֶץ הַיְיָהָה תֵהוֹ וְבָהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ

a. "The verb הָיָה is used in the weak sense of *to be* as copula, when one wishes to specify the temporal sphere of a nominal sentence. It is therefore not a simple copula, but a copula with a temporal sense like the English verb *to be*: Gen 1.2 וְהָאָרֶץ הַיְיָהָה תֵהוֹ וְבָהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ *now the earth was desolate and solitude*. . . ." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §154m]

b. "When the circumstances described are past or future, a finite form of a verb is employed. For the past a perfect aspect is used . . . וְהָאֲרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוֹת, 'the earth having been a formless void'. . . ." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §495]

2. תֹהוֹת וְבֵהוּ

a. "The very frequent connexion of nouns expression kindred ideas, by means of וְ, is due simply to considerations of rhythm, for even in such cases the Wāw must immediately precede the tone-syllable, which must be marked by a disjunctive accent" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §104g]

b. Hendiays: "A single concept may be expressed by two words linked by the conjunction וְ, . . . תֹהוֹת וְבֵהוּ, 'a formless void' (Gen 1.2). . . ." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §72]

3. וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים

a. "The construct may be marked by a conjunctive accent" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, p. 138]

1.3

1. יהי אֹר

a. "The jussive is used to express all the nuances of will: from a superior to an inferior: command, exhortation, advice, invitation, permission; - from an inferior to a superior: wish, prayer, request for permission etc. The jussive is often followed by the entreating particle אֲנִי, especially in the requests for permission." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §114h]

b. "The jussive of *optative* sentences is mostly found before the subject. . . ." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §1551]

c. "The *jussive* standing alone, or co-ordinated with another jussive: In affirmative sentences to express a command, a wish (or a blessing), advice, or a request;" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §109b]

1.4

1. אֵתְהָאֹר

a. "The article is, generally speaking, employed to determine a substantive wherever it is required by Greek and English; thus: (a) When a person or thing already spoken of is mentioned again, and is consequently more definite to the mind of the hearer or reader" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §126d]

2. וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאֹר כִּי־טוֹב

a. "With the *verba sentiendi* (- 'verbs of sense perception'), especially with רָאָה *to see* and יָרַע *to*

know, there is often anticipation of the subject" [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §157d]

b. ". . . Lit., "the light that (it was) good." With verbs of perception the subj is regularly anticipated by making it the obj of the verb (Joüon, 157d; cf. Gen 6:2). On the translation of טוב כי see J. L. Kugel, *JBL* 99 (1980) 433–35, and J. G. Janzen, *JBL* 102 (1983) 99–106." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

1.5

1. וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְאוֹר יוֹם וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא לַיְלָה.

a. "Wayyiqtol is also avoided if the 2nd action is *simultaneous* or represented as such: Gen 1.5 "And God called (וַיִּקְרָא) the light 'day,' and the darkness he called (it) 'night' (וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא)." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §118f]

b. "The verb may also be preceded by a prepositional phrase: (1) for emphasis. . . . (2) for contrast. . . ; cf. Gen 1.5." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §575]

c. Andersen notes that the sentence is unified by the chiasm of the verbs with indirect objects. [Andersen, Francis I., *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, 129]

2. וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְאוֹר יוֹם.

a. The לְ of Specification [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §273]

3. וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא לַיְלָה.

a. The co-ordinative use of the conjunction וְ: "whereas the darkness he called night" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §430]

b. "The sense of the perfect is to associate the naming of night with the naming of day; it is not a continuation of the work of creation. And so it is not a case of the imperfect consecutive but of the perfect, with the sentences reversed." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 78]

c. Niccacci argues that the wayyiqtol followed by the qatal can be used to express contrast (cf. 1.10). [Niccacci, Alviero, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 64]

4. יוֹם אֶחָד.

a. "The indefinite noun plus אחד has a definite sense in the opening of Genesis: יוֹם אֶחָד 'the first day' (Gen 1.5); this pattern is found nowhere else – even the rest of the account uses indefinite nouns with ordinal numbers (Gen 1.8, 13, etc.)." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, p. 274]

1.6

1. ויהי מבדיל בין מים למים

a. "To emphasize the durative aspect in future, a form of the verb הָיָה with future meaning is added to the participle . . . Gen 1.6 *let it be separating* (=let it keep . . . apart)." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §121e] N.B. "Participle in the sphere of the *future*. The use of the participle to express the near future and the future in general is an extension of the use of the participle as present. A future action, mainly an approaching action, is represented as being already in progress. Like the *yiqtol* of future, the participle of the future does not express the aspect of the action, which may be instantaneous as well as durative." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §121e]

b. "To give express emphasis to an action continuing in the *past*, the perfect הָיָה in the corresponding person is sometimes added to the participle, and similarly the imperfect יִהְיֶה (or the jussive יִהְיֶה, or the imperfect consecutive) is used to emphasize an action continuing in the *future*. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §116r]

c. "By connecting a finite form of הָיָה with a following predicate participle, an aspectual and /or modal index is assigned to the participle, yielding forms that are past progressive, perfect progressive, future progressive, or jussive progressive . . . 'Let there be a firmament . . . (*let it be*) *dividing* water from water.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, p. 628-629]

d. "Hiph ptcp בדל "dividing, separating" following the verb "to be" expresses continuing future action (*GKC*, 116r; Joüon, 121e). Alternatively the ptcp may be viewed as a virtual noun in parallel to "firmament," so that "Let there . . . between the waters" is a pair of conjoined precative clauses (*SBH*, 105)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. בין מים למים:

a. The "strong vocalization" is used . . . "4) when there is a repetition of the noun" [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §103c]

b. ". . . the so-called *emphatic lamed*. This particle must be distinguished first of all from the independent hypothetical *lû* (written לוּ, לֹא, לוֹא), which introduces optative clauses ('Oh that . . . !') and subordinate clauses of unreal and concessive force ('even if . . . !'). Further, it is strongly possible that the emphatic or asservative *lamed* is etymologically distinct from the preposition, though the Masoretes do not distinguish the two. Emphatic *lamed* stands (a) before a noun in a verbless clause, (b) before a verb form in a verbal clause, and (c) before vocatives. A different emphatic use involves other prepositions: I may follow another preposition directly (לְ) or as a complement (לְ . . . בֵּין, Gen 1.6), and its use in such constructions can also be termed emphatic." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, p. 212]

c. "Probably here belongs the use of לְ to avoid repetition of a preposition, e.g. בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם, 'between waters and waters' (Gen 1.6); cf. Deut 17.8, 2 Sam 19.36." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §273]

3. ויהי כן

a. BHS: huc tr (hither, to this place; it-they transpose/s/d –words) . . . Here BHS wants one to insert the וַיְהִי־כֵן from the end of verse 7 here. Following the LXX in verses 9, 11, 15, 20, 24, 30. The LXX has καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως here.

b. "It is questionable whether the fulfillment report וַיְהִי־כֵן is in place at the end of v. 7 between the separation and the naming, because it never occurs in such a place elsewhere, but always belongs to the creation command. Gk puts it at the end of v. 6, immediately after the command to which it belongs. BHK and the majority of modern exegetes follow Gk here. But throughout Gen 1 one can discern clearly the tendency of LXX to schematize and to allow the same pattern of sentences to recur as regularly as possible. This harmonizing tendency could be at work here. In favor of the Gk here is the fact that in all other places, vv. 3, 9, 11, 15, 24, 30 (missing in v. 20) וַיְהִי־כֵן always follows immediately on the creation command." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 78]

1.7

1. הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר מֵעַל לְרַקִּיעַ

a. "A relative clause is usually equivalent to an attribute of a substantive; it corresponds most commonly to an adjective or a participle in apposition. But, like the ordinary, i.e. non-relative clause, it can be substantivized. . . . The relative clause is either syndetic (with אֲשֶׁר, ש) or asyndetic. The asyndetic clause seems to be the older of the two; in our texts it is found especially in poetry and elevated prose.

The relative clause with an antecedent is of two kinds, limiting and non-limiting. The former serves to distinguish between more than one member of the class of the entity denoted by the antecedent as in Gen 1.7 . . . *the waters which were under the firmament* as against those which were above it." [Joüon & Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §158a*]

b. "Relative clauses are in many ways similar to attributive adjectives. They differ in conveying more complex information, that is, information that requires a predication of its own. The two verbless relative clauses here allow the specification of the רַקִּיעַ as a reference point, as the use of the adjectives תַּחְתִּי 'lower' and עֲלִי 'upper' with מַיִם would not." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, p. 330-331]

1.8

1. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν

a. "G inserts "And God saw that it was good." An inept attempt at standardization (cf. vv 4, 10, 12, etc.) because (a) the heavens were not complete till day 4, and (b) the addition mars the sevenfold use of the formula in the MT." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. וַיְהִי־בִקְרַיִם יוֹם שֵׁנִי

a. "Translate "a second day," in contrast to I:31 where the article occurs, Ges-K §126w. 9a Gk reads συναγωγῆ, which could correspond to מִקְוֵה in v. 10. But Gk does not read in v. 10, but τὰ

συστήματα τῶν ὑδάτων. In the sentence immediately following where Gk reports the fulfillment of the creation command (the sentence is lacking in MT) συναγωγή occurs again. Gk reads here: καὶ συνηχθη τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὤφθη ἡξηρά. This sentence is not to be inserted into MT (contrary to many exegetes) nor is מקוה to be read in v. 9 in place of מקוה. U. Cassuto has justified correctly the retention of מקוה: "The number one can readily be understood in connection with place. but it is not appropriate to pool. . ." Moreover the מקוה in v. 10 describes the result, the מקוה in v. 9 the process of creation; the choice of different nouns is deliberate." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 78-79]

b. "G adds "And the water which was below the heaven gathered to their places and the dry land appeared," characteristically conforming to the standard pattern by adding the execution formula absent from MT." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

1.9

1. אֶל-מְקוֹם אֲסָדָה

a. " For מקום "place" G reads συναγωγήν "place of assembly." This would seem to be a fair translation of מקום, though some suggest it presupposes Heb. מקוה "gathering" (cf. T. L. Fenton, *VT* 34 [1984] 438–45)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. וַתֵּרָאֵה

a. Although it is usual for the III-ה to be apocopated (i.e. without the final ה-) however the present N-stem has retained the ה. [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §75t]

b. Here the jussive and the imperfect (yiqtol) form is the same. Translated as "let it appear" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §107n]

c. "As the *cohortative* is used in the 1st pers., so the *jussive* is especially found in the 2nd and 3rd pers. sing. and plur. to express a more or less definite desire that something should nor should not happen (cf. for its form, which frequently coincides with that of the ordinary *imperfect*)." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §109a]

d. ". . . the long form of a weak verb can be used as a jussive (e.g., tr³h in Gen 1.9 . . . , yet no one denies that the jussive and the non-perfective can be distinguished." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §31.1.1f]

e. "Volitional Uses of the Non-Perfective: Closely relate to the modal nuances of the non-perfective, which express a situation wherein the action of the subject is contingent on the will of the speaker, is its use in situations where the speaker imposes an obligation on the subject addressed. In this use it approximates the imperative mood and is, in fact, frequently found in conjunction with an imperative form. The force with which the speaker is able to make the imposition depends on the social distance between speaker and addressee. If an inferior addresses a superior the obligation takes the force of a request, but if the communication proceeds from a superior to an inferior it has the force of a command. The volitional non-perfective is closely

related both morphologically and semantically to the volitional paradigms, including the cohortative and the jussive as well as the imperative. These forms emphasize the will of the speaker, whereas the non-perfectives to be treated here emphasize the action enjoined or forbidden.

A *non-perfective of injunction* express the speaker's will in a positive request or command. . . .
 וְתִרְאֶה הַיְבֹשֶׁת *Let the dry ground appear.* [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §31.5a-b]

f. Jussive:

The Canaanite dialects antecedent to Hebrew distinguished prefix forms yaqtulu and yaqtul. . . . The Hebrew *jussive* in some sense derived from the short yaqtul form. Whatever the historical facts, there are two groups of yiqtol forms in Biblical Hebrew, the long and short, for certain verbal stems and roots. In cases where the differentiation is found, the short form is the jussive (as well as the wayyqtl form).

<i>long form</i>	<i>jussive</i>
יִלְרִית	יִכְרַח
יִגְלֶה	יִגַּל
יִרְאֶה	יִרְא
יִחַרְרֶה	יִחַר
יִקֹּם	יִקַּם
יִקִּים	יִקַּם

The differentiation is not common, however, and there is no morphological distinction between jussive and non-jussive forms with most roots. For example, in the Aaronide blessing, only two of the six verbs are formally jussives, yet all have the same volitional sense.

יְבָרְכֶךָ יְהוָה וַיְשַׁמְרֶךָ:
 יֵאָר יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֵלֶיךָ וַיַּחֲנֶנֶךָ:
 יִשָּׂא יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֵלֶיךָ
 וַיִּשֶׂם לְךָ שָׁלוֹם:

In such a situation all verbs are to be taken as jussives. In some instances the distinctive form of the jussive is not used even when it could appear (cf. 1 Sam 25.25; אֶל-נָא יִשִּׂים), a phenomenon we already observed with wayyqtl. The longer form is more common before a pausal form or in pause (e.g., וְתִרְאֶה, Gen 1.9; and וַיִּרְאֶה, 2 Kgs 6.17). This sporadic split between form and meaning advises us to distinguish between *jussive form* and *jussive sense*; it is the latter we are chiefly concerned with. Because of the widespread polysemy of yqtl forms the interpreter must in most instances judge on the basis of semantic pertinence whether the form is jussive or non-perfective." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §34.2.1a]

1.10

1. וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לַיְבֹשֶׁת אֶרֶץ.

a. The preposition לְ . . . "Of specification, meaning 'with respect to,' . . . Sometimes this takes the place of the accusative of specification . . . leading to the use of לְ with a substantive as a

variant of the accusative of the direct object of a verb (as regularly in Aramaic)" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §273]

2. וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב

a. The Conjunction כִּי: "Nominalizing, introducing noun clauses like Greek ὅτι, e.g. וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב, 'God saw that it was good' (Gen 1.10); cf. Gen 22.12. . . ." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §451]

1.11

1. תְּדַשָּׂא הָאָרֶץ הַשָּׂא עֵשֶׁב מִזְרִיעַ זֶרַע עֵץ פְּרִי עֵשָׂה פְּרִי לְמִינוֹ

a. "SamPent, G, S, Vg add "and" before "fruit trees." This reading implies that עֵשֶׂב "plants" and עֵץ "tree" are included in דְּשָׂא "grass," whereas without "and," "grass," "plants," "trees" could be mutually exclusive categories. The former interpretation is probably correct, although the MT reading may be preferable as the more difficult. Waltke (217) notes SamPent tends to eliminate asyndetic constructions." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998.]

b. "The question whether, with Sam and other versions, one should read וְעֵץ instead of עֵץ depends on one's understanding of the sentence as a whole. If three species of plants are enumerated, then an asyndetic arrangement is possible; but if תְּדַשָּׂא דְּשָׂא ("Let the earth put forth vegetation") is the governing idea then the asyndetic succession of עֵשֶׁב and עֵץ would be harsh. The threefold division is supported by Dillmann, Driver, Budde and others, and twofold by Delitzsch, Holzinger, Skinner, Gunkel, Procksch, von Rad, Zimmerli, Cassuto, Speiser and the majority of modern exegetes. With the twofold division there are two possibilities: תְּדַשָּׂא דְּשָׂא can be understood as a construct chain (so Procksch, following the LXX βοτάνη γόρτου, "green of plants"). But תְּדַשָּׂא דְּשָׂא is for the most part considered to be the governing idea and עֵשֶׁב and עֵץ to be the two species. It is better then, with this almost unanimous interpretation, to read וְעֵץ instead of עֵץ. This reading is attested by Sam, Gk, TgJ, Syr, Vg, and accords too with v. 12." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

2. תְּדַשָּׂא הָאָרֶץ הַשָּׂא

a. "With the proper accusatives of the object may also be classed what is called the *internal object* (also named *schema etymologicum* or *figura etymologica*), i.e. the addition of an object in the form of a noun derived from the same stem," [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §117p]

b. "The *jussive* standing alone, or co-ordinated with another jussive: (a) In affirmative sentences to express a command, a wish (or a blessing), advice, or a request; in the last case (the optative or precative) it is frequently strengthened by the addition of וְ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §109b]

c. "The *effected-object accusative* is the result or effect of a transitive verb's action. . . . The 'vegetation' is not acted on by the verb's action; it rather results from the actions the verb

describes. The verb and the effected object are often derived from the same root; such an object is called a *cognate effected accusative*." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §10.2.1f]

3. עץ פרי עשה פרי למינו

a. The Preposition ל: "Norm, expressing mode or manner, and meaning 'according to,' . . . 'fruit-trees producing fruit according to their types' (Gen 1.11); cf. Gen 13.17." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §274] see also Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §11.210c.

4. מזריע זרע

a. The H stem of זרע here has both the causative value and a denominative function, like many N and D stem verbs. [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §27.4a²⁷]

1.12

1. למינהו

a. A connecting vowel ē is used here with the 3rd pers. sing. suffix. [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §91d]

1.14

1. יהי מארת . . . וְהָיָה . . .

a. The perfect (or jussive, cohortative, optative, imperfect) with the wāw consecutive continues the meaning of the first, i.e., "let there be light . . . and let them be, . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §112q]

b. "The most important of the volitional forms is the imperative, and, as Driver notes, weqatalī is 'by far the most common construction after an imperative: sometimes, however, a succession of imperatives is preferred, and sometimes the perfect and imperative alternate. It is also found after cohortatives and jussives." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §32.2.2b]

c. Also Davidson, A. B., *Hebrew Syntax*, §55a.

2. אלהים יהי מארת ברקיע השמים

a. "As in other languages, so also in Hebrew, the predicate in general conforms to the subject in gender and number. There are, however, numerous exceptions to this fundamental rule." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §145a]; "Variations from the fundamental rule very frequently occur when the predicate precedes the subject (denoting animals or things). The speaker or writer begins with the most simple form of the predicate, the uninflected 3rd singular masculine, and leaves us without indication as to which of the following subjects (and so which gender or number) is to define the predicate thus left temporarily indefinite." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §145o]

b. "Divergences from the basic rule that the predicate conforms with the subject in number and gender are frequent when the predicate precedes the subject Ges-K §145o; BrSynt §50a." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

c. "When the verb precedes, the third masculine singular of the verb is often used regardless of the gender or number of the subject, especially when the latter is inanimate or animal . . . cf. Gen 39.5; 2 Kgs 3.18, 26." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §228]

d. Also Davidson, A. B., *Hebrew Syntax*, §113b

3. . . . וְהָיָה מֵאֵרֶת . . . וְהָיָה

a. "As soon as a sentence which begins with an uninflected predicate is carried on after the mention of the subject, the gender and number of the subsequent (co-ordinate) predicates must coincide with those of the subject." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §145s]

4. . . . וְהָיָה מֵאֵרֶת בְּרָקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהַבְדִּיל . . . vs. γεννηθήτωσαν φωστῆρες ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς φάσματος τῆς γῆς τοῦ διαχωρίζειν . . .

a. "SamPent, G add "to shine upon the earth and." Typical harmonizing addition. MT to be retained." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

5. וְהָיָה לְאֵתָת וּלְמוֹעֲדִים וּלְיָמִים וְשָׁנִים:

a. The Preposition לְ: "Product, when an action results in a state of condition, . . . It is very common with the verb הָיָה in the meaning 'become' (e.g. Gen 1.14). With a construct infinitive it imparts a gerundive sense." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §278]

1.16

1. אֶת־הַמְּאֹר הַגָּדֹל . . . וְאֶת־הַמְּאֹר הַקָּטָן

a. "The correlative comparatives *greater – less* (older – younger) are expressed by the simple adjective with the article (*the great*, equivalent to *the greater*, etc.); Gn 1.16; 19.31, 34; 27.16, 18, 26." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §133f]

b. "Lit., "large" "small," The use of the simple adjective to express the comparative and superlative is normal Heb. (cf. 19:31, 34, etc.; *GKC*, 133f.)" [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. לְמִמְשָׁלָת

a. The Preposition לְ: "Purpose . . . 'that I may make you into a great nation' (Gen 1.16); cf. Gen 22.7; Judg 20.20. It is especially frequent with the construct infinitive." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §277]

3. Repetitive Apposition:

a. "Direct repetition of a noun can serve a variety of purposes; the sense may be distributive . . . , diverse. . . , or emphatic Apposition in the strict sense can also involve repetition: the appositive then repeats the leadword. . . ." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §12.5a]

1.20

1. על־הָאָרֶץ

a. The locative use of על: 'over the earth' [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §286] Also Davidson, A. B., *Hebrew Syntax*, §101Rem.d.

2. . . . יִשְׂרָצוּ הַפְּמִים שָׁרֵץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה וְעוֹף יְעוֹפֵף

a. "In the second command in v. 20 the order of the words is reversed; however the jussive remains at the beginning of the sentence. The sense of the inversion here is to stress the balance between fish and birds in the work of creation as beings that inhabit the sea and the sky. One could render this by "as well. as"; but this is not necessary." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

b "Chiastic sentence indicating creation of birds and fishes to be "distinct but concomitant" acts (*SBH*, 105–6); cf. vv 5, 10." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

3. . . . καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως

a. "One would expect to find the fulfillment command כֵּן וַיְהִי after the creation command; the LXX adds it, following its tendency to schematize." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

b. "G adds "and it was so," characteristically conforming the use of this phrase to the standard formula, but spoiling the sevenfold appearance of the phrase in the MT." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

1.21

1. לְמִינֵהֶם

a. "Also in Gen 1.21; 4.4; Ezra 10.12; Nahum 2.8; etc., the Keth. perhaps intends the singular, לְמִינֵהֶם, etc., but the Masora requires the plural with defective ê." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §91c]

2. וְאֵת כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה . . . וְאֵת כָּל־עוֹף כָּנָף

a. "As accusatives determined in other ways, we have in the first place to consider the collectives

introduced by כל includes a determinative sense, cf. e.g. Gen 1.21, 30; 8.21; Deut 2.34; 2 Kgs 25.9." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §117c]

1.22

1. וַיְבָרֶךְ

a. "In Piel and Hithpael the lengthening of the vowel before the guttural causes the tone to be thrown back upon the penultima, and consequently the sere of the ultima to be shortened to s^eghô l. . . . after wāw consecutive, e.g. וַיְבָרֶךְ and he blessed, Gen 1.22. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §64g]

2. וַיְבָרֶךְ אֶתְּם אֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר

a. "Inf constr אמר "to say" introduces direct speech (cf. Lambdin, 49.)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

3. פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ

a. "Hendiadys (*SBH*, 117), i.e.; "Be abundantly fruitful." 2 masc. pl. impv פרה "be fruitful," רבה." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

1.24

1. וַחֲתִיתֹּ־אָרֶץ

a. "Normal constr of חיה is חיה cf. v 25. This form with additional (paragogic) waw occurs in six other poetic passages (e.g., Isa 56:9). *GKC*, 90k, and Joüon, 93r, suggest it is the remains of an old case ending. SamPent reads חיה, as elsewhere omitting the paragogic waw (cf. Waltke, 217.)" [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

b. "Of the ending ו (always with tone): in prose only the Pentateuch, but in elevated style, Gen 1.24 וַחֲתִיתֹּ־אָרֶץ *the beast of the earth* (= v. 25); similarly in Pss 50.10; 79.2; 104.11, 20; Isa 56.9 (x2), Zp 2.14" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §90o]

1.25

1. וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ

a. "There are two approaches to descriptions of the particle's function. (1) The tradition calls it the *nota accusativi* or "sign of the accusative" and essentially explains away the occurrences that do not fit this rubric. (2) More recent grammarians regard it as a marker of emphasis used most often with definite nouns in the accusative role. The apparent occurrences with the nominative are most problematic – are they to be denied, emended away or the like, or are they to be

explained? The last course seems best, though the difficulty of the problem cannot be denied: "No single particle has given rise to more widespread and also mutually more contradictory discussion than this so-called *nota accusativi*."" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §10.3a-c]

b. "The emphatic particle is used most often to mark the *definite direct object* of a transitive verb." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §10.3.1a]

1.26

1. וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם.

a. "The ordinary form of the imperfect with the ending ה־ serves in verbs ל"ה to express the cohortative" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §751]

2. בְּצִלְמֵנוּ

a. The use of בְּ for comparison. [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §119h]

b. "Ges-K §119h: "Underlying the varying uses of this preposition (2) is either the idea of being or moving. . . or else the idea of *fastening* on something, close *connection with* something (also in a metaphorical sense. . . or in a comparison. . .)." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

3. כְּדִמוּתֵנוּ

a. "This preposition is the only extremely common particle of relation that has no basic spatial or temporal sense; it describes comparison and correspondence (like, as, just as). . . . There are three facets to the basic use of כְּ. (1) The preposition may denote *agreement in quantity or measure*, as in 'Moses is *as* tall *as* Joshua'. Related to this is the use of the preposition before *approximations*, as in 'Moses is *about* that tall'. (2) *Agreement in kind* is also marked with כְּ, cf. 'Joshua is *like* Moses *as* a prophet.' *Agreement in manner or norm* (cf. 'Joshua is a prophet *in the manner of* Moses') is akin to agreement in kind. . . ." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §11.2.9b] "Let us make 'ādām in our image *according to* our likeness."

b. "SamPent, G, Vg insert "and." MT may stand, specifying apposition." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

4. נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצִלְמֵנוּ כְּדִמוּתֵנוּ וַיִּרְדּוּ.

a. "Conjunctive wāw serves to join two clauses which describe interrelated or over-lapping situations not otherwise logically related. Pairs of such clauses may form a *hendiadys*. There is a tendency, both in translation and commentary, to assign to the conjunctive wāw a more logically distinct value where possible; this tendency may obscure the distinctive shape of Hebrew narrative. . . . Conjunctive wāw can connect *volitional forms*: . . . cohortative + jussive" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §39.2.5a-b]

5. בְּרִגְתַּי הַיָּם

a. "Collectives in the fem. form, generally fem. participles used substantively, especially as the comprehensive designation of a number of persons דָּגָה *a shoal of fish*. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §122s]

6. וּבְכָל-הָאָרֶץ

a. "With Syr, add חַיָּה this is indicated by vv. 24 and 25. This can only be explained as a scribal omission; so too Delitzsch, *Lese- und Schreibfehler* n. 92." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

1.27

1. "Three clauses in apposition: b-c in epic apposition to a-b, and c-d specifying apposition to b-c (*SBH*, 55.)" [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. "The twice repeated resumption of the imperf. consec. with the inverted perf. בְּרִא is to be understood in an explicating sense." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

1.28

1. "G, S insert "and all cattle; G also adds "and all the earth." Unnecessary harmonistic additions. MT is preferable." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. "SamPent unnecessarily inserts def art (*GKC*, 117c.)" [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

3. "The way in which the first two sentences in v. 28 are linked is stylistically improbable with P and syntactically harsh: אֱלֹהִים is twice repeated as the subject and as the third word of each sentence: the imperf. consec. can scarcely be understood as a continuation of וַיִּבְרָךְ. And so with the Gk לֵאמֹר is to be read instead of the second sentence (so too BHK)." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

4. "Sam adds the article to the MT חַיָּה. However the MT is not to be emended, cf. Ges-K §117c, BrSynt §96. LXX and Sam insert וּבְכָל-הָאָרֶץ the harmonizing tendency is again at work; the addition is not required. The critical note to v. 28b in BHK is not accurate; Gk assimilates the text to the sequence in v. 26." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

1.29

1. "It is probable that the text at the end of v. 29 is disturbed; but a reconstruction is not necessary because the sense is clear. V. 29 confirms that the division of the plants in v. 11 is twofold, not threefold." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

2. . . . זרע זרע . . .

a. " introduces a clause giving ground for subsequent action (Lambdin, 169–70.)" [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

3. נתתי

a. Use of Perfect: "To express *future* actions, when the speaker intends by an express assurance to represent them as finished, or as equivalent to accomplished fact Especially in promises made by God, Gen 1.2; 15.18; 17.20; Judg 1.2. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §106m]

4. לְכֶם יִהְיֶה לְאֹכֶלָה

a. "The "indirect object" *lamed* marks one sort of goal, while another sort of goal is marked by the *lamed* of purpose 'It shall be yours *as* food.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §11.2.10d]

1.30

1. "The verb נתתי from v. 29 completes the sense (cf. 9:3); it is not necessary to insert it into the text." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 79]

Genesis 2

2.1

1. וַיְכַלּוּ

a. "The *imperfect consecutive* serves, . . . to represent either expressly, or at least to a great extent, a *chronological* succession of actions or events; elsewhere it expresses those actions, etc., which represent the logical consequence of what preceded, or a result arising from it by an inherent necessity. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* is used – (a) As a final summing up of the preceding narrative, e.g. Gen 2.1; 23.20 . . . , 1 Sam 17.50; 31.6." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §111k]

b. "Waw consec + 3 masc. pl. impf. pual כלה "to finish" used to sum up or recapitulate a narrative; cf. 23:20 (*GKC*, 111k; Joüon, 118i)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

c. "The wayyqtl statement can be a summary remark. . . . 'Thus the heavens and the earth *were completed*.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §33.2.1d]

2.2

1. בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי

a. "Sam, Gk, Syr (and others) read הששי "the 6th day"; even though this reading makes more sense, the MT should not be altered." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 80]

b. "SamPent, G, S read "6th day." An interpretation designed to avoid any suspicion that God was active on the 7th day. Tg. Onq. also has this concern and uses different verbs for finishing in vv 1–2 (B. Grossfeld, *JJS* 24 [1973] 176–78). For reasons given in the comment on this verse a pluperfect translation "had finished" may be justified here, which avoids the problem felt by the versions." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. וַיִּשְׁבֹּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִכָּל־מַלְאֲכָתּוֹ

a. "A rather large number of Gk miniscules insert θεός here and Heb 4:14, Philo and Eusebius seem also to have read it. This would be -more in accordance with P's style and it may well be that it preserves the original text. But as the attestation is so weak, the MT should remain." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 80]

3. וַיִּשְׁבֹּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִכָּל־מַלְאֲכָתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה

a. Use of the perfect: "To represent actions, etc., which were already completed in the past, at the time when other actions or conditions took place This is especially frequent, from the nature of the case, in relative, causal, and temporal clauses, when the main clause contains a tense referring to the past, e.g. Gen 2.2 Gen 7.9, 19.27, etc.; 29.10. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §106f]

b. The Relative Pronoun: "Relative clauses are most frequently (but not necessarily) introduced by the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר. This is not, however, a relative pronoun in the Greek, Latin, or English sense, nor is it a mere *nota relationis*, but an original *demonstrative* pronoun. Hence it is used –
(1) In immediate dependence on the substantival idea to be defined, and virtually in the same case as it (hence belonging syntactically to the main clause); Gen 2.2 and *God finished עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר מַלְאֲכָתּוֹ his work, istud, he had made (it)*. Such qualifying clauses may be called relative clauses." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §138a-b]

2.3

1. אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשׂוֹת

a. ". . . the infinitive with ל is very frequently used in a much looser connexion to state motives, attendant circumstances, or otherwise to define more exactly. In English, such infinitive constructions must frequently be turned by *that* or a gerund" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §114o]

b. "The ל, in לַעֲשׂוֹת is explained in Ges-K §114o, cf. Köhler, *Lex*, ל, n. 25d. It is possible that in this closing sentence P has again deliberately put side-by-side the two different words for God's act of creation." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 80]

c. "Lit., "to work, do" (ל + inf constr עָשָׂה; cf. לאמר "saying" *GKC*, 1140; Joüon, 124o n.)."

[Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

d. "which God had creatively made" [Cassuto, U, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis: From Adam to Noah, Part One*, 69]

2.4

1. בְּהִבְרָאִם

a. The ה is an example of a peculiarity in the Hebrew manuscript tradition called a *minuscule*, where the letter is slightly raise and smaller than the rest. N. B. Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §5n.

b. "A number of manuscripts have the *littera minuscula* ה in the last word, cf. Ges-K §5n; it has been proposed therefore that the verb should be read as a qal infinitive; however there is no objection to the MT." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 80]

c. "The minuscule ה in בְּהִבְרָאִם "when they were created" (niph inf + 3 masc. pl. suffix) in some mss leads *BHS* to propose reading the qal בְּבִרְאִם "when (God) created them." MT may be retained." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

d. "The period of time to which an action or occurrence represented by the infinitive construct belongs, must sometimes be inferred from the context, or from the character of the principal tenses; cf. e.g. Gen 2.4 *these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth*, בְּהִבְרָאִם *when they were created* (prop. in their created). . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §114q]

e. Pronominal Suffix: "Subjective, e.g. . . . בְּהִבְרָאִם, 'when they were created' (Gen 2.4). . . ." [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §109]

f. בְּ: "Temporal, expressing point of time" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §241]

2. N.B. that 2.4 does not use את before וְהָאָרֶץ וְהַשָּׁמַיִם or וְהָאָרֶץ וְהַשָּׁמַיִם over against 2.1. Why?

3. בְּיוֹם עֲשׂוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אָרֶץ וְשָׁמַיִם

a. "An infinitive construct can manifest its verbal character in various ways. . . . Less often both subject and object follow the infinitive; the object may be unmarked or signaled by את" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §36.3.1a]

b. "בְּיוֹם עֲשׂוֹת: Ges-K §114e: "This use of the infinitive construct is especially frequent in connection with בְּ or בְּ to express time determinations." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 183]

4. αὐτῆ ἢ βίβλος γενέσεως > אֱלֹהֵ תוֹלְדוֹת

a. "Instead of אלה LXX has the beginning of 5:1 זה ספר." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 80]

b. "G reads "This is the book of" for MT "This/these," אלה, assimilating the formula to 5:1. MT is preferable." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

5. יהוה אלהים

a. ". . . this description of God in Genesis is found only in chs. 2-3; Gk has δ θεός in 2:5, 7, 9, 19, 21." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 183]

6. ארץ ושמים

a. "Sam and Syr have וארץ שמים instead of ארץ ושמים. This is by analogy with 2:4a; the usual sequence of MT is to be retained." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 183]

b. "G S SamPent Tg. Neof. have instead of "earth and heaven" the more usual order "heaven and earth." This rearrangement mars the elaborate chiasmus of v 4 in MT . . ." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2.5

1. The Syntax of verses 5-6:

a. ". . . there is an essential distinction between verbal-clauses, according as the subject stands before or after the verb. In the verbal-clause proper the principal emphasis rests upon the action which proceeds from (or is experienced by) the subject, and accordingly the verb naturally precedes (*necessarily* so when it is in the perf. consec. or imperf. consec.). Nevertheless, the subject does sometimes precede even in the verbal-clause proper, in the continuation of the narrative, e.g. Gen 7.19; 1 Sam 18.1; 2 Sam 19.12; especially so if there is special emphasis upon it, e.g. Gen 3.13 (it is not I who am to blame, but) *the serpent beguiled me*, cf. Gen 2.5, etc. In the great majority of instances, however, the position of the subject at the beginning of a verbal-clause is to be explained from the fact that the clause is not intended to introduce a new fact carrying on the narrative, but rather to describe a *state*. Verbal-clauses of this kind approximate closely in character to noun-clauses, and not infrequently (*viz.* when the verbal form might just as well be read as a participle) it is doubtful whether the writer did not in fact intend a noun-clause." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §142a]

b. "Vv 5–6 are conjoined circumstantial clauses preparing for the action in v 7. According to *SBH* (86) they modify the inf constr "made" in v 4, but it would be simpler to regard them as simply episode-initial as in 3:1 (cf. *SBH*, 79)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

c. Niccacci argues that like 1.1-2, 2.5-6 is an antecedent to the beginning of the narrative in 2.7 which finally introduces the wayyiqtol. [see Niccacci, Alviero, *The Syntax of the Verb in*

d. "H. Gunkel understands v. 4b as antecedent, vv. 5, 6 as parenthesis, v. 7 as final sentence. So too Meyer, *Textbuch*." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 183]

2. טָרָם יְהִיָּה . . . טָרָם יִצְמַח

a. Use of the Perfect: "To express actions, etc., which *continued* throughout a longer or shorter period The imperfect is frequently used in this way after the particles אָז *then*, טָרָם *not yet*, בְּטָרָם *before*, עַד- *until*," [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §107b-c]

b. "טָרָם *not yet*, when referring to past time is used, as a rule with the imperfect, Gen 2.5 טָרָם . . . בָּל *none . . . yet . . .*" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §152r]

3. כִּי לֹא הִמְטִיר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עַל־הָאָרֶץ

a. Use of the perfect: "To represent actions, etc., which were already completed in the past, at the time when other actions or conditions took place and in a negative statement, Gen 2.5 *for the Lord God had not* (up to this time) *caused it to rain*, etc. This is especially frequent, from the nature of the case, in relative, causal, and temporal clauses, when the main clause contains a tense referring to the past, e.g. Gen 2.2 Gen 7.9, 19.27, etc.; 29.10. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §106f]

b. "With some verbs of motion 'I has a terminative sense ('on, to, onto'). . . . YHWH God had not (yet) made it rain *upon* the earth." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §11.2.13b]

c. N.B. that the verb הִמְטִיר "Like the Niphal and the Piel, the Hiphil has a denominative function. The causative value is always present in this use but with a wide range of meanings, and extended meanings, depending on the root. . . ." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §27.4a]

4. וְאָדָם אֵין לְעֵבֶד אֶת־הָאָדָמָה

a. "The absolute state אֵין, with an evident transition to the meaning of the verbal predicate, *there does not exist*, always *follows* the word negated. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §152k]

b. אֵין is used here "In apposition to a substantive which usually precedes" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §408]

2.6

1. וְאָדָם יַעֲלֶה מִן־הָאָרֶץ

a. Use of the Imperfect: "In the sphere of *past time*: (a) To express actions, etc., which *continued* throughout a longer or shorter period, Gen 2.6 *a mist went up* continually (יַעֲלֶה)" [Kautzsch

& Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §107b]

b. "Driver (*Tenses*, p. 35f.) rightly lays stress upon the inherent distinction between the *participle* as expressing *mere* duration, and the *imperfect* as expressing *progressive* duration (in the present, past, or future). . . . In . . . יַעֲלֶה Gen 2.6 represents new mists as constantly arising" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §107d]

c. "In Chapter 29 we noted that most grammarians have erred in trying to abstract one meaning from the several uses of the prefix conjugation, and we suggested that the only possible generalization had to be expressed negatively: the non-perfective conjugation stands over against the perfective conjugation. The non-perfective prefix conjugation has two major values: to signify either an imperfective situation in past and present time, or a dependent situation. In the latter use, the situation may be dependent on the speaker, the subject, or another situation. . . .

In the *customary non-perfective* the internal structure of a situation is conceived of as extended over an indefinite period in the time prior to the act of speaking. Bernard Comrie remarks that the view may be "so extended in fact that the situation referred to is viewed not as an incidental property of the moment but, precisely, as a characteristic feature of a whole period." The *pas* customary non-perfective, in contrast to what we call the present non-perfective, implies that the situation described no longer holds at the time of the utterance. With active situations the customary non-perfective is essentially a statement of iterativity (i.e., 'he used to do X'). This usage is less frequent with stative situations, in which it represents the situation as existing without interruption. . . . 'Streams (?) would come up from the ground' Gen 2.6. . . ." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §31.1.2-31.2b]

d. "The precedence of the subject makes this sentence too a circumstantial sentence; the imperf. יַעֲלֶה describes continuous action in the past, Ges-K §107, d; BrSynt §135d." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 183]

2. וְהִשְׁקָה אֶת-כָּל-פְּנֵי-הָאָדָמָה

a. "The perfect consecutive in immediate dependence on the preceding tense, or its equivalent, serves (a) As a frequentative tense to express *past* actions, etc., i.e. actions repeatedly brought to a conclusion in the *past*, and follows tenses, or their equivalents, representing actions which have *continued* or been *repeated in the past*: (α) After a simple imperfect, e.g. Gen 2.6 וַיָּאֵר יַעֲלֶה *there went up a mist* (again and again) *from the earth*, וְהִשְׁקָה *and watered* (as it were, *and ever watered afresh*), etc. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §112e]

3. אֵד

a. "The old versions (e.g., Gk πηγῆ) show that the meaning of the word אֵד was uncertain even then; the same accounts for the variants in the preposition in Tgm (5 for In). KBL renders the passage: "the subterranean-sweet water stream, basic water(?)" [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 183]

2.7

1. וַיִּצְרֶה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם עֵפֶר מִן-הָאָדָמָה

a. "Expressions which mean *to make, to form, to build something out of* something; in such cases, besides the accusative of the object proper, another accusative is used for the material of which the thing is made" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §117hh]

b. "Verbs of creation and appointment often govern two accusatives. These may be *thing made + materials*. . . 'And YHWH God formed *the man* | *from the dust* of the ground.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §10.2.3b]

2. עֵפֶר מִן־הָאָדָמָה

a. מִן is here used as a source [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §322]

3. וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

a. "ל" describes the result or product of an action, so here and in v. 22, BrSynt §107ig." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 184]

2.8

1. וַיִּטֵּעַ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים גֶּן־בְּעֵדֶן מִקְדָּם וַיִּשֶׂם שָׁם אֶת־הָאָדָם

a. "The emphatic particle is used most often to mark the *definite direct object* of a transitive verb. . . 'And YHWH God planted a garden . . . and placed *Adam* there.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §10.3.1a]

2. גֶּן־בְּעֵדֶן מִקְדָּם

a. "מקדם" "The basic meaning (of the prep. מִן) is 'part of. . .' Because a part of a thing can also be presented separated from the thing itself, מִן can also express the location at a place different from the standpoint of the subject." Gen 21:16; Ex 2:4; 20:4 etc., BrSynt §111, c, d; Meyer, *Textbuch*." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 184]

2.9

1. כָּל־עֵץ נֶחְמַד לְמִרְאָה

a. ". . . before an indeterminate genitive כָּל is used in the more indefinite (individualizing) sense of *of all kinds, any, or distributively each, every*, e.g. כָּל־עֵץ every (kind of) tree, Gen 2.9." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §127b]

b. "The substantive כָּל followed by an indefinite substantive may have a distributive sense" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §105]

c. "כָּל before indefinite noun may mean 'all kinds of' (*GKC*, 127b); cf. Gen 4:22; 24:10." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

d. "Niph ptcp חמד with gerundive sense: “desirable, pleasant” (*GKC*, 116e)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. בתוך הגן

a. "The construct state is a form of the noun or a nominal equivalent that may serve any syntactic function or case: . . . 'in the middle (Construct: Genitive) of the garden'. . . ." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §9.2a-b]

3. ועץ הדעת טוב ורע

a. "As a substantive the infinitive construct may be *definite*, occurring not only with suffixes but also with the article, כל (notably in late Biblical Hebrew), etc. . . . 'the tree of *the knowing* of good and evil.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §36.2.1e]

b. "דעת “knowledge.” Though a substantivized inf from ידע, it may still take a dir obj “good and evil” (*GKC*, 115d; Joüon, 124j); cf. Jer 22:16." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

4. ועץ החיים בתוך הגן ועץ הדעת טוב ורע

a. "The last eight words of the verse, “and the tree of life . . . and the tree of the knowledge. . . .” are uncertain and sound like a later addition. However the traditional text, constant in the whole textual tradition, is to be retained. The question is one of tradition history, not textual criticism." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 184]

2.10

1. ונהר יצא מעדן להשקות את־הגן ומזם יפרד

a. "Driver (*Tenses*, p. 35f.) rightly lays stress upon the inherent distinction between the *participle* as expressing *mere* duration, and the *imperfect* as expressing *progressive* duration (in the present, past, or future). Thus the words ונהר יצא Gen 2.10 represent the river of paradise as going out of Eden in a continuous, uninterrupted stream, but יפרד, which immediately follows, describes how the parting of its waters is always taking place a fresh." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §107d]

b. Particples: ". . . the participle describes an ongoing state of affairs, involving repeated or continuous action. . . . 'Now, a river *was flowing* from Eden.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §37.6d]

c. "The ptcp “flowing,” the subsequent impf. 10.d (3 masc. sg impf. niph פרד), and pf with waw 10.e draw attention to the continuity of the actions (*GKC*, 107d, 112e)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

d. "The series of imperf. consec. is interrupted by w. 10-14. The first sentence is a nominal sentence describing a situation: "Driver . . . rightly lays stress upon the inherent distinction between *the participle* as expressing *mere* duration, and the imperfect as expressing *progressive* duration (in the present, past or future). Thus the words יצא ונהר Gen 2:10 represent the river of Paradise as going out of Eden in a continuous, uninterrupted stream, but ופרד, which immediately follows, describes how the parting of its waters is always taking place afresh." Ges-K §107d, cf. BrSynt §44c." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 184]

2. והיה לארבעה ראשים:

a. "The perfect consecutive in immediate dependence on the preceding tense, or its equivalent, serves . . . (a) After a simple imperfect This frequentative use of the perfect consecutive is equally evident after frequentative imperfects, Gen 2.10 (והיה) *and it became* again every time." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §112e]

2.11

1. שם האחד פישון

a. ". . . the use of אחד as an ordinal . . . in such cases as Gen 1.5, 2.11, the meaning of *first* is derived solely from the context." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §98a]

b. "The cardinals are determined by the article, when they refer back (without) being connected with the object numbered. . . . to a number or list already mentioned, Gen 2.11 . . . *the name of the one* (the first) *is Pishon*. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §134k]

c. "In a verbless clause of identification ("Who or what is the subject?"), the two parts of the clause usually occur in the order *subject-predicate*." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §8.4.1a]

2. הוא הסבב את כל־ארץ החוילה

a. ". . . a noun-clause with a participle as predicate may have for its subject either a substantive or a personal pronoun; in both cases the participle, especially if there be a certain emphasis upon it, may precede the subject. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §116q]

b. ". . . a determinate adjective or participle (equivalent to a relative clause) is used apparently as a predicate, e.g. Gen 2.11 הוא הסבב *it is the compassing*, i.e., *that is it which compasseth*" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §126k]

c. ". . . so-called relative use of the article is most common with participles, whether used attributively or predicatively. . . . 'It is *the one that circles around*. . . .'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §13.5.2d]

d. "When the relative participle as predicate receives the article, it identifies the subject. . . ." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §37.5c]

3. אשר־שם הזהב:

a. "The article in **הַזֶּה** describes the type, BrSynt §21c." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 184]

2.12

1. **וַיֵּהֱבֵב הָאָרֶץ הַהוּא טוֹב**

a. "The *predicate* of a noun-clause may be – . . . (b) An adjective or participle, e.g. Gen 2.12 **טוֹב הַהוּא וַיֵּהֱבֵב הָאָרֶץ הַהוּא** and *the gold of that land is good*. . . ." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §141b]

b. "The construct state is a form of the noun or a nominal equivalent that may serve any syntactic function or case. . . . 'And *the gold* (Construct: Nominative) of that land is good.'" [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §9.2a]

c. "'And the gold"; the hatef vowel instead of **וַיֵּהֱבֵב** is prompted by the **ו** before initial sibilant (*GKC*, 10g)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

d. "**הוּא** stands for **הוּא** ("that" masc. sg) or **הִיא** ("that" fem. sg) in the Pentateuch, the punctuation making it clear when it is, as here, to be read as fem. (a so-called *qere perpetuum*, *GKC*, 321). For a possible historical explanation of the form as a mark of early Heb. see G. A. Rendsburg, *Bib* 63 (1982) 351–69." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2.15

1. "The narrative thread is resumed with the imperf. consec." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 184]

2.16

1. **וַיֵּצֵא יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עַל־הָאָדָם**

a. "Within the Hebrew syntactic system, a single verb may vary. Some verbs may govern either direct-object accusatives, or prepositional objects, with no appreciable difference in meaning." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §10.2.1c]

2. **מִכָּל עֵץ־הָגֶן אֲכַל תֹּאכַל:**

a. ". . . imperfects are used – (1) In a permissive sense, e.g. Gen 2.16 *of every tree of the garden (אֲכַל תֹּאכַל) thou mayest freely eat* (the opposite in verse 17); 3.2; 42.37; Lev 21.3, 22; Job 21.3." [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §107s]

b. Imperfect uses as "permissive, expressing an idea to be rendered by 'may,'" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §170]

c. "The infinitive absolute is used to give emphasis to an antithesis, e.g. . . . Hence also, as permissive, Gen 2.16f. **אָכַל תֹּאכַל** *thou mayest freely eat*, but, etc. (so that verse 16 is in antithesis to verse 17)" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §113p]

2.17

1. וּמַעַץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וְרַע לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ

a. "לא + impf. for permanent prohibitions (*GKC*, 107b; Lambdin, 114); cf., Exod 20:4–17." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

2. מוֹת תָּמוּת:

a. "The infinitive absolute used *before* the verb to *strengthen* the verbal idea, i.e., to emphasize in this way either the certainty (especially in the case of threats) or the forcibleness and completeness of an occurrence. in English, such an infinitive is mostly expressed by a corresponding adverb, but sometimes merely by putting greater stress on the verb" [Kautzsch & Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §113n]

b. "The inf. abs. puts stronger stress on the idea contained in the verb; cf. the corresponding emphasis in the legal formulas." [Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, 184]

c. "inf abs מוֹת with finite verb (תָּמוּת impf.) makes statement very emphatic, lit., "you shall dying die" (*GKC*, 1131-n; A. B. Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894] 86a)." [Wenham, Gordon J., *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1-15*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998]

3. כִּי בַיּוֹם אֲכָלְךָ מִמֶּנּוּ מוֹת תָּמוּת:

a. Prefix (non-perfective) Conjugation: "The imperfectum . . . must designate an action which is not important in itself, but which stands in relationship to something else, and in this relationship has its meaning. In brief: it is dependent." This use overlaps with some of the modal nuances, which also involve dependency, especially those of capability, of obligation, and of deliberation. . . "because when you eat of it you *shall* surely die." [Waltke & O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*, §31.6.2a]

4. בַּיּוֹם אֲכָלְךָ מִמֶּנּוּ

a. Infinitive Construct: "As a genitive, e.g. . . . 'on the day that you eat from it'" [Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, §194]

Genesis 3

3.1

1. וְהִנָּחַשׁ הָיָה עֲרוֹם מִכָּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה

a. “The *imperfect* with *wāw consecutive* serves to express actions, events, or states, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or states mentioned immediately before. The *imperfect consecutive* is used in this way most frequently as the *narrative tense*, corresponding to the Greek *aorist* or the Latin *historic perfect*. As a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfects with *wāw consecutive*. . . .” [GKC §111a]

b. “The verb הָיָה is used in the weak sense of *to be* as a copula, when one wishes to specify the temporal sphere of a nominal sentence. It is therefore not a simple copula, but a copula with a temporal sense like the English verb *to be*: Gen 1.2; 3.1; 6.19; 1 Kgs 10.6.” [Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §154m]

2. מִכַּל חַיִּת הַשָּׂדֶה.

a. “מִן, originally *separation*, represents both the idea of *distance*, *separation* or *remoteness from* a place, Am 1.1. From the idea of *separation* is naturally derived on the one hand the sense of (*taken*) *from among* . . . , *enumero*, e.g. Gen 3.1 *subtil as none other of the beasts*. . . .” [GKC §119w]

3. . . . אֵף כִּי־אָמַר אֱלֹהִים

a. “A nominal or verbal clause may form a unit which can be considered and treated as a substantive. . . . Like a substantive, a substantival clause can function as the subject or predicate of a sentence, and as the complement of a preposition or genitive, and occur in apposition. But it is mainly as object that it is commonly used” [Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §157aN]

4. לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכֹּל עֵץ הַגֶּן: .

a. “Opposite and conflicting notions are less sharply distinguished than in our languages. . . . The phrases combining the negative לֹא and כֹּל *every* are ambiguous: the meaning can be *not every* or *none*. Thus in Gen 3.1 the context requires: *you may not eat from every tree* rather than *from any tree*. . . .” [Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §160k]

3.2

1. מִפְּרֵי עֵץ־הַגֶּן נֹאכְלִים:

a The imperfect is used, “in a permissive sense, Gen 2.16; 3.2; 42.37; Lev 21.3, 22; Job 21.3.” [GKC §107s]

2. מִפְּרֵי עֵץ־הַגֶּן

a. “When a genitive, determined in any way, follows a *nomen regens*, it also determines the *nomen regens*, which, . . . is always in the construct state. . . . An independent genitive may be determinate (d) By construction with another genitive determined in some way, e.g. Gen 3.2 Thus in Isa 10.12 four, and in 21.17 even five, members of a series are determined by a concluding determinate genitive.” [GKC §127a]

b. “Where three or more nouns follow one after another in genitival relationship, the first normally serves as the nucleus of the entire chain: a + (b + c + . . .). Thus in Gen 3.2 פְּרִי עֵץ הַגֶּן, the הַגֶּן is construed with עֵץ rather than with פְּרִי: (עֵץ הַגֶּן) + פְּרִי.” [Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §130]

3.3

1. פִּן־תְּמָחוּן

a. Paragogic Nun:

i. “Instead of the plural forms in ׀ there are, especially in the older books, over 300 forms with the fuller ending ׀ן (with Nun paragogicum), always bearing the tone. . . . This usually expresses marked emphasis, and consequently occurs most commonly at the end of the sentences (in the principal pause), in which case also the (pausal) vowel of the second syllable is generally retained.” [GKC §47m]

ii. “In reality the ׀ belongs to primitive forms and is found in Ugaritic, Arabic, Aramaic, etc. The total of 305 examples are evenly distributed in the Old Testament; one finds them especially in Deuteronomy (56), Isaiah (37), Job (23), and Psalm 104 (15). The reason for the presence of a form with ׀ן can be the antiquity of a text, a deliberate archaism, Aramaic influence, and metre. But the usual reason seems to be preference for a fuller and more emphatic form. This explains why one finds forms with ׀ן especially in pause (in major and intermediate pauses). . . . The fact that no long forms occurs with the prohibitive אַל and extremely rarely (only 9 times: Deut 1.22; 4.11 [x2]; 5.20; Jdg 8.1; Isa 41.5; Ezek 44.8; Amos 6.3) with the inversive Waw accords with the general assumption that the short form represents the original jussive.” [Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §44e]

3.4

1. לֹא־מוֹת תְּמָחוּן

a. “The regular place of the negative is between the intensifying infinitive absolute and the finite verb. . . . Exceptions are Gen 3.4 (where the negation of the threat pronounced in 2.17 is expressed in the same form of words; Amos 9.8, Ps 49.8.” [GKC §113v; also Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §123o]

3.5

1. כִּי יִדַע אֱלֹהֵי

a. “(1) A personal pronoun tends to occupy the second slot when no prominence is intended to be given to it. . . . Partly as a corollary of what has been said above, the predicate preceding a pronominal subject often does receive some prominence: . . . This is particularly true in subordinate clauses introduced by כִּי *because, that* and אִם *if*. . . .” [Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A*

2. **בְּזֶמְנוֹ וְנִפְקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם**

a. “The *Waw of apodosis*, as indicated by its name, is a Waw which is put at the beginning of an apodosis to link it to its protasis. . . . In a broad sense, we may include in this category the Waw which is very often found not before, but after a secondary part of a statement which functions as a protasis linking this to the principal part, which functions as an apodosis: . . . **בְּזֶמְנוֹ וְנִפְקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם** *the day you eat from it (then) your eyes will open. . . .*” [Joüon, Paul & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §176a]