

PAR-SHA 6

EXPOSITION [1:24-25]

24. E-LO-HIM SAID: THE LAND(S) SHALL YIELD VOLITIONAL LIFE (FORMS) OF VARIOUS TYPES  
GRAZERS, CRAWLERS AND THOSE WHO LIVE OFF THE LAND BY THEIR KINDS - AND IT BECAME THUS.

תּוֹצֵא תוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ TOH-TZEI HA-A-RETZ (THE EARTH [SHALL] YIELD): The root “Yud-Tzadiq-Aleph” (GO/COME OUT) refers to departure or extraction (cf. EXODUS 12:46; JEREMIAH 32:21; RUTH 2:18), not development or manufacture. The opposite applies when it is metaphorical [*Jacob's descendants are יִצְאֵי יִרְכּוּ YOH- TZ'EI Y'REI-CHOH (ISSUE OF HIS LOINS - GENESIS 46:26); Job says of the earth מִמֶּנָּה יִצְאֵי לֶחֶם MI-MEH-NAH YEI-TZEI LEH-CHEM (FROM IT ISSUES BREAD - JOB 28:5)]. A literal TOH-TZEI would mean fully formed animals cracked through the earth's crust to clamber onto land, with no account of how they came to be. It is more reasonable that TOH-TZEI is figurative - “products” of the land.*

לְמִינָהּ לְ MEE-NAH (TO ITS KIND - see v. 11): When a “Lamed” prefix (ל - “to”) does not put a noun into the dative case, it indicates a transition or process - later animal types differed from the earlier. *Had all species appeared simultaneously, the text would read תּוֹצֵא תוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ כֹּל נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה TOH-TZEI HA-A-RETZ KOL NEH-PHESH CHA-YAH (THE EARTH SHALL BRING FORTH ALL THE LIVING - cf. GENESIS 9:12; EXODUS 1:5; LEVITICUS 24:17). The “Lamed” prefix implies phylogeny, each area producing variations among classes.*

וְהַחַיִּים וְהַתּוֹצֵאִים בְּהֵמָה וְרִמָּה וְהַחַיִּים בְּהֵמָה וְרִמָּה B'HEI-MAH VA-REH-MESS V'CHAI-Y'THOH E-RETZ (GRAZERS, CRAWLERS AND [THOSE] WHOSE LIFE [IS] OF EARTH): B'HEI-MAH with no “Vav” prefix (ו - “and”) is a subset of the earlier נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה NEH-PHESH CHA-YAH but the “Vav” on REH-MESS (*usually omitted on nouns between the first and last in a sequence*) tells us the categories shared traits (*convergent evolution*). Scripture does not classify by anatomy, physiology or taxonomy but by how animals relate to man. The precise meaning of B'HEI-MAH is unclear (*most render it “beast” but it has no exact English equivalent*); it is an ungulate living off local flora (cf. EXODUS 12:29; LEVITICUS 19:19; JONAH 3:7). *When He threatens וְשֵׁין בְּהֵמָה לֶחֶם אֲשֶׁר-לֵהֶם V'SHEIN B'HEI-MOHTH A-SHA-LACH (TEETH OF B'HEI-MOHTH I WILL DISPATCH - DEUTERONOMY 32:24), the terror comes from fear these placid chewers [not “wild” beasts] will invade homes in search of food. The REH-MESS crawled (cf. LEVITICUS 20:25; HOSEA 2:20; PSALMS 148:10 - see v. 21) to find food or a mate. The CHA-Y'THOH E-RETZ are not grazers or roamers, nor is their E-RETZ ground but a defined area where they live off whatever was available, including other animals (cf. PSALMS 79:2). The text does not preclude the emergence of carnivores with, or soon after, herbivores. The assumption that flesh consumption was interdicted before the Deluge came from faulty readings of GENESIS 1:29-30 and 9:3-4.*

25. E-LO-HIM MADE (ADVANCED) LAND DWELLERS BY KINDS AND (THEIR) GRAZERS BY KINDS  
AND ALL THE GROUND CRAWLERS BY KIND - AND E-LO-HIM SAW WHEN (ALL BECAME) GOOD.

וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים VA-YA-AHSS E-LO-HIM (E-LO-HIM MADE): VA-YA-AHSS is a finishing or completion (see v. 7 – VA-YA-AHSS). וַיְהִי כֵן VA-Y'HEE KHEIN (AND IT BECAME THUS) that ended the last verse told us these creatures had already attained the forms we would recognize {VA-YA-AHSS (HE MADE) following TOH-TZEI (BRING FORTH - v. 24) allows no interpretation but that the events in verse 24 preceded those of verse 25}. What was now “made” was a further emergence. L'MEE-NAH/L'MEE-NEI-HOO (TO ITS KIND) after every category indicates speciation within each.

חַיִּים חַיִּים הָאָרֶץ CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ (DWELLERS ON THE LAND): We have three more differences between the verses: 1] CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ is first, not at the end. 2] The generic CHA-Y'THOH E-RETZ became the specific CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ. 3] The “Heh” definite article prefix and direct object indicator ETH convert this to a singular group of different types. *Verse 24 lists three forms of NEH-PHESH CHA-YAH (the extra L'MEE-NAH [TO ITS KIND] separates these passages) - grazers, roamers and foragers, then carnivores. By contrast, E-LO-HIM here focused on the CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ, evidenced by their heading this list and no generic NEH-PHESH CHA-YAH. A singular noun used for a class, being abstract, cannot be modified by ETH unless KOL (ALL) or another inclusive is added. When ETH reinforces a definite article “Heh” prefix, it adjusts that noun's character, dimensions and ancillary aspects like gender and number. The ETH preceding CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ tells us it is not a class noun but one of these*

creatures that had types, as indicated by its L'MEE-NAH (TO ITS KIND). Its placement in verse 25 tells us it is within the CHA-Y'THOH E-RETZ of verse 24 but to see what these were, whose development required intervention, we turn to the next categories in the verse.

וְאֵת-הַבְּהֵמָה V'ETH HA-B'HEI-MAH (AND THE GRAZERS): B'HEI-MAH is a singular noun; the indicative “Heh” prefix preceded by ETH makes it specific types (not a class as in v. 24). As the CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ (LAND DWELLERS) were a subset of the CHA-Y'THOH E-RETZ (THOSE WHO LIVE ON THE LAND) – hunters and predators, these were types of grazers domesticated by the CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ as stable sources of food and motive power.

כָּל-רֶמֶשׂ הָאֲדָמָה KOL REH-MESS HA-A-DA-MAH (ALL THE GROUND CRAWLERS): A-DA-MAH, used but once in the chapter, references land in relation to A-DAM (MAN), the masculine form. Only “ground crawlers” in proximity to A-DAM received divine attention. *These formed variants - here is the one time in this PAR-SHA the text uses the plural לְמִינֵהוּ L'MEE-NEI-HOO (BY KINDS) - that evolved in different A-DA-MAH regions (and diverged as species). These “roamers”, with the “grazers”, were “made” to support, with vegetation, the CHA-YATH HA-A-RETZ subset of CHA-Y'THOH E-RETZ, carnivores taking advantage of all their vicinities offered.* A-DAM and A-DA-MAH are two sides of a coin - there is no A-DA-MAH without A-DAM. The CHA-YAH of verse 25, who converted E-RETZ to A-DA-MAH, is the *class of the first hominids. This is not Primordial Adam (2:7 - אָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן “Adam HaRishon” of post-biblical literature) or the successor (v. 26) but the CHA-YOHTH HA-A-RETZ He “made”.*

וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי-טוֹב VA-YAHR E-LO-HIM KEE TOHBH (AND E-LO-HIM SAW WHEN [IT BECAME] GOOD): He did not evaluate His own handiwork (see v. 4) but appraised earth's issuance (v. 24). Why, then, is this not at the end of verse 24? A more pertinent query, overlooked by commentators, is why verses 24 and 25 are not in the last PAR-SHA [“day” five]. The emergence of terrestrial and marine life should be juxtaposed (*especially since they intersect, e. g. amphibians*). If two disparate activities can share “day” three, why not two complementary ones in “day” 5? If E-LO-HIM consigned an entire “day” to bring forth light and another to separate the two aqueous regions, did not the “Crown of Creation” deserve the same?

Nature generated variations (v. 12 - *e. g. the extinct Burgess Shale “types”*); when useful ones emerged, they sometimes needed “adjustments”. The Israelites had no inkling of the mechanics but intuited that E-LO-HIM intervened at times, the text only reporting His acts and their outcomes, notably those lavished on proto - humans and those sharing their environs. Since the rest of the world developed without His guidance, He had to “see” if the two spheres were compatible, for they were the setting for A-DAM – and why this creation segment was in layer six.

### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

E-LO-HIM directed terrestrial areas to bring forth animals - grazers, roamers foraging for flora and carnivores. From this last group, He fashioned protohumans, who consumed diverse plants and animals and, by improvising other uses for them, subsisted in many sectors. These creatures all coexisted with those that evolved naturally.

### EXPOSITION [1:26-28]

26. E-LO-HIM SAID: WE WILL MAKE HUMANS USING OUR FORM WITH OUR (ABILITY TO) IMAGINE  
THEY WILL EXPLOIT THE FISH OF THE SEA AND BIRDS OF THE HEAVEN AND THE GRAZERS  
AND THE EARTH AND ALL THE CREEPERS THAT CRAWL ON THE GROUND.

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים וַיַּעֲשֶׂה VA-YOHR MER E-LO-HIM NA-A-SEH (E-LO-HIM SAID WE WILL MAKE): This would be another “utterance” setting events in motion but for the plural “We will make” - and no indication who was solicited or a response. Traditional hermeneutics may be homiletically gratifying but fail to address another difficulty: עָשָׂה OH-SEH (MAKE/DO) is completion or perfection of something already extant and should follow בֹּרָא BOH- REH (CREATE - *cf. His making the atmosphere [v. 6-7], the luminaries [v. 14-16] and animals [v. 24-25]*); here, it precedes וַיִּבְרָא VA-YIBH-RA (HE CREATED - v. 27). *Scripture does not adhere to strict ordering of events or processes but successive ones in one*

passage are always chronological. וַיִּצְעֲקֵהּ NA-A-SEH is jussive, indicating E-LO-HIM's selective participation; His utterance was directed to the group best situated and most capable of carrying it out.

אֲדָמָה A-DAM: This is a class noun [וַיִּרְדּוּ V'YIR-DOO - AND THEY WILL EXPLOIT]. NA-A-SEH (WE WILL MAKE) embraced the hominids (see v. 25 – V'ETH KOL REH-MESS HA-ADA-MAH) who were to bring forth a new type, the only creation whose form, capabilities and future behavior were outlined in the text. NA-A-SEH summons a collective; it does not require all parties to act simultaneously or be aware of the objective (cf. GENESIS 11:4; EXODUS 19:8; SONG OF SONGS 8:8).

---

In the next chapter, one A-DAM assumes a more complex personality; other humans existed contemporaneously [cf. Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Chagiga 13b-14a; Midrash Genesis Rabbah 19:5].

---

"In Our image, according to/after Our likeness" fostered dogmas of man as the epitome of creation but the "Vav" conjunction, always used with complimentary elements of a pair, is absent (cf. GENESIS 24:49; NUMBERS 22:18; PSALMS 115:4). Esau was עֵשָׂו אִישׁ שָׂדֵה YOH-DEI-A TZA-YID ISH SAH-DEH (KNOWING HOW TO TRAP, A MAN OF FIELD[S] – charming, a "man of the world", two distinct traits; likewise, his brother Jacob was יַעֲקֹב אֶהְלִים TAHM YOH-SHEIBH OH-HA- LIM (WITHOUT GUILE, A TENT DWELLER {plain-spoken, studious} - GENESIS 25:27 and cf. GENESIS 16:12; NUMBERS 24:4). A second anomaly is the "Beth" prefix of TZEH-LEM changed to a "Kaph" for D'MOOTH, making כְּדִמוּתָנוּ KI-D'MOO-THEI-NOO a redundant "like our likeness" (Scriptural analogies are explicit – cf. EXODUS 24:10; NUMBERS 9:15; ISAIAH 40:22).

בְּצַלְמֵנוּ B'TZAL-MEI-NOO (USING OUR [PHYSICAL] FORM): צֶלֶם TZEH-LEM is not "image"; the root "Tzadiq-Lamed" ("shadow/shade") and appended "Mem" is a physical embodiment of a mental projection (cf. NUMBERS 33:52; EZEKIEL 7:20; DANIEL 3:1). Visual representation is תְּמוּנָה T'MOO-NAH (PICTURE - cf. NUMBERS 12:8; DEUTERONOMY 4:12; PSALMS 17:15). The simile in PSALMS 39:6 [7 in the Hebrew] is to a hollow corporeality; a metaphor requires a "Kaph" prefix, not a "Beth". A comparison to E-LO-HIM needs "Yud-Tzadiq-Reish" (INCLINATION/NATURE - cf. GENESIS 6:5; DEUTERONOMY 31:21; CHRONICLES I 28:9) or "Mem-Shin-Lamed" (LIKEN/RESEMBLE - cf. ISAIAH 46:5; PSALMS 28:1; JOB 30:19) and is never a physical manifestation, anathema to the Israelites. Suggestions that it mirrored celestial beings postulate entities to which physical models cannot apply. Some refer to intellectual talents or morals. This is tenuous; when He bestows cognitive or aesthetic gifts, they are spelled out (cf. EXODUS 31:3, 35:35; KINGS I 3:12, 5:9) and attributing this here is discordant with Chapters 2-3, where man acquires "knowledge" by his own initiative. Scripture does not couch terms so obliquely their plain meaning is obscured. TZAL-MEI-NOO is the first-person plural possessive of one TZEH-LEM belonging to a group (cf. AMOS 5:26), the hominids directed to use their physical forms for a new A-DAM type. Nor is it incongruous that they participated unwittingly; NA-A- SEH (WE WILL MAKE) following VA-YOH-MER (HE SAID) indicates only an initiated process. When Joseph suggested פָּרְעֹה יַעֲשֶׂה YA-A-SEH PHAR-OH (PHARAOH SHALL MAKE - GENESIS 41:34), the stockpiling done by others who may not have known why they were doing it was attributed to Pharaoh. The laborers erecting the tower were not all aware they were furthering וְנִבְעֵשְׂהָ לָנוּ V'NA-A-SEH LA-NOO SHEM (WE WILL MAKE A NAME FOR OURSELVES - GENESIS 11:4). Populations "made" the A-DAM via their procreative proclivities. Including Himself in this did not require He share this TZEH -LEM. When the tribes asking to remain in trans-Jordan agreed to accompany their brethren into Canaan for battle, they stipulated that תַּבְּנוּ נָשֵׁינוּ TA-PEI-NOO NA-SHEI-NOO (OUR CHILDREN, OUR WIVES) would remain behind (NUMBERS 32:26). Of their thousands, some had neither wives nor children; this did not preclude their joining in the declaration.

כְּדִמוּתָנוּ KI-D'MOO-THEI-NOO (WITH OUR [ABILITY TO] IMAGINE): Those translating this "like us/to resemble us/according to our likeness" rely on the King James "after our likeness", not realizing that the Stuart English "after" was adverbial, not a preposition ("she takes after her mother"). The root "Daled-Mem-Heh" ("compare/likened" - cf. ISAIAH 1:9; PSALMS 17:12; SONG OF SONGS 2:9) is mental perception. צֶלֶם TZEH-LEM is an objective shape, דְּמוּת D'MOOTH a subjective reaction, like Impressionist painting. {EZEKIEL 1 is replete with this word; his visions were ideations.} The conventional view that His "likeness" was a behavioral or spiritual ideal imbued into A -DAM is wrong. The meaning of KI-D'MOO-THEI-NOO is gleaned from its other occurrences. In PSALMS 58:4 [5 in the Hebrew], "venom" is כְּדִמוּת חֲמַת־נָחָשׁ KI-D'MOOTH CHA-MAHS NA-CHASH (LIKE A SNAKE'S POISON), not physical toxin but the perceived effect of hateful words. In DANIEL 10:16, כְּדִמוּת בְּנֵי אָדָם KI-D'MOOTH B'NEI A-DAM is not "one who looked like a man". B'NEI A-DAM is plural (SONS OF MEN - cf. DEUTERONOMY 32:8; PSALMS 36:8; ECCLESIASTES 3:19); some render it that way but it does not fit this

context. The singular is בְּנֵי אָדָם BEN A-DAM (cf. ISAIAH 51:12; EZEKIEL 3:1; PSALMS 8:5) but for a comparison, the simpler אֲדָמָה K'A-DAM (cf. HOSEA 6:7; PSALMS 82:7; JOB 31:33), כְּאִישׁ K'ISH (LIKE A MAN [PERSON] - cf. ISAIAH 66:3; ZECHARIAH 4:1; NEHEMIAH 8:1) or כְּגֵה־בְהֵר K'GEH-BHER (MANLY) - cf. JEREMIAH 23:9; PSALMS 88:5; JOB 38:3) suffices. These, with וְהִנֵּה V'HI-NEI (see v. 29), point to the correct translation, “as people suppose [angelic apparitions appear]” - KI-D'MOO-THEI-NOO, like TZEH-LEM, is a shared attribute. These instances of D'MOOTH, a cognitive estimation modified by the comparative “Kaph”, intimate a common mental aptitude. As the physical contours of the A-DAM prototype were provided by his ancestors, so their mental acuties and the flexibility to develop that faculty indispensable to human progress – *imagination*.

וְיִרְדּוּ V'YIR-DOO (THEY WILL EXPLOIT): “They shall rule/have dominion over” is technically defective but a simple objection refutes it - man never “rule(d) over the fish of the sea and birds of the air”. The radical “Reish-Daled” is not mastery or reign but taking tribute, from a nation (cf. DEUTERONOMY 20:20; ISAIAH 45:1; PSALMS 144:2) or a person (cf. LEVITICUS 25:43; EZEKIEL 34:4; JEREMIAH 5:31). The A-DAM was to exploit - the words not addressed to him but inform the directive NA-A-SEH; he was to develop skills to thrive all over the planet.

27. This verse has three independent sentences (they are not connected by a “Vav” [“and”]).

E-LO-HIM CREATED THE HUMAN IN HIS [A-DAM'S] FORM.

HE CREATED HIM WITH A PROJECTION (OF) E-LO-HIM.

HE CREATED THEM MALE AND FEMALE.

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ VA-YIBH-RA E-LO-HIM ETH HA-A-DAM B'TZAL-MOH (E-LO-HIM CREATED THE HUMAN IN HIS [A-DAM'S] FORM): VA-YIBH-RA ([HE] CREATED) should precede NA-A-SEH (WE WILL MAKE - a finishing or completion [v. 26]). The order is reversed because this TZEH-LEM indirectly motivated a collective “making” through a BOH-REH (CREATE - see 1:1, BA-RA) process. *Translators assumed the possessive “his” referred to E-LO-HIM and the next passage (IN THE IMAGE OF E-LO-HIM HE CREATED HIM) is an emphatic appositive; that would be אֱלֹהִים בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצַלְמוֹ B'TZAL-MOH B'TZEH-LEM E-LO-HIM (cf. GENESIS 37:1; LEVITICUS 6:9; ESTHER 9:1). The added BA-RA OH-THOH makes these four words an independent sentence and, in biblical syntax, the possessive noun of the verse's first sentence relates to the last-mentioned noun in that phrase, the TZEH-LEM of the A-DAM [a reading supported by the vertical line inserted into the sentence by the Masoretes].* The first sentence of this verse, with the definite article prefix “Heh” and direct object indicator ETH modifying A-DAM, refers to the TZEH-LEM of the hominids that physically molded the A-DAM.

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצַלְמוֹ B'TZEH-LEM E-LO-HIM BA-RA OH-THOH (WITH E-LO-HIM'S PROJECTION HE CREATED HIM): This permutation of the last sentence misled commentators; the changed word order changes the phrase's meaning. An opening prepositional phrase tags this a second TZEH-LEM (cf. SAMUEL I 9:20; KINGS I 1:26; ISAIAH 7:24). *To illustrate: רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים ROO-ACH E-LO-HIM (1:2) is not a prepositional possessive but an adjectival construct [a “supernatural wind”, not “His wind”]; TZEH-LEM here is not an objective projection but a numinous one.* The A-DAM was imbued with the faculty integrating experience and imagination - consciousness, the only Divine trait which could be His TZEH-LEM (“projection”) used to “create” the A-DAM.

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצַלְמוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָא אֹתָם ZA-KHAR U-N'QEI-BHA BA-RA OH-THAM (MALE AND FEMALE HE CREATED THEM): Those citing this as proof of multiple sources (it seems to contradict 2:21-22 [in which Eve was “built” from Adam]) have a problem. The procreative blessing (v. 22) mentions no male/female dichotomy - readers knew all creatures have genders. What need to state this for the A-DAM? *Traditionalists maintaining this refers to the Eden couple also confront this puzzle. The answer that “His image and likeness” informed both sexes is not tenable; Adam himself recognized the woman as his clone (2:23). A more egalitarian view, that these words promote sexual equality, is a modern sensibility. Such an assertion belongs in Chapter 3, after the woman's “trespass”. Biblical women were not that subordinate; like Eve, they are as assertive and independent as men - often more so. Certainly, women often suffered discrimination but the idea that a Scriptural snippet would alleviate that - or that readers would even catch it - is fanciful apologetics; for that, the text would read זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאָם ZA-KHAR U-N'QEI-BHA B'RAH-AHM (cf. GENESIS 5:2,*

6:19, 7:3). The plural pronoun after two singular class nouns indicates reversion to the group with which the section began, the *males and females siring the two sexes together and “creating” the new breed of mankind.*

28. E-LO-HIM BLESSED THEM AND SAID TO THEM: REPRODUCE AND INCREASE NUMBERS  
AND FILL THE EARTH AND CONQUER IT AND EXPLOIT FISH OF THE SEA  
AND BIRDS OF THE HEAVENS AND ALL LIFE THAT TREADS ON THE EARTH.

וַיְבָרֶךְ VA-Y'BHA-REKH ([HE] BLESSED): Unlike verse 22, this blessing was confined to one type, another example of Scripture's remarkable insight. Hierarchies in any biosphere consist of ever smaller groups ascending a pyramid, each species needing a larger support population on the level below it. A blessing granting numerical parity to all creatures is a recipe for ecological disaster. Only man, who would need sustenance and succor all over the globe, received it.

וַיִּכְבְּשֵׁהָ V'KHI-BH'SHOO-HAH (AND CONQUER IT): “Subdue” is תִּכְבֹּעַ TAKH-NEE-YA (LOWER/HUMBLE - cf. JUDGES 4:23; ISAIAH 25:5; CHRONICLES II 28:19) or תִּכְרֶיעַ TAKH-REE-YA (BOW - cf. JUDGES 11:35; PSALMS 18:39 [40 in the Hebrew]; JOB 31:10); like כִּיבוֹשׁ KEE-BOOSH (“conquest”), these impact human adversaries, not environmental challenges, perhaps why others chose “master” but that is תִּשְׁלוֹת TISH-LOHT (CONTROL - cf. GENESIS 42:6; NEHEMIAH 5:15; ESTHER 9:1) or תִּמְשֹׁל TIM-SHOHL (RULE - cf. GENESIS 24:2; PSALMS 22:29; PROVERBS 16:32) - and man's resourcefulness is stipulated in the second half of this verse. If meant to extend human habitat into hostile territories, the order of the verbs would be reversed; subjugation precedes occupation and articulated with פָּקֹד P'QOHD (ORDER/DIRECT - cf. GENESIS 39:4; NUMBERS 27:16; JEREMIAH 1:10), תְּנַהֵג T'NA-HEIG (CONDUCT - cf. GENESIS 31:26; EXODUS 3:1; ISAIAH 11:6) or תְּנַהֵל T'NA-HEIL (MANAGE - cf. GENESIS 33:14; EXODUS 15:13; ISAIAH 49:10). KI-BOOSH (BEAT/FLATTEN - root “Kaph-Beth-Shin”) is transcendent. *Transgressions He will יִכְבֹּשׁ YIKH-BOHSH (MICAH 7:19) are annulled, as if never committed. Sling-stones (ZECHARIAH 9:15) are “conquered” when deflected, reverting to plain rocks. More amusing was the king, finding Haman prostrate before the queen, claiming that he tried לִכְבֹּשׁ LIKH-BOHSH [wrongly translated “assault/violate/force/ravage” - that is תִּפְשֵׁ TOH-PHEIS (ENTWINE/FORCE - DEUTERONOMY 22:28) or תַּעֲנֶה T'A-NEH (DISTRESS - GENESIS 34:2; SAMUEL II 13:12)]. Ahasuerus said “vanquish” for he recognized that Haman tried to convince Esther to retract her accusation (ESTHER 7:8). More telling is Jeremiah's outrage at the re-enslavement of the liberated (JEREMIAH 34:11, 16), their freedom again suppressed. The same holds when KI-BOOSH is linked to invasion (cf. NUMBERS 32:22, CHRONICLES I 22:18), the survivors' national identity obliterated. When Cyrus permitted subject peoples to retain national expression, he was said לָרַד L-RAHD... גּוֹיִם GO-YIM (TO SUBDUE... NATIONS - ISAIAH 45:1). The common theme in these is eradication of a prior condition, wresting land from its inhabitants. The only tenable translation of V'KHIBH-SHOO-HAH is “and conquer it” (cf. NUMBERS 32:29; JOSHUA 18:1; NEHEMIAH 5:5), areas A-DAM would settle, driving out or subsuming the hominids there and eliminating them as separate, identifiable societies. This may distress those accustomed to view A-DAM as the first human but nothing in the text suggests that. *The existence of pre-historic populations was likely known by Scripture's early readers. Later generations, dissociated from this awareness, projected creation models into the text that filled a void that came of ignorance, as they lacked tools and techniques of archaeology or history. This does not mean they forgot everything; collective memory remnants were submerged in lore but an imagined history cannot supersede one supported by recent discoveries - and Scripture itself. (“Conquer” suggests confrontation between groups vying for territory, an enduring feature of human behavior which Scripture recognizes. It is no accident that A-DAM's strain of humanity is the only one populating the whole planet, unlike the other creatures which are confined to bounded territories).**

... וַיִּרְדּוּ U-R'DOO... (AND EXPLOIT...): The fish and birds of verse 26 are here but “crawlers” is now “all beings that crawl”, for רוּמַשׁ ROH-MESS (“tread” is better) here refers to all wildlife man will encounter, including large herbivores and carnivores. The directive empowered the A-DAM to exploit these wherever he came across them (*unlike other creatures who thrive only in their sectors*), enabling him to spread over the earth. The grazers and plant life transferred to verses 29 and 30 get special attention.

DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

E-LO-HIM directed hominids to produce offspring with their physical form and the imagination required to exploit their surroundings. He enhanced a group of these with consciousness, so they could adapt nature to themselves instead of adapting themselves to nature. His blessing powered their proliferation and enabled them to modify environments into suitable habitats and vanquish all opposition.

EXPOSITION [1:29-31]

29. E-LO-HIM SAID: VERILY I HAVE GIVEN YOU ALL GRASSES FORMING SEEDS  
THAT ARE ON THE ENTIRE EARTH AND EVERY TREE THAT HAS FRUIT CONTAINING SEEDS  
THESE WILL BECOME YOUR FOOD SOURCES.

... וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים הִנֵּה נֹתְתִי VA-YOH-MER E-LO-HIM HI-NEI NA-THA-TEE... (E-LO-HIM SAID VERILY I HAVE GIVEN...): This should be VA-YEE-TEIN E-LO-HIM ETH KOL EI-SEBH HA-A-RETZ V'ETH KOL ETZ PREE L'A-DAM L'OKH-LAH (AND E-LO-HIM GAVE ALL THE EARTH'S GRASSES AND FRUIT BEARING TREES TO A-DAM FOR FOOD - cf. v. 17) - twelve words, not twenty-seven! VA-YOH-MER E-LO-HIM as an utterance (see v. 3) makes NA-THA-TEE (I HAVE GIVEN) problematic [it was a conveyance, not an unfolding] and is out of place, for nothing yet addressed creature needs. *If we are told the arrangements for A-DAM, why not other creatures? Theirs had to accompany their appearance; why is that narrative (v. 30) deferred until after the A-DAM's creation?* VA-YOH-MER (HE SAID) as communication explains the past tense NA-THA-TEE (I HAVE GIVEN) and plural LA-KHEM (TO YOU) but relates to post-creation and belongs in the next chapter but וַיְהִי כֵן VA-Y'HEE KHEIN (AND IT BECAME AS IT IS - v. 30) indicates a *development*, not just provisioning.

הִנֵּה HI-NEI, an elastic exclamatory usually rendered “here/ behold”, can also reinforce the reality or verity of what was said in the face of doubt or skepticism (cf. GENESIS 20:16; EXODUS 4:14; JUDGES 7:13). When coupled with נֹתְתִי NA-THA-TEE, a wrong is redressed (cf. GENESIS 20:26; EZEKIEL 3:8; ESTHER 8:7), a promise or expectation fulfilled (cf. JUDGES 1:2; KINGS I 3:12; EZEKIEL 4:8) or persons enabled (cf. EXODUS 31:6; NUMBERS 18:21; JEREMIAH 1:9). Here, it allayed A-DAM's apprehension at going forth to “populate” the earth.

וְרֵעַ זֶרַע זָרַע וְרֵעַ זָרַע KOL EI-SEBH ZOH-REI-AH ZEH-RA (ALL GRASSES FORMING SEED): Man risked finding insufficient means in new realms; he had to be assured he could bring what he needed until his skills and knowledge in the new matched that in the old. For this, he was given portable granaries. *EI-SEBH is any grass or grain (cf. EXODUS 10:12; PSALMS 105:35; JOB 5:25). The doubled “Zayin-Resh-Ayin” root of ZOH-REI-AH ZEH-RA (FORMING SEED) limits the produce to seeds which separate from the parent plant and can be stored until consumed or planted in different soils and climates.*

וְרֵעַ זָרַע זָרַע וְרֵעַ זָרַע KOL HA-ETZ A-SHER BOH P'REE ETZ ZOH-REI ZO-RA (EVERY TREE WHICH HAS SEED-BEARING FRUIT): This is not all fruit trees [*the “Heh” definite article prefix {HA-ETZ} is restrictive*] but those whose fruits contain seeds and pulp. *These could be stored and their seeds planted. {Pristine fruits contained far less bulk than they do today.}*

יְהִי לָכֶם LA-KHEM YI-H'YEH (FOR YOU SHALL [IT] BE): The second LA-KHEM is not superfluous; it references another group [*evidenced by the inversion of the words LA-KHEM YI-H'YEH, the MeirKhaTifcha punctuation rather than the expected Tifcha-Moonach and the Ethnachta on ZEH-RA, all setting the last three words in the verse apart*]. This LA-KHEM is “to [all] of you” - *the readers*, who are told that this mechanism is still a survival tool.

לְאֹכְלָהּ L'OKH-LAH (FOR FOOD SOURCE[S]): “Food” is אֹכֶל OH-KHEL (cf. GENESIS Chs. 42-44). The root “Aleph-Kaph-Lamed”, in its feminine noun form OKH-LAH, is not food but something turned into food or a commissary (*e. g. GENESIS 6:21, when Noah stocked the ark*), here a “food repository” of the items in the verse (cf. EXODUS 16:15; LEVITICUS 25:6; EZEKIEL 34:8). E-LO-HIM acquainted the A-DAM with rudimentary agriculture - it did not evolve.

30. AND FOR ALL BEASTS OF THE EARTH AND FOR ALL BIRDS OF THE HEAVENS  
AND FOR ALL THAT TREAD ON THE EARTH (ALL THOSE) WHICH HAVE VITAL LIFE  
(I GIVE) ALL DRIED GRASS STALKS FOR A FOOD SOURCE - AND IT BECAME AS IT (NOW) IS.

... וְלִכְל־תַּיִתּוּ U-L'KHOL CHA-YATH... (AND FOR ALL BEASTS...): This still speaks to the A-DAM. *When נָתַן NOH-THEIN (GIVE) has more than one indirect object, it is repeated for each to avoid ambiguity (cf. GENESIS 24:53; DEUTERONOMY 3:12-13, 15-16, 11:13-14); its omission here [it should precede ETH] means everything “for” the animals was given to man! There is no indication that other creatures received, or needed, feeding instructions; why was A-DAM told this?*

תַּיִתּוּ אֶשְׂרֵי-בֹוּ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה A-SHER BOH NEH-PHESH CHA-YAH (WHICH IN IT [IS] VITAL LIFE): This follows the enumeration of three animal categories but is not a fourth (that is לִכְלֵי נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה U-L'KHOL NE-PHESH CHA-YAH [AND TO ALL VITAL LIVING THINGS]). It speaks to the vitality of the animals (see 1:20-22) culled, those with the *elan vital* to survive arduous treks and establish viable populations, as well as an additional food reserve for man.

יֶרֶק יָבֵשׁ YEH-REQ EI-SEBH (DRIED GRASS STALKS): This is not “green herbs/plants”. יָרוֹק YA-ROHQ (root “Yud-Reish-Qoph”) is “dried/colorless”. *יָרֵק יָשָׁא VEE-RAQ DEH-SHEH [ISAIAH 37:27] is “withered [remains of] herbage”, not “green herbage” [an error repeated in JOB 39:8]; faces turned לִיבָרָקוֹן L'YEI-RA-QON paled [JEREMIAH 30:6]. The faulty identification with “green” arose from its frequent association with vegetation (cf. DEUTERONOMY 1:10; KINGS I 21:2; PROVERBS 15:17). Its correct meaning is adduced from כְּיֶרֶק יָשָׁא יִבֹּלוּן KH'YEH-REQ DEH-SHEH YI-BOH-LOON (LIKE YEH-REQ HERBAGE THEY WILL WITHER - PSALMS 37:2) or יֶרֶק לֹא יִהְיֶה YEH-REQ LOH HA-YAH ([EVEN] YEH-REQ WILL NOT BE – no trace will remain [ISAIAH 15:6]). EI-SEBH is also “grain”, which is not green. Most greenery is leaves, provender for many herbivores and insects. These are not EI-SEBH, which grows directly from the ground; the ancients knew more animals feast on leaves than herbage. Balaq, king of Moab, likened the Israelites to “an ox licking up field YEH-REQ” (NUMBERS 22:4), perturbed by their swiftly overpowering his neighbors. Grazing animals “eat grass” (cf. DEUTERONOMY 11:15; PSALMS 106:20; DANIEL 4:30). If they are exceptionally destructive, uprooting vegetation entirely, the verb is בָּעַר BEE-EIR (CONSUMED - cf. EXODUS 22:4; KINGS I 14:10; ISAIAH 3:14). An ox “licking up” loose tufts is not very terrifying. Balaq pictured Israel dispatching its opposition as easily as an ox licks up emaciated plant residue. This explains his desperation but makes our verse difficult, for it consigns His creatures, other than man, to live on shriveled remnants, hardly consistent with the spirit of the narrative.*

The convention that primeval man was vegetarian is based on the Flood survivors ostensibly getting permission to eat flesh (GENESIS 9:1-3). The prophets' visions of a world without predator and prey (e. g. ISAIAH 11:6) and their occasional disparagement of blood sacrifice (ISAIAH 1:11; HOSEA 5:6; MALACHI 1:7) contributed to the vegetarian ideal but then it should have a more pronounced presence in prediluvian Genesis. If the Eden story records man's succumbing to temptation, as commonly {and erroneously} perceived, why contrive a prohibition when one was in place? The impact would be greater if man violated a recognized propriety. And should one argue that this is why another was enjoined - man could justify the injunction against eating flesh but saw no reason not to eat from the tree, no punishment was prescribed for the former, whereas one eating from the tree would forfeit his life! Similarly, Abel's offering (GENESIS 4:4) only had meaning if congruous to Cain's, so animals must have served as food; if only kept for their products, those should have been presented, not the “fattest sheep”. As for the wickedness that brought the Deluge (GENESIS 6:11), if man treated all moral imperatives cavalierly, he would think nothing of consuming other creatures; yet Scripture makes no mention of it.

MITZ-VOHTH (COMMANDMENTS) are explicit, those pertaining to diet unequivocal (EXODUS 23:15; LEVITICUS 11:47; DEUTERONOMY 12:23). Those imputing food restrictions must posit that נָתַן NOH-THEIN (GIVE) also grants permission to consume. NOH-THEIN pertains to conveyance, physical or conceptual (see v.17), not permission but custody, control or access (cf. GENESIS 10:3; NUMBERS 32:40; DEUTERONOMY 3:12 and note how it is used in LEVITICUS 19:14). [The modern idiom תֵּן לִי TEIN LEE (“Allow Me”) is not biblical.] At first glance, NUMBERS 21:23 looks like “giving” can mean “permitting”; when Sihon denied Israel access to his territory, the text states וְלֹא-נָתַן סִיחֹן אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל V'LOH NA-THAN SEE-CHOHN ETH YIS-RA-EL A-BHOR (AND SIHON DID NOT GIVE ISRAEL PASSAGE). A closer look reveals otherwise. ETH YIS-RA-EL makes Israel the direct object of the transitive verb “gave”, while A-BHOHR is gerundial, not infinitive. Sihon denied Israel passage, refusing them “visas”. It was not a prohibited action but a refusal to grant them visitor status. The same applies to NUMBERS 20:21; similar constructs in GENESIS 20:6, 31:7 and EXODUS 3:19 refer to physical restraints, not prohibitions, and DEUTERONOMY 18:14 indicates that divination faculties were withheld from Israel.

Canaan's pre-historic Natufians hunted and their descendants domesticated animals for food. When Abraham made his shopping trip to Egypt (GENESIS 12:10), the great pyramids were over 500 years old, prediluvian by centuries. Records show that beef and lamb were lavished on their building crews; the Egyptians would never contaminate these sacred crypts by feeding the laborers forbidden foods. Pristine man consumed animals - and was entitled to (v. 26)! Verse 30, like 29, is part of the migration blueprint. Verse 29 outlined the transference of agriculture to new regions, verse 30 how this applied to animals (why רֶמֶשׂ הָאֲדָמָה REH-MESS HA-A-DA-MAH [LAND CRAWLER - v. 25] became רוֹמֵשׁ עַל־הָאָרֶץ ROH- MEISS AL HA-A-RETZ ([ONE] WHO TREADS UPON THE [ENTIRE] EARTH).

לְאֹכְלָהּ L'OKH-LAH (FOR [A] FOOD SOURCE): As man had resources enabling him to migrate, his livestock and domesticates would be sustained by husks and remnants of field produce. And as seeds and fruits stood humans in good stead until they established themselves in new territories, these dried stalks and forage material would do likewise for their animals.

וַיְהִי־כֵן VA-Y'HEE KHEIN [see v. 7]: The development of agriculture and animal husbandry was indispensable to human progress and remained part of man's cultural matrix. It was not an adaptation; to become farmer and herder, man was given divine assistance.

31. E-LO-HIM SAW ALL HE MADE AND LO! (ALL) WAS VERY GOOD  
IT BECAME A MIXTURE AND IT BECAME AN EMERGENCE - THE SIXTH DAY.

וַיַּרְא VA-YAHR... KOL A-SHER A-SAH (SAW... ALL HE MADE): He only inspected what He "made" - the atmosphere, sun and moon, creatures of "day 6" and the A-DAM communities.

וְהָיָה־טוֹב מְאֹד V'HI-NEI TOHBH M'OHD (AND LO [ALL] WAS VERY GOOD): HI-NEI (see v. 29) draws attention - this "good" warranted mention. *The TOHBH evaluation pertained to entities other than those He "made" [see Decompressed Recapitulation, v. 6-8]. The HI-NEI interjection was motivated, not by TOHBH, but by the superlative adverb M'OHD (VERY). What drew His "approbation" was the compatible integration of the part of creation He forged with the sector that emerged naturally. It also marked the end of His involvement; henceforth, man was to be the actor.*

יוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי YOHM HA-SHEE-SHEE (THE SIXTH DAY): The indicative "Heh" ("the") modifying SHEE-SHEE (the only "day" prefixed, which inspired countless unnecessary homilies) serves a simple, yet essential, purpose - it marks the day as completing and closing all layers. This is necessary precisely because the preceding days were not strictly sequential but unfolded over long, overlapping periods. Six creation days as prelude to a seventh is a conceptual template commemorated in a chronological mode but not originating in one. The sextet of days is now identified as such to be the basis for the unique status of the seventh.

### DECOMPRESSED RECAPITULATION

Man was given seeds and fruit containing seeds to store, consume, transport and plant in regions to which he migrated. This incipient agriculture was E-LO-HIM's agenda, not something that evolved, and remained a permanent subsistence tool for man, which also let him take animals to new habitats by providing fodder and husks for temporary forage. Man's growing proficiency in animal husbandry and agricultural skills enabled him to settle diverse environments. Near the end of the sixth creation "day", E-LO-HIM appraised those features of our world which resulted from His direct involvement to gauge how they integrated with those that naturally emerged. Seeing compatibility, He deemed it "very good", for everything necessary to perpetuate man's existence and give him the resources to carry out His plan was in place.