



millennium until this concept was entrenched in the Hebrew psyche, evinced throughout the Talmud and the works of Philo of Alexandria and Josephus. The community which produced Scripture would never countenance any hint of multiplicity or bifurcation in the Deity.

אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ ETH HA-SHA-MA-YIM V'ETH HA-A-RETZ (THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH): ETH ("Aleph-Taph"), the most ubiquitous word in Scripture, has an intrinsic meaning ("with", alluding to proximity - cf. GENESIS 13:5; EXODUS 1:1; JUDGES 1:16) but its primary role is designating direct objects. HA-SHA-MA-YIM (THE HEAVEN) and HA-A-RETZ (THE EARTH) have denotative "Heh" prefixes. *Imagine a lad, perched in the crow's nest of the Santa Maria as she neared the Bahamas, yelling "Land!". He would not shout "the land"; that would mean it was a known destination. This is a particular "earth" and its "heavens"; without the prefixes and direct object indicator, the verse would refer to the creation of the universe [and the form used when the heavens and earth are meant in a generic sense (cf. ISAIAH 65:17; JEREMIAH 33:25; PSALMS 121:2)]. This text narrows the locale to where we find ourselves (cf. DEUTERONOMY 4:32; ISAIAH 45:18; HOSEA 2:20) and which became, from then on, our sole venue.*

## 2. THE EARTH WAS UNIFORM, INERT AND OPAQUE THROUGHOUT (ITS) MASS AND (A) WIND (OF) E-LO-HIM BLOWING (DOWN) ON (THE) SURFACE (OF) THE WATERS.

This verse has been interpreted metaphorically, allegorically and mystically, with profundities only initiates are privy to. We do not dispute these but insist that, first and foremost, the text has a plain meaning readily perceived by its early readers.

תְּהוֹ וְתוֹ THOH-HOO VA-BHOH-HOO (UNIFORM AND INERT): "Formless and void" is wrong. That the earth had no specific shape means nothing, while "void" applies to an area emptied of what was there, not a pristine state. The possibility, premised on these words' meanings in old English {but unsupported by Hebrew grammar and syntax}, that they refer, not to the earth, but what should have been on it explains why some resorted to bleak portrayals like "desolate/empty/waste/chaos" but their Hebrew analogues, שְׁמֵם SHOH-MEIM (ABANDONED/FORLORN - cf. ISAIAH 49:8; LAMENTATIONS 1:4; DANIEL 8:13), צָחַק TZ'CHEE-AHCH (BARE - cf. EZEKIEL 24:7, 26:4; NEHEMIAH 4:7), חֲרָבָה CHOR-BAH (RUINED - cf. LEVITICUS 26:31; ISAIAH 51:3; DANIEL 9:2), הָרוּס HA-ROOS (DESTROYED - cf. KINGS I 18:30; JEREMIAH 1:10; PSALMS 58:7), נִשְׁמָד NISH-MAHD (LAID WASTE - cf. JOSHUA 11:20; ZECHARIA 12:9; ESTHER 3:6) and רֵיקָה REIQ (EMPTY - cf. GENESIS 37:24; JUDGES 7:16; KINGS II 4:3), all better than TOH-HOO VA-BHOH-HOO, still do not work - they relate to prior conditions that were destroyed or eroded. Some averred that such adverse situations were meant to be brought to mind but Scripture does not use circumlocutions - if that was its intent, the text would use unambiguous vocabulary, not obscurities.

TOH-HOO, the letter ת "Taph" ("spot/mark") with הוּא HOO (IT), implies that no point in or on a body is distinguishable from another. In SAMUEL I 12:21, TOH-HOO is a noun and then an adjective. Samuel exhorted Israel to abandon alien beliefs and practices, not because they no longer conferred benefits - they never did, which tells us why extant translations of TOH-HOO are wrong. They all point to the past, recounting destruction; TOH-HOO looks to the future, one without prospects - earth's initial condition could not change. Isaiah accentuated this when he declared לֹא־תָהוּ בְרָצָה LOH THOH- HOO BH'RA-AH (ISAIAH 45:18), usually translated "He did not create it a waste", which is doubly flawed (besides the object and prepositional phrase in reverse order) - it incorrectly turns an adjective into a noun and evaluates a condition which has no precedent for comparison. (*Other renderings, like "in vain/to be empty", wander further afield, as they require a dative "Lamed" prefix to TOH-HOO*). Rather, He B'RA-AH (CREATED IT) by altering its state to LOH (NOT) TOH-HOO, making change possible.

TOH-HOO pairs with BOH-HOO again only in Isaiah's קוֹ-תֵהוּ QAV (LINE) THOH-HOO weighted with אֲבִנֵי־בָהוּ ABH-NEI (STONES) BHOH-HOO (34:11 - JEREMIAH 4:23 reprises GENESIS 1:2). בְּוֹ BOH (IN IT) and הוּא HOO (IT [IS]) suggest a homogenous, amorphous substance, affording no tactile recognition anywhere. The "weight" of any of Isaiah's

stones was “in it”, weightless, hence useless in a plumb line. Similarly, the earth was BOH-HOO, not “void” but “devoid”; as weightlessness precludes natural motion, the earth lacked energy for change or movement – until E-LO-HIM injected it to disrupt TOO-HOO, its uniformity, and BOH-HOO, its dormancy. *Those who read TOH-HOO as “waste/void” were influenced by ISAIAH 24:10, where קִרְיַת-תְּהוֹמָה QIR-YATH TOH-HOO is rendered “city of destruction/waste”. This requires קִרְיַת QIR-YAH (cf. ISAIAH 1:21; PROVERBS 11:10; LAMENTATIONS 2:11). With the construct QIR-YATH, Isaiah decried the city as morally vacuous due to its residents’ behavior. This was the primeval globe – not land areas, for we are told nothing about them, not their structure, composition or contents. There can be no “desolation/waste” without a prior ordered state. The claim that this was the intent, to tell us our world was not like that at first, is a classic logical fallacy - circular reasoning. There is no better way to say that than חָרַב וְרֵק CHA-REIBH VA-REIQ (DESOLATE AND EMPTY - cf. JEREMIAH 33:10; EZEKIEL 29:10 - GENESIS 37:24; NEHEMIAH 5:13). Some treat this phrase as onomatopoeia, the second word a nonce term rhyming with the first and reinforcing it. For that, the punctuation on the first four words in the verse should be “Mahpakh-Pashta-Zaqef- Qatan.” Its “Meircha-Pashta” separates TOH-HOO from VA-BHOH-HOO, implying distinct meanings. The JEREMIAH 4:23 passage does the same, the “Tifcha” on TOH-HOO [rather than on V’HI-NEI {AND BEHOLD}] separates it from TOH-HOO.*

וְחֹמָה וְחֹמָה V’CHOH-SHEHKH AL P’NEI T’HOHM (AND OPAQUE THROUGHOUT ITS MASS): T’HOHM is not “the deep”; that is מַעְמָקִים MA-A-MAH-QIM (DEPTHS - cf. ISAIAH 51:10, EZEKIEL 27:34; PSALMS 69:2 [3 in the Hebrew]), מְצוּלָה M’TZOO-LAH (SUBMERGED - cf. EXODUS 15:5; JONAH 2:4; MICAH 7:19), תַּחְתִּית TACH-TITH (BOTTOM - cf. DEUTERONOMY 32:22; LAMENTATIONS 3:55; NEHEMIAH 4:7) or מְשֻׁקַּע MISH-QA (SUNKEN - cf. JEREMIAH 51:64; EZEKIEL 34:18; AMOS 8:8). Furthermore, “the deep” would be equivalent to הַמַּיִם HA-MA-YIM (“the water”) at the verse’s end, which would therefore be referred to with the prepositional pronoun עָלָיָהּ AH-LEH-HAH (UPON IT - cf. GENESIS 28:13; LEVITICUS 10:1; NUMBERS 19:2). The overriding difficulty with the standard translation is the same one that beset the ones of the verse’s opening passage - it makes no sense. Readers were just told of the barren, austere condition of the EH-REHTZ (“land”). If “darkness” sat astride T’HOHM, what straddled the region above EH-REHTZ? If T’HOHM is the whole planet’s surface, it should be עַל כֻּלָּהּ AL KOO-LAH (UPON ALL OF IT - cf. EXODUS 14:7; SAMUEL II 2:9; EZEKIEL 29:2) or the more concise וְהָאֲרֶץ וְהָאֲרֶץ V’HA-AH-REHTZ HA-Y’THAH ... וְהָאֲרֶץ V’CHAH-SHOOKH (AND THE EARTH WAS... AND DARK - cf. AMOS 5:8; PROVERBS 22:29; DANIEL 2:22). A collateral problem is that CHOH-SHEHKH is the dark quality of other elements; darkness itself is אֲפֵלָה AH-PHEI-LAH (cf. EXODUS 10:22; DEUTERONOMY 28:29; PSALMS 91:6).

T’HOHM (TOH-HOO with appended “Mem”) describes a quiescent earth. It does not locate darkness; that requires מֵעַל MEI-AL (OVER - cf. GENESIS 1:7; EZEKIEL 1:19; ESTHER 3:1), מִמֵּעַל MI-MA-AHL (FROM UPON - cf. GENESIS 22:9; EXODUS 20:4; KINGS I 6:3) or מִלְּמַעְלָה MI-L’MA-LAH (ABOVE - cf. EXODUS 25:21; NUMBERS 4:25; EZEKIEL 1:11). Nor is its root “Heh-Vav-Mem” [“rushing sounds”]; that yields תְּהוֹמָה T’HOO-MAH (cf. SAMUEL I 4:5; MICAH 2:12; RUTH 1:19). Because T’HOHM is often associated with water, it was erroneously rendered here as “the deep/abyss”. Depth (water or other) has root “Ayin-Mem-Qoph” (cf. PROVERBS 18:4; JOB 11:8; ECCLESIASTES 7:24). T’HOHM is a large mass; it can be a body of water but here it is an ice layer. *When the Israelites praised Him (EXODUS 15:8) with קָפְצוּ תְהוֹמַת בְּלִבִּי QO-PH’OO TH’HOH-MOHTH B’LEBH YAM (PILLARS CONGEALED IN THE HEART OF THE SEA), they saw a miraculous ice formation below the sea surface, instead of its normal place on top. This is also a logical translation of some other passages (ISAIAH 51:10, EZEKIEL 26:9, PSALMS 104:6) and a better reading of GENESIS 7:11, where נִבְּחָהּ נִבְּחָהּ נִבְּחָהּ נִבְּחָהּ נִבְּחָהּ NIBH- Q’OO KOL MA-Y’NOHTH T’HOHM RA-BAH as “all the fountains of the great deep burst forth” is unintelligible - the ancients did not think there were fountains in the seas. For bursting waters, the verb is נִפְּחָהּ נִפְּחָהּ NIPH-R’TZOO (cf. JUDGES 5:17; SAMUEL II 13:25; JOB 28:4). The “great” T’HOHM was a glacier that calved into torrents that inundated the surrounding area. קוֹחַ נֵיסַס קוֹחַ נֵיסַס קוֹחַ נֵיסַס קוֹחַ נֵיסַס KOH-NEISS KA-NEID MEI YAM NOH-THEIN B’OH-TZA-ROHTH T’HOH-MOHTH (PSALMS 33:7) is translated “He gathers the waters of the sea; He sets the deep in storehouses” but the second phrase has a plural noun following a prepositional clause; it should be נוֹתֵן תְּהוֹמָה בְּאֻצְרוֹת NOH-THEIN T’HOHM B’OH-TZ’ROH. The correct*

reading is “He congeals the waters of the sea like [into] a column and deposits [them as] glaciers in His storehouse”. This substratum was impenetrable - indicated by על־פָּנָי AL P’NEI (ON THE FACES OF) - and covered the earth’s interior (cf. JOB 6:16, where ice presented total darkness even at its top, and JOB 38:29-30, where a like phenomenon is exhibited AL P’NEI [on the face of] ice formations]. קָרָה QEH-RACH is “ice” in modern Hebrew but is reserved for climate in biblical usage (cf. GENESIS 31:40; JEREMIAH 36:30; PSALMS 147:17). AL P’NEI adds an observer’s dimension (cf. GENESIS 16:12; SAMUEL I 15:7; ECCLESIASTES 11:1 and note that על־פָּנָי AL PAH-NEYE [EXODUS 20:3] is not “before Me” {physical proximity} but His omnipresence). “Darkness” was not a substance above the T’HOHM but the perception of a hypothetical observer.

---

The narrative opens with earth, of some material, covered with ice - no explanation of its origin. Christian theologians trying to reconcile their translations with Hellenistic ideas postulated CREATIO EX NIHILO (CREATION OUT OF NOTHING), later adapted by Jewish thinkers as יש מאין YEISH MEI-A-YIN. We do not force a dogma into a text that neither needs nor sustains it nor can we infer how far back time reaches. The “Big Bang” cosmic origin model extrapolates an expansion from a singularity – not the same as a beginning. Assertions of an induced quantum fluctuation triggering an inflationary burst are also dubious; these are inherently random. Scripture focused solely on how our locale was transformed into a habitat.

---

וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים V’ROO-ACH E-LO-HIM (AND A WIND [OF] E-LO-HIM): “Spirit of the Lord/Divine Presence” have overtones the Hebrew lacks; the more neutral “Mighty Wind” also fails, and such expressions omit divine names (cf. EXODUS 14:21, KINGS 1 19:11, JOB 1:19, 8:2). ROO-ACH (WIND) is not an entity but a condition or force that impels movement. *A husband sanctions his wife when he has a ROO-ACH of jealousy (NUMBERS 5:14). Caleb’s ROO-ACH (NUMBERS 14:24) moved him to praise the Promised Land. When Pharaoh said (GENESIS 41:38) Joseph possessed ROO-ACH E-LO-HIM, he did not mean the divine was in him; no Egyptian then would say that. He praised his ability to find the right way (cf. NUMBERS 27:18; SAMUEL I 16:12-22; PSALMS 51:10-11 [12-13 in the Hebrew]).* The ROO-ACH here produced a phenomenon ordinarily impossible.

מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פָּנָי הַמַּיִם M’RA-CHE-FEHTH AL P’NEI HA-MA-YIM (BLOWING [DOWN] ON THE WATER [SURFACE]): Wind did not blow over the water; that is מְנַשֶּׁבֶת M’NA-SHEH-BHEHTH (BLOWING - cf. ISAIAH 40:7; PSALMS 147:18) or נוֹשֵׁף NOH-SHEIPH (EXHALE - cf. EXODUS 15:10; ISAIAH 40:24), with מֵעַל MEI-AL (ABOVE - cf. GENESIS 7:17; PSALMS 148:4; NEHEMIAH 12:37). {As in the preceding passage, AL P’NEI indicates an interaction, not a location.} “Moved” is נָדָד NOH-DEID (ROVE - cf. JEREMIAH 49:5; HOSEA 9:17; JOB 15:23) or נָחַע NOH-AH (MOVE - cf. NUMBERS 32:13; ISAIAH 6:4; LAMENTATIONS 2:15). “Hovering” is better but ruled out by the nature of wind. Helicopters and hummingbirds hover; wind is the effect of impelled particles. These interpretations ascribe no purpose or outcome to this wind. The root “Reish-Cheth-Pei” is associated with vibration (cf. JEREMIAH 23:9), like birds palpitating their wings over nests to create a downward draft (cf. DEUTERONOMY 32:11 – had that verse meant “hover”, it would be MEI-AL {ABOVE}). This ROO-ACH propelled particles downward, their kinetic energy converted to heat on impact, melting the ice. Only E-LO-HIM could create a pressure gradient everywhere perpendicular to the earth’s surface (winds move across surfaces or in circular paths parallel to them). {There are biblical passages that seem to suggest ROO-ACH can mean “spirit/soul” (e. g. ECCLESIASTES 12:7 - “the ROO-ACH returns to E-LO-HIM”). To see why these are spurious readings, we look at ECCLESIASTES 3:21: “Who knows the ROO-ACH of man [that] rises and the ROO-ACH of the animal [that] descends. מִי יֹדֵעַ MEE YOH-DEI-YA (WHO KNOWS) sounds like a question but the “Heh” prefix on הָעֹלֶה HA-OH-LAH (THAT RISES) and הַיֹּרֵד HA-YOH-REH-DEHTH (THAT DESCENDS) is not the interrogative but the indicative. Another riddle is that, throughout the book, principal references are all singular [A-DAM, ISH (MAN), CHA-KHAM (SAGE) or K’THIL (FOOL)]; בְּנֵי הָאָדָם B’NEI HA-A-DAM is a group with one ROO-ACH. ECCLESIASTES is a polemic on the futility of planning. The author questions whether human plans are of greater consequence than that of a cow whose attention is to the area where she will get her next mouthful of grass. All are driven by a ROO-ACH, a disposition to act. Who is to say whether the “loftier” one is of more importance or abiding significance? When the Psalmist says בְּיָדְךָ אֶפְקֵיד רוּחִי B’YA-D’KHA APH-QID ROO-CHEE

(PSALMS 31:5 [6 in the Hebrew]), he was not depositing his “soul” with the Almighty; such an interpretation is completely out of synchrony with that entire Psalm, in which David laments being beset by enemies. He will “invest” all his actions in His hand, guided by His direction. The post-biblical רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ ROO-ACH HA-QOH-DESH is associated with a “holy spirit” but that, in biblical parlance, is ROO-ACH QOH-DESH (HOLY WIND) or HA-ROO-ACH HA-QOH-DESH (THE HOLY WIND). ROO-ACH HA-QOH-DESH is a wind of that which is motivated by holiness. רוּחַ קְדוּשָׁהּ ROO-ACH QOD-SH’KHA (PSALMS 51:11 – 13 in the Hebrew) is not “Your Holy Spirit” but the “wind of your holiness”, inspired by Your truth and immanence. “Inspiration”, from the archaic “in-spirited”, means exactly that; people actuated to behave a certain way were “in-spirited”. This led to “inspiration” as an agency of human endeavor or animation. In Indo-European languages, the word retained its original connotation of breath, later transferred to the more abstract “spirit” but deemed to be real. In ancient Palestine, the word retained its basic meaning of “wind” as a force prodding movement, never an independent entity.}

### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

When E-LO-HIM initiated the transformation of earth and its celestial region into a habitat for man, it was an inert, amorphous mass covered with ice and permeated by darkness. A “wind of E-LO-HIM” drove particles down to the surface; their kinetic energy converted to heat upon impact and melted the ice layer.

This required a supernaturally induced pressure differential - the only way particles can be propelled down everywhere perpendicular to the surface - that manifested the Divine acting in, and through, nature. Nothing in the text indicates how long this lasted, what occurred before - whether in this locale or elsewhere in the universe - or how far back time reached. Nor are there references to the creation of ice and water, the material beneath them or the particles above them. Scripture’s lens is phenomenological, not ontological, conveying the effect of His actions, not His essential nature or that of physical entities.

### EXPOSITION [1:3-5]

#### 3. E-LO-HIM SAID: LET LIGHT BECOME – AND LIGHT BECAME (USEFUL).

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים, VA-YOH-MER E-LO-HIM (AND E-LO-HIM SAID): This couplet introduces “utterances” that triggered real causes and effects. The root "Aleph-Mem-Resh" (SAY) goes beyond rhetoric. DEUTERONOMY 26:5 asks the bearer of First Fruits וַיִּזְכֹּר וַיֹּאמֶר V’A-NEE-THA V’A-MAR-TA (RAISE YOUR VOICE AND SAY), to elevate them, after which (26:17-18) Y-H-W-H and Israel HE-EH-MEER - EXALT each other. An Emir {Arabic} is a commander whose dicta are obeyed. Generals do not directly control each cog in their military machines nor does E-LO-HIM micro-manage His world. This may conflict with dogmas that He controls every detail in the universe, a view with vehement dissenters. Scripture does not insist on His constant, pervasive guidance; it grants Him the same power we have of making “machines” that run automatically.

וַיְהִי אֶחָד, VA-Y’HEE OHR (AND LIGHT BECAME [USEFUL]): VA-Y’HEE is not immediate appearance. וַיְהִי אַחֲרָי VA-Y’HEE A-CHA- REI (IT CAME TO BE AFTER - e. g. GENESIS 22:20) suggests a duration the reader must gauge. וַיְהִי בַיּוֹם VA-Y’HEE BEE-MEI (IT HAPPENED IN THE DAYS OF - e. g. ESTHER 1:1) chronicles a span of years or decades. הָיָה HA-YAH (WAS) is used for incidents that occurred or conditions already existent. In EXODUS 10:23, הָיָה אֶחָד HA-YAH OHR (LIGHT WAS *immediately* for Israel during the plague of darkness) would be written that way here had the light appeared at once. *We are not told light’s source or how long it took to attain its present nature. Traditional scholars posit that He also created the sun on the first day but placed it on the fourth, the sun, moon and stars tucked away somewhere until then. Why He created things not needed until half-way through the creation process, or what light was doing until then, is not addressed - nor how vegetation sprouted on earth before sunlight powered its growth, something early readers, many of whom were farmers, might have wondered. Mystics cast this primordial light as a “higher enlightenment”, which ironically had to become occult lest it be abused, though why and how is not disclosed; contrivances that make a verse intelligible by subverting its plain meaning must be rejected.*

#### 4. E-LO-HIM SAW THE LIGHT WHEN (IT BECAME) GOOD AND E-LO-HIM DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN THAT LIGHT AND ITS DARKNESS.

כִּי־טוֹב VA-YAHR... KEE TOHBH (AND SAW... WHEN [IT BECAME] GOOD): “See” is “discern/assess” (cf. GENESIS 38:14; EXODUS 2:2; DEUTERONOMY 11:26). TOHBH (GOOD) can refer to a pleasing song or tasty meal but usually evaluates functional utility (*when two of the spies [NUMBERS 14:7] praised Canaan as TOH-BHAH {the feminine form}, they meant it would support its inhabitants; when Laban [GENESIS 29:19] declared that giving his daughter to Jacob was TOHBH, he foresaw an auspicious union*). Light dispels darkness and enables perception; how well it does this depends on its amount and intensity, not its quality. KEE here is “when” (cf. DEUTERONOMY 26:1; JUDGES 2:18; KINGS I 8:42) - He “saw the light when it (became) good”. “That the light was good” would be כִּי־טוֹב הָאֵוֶר KEE TOHBH HA-OHR (cf. GENESIS 3:6, 40:16; PSALMS 34:9; PROVERBS 31:18). אָתָּה ETH and the inverted order tell us He checked if the light was “good”, sufficiently developed for His next step.

וַיִּבְדֵּל VA-YABH-DEIL (AND [HE] DISTINGUISHED): “Separate” is rooted in “Peh-Reish-Daled” (cf. GENESIS 13:9; JUDGES 4:11; NEHEMIAH 4:13) or the Aramaic “Peh-Reish-Shin” (“part” - cf. EZEKIEL 34:12; a PAR-SHA is a distinct paragraph). VA-YABH-DEIL (root “Beth-Daled-Lamed” - cf. NUMBERS 8:14; DEUTERONOMY 29:20; KINGS I 8:53) focuses on divergences (as in the next verse) - He “distinguished”. Separating light from dark is unnecessary; light dispels darkness. The ancients felt the warmth of sun rays, saw them foster plant growth and knew they were not exclusive to the sun, that other things can illuminate and provide warmth when אֵוֶר OHR from matter emits light and heat. They understood that His “utterance” initiated a process that drew useful light from matter. *Some opine this passage was inserted to refute sun worshipping cults, just as myths of deities fabricating man out of primordial substances were controverted by the biblical creation account. Scripture would not be eternal if those passages were no longer needed to combat ideas long abandoned; rather, everything in it is always relevant, meaningful and instructive.*

#### 5. E-LO-HIM CALLED TO THE LIGHT (TO BE) DAY AND TO THE DARKNESS (TO BE) NIGHT

##### THERE BECAME A MIXTURE AND (THEN) THERE BECAME AN EMERGENCE (WHICH COMPRISED) ONE DAY

וַיִּקְרָא VA-YI-Q’RA... (AND [HE] CALLED...): An indirect object of QOH-REI (the dative “Lamed” [“to’] prefix is used all five times in this chapter) is “called” to a mission (*in SAMUEL II 5:9, the fortress was not named [VA-YI-Q’RA OH-THAH] but “called” [VA-YI-Q’RA LAH] to be “David’s city”*). Light was “called” to its tasks and their times for growth and development - “day”; darkness informs periods of respite - “night”. These are the cycles of our days and nights, not the creation stages.

וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר VA-Y’HEE EH-REBH VA-Y’HEE BHOH-QER (AND [THERE] BECAME A MIXTURE AND [THERE] BECAME AN EMERGENCE): Evening lasts for about an hour after sunset begins, morning a like period after sunrise. These non-contiguous intervals do not constitute a day. EH-REBH (root Ayin-Reish-Beth) is “mix” (cf. EXODUS 12:38; LEVITICUS 13:48; PSALMS 78:45), adapted for “evening”, when light and darkness mingle, but used here in its original meaning - a “mixture” of materials and forces. BOH-QER is “morning” because we can then “discern” entities or shapes (cf. LEVITICUS 27:33; KINGS II 16:15; EZEKIEL 34:12); in the creation saga, it denotes the resultant of that “day’s” development.

יוֹם YOHM (DAY): The words for time have distinct connotations. פֶּעַם PA-AHM (OCCASION - cf. GENESIS 29:34; LEVITICUS 25:8; DEUTERONOMY 16:16) is a specific, often recurring, event, not necessarily at a fixed time. עֵת EITH (SEASON/ERA - cf. GENESIS 38:1; DEUTERONOMY 3:23; ECCLESIASTES 3) and זְמַן Z’MAHN (INTERVAL - cf. ESTHER 9:27, EZRA 10:14; NEHEMIAH 2:6) are definite times. None of these hint at time measurement. רֵגַע REH-GA (MOMENT - cf. EXODUS 33:5; NUMBERS 16:21; ISAIAH 54:7) is an instant too quick to calibrate. The Aramaic שָׁעָה SHA-AH (HOUR - DANIEL 3:6, 4:16) originated with the Babylonians, who established the 12-hour day, 60-minute hour and standard units for comparing intervals and their number. Scripture’s perspective, shared by prominent scientists like Albert Einstein and Ernst Mach, does not measure time by standard units but by what occurs in an interval; if it envelops an event or process, it makes no difference if it lasts seconds or billions of years – it is one “day”. The days that populate our affairs may be numbered sequentially (cf. NUMBERS 7:12-78, Ch. 29) but are delineated

by their inception at sunrise and departure at sunset [not by a sequence of units adding to a certain sum] or by what takes place within them. The standard day begins and ends at sunset (LEVITICUS 23:32); within the sanctuary, it began at daybreak and ended at mid-afternoon, late afternoon, nightfall or the next daybreak, depending on the service to which it was attached (e. g. LEVITICUS 7:15-16) - simultaneous days with different end points.

Each creation day was defined by the metamorphosis it hosted. An abstract “day” is associated with an activity or phenomenon, like the punishment exacted בְּיוֹם פְּקוּדָי B'YOHM PO-Q'DEE (EXODUS 32:34), usually translated “the day of My visitation” but is more accurately “Whenever I visit retribution” and not limited to any “day”. Our text does not state that there was night and day or evening, night, morning and day; there were no distinct intervals between E-REBH and BOH-QER. A creation “broke through” after its ontogenesis each “day”. The first “day” is numbered cardinally - One Day (the others numbered by ordinals), telling us these “days” were defined by the transformations occurring in each, in which a mix of ingredients was powered by energy and transmuted to an “emergence”, the first framing the formation of usable energy and light. Each creation day’s PAR-SHA is, in the Torah scrolls, separated at its beginning and end by a full space, suggesting these days were not sequential (cf. NUMBERS 29:12-30:1) - they overlapped!

### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

E-LO-HIM directed light to form. When it became useful as a source of energy and illumination, He demarcated it from darkness, assigning it to invigorate daytime activities and darkness for nightly repose. Space, matter (solid, liquid and gas), energy and time intermingled to inform an environment, a synthesis defining period [day] one.

Light heads the creation order but its designation as the central feature of “day” and darkness of “night” belongs in the fifth PAR-SHA, with the flora and fauna that react to light and dark. This passage placed here tells us light is an energy manifestation independent of its source, a remarkable insight. When all creation myths evinced no awareness of light’s centrality, Genesis posited it, not as a deity, but the first creation which powered the emergence of life, a view promulgated millennia before it became generally accepted.