*Answers Research Journal* 11 (2018):341–358.
https://assets.answersresearchjournal.org/doc/v11/hebrew_genesis_1_1.pdf

ARJ

# Syntactical Features of Hebrew Genitive Clauses and Their Implications for Translating Genesis 1:1

**Josh Wilson,** Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Park Hills, Missouri and Professor of Bible, 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 בָּרֵאשִׁית 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. Building off his previous article (Wilson 2018), the author in this article defends the traditional translation of Genesis 1:1 by arguing that at the clause level of investigation, בְּרֵאשִׁית cannot be in construct with the verb בָּרָא and the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1. According to the author, such a construction would be a Hebrew genitive clause governed by a *nomen regens*. According to the author, Hebrew genitive clauses in general have certain syntactical features that delimit how they relate to their main clauses. When such a genitive clause construction for Genesis 1:1 is analyzed in its relation to the main clause—whether that be Genesis 1:2a or 1:3—the data shows that it lacks the syntactical features characteristic of genitive clauses in general. Thus, it is highly improbable that Genesis 1:1 contains a genitive clause, and as a consequence, it is equally improbable that the verse could be rendered with a dependent clause.

**Keywords:** genitive clause, substantival clause, participatory clause, absolute, construct, finite verb, *regens*, verse-ending *soph passuq*, clause-level *waw*, *waw*-consecutive

## Introduction

In the previous article (Wilson 2018), issues related to the translation of Genesis 1:1 were examined at the lexical and grammatical levels.[1] That article identified the word רֵאשִׁית in Genesis 1:1 as a Hebrew relator noun and demonstrated that it could function in the verse as a definite, grammatically absolute noun even though it is both anarthrous and lexically relative.[2] Such a grammatical state for the relator noun makes it possible for Genesis 1:1 to be rendered as an independent clause: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This rendering would then support Genesis 1:1 being interpreted as the first act of creation. This interpretation would then also support the longstanding doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*.[3] Translation affects interpretation, and interpretation affects theology. This translation, called the traditional translation, and its interpretive and theological conclusions, have been held by Jews and Christians for millennia; however, today this translation is not always utilized.

As also explained in the previous article, a growing group of scholars argue that Genesis 1:1 should not be rendered with an independent clause, but rather with a dependent clause. This translation, called the dependent-clause translation, is now even used in updated versions of some translational traditions. Consider the following examples with the traditional independent clause version placed first and its later revision to the dependent clause second:

*Protestant Translational Tradition*

> [1]In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. [2]The 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. [3]And God said, "Let there be light." (RSV 1952)

> [1]In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, [2]the 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. [3]Then God said, "Let there be light." (NRSV 1989)

[1] In Wilson (2018), the lexical level focused on evidences pertaining to word meanings. For example, does בְּרֵאשִׁית have a relative meaning? The grammatical level focused on evidences pertaining to how words function in a sentence. For example, can בְּרֵאשִׁית function in the absolute state in Genesis 1:1? This present article will focus on evidences at the clausal level by determining how clauses and their elements relate to one another.

[2] The term "grammar" can have varying meanings that are both narrow and broad. This article and the previous one uses the term "grammar" in its narrow sense according to following definition given by *Merriam Webster's* online dictionary: "The study of classes of words, their inflections, and their functions and relations in the sentence."

[3] Since Genesis 1:1, being the first act of creation, does not describe anything as being in existence before the initial creation other than God, interpreters have logically and theologically concluded that God created *ex nihilo*.

ISSN: 1937-9056 Copyright © 2018 Answers in Genesis, Inc. All content is owned by Answers in Genesis ("AiG") unless otherwise indicated. AiG consents to unlimited copying and distribution of print copies of *Answers Research Journal* articles for non-commercial, non-sale purposes only, provided the following conditions are met: the author of the article is clearly identified; Answers in Genesis is acknowledged as the copyright owner; *Answers Research Journal* and its website, www.answersresearchjournal.org, are acknowledged as the publication source; and the integrity of the work is not compromised in any way. For website and other electronic distribution and publication, AiG consents to republication of article abstracts with direct links to the full papers on the ARJ website. All rights reserved. For more information write to: Answers in Genesis, PO Box 510, Hebron, KY 41048, Attn: Editor, *Answers Research Journal*. *The views expressed are those of the writer(s) and not necessarily those of the* Answers Research Journal *Editor or of Answers in Genesis.*

*Jewish Translational Tradition*

> [1]IN THE beginning God created the heaven and the earth. [2]Now 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. [3]And God said: 'Let there be light.' (JPS 1917)

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

*Catholic Translational Tradition*

> [1]In the beginning God created heaven, and earth. [2]And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved over the waters. [3]And God said: Be light made. (DRA 1899)[4]

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

This change in translation clearly causes a change in interpretation: Genesis 1:1 is no longer the first act of creation. This interpretation can then also cause a change in theology making this foundational verse no longer supportive of the doctrine of *creation ex nihilo*. Baasten, a proponent of the dependent clause translation states,

> Armed with grammatical knowledge [about the dependent-clause translation] we might now be in a position to say that God's 'creating the heavens and the earth' consists of bringing order into an unformed chaos, which was there already, and that the first creational act consists of creating light. That is what is actually described in Gen 1:1–3.
>
> But what about this unformed lump of earth, which apparently was there already when God 'began to create the heavens and the earth'? Was it created by God? The answer to that question is surprisingly simple: we do not know, since nothing is said about that in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. That may come as a true surprise: Genesis 1 does not explain who created the earth that was still chaos. (Baasten 2007, 181. See also Orlinsky 1966)

Wilson (2018) analyzed evidences at the lexical and grammatical levels in order to demonstrate that the traditional translation is linguistically possible. However, it did not demonstrate whether the traditional translation of Genesis 1:1 is preferable to the dependent-clause translation. This present article will thus analyze evidences at the clausal level[5] in order to demonstrate that the traditional translation of Genesis 1:1 is not only more preferable, but also more probable.

## Thesis

The focus of the debate between the traditional translation and dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1 is on whether the relator noun רֵאשִׁית is in the absolute state, the position of the traditional translation, or the construct state, the position of the dependent-clause translation. If רֵאשִׁית is in the absolute state, then the relator noun stands on its own, and the verse is easily rendered as an independent clause. This rendering poses no problems at the clausal level.[6] However, if רֵאשִׁית is not in the absolute state, but rather the construct state, then the relator noun is immediately in construct with the finite verb בָּרָא, creating a dependent clause out of the verse. But how probable is this *seemingly* uncommon construction?

In order to show that such a construction is possible, proponents of the dependent-clause translation often cite other examples of nouns immediately in construct with finite verbs. One of the most oft cited examples is from Hosea 1:2a, where the noun תְּחִלַּת is immediately in construct with the verb דִּבֶּר.[7]

[8] תְּחִלַּת דִּבֶּר־יְהוָה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־הוֹשֵׁעַ לֵךְ־קַח־לְךָ אֵשֶׁת זְנוּנִים

> When the LORD first spoke to Hosea, the LORD said to Hosea, "Go, get yourself a wife of whoredom,…" (NJV)

The strength of this example is that the structure of the passage is very similar to Genesis 1:1, and the *regens* תְּחִלָּה is nearly identical to רֵאשִׁית in meaning.[9] Furthermore, almost all modern translations render Hosea 1:2a with a dependent clause,[10] 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

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

[5] Regarding the term "clausal level" see fn. 1.

[6] Opponents of the traditional translation only challenge its viability at the lexical and grammatical levels. These challenges were addressed and answered in the previous article. See Wilson 2018.

[7] N.b. the construct form of the noun תְּחִלָּה in this passage.

[8] All biblical citations from the original languages are provided by BibleWorks 6.0. [CD ROM] (2003).

[9] Both words seem to have considerable semantic overlap. Cf. Proverbs 4:7 with 9:10; Jeremiah 26:1 with Ezra 4:6; Isaiah 46:10 with Ecclesiastes 10:13.

[10] Cf. ESV, JPS, NASB, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, et al., but n.b. NAB, which seems to follow the rendering of the Vulgate.

speak through Hosea;"[11] and the NJV renders Genesis 1:1 as "When God began to create heaven and earth." Thus, if תְּחִלַּת can be immediately in construct with the finite, perfect verb דִּבֶּר in Hosea 1:2a, then it would seem that it is also possible for בְּרֵאשִׁית to be immediately in construct with the finite, perfect verb בָּרָא in Genesis1:1.

In addition to the similarly structured passage of Hosea 1:2a, there are several other passages in which a noun is immediately in construct with a finite verb.[12] For instance the noun יָד is immediately in construct with a finite verb in Exodus 4:13 and Lamentations 1:14.[13] The noun עֵת is immediately in construct with a finite verb in Job 6:17; Jeremiah 6:15; 49:8; and 50:31. Finally, the noun יוֹם is immediately in construct with a finite verb in Exodus 6:28; Leviticus 14:46; Numbers 3:1; Deuteronomy 4:15; 1 Samuel 25:15; Psalms 18:1; 56:10; 138:3; and Jeremiah 36:2. A noun immediately in construct with a finite verb may at first seem out of place, but such a construction is not so rare in biblical Hebrew.[14]

More recent proponents of the dependent-clause translation have also explained that the possible construction of the dependent-clause translation is not simply the case of a noun being in construct with just a finite verb; rather, it is the case of a noun being in construct with an entire clause (Baasten 2007; Holmstedt 2008).[15] Thus, in Genesis 1:1, if בְּרֵאשִׁית is in the construct state, it would not simply govern the verb בָּרָא, even though it would be immediately in construct with the verb, it would govern the clause בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ. In the broadest sense then, the ensuing clause of Genesis 1:1 could be labeled as a substantival clause, or rather a whole clause that is functioning as a single substantive. Concerning such clauses, Joüon and Muraoka state,

> A nominal or verbal clause may form a unit which can be considered and treated as a substantive. Thus, "I know *that you arrived*" is equivalent to "I know (of) *your arrival*"; the clause *that you arrived* is a substantival clause equivalent to the substantival phrase *your arrival*, and just as the phrase is an object, *that you arrived* may be analysed as an object clause. Like a substantive, a substantival clause can function as the subject or predicate of a sentence, and as the complement of a preposition or genitive, and occur in apposition. But it is mainly as an object that it is commonly used. (Joüon and Muraoka 2008 §157a)[16]

Thus, if the dependent-clause translation were to be correct, בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ would then be labeled as a substantival clause.

There are, however, various types of substantival clauses. The three main types are the subject, object, and genitive clauses. Because בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ would be in construct with the relator noun רֵאשִׁית, if the dependent-clause translation were correct, it can be labeled as a genitive-type substantival clause. Joüon and Muraoka add,

> A clause, whether verbal or nominal forms a block which may, in some cases, be regarded as a substantive; it will therefore be possible to consider it as a genitive in relation to a preceding noun, which will act as its *nomen regens*. In fact the following are found used as *nomen regens* in this position: 1) mainly nouns which have become prepositions; 2) some nouns used in an almost prepositional fashion; 3) (rather rarely) pure substantives keeping their full nominal value. (Joüon and Muraoka 2008 §129p)

The previous citations of a noun in construct with a finite verb are actually all examples of this genitive-type substantival clause, which hereinafter is referred to as a genitive clause. Thus, if בְּרֵאשִׁית is in the construct state, then בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ is a genitive clause.[17]

This article, therefore, grants that it is possible for the word בְּרֵאשִׁית to be in construct with the clause בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ. These kinds of constructions, genitive clauses, are actually not so uncommon in biblical Hebrew.[18] However, when such a construction for Genesis 1:1 is analyzed in its relation to Genesis 1:2 and 1:3, then there are serious syntactical complications for the verse being rendered in this way. Thus, this article contends

[11] In Genesis 1:1 the NIV follows the traditional translation.
[12] The following examples are all taken from the Hebrew grammars of Waltke and O'Connor (1990) and Joüon and Muraoka (2008). As will be explained later, these are all examples of genitive clauses.
[13] There are two occurrences of the word יָד in Lamentations 1:14. The first occurrence is in construct with a pronominal suffix and the second is in construct with a finite verb.
[14] See appendix for many more examples.
[15] Baasten labels the construction in Genesis 1:1 as an asyndetic nominalised clause, and Holmstedt labels it as an unmarked, restrictive relative clause.
16 An *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Waltke and O'Connor 1990) also states, "It is common for a clause to stand in a case frame usually occupied by a noun; such a dependent clause is called a *noun* clause or a constituent noun clause" (see Waltke and O'Connor 1990, §38.8a). Instead of the terms *noun* clause or constituent noun clause, this article follows the taxonomy of Joüon and Muraoka and uses the term substantival clause.
[17] In most grammars, one can find many examples of genitive clauses in sections dealing with the relative clause (see Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155c-n; Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §158 a-dc; Waltke and O'Connor, 1990 §19.6a-b), sections dealing with the genitive case or construct state (see Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §130d; Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §129p-q; Waltke and O'Connor 1990, §9.6a-e), and sections dealing with substantival clauses (see Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §157a; Waltke and O'Connor 1990, §38.8c). All of these examples and more (see appendix) can be and will be compared with the possible genitive clause of Genesis 1:1 in order to determine the viability of the dependent-clause translation.
[18] See appendix.

that the dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1 is syntactically improbable, nearly impossible, because it lacks the pertinent syntactical features common to genitive clauses in their relation to other clauses.

## The Clausal Level

### *Is Genesis 1:1 Subordinate to Genesis 1:2a or 1:3?*

Before exploring the syntactical features of genitive clauses at the clausal level and determining the probability of Genesis 1:1 being this type of dependent clause, one must first determine which dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1 to analyze. If Genesis 1:1 truly is a dependent clause, then it is syntactically subordinate to a main clause, but to which main clause? There are two options. Some proponents of the dependent-clause translation argue that Genesis 1:1 is syntactically subordinate to the first clause of Genesis 1:2a. However, most argue that Genesis 1:1 is syntactically subordinate to Genesis 1:3, with Genesis 1:2 being a parenthetical comment.[19]

**Genesis 1:2a as the main clause.** Arguing that Genesis 1:1 is subordinate to Genesis 1:2a is the more difficult of the two options, which explains why so few scholars support this translation.[20] It has serious syntactical complications. On the one hand, Keil and Delitzsch argue that if Genesis 1:2a is the main clause, then it would have to start with the construction וַתְּהִי הָאָרֶץ (Keil and Delitzsch 1872, 46).[21] Waltke argues that 1:2a would have to start with the construction הָיְתָה הָאָרֶץ, like the main clauses in Jeremiah 26:1; 27:1; and 28:1 (Waltke 1975, 222; see also Cassuto 1961, 19). On the other hand, Ross and Wenham argue that the manner in which Genesis 1:2a actually begins, וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה, demonstrates that it is a circumstantial clause, (Ross 1988, 719; Wenham 1987, 12) which would also make Genesis 1:2a a dependent clause and thus not the main clause of Genesis 1:1. These syntactical arguments suggest that the subordination of Genesis 1:1 to 1:2a is unlikely.

Other scholars, however, argue that the subordination of Genesis 1:1 to 1:2a is still possible. Both Skinner and Gross, who are not proponents of this translational option, note that although Genesis 1:2a has the structure of a circumstantial clause, there is no absolute rule against a main clause having a similar structure when it is the apodosis of a temporal clause (Brown 1993, 72; Skinner 1951, 14–15). Skinner cites Genesis 7:10; 22:1 and Leviticus 7:16b as examples of such a construction, and Gross cites Isaiah 6:1. However, at least two of the examples are not precise parallels,[22] and the small sampling of evidence suggests that the translation is still unlikely. Nevertheless, the later syntactical conclusions of this article will also be applicable to this difficult translational option.

**Genesis 1:3 as the main clause.** Scholars who argue that Genesis 1:1 is subordinate to Genesis 1:3 maintain that Genesis 1:2 is a parenthetical comment.[23] The main argument is that the word order of Genesis 1:2 is typical of a parenthetical construction (subject-verb-object) (Brown 1993, 73; Lane 1963, 70–71; Orlinsky 1966, xv; Speiser 1964, 12.) Furthermore, Genesis 1:3 begins with the more appropriate *waw*-consecutive.[24] The subordination of a dependent clause, especially a temporal clause, to a main clause that begins with a *waw*-consecutive is a common feature of biblical Hebrew, thus making the syntactical relationship between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3 entirely probable.

Some scholars challenge the idea that Genesis 1:2 could be a parenthetical construction. Cassuto, a proponent of the traditional translation, argues that if Genesis 1:2 were a parenthetical clause, it would not contain the verb הָיָה. Thus, since Genesis 1:2a is not parenthetical and since it is not the main clause of Genesis 1:1, the dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1 is impossible on syntactical grounds (Cassuto 1961, 19–20).[25] However, Waltke, another proponent of the traditional translation argues that the copula הָיָה is often present in parenthetical

[19] Westermann only cites Hugo Grotius as a proponent of the former dependent-clause translation, but cites many others as proponents of the latter. See Westermann 1990, 95.

[20] The Medieval Jewish scholar Ibn Ezra was the first to suggest that Genesis 1:1 is subordinate to Genesis 1:2a.

[21] Many later commentators argue this same point. See Cassuto 1961, 19; Heidel 1951, 94; Leupold 1950, 45; Mathews 1996, 137 n. 98; Young 1958, 133 n. 1.

[22] In Skinner's example of Leviticus 7:16b, the syntactical relationship between the clauses is much more different than that of Genesis 1:1–2. Genesis 1:1–2 has a *waw* separating the two clauses; whereas, there is no *waw* separating the clauses in Leviticus 7:16b בְּיוֹם הַקְרִיבוֹ אֶת־זִבְחוֹ יֵאָכֵל. The reason there is no *waw* separating the clauses inLeviticus 7:16b is that the clause הַקְרִיבוֹ אֶת־זִבְחוֹ is an embedded genitive clause that is the *rectum* of the governing noun בְּיוֹם, which itself is part of the main clause. A *waw* would separate the main clause element בְּיוֹם from the main clause verb יֵאָכֵל. Concerning Gross's example of Isaiah 6:1, Brown states, "However, the example drawn from Isaiah does not resolve the issue, since the verb is "pronounless" (*bišnat môt hammelek vuzziyyāhû wā'er'eh 'et 'ădonāy*…), in contrast to the clause beginning with the subject in [Genesis] 1:2" Brown 1993, 72. Isaiah 6:1 is actually a better example of the syntactical relationship between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3.

[23] The Medieval Jewish scholar Rashi was the first to argue this position. According to Westermann, Heinrich Ewald is one of the first modern commentators to make this argument. See Westermann 1990, 95.

[24] Brown stresses that parenthetical constructions are syntactically dependent and are usually introduced by an explanatory or parenthetical disjunctive *waw* (i.e., Genesis 13:7; 29:16; Ruth 4:6–7; 1 Samuel 1:9). See Brown 1993, 72–73.

[25] Cassuto's argument is used by later scholars to argue against the dependent-clause translation. See Hamilton 1990, 117; Hasel 1971, 160; Young 1991, 134 n. 2.

clauses that, like Genesis 1:2, have the pattern *waw* + noun + verb (cf. Jonah 3:3; Zechariah 3:2–3) (Waltke 1975, 225). Thus, even major proponents of the contrary traditional translation, such as Waltke and Westermann, (Westermann 1990, 96) argue that the dependent-clause translation, in which Genesis 1:2 is a parenthetical comment, should not be rejected on syntactical grounds.

With respect to the dependent-clause translation in general, several modern scholars render Genesis 1:1 as a temporal clause and then make syntactical comparisons with other types of temporal clauses. Orlinsky states,

> Scholars have long recognized the fact that the first vowel in the first word in Hebrew, *bᵉ(reshíth)*, in the place of expected *ba(reshíth)*—indeed the very word itself (as distinct from *barishonáh*)—points to the meaning "In the beginning of (God's creating…)," that is, "When God began (to create)." Secondly, when the story of creation is resumed later, in 2.4, it is again the temporal ("when") construction that is employed: "When the LORD God made earth and heaven." The best known parallel is the Babylonian account of the rise of Marduk and creation, *Enuma Elish*, and it likewise begins with the "when" sentence structure. (Orlinsky 1966, xiv)[26]

Thus, it is not surprising that opponents of the dependent-clause translation, like Waltke and Westermann, would defend its syntactical viability. Since temporal clauses are frequently subordinate to their main clauses by means of a *waw*-consecutive, and since Genesis 1:2 can function as a parenthetical clause, there seems to be no syntactical issues, at the clausal level, with rendering Genesis 1:1 as a dependent temporal clause. However, the problem with comparing the syntactical relationship between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3 with the syntactical relationship between temporal clauses and *waw*-consecutive clauses is that if רֵאשִׁית is in construct with בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ, then the construction does not create a simple temporal clause, but rather a genitive clause. Thus, from a methodological perspective, any syntactical comparisons should be made with genitive clauses, not with syntactically unrelated temporal clauses.

## A Syntactical Analysis of the Genitive Clause

In order to best determine the syntactical viability of the dependent-clause translation, with its particular genitive clause construction, one must analyze the syntactical features of genitive clauses in general. Fortunately, the Hebrew Old Testament has a large pool of evidence in which genitive clauses occur in both prose and poetry. Using this author's own searches in *BibleWorks 6* and the examples in Joüon and Muraoka (2008) and Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley (1909), this author has pooled together a total 209 examples of genitive clauses (see appendix).[27] However, unlike Genesis 1:1, some of these examples do not have the noun immediately in construct with the finite verb, and some do not have a noun as the governing element, the *regens*, —some are governed by a pronoun, preposition, or an implied *regens*. Nevertheless, since these clauses as a whole are all in construct with some type of *regens*, they are all genitive clauses, and a simple analysis of all of them demonstrates that they have two main syntactical features.

**First syntactical feature.** In nearly every one of the 209 examples, the genitive clause is not separated from the main clause by either a clause-level *waw*[28] or a verse-ending *soph passuq*. Since the genitive clause functions as the *rectum* of a governing element, the *regens*, it is actually an embedded participant in the main clause. For instance, in 1 Samuel 25:15b the genitive clause הִתְהַלַּכְנוּ אִתָּם בִּהְיוֹתֵנוּ בַּשָּׂדֶה is an embedded participant in the main clause וְלֹא־פָקַדְנוּ מְאוּמָה כָּל־יְמֵי. It functions as the *rectum* of the governing noun יְמֵי. Thus, genitive clauses are not separated from the main clause by either a clause-level *waw* or a verse-ending *soph passuq* because they are embedded participants in it. A clause-level *waw* or verse-ending *soph passuq* would signal separation, not participation. If בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ in Genesis 1:1 is a genitive clause, then it is separated from its main clause—whether that be Genesis 1:2a or 1:3—by *both* a clause-level *waw and* a verse-ending *soph passuq*. Such significant separation of the genitive clause from its main clause would antithetical to this syntactical feature of genitive clauses.

**Second syntactical feature.** In nearly every one of the 209 examples, the *regens* that governs the genitive clause is also not separated from the main clause by either a clause-level *waw* or a verse-ending *soph passuq*. The *regens* actually has a dual function. It is both the governing element of the genitive clause and a grammatical participant in the main clause (hereinafter referred to as the participatory clause). For instance, in Exodus 18:20b the noun דֶּרֶךְ, the

[26] The comparisons made in this citation attempt to demonstrate that the evidence from the parallel literature supports the dependent-clause translation. However, it is plain that Orlinsky treats a dependent Genesis 1:1 as a temporal clause.

[27] Although the list of these examples is not exhaustive, the pool of evidence is large enough to draw sound syntactical conclusions. Some of the examples from the grammars may be disputable (e.g., 1 Chronicles 17:13; 2 Chronicles 31:19; Nehemiah 8:10), but most are not.

[28] Even though the clause-level *waw* acts as a conjunction, one of its main syntactical functions is to distinguish one clause and its elements from that of another.

*regens*, governs the genitive clause יֵלְכוּ בָהּ. Yet, the governing noun דֶּרֶךְ also functions as the direct object of the participatory clause וְהוֹדַעְתָּ לָהֶם אֶת־הַדֶּרֶךְ. Thus, the *regentes* of genitive clauses are not separated from the participatory clause by either a clause-level *waw* or verse-ending *soph passuq* because they are grammatical participants in it. Again, a clause-level *waw* or verse-ending *soph passuq* would signal separation, not participation. If בְּרֵאשִׁית in Genesis 1:1 is the *regens* of the genitive clause בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ, then it is separated from the participatory clause—whether that be Genesis 1:2a or 1:3—by *both* a clause-level *waw and* a verse-ending *soph passuq*. Such a separation of the *regens* from its participatory clause would be antithetical to this syntactical feature of genitive clauses. There are, however, a small number of exceptions to these syntactical features that require examination.

## Exceptions to the Syntactical Characteristics

Even though the genitive clause בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ in Genesis 1:1 and its *regens* בְּרֵאשִׁית lack these two syntactical features, there are a few other genitive clauses and their *regentes* that also lack them. Of all the 209 examples of genitive clauses, there are a total of nine in which the genitive clause and its *regens* seem to be separated from the participatory clause by either a clause-level *waw* or verse-ending *soph passuq*, though none of them by both. These nine exceptions, cited in Joüon and Muraoka 2008 and Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909 as genitive-type clauses, are found in Numbers 23:3; 2 Chronicles 30:19; Job 3:15; 7:2 (2×); Psalms 83:15 (2×); 138:3; and Hosea 1:2.[29]

**Genitive clauses separated by a verse-ending *soph passuq*.** The genitive clauses in 2 Chronicles 30:19 (Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909 §155n; Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §129q); Job 3:15 (Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley, 1909 §155e (Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §158b); Job 7:2 (2×) (Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155g); and Psalm 83:15 (2×) (Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155g) are all examples in which the *soph passuq* separates the genitive clause and its *regens* from the participatory clause. One may argue that in each case the genitive clause and the *regens* are outside the bounds of the *soph passuq* because the sentence as a whole is too long. Genesis 1:1–3 would then be a perfectly matching example. However, the genitive clause and its *regens* can just as well be found at the end of long sentences in which the limits of the *soph passuq* stretch quite far (cf. 2 Kings 8:6; 1 Chronicles 15:12; 2 Chronicles 31:19; Jeremiah 2:6; 17:4; 52:12), and the verses of Job 3:15; 7:2 and Psalm 83:15 are short. Thus, sentence length may not be an adequate explanation for these exceptions, since as a general rule, they did not usually allow the *soph passuq* to separate the elements of a clause from the clause itself.

With respect to the poetic verses of Job 3:17; 7:2 and Psalm 83:15, the *soph passuq* seems to separate the genitive clauses and their *regentes* from the participatory clause because they are part of a different poetic colon, not because the sentence is too long.[30] Thus, they cannot be syntactical parallels to the prose verses of Genesis 1:1–3. With respect to 2 Chronicles 30:19, sentence length does seem to be the only explanation for why the *soph passuq* separates the genitive clause and its *regens* from the participatory clause in 2 Chronicles 30:18.[31] However, 2 Chronicles 30:19 would then be the only true syntactical parallel to Genesis 1:1–3. Only one parallel example out of 209 strongly suggests that Genesis 1:1 is not a genitive clause.

[29] Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley (1909) cite Jeremiah 14:18 (see § 155h) as an example of a genitive clause. This example from Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley (1909) seems to show a clause-level *waw* that separates the genitive clause from both its *regens* and the participatory clause. However, this example from Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley (1909) will not be treated in the following list of exceptions to the syntactical features of the genitive clause because it is doubtful that it actually is a genitive clause. The sentence of Jeremiah 14:18b, כִּי־גַם־נָבִיא גַּם־כֹּהֵן סָחֲרוּ אֶל־אֶרֶץ וְלֹא יָדָעוּ, can be rendered in two ways, as either "For both prophet and priest peddle in the land which they do not know," or "For both prophet and priest peddle in the land, but they do not know." The intervention of the clause-level *waw* between the alleged genitive clause and its *regens* suggests that the latter rendering is more appropriate, which would mean that there is no genitive clause in Jeremiah 14:18b. The NASB, NIV, NKJV, LXX, and Vulgate render the supposed genitive clause with a relative clause modifying the *regens* אֶרֶץ. However, the ESV, NLT, NRSV, and the Targumim render the sentence of 14:18b with two separate independent clauses. The most likely explanation for this difference is that the former group of translations treats the last clause of 14:18b as a circumstantial clause rather than as a genitive clause, which is also grammatically and syntactically possible. (Cf. Genesis 16:1; 22:24; 24:29; Esther 2:21 where the translators of the LXX and Vulgate render the circumstantial clauses with a relative construction, but the Targumim render it with a similar circumstantial clause. This is probably what each translation is doing with the last clause of Jeremiah 14:18b.) If the construction is a genitive clause, it is without parallel, and even Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley (1909), which treat it as a genitive, suggest that there should be no intervening *waw*. Nevertheless, whether or not the last clause of Jeremiah 14:18b is a genitive clause, instead of a separate independent clause or a circumstantial clause, there is no syntactical parallel between it and Genesis 1:1 because a clause-level *waw* does not separate the genitive clause בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ from its *regens* בְּרֵאשִׁית.

[30] Even the preceding verse of Job 3:14 is not the main clause but is rather an extended phrase, like Job 3:15, of the main clause that starts in Job 3:13.

[31] Even the ESV, NIV, and NRSV have difficulty with this irregularity in that they move the *regens*, the direct object of the main clause, to the preceding verse of 31:18 even though in the Hebrew the *regens* is in 31:19.

**Genitive clauses separated by a clause-level *waw*.** The genitive clauses in Numbers 23:3 (Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §130d); Psalm 138:3 (Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §130d); and Hosea 1:2 (Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §130d; Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §129p) are all examples in which a clause-level *waw* separates the genitive clause and its *regens* from the participatory clause.[32] These examples are the closest syntactical parallels to Genesis 1:1, but even they are not without problems. As previously noted, the syntactical structure of Hosea 1:2 is a commonly used parallel to the syntactical structure of Genesis 1:1 and 1:3. First, in Hosea 1:2, the genitive clause and its *regens* are separated from the participatory clause by a *waw*-consecutive, just like Genesis 1:1 is separated from 1:3. Second, in both verses the verb of the genitive clause is in the perfect conjugation. Finally, in both verses nouns of nearly identical semantic meaning, רֵאשִׁית and תְּחִלָּה, are the *regens*. However, in ancient translations and older codices the syntactical structure of Hosea 1:2 is much different from the many modern translations.

Current and ancient evidences suggest that in Hosea 1:2, the finite verb of the genitive clause, דִּבֶּר, may actually be a noun. First, Brown, Driver, and Briggs (1907) suggest that הַדִּבֵּר in Jeremiah 5:13 is a noun,[33] which would take the form דִּבֶּר in Hosea 1:2, and Collins notes that דִּבֶּר functions as a noun in Rabbinic and Modern Hebrew (Collins 2006, 51). Second, in both the Leningrad and Aleppo codices, a paragraph break separates the alleged genitive clause and its *regens*, תְּחִלַּת דִּבֶּר־יְהוָה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ, from the participatory clause, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־הוֹשֵׁעַ (Freedman, Beck, and Zuckerman 1998, 619; Goshen-Gottstein, 1976, שׁעט). This break creates such separation that the communities that produced these codices probably did not think that Hosea 1:2 contained a genitive clause, nor did they think that the two clauses were even syntactically related. Finally, both the LXX and the Targumim render the word דִּבֶּר as a regular noun, λόγος and פתגם, and the Vulgate renders it as a gerund, *loquendi*.[34] The evidence from these sources suggests that the phrase תְּחִלַּת דִּבֶּר־יְהוָה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ could very well have been read by earlier Jews as a simple, clauseless introduction to the book. Thus, Hosea 1:2 may not even contain a genitive clause.

The examples from Psalm 138:3 and Numbers 23:3, however, appear to be true parallels to the syntactical relationship between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3. In Psalm 138:3 the genitive clause קָרָאתִי and its *regens* בְּיוֹם are clearly separated from the participatory clause, וַתַּעֲנֵנִי, by a *waw*-consecutive. However, not only is this example seemingly irregular for genitive clauses, it is irregular for most sentences that begin with the construction בְּיוֹם or בַּיּוֹם. When these words begin a sentence they are rarely separated from their participatory clause, by a *waw*-consecutive.[35] Nevertheless, there is no denying the syntactical structure of Psalm 138:3. It parallels the syntactical structure of Genesis 1:1 and 1:3.

Numbers 23:3 acts the same way. The genitive clause מַה־יַּרְאַנִי and its *regens* וּדָבָר are also separated from the participatory clause וְהַגַּדְתִּי לָךְ by a *waw*-consecutive, making the syntactical structure of the verse a close parallel to the syntactical structure of Genesis 1:1 and 1:3. However, even though Psalm 138:3 and Numbers 23:3, and possibly Hosea 1:2,

[32] One could argue that the genitive clauses in Exodus 6:28; 1 Samuel 5:9; and 2 Chronicles 24:11 belong to this list of exceptions. The genitive clauses in these verses seem to show a genitive clause and its *regens* separated from the main clause by a *waw*. They even seem to show that the genitive clause rather than being embedded in the main clause can be an external dependent clause along with its *regens*. In fact, some English translations render the verses in either way. (In Exodus 6:28, the ESV and NRSV render the *regens* as a participant in the succeeding *waw*-consecutive clause, and the NIV renders the genitive clause as if it were an unembedded dependent clause. In 1 Samuel 5:9, the ESV, NASB, NIV, and NRSV render the genitive clause as if it were an unembedded dependent clause. Finally, in 2 Chronicles 24:11, the ESV and NRSV render the genitive clause as if it were an unembedded dependent clause. In these verses the meaning in the differing translations is the same as that of the Hebrew text, but the grammar is vastly different.) However, each *regens* in these clauses is preceded by the common verbal phrase וַיְהִי. The וַיְהִי verbal phrase is actually a clause in and of itself, even when only a single determinate noun is its object. (Cf. Genesis 1:5; 26:32; Genesis 39:11; Judges 6:25; 7:9; 2 Samuel 7:4; 2 Kings 19:35; 1 Chronicles 17:3. Cf. also the use of וְהָיָה in Isaiah 22:20; 23:15; Hosea 1:5; Amos 8:9; Micah 5:9.) Thus, in Exodus 6:28; 1 Samuel 5:9; and 2 Chronicles 24:11, the *regens* in each verse יוֹם, עֵת, and אַחֲרֵי, participates in the וַיְהִי clause, and the genitive clause is also embedded in it. The functions of the embedded genitive clauses are not to be subordinate to the succeeding *waw*-consecutive clauses, but are to be more descriptive of their *regens*. (Cf. Genesis 31:10; Exodus 12:29, 41; 14:24; Numbers 7:1; Deuteronomy 27:2; Ruth 1:1; 1 Samuel 3:2; 30:25.) The וַיְהִי clause is a complete clause in and of itself and is the participatory clause of the *regens*, not the succeeding *waw*-consecutive clause. Thus, Exodus 6:28; 1 Samuel 5:9; and 2 Chronicles 24:11 are not exceptions to the syntactical features of the genitive clause and are not true parallels to the syntactical relationship between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3. Even if, however, the *waw*-consecutive clauses of Exodus 6:28; 1 Samuel 5:9; and 2 Chronicles 24:11 were the participatory clause of the preceding *regens*, Genesis 1:1 would still not be a viable syntactical parallel since it does not begin with the verbal phrase וַיְהִי.

[33] Brown, Driver, and Briggs 1907 s.v. "דִּבֶּר."

[34] The presence of the gerund, *loquendi*, suggests that the word in the Hebrew text used by the translator was an infinitive rather than a finite verb. Of course it is entirely possible that the text did have a finite verb and that the translator, because of the genitive clause, rendered it as a gerund. However, the Vulgate almost always renders genitive clauses with a participle or relative clause, not a gerund.

[35] Interestingly the only other example this author could find in which the word בְּיוֹם or בַּיּוֹם begins a sentence and is separated from its participatory clause by a *waw*-consecutive is in Genesis 22:4. The Vulgate does not translate the *waw*-consecutive of this sentence, but the LXX and the Targumim do.

may be close syntactical parallels, the case that Genesis 1:1 is a genitive clause is less convincing when the evidence of these verses is placed in the overall context of the data.

## Final Assessment

Substantival clauses in general and genitive clauses in particular are a unique type of clause in that they are embedded participants in the clauses to which they are subordinate. Moreover, with respect to genitive clauses, even their *regentes* are participants in the subordinating clauses. Thus, it is not surprising that nearly all of the 209 examples of genitive clauses do not have a clause-level *waw* or a verse-ending *soph passuq*, markers that usually separate elements of one clause from another, separating the genitive clause and its *regens* from the participatory clause. Thus, the syntactical evidence as a whole strongly suggests that Genesis 1:1 does not contain a genitive clause. Consider also the following data: More than 97% of genitive clauses and their *regentes* are not separated from their participatory clauses by a verse-ending *soph passuq*; Genesis 1:1 is.[36] More than 98% of genitive clauses and their *regentes* are not separated from their participatory clauses by a clauses-level *waw*; Genesis 1:1 also is.[37] In all 209 examples, 100% of them, the genitive clauses and their *regentes* are not separated from their participatory clauses by both a clause-level *waw* and a verse-ending *soph passuq*; Genesis 1:1 is. In all 209 examples, 100% of them, the genitive clauses and their *regentes* are not even separated from their participatory clauses by any kind of intervening clause; Genesis 1:1 also is with the intervening parenthetical comment of Genesis 1:2.[38] If בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ is a genitive clause governed by the *regens* בְּרֵאשִׁית, then it truly has no syntactical parallel with the other 209 genitive clauses and their *regentes* because the verse is separated from the participatory clause by not just a clause-level *waw*, a verse-ending *soph passuq*, or intervening clause, but by all three.

## Conclusion

Having broadly categorized the dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1 as a genitive clause, this author has collected a pool of data that can better determine the syntactical viability of the dependent clause translation. This article has shown that when this translation is compared with other genitive clauses, it lacks the pertinent syntactical features common to genitive clauses in their relation to participatory clauses. Though the dependent-clause translation may be possible or even probable at the lexical and grammatical levels, this article has shown that it does not and cannot work at the clausal level. With respect to the traditional translation, however, there is and never has been any debate about its viability at the clausal level, and the analysis of the previous article has already demonstrated its viability at the lexical and grammatical levels (Wilson 2018). Thus, between the traditional translation and the dependent-clause translation of Genesis 1:1, the traditional translation is the only logical and probable rendering of the passage. And if the traditional translation is the only logical rendering of the passage, then the interpretation of it as the first act of creation is still valid. If the interpretation of Genesis 1:1 as the first act of creation is still valid, then this passage still logically and theologically communicates to the reader that God created the heavens and the earth ex nihilo.

## References

Baasten, Martin F.J. 2007. "First Things First: The Syntax of Gen 1:1–3 Revisited." In *Studies in Hebrew Language and Jewish Culture*, edited by Martin F.J. Baasten and Reinier Munk, 169–188. Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Brown, F., S. Driver, and C. Briggs. eds. 1906. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon.

Brown, William 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, Frederick Fyvie. 1970. *The English Bible: A History of Translations from the Earliest English Versions to the New English Bible*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cassuto, Umberto. 1961. *From Adam to Noah: A Commentary on Genesis I-VI 8*. Vol. 1. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem, Israel: The Magnes Press.

Collins, C. John. 2006. *Genesis 1–4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing.

Freedman, David Noel, Astrid B. Beck, and Bruce E. Zuckerman. eds. 1998. *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers.

Gesenius, Wilhelm, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley. 1922. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press.

[36] The prose example from 2 Chronicles 30:19 and the poetic examples from Job 3:15; 7:2 (2×); and Psalm 83:15 (2×) were not included in this percentage even though the poetic examples are probably only separated from the participatory clause for poetic purposes. If, however, the poetic examples had been included in this percentage, then 2 Chronicles 30:19 would be the only example (less than 1%) that would be syntactically comparable to Genesis 1:1.

[37] The examples from Numbers 23:3; Psalm 138:3; and Hosea 1:2 were not included in this percentage.

[38] This is of course treating Genesis 1:3 as the participatory clause. This statistic does not apply if Genesis 1:2 is the participatory clause. However, as was discussed earlier in the article, treating Genesis 1:2 as the participatory clause comes with its own set of syntactical problems.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. ed. 1976. *The Aleppo Codex*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Magnes Press for the Hebrew University Bible Project.

Hamilton, Victor 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.

Hasel, Gerhard F. 1971. "Recent Translations of Genesis 1:1: A Critical Look." *The Bible Translator* 22, no. 4 (October 1): 154–168.

Heidel, Aexander. 1951. *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation*. 2nd ed. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Holmstedt, Robert D. 2008. "The Restrictive Syntax of Genesis i 1." *Vetus Testamentum* 58: 56–67.

Joüon, P., and T. Muraoka. 2008. A *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Subsidia biblica 27. Rome.

Keil, C.F., and Franz Delitzsch. 1872. *The Pentateuch*. Vol. 1 of *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Martin. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark.

Lane, William R. 1963. "The Initiation of Creation." *Vetus Testamentum* 13, no. 1 (1 January): 63–73.

Leupold, Herbert C. 1950. *Exposition of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

Orlinsky, Harry M. 1966. "Foreword." In *Genesis: The N.J.V. Translation*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Harper Torch Books; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Jewish Publication Society of America, The Temple Library.

Ross, Allen P. 1988. *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

Skinner, John. 1951. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. 2nd ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T & T Clark.

Speiser, E.A. 1964. *Genesis*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Waltke, Bruce K. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part III: The Initial Chaos Theory and the Precreation Chaos Theory." Bibliotheca Sacra 132, no. 527 (July): 216–228.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Wenham, Gordon J. 1987. Genesis 1–15. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 1. Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher.

Westermann, Claus. 1990. *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Translated by J.J. Scullion. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House.

Wilson, Joshua D. 2018. "Linguistic Traits of Hebrew Relator Nouns and Their Implications for Translating Genesis 1:1." *Answers Research Journal* 11: 1–21.

Young, Edward J. 1959. "The Relation of the First Verse of Genesis One to Verses Two and Three." *Westminster Theological Journal* 21, no. 2 (May): 133–146.

**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, Francis I. 1974. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. Janua Linguarum Series Practica 231. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Anderson, Bernhard W. 1967. *Creation Versus Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible*. New York, New York: Association Press.

Anderson, Gary. 1990 "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1): 21–29. Arnold, Bill T., and John H. Choi. 2003. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Arbez, Edward P., and John P. Weisengoff. 1948. "Exegetical Notes on Genesis 1:1–2." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 10, no. 2 (April): 140–150.

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: 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, Hermann J. 1980. "שָׁמַיִם (*shāmayim*) *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, Yitzhak. 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.

Barr, James. 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 Brueggemann*. Edited by Tod Linafelt, and Timothy Kandler Beal, 55–65. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.

Bartelmus. 1978. "שָׁמַיִם (*šāmayim*)." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by J.T. Willis. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Basil the Great. 1885 (1957). *The Hexaemeron*. 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: 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, Samuel. 1996. Introduction. *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc.

Berman, Samuel. trans. 1996. *Tanḥuma*. Under the title *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc.

Berry, Daniel M. 2003. "Understanding the Beginning of Genesis: Just How Many Beginnings Were There?" *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (June): 90–93.

Black, Crofton. 2006. *Pico's "Heptaplus" and Biblical Hermeneutics*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions. Vol. 116. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

Blacker, Carmen, and Michael Loewe, eds. 1975. *Ancient Cosmologies*. London, United Kingdom: Allen and Unwin.

Blythin, Islwyn. 1962. "A Note on Genesis I 2." *Vetus Testamentum* 12, no. 1 (January): 120–121.

Börner-Klein, Dagmar. 2004. Introduction to *Pirke De-Rabbi Elieser*. Studia Judaica: Forschungen Zur Wissenschaft Des Judentums. Berlin, Germany: Walter De Gruyter.

Brayford, Susan. 2007. *Genesis*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

Brodie, Thomas L. 2001. *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary, Historical, and Theological Commentary*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Brody, Seth, trans. 1999. *Rabbi Ezra ben Solomon of Gerona: Commentary on the Song of Songs and Other Kabbalistic Commentaries*. Commentary Series. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, Medieval Institute Publications for TEAMS.

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. Commentary Series. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, Medieval Institute Publications for TEAMS.

Brueggemann, Walter. 1982. *Genesis: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Interpretation*. Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press.

Brüll, Adolph, ed. 1971. *Das samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch*. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag.

Calvin, John. (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, John. (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.

Chapman, John. 1908. "Clementines." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04039b.htm.

Childs, Brevard S. 1959. "The Enemy of The North and the Chaos Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78. no. 3 (September) 187–198.

Childs, Brevard 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.

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, Cornelius. 1907. "St. Athanasius." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 2. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02035a.htm.

Clifford, Richard J., and Roland E. Murphy. 1990. "Genesis." In *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, 8–43. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Clifford, Richard J., and John 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, George 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, Johann. 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, Paul. 1996. "Is *Creatio Ex Nihilo* a Post-Biblical Invention? An Examination of Gerhard May's Proposal." *Trinity Journal* 17, no. 1 (Spring): 77–93.

Cotter, David W. 2003. *Genesis*. Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

Coxe, A. Cleveland, ed. (1885) 1957. *Fragments*. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 6. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Coxe, A. Cleveland, 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, John D. 1997. "An Examination of the Egyptian Background of the Genesis Cosmogony." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 35, no. 1: 18–40.

Davids, Peter H. 2006. *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*. Grand Rapids. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Davis, John D. (1894) 1980. *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*. New York, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

DeLancey, Scott. 2005. "Adpositions as a Non-Universal Category." In *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories. Studies in Language Companion Series* 72. Edited by Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges, and David S. Rood. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Delitzsch, Franz. 1888. *A New Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by S. Taylor. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T & T Clark.

DeRoche, Michael. 1988. "The *Rûaḥ ʾĔlōhîm* in Gen 1:2c: Creation or Chaos?" In *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical & Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*. Edited by Lyle Eslinger and Glen Taylor, 303–318. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series*, 67. Sheffield, United Kingdom: JSOT.

Dines, Jennifer. 1995. "Imaging Creation: The Septuagint Translation of Genesis 1:2." *Heythrop Journal* 36 (October): 439–450.

Dods, Marcus. (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.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. 1904. *The Book of Genesis*. 2nd ed. Westminster Commentaries. London, United Kingdom: Methuen & Co.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. 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, William J. 2002. *The Faith of Israel: A Theological Survey of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

Eichrodt, Walther. 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 Bernard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper.

Feinberg, John S. 2001. *No One Like Him: The Doctrine of God*. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway.

Fishbane, Michael. 1971. "Jeremiah IV 23–26 and Job III 3–13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern." *Vetus Testamentum* 21, no. 2 (April): 151–167.

Fouts, David M. 2004. "Selected Lexical and Grammatical Studies in Genesis 1." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 42 (1): 79–90.

Freedman, H., and Maurice Simon, trans. 1939. *Genesis Rabbah*. Vol. 1 *Midrash Rabbah*, 3–1003. London, United Kingdom: The Soncino Press.

Freedman, H., and Maurice Simon, trans. 1939. *Midrash Rabbah*. 5 vols. London, United Kingdom: The Soncino Press.

Frendo, Anthony J. 1999. "Genesis 1:1, An Archaeological Approach." In *Michael: Historical, Epigraphical and Biblical Studies in Honor of Prof. Michael Heltzer*. Edited by Yitzhak Avishur and Robert Deutsch, 161–169. Jaffa, Israel: Archaeological Center Publications.

Garrett, Duane. 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 George Arthur Buttrich. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon.

Gentry, Peter 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 Bernard A. Taylor, 285–298. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, no. 51. Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.

Geyer, John B. 1999. "Desolation and Cosmos." *Vetus Testamentum* 49, no. 1 (January): 49–64.

Gilboa, R. 1998. *Intercourses in the Book of Genesis: Mythic Motifs in Creator-Created Relationships*. Sussex, England: The Book Guild Ltd.

Gill, John. (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, Jonathan A. 1983. *II Maccabees*. The Anchor Bible 41A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Görg, Manfred. 1980. "*Tôhû Wâbôhû*—ein Deutungsvorschlag." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft* 92: 431–434.

Görg, Manfred. 2006. "תֹּהוּ (*tōhû*)." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Goshen-Gottstein, Alon. 2001. "Critical Encounters with Rabbinic Doctrines of Creation: The Teacher as Source of Authority or as Partner in Dialogue." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 4, no. 3 (October): 155–165.

Graves, Robert, and Raphael 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, Walter. 1981. "Syntaktische Erscheinungen Am Anfang Althebräischer Erzählungen: Hintergrund und Vordergrund." *Vetus Testamentum* 32: 131–145.

Grossfeld, Bernard. 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, Bernard, trans. 1988. *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 6. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.

Grudem, Wayne. 1994. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

Gruenthaner, Michael J. 1947. "The Scriptural Doctrine on First Creation." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (January): 48–58.

Gunkel, Hermann. 1994. *The Stories of Genesis*. Edited by William R. Scott. Translated by John J. Scullion. Vallejo, California: Bibal Press.

Gunkel, Hermann. 1997. *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.

Gunkel, Hermann. 2006. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*. Translated by K. William Whitney, Jr. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Hakham, Amos. 2003. *Psalms 101–150*. Vol. 3 of *Psalms*. The Koschitzky edition. *The Bible with the Jerusalem Commentary*. Jerusalem, Israel: Mosad Harav Kook.

Hamilton, Victor P. 1980. "אֶרֶץ (*ʾereṣ*) *earth, land, city (-state), (under) world*." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago, Illinois: Moody Press.

Hamilton, Victor P. 2005. *Handbook on the Pentateuch*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing Group.

Harrison, Roland K. 1988. "Earth." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Havey, Francis. 1908. "Clement of Alexandria." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04045a.htm.

Heller, Roy 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, Ronald S. 1998. *The Text of Genesis 1–11*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Honeyman, A.M. 1952. "Merismus in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71, no. 1 (March): 11–18.

Humbert, Paul. 1955. "Trois Notes Sur Genese 1." *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 56: 85–96.

Hurowitz, Victor. 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. Norman Strickman and Arthur M. Silver. New York: Menorah Publishing Company.

Irenaeus. (1885) 1957. *Against Heresies*. Translated by Alexander Roberts and William 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 David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday.

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: Christian Literature. Reprint. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Jongeling, Bastiaan. 1980. "Some Remarks on the Beginning of Genesis 1:2." *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, no. 4 (October): 275–280.

Josephus. F. 1981. *Josephus: Complete Works*. Translated by William Whiston. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications.

Kahle, Paul E. 1959. *The Cairo Geniza*. 2nd ed. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

Kohler, Kaufman, and Philip Bloch. 1906. "Baḥya (Beḥai) 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.

König, Eduard. 1919. *Die Genesis*. Gütersloh, Germany: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann.

Konkel, A.H. 1997. "בהו." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

Krašovec, J. 1983. "Merism—Polar Expression in Biblical Hebrew." *Biblica* 64 (2): 231–239.

Kugel, James. 1983. "Two Introductions to Midrash." *Prooftexts* 3, no. 2 (May): 131–155.

Lambdin, Thomas Oden. 1971. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Lambert, W.G. 1965. "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis." *Journal of Theological Studies* 16, no. 2 (October): 287–300.

Lebreton, Jules. 1910. "St. Justin Martyr." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York, New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08580c.htm.

Leclercq, Henri. 1910. "St. Gregory of Nyssa." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07016a.htm.

Leclercq, Henri. 1911. "The First Council of Nicaea." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11044a.htm.

Leibowitz, Nehama. 1972. *Studies in the Book of Genesis: In the Context of Ancient and Modern Jewish Bible Commentary*. Translated by Aryeh Newman. Jerusalem, Israel: World Zionist Organization, Department for Torah Education and Culture.

Levy, B. Barry. 1986. *Introduction, Genesis, Exodus*. Vol. 1 of *Targum Neophyti 1: A Textual Study*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, Maryland: University of America Press.

Lim, Johnson T.K. 2002. "Explication of an Exegetical Enigma in Genesis 1:1–3." *Asia Journal of Theology* 16, no. 2 (October): 301–314.

Lockshin, Martin 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: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01383c.htm.

Luther, Martin. 1958. *Luther's Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by J. Theodore Mueller. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

Luyster, Robert. 1981. "Wind and Water: Cosmogonic Symbolism in the Old Testament." *Zeitschrift Für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93, no. 1: 1–10.

Luzzatto, Samuel David. 1998. *The Book of Genesis: A Commentary by ShaDaL (S.D. Luzzatto)*. Translated by D.A. Klein. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc.

Maher, Michael. 1992. trans. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 1B. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press. .

Matthews, Kenneth A. 1996. *Genesis 1–11:26*. *The New American Commentary*. Vol. 1A. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman and Holman Publishers.

May, Gerhard. 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, Martin. trans. 1992. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 1A. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

McSorley, Joseph. 1907. "St. Basil the Great." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02330b.htm.

Miller, Ed. L. 1999. "'In the Beginning': A Christological Transparency." *New Testament Studies* 45, no. 4 (October): 587–592.

Muller, R.A. 1988. "World." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Murphy, Todd J. 2003. *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of Biblical Hebrew*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Myers, Jacob M. 1974. *I and II Esdras*. *The Anchor Bible* 42. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Neusner, Jacob. 1985. Introduction to *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis*. Brown Judaic Studies, no. 104. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Neusner, Jacob. 1988. Introduction to *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. London, United Kingdom: Yale University Press.

Newman, Jacob. trans. 1960. *The Commentary of Nahmanides on Genesis, Chapters 1-6*. Pretoria Oriental Series. Vol. 4. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.

Niccacci, Alviero. 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 George H. van Kooten, 3–20. Themes in Biblical Narrative. Vol. 8. Leiden, Netherland: Brill.

Oden, Robert A. Jr. 1992. "Cosmogony, Cosmology." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman, 1162–1171. 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, Harry M. 1957. "The Plain Meaning of Ru$^{a}$ḥ in Gen. 1.2." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 48, no. 2 (October): 174–182.

Orlinsky, Harry M. 1983. "Enigmatic Bible Passages: The Plain Meaning of Genesis 1:1–3." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 46, no. 4 (December): 207–209.

Ottosson. M. 1978. "אֶרֶץ (*'erets*)." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Ouro, Roberto. 1998. "The Earth of Genesis 1:2: Abiotic or Chaotic? Part I." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 35, no. 2 (Autumn): 259–276.

Ouro, Roberto. 1999. "The Earth of Genesis 1:2: Abiotic or Chaotic? Part II." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 37, no. 1 (Spring): 39–53.

Ouro, Roberto. 2000. "The Earth of Genesis 1:2: Abiotic or Chaotic? Part III." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38, no. 1 (Spring): 59–67.

Pearl, Chaim. 1970. Introduction to *Rashi: Commentaries on the Pentateuch*. The B'Nai B'Rith Jewish Heritage Classics. Translated by Chaim Pearl. New York, New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc.

Pearson, Anton T. 1953. "An Exegetical Study of Genesis 1:1–3." *Bethel Seminary Quarterly* 2, no. 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* 18, no. 58 (June): 3–11.

Peterson, John Bertram. 1907. "Apostolic Constitutions." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. 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 David T. Runia. *Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series*. Vol. 1. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

Plaut, W. Gunther. 1974. *Genesis*. Vol. 1 of *The Torah: A Modern Commentary*. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Polliack, Meira. 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.

Poncelet, Albert. 1910. "St. Irenaeus." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08130b.htm.

Prat, Ferdinand. 1911. "Origen and Origenism." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11306b.htm.

Rahlfs, Alfred. 1979. "History of the Septuagint Text." In *Septuaginta*, LVI–LXV. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Ramban. 1960. *The Commentary of Nahmanides on Genesis Chapters 1–6*. Vol. 4. Translated by Jacob Newman. Pretoria Oriental Series. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.

Rashbam. 1989. *Rabbi Samuel ben Meir's Commentary on Genesis: An Annotated Translation*. Translated by Martin I. Lockshin. Jewish Studies. Vol. 5. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.

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.

*Recognitions of Clement*. (1885) 1957. Translated by Thomas Smith. American ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 8. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Rechenmacher, H. 2002. "Gott und das Chaos: Ein Beitrag Zum Verständnis von Gen 1, 1–3." *Zeitschrift Für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 114, no. 1: 1–20.

Reddish, Mitchell G. 1992. "Heaven." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday.

Reider, Joseph. 1957. *The Book of Wisdom: An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature. New York: Harper & Brothers for The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning.

Ridderbos, N. H. 1958. "Genesis 1 und 2." In *Studies on the Book of Genesis*. Edited by Berend Gemser, 214–260. Oudtestament Studiën 12. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.

Robbins, Frank Egleston. 1912. "The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis." Ph.D. diss. The University of Chicago.

Rooker, Mark F. 1992. "Genesis 1:1–3: Creation or Re-Creation? Part 1." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (July–September): 316–323.

Rooker, Mark F. 1992. "Genesis 1:1–3: Creation or Re-Creation? Part 2 (of 2 parts)." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (October–December): 411–427.

Rosenberg, A. J. trans. 1993. *The Book of Genesis*. Vol. 1 of *Mikraoth Gedoloth*. Books of the Bible. New York: The Judaica Press.

Rottzoll, Dirk U. 1994. *Rabbinischer Kommentar Zum Buch Genesis*. Studia Judaica 14. Berlin, Germany: Walter De Gruyter.

Ryan, John K. trans. 1960. Introduction to *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. New York: Doubleday, Image Books.

Sacks, Robert 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, John H. 1990. *Genesis*. In vol. 2 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by F.E. Gaebelein, 3–248. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

Sarna, Nahum M. 1970. *Understanding Genesis*. New York: Schocken Books. First Schocken Paperback Edition, 1968.

Sarna, Nahum M. 1989. *Genesis. The JPS Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Jewish Publication Society.

Sasson, Jack M. 2005. "Of Time and Immortality: How Genesis Created Them." *Bible Review* 21, no. 3 (Summer): 32–41, 52–54.

Schmid, H.H. 1997. "אֶרֶץ *'ereṣ* earth, land." In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.

Schorsch, Ishmar. 2007. *Canon Without Closure: Torah Commentaries*. New York, New York: Aviv Press.

Schreiner, Thomas R. 2003. *1, 2 Peter, Jude. The New American Commentary*. Vol. 37. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Scullion, John J. 1992. *Genesis*: *A Commentary for Students, Teachers, and Preachers. Old Testament Studies*. Vol. 6. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

Shanks, Hershel. 1972. "How the Bible Begins." *Judaism* 21, no. 1 (Winter): 51–58.

Shimasaki, Katsuomi. 2002. *Focus Structure in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of Word Order and Information Structure*. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press.

Simon, Maurice. 1947. Introduction. *The Soncino Chumash: The Five Books of Moses with Haphtaroth*. Edited by Abraham Cohen. Hindhead, England: The Soncino Press.

Simpson, Cuthbert A., and Walter Russell Bowie. 1952. *The Book of Genesis. The Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 1. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press.

Skoss, Solomon 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, Pennsylvania: The Jewish Publication Society's Press.

Stadelmann, Luis I.J. 1970. *The Hebrew Conception of the World. Analecta Biblica* 39. Rome, Italy: Biblical Institute Press.

Strickman, H. Norman, and Arthur M. Silver. trans. 1988. *Bereshit*. Vol. 1 of *Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch*. New York: Menorah Publishing Company, Inc.

Tertullian. (1885) 1957. *Against Hermogenes*. Translated by D. Holmes. American ed. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 3. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Teske, Roland J. trans. 1991. Introduction. *Saint Augustine on Genesis. The Church Fathers: A New Translation*. Vol. 84. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Theophilus of Antioch. *Theophilus to Autolycus*. American ed. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 2. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Thomas, D. Winton. 1953. "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 3, no. 3 (July): 209–224.

Tsumura, David Toshio. 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, David Toshio. 1994. "Genesis and Ancient Near Eastern Stories of Creation: An Introduction." In *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11*. Edited by Richard S. Hess, and David Toshio Tsumura, 27–57. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Tsumura, David Toshio. 1997. "שָׁמַיִם." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

Tsumura, David Toshio. 2005. *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Unger, Merrill F. 1958. "Rethinking the Genesis Account of Creation." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 115, no. 457 (January–March): 27–35.

van der Merwe, Christo H.J., Jackie A. Naude, and Jan 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 Willem den Boer et al., 371–382. Amsterdam, Netherlands: North-Holland Publishing Company.

von Rad, Gerhard. 1963. *Genesis: A Commentary*. 2nd ed. Rev. ed. Translated by J.H. Marks. *The Old Testament Library*. London, United Kingdom: SCM Press Ltd.

Waltke, Bruce K. 1974. *Creation and Chaos: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Biblical Cosmogony*. Portland, Oregon: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary.

Waltke, Bruce K. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part I: Introduction to Biblical Cosmogony." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132, no. 525 (January): 25–36.

Waltke, Bruce K. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part II: The Restitution Theory." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132, no. 526 (April): 136–144.

Waltke, Bruce K. 1975. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Part IV: The Theology of Genesis 1." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132, no. 528 (October): 327–342.

Waltke, Bruce K. 1976. "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1-3, Part V: The Theology of Genesis 1—Continued." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 133, no. 529 (January): 28–41.

Waltke, Bruce K. 2001. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

Waltke, Bruce K. 2004. *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Waltke, Bruce K. 2007. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan..

Walton, John 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, John 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, John H. 2009. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Walton, John H., and Victor H. Matthews. 1997. *Genesis. Genesis–Deuteronomy. The IVP Bible Background Commentary*, 12–81. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Watson, Rebecca 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, Wilfred 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, Peter. 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 Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Diethard Römheld, 195–211. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Weippert, Manfred. 2004. "Schöpfung am Anfang oder Anfang der Schöpfung?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 60, no. 1: 5–22.

Wellhausen. Julius. 1994. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Scholars Press Reprints and Translations Series. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Wenham, Gordon J. 2003. *The Pentateuch*. Vol. 1. *Exploring the Old Testament*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Westall, M.R. 1977. "The Scope of the Term 'Spirit of God' in the Old Testament." *Indian Journal of Theology* 26, no. 1 (January–March): 29–43.

Westermann, Claus. 1997. "תְּהוֹם *tᵉhôm* flood." In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni, and Claus Westermann. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.

Wevers, John William. 1974. *Text History of the Greek Genesis*. Philologisch-Historische Klasse Dritte Folge, nr. 81. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wevers, John William. 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series*, no. 35. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Williams, Ronald J. 2007. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Revised by John C. Beckman. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Winston, David. 1971. "The Book of Wisdom's Theory of Cosmogony." *History of Religions* 11, no. 2 (November): 185–202.

Winston, David. 1979. *The Wisdom of Solomon. The Anchor Bible*. Vol. 43. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. 1948. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wright, Christopher J.H. 1997. "אֶרֶץ." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

Wyatt, Nicholas. 1993. "The Darkness of Genesis I 2." *Vetus Testamentum* 43, no. 4 (October): 543–554.

Young, Edward J. 1961. "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:2." *Westminster Theological Journal* 23, no. 2 (May): 151–178.

Young, Frances. 1991. "'Creatio Ex Nihilo': A Context for the Emergence of the Christian Doctrine of Creation." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44, no. 2 (May): 139–151.

Youngblood, Ronald. ed. 1990. *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions About Creation and the Flood*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

Youngblood, Ronald F. 1980. "תֹּהוּ (*tōhû*) confusion." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago, Illinois: Moody Press.

Zevit, Ziony. 1998. *The Anterior Construction in Classical Hebrew*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

# Appendix

## Genitive Clauses

### *The Compilation of the Data*

The following is a list of various references that in total contain 209 genitive clauses. This list is compiled from the examples found by this author and from those presented in GKC and Joüon. They are the following: Genesis 15:13; 24:22; 39:4; 43:3; 49:27; Exodus 4:13; 6:28; 9:4; 15:17; 18:20; Leviticus 7:9, 35; 14:16, 46; 25:48; Numbers 3:1; 7:13; 23:3; Deuteronomy 4:15; 32:11 (2×), 17, 35; Joshua 7:21; 14:10; Judges 8:1; 20:15; 1 Samuel 5:9; 6:9; 17:4; 25:15; 26:14; 2 Samuel 12:22; 20:21; 22:1, 44; 1 Kings 13:2, 12; 2 Kings 3:8; 8:6; 1 Chronicles 9:22; 12:23; 15:12; 17:13; 18:8; 29:1, 3; 2 Chronicles 1:4; 15:11; 16:9; 18:23; 20:22; 24:11; 28:9; 29:27; 30:17, 19; 31:19; Ezra 1:5; Nehemiah 8:10; 13:23; Job 1:1; 3:3 (2×), 15; 6:17; 7:2 (2×); 9:26; 11:16; 13:28 (2×); 15:3 (2×); 18:21; 21:27; 24:19; 28:1; 29:2, 12, 16; 30:13; 31:12 (2×); 38:19, 24, 26; Psalms 4:8; 7:16; 11:4; 16:3, 4; 18:1, 3, 44; 25:12; 32:2, 8; 33:12; 34:9; 38:14; 42:2; 49:13, 14, 21; 51:10; 56:4, 10; 58:5, 9; 59:17; 65:5; 68:31; 71:18; 74:3; 78:6; 81:6; 83:15 (2×); 90:5, 15 (2×); 102:3; 104:9; 119:136; 125:1; 138:3; 141:9; Proverbs 8:32; 17:14; 22:11; 26:17; 30:17 (2×); Ecclesiastes 10:5; Isaiah 6:6; 15:1, 7; 28:16; 29:1, 14; 38:5; 40:20 (2×); 41:2, 10, 24; 42:1, 16 (3×); 44:1, 2 (2×); 48:17; 51:1 (2×), 2, 7, 12; 53:7; 54:1 (2×), 5; 55:13; 56:2; 61:10, 11; 62:1; 63:19; 64:2; 65:1; 66:1; Jeremiah 2:6, 8, 11; 5:21; 6:15; 13:20; 14:18; 15:14; 17:4; 20:8; 23:9, 29; 32:18; 36:2; 48:36; 49:8; 50:31, 46; 52:12; Lamentations 1:10, 14, 21; 3:1; Ezekiel 13:3; 22:24; 25:7; Hosea 1:2; 4:14; 6:3; Micah 5:2; Habakkuk 1:6; 2:14; Zephaniah 2:1, 12; Zechariah 6:12; Malachi 2:16.

### *The Sources of the Data*

The data has been compiled from this author's own research and the grammars of Gesenius, Kautzsch, Cowley 1909 and Joüon and Muraoka 2008.[39] The following information displays the source locations from which the data has been collected.

### Personal Research

These examples were found using the search features of BibleWorks 6.[40] Leviticus 7:9; Job 24:19; Psalms 32:2; 38:14; 58:9; 74:3; 104:9; Proverbs 17:14; Isaiah 15:1; 41:10; 44:1, 2; 51:2;[41] Jeremiah 5:21; 17:4; 20:8; 32:18; Lamentations 3:1; Ezekiel 22:24; Zephaniah 2:1, 12.

### Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley (1909)

These examples are divided according to the sections in which they are cited. Some examples are cited more than once in Gesenius, Kautsch and Cowley (1909), but the multiple citations are only counted once in the total list of genitive clauses cited at the beginning of this appendix.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §130d.** Genesis 39:4; Exodus 4:13; 6:28; 9:4; Leviticus 14:46; 25:48; Numbers 3:1; 23:3; Deuteronomy 4:15; 1 Samuel 5:9; 25:15; 2 Samuel 22:1; Job 6:17; 18:21; 29:2, 16; Psalms 16:3; 18:1; 56:9; 59:16; 65:4; 81:5; 90:15; 102:2; 138:3; Proverbs 8:32; Isaiah 29:1; Jeremiah 6:15; 36:2; 48:36; 49:8; 50:31; Lamentations 1:14; Hosea 1:2.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155d.** Genesis 39:4; Judges 8:1; 20:15; 1 Samuel 6:9; 1 Kings 13:12; 2 Kings 3:8; 1 Chronicles 9:22; 12:22; 29:1, 3; 2 Chronicles 15:11; 18:23; 30:17; 31:19; Ezra 1:5; Nehemiah 13:23; Jeremiah 52:12.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155e.** Genesis 15:13; Deuteronomy 32:17; 2 Samuel 20:21; Job 1:1; 3:15; 38:26; Psalm 11:4; 49:13; Proverbs 22:11; 26:17; Habakkuk 1:6; Zechariah 6:12.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155f.** Genesis 49:27; Deuteronomy 32:17; 1 Samuel 6:9; 2 Chronicles 28:9; Job 3:3; 31:12; Psalm 16:4; 34:8; 68:30; 71:18; 78:6; Proverbs 30:17; Isaiah 28:16; 29:14; 38:5; 40:20; 51:12; 54:1; 55:13; 56:2; Lamentations 1:10; Ezekiel 25:7; Hosea 4:14.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155g.** Deuteronomy 32:11; Job 7:2; 9:26; 11:16; Psalms 42:1; 49:12, 20; 58:4; 83:14; 90:5; 125:1; Isaiah 53:7; 61:10, 11; 62:1; Jeremiah 23:29; Hosea 6:3; Habakkuk 2:14.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155h.** Exodus 15:17; Deuteronomy 32:17; Judges 8:1; Job 13:28; 28:1; Psalms 7:15; 25:12; 32:8; 33:12; 51:8; Ecclesiastes 10:5; Isaiah 6:6; 15:7; 42:16; 48:17; 64:3; Jeremiah 14:18; 23:9; 48:36; Lamentations 1:21.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155i.** Exodus 18:20; Job 3:3; Psalms 18:2; 32:2; Isaiah 42:1; Jeremiah 2:6.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155k.** Job 21:17; 38:19, 24; Isaiah 51:1.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155l.** Leviticus 7:35; Deuteronomy 32:35; 2 Chronicles 20:22; 24:11; 29:27; Job 6:17; Psalms 4:8; 56:4, 10; Jeremiah 36:2; Micah 5:2.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909, §155m.** 1 Samuel 26:14; Isaiah 63:19.

**Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1909 §155n.** Genesis 39:4; Exodus 4:13; 9:4; 1 Chronicles 15:12; 29:3; 2 Chronicles 1:4; 16:9; 30:19; 31:19; Ezra 1:5; Nehemiah 8:10; Job 29:12, 16; 30:13; Psalms 65:5; 81:6; 119:136; 141:9; Proverbs 8:32; Isaiah 41:2, 24; 65:1; Jeremiah 2:8, 11; Lamentations 1:14; Ezekiel 13:3; Malachi 2:16.

### Joüon and Muraoka (2008)

These examples are divided according to the sections in which they are cited. There is considerable overlap between the examples of this grammar and those of Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley (1909), but the overlapping examples are only counted once in the total list of genitive clauses cited at the beginning of this appendix.

**Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §129p.** Genesis 1:1;[42] 43:3; Exodus 6:28; Leviticus 14:16; 25:48; Joshua 14:10; 1 Samuel 25:15; 2 Samuel 12:22; 2 Kings 8:6; Job 29:2; Psalms 56:4; 102:3; Isaiah 29:1; Jeremiah 6:15; 50:46; Hosea 1:2.

**Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §129q.** Genesis 39:4; Exodus 4:13; 9:4; 2 Chronicles 30:19; Job 18:21; 29:16; Psalms 81:6; Jeremiah 2:8.

**Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §158a.** Genesis 49:27; Deuteronomy 32:17; 1 Samuel 6:9; Job 3:3; 31:12; Psalms 16:4; 34:9; 71:18; 78:6; Proverbs 30:17; Isaiah 51:12; 55:13; 56:2; Jeremiah 13:20; 15:14; Lamentations 1:10.

**Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §158b.** Genesis 24:22; Numbers 7:13; Joshua 7:21; 1 Samuel 17:4; 2 Samuel 20:21; 1 Kings 13:2; Job 1:1; 3:15; Isaiah 51:7; 54:5; 66:1; Zechariah 6:12.

[39] The examples from Waltke and O'Connor (1990) are not cited because they are all referenced in Gesenius, Kautsch, and Cowley (1909).

[40] To get these findings, I simply searched for all examples in the Hebrew Bible in which a noun was in construct with a finite verb. Many examples overlap with the examples from the grammars; thus, these are the leftovers that were not cited. The complications of this type of search are that not all nouns that may be in construct with a verb are necessarily tagged in the software as being a grammatical construct. Thus, this search was by no means exhaustive of the Hebrew text.

[41] No search criteria were used to find Isaiah 51:2; it was an unintended discovery.

[42] Joüon and Muraoka (2008) assume that Genesis 1:1 is a genitive clause. However, since the verse is the focus of this investigation as to whether or not it contains a genitive clause, it is not included in the final list of genitive clauses cited at the beginning of this appendix.

**Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §158c.** Exodus 15:17; Judges 8:1; 2 Samuel 22:44; Psalms 18:44; 33:12; 90:15; Isaiah 42:16; 51:1.

**Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §158d.** Genesis 39:4; 1 Chronicles 15:12; 17:13; 2 Chronicles 16:9; Nehemiah 8:10; Job 18:21; Proverbs 8:32; Isaiah 41:24; 54:1; 63:19; 65:1; Jeremiah 2:8, 11.

**Joüon and Muraoka 2008, §158db.** 1 Chronicles 18:8; Job 3:3; 15:3; Jeremiah 2:6; 23:9.