

Linguistic Traits of Hebrew Relator Nouns and Their Implications for Translating Genesis 1:1

Dr. Josh Wilson, Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Park Hills, Missouri and Professor of Bible at Missouri Baptist University.

Abstract

In the debate over the proper translation of Genesis 1:1, one of the key issues is whether the first word of the verse, בְּרֵאשִׁית, is in the absolute or construct state. If בְּרֵאשִׁית is in the construct state, then it is in construct with the verb בָּרָא and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1, and the verse should be rendered with a dependent clause. This rendering is known as the dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1 found in such versions as the NRSV, NJV, and NAB. If בְּרֵאשִׁית is in the absolute state, then it is not in construct with בָּרָא and the ensuing clause, and the verse should be rendered with an independent main clause. This rendering is known as the traditional translation of Genesis 1:1 found in such versions as the KJV, NAS, NIV, and ESV. In this article, the author defends the traditional translation of Genesis 1:1 by arguing that בְּרֵאשִׁית, properly understood, is a Hebrew relator noun. According to the author, since בְּרֵאשִׁית is a Hebrew relator noun, it will have a relative meaning at the lexical level, but will still function as a noun in the absolute state at the grammatical level. This trait of being lexically relative yet grammatically absolute, which is possible with Hebrew relator nouns, also explains why בְּרֵאשִׁית is not pointed with a definite article in Hebrew even though it is rendered with one in the traditional translation.

Keywords: absolute, construct, relative meaning, absolute meaning, relator noun, lexically relative, grammatically relative, grammatically absolute, *nomen regens*, *nomen rectum*, definite, definite article, anarthrous

Introduction

For many centuries and almost a couple millennia, a traditional translation and interpretation of Genesis 1:1 have led Christian and Jewish scholars to conclude that God created the world out of nothing.¹ According to this tradition, Genesis 1:1 introduces God's first creative act with an independent main clause. Genesis 1:2 then describes this first creative act as being in an incomplete state. The rest of the Genesis narrative then describes how God shaped, filled, and added to that initial creation. Since Genesis 1:1 does not describe anything as being in existence before the initial creation other than God, many interpreters have logically concluded that God created the world from nothing. Although it is not explicitly stated, the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* is a logical and theological conclusion of the traditional translation and interpretation of Genesis 1:1 (Matthews 1996, 141; Sarna 1989, 5; Skinner 1951, 13; Waltke 1975, 217).² Again, the translation renders Genesis 1:1 as an independent main clause, and the interpretation makes Genesis 1:1 the first creative act. This traditional translation, however, is not always utilized.

For nearly a thousand years a small group of proponents have argued for a different translation of Genesis 1:1.³ According to this view, Genesis 1:1

should be rendered with a dependent clause and should be subordinate to either Genesis 1:2a or Genesis 1:3.⁴ Furthermore, within this last century, this dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1 has gained a larger following, and some translational traditions have even updated older versions to reflect it. Consider the following examples:

Protestant Translational Tradition

¹In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. ²The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters. ³And God said, "Let there be light" (RSV, 1952)

¹In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, ²the earth was a formless void and darkness covered the face of the deep, while a wind from God swept over the face of the waters. ³Then God said, "Let there be light" (NRSV, 1989)

Jewish Translational Tradition

¹IN THE beginning God created the heaven and the earth. ²Now the earth was unformed and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God hovered over the face of the waters. ³And God said: 'Let there be light.' (JPS, 1917)

¹ All biblical citations from the original languages, including the passages from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, are provided by *BibleWorks 6.0*. [CD ROM] (2003).

² Many scholars of varying positions refer to this reading of the passage as the traditional translation and interpretation. Westermann, however, contends that this interpretation is not traditional. See Westermann (1990, 95).

³ The Medieval Jewish scholars Rashi (d. 1105) and Ibn Ezra (d. 1164) are the first known proponents of this alternate translation.

⁴ If the dependent clause of Genesis 1:1 is subordinate to Genesis 1:3, then Genesis 1:2 is usually treated parenthetically. Cf. the NJV.

¹When God began to create heaven and earth—²the earth being unformed and void, with darkness over the surface of the deep and a wind from God sweeping over the water—³God said, “Let there be light” (NJV, 1985)

Catholic Translational Tradition

¹In the beginning God created heaven, and earth.
²And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved over the waters. ³And God said: Be light made. (DRA, 1899)⁵

¹In the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth, ²the earth was a formless wasteland, and darkness covered the abyss, while a mighty wind swept over the waters. ³Then God said, “Let there be light,” (NAB, 1970)

This change in translation produces a change in interpretation. No longer is Genesis 1:1 the first act of creation. Rather, Genesis 1:1, along with 1:2, describe the context in which the first act of creation takes place: the creation of light in Genesis 1:3.⁶ According to this interpretation then, the elements of Genesis 1:2 were already present before God began creating. Thus, one can logically conclude that since these elements, which God utilized in his later work of creation, were in existence before God’s first act of creation, the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* is not implicit in the text. Orlinsky, a proponent of the dependent-clause translation and a translator of the NJV, states,

The implications of the new, correct rendering [of Genesis 1:1 as a dependent clause] are clear. The Hebrew text tells us nothing about “creation out of nothing” (*creatio ex nihilo*), or about the beginning of time; it has nothing to say about the order of creation, so far as heaven, earth, darkness, deep, wind, or water are concerned. Indeed, the last four elements are not even described as having been created by God; the text merely asserts that these elements were present when God began to create the universe. What, then, constituted the first act of creation, if it wasn’t any of heaven, earth, darkness, etc.? The text, once again gives us the answer directly, in verse 3: “(when God began to create the heaven and the earth...) God said,

‘Let there be light’; and there was light.” In other words, the first thing God did when he created the world was to create light... Naturally, there are those who are upset by this old-new interpretation. “When did time begin?” they ask. “What existed in the beginning? Who created the darkness and the water and the deep? And is there no longer any beginning? And what happens to the theological concept of *creatio ex nihilo*?” And so on. Now every scholar or committee of scholars that assumes the responsibility of producing an authorized translation of the Bible for members of a religious group is aware of the difficulties that may arise as a consequence of the translation achieved for such “delicate” passages as Genesis 1:1–3. But the reply by the biblical scholar to such questions can only be: We know only what the Hebrew text of the Bible tells us. If the ancient Hebrew writer did not think about these things, or if he did, did not care to bother his readers with them, it is not for us to read into his text what he did not put into it; and anyone who does this is simply not being faithful to his biblical Hebraic source. (Orlinsky 1966, xv)

As is clear in the case of Genesis 1:1, translation affects interpretation, and interpretation affects theology; yet, what is the reasoning for this alternate translation?

Thesis

In the debate over the proper translation of Genesis 1:1, the major issue is whether the word *בְּרֵאשִׁית* is in the absolute or construct state. If *בְּרֵאשִׁית* is a construct, then it is in construct with the verb *בָּרָא* and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1,⁷ and the verse should be rendered with a dependent clause. Naturally, this is the argument of the dependent-clause translation. If *בְּרֵאשִׁית* is an absolute, then it is not in construct with *בָּרָא* and the ensuing clause, and the verse should be rendered with an independent main clause. This is the argument of the traditional translation.⁸

However, proponents of the dependent-clause translation raise two main linguistic challenges to the possibility of the traditional translation: one at the lexical level, the other at the grammatical level.⁹

⁵ This is the Douay-Rheims American Edition (DRA). Unlike the later NAB, the DRA is translated mostly from the Vg rather than Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. See Bruce (1970, 113).

⁶ For an early modern treatment of this view, see Skinner (1951).

⁷ This would make the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1 a genitive substantival clause with *בְּרֵאשִׁית* functioning as its *nomen regens*. See Joüon and Muraoka (2008, § 129p.)

⁸ Lane also states, “The question whether verse 1 is a complete sentence or only a dependent clause is centered in the syntactical interpretation of the first word, *bārē(‘)šīt*. If the noun *rē(‘)šīt* is in the absolute state, verse 1 contains a complete thought and is an independent clause or sentence. If, on the other hand, it is in the construct state, verse 1 is not a complete thought and forms a temporal clause which must be completed by either verse 2 or 3.” Lane (1963, 66).

⁹ The term “grammar” can have several meanings that are both narrow and broad. This article uses the term “grammar” in its narrow sense according to following definition given by Miriam Webster’s online dictionary: “The study of classes of words, their inflections, and their functions and relations in the sentence.”

First, at the lexical level, they challenge that the word **רֵאשִׁית** always has a relative meaning, the beginning *of*. Since its meaning is always relative, its rendering in Genesis 1:1 cannot be in the absolute state, but must be in the construct state.¹⁰ Second, at the grammatical level, they challenge that if **בְּרֵאשִׁית** in Genesis 1:1 were in the absolute state and also definite, in *the* beginning, the word be pointed with an articular *qamets*, **בְּרֵאשִׁית**, rather than with a vocal *sheva*.¹¹ Since, however, **רֵאשִׁית** is pointed with a vocal *sheva*, it is further evidence that the word is in the construct state.¹² Both of these linguistics challenges do raise serious objections to the traditional translation. This article, however, contends that the traditional translation of Genesis 1:1 is linguistically possible because **רֵאשִׁית** in Genesis 1:1 is functioning as a lexically relative yet grammatically absolute Hebrew relator noun.

The Lexical Level

The Relative Meaning of **רֵאשִׁית**

Before exploring the linguistic traits of Hebrew relator nouns, one must first understand the lexical dilemma that proponents of the dependent-clause translation charge against the traditional translation. When they argue that **רֵאשִׁית** has a relative meaning, they are describing its tendency to be semantically related to another word or concept. Skinner states, “The [independent-clause] construction seems to me, however, opposed to the essentially relative idea of [**רֵאשִׁית**],—its express reference to *that of which* it is the beginning” (Skinner 1951, 13, n.1). Simpson also states, “But the Hebrew *bʿrēshîth* seems to mean ‘in the beginning of’ rather than in the beginning, and this requires that vs. 1 should be taken with vs. 3—on vs. 2 see below—and rendered, ‘In the beginning of God’s creating the heavens and the earth, God said, etc.’” (Simpson and Bowie, 1952, 466). Finally, Orlinsky adds, “The very first word, *bʿreshith*, as every student of biblical Hebrew knows, means ‘In

the beginning of,’ with the word or phrase that follows indicating the object (as in ‘In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah’—Jeremiah 26:1, KJV)” (Orlinsky 1983). Thus, according to these scholars, if **בְּרֵאשִׁית** has a relative meaning then it should be rendered as “In the beginning of,” which would make the word a grammatical construct.

In order to defend the absolute rendering of **בְּרֵאשִׁית** as “In the beginning,” many proponents of the traditional translation argue that in Genesis 1:1 the word has an absolute meaning (Childs 1960; Eichrodt 1962, 1–10; Hasel 1971, 158; Ridderbos 1958, 218; Westermann 1990, 98).¹³ They often cite Isaiah 46:10a as evidence of this claim.¹⁴ It states the following:

מְגִיד מֵרֵאשִׁית אַחֲרֵית וּמִקֶּדֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא-נַעֲשׂוּ

declaring from the beginning, the end, and from before, that which has not been done,

In this verse, the word **מֵרֵאשִׁית** is in the absolute state and seems to be both lexically and grammatically comparable to the use of **רֵאשִׁית** in Genesis 1:1. In addition, many modern bible translations render the word **מֵרֵאשִׁית** in Isaiah 46:10a as “from the beginning,” not “from the beginning of.”¹⁵ Thus, Isaiah 46:10a seems to demonstrate that the word can have an absolute meaning.¹⁶

However, scholars of the dependent-clause translation argue that even though the occurrences of **רֵאשִׁית** in Isaiah 46:10a and Genesis 1:1 may appear to be grammatically parallel, **מֵרֵאשִׁית** in Isaiah 46:10a has a lexically relative meaning. Therefore, it cannot function as a lexical parallel to the alleged absolute meaning of **רֵאשִׁית** in Genesis 1:1. Humbert states,

On constate donc qu’au sens proprement temporel le substantif *rēšîl* ne figure qu’une seule fois à l’état absolu: Es. 46:10. La possibilité théorique de

¹⁰ Thus, it is in construct with **בְּרֵאשִׁית** and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1, which again creates a dependent clause.

¹¹ Since there is no morphological difference between the construct and absolute forms of **רֵאשִׁית**, one must use the pointing of the preposition **בְּ** to determine whether **בְּרֵאשִׁית** may be absolute or construct. (Cf. Neh 12:44 where the absolute form of **רֵאשִׁית** is pointed with an articular *qamets*. Unfortunately this example can only be a morphological parallel to **רֵאשִׁית** and not a lexical or grammatical parallel since it is not a temporal use of the word.)

¹² The *rectum* of the alleged construct chain, **בְּרֵאשִׁית** and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1, would, through context, already make the *regens*, **רֵאשִׁית**, definite, so no article would be needed to indicate definiteness. Thus, if **בְּרֵאשִׁית** is in the construct state, the lack of the articular *qamets* is expected.

¹³ This article, which defends the traditional translation, rejects the notion that **בְּרֵאשִׁית** has an absolute meaning. As will be seen further on, it is not necessary for **בְּרֵאשִׁית** to be absolute in meaning in order to be grammatically absolute.

¹⁴ König states, “Denn auch andere Adverbia stehen im absoluten Sinne, wie ich durch eine eingehendere Untersuchung festgestellt habe. Man vergleiche nur *mêrēschîth* (Jes. 46 10) im absoluten Sinne = „von Uranfang an.“ (For other adverbs, without the article, are in the absolute sense as I have found through a more thorough investigation. One need only compare *mêrēschîth* [Isa 46:10] in the absolute sense = “From the very beginning.”) (König 1919, 130). Wenham also states, “Nor can it be shown that **רֵאשִׁית** may not have an absolute sense. It may well have an absolute sense in Isaiah 46:10, and the analogous expression **מֵרֵאשִׁית** in Prov 8:23 certainly refers to the beginning of all creation. The context of **מֵרֵאשִׁית** standing at the start of the account of world history makes an absolute sense highly appropriate here” (Wenham 1987, 12). See also Matthews (1996, 137 n. 99, 138 n. 103).

¹⁵ Cf. NASB, NIV, NJPS, NAV, NRSV.

¹⁶ This is the only other passage in the Bible in which the temporal use of **רֵאשִׁית** is grammatically absolute.

construire absolument un *rēšit* temporel existe donc, mais ce passage mérite d'être considéré de plus près. D'abord, guidés par un sûr instinct, les LXX y traduisent *mērēšit* par ἀναγγέλλων πρότερον τὰ ἔσχατα, c'est à dire qu'ils entendaient *mērēšit* adverbiallement («d'avance») et, au fond, relativement (=d'avance par rapport à autre chose), et non point au sens vraiment absolu de «au commencement». Ensuite, dans le TM lui-même, il y a un rapport de corrélation évidente entre *mērēšit* et *aḥarīt* qui undiquent terminus a quo et terminus ad quem d'un certain laps de temps (cp. aussi le couple *rēšit*... *aḥarīt* dans Job 8,7; 42,12; Eccl. 7,8), temps conçu de façon passablement concrète d'ailleurs vu le parallélisme de *aḥarīt* avec *ašer lō' na'asū*. Or qui dit corrélation dit relation, implicite à tout le moins : par conséquent le *sens* même de *rēšit* dans Es. 46,10 est au fond relatif, même si la *construction* ne l'est pas et si *rēšit* est à l'état absolu. Le passage Es. 46:10 ne peut donc pas être légitimement invoqué en faveur d'un sens temporel absolu de *berēšit* dans Gen 1,1 qui reste donc, finalement, sans exemple. (Humbert 1955, 86–87)¹⁷

According to Humbert the word מְרֵאִשִׁית in Isaiah 46:10a still refers to the beginning of something; which makes it relative in meaning.¹⁸

The strength of Humbert's argument is that because מְרֵאִשִׁית in Isaiah 46:10a has a relative meaning, there is no parallel evidence that בְּרֵאִשִׁית in Genesis 1:1 has an absolute meaning. Thus, based upon the weight of the evidence, the word should have a relative meaning in Genesis 1:1 as well. If בְּרֵאִשִׁית is lexically relative, then according to proponents of the dependent-clause translation, it should be rendered as “In the beginning of,” and should be in construct with the verb בָּרָא and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1. If the word is in construct with the verb בָּרָא and the ensuing clause, then Genesis 1:1 should be rendered as a dependent clause. If this line of reasoning is sound, then the evidence as a whole seems to support the dependent-clause translation.

However, there seems to be some faulty reasoning from proponents of both translational positions. Proponents of the traditional translation who argue

that רֵאִשִׁית in Genesis 1:1 has an absolute meaning, hoping to sustain their argument that the word is grammatically absolute, have done themselves a disservice. How can a word like רֵאִשִׁית, if it is rendered as “beginning,” have an absolute meaning? How can it refer to a beginning that is unrelated to anything? The very nature of the word requires that it refer to the beginning of something. If it refers to the beginning of something, then its meaning is relative to that something. A beginning that is unrelated to anything is the beginning of nothing, and it is thus not a beginning. On the other hand, proponents of the dependent-clause translation, who argue that the relative meaning of רֵאִשִׁית requires the word to be in grammatical construct, have also done themselves a disservice because the evidence only demonstrates that רֵאִשִׁית has a relative meaning. It does not demonstrate that a relative meaning requires the word to be rendered as “the beginning of.” In fact, the Isaiah 46:10a passage is still a strong parallel to Genesis 1:1 since the verse demonstrates that the word רֵאִשִׁית can be relative in meaning yet grammatically absolute. As stated previously in the thesis of this article, the word רֵאִשִׁית is actually one of several types of Hebrew relator nouns, and when its usage is compared to that of other relator nouns, the evidence demonstrates that it is common for a relator noun like רֵאִשִׁית to be both lexically relative and grammatically absolute.

Defining and Identifying Relator Nouns

Before demonstrating that relator nouns can be lexically relative and grammatically absolute, one must first define what a relator noun is and identify examples of them. In an article dealing with adpositions, DeLancey describes relator nouns in the following manner:

Relator noun categories are frequently the topic of discussion, and sometimes extended controversy, as to whether they are nouns or adpositions. For all the confusions that they seem to engender, relator nouns are not an unfamiliar phenomenon to anyone, being easily recognized in such unexotic languages as French and English. Since each of these languages

¹⁷ The translation is, “We note therefore that in the strictly temporal sense, the substantive *rēšit* only appears one time in the absolute state: Isaiah. 46:10. The theoretic possibility of constructing a temporal *rēšit* in an absolute manner exists therefore, but this passage merits closer consideration. First of all, guided by instinct, the LXX translate *mērēšit* by ἀναγγέλλων πρότερον τὰ ἔσχατα, that is to say that they understood *mērēšit* adverbially [‘from before’] and, at the end, relatively [= from before in relation to another thing], and not at all in the absolute sense of “in the beginning.” Then, in the MT itself, there is a correlation connection evident between *mērēšit* and *aḥarīt* that indicates a terminus a quo and a terminus ad quem of a certain lapse of time [cf. also the pair *rēšit*... *aḥarīt* in Job 8:7; 42:12; Eccl. 7:8], time conceived in a fairly concrete fashion as seen elsewhere in parallelism to *aḥarīt* with *ašer lō' na'asū*. Now what says correlation says relation, all the less implicit: consequently, the sense even of *rēšit* in Isaiah 46:10 is relative in the end, even if the construction is not relative and even if *rēšit* is in the absolute state. The passage Isaiah 46:10 cannot be therefore legitimately called upon in favor of the absolute temporal sense of *berēšit* in Genesis 1:1, which remains, therefore, without example.” Lane goes so far as to argue that the translation “declaring the end from the beginning” in Isa 46:10a is inaccurate. See Lane 1963, 67.

¹⁸ Even Ridderbos, a proponent of the traditional translation, grants Humbert this claim; however, he still argues that רֵאִשִׁית has an absolute meaning in Genesis 1:1. See Ridderbos 1958, 218.

has a robust and thriving adposition category, relator nouns constitute a relatively marginal category, but a number of them are quite frequent in occurrence and encode fairly basic concepts: à *côté de*, on *top of*, in *front/back of*, etc. Such constructions can be a source of new prepositions, e.g. English *atop* < *on top of*, *beside* < *by side of*. In languages which invest less in a lexical category of adpositions, relator nouns may constitute a substantial and important category. (DeLancey 2005, 190)

In general, relator nouns are nouns that are semantically dependent upon other words to complete their meanings. They can also be grammatically dependent upon those words—usually by means of the preposition “of” in English or the construct state in Hebrew. This dependency explains why relator nouns, by nature, have a relative meaning.

Once relator nouns are defined, they are easy to identify. English words, such as front, back, middle, side, end, and beginning are all relator nouns because their meanings are relative to other words or concepts in a sentence. For instance, if the word “book” is lexically and grammatically related to these English relator nouns, then their meanings become relative to and dependent upon that word: the front of the book, the back of the book, the middle of the book, the side of the book, the end of the book, the beginning of the book. Without the word “book” these relator nouns would be empty of meaning: The front of what? The back of what? The middle of what? The side of what? The end of what? The beginning of what?

Relator nouns are easily identifiable in Hebrew as well. They include such words as *פְּנֵה*, *אָחוֹר*, *חֹץ*, *בֵּית*, *רֵאשִׁית*, *אֲחֵרִית*, *רֵאשׁ*, *יָמִין*, *שְׂמֹאל*, *בֵּית*. They exhibit the common traits of relator nouns in that they are also lexically relative to other words or concepts to complete their meanings.¹⁹ Again, because of their relative nature, these nouns are most commonly found in grammatical construct with other words.²⁰ The following analysis demonstrates these traits in the Hebrew relator nouns.²¹

The relator nouns *פְּנֵה* and *אָחוֹר*.

The relator nouns *פְּנֵה* and *אָחוֹר* describe spatial relationships between themselves and the things to which they are semantically related, referring to the front, *פְּנֵה*, or the back, *אָחוֹר*, of the related word or concept. In the following examples they are lexically

and grammatically relative to such words as *מִשְׁכַּן*, *אֹהֶל*, *בַּיִת*, *קֹדֶשׁ*, *פְּרָכֶת*, and *אֹהֶל*.

Exodus 26:12

וְכַפֵּלְתָּ הָעֶרְוָה בִּירֵיעַת הָאֹהֶל חֲצֵי הָעֶרְוָה הַנִּשְׁבְּרָה עַל אַחֲרֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן:
And the leftover excess in the curtains of the tent, the half of the curtain that is left over, will run over the **back of** the tabernacle.

Exodus 26:9b

וּכְפַלְתָּ אֶת-הָעֶרְוָה הַשְּׁשִׁית אֶל-מִוֶּלֶד פְּנֵי הָאֹהֶל:
And you shall double over the sixth curtain to the opposite of the **front of** the tent.

Leviticus 4:6

וְטָבַל הַכֹּהֵן אֶת-אֶצְבְּעוֹ בְּדָמָם וַהֲזִיחַ מִן-הַדָּמִים שֶׁבַע פְּעֻמִּים לְפָנֵי יְהוָה אֶת-פְּנֵי פְרֹכֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ:
And the priest shall dip his finger into the blood, and seven times he shall sprinkle the **front of** the veil of the sanctuary before the LORD.

Ezekiel 41:21

הַהֵיכָל מְזוּחָת רִבְעָה וּפְנֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ הַמִּזְרָאֵה כְּמִזְרָאֵה:
The door frames of the temple and the **front of** the sanctuary were square, the appearance of *one being* like the appearance of *the other*.

Ezekiel 47:1a

וַיִּשְׁבְּעֵנִי אֶל-פֶּתַח הַבַּיִת וְהַנְּהַרְמִים יָצְאוּ מִתַּחַת מַסְתַּן הַבַּיִת קְדִימָה כִּי-פָנֵי הַבַּיִת קְדִימִים:
And he returned me to the opening of the temple, and behold, waters were coming out from under the threshold of the temple toward the east because the **front of** the temple was *facing* eastward.

In his description of relator nouns, DeLancey states that there is sometimes controversy over whether relator nouns should be categorized as prepositions. With respect to *אָחוֹר* and *פְּנֵה*, one may ask whether these words should also be categorized as prepositions. The question, however, would fail for two reasons. First, there are already lexically similar prepositions, *אֲחֵרִי* and *לְפָנֵי*, that probably developed from these relator nouns. Second, although the relator nouns *אָחוֹר* and *פְּנֵה* and the prepositions *אֲחֵרִי* and *לְפָנֵי* have very similar, almost interchangeable, meanings, the relator nouns can also be used in instances in which they do not need to be *grammatically* related to another word.²² The prepositions do not function in this manner.

¹⁹ This trait explains why proponents of the dependent-clause translation argue that *רֵאשִׁית* has a relative meaning and should be translated with the preposition “of,” making it relative to the word *בְּרֵאשׁ* and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1.

²⁰ Although Hebrew relator nouns are usually in construct with the words to which they are semantically related, some are grammatically linked to their related words by the preposition *לְ*. Cf. 2 Kings 23:13; Ezekiel 10:3; Joshua 15:21; Nahum 2:10; 3:3.

²¹ The following examples of relator nouns have been translated as literally as possible to bring out their relative meanings.

²² Cf. 2 Chronicles 13:13–14.

Zechariah 4:3³¹

וְהָיוּ שְׁנֵי זֵיתִים עֲלֶיהָ אֶחָד מִיְמֵינֵי הַבֵּל וְאֶחָד עַל שְׂמאלָהּ:

And there were two olive trees beside it, one on the **right side of** the bowl and the other on the **left side of** it.

1 Chronicles 6:24

וְאָחִיו אֲסָף הַעֲבָד עַל-יְמֵינוֹ אֲסָף בֶּן-בְּרִכְיָהוּ בֶן-שִׁמְעָא:

And his brother, Asaph, was standing by the **right side of** him, Asaph the son of Berechiah son of Shimea.

2 Samuel 2:21a

וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אֲבִנֶר שָׁה לְךָ עַל-יְמִינֶךָ אוֹ עַל-שְׂמאלֶךָ וְאָחִיו לְךָ אֶחָד בְּדֹנְעֵימִים

And Abner said to him, “Turn yourself to the **right side of** you or to the **left side of** you and I take one of the young men for you.”

The words *שְׂמאל* and *יְמִין* do not always act as relator nouns. They can also refer to the actual left hand or the right hand of a person,³² in which instances they are regular nouns. The previous verses, however, demonstrate that the nouns also act relationally, referring to the right side or left side of a thing or person.³³ Unlike prepositions, these relator nouns can also be used in sentences in which they are not grammatically related to another word.

אֶחָרִית and ראש relator nouns

The relator nouns *אֶחָרִית* and *ראש* describe temporal relationships between themselves and the things to which they are semantically related, usually referring to the beginning, *ראש*, or the end *אֶחָרִית* of the related word or concept. In the following examples, they are lexically and grammatically relative to such things as *הַתִּיכּוֹנָה*, *הָאֶשְׁמֶרֶת הַתִּיכּוֹנָה*, *שָׁנָה*, *דְּבָר*, and *הָ*.³⁴

Judges 7:19a

וַיָּבֹא גִדְעוֹן וּמֵאה אִישׁ אִשְׂרָאֵל בְּקֶדֶה הַמִּזְחָה רֹאשׁ הָאֶשְׁמֶרֶת הַתִּיכּוֹנָה

And Gideon, and the one hundred men with him, came into the outskirts of the camp at the **beginning of** the middle watch.

Ezekiel 40:1a

בְּעֶשְׂרִים וָחֲמֵשׁ שָׁנָה לְגָלוּתֵנוּ בְּיֶאֱשׁ הַשְּׁנָה בְּעֶשְׂרִי לַחֹדֶשׁ

In the twenty-fifth year of our exile, in the **beginning of** the year on the tenth day of the month,

Deuteronomy 11:12³⁵

אֲרֵץ אֲשֶׁר-יְחַדְּךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ דָּשׁ אֹתָהּ וְיִבְרַח עֵינֵי יְחִידָהּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּהַ מְנַשִּׁית הַשְּׁנָה וְעַד אֶחָרִית שָׁנָה:

a land for which the LORD your God cares, the eyes of the LORD your God are continually upon it; from the beginning of the year until the **end of** the year.

Ecclesiastes 7:8³⁶

טוֹב אֶחָרִית דְּבַר מְרֵאשִׁיתוֹ טוֹב אֶרְךָ-רוּחַ מִגְבוּהַ-רוּחַ:

The **end of** a matter is better than the beginning of it, and patience of spirit is better than pride of spirit.

Amos 8:10

וְהִפַּכְתִּי חַנוּכֹּתֵיכֶם לְאֵבֶל וְכָל-שִׁירְיֹכֶם לְקִנָּה וְהִעַלְתִּי עַל-כָּל-מִזְבְּחֵיכֶם שֶׁן וְעַל-כָּל-רֹאשׁ קָרְחָה וְעַמְתִּיהָ כָּאֵבֶל יוֹדֵד וְאֶחָרִיתָהּ כְּיוֹם מָוֶה:

And I will turn your festivals into mourning and all your songs to dirges, and I will put sack cloth upon all loins and baldness upon all heads, and I will make it as the mourning of an only *child*, and the **end of** it will be as a day of bitterness.

These verses demonstrate that temporal relator nouns are less restrictive in their lexical relationships than spatial relator nouns. For instance, in Ecclesiastes 7:8, the word to which *אֶחָרִית* is semantically and grammatically related, *דְּבַר*,³⁷ does not have a specific meaning. Thus, the meaning to which *אֶחָרִית* is actually related is communicated in the context of the passage instead of by the word to which it is grammatically linked.³⁸ Also in Amos 8:10, the pronominal suffix *הָ*—of the relator noun *אֶחָרִית* seems to be an inclusive reference to the end of all the events described in Amos 8:8–10. Thus, even though *אֶחָרִית* is grammatically related to the suffix, it is semantically related to the series of events expressed in the context.³⁹ Since *אֶחָרִית* can be semantically related to a series of events, it seems plausible that

³¹ This verse and the previous seem to show that the prepositions *מִן* and *עַל* are interchangeable in meaning when used with *שְׂמאל* and *יְמִין*.

³² Cf. Genesis 48:14; Judges 5:26; Psalms 21:9; 26:10; 74:11; 89:14, 26; 138:7; 139:10; 144:11; Song of Solomon 2:6; 8:3; Isaiah 48:13; Daniel 12:7, but also cf. Genesis 48:17; Judges 3:15, 21; 7:20; 20:16; 2 Samuel 20:9; Psalm 73:23; 121:5; Jeremiah 22:24 Ezekiel 39:3 where the nouns *שְׂמאל* and *יְמִין* are actually in construct with the word *יָד*.

³³ N.b. especially how the two relator nouns further define the less-specific relator noun *אֶצֶל* in Nehemiah 8:4. Cf. also 1 Kings 7:39 where the relator nouns further define the less-specific relator noun *כְּתֵף*.

³⁴ For more examples of *ראש* referring to the beginning of something, see Exodus 12:2; Numbers 10:10; 28:11; Lamentations 2:19. For more examples of *אֶחָרִית* referring to the end of something see Genesis 49:1; Numbers 23:10; 24:14; Deuteronomy 4:30; 32:20; Psalms 37:38; 73:17; Proverbs 14:12; 16:25; Isaiah 2:2; 47:7; Jeremiah 5:31; 23:20; Lamentations 1:9; Ezekiel 23:25; 38:16; Daniel 8:19; 11:4; Hosea 3:5; Amos 4:2; 9:1; Micah 4:1. N.b. especially Numbers 24:20; Job 8:7; 42:12, where *אֶחָרִית* and *רֵאשִׁית* occur together as an antonymic, relator noun pair.

³⁵ N.b. the use of *רֵאשִׁית* in this sentence.

³⁶ N.b. the use of *רֵאשִׁית* in this sentence as well.

³⁷ The relator nouns *אֶחָרִית*, *אֶשְׁרִית*, and *ראש* may be semantically and implicitly related to this word when no other concept is specified in the context of their passages (cf. Genesis 1:1; Isaiah 41:4, 26; 46:10; 48:16).

³⁸ N.b. that the same applies to the relator noun *רֵאשִׁית*.

³⁹ Cf. also Isaiah 47:7; Jeremiah 5:31.

ראשית may function in a similar manner in Genesis 1:1.⁴⁰

The relator noun ראשית.

The relator noun ראשית also describes temporal relationships between itself and the things to which it is semantically related, usually referring to the beginning of the related word or concept. It can be lexically and grammatically relative to such things or people as שנה (Deuteronomy 11:12), איוב (Job 8:7; 42:12), חכמה (Psalm 111:10; Proverbs 4:7), דעת (Proverbs 1:17), דרך (Proverbs 8:22), מדון (Proverbs 17:14), דבר (Ecclesiastes 7:8), ממלכות (Jeremiah 26:1; 27:1; 28:1; 49:34), and חטאת (Micah 1:13).⁴¹ Thus, ראשית is a relator noun, and it most likely has a relative meaning, even in Genesis 1:1.

The semantic dependence of the words פנה, אחור, חוץ, בית, שמאל, ימין, ראש, אחרית, and ראשית is what makes them relator nouns, and all of the cited examples demonstrate this trait. In most contexts these relator nouns would be empty of meaning if they were not semantically related to another word or concept. For example, if the relator noun ראש, “beginning,” is not semantically related to the phrase האשמרת התיכונה, “the middle watch,” in Judges 7:19a, then no reader would be able to determine what ראש is the beginning of. However, the main question to be asked now is since relator nouns are lexically relative, do they always have to be in grammatical construct? In other words, do relator nouns always have to be translated with the preposition “of”?

Grammatically Absolute Relator Nouns

Although relator nouns in general are both lexically and grammatically relative to another word, or in the case of some temporal relator nouns another concept, they can also be lexically relative to another word or concept while functioning as a grammatical absolute. Even in English, relator nouns do not have to be grammatically linked to another word. The most notable English example is the use of the relator noun “end” at the conclusion of a story. No English speaker argues that because the word “end” is relative in meaning, the phrase “The End” must be relative in form as well and changed to “The End of.” Furthermore, when reading the phrase “The End” at the completion of a book or movie, the English speaker does not ask, “The end of what?” The meaning to which the relator noun “end” is semantically related is implicit in context of the event. Thus, in English, relator nouns can be

both lexically relative and grammatically absolute. Similarly, relator nouns in Hebrew can also be both lexically relative and grammatically absolute. In other words, these Hebrew relator nouns, even though they are relative, can stand alone and are not required to be rendered with the preposition “of.”

The relator nouns פנה and אחור.

The relator nouns פנה and אחור can be relative in meaning and grammatically absolute, while still referring to the front, פנה, or the back, אחור, of a related word or concept. In the following examples they are lexically, but not grammatically, relative to such things or people as יואב, יהודה, and מגלת-ספר.

2 Samuel 10:9a

וַיֵּרָא יוֹאָב כִּי־הִתְחַמָּה אֵלָיו פְּנֵי הַמַּלְחָמָה מִפְּנִים וּמֵאֲחֹרַיִם

And Joab saw that the front of the battle was against him from the **front** and from the **back**.

1 Chronicles 19:10a

וַיֵּרָא יוֹאָב כִּי־הִתְחַמָּה פְּנֵי־הַמַּלְחָמָה אֵלָיו מִפְּנִים וּמֵאֲחֹרַיִם

And Joab saw that the front of the battle was against him **front** and **back**.

2 Chronicles 13:14a

וַיִּפְּגְוּ יְהוּדָה וַתִּגַּח לָהֶם הַמַּלְחָמָה מִפְּנִים וּמֵאֲחֹרַיִם

And Judah turned, and behold the battle was against him **front** and **back**.

Ezekiel 2:10a⁴²

וַיִּפְרֹשׂ אוֹתָהּ לְפָנָי וְהָיָא כְּתוּבָה בְּפָנִים וּמֵאֲחֹרַיִם

And he spread it out before him, and it was inscribed on the **front** and the **back**.

In 2 Chronicles 13:14 both nouns are clearly acting in the place of the prepositions אחר and לפני, which are also in relation to יהודה in 13:13. However, even though the two nouns are relative in meaning to יהודה they are grammatically absolute. In other words, they have a relative meaning, but are not rendered with the preposition “of.”

The relator nouns חוץ and בית.

The relator nouns חוץ and בית can be relative in meaning and grammatically absolute, while still referring to the outside, חוץ, or the inside, בית, of a related word or concept. In the following examples they are lexically, but not grammatically, relative to such things as מחנה, עיר, תבה, and ארון.

⁴⁰ That is, of course, without the pronominal suffix ה.

⁴¹ ראשית is also paired with the relator noun אחרית in Job 42:12; Ecclesiastes 7:8; Isaiah 46:10.

⁴² פנה and אחור are semantically relative to מגלת-ספר in Ezekiel 2:9.

Deuteronomy 23:13–14a

יָרֵד תִּהְיֶה לָּךְ מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה וַיֵּצֵאתָ שָׁמָּה חוּץ
וַיִּתֵּן תִּהְיֶה לָּךְ עַל-אֹמֶק וְהָיָה בְּשִׁבְתְּךָ חוּץ וְרִפְרַתָּה בָּהּ
And there shall be a place for you outside of the
camp, and you will go out to there *on the outside*,
and there will be a spade for you among your tools,
and it will be, when you sit down *outside*, that you
will dig with it,

Genesis 19:16b–17a

וַיֹּצִיאוּ וַיִּצְהָרוּ מִחוּץ לְעִיר:
וַהֲיִי כְהוֹצִיאֵם אֹתָם הַחוּצָה וַיֹּאמֶר הַגֹּלֵל עַל-נַפְשֶׁךָ
And they brought him out and put him outside of the
city, and it came about, when they brought them to
the *outside*, that one said, “Flee for your life,

Ezekiel 7:15⁴³

וְהָיָה הַחֶרֶב בְּחוּץ וְהַדָּבָר וְהָרֶעַב מִבֵּית אֲשֶׁר בְּשָׂדֵה פָּדַד וַיָּמוּת וַאֲשֶׁר בְּעִיר רָעַב
וְדָבַר יִאֲבָלוּ:
The sword is on the *outside* and the plague and
famine are on the *inside* so that in the field, one
will die by the sword, and in the city another will be
devoured by famine and plague.

Genesis 6:14b

קָנִים תַּעֲשֶׂה אֶת-הַתֵּבָה וּכְפַרְתָּ אֹתָהּ מִבֵּית וּמִחוּץ בַּכֹּפֶר:
You will make the ark with cells, and you will cover it
from the *inside* and the *outside* with pitch.

Exodus 37:2a⁴⁴

וַיִּצְפְּרוּ חָיָב טָהוֹר מִבֵּית וּמִחוּץ
And he overlaid it with pure gold from the *inside*
and the *outside*.

In Deuteronomy 23:13–14a the relator noun *חוּץ* is used three times and has the exact same meaning in all three instances. However, in two of the instances the noun is grammatically absolute, but lexically relative to the word *מִחוּץ*.⁴⁵ Also, in Ezekiel 7:15 *חוּץ* and *בֵּית* are semantically, not grammatically, related to the word *עִיר*. The preposition *בְּ* is also semantically related to *עִיר*. Again, however, the preposition cannot be grammatically independent. Thus, the grammatically absolute and lexically relative *בֵּית* is used in its place and does not need to be translated with the preposition “of.”

The relator nouns *שְׂמאל* and *יְמין*.

The relator nouns *שְׂמאל* and *יְמין* can be relative in meaning and grammatically absolute, while still referring to the left side, *שְׂמאל*, or the right side, *יְמין*, of a related word or concept. In the following examples

they are lexically, but not grammatically, relative to such things and people as *מִזְבֵּחַ*, *הֵיכָל*, *הַיְמָן*, and *עֲשֵׂה־אֵל*.

2 Kings 12:10a

וַיִּקַּח יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהִים וַיִּקַּח חֹר בְּרִלְתוֹ וַתֵּן אֹתוֹ אֶצְלַת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
בְּיְמִין בְּבוֹאֵי-אִישׁ בֵּית יְהוָה
And Jehoida the priest took a chest and bore a hole into
its door and placed it on the side of the altar, on the
right side, as one is coming into the house of the LORD.

2 Chronicles 3:17a

וַיִּקֶם אֶת-הָעַמּוּדִים עַל-פְּנֵי הַהֵיכָל אֶת-יְמִין וְאֶת-מִזְבְּחוֹ
And he placed the pillars in front of the temple, one
on the *right side* and one on the *left side*.

1 Chronicles 6:29

וּבְנֵי מֵרָרִי אֲחֵיהֶם עַל-הַשְּׂמָאל אִתּוֹן בֶּן-קִישִׁי בֶן-מַלְלוּךְ:
And the sons of Merari, their brothers, were upon the
left side, Ethan son of Kishi, son of Abdi, son of Malluch,

2 Samuel 2:19

וַיִּדְרֹךְ עֲשָׂהֵל אַחֲרֵי אַבְנֵר לְלִבָּת עַל-הַיְמָן עַל-הַשְּׂמָאל נֹאדֵי אַבְנֵר:
And Asahel pursued after Abner and he did not
turn to go to the *right side* or the *left side* from
going after Abner.

In 2 Kings 12:10a the relator nouns *שְׂמאל* and *יְמין* further define the less specific relator noun *אֶצְלַת*, just as they do in Nehemiah 8:4. However, in 2 Kings 12:10a the relator nouns are grammatically absolute; whereas, in Nehemiah 8:4 they are in grammatical construct.⁴⁶ Also in 2 Chronicles 3:17 the phrase in which the relator nouns *שְׂמאל* and *יְמין* are used is nearly identical to the phrase in Zechariah 4:3. However, in 2 Chronicles 3:17 the relator nouns are grammatically absolute; whereas, in Zechariah 4:3 they are in grammatical construct. Finally, in 1 Chronicles 6:29 the grammatically absolute relator noun *שְׂמאל* is semantically related to *הַיְמָן* in 1 Chronicles 6:18, but in 1 Chronicles 6:24 its antonym *יְמין* is in grammatical construct with the pronoun whose antecedent is also *הַיְמָן*. Thus, rendering the relator nouns in 2 Kings 12:10a; 2 Chronicles 3:14; and 1 Chronicles 6:29 with the preposition “of” would be grammatically incorrect.

The relator nouns *ראש* and *אַחֲרִית*.

The relator nouns *ראש* and *אַחֲרִית* can be relative in meaning and grammatically absolute, while still referring to the beginning, *ראש*,⁴⁷ or the end, *אַחֲרִית*, of a related word or concept. However, the things to which they are semantically related are not always explicitly stated in the context of the passage.

⁴³ *עִיר* and *בֵּית* are both semantically related to the word *חוּץ*.

⁴⁴ *חוּץ* and *בֵּית* are semantically related to *אֲרוֹן* in Exodus 37:1.

⁴⁵ Cf. also the two uses of *חוּץ* in Genesis 19:16b–17.

⁴⁶ Cf. also 1 Kings 7:39 where the relator nouns further define the less-specific relator noun *כֶּתֶר* even though they are grammatically absolute.

⁴⁷ In all of the example passages in which a temporal *ראש* is used in the absolute grammatical state, the LXX translates the word with the Greek equivalent ἀρχή.

Proverbs 8:23⁴⁸

מֵעוֹלָם נִסְכַּחְתִּי מִרֵאשִׁית מִקְדְּמֵי־אָרֶץ:

From everlasting I have been established, from the **beginning**, from before the earth

Ecclesiastes 3:11b⁴⁹

גַּם אֶת־הָעֹלָם יָתֵן בְּלִבָּם נִפְלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִנְצֵא הָאִים אֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים מִרֵאשִׁית וְעַד־סוֹף:

Moreover, he has set eternity in their heart so that man will not find out the work which God does from **beginning** to end.

Isaiah 40:21⁵⁰

הֲלֹא חִדְעוּ הָאֱלֹהִים תַּעֲבֹדוּ הֲלֹא תִהְיֶה תִּהְיֶה מִרֵאשִׁית לָכֵן הֲלֹא יָבִינְתֶם נוֹסוֹת הָאָרֶץ: הֲלֹא חִדְעוּ הָאֱלֹהִים תַּעֲבֹדוּ הֲלֹא תִהְיֶה תִּהְיֶה מִרֵאשִׁית לָכֵן הֲלֹא יָבִינְתֶם נוֹסוֹת הָאָרֶץ: Have you not known? Have you not heard? Has it not been declared to you from the **beginning**? Have you not understood from the foundations of the earth?

Isaiah 41:4⁵¹

מִי־פָעַל וְעָשָׂה קִדָּה תְהוֹת מִרֵאשִׁית אֲנִי יְהוָה רֵאשִׁית וְאַחֲרָיִם אֲיִהוּא: מִי־פָעַל וְעָשָׂה קִדָּה תְהוֹת מִרֵאשִׁית אֲנִי יְהוָה רֵאשִׁית וְאַחֲרָיִם אֲיִהוּא: Who has done and made *this*, calling the generations from the **beginning**? *It is I*, the LORD, the first and the last. I am He.

Isaiah 41:26a⁵²

מִי־הִגִּיד מִרֵאשִׁית וְיִדְעָה וּמִלְפָּנִים וְנֹאמַר צְדִיק:

Who has declared it from the **beginning** that we might know and that we might say from former times, “You are righteous.”

Isaiah 48:16a⁵³

קִרְבוּ אֵלַי שְׁמַעוּ־זֹאת לֹא מִרֵאשִׁית בְּסֵתֶר דִּבְרֹתַי מִעַתָּה הִיחֹתָ שֵׁם אֲנִי קִרְבוּ אֵלַי שְׁמַעוּ־זֹאת לֹא מִרֵאשִׁית בְּסֵתֶר דִּבְרֹתַי מִעַתָּה הִיחֹתָ שֵׁם אֲנִי Draw near to me, listen to this, *for* from the **beginning** I have not spoken in secret. From the time of its being there, I *am*.

Isaiah 46:10a⁵⁴

מְגִיד מִרֵאשִׁית אֲדִיבִית וּמִקֶּדֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נַעֲשָׂה:

declaring from the beginning, the **end**, and from before, that which has not been done,

Ecclesiastes 10:13⁵⁵

תְּהִלַּת דְּבָרֵי־פִיהוּ סִכְלוּת וְאֲדִיבִית פִּיהוּ הוֹלָלוֹת רָעָה:

The beginning of the words of his mouth are folly and the **end of the words** of his mouth are evil madness.

These verses demonstrate that even temporal relator nouns can also be grammatically absolute even though they are lexically relative. However, even the meanings to which they are semantically related do not have to be explicitly stated in the verse; rather, the context of the passage as a whole supplies the general concept to which these nouns are semantically related.

The relator noun רֵאשִׁית

In Isaiah 46:10, the relator nouns רֵאשִׁית and אַחֲרֵית are grammatically absolute, but semantically related to a meaning that is implicit in the passage. As Humbert notes, the meanings of the words are semantically related to an unspecified *laps de temps* (lapse of time).⁵⁶ Like the English phrase “The End,” where the meaning of the relator noun is relative to a meaning implicit in the context of the event, the relator nouns רֵאשִׁית and אַחֲרֵית are relative to a meaning implicit in the context of Isaiah 46:10a. This implicit relationship in meaning is not lost on Hebrew speakers. Ramban, a Medieval Jewish rabbi, states, “But there is the verse [Isa 46:10] ‘Declaring the end from the beginning’ (mê-rê’shîth), and if he constructs (the word mê-rê’shîth) with dâbhâr (thing) understood, here too [in Gen 1:1] it can be constructed (with a word understood) in the same way” (Newman 1960, 33).⁵⁷ Thus, the passage of Isaiah 46:10a demonstrates that the noun רֵאשִׁית can be grammatically absolute and lexically relative to a meaning that is implicit in the context of the

⁴⁸ ראש may be semantically related to מִפְּעֻלָּיו in Proverbs 8:22. In general ראש may be semantically related to such implicit concepts as עֵת, “time,” or הַכֹּל, “everything,” which is used to refer to all of creation in Jeremiah 10:16. The text is not specific about the meaning to which ראש is semantically related; nevertheless, the meaning communicated by the verse as a whole is clear.

⁴⁹ ראש may be semantically related to the words הַכֹּל or בְּעֵתוֹ in Ecclesiastes 3:11a. In general ראש may be semantically related to such an implicit concept as דְּבָר, “thing or matter” (cf. Ecclesiastes 7:8).

⁵⁰ ראש may be semantically related to the events described in Isaiah 41:2, 3, and/or 25. In general ראש may be semantically related to such an implicit concept as דְּבָר, “thing or matter.”

⁵¹ The text gives no specifics about the thing to which ראש is semantically related; however, in general it may be semantically related to such implicit concepts as עֵת, “time,” הַכֹּל, “everything,” or דְּבָר, “thing or matter.”

⁵² ראש may be semantically related to the events described in Isaiah 41:2, 3, and/or 25. In general ראש may be semantically related to such an implicit concept as דְּבָר, “thing or matter.”

⁵³ ראש may be semantically related to the events described in Isaiah 48:14. In general ראש may be semantically related to such an implicit concept as דְּבָר, “thing or matter.”

⁵⁴ The text is not specific about the concept to which אַחֲרֵית is semantically related. In general אַחֲרֵית may be semantically related to דְּבָר, “thing or matter.”

⁵⁵ אַחֲרֵית seems to be semantically related to the word דְּבָרִי. The parallelism suggests that דְּבָרִי has been elided in the second colon.

⁵⁶ Cf. Ecclesiastes 7:8 where the two relator nouns are in grammatical construct, but are still lexically relative to something that is unspecified.

⁵⁷ Rashi, one of the first proponents of the dependent clause translation, also understands Isaiah 46:10a in the same sense (Rashi 1946, 2). Even the old Karaite scholars ‘Ali ben Suleimān and Ibn Janāh contemplate the relative nature of רֵאשִׁית and the implicit meaning to which it is semantically related in Genesis 1:1 (Skoss 1928, 93 n. 1.2).

passage.⁵⁸ It is a perfect parallel to the traditional translation of **רֵאשִׁית** in Genesis 1:1.

Lexical Conclusion

The preceding evidences demonstrate two things concerning relator nouns as a whole. First, contrary to the views of some scholars, a relative meaning for a relator noun does not require a “relative” construction or translation—i.e. “in the beginning of.” Relator nouns can be lexically relative yet grammatically absolute.⁵⁹ This phenomenon is typical of relator nouns and is neither a lexical nor a grammatical anomaly. Second, with respect to temporal relator nouns, the words or concepts to which they are semantically related do not have to be explicitly stated in the context of the passage. Like the English phrase “The End,” the relator noun’s context can supply the relational meaning implicitly. In the case of Genesis 1:1, the context tells the reader that the concept to which **רֵאשִׁית** is semantically related may be the universe, time, or the event of creation (“In the beginning of all things,” “In the beginning of time,” or “In the beginning of the creation event”).⁶⁰ It may be that the related concept is not specified because Genesis 1:1 describes, all at the same time, the beginning of the universe, time, and the creation event. Readers of the Hebrew and the traditional English translation of Genesis 1:1 can easily understand the “beginning” to be semantically related to such implicit concepts in the text.

The Grammatical Level

The absence of the definite article

Before returning to the linguistic traits of Hebrew relator nouns, one must also understand the grammatical dilemma that proponents of the

dependent-clause translation charge against the traditional translation. As stated earlier, if **רֵאשִׁית** is grammatically absolute and definite in meaning,⁶¹ one would also expect the word to be pointed with an articular *qamets*, **רֵאשִׁית**, rather than with a vocal shewa.⁶² However, if **רֵאשִׁית** is in construct with **רֵא** and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1, then one would expect **רֵאשִׁית** to be anarthrous and pointed as it is: with the vocal *shewa*.⁶³

To cite further evidence for this charge, proponents of the dependent clause translation frequently use Hosea 1:2a as a grammatical parallel, where the anarthrous noun **תְּחִלָּה** is in construct with the verb **דִּבֶּר** and the ensuing clause.⁶⁴ The passages states,

תְּחִלָּתָהּ דִּבְרַיְהוָה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל-הוֹשֵׁעַ לֵךְ קַח-לְךָ אִשָּׁת זְנוּנִים
When the LORD first spoke to Hosea, the LORD said to Hosea, “Go, get yourself a wife of whoredom,” (NJPS)

The strength of this example is that the structure of the passage is very similar to Genesis 1:1, and the *nomen regens* of the construct chain, **תְּחִלָּה**, is nearly identical to **רֵאשִׁית** in meaning.⁶⁵ Furthermore, almost all modern translations render Hosea 1:2a with a dependent temporal clause,⁶⁶ and some are nearly identical in structure to the dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1. For example the NIV renders Hosea 1:2a as “When the LORD began to speak through Hosea;”⁶⁷ the NJV renders Genesis 1:1 as “When God began to create heaven and earth.”

In order to show that an anarthrous **רֵאשִׁית** in Genesis 1:1 can still be grammatically absolute and definite in meaning proponents of the traditional translation frequently use König’s argument (König 1919. 130 n. 1),⁶⁸ that **רֵאשִׁית** is a type of temporal noun that is often anarthrous when functioning as an

⁵⁸ Wenham also seems to recognize the word’s relationship to a meaning implicit in the context. He states, “In temporal phrases [רֵאשִׁית] is most often used relatively, i.e., it specifies the beginning of a particular period, e.g., ‘From the beginning of the year’ (Deut 11:12) or ‘At the beginning of the reign of’ (Jer 26:1). More rarely, as [in Genesis 1:1], it is used absolutely, with the period of time left unspecified; only the context shows precisely when is meant, e.g., Isa 46:10. ‘Declaring the end from the beginning and from ancient times (מִקְדָּם) things not yet done’ (cf. Prov 8:22)” (Wenham 1987, 13–14).

⁵⁹ Skinner states, “But [the traditional translation] is not in accordance with the usage of רֵאשִׁית” (Skinner 1951, 13.) The cited examples of relator nouns demonstrate this statement to be incorrect.

⁶⁰ Even if **רֵאשִׁית** refers to the beginning of the world, or the cosmological first cause of the world, its meaning is still relative to that event. As a relator noun, **רֵאשִׁית** is empty of meaning until it is semantically related to something in the sentence or context, whether that thing is explicitly or implicitly stated.

⁶¹ As a relator noun, **רֵאשִׁית** must be semantically related to another word or concept. This semantic relationship makes relator nouns naturally definite, like the natural definiteness of cardinal numbers (see GKC § 134). Even if, on the rare occasion, the word or concept to which the relator noun is related is itself indefinite, the relator noun would still be definite because of its inherent semantic dependency. Consider Eccl 7:8, where the relator nouns **אֶחָדִים** and **רֵאשִׁית** are in construct with and semantically related to the indefinite word **דִּבֶּר**. Even though **דִּבֶּר** is indefinite, modern translations still render the relator nouns in this passage with definite articles. Thus, if **רֵאשִׁית** is a relator noun, it must be definite in meaning.”

⁶² Fn 11.

⁶³ Fn 12.

⁶⁴ N.b. the construct form of the noun **תְּחִלָּתָהּ** in this passage.

⁶⁵ Both words seem to be virtually interchangeable. Cf. Proverbs 4:7 with 9:10; Jeremiah 26:1 with Ezra 4:6; Isaiah 46:10 with Ecclesiastes 10:13.

⁶⁶ Cf. ESV, JPS, NASB, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, et al., but n.b. NAB, which seems to follow the rendering of the Vg.

⁶⁷ In Genesis 1:1 the NIV follows the traditional translation.

⁶⁸ Scholars who use König’s argument are the following: Heidel (1951, 92); Hasel (1971, 158–159); Westermann (1990, 96); Waltke(1975).

adverbial expression of time, like **ראש קדם**, and **עו לם**.⁶⁹ Thus, if **בראשית** is functioning in this manner in Genesis 1:1, then it would not have to be pointed with the articular *qamets*. König's argument, however, should be rejected for two reasons. First, it is fraught with many problems and doesn't necessarily explain why these types of words are frequently anarthrous. Second, there is a better explanation for why **בראשית** is pointed with a vocal *sheva* that is more reflective of the relator noun classification.

The complications of König's argument.

As König argues, the word **בראשית** can certainly be classified as a temporal noun; however, many problems arise when he classifies it with other types of temporal nouns. First, temporal nouns like **ראשית** and **ראש** are not lexically analogous to **קדם** and **עולם**. The former nouns frequently refer to specific moments or periods in time: the beginning of something. The latter refer to indefinite periods of time. For instance, the temporal noun **קדם** almost always refers to an unspecified, immeasurable period of past time, and the temporal noun **עולם** is so unspecific that it can refer to an indefinite period of past *or* future time.⁷⁰ Thus, a possible explanation for why both **קדם** and **עולם** can be both anarthrous and grammatically absolute is that they are lexically indefinite; an article would seem to imply a lexically definite meaning.⁷¹ Thus, these nouns cannot be used as examples to explain why a definite **בראשית** in Genesis 1:1 can be both anarthrous and grammatically absolute.

König and the proponents of his argument might then counter that **ראשית** in Genesis 1:1 also has a lexically indefinite meaning like that of **קדם** and **עולם**,⁷² but in all its temporal uses, whether in construct or absolute (Isaiah 46:10), **ראשית** always has a definite meaning, **קדם** and **עולם** never do. Furthermore, as a relator noun, the meaning of **ראשית** is always semantically related to another word or concept, which makes the word naturally definite even if it is not grammatically related to another word.⁷³ Anyone who might argue that **ראשית** has an indefinite meaning in Genesis 1:1 would have to argue that it has a non-relative

meaning, which seems antithetical to the relator noun concept.

Second, proponents of the dependent-clause translation challenge König's argument. They counter that the examples with which he compares **בראשית** are all taken from poetic texts which do not frequently use the definite article. Brown states,

In addition, all the examples of related words used absolutely but without the article (*mērōš* in Isa 40:21; 41:4, 26; 48:16; *miqqedem* in Isa 46:10; *mēvōlām* in Isa 46:9) are culled from poetic texts, which by nature tend to "omit" the articles for nouns considered definite. Thus, on methodological grounds alone the comparison of poetic texts with Genesis 1 is problematic when used to argue for the absolute function of *bērēšit* in Gen 1:1. **Indeed, the absence of the article still supports the interpretation of *bērēšit* as a construct.** [emphasis mine] (Brown 1993, 64)⁷⁴

Even though opponents raise this objection, proponents of König's argument rarely cite prose examples, even though they do exist and are a counter to this challenge.⁷⁵ However, if **ראש** and **ראשית** are not semantically analogous to **קדם** and **עולם**, then there are no other prose examples with which to compare **ראשית**. Isaiah 46:10 is a great parallel verse in which **ראשית** is grammatically absolute, definite in meaning, and anarthrous, but a proponent of the dependent-clause translation can easily argue that the word would have a definite article if it were not in a poetic passage.

Third, since the temporal nouns **ראשית** and **ראש** almost always refer to the beginning of something, they are much more comparable to the temporal relator noun **תחלה**, which at times is semantically interchangeable with **ראשית**.⁷⁶ The word's semantic proximity to **ראשית** and **ראש** makes it a better methodological candidate for grammatical comparison. However, this is a problem for König and the proponents of his argument because even though **תחלה** is often grammatically absolute, it always functions in this manner with the article, not without.⁷⁷ Thus, according to this bit of evidence, the lexically comparable **ראשית** should also have the article when it is grammatically absolute. The

⁶⁹ Cf. **ראש** (Isaiah 40:21; 41:4, 26; 48:16; Proverbs 8:23, Ecclesiastes 3:11); **קדם** (Micah 5:1; Habakkuk 1:12); **עולם** (Genesis 3:22; 6:3, 4; Psalm 90:2; Proverbs 8:23).

⁷⁰ See Brown, Driver, and Briggs (1907) and Koehler, Baumgartner, and Stamm (1994–1999), s.v. "עולם."

⁷¹ Even when it has the definite article, the word **עולם** has an indefinite meaning (cf. 1 Chronicles 16:36; Nehemiah 9:5; Psalms 41:14; 106:48).

⁷² Although most modern scholars do not make this argument for the traditional translation, this may have been the view of the targumic translators of Genesis 1:1 and the LXX translators of Isaiah 46:10.

⁷³ See fn 62.

⁷⁴ In order to counter this charge, Heidel suggests that the text of Genesis 1 may itself be more poetic than prosaic (Heidel 1951, 92 n. 41). However, no other proponents of the traditional translation seem to make this argument.

⁷⁵ Cf. **קדם** Nehemiah 12:46; **עולם** Genesis 3:22; 6:4; 13:15; Exodus 3:15; et al.

⁷⁶ Cf. Proverbs 4:7 with 9:10; Jeremiah 26:1 with Ezra 4:6; Isaiah 46:10 with Ecclesiastes 10:13.

⁷⁷ Genesis 13:3; 41:21; 43:18, 20; Judges 1:1; 20:18; 2 Samuel 17:9; Nehemiah 11:17; Isaiah 1:26; Daniel 8:1; 9:21.

evidence as a whole demonstrates the weakness of König's argument, which makes the plausibility of the traditional translation weak as well. However, there is a better explanation for why a lexically definite and grammatically absolute **בְּרֵאשִׁית** is not pointed an articular *gamets*.

Relator Nouns and the Hebrew Definite Article

The previous lexical discussion has already established that **רֵאשִׁית** is a relator noun. As shown earlier, the relator noun classification demonstrates that relator nouns, like **רֵאשִׁית**, can be grammatically absolute even though they are relative in meaning. This classification, however, can also explain why **בְּרֵאשִׁית** is pointed with a vocal *shewa* instead of an articular *gamets*.

Because relator nouns are relative in meaning to another word or concept, they are definite in meaning by nature.⁷⁸ The following verses will demonstrate, however, that when they function as grammatical absolutes they can frequently be found with or without the article in passages of both prose and poetry. Consider the use of the relator nouns **חוּץ** and **בֵּית**:

Ezekiel 7:15

הַדָּבָר הַחוּץ וְהַדָּבָר הַבָּיִת אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה פָּדַד יָמוֹת וְהָאִשֶׁר בְּעִיר רָעַב
וְהַדָּבָר יֵאָמֵר:

The sword is on the **outside** and the plague and famine are on *the inside* so that in the field, one will die by the sword, and in the city another will be devoured by famine and plague.

Lamentations 1:20b⁷⁹

מִנְּיָן הַמְּבִלְיוֹת טָפַף לְבָבִי בְּקִדְבִי כִּי נָדוּ מִדִּי מִחוּץ שָׂלַח הַדָּבָר בְּמִנְיָתִי:
my organs are in turmoil, my heart is turned within me for I have certainly rebelled. On *the outside* the sword makes childless, on the **inside** it is like death.

In these verses **חוּץ** and **בֵּית** are paired together, like they are in other passages,⁸⁰ and both are semantically related to the word **עִיר**. However, in both instances one relator noun is pointed with the article, but the other is not, even though both nouns are grammatically absolute and definite in meaning. Thus, the grammar of the passages demonstrates that a relator noun can be grammatically absolute and definite in meaning, but still be anarthrous.

Deuteronomy 23:13–14a⁸¹

וְיָד תְּהִיָּה לְךָ מְחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה וְיָצְאתָ שָׁמָּה חוּץ:
וְיָתֵד תְּהִיָּה לְךָ עַל-אֹמֶק וְהָיָה בְּשִׁבְתְּךָ חוּץ וְהִפְרַתָּה בָּהּ

And there shall be a place for you **outside** of the camp, and you will go out to there *on the outside*, and there will be a spade for you among your tools, and it will be when you sit down *on the outside*, you will dig with it,

In this example the relator noun **חוּץ** in the first clause of verse 13 is semantically and grammatically related to **מַחֲנֶה** and is clearly definite in meaning. However, in the latter half of verses 13 and 14, **חוּץ** is grammatically absolute, but still relative in meaning to **מַחֲנֶה**. However, in its grammatically absolute form, **חוּץ** is anarthrous even though it is definite in meaning. Again, the evidence demonstrates that an anarthrous relator noun can be grammatically absolute and definite in meaning.

The relator nouns **שְׂמֹאל** and **יְמִין** can also function in the same manner. Consider the following uses.

2 Samuel 2:21a

וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אַבְנֵר נְטָה לְךָ עַל-יְמִינְךָ אוֹ עַל-שְׂמֹאלְךָ וַיֵּאָדוּ לְךָ אֶחָד מִהַנְּעָרִים

And Abner said to him, “Turn yourself to the **right side** of you or to the **left side** of you and I will take one of the young men for you.”

2 Samuel 2:19

וַיִּדְרֹף עֲשׂוּרָאֵל אַחֲרֵי אַבְנֵר לִלְכֹת עַל-יְמִין וְעַל-שְׂמֹאל מֵאֲחֵרֵי אַבְנֵר:

And Asahel pursued after Abner and he did not turn to go to the **right side** or the **left side** from *going* after Abner

Numbers 20:17b

וְהָרַף הַמִּלְכָּד נֶלְךְ לֹא נְטָה יְמִין וְשְׂמֹאל עַד אֲשֶׁר-נִשְׁעַר גְּבֻלְךָ:

We will go the way of the king; we will not turn to *the right side* or *the left side* until we cross your territory.

Numbers 22:26

וַיֹּסֵף מִלְּאֲדֵי-יְהוָה עֲבֹד וַעֲבֹד בְּמִקְוֵם צָר אֲשֶׁר אֵין-דֶּרֶךְ לְשׁוֹת יְמִין וְשְׂמֹאל:

And the messenger of the LORD passed on further, and stood in the narrow place in which there is not a way to turn to *the right side* or *the left side*.

In these examples, the relator nouns **שְׂמֹאל** and **יְמִין** are used with the verb **נָטָה** to describe turning from the path either to the right side or the left side

⁷⁸ See fn 62.

⁷⁹ There are a couple of reasons to translate the verse in this manner. First, Lamentations 1:19 suggests that the speaker of this passage is referring to the inside and the outside of a city during a siege, not the inside of a house. Second, the parallel language of Ezekiel 7:15 (cf. also Deuteronomy 32:25) matches the situation described in Lamentations 1:19–20 exactly. There are those who die by the sword outside of the city and those who perish of famine inside. Although Lamentations 2:21 does describe death by the sword in the streets, the more technical form **חִוּצוֹת** is used in the passage rather than simply **חוּץ**.

⁸⁰ Genesis 6:14; Exodus 25:11; 37:2; 1 Kings 7:9.

⁸¹ The words “on the” are added to the translation to bring out the definiteness of the word **חוּץ**.

of oneself (cf. 2 Samuel 2:21). The Numbers passages, however, demonstrate that this word pair, when used in the same way with the same verb, can be grammatically absolute and definite in meaning even though both words are anarthrous.⁸²

1 Kings 7:39a

וַתֵּן אֶת־הַמְּבֹרֹטִים חֲמִשָּׁה עַל־פְּתָחַי הַבַּיִת מִשְׁמָאלוֹ
 And he placed the stands, five on the side of the temple on *the right side* and five upon the side of the temple on its *left side*.

2 Chronicles 3:17a

וַיָּקָם אֶת־הַעַמֻּדִים עַל־פְּנֵי הַחֵיכַל אֶחָד מִיְמִין וְאֶחָד מִשְׁמָאלוֹ
 And he placed the pillars in front of the temple, one on *the right side* and one on the *left side*.

Finally, both of these examples demonstrate that even though *שְׂמָאל* and *יְמִין* are used in exactly the same manner, *שְׂמָאל* is grammatically definite and *יְמִין* is not. Both, however, are definite in meaning, which again suggests that relator nouns can be both grammatically absolute and definite in meaning, yet anarthrous in form.

In addition to these passages, there are a number of verses in which a definite and grammatically absolute relator noun can be either articulated or anarthrous. The relator nouns *אָחוּז* and *פְּנָה* are always anarthrous when they are grammatically absolute (2 Samuel 10:9; 1 Chronicles 19:10; 2 Chronicles 13:14; Psalm 139:5; and Ezekiel 2:10). The relator nouns *חֻוץ* and *בַּיִת* can be pointed with the article when they are grammatically absolute (Genesis 9:22; 19:17; 24:31; 39:11; Exodus 21:19; Leviticus 18:9; Deuteronomy 24:11; 25:5; Judges 12:9; 19:25; 2 Samuel 13:18; 2 Kings 4:3; 2 Kings 10:24; Ezra 10:13; Job 31:32; Psalm 41:7; Proverbs 22:13; 24:27; Song of Solomon 8:1; Ezekiel 41:9, 17, 25; Hosea 7:1), but there are other passages in which they are anarthrous (Genesis 6:14; Exodus 12:46; 25:11; 37:2; Leviticus 14:41; Deuteronomy 23:13, 14; 32:25; 1 Kings 6:6, 15, 16; 7:9; Isaiah 33:7; Lamentations 1:20; Ezekiel 7:15; 40:5, 19; 46:2; 47:2). The relator nouns *שְׂמָאל* and *יְמִין* can also be pointed with an article when they are grammatically absolute (Genesis 13:9; 2 Samuel 2:19; 1 Chronicles 6:29; 2

Chronicles 3:17; Nehemiah 12:31; Ezekiel 1:10), but mostly they are anarthrous (Genesis 24:49; Numbers 20:17; 22:26; Deuteronomy 2:27; 5:32; 17:11, 20; 28:14; Joshua 1:7; 17:7; 19:27; 23:6; 1 Samuel 6:12; 1 Kings 7:39, 49; 2 Kings 12:10; 22:2; 2 Chronicles 3:17; 4:6, 7, 8; 34:2; Job 23:9; 30:12; Psalm 142:5; Proverbs 4:27; Isaiah 54:3). Finally, the temporal relator nouns *אֲחֵרִית* and *רֵאשִׁית* are almost always anarthrous when they are grammatically absolute (Psalm 37:37; Proverbs 8:23; 23:18; 24:14; 24:20; Ecclesiastes 3:11; 10:13; Isaiah 40:21; 41:4, 26; 46:10; 48:16; Jeremiah 29:11).⁸³

Grammatical Conclusion

The preceding evidences demonstrate that relator nouns can be anarthrous when they are grammatically absolute. The reason for this is because they are in a grammatical state of flux. On the one hand, they are in an almost implicit grammatical construction with a related thing or concept,⁸⁴ yet on the other hand, they are grammatically absolute with a definite meaning. Because these nouns are lexically dependent on another word or concept to complete their meaning, like a noun in grammatical construct, one would expect grammatically absolute relator nouns to be anarthrous. However, because they have a definite meaning when they are grammatically absolute, one would also expect them to have the definite article. Thus, it is not surprising that grammatically absolute relator nouns can occur with or without the article. With respect to the relator noun *בְּרֵאשִׁית* in Genesis 1:1, if it is grammatically absolute, it does not have to be pointed with an articular *qamets*, even though it could be. Such is the nature of relator nouns in this grammatical state of flux.

Conclusion

Once *בְּרֵאשִׁית* is correctly identified as a relator noun, a better methodology can be used for collecting and analyzing the lexical and grammatical data. This article has shown that when the word *בְּרֵאשִׁית* is compared with other types of relator nouns, the lexical evidence demonstrates that it can be grammatically absolute even if it is lexically relative. Thus, the challenge put forth by opponents that

⁸² Numbers 20:17 and Deuteronomy 2:27 describe very similar happenings where the Israelites request a nation's permission to travel through their land, and they swear not to deviate to their left or to their right from the path. However, Numbers 20:17 uses the verb *נָטָה* to describe not turning to one's left or right, and Deuteronomy 2:27 uses the verb *סוּר*. These parallel verses suggest that the act of turning, or not turning, to one's left or right can be described by both verbs. The examples from 2 Samuel suggest that the relator nouns *שְׂמָאל* and *יְמִין* when used either with *נָטָה* or *סוּר* are definite in meaning even though they are anarthrous.

⁸³ One could argue that in some cases, in which *אֲחֵרִית* is grammatically absolute, it should be rendered as "future" rather than "end," which would mean that the word is not being used as a relator noun (cf. Psalm 37:37; Proverbs 23:18; 24:14, 20; Jeremiah 29:11). However, *אֲחֵרִית* is often semantically related to a person and is used as a reference to the latter days of that person's life (Numbers 23:10; Job 8:7; 42:12; Proverbs 5:11; 19:20; Jeremiah 17:11). Thus, in the cases where *אֲחֵרִית* is grammatically absolute, but implicitly related to a person, it still functions as a relator noun even though it could be rendered as "future."

⁸⁴ This is Brown, Driver, and Briggs's (1907) description of *אֲחֵרִית* in Isaiah 46:10. It is absolute, but implicitly it is the end of a phase of history. See Brown, Driver, and Briggs's (1907), s.v. "אֲחֵרִית."

because **רָאשִׁית** is lexically relative, it must be rendered in the construct state in Genesis 1:1, does not stand up to scrutiny.

Furthermore, this article has shown that when **בְּרֵאשִׁית** is again compared with other types of relator nouns, the grammatical evidence demonstrates that it can be anarthrous even though it is grammatically absolute. Thus, the challenge put forth by opponents that because **בְּרֵאשִׁית** is not pointed with an articular *qamets*, the word is in the construct state, also does not stand up to scrutiny.

Both the lexical and grammatical evidences of Hebrew relator nouns demonstrate that **בְּרֵאשִׁית** can be in the absolute state in Genesis 1:1, which would render the verse as an independent clause. This is the traditional translation of the passage, which allows Genesis 1:1 to be interpreted as the first act of creation. However, the grammatical and lexical evidences only demonstrate that the traditional translation is itself linguistically possible. Syntactical evidence presented in a forthcoming article will demonstrate that the traditional translation of Genesis 1:1 is not only linguistically possible, it is the only reasonable translation of the first verse of the Bible.

References

- BibleWorks. 2003. CD-ROM 6.0. Norfolk, Virginia.
- Brown, W.P. 1993. *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1–2:3*. Dissertation Series/Society of Biblical Literature, no.132. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Bruce, F.F. 1970. *The English Bible: A History of Translations from the Earliest English Versions to the New English Bible*. Rev. ed. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Childs, B.S. 1960. *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Chatham, England: W. & J. MacKay and Co Ltd; Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc.
- Collins, C.J. 2006. *Genesis 1–4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing.
- DeLancey, S. 2005. “Adpositions as a Non-Universal Category.” In *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*, Studies in Language Companion Series 72. Edited by Z. Frajzyngier, A. Hodges, and D.S. Rood. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Eichrodt, W. 1962. “In the Beginning: A Contribution to the Interpretation of the First Word of the Bible.” In *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of J. Muilenburg*. Edited by B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson. New York, New York: Harper.
- Hasel, G.F. 1971. “Recent Translations of Genesis 1:1: A Critical Look.” *The Bible Translator* 22 (4): 154–168.
- Heidel, A. 1951. *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation*. 2nd ed. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Humbert, P. 1955. “Trois Notes Sur Genese 1.” *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 56: 85–96.
- König, E. 1919. *Die Genesis*. Gütersloh, Germany: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann.
- Lane, W.R. 1963. “The Initiation of Creation.” *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1): 63–73.
- Matthews, K.A. 1996. *Genesis 1–11:26*. The New American Commentary. Vol.1A. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman and Holman Publishers.
- Newman, J., trans. 1960. *The Commentary of Nahmanides on Genesis, Chapters 1-6*. Pretoria Oriental Series. Vol.4. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Orlinsky, H.M. 1966. “Foreword.” In *Genesis: The N.J.V. Translation*. New York, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Harper Torch Books; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Jewish Publication Society of America, The Temple Library.
- Orlinsky, H.M. 1983. “Enigmatic Bible Passages: The Plain Meaning of Genesis 1:1-3.” *Biblical Archaeologist* 46 (4): 207–209.
- Ramban. 1960. *The Commentary of Nahmanides on Genesis Chapters 1–6*. Vol.4. Translated by J. Newman. Pretoria Oriental Series. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Rashi. 1946. *Genesis. Pentateuch: With Targum Onkelos, Haphtorah and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi’s Commentary*. Vol.1. Translated by M. Rosenbaum and A.M. Silbermann, 2–281. London, United Kingdom: Shapiro, Vallentine & Co.
- Ridderbos, N.H. 1958. “Genesis 1 und 2.” In *Studies on the Book of Genesis*. Edited by B. Gemser, 214–260. Oudtestament Studiën 12. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Sarna, N.M. 1989. *Genesis*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Simpson, C.A., and W.R. Bowie. 1952. *The Book of Genesis*. The Interpreter’s Bible. Vol.1. New York, New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press.
- Skinner, J. 1951. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. 2nd ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark.
- Skoss, S.L. 1928. “The Arabic Commentary of ‘Ali ben Suleimān the Karaite on the Book of Genesis: Edited from Unique Manuscripts and Provided with Critical Notes and an Introduction.” Ph.D. diss., The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society’s Press.
- Walte, B.K. 1975. “The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part III: The Initial Chaos Theory and the Precreation Chaos Theory.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132: 216–228.
- Wenham, G.J. 1987. *Genesis 1–15*. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 1. Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher.
- Wenham, G.J. 2003. *The Pentateuch*. Vol.1. *Exploring the Old Testament*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Westermann, C. 1990. *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Translated by J.J. Scullion. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Wevers, J.W. 1974. *Text History of the Greek Genesis*. Philologisch-Historische Klasse Dritte Folge, nr.81. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, J.W. 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, no.35. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Williams, R.J. 2007. *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Revised by J.C. Beckman. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Winston, D. 1979. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. The Anchor Bible Vol.43. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

- Wolfson, H.A. 1948. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Youngblood, R.F. ed. 1990. *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions About Creation and the Flood*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Zevit, Z. 1998. *The Anterior Construction in Classical Hebrew*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Bibliography

- Aberbach, M., and B. Grossfeld, trans. 1982. *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., Center for Judaic Studies University of Denver.
- Allen, L.C. 1983. *Psalms 101–150*. World Biblical Commentary. Vol. 21. Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher.
- Ambrose of Milan. 1961. *Hexameron*. Translated by J.J. Savage. In *Saint Ambrose: Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*. The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation. Vol. 42. New York, New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc.
- Andersen, F.I. 1974. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. Janua Linguarum Series Practica 231. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.
- Anderson, B.W. 1967. *Creation Versus Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible*. New York, New York: Association Press.
- Anderson, G. 1990. "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1): 21–29.
- Arbez, E.P., and J.P. Weisengoff. 1948. "Exegetical Notes on Genesis 1:1–2." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 10 (2): 140–150.
- Arnold, B.T., and J.H. Choi. 2003. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Athanasius. (1885) 1957. *On the Incarnation of the Word*. Translated by A. Robertson. American ed. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2nd series. Vol. 4. New York, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Augustine. 1960. *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Translated by J.K. Ryan. New York, New York: Doubleday, Image Books.
- Augustine. 1982. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. 2 vols. Translated by J.H. Taylor. Ancient Christian Writers, no. 41–42. New York, New York: The Newman Press.
- Augustine. 1991. *Against the Manichees*. Translated by R.J. Teske. In *Saint Augustine on Genesis*. The Church Fathers: A New Translation. Vol. 84. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Augustine. 1991. *On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book*. Translated by R.J. Teske. In *Saint Augustine on Genesis*. The Church Fathers: A New Translation. Vol. 84. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Austel, H.J. 1980. "שָׁמַיִם (*shamayim*) heaven, heavens, sky." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer, and B.K. Waltke. Chicago, Illinois: Moody Press.
- Avishur, Y. 1984. *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 210. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer.
- Baasten, M.F.J. 2007. "First Things First: The Syntax of Gen 1:1–3 Revisited." In *Studies in Hebrew Language and Jewish Culture*. Edited by M.F.J. Baasten and R. Munk, 169–188. Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Barr, J. 1998. "Was Everything That God Created Really Good? A Question on the First Verse of the Bible." In *God in the Fray: A Tribute to Walter Brueggeman*. Edited by T. Linafelt and T.K. Beal, 55–65. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Bartelmus. "שָׁמַיִם (*šamayim*)." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J.T. Willis. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Basil the Great. 1885 (1957). *The Hexameron*. Translated by B. Jackson. American ed. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2nd series. Vol. 8. New York, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Baur, C. 1910. "St. John Chrysostom." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08452b.htm>.
- Beale, G.K. 1999. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans.
- ben Asher, B. 1999. "R. Bahya Ben Asher of Saragossa Commentary on Genesis 1:1–2." In *Rabbi Ezra ben Solomon of Gerona: Commentary on the Song of Songs and Other Kabbalistic Commentaries*. Edited by S. Brody, 210–233. Commentary Series. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, Medieval Institute Publications for TEAMS
- Berman, S. 1996. Introduction to *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc.
- Berman, S. trans. 1996. *Tanhuma*. In *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc.
- Berry, D.M. 2003. "Understanding the Beginning of Genesis." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 31 (2): 90–93.
- Black, C. 2006. *Pico's "Heptaplus" and Biblical Hermeneutics*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions. Vol. 116. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Blacker, C., and M. Loewe, eds. 1975. *Ancient Cosmologies*. London, United Kingdom: Allen and Unwin.
- Blythin, I. 1962. "A Note on Genesis I 2." *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1): 120–121.
- Börner-Klein, D. 2004. Introduction to *Pirke De-Rabbi Elieser*. Studia Judaica: Forschungen Zur Wissenschaft Des Judentums. Berlin, Germany: Walter De Gruyter.
- Brayford, S. 2007. *Genesis*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Brodie, T.L. 2001. *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary, Historical, and Theological Commentary*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Brody, S. 1999. Introduction to "R. Bahya Ben Asher of Saragossa Commentary on Genesis 1:1–2." In *Rabbi Ezra ben Solomon of Gerona: Commentary on the Song of Songs and Other Kabbalistic Commentaries*. Edited by S. Brody, 207–209.
- Brown, F., S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs. 1907. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press.

- Brody, S., trans. 1999. *Rabbi Ezra ben Solomon of Gerona: Commentary on the Song of Songs and Other Kabbalistic Commentaries*. Commentary Series. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, Medieval Institute Publications for TEAMS.
- Brueggemann, W. 1982. *Genesis: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Interpretation*. Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press.
- Brüll, A., ed. 1971. *Das samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch*. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Calvin, J. (n.d.) 1999. *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles*. Vol. 22 of *Calvin's Commentaries*. Translated and edited by J. Owen. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Calvin Translation Society. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Calvin, J. (n.d.) 2003. *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis*. Vol. 1 of *Calvin's Commentaries*. Translated by J. King. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Calvin Translation Society. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Cassuto, U. 1961. *From Adam to Noah: A Commentary on Genesis I-VI 8*. Vol. 1. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem, Israel: The Magnes Press.
- Chapman, J. 1908. "Clementines." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04039b.htm>.
- Childs, B.S. 1959. "The Enemy of The North and the Chaos Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 7: 187–198.
- Clement of Alexandria. (1885) 1957. *The Miscellanies*. American edition. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 2. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Clifford, C. 1907. "St. Athanasius." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02035a.htm>.
- Clifford, R.J., and R. E. Murphy. 1990. "Genesis." In *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy, 8–43. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Clifford, R.J., and J.J. Collins, eds. 1992. *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 24. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Coats, G.W. 1983. *Genesis: With an Introduction to Narrative Literature*. The Forms of Old Testament Literature. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*. (1885) 1957. Translated by J. Donaldson. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 7. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Cook, J. 2001. "The Septuagint of Genesis: Text And/ or Interpretation?" In *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin, 315–329. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 155. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.
- Copan, P. 1996. "Is *Creatio Ex Nihilo* a Post-Biblical Invention? An Examination of Gerhard May's Proposal." *Trinity Journal* 17: 77–93.
- Cotter, D.W. 2003. *Genesis*. Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- Coxe, A.C., ed. (1885) 1957. *Fragments*. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 6. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Coxe, A.C., ed. (1885) 1957. Introductory note to *Tertullian: Part First*. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 3. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Currid, J.D. 1997. "An Examination of the Egyptian Background of the Genesis Cosmogony." *Bibliche Zeitschrift* 35 (1): 18–40.
- Dauids, P.H. 2006. *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Davis, J.D. (1894) 1980. *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*. New York, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Delitzsch, F. 1888. *A New Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by S. Taylor. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark.
- DeRoche, M. 1988. "The *Rûah 'Ēlōhîm* in Gen 1:2c: Creation or Chaos?" In *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical & Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*. Edited by L. Eslinger and G. Taylor, 303–318. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series*, 67. Sheffield, United Kingdom: JSOT.
- Dines, J. 1995. "Imaging Creation: The Septuagint Translation of Genesis 1:2." *Heythrop Journal* 36: 439–450.
- Dods, M. (1885) 1957. Introductory note to *Theophilus of Antioch*. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 2. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Dods, M. ed. (1885) 1957. Theophilus of Antioch. In *Theophilus to Autolytus*. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 2. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Driver, S.R. 1904. *The Book of Genesis*. 2nd ed. Westminster Commentaries. London, United Kingdom: Methuen & Co.
- Driver, S.R. 1969. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*. 3rd ed. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Dumbrell, W.J. 2002. *The Faith of Israel: A Theological Survey of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Feinberg, J.S. 2001. *No One Like Him: The Doctrine of God*. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway.
- Fishbane, M. 1971. "Jeremiah IV 23–26 and Job III 3–13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern." *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (2): 151–167.
- Fouts, D.M. 2004. "Selected Lexical and Grammatical Studies in Genesis 1." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 42 (1): 79–90.
- Freedman, D.N., A.B. Beck, and B.E. Zuckerman, eds. 1998. *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Freedman, H. and M. Simon, trans. 1939. *Genesis Rabbah*. Vol. 1 of *Midrash Rabbah*, 3–1003. London, United Kingdom: The Soncino Press.
- Freedman, H., and M. Simon, trans. 1939. *Midrash Rabbah*. 5 vols. London, United Kingdom: The Soncino Press.
- Frendo, A.J. 1999. "Genesis 1:1, An Archaeological Approach." In *Michael: Historical, Epigraphical and Biblical Studies in Honor of Prof. Michael Heltzer*. Edited by Y. Avishur and R. Deutsch, 161–169. Jaffa, Israel: Archaeological Center Publications.

- Garrett, D.A. 2003. *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs*. The New American Commentary, vol. 14. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press.
- Gaster, T.H. 1962. "Earth." In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G.A. Buttrick. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon.
- Gentry, P.J. and R.B. ter Haar Romeny. 2001. "Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Material for the Book of Genesis." In *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by B.A. Taylor, 285–298. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, no. 51. Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Geyer, J.B. 1999. "Desolation and Cosmos." *Vetus Testamentum* 49 (1): 49–64.
- Gilboa, R. 1998. *Intercourses in the Book of Genesis: Mythic Motifs in Creator-Created Relationships*. Sussex, England: The Book Guild Ltd.
- Gill, J. (1810) 2005. *The First Book of Moses Called Genesis*. Vol. 1 of *Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, 1–315. London, United Kingdom: Mathew & Leigh. Reprint, Paris, Arkansas: The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc.
- Goldstein, J.A. 1983. *II Maccabees*. The Anchor Bible 41A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Görg, M. 1980. "Tôhû Wâbôhû—ein Deutungsvorschlag." *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft* 92: 431–434.
- Görg, M. 2006. "תֹהוּ (tôhû)." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J. T. Willis. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Goshen-Gottstein, A. 2001. "Critical Encounters with Rabbinic Doctrines of Creation: The Teacher as Source of Authority or as Partner in Dialogue." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 4 (3): 155–165.
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., ed. 1976. *The Aleppo Codex*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Magnes Press for the Hebrew University Bible Project.
- Graves, R., and R. Patai. 1944. *Hebrew Myths: The Book of Genesis*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Gregory of Nyssa. (1885) 1957. *On the Making of Man*. Translated by W. Moore and H. Wilson. American ed. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2nd series. Vol. 5. New York, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Gross, W. 1981. "Syntaktische Erscheinungen Am Anfang Althebräischer Erzählungen: Hintergrund und Vordergrund." *Vetus Testamentum* 32: 131–145.
- Grossfeld, B. 1969. "A Commentary on the Text of a New Palestinian Targum (Codex Neofiti I) on Genesis I–XXV." Ph.D. diss., The Johns Hopkins University.
- Grossfeld, B., trans. 1988. *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 6. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.
- Grudem, W. 1994. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Gruenthaner, M.J. 1947. "The Scriptural Doctrine on First Creation." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 9 (1): 48–58.
- Gunkel, H. 1994. *The Stories of Genesis*. Edited by W.R. Scott. Translated by J.J. Scullion. Valjejo, California: Bibal Press.
- Gunkel, H. 1997. *Genesis*. Translated by M. E. Biddle. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.
- Gunkel, H. 2006. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*. Translated by K.W. Whitney, Jr. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hakham, A. 2003. *Psalms 101–150*. Vol. 3 of *Psalms*. The Koschitzky edition. The Bible with the Jerusalem Commentary. Jerusalem, Israel: Mosad Harav Kook.
- Hamilton, V.P. 1980. "אֶרֶץ (eres) earth, land, city (-state), (under) world." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer, and B.K. Waltke. Chicago, Illinois: Moody Press.
- Hamilton, V.P. 1990. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hamilton, V.P. 2005. *Handbook on the Pentateuch*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing Group.
- Harrison, R.K. 1988. "Earth." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by G.W. Bromiley. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Havey, F. 1908. "Clement of Alexandria." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04045a.htm>.
- Heller, R.L. 2004. *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Studies 55. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Hendel, R.S. 1998. *The Text of Genesis 1–11*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holmes, D. trans. (1885) 1957. Tertullian. *Against Hermogenes*. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 3. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Honeyman, A.M. 1952. "Merismus in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1): 11–18.
- Hurowitz, V. 2005. "The Genesis of Genesis: Is the Creation Story Babylonian." *Bible Review* 21 (1): 36–54.
- Ibn Ezra. 1988. *Genesis*. Vol. 1 of *Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch*. Translated by H.N. Strickman and A.M. Silver. New York, New York: Menorah Publishing Company.
- Irenaeus. (1885) 1957. *Against Heresies*. Translated by A. Roberts and W.H. Rambaut. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 1. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Janzen, W. 1992. "Earth." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York, New York: Doubleday.
- John Chrysostom. 1986. *Saint John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis 1–17*. Translated by R. C. Hill. The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation. Vol. 74. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- John of Damascus. (1885) 1957. *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*. Translated by S. D. F. Salmond. American ed. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2nd series. Vol. 9. New York, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

- Jongeling, B. 1980. "Some Remarks on the Beginning of Genesis I, 2." *Folia Orientalia* 21: 27–32.
- Joosten, J. 1993. "The Syntax of Relative Clauses With a First or Second Person Antecedent in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 52 (4): 275–280.
- Josephus, F. 1981. *Josephus: Complete Works*. Translated by W. Whiston. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications.
- Jöüon, P., and T. Muraoka. 2008. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Subsidia biblica 27. Rome, 2008.
- Kahle, P.E. 1959. *The Cairo Geniza*. 2nd ed. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Keil, C.F., and F. Delitzsch. 1872. *The Pentateuch*. Vol.1 of *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Martin. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark.
- Kohler, K., and P. Bloch. 1906. "Bahya (Behai) ben Asher ben Halawa." In *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company. <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/2367-bahya-behai-ben-asher-ben-halawa>.
- Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J.J. Stamm. 1994–1999. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Konkel, A.H. 1997. "בְּהַי." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by W.A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Krašovec, J. 1983. "Merism—Polar Expression in Biblical Hebrew." *Biblica* 64 (2): 231–239.
- Kugel, J. 1983. "Two Introductions to Midrash." *Prooftexts* 3 (2): 131–155.
- Lambdin, T.O. 1971. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Lambert, G.W. 1965. "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis." *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (2): 285–300.
- Lebreton, J. 1910. "St. Justin Martyr." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08580c.htm>.
- Leclercq, H. 1910. "St. Gregory of Nyssa." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07016a.htm>.
- Leclercq, H. 1911. "The First Council of Nicaea." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11044a.htm>.
- Leibowitz, N. 1972. *Studies in the Book of Genesis: In the Context of Ancient and Modern Jewish Bible Commentary*. Translated by A. Newman. Jerusalem, Israel: World Zionist Organization, Department for Torah Education and Culture.
- Leupold, H.C. 1950. *Exposition of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Levy, B.B. 1986. *Introduction, Genesis, Exodus*. Vol.1 of *Targum Neophyti 1: A Textual Study*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, Maryland: University of America Press.
- Lim, J.T.K. 2002. "Explication of an Exegetical Enigma in Genesis 1:1–3." *Asia Journal of Theology* 16 (2): 301–314.
- Lockshin, M.I., trans. 1989. *Rabbi Samuel ben Meir's Commentary on Genesis: An Annotated Translation*. Jewish Studies. Vol.5. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Loughlin, J. 1907. "St. Ambrose." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01383c.htm>.
- Luther, M. 1958. *Luther's Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by J. Theodore Mueller. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Luyster, R. 1981. "Wind and Water: Cosmogonic Symbolism in the Old Testament." *Zeitschrift Für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93 (1): 1–10.
- Luzzatto, S.D. 1998. *The Book of Genesis: A Commentary by ShaDaL (S.D. Luzzatto)*. Translated by D.A. Klein. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc.
- Maher, M. 1992. trans. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible. Vol.1B. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- May, G. 1994. *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creatio Out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought*. Translated by A.S. Worrall. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T&T Clark.
- McNamara, M., trans. 1992. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible. Vol.1A. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- McSorley, J. 1907. "St. Basil the Great." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02330b.htm>.
- Miller, E.L. 1999. "In the Beginning': A Christological Transparency." *New Testament Studies* 45 (4): 587–592.
- Muller, R.A. 1988. "World." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by G.W. Bromiley. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Murphy, T.J. 2003. *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of Biblical Hebrew*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Myers, J.M. 1974. *I and II Esdras*. The Anchor Bible 42. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Neusner, J. 1985. Introduction to *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis*. Brown Judaic Studies, no.104. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Neusner, J. 1988. Introduction to *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. London, United Kingdom: Yale University Press.
- Niccacci, A. 1990. *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. Translated by W.G.E. Watson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 86. Sheffield, United Kingdom: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Noort, E. 2005. "The Creation of Light in Genesis 1:1–5: Remarks on the Function of Light and Darkness in the Opening Verses of the Hebrew Bible." In *The Creation of Heaven and Earth: Re-Interpretations of Genesis I in the Context of Judaism, Ancient Philosophy, Christianity, and Modern Physics*. Edited by G.H. van Kooten, 3–20. Themes in Biblical Narrative. Vol.8. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Oden, R.A. Jr. 1992. "Cosmogony, Cosmology." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman, 1162–1171. New York, New York: Doubleday.
- Origen. (1885) 1957. *De principiis*. Translated by F. Crombie. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol.4. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Orlinsky, H.M. 1957. "The Plain Meaning of Ru^h in Gen. 1.2." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 48 (2): 174–182.
- Ottosson, M. 1978. "עֲרֵטִים (erets)." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J.T. Willis. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Ouro, R. 1998. "The Earth of Genesis 1:2: Abiotic or Chaotic? Part I." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 35 (2): 259–276.
- Ouro, R. 1999. "The Earth of Genesis 1:2: Abiotic or Chaotic? Part II." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 37 (1): 39–53.
- Ouro, R. 2000. "The Earth of Genesis 1:2: Abiotic or Chaotic? Part III." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38(1): 59–67.
- Pearl, C. 1970. Introduction to *Rashi: Commentaries on the Pentateuch*. Translated by C. Pearl. New York, New York: W.W Norton & Company Inc.
- Pearson, A.T. 1953. "An Exegetical Study of Genesis 1:1–3." *Bethel Seminary Quarterly* 2 (1): 14–33.
- Perry, T.A. 1993. "A Poetics of Absence: The Structure and Meaning of Genesis 1.2." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 58: 3–11.
- Peterson, J.B. 1907. "Apostolic Constitutions." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01636a.htm>.
- Philo. 2001. *Philo of Alexandria: On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*. Translated by D.T. Runia. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series. Vol.1. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Plaut, W.G. 1974. *Genesis*. Vol.1 of *The Torah: A Modern Commentary*. New York, New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
- Polliack, M. 1997. *The Karaite Tradition of Arabic Bible Translation: A Linguistic and Exegetical Study of Karaite Translations of the Pentateuch from the Tenth & Eleventh Centuries C.E.* Études Sur Le Judaïsme Médiéval. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Poncellet, A. 1910. "St. Irenaeus." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08130b.htm>.
- Prat, F. 1911. "Origen and Origenism." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11306b.htm>.
- Rahlfs, A. 1979. "History of the Septuagint Text." In *Septuaginta*, LVI–LXV. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Rashbam. 1989. *Rabbi Samuel ben Meir's Commentary on Genesis: An Annotated Translation*. Translated by M.I. Lockshin. Jewish Studies. Vol. 5. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Rechenmacher, H. 2002. "Gott und das Chaos: Ein Beitrag Zum Verständnis von Gen 1, 1–3." *Zeitschrift Für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 114 (1) 1–20.
- Reddish, M.G. 1992. "Heaven." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York, New York: Doubleday.
- Reider, J. 1957. *The Book of Wisdom: An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature. New York, New York: Harper & Brothers for The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning.
- Robbins, F.E. 1912. "The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis." Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago.
- Rooker, M.F. 1992. "Genesis 1:1–3: Creation or Re-Creation? Part 1 (of 2 parts)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149: 316–323.
- Rooker, M.F. 1992. "Genesis 1:1-3: Creation or Re-Creation? Part 2 (of 2 parts)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149: 411–427.
- Rosenburg, A.J. trans. 1993. *The Book of Genesis*. Vol.1 of *Mikraoth Gedoloth*. Books of the Bible. New York, New York: The Judaica Press.
- Ross, A.P. 1988. *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Rottzoll, D.U. 1994. *Rabbinischer Kommentar Zum Buch Genesis*. Studia Judaica 14. Berlin, Germany: Walter De Gruyter.
- Ryan, J.K. trans. 1960. Introduction to *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. New York, New York: Doubleday, Image Books.
- Sacks, R.D. 1990. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies. Vol.6. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Sailhamer, J.H. 1990. *Genesis*. In vol.2 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 3–248. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Sarna, N.H. 1970. *Understanding Genesis*. New York, New York: Schocken Books.
- Sasson, J.M. 2005. "Of Time and Immortality: How Genesis Created Them." *Bible Review* 21 (3): 32–41, 52–54.
- Schorsch, I. 2007. *Canon Without Closure: Torah Commentaries*. New York, New York: Aviv Press.
- Schreiner, T.R. 2003. *1, 2 Peter, Jude*. The New American Commentary. Vol.37. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Scullion, J.J. 1992. *Genesis: A Commentary for Students, Teachers, and Preachers*. Old Testament Studies. Vol.6. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- Shimasaki, K. 2002. *Focus Structure in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of Word Order and Information Structure*. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press.
- Simon, M. 1947. Introduction to *The Soncino Chumash: The Five Books of Moses with Haphtaroth* Edited by A. Cohen. Hindhead, England: The Soncino Press.
- Schmid, H.H. 1997. "אֶרֶץ 'ereṣ earth, land." In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Translated by M.E. Biddle. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Shanks, H. 1972. "How the Bible Begins." *Judaism* 21 (1): 51–58.
- Smith, T. trans. (1885) 1957. *The Recognitions of Clement*. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol.8. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Speiser, E.A. 1964. *Genesis*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Stadelmann, L.I.J. 1970. *The Hebrew Conception of the World*. Analecta Biblica 39. Rome, Italy: Biblical Institute Press.
- Strickman, H.N.1988. Translated by A.M. Silver. *Bereshit*. Vol.1 of *Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch*. New York, New York: Menorah Publishing Company, Inc.
- Teske, R.J. trans. 1991. Introduction to *Saint Augustine on Genesis*. The Church Fathers: A New Translation. Vol.84. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Thomas, D.W. 1953. "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (3): 209–224.
- Tsumura, D.T. 1989. *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 83. Sheffield, United Kingdom: JSOT Press.

- Tsumura, D.T. 1994. "Genesis and Ancient Near Eastern Stories of Creation." In *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11*. Edited by R.S. Hess and D.T. Tsumura, 27–57. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Tsumura, D.T. 1997. "שָׁמַיִם." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by W.A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Tsumura, D.T. 2005. *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Unger, M.F. 1958. "Rethinking the Genesis Account of Creation." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 115: 27–35.
- van der Merwe, C.H.J., J.A. Naude, and J.H. Kroeze. 1999. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Biblical Languages: Hebrew 3. Sheffield, United Kingdom: Sheffield Academic Press.
- van Winden, J.C.M. 1973. "The Early Christian Exegesis of 'Heaven and Earth' in Genesis 1,1." In *Romanitas et Christianitas*. Edited by W. den Boer et al., 371–382. Amsterdam, Netherlands: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- van Winden, J.C.M. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part II: The Restitution Theory." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (526): 136–144.
- van Winden, J.C.M. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part III: The Initial Chaos Theory and the Precreation Chaos Theory." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (527): 216–228.
- van Winden, J.C.M. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part IV: The Theology of Genesis 1." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (528): 327–342.
- van Winden, J.C.M. 1976. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part V: The Theology of Genesis 1—Continued." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 133 (529): 28–41.
- von Rad, G. 1963. *Genesis: A Commentary*. 2nd ed. Rev. ed. Translated by J.H. Marks. The Old Testament Library. London, United Kingdom: SCM Press Ltd.
- Waltke, B.K. 1974. *Creation and Chaos: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Biblical Cosmogony*. Portland, Oregon: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary.
- Waltke, B.K. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part I: Introduction to Biblical Cosmogony." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (525): 25–36.
- Waltke, B.K. 2001. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Waltke, B.K. 2004. *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Waltke, B.K. 2007. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Walton, J.H. 2006. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, Baker Publishing Group.
- Walton, J.H. 2009. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Walton, J.H. 2008. "Creation in Genesis 1:1–2:3 and the Ancient Near East: Order out of Disorder after *Chaoskampf*." *Calvin Theological Journal* 43: 48–63.
- Walton, J.H., and V.H. Matthews. 1997. *Genesis-Deuteronomy of The IVP Bible Background Commentary*, 12–81. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Watson, R.S. 2005. *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of "Chaos" in the Hebrew Bible*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, Band 341. Berlin, Germany: Walter De Gruyter.
- Watson, W.G.E. 1984. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 26. Sheffield, United Kingdom: JSOT Press.
- Weimar, P. 1999. "Chaos und Kosmos: Gen 1,2 als Schlüssel einer älteren Fassung der priesterschriftlichen Schöpfungserzählung." In *Mythos im alten Testament und seiner Umwelt*. Edited by A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and D. Römheld, 195–211. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Weippert, M. 2004. "Schöpfung am Anfang oder Anfang der Schöpfung? Noch einmal zu Syntax und Semantik von Gen 1,1–3." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 60 (1): 5–22.
- Wellhausen, J. 1994. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Scholars Press Reprints and Translations Series. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Westall, M.R. 1977. "The Scope of the Term 'Spirit of God' in the Old Testament." *Indian Journal of Theology* 26 (1): 29–43.
- Westermann, C. 1997. "תְּהוֹם *t'hôm* flood." In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Translated by M.E. Biddle. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Winston, D. 1971. "The Book of Wisdom's Theory of Cosmogony." *History of Religions* 11 (2): 185–202.
- Wright, C.J.H. 1997. "אֶרֶץ." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by W.A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Wyatt, N. 1993. "The Darkness of Genesis I 2." *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (4): 543–554.
- Young, E.J. 1959. "The Relation of the First Verse of Genesis One to Verses Two and Three." *Westminster Theological Journal* 21 (2): 133–146.
- Young, E.J. 1961. "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:2." *Westminster Theological Journal* 23 (2): 151–178.
- Young, F. 1991. "'Creatio Ex Nihilo': A Context for the Emergence of the Christian Doctrine of Creation." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44 (2): 139–151.
- Youngblood, R.F. 1980. "תְּהוֹם (*tōhū*) confusion." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer, and B.K. Waltke. Chicago, Illinois: Moody Press.

