

Bereshit as Name, Principle, and Word

Genesis 1:1 in Unpointed Biblical Hebrew — An Evidence-First Clause Audit

Scope. Strictly philological: Biblical Hebrew syntax/coordination/onomastics; no gematria or numerology. Theology is separated and treated descriptively in Appendix E.

Author: Allen Donow (Independent researcher)

With: GPT-5 Thinking (AI research partner)

Contact: adonow@yahoo.com

Website: brasyt.com

Date: April 2026 — Florida, USA

Version 1.0 (Core + Appendices A–F)

Bereshit as Name, Principle, and Word — Preface

Preface

This report presents the full documentation behind the companion article, *Bereshit as Subject in Genesis 1:1: A Philological Reassessment*. Readers seeking a shorter article-length presentation of the core grammatical argument may consult that study; the present report preserves the broader documentation, appendices, and replication notes.

The project has been developed as a human–AI collaboration. Analytical assistance, tabulation, and drafting support were provided by GPT-5 Thinking; all final judgments, interpretations, and responsibility remain with the author.

This report is strictly philological in method. Its central claim is limited: Genesis 1:1 may be read with *berē'šît* as a nominal subject without violating Biblical Hebrew grammar, though the coordination profile remains distributionally under-attested in the presently surveyed corpus. Questions of theology, reception, and doctrinal implications are treated separately and descriptively.

Bereshit as Name, Principle, and Word — Abstract

Abstract

This paper asks a narrow, checkable question: does Biblical Hebrew usage allow Genesis 1:1 to be read with **berē'šit** as a nominal subject without violating attested clause patterns and coordination behavior? We approach the problem descriptively and corpus-first. (1) **Clause frames**: a survey of S-initial clauses in narrative prose shows that subject-first is **licensed, though non-default**, for scene entry, topic shift, and evaluation (Appendix A). (2) **Coordination/objects**: we map the distribution of **'et, waw** placement (final-only vs. polysyndetic), and strategic **asyndeton** within direct-object series (Appendix B). (3) **Onomastics**: Hebrew onomastics includes preposition-initial or phrase-like names, keeping a nominal value for **berē'šit** within grammatical plausibility (Appendix C). Two corpus sweeps (329 verses, 348 **'et X ... w'e't Y** instances) found no exact triad matching **INDEF → DEF('et) → DEF('et)** with final-only **waw** and **asyndeton 1→2** in a single DO chain; several near-miss classes were logged (Appendix B). **Conclusion**: a subject-initial parse with **berē'šit** is **grammatically licit** but **distributionally under-attested** in the presently surveyed corpus. The paper distinguishes grammar from theology; reception-historical and doctrinal implications are summarized separately (Appendix E). Replication notes (Appendix F) and working CSVs allow readers to rerun and refine the searches, including proposed ETCBC/SHEBANQ queries and later-Hebrew checks (Qumran/Ben Sira).

Table of Contents	page
Preface	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Bereshit as Name, Principle, and Word — Core Only	1
Appendix A — S-initial Clauses	11
Appendix B (v4) — Lists, $\pi\alpha$ -marking, and Asyndeton	17
Appendix C — Onomastics	33
Appendix D — Reception & Composition Notes	36
Appendix E — Theological Notes & Implications	39
Appendix F — Replicability Note	45

Bereshit as Name, Principle, and Word — Core Only

Overview (core claim). A subject-initial parse with *berē'šît* as nominal subject is **grammatically licit yet distributionally under-attested** within the currently surveyed Biblical Hebrew corpus. More specifically, it combines a licensed S-initial frame with a **licensed but distributionally under-attested coordination profile**. The Core distinguishes grammar from theology; reception-historical and doctrinal implications are summarized separately (Appendix E). Replication notes (Appendix F) and working CSVs allow readers to rerun and refine the searches.

Scope

This study is strictly philological. We do not use gematria, numerology, or hidden-code methods. Our argument rests on publicly checkable evidence from Biblical Hebrew grammar (syntax, morphology, word order; use of *'et*; asyndeton), textual history (unpointed vs. Masoretic vocalization; comparison with ancient versions), onomastics (how prepositional/adverbial material becomes proper names), and discourse features in Gen 1:1–3. Reception history (e.g., LXX, Targum, Megillah 9a) is cited descriptively, not as proof of intent. Theological reflections (Word/Wisdom/Logos) are presented after the linguistic case and clearly distinguished from it.

*Replication/limits (HB only): No exact parallels to the Gen 1:1 object chain were found; the coordination shape is **distributionally under-attested** in the present sweep—pending wider corpora and alternative annotation.*

Keywords: Genesis 1:1; Biblical Hebrew syntax; *'et*-marking; coordination/asyndeton; onomastics; subject-initial clauses.

Terminology note: We use **'et-marked** / **'et-unmarked** for the presence or absence of the direct-object marker ׀. When discussing corpus tools (e.g., SHEBANQ/BHSA), we use **annotated**, **tagged**, or **labeled** for features assigned by the database. When discussing Gen 1:1's

syntax, we use **distributionally under-attested** for patterns that are licensed in Biblical Hebrew but comparatively infrequent in the surviving corpus.

Introduction

Genesis 1:1 opens the Hebrew Bible with a clause whose first word—בראשית (*berē'šît*)—is syntactically contested and exegetically consequential. In the unpointed script of the oldest witnesses, the form can be construed in more than one way. Later Masoretic vocalization regularized a particular reading; major ancient translations (e.g., the Septuagint) likewise favored clarity. **This study asks a narrow, linguistic question:** *Does Biblical Hebrew usage allow Genesis 1:1 to be read with *berē'šît* as a nominal subject without violating the language's attested clause patterns and coordination behavior?*

Because Genesis 1:1 stands at the head of Scripture, clarifying this grammatical possibility matters for how v.1 relates to vv.2–3 and for how later interpretive traditions are assessed.

Orientation note. We treat the Bible as an ancient Hebrew corpus, not a rulebook: our claims rest on attested patterns, not on what “must be” true in principle. Cf. Delitzsch (on Gen 1 as divine disclosure) and A. B. Davidson (on revelation presupposed); our concern here is grammatical possibility, not intent.

Our approach is descriptive and corpus-based. **First**, we survey subject-initial clauses in narrative prose—especially *waw* + NP + *qatal* and S + participle/copular frames—to establish that clauses beginning with a nominal subject are a **licensed but non-default** option in Biblical Hebrew (see **Appendix A — S-initial Clauses**). **Second**, we analyze object-series behavior: direct-object marking with *'et*, distribution of *waw* within lists (every item vs. final-only), and *asyndeton* across series, in order to situate the sequence וְאֵת־הַשָּׁמַיִם, וְאֵת־הָאָרֶץ within broader coordination practice (see **Appendix B (v4) — Unified Table: Lists, 'et-marking, and Asyndeton**). **Third**, we note that Hebrew onomastics allows some preposition-initial or phrase-like forms to function nominally (e.g., בְּצִלְאֵל and בְּסוּדָה), which keeps a nominal value for *berē'šît* within grammatical plausibility (see **Appendix C — Onomastics**).

The minimal claim of the paper is modest: Biblical Hebrew grammar does **not** preclude a clause that begins with a nominal subject; such clauses are amply attested and serve recognizable discourse functions (topic switch, scene entry, evaluation). **The testable claim is specific:** the object-series in Gen 1:1 exhibits a **licensed but distributionally under-attested** coordination profile. Its individual components are attested separately—mixed ’et-marking of other kinds, final-only **waw**, and early **asyndeton**—even though no exact parallel to the full Gen 1:1 fingerprint has yet been located.

To avoid category mistakes, we separate translation practice from **hermeneutical rules** in a brief sidebar (LXX/Targum models vs. Hillel/Ishmael). We also **bracket theological identification** in the core argument. Demonstrating a grammatical possibility does not adjudicate theological identity; reception-historical and interfaith implications are summarized elsewhere and kept distinct from the clause audit itself.

Falsifiability. The proposal would be undermined by: (i) a robust demonstration that subject-initial clauses of the relevant shapes are vanishingly rare or illusory; (ii) evidence that Gen 1:1’s coordination profile has no parallels in BH prose; or (iii) strong onomastic arguments that prepositional/adverbial bases cannot function nominally. See **Appendix F, “Box F.1 — Falsifiable Counter-Reads (How this proposal could fail).”** Conversely, additional corpus matches for the coordination pattern or further S-initial attestations increase plausibility, not certainty.

Method — Substitution / Minimal-Pair Diagnostic

Purpose. Isolate the syntactic question by replacing the contested first NP with an uncontroversial proper name.

Control clause (grammatical frame):

יַעֲקֹב בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ

“Jacob created elohim, the heavens, and the earth.”

Predictions & checks

1. S-initial licensing. BH narrative allows subject-initial clauses at topic/scene entry → see **Appendix A**.
2. Object-series behavior. Category םלְהִיָּם may be 'et-unmarked; the definite pair takes 'et with final-only *waw* → see **Appendix B**.
3. Coordination profile. Mixed 'et + final-only *waw* + an asyndetic break between items 1–2 → attested variants (**Appendix B**).

Result. The frame is fully grammatical. What remains is onomastic/philological: can בְּרֵאשִׁית function as a name/nominal subject in that frame?

Replication status (updated). Two-pass HB sweep: Pass 1 cataloged 329 verses (348 total instances) of the template 'et X ... w^e'et Y. Pass 2 tightened the apposition detector (head-term + repeated 'et names/titles) and annotated a Definiteness basis (see **Appendix B, “Legend”**) per item (article / suffix / proper-name / quantifier / bare) by checking wider clause context. **Result:** still **no exact parallel** to INDEF → DEF('et) → DEF('et) with **final-only waw** and **asyndeton 1→2** in a single simple DO chain. Borderline cases and negatives are logged in **Appendix B (v4), “Extended Diagnostics & Sweeps”** (with tables, near-misses, and notes). Working CSVs (*extended_sweep_working_table.csv*; *extended_sweep_second_pass.csv*) and supporting scripts are available via the website Downloads menu.

SHEBANQ replication note. A SHEBANQ-based replication workflow, extended through export-to-CSV and custom clause/verse aggregation (Appendix F), yielded a manageable review set of candidate verses in Genesis. Only a small hand-reviewed subset proved materially relevant to Appendix B's object-chain question.

Replication/limits. Under our current corpus and criteria we find **no exact parallels** for the Gen 1:1 object-chain; we therefore characterize its coordination profile as **distributionally under-attested in the present corpus**, while avoiding absolute claims pending wider corpora and alternative annotation.

Falsifier. If S-initial frames of the relevant type or mixed-marking lists prove vanishingly rare/illusory, the diagnostic fails.

Distributional status. At present, the specific coordination shape (**INDEF** → **DEF[’et]** → **DEF[’et]** with **final-only waw** in a single DO chain) appears **distributionally under-attested in the present corpus**. Near-misses exist (e.g., Exod 1:11 apposition; Deut 12:6 mixed ’et with suffixal definites; Ps 146:6 predicate list with final ’et-cluster), but no exact parallel has yet been located in the present sweep.

Onomastic note. For focused preposition-initial name evidence, see **Appendix C — Onomastics**: **בְּסוּדָּהָ** and **בְּצִלְאֵל**. The point is **nominal plausibility in principle**, not a claim about historical segmentation.

Word terminology (pointer). For a brief, non-doctrinal clarification of “Word” terminology, see Appendix E, “Promise Spoken, Written, Enacted — A Working Analogy for ‘Word’” (illustrative only; not part of the grammatical evidence).

Methodological Posture: Grammar as Descriptive, Not Prescriptive

We do not treat the HB as an infallible **rulebook** of grammar; we treat it as a **corpus** whose usage constrains plausible analysis. Absence of a pattern from the surviving corpus does not, by itself, render that pattern “ungrammatical,” but **positive attestation** raises confidence. Our procedure is therefore: (1) state the pattern precisely; (2) search for **independent parallels**; (3) weight by genre/register; (4) keep claims calibrated to the **distribution** actually observed.

Minimal Semantics & Discourse Guardrails (non-theological)

Purpose. Keep only the constraints needed to rule out impossible readings; leave theology to Appendix E.

1. **Verb selection (ברא).** *bara'* selects a volitional agent as subject. A proper name/title (Bereshit) can satisfy this; a mere temporal phrase (“in-the-beginning”) cannot.
2. **Object series fit.** Treat אֱלֹהִים in Gen 1:1—if object—as a category/common NP (“gods/powers”), and הָאָרֶץ ... הַשָּׁמַיִם as a definite pair. Do not read the pair as an appositive gloss on אֱלֹהִים (“elohim, namely the heavens and the earth”); those sets are not co-extensive.
3. **Coordination plausibility.** Mixed *'et*-marking + final-only *waw* + an **asyndetic** break between items 1–2 is **licensed but distributionally under-attested, with individual components attested separately** (see Appendix B). Under-attested ≠ ungrammatical.
4. **Discourse coherence (Gen 1:1–3).** A subject shift from v. 1 to v. 3 (from Bereshit → Elohim) is normal in BH narrative (topic switch/scene entry); nothing forces v. 1’s subject to persist.

Outcome. If a reading clears (1)–(4), it is semantically admissible; adjudicating intent remains outside the Core.

Homography Note: אֱלֹהִים across Gen 1 (object vs. subject)

Purpose. Flag how the same written form אֱלֹהִים functions with two semantic values in our analysis—(a) a common plural (“gods/powers”) as a direct object in Gen 1:1, and (b) the proper singular Deity (“Elohim”) as subject from 1:3 onward—without violating Biblical Hebrew morpho-syntax.

1) The lexeme.

אֱלֹהִים is morphologically m.pl.. In BH it is homographic:

- **Plural common noun** “gods/powers” (takes plural agreement/adjectives when it’s the subject; as an object, agreement is irrelevant).
- **Singular proper** “God” (the Deity), typically with singular verbal agreement when it’s the subject.

2) Diagnostics used here.

- **Subject-side agreement.** Where אֱלֹהִים is subject in Gen 1 (e.g., וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים, וַיֵּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים), the verbs are 3ms, signaling proper-singular Deity usage.

- **Object-side marking.** In Gen 1:1, our test parse treats אֱלֹהִים as the first item in a three-object coordination: (INDEF) וְאֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם · אֶת הָאָרֶץ · אֱלֹהִים. Lack of article/suffix/ *'et* on the first item supports a category/common reading (“gods/powers”), not the proper singular.
- **Apposition check.** We do not read “אֱלֹהִים, namely the heavens and the earth.” Semantically, “gods/powers” ≠ cosmic domains, so the pair cannot be appositive renamings of אֱלֹהִים (see Appendix B, Apposition exemplars).

3) Discourse shift (v.1 → v.3).

A shift from object in v.1 (category gods/powers, created) to subject in v.3 (proper Elohim, the Deity acting) is ordinary at the discourse level: BH narratives frequently pivot topics between adjacent clauses. Agreement patterns (3ms subject verbs from v.3 on) cue the reader that the Deity is now the acting subject, distinct from any created “powers.”

4) Construct phrases (e.g., רִוַח אֱלֹהִים).

Constructs with אֱלֹהִים are resolved by context: when surrounding verbal agreement and discourse mark Deity, X-of-Elohim is read as “of God.” This is independent of the object-reading in 1:1; the construct itself does not force plural “gods.”

5) Bottom line.

The homograph is resolved locally by agreement (on subjects) and by definiteness/ *'et*-marking (on objects). Thus, אֱלֹהִים can be a created category object in 1:1 and the creating Deity from 1:3 onward, without grammatical contradiction or theological claims inside the Core.

Sidebar — Why this hasn’t been argued (much)

Path-dependence from canonical forms. Since the LXX and later Masoretic pointing, Gen 1:1 has been stabilized publicly as “In the beginning God created ...”. Once a form is canonized, alternatives bear a heavy prior.

Methodological parsimony. Philology prefers the least ‘costly’ analysis. Because בְּרֵאשִׁית is not elsewhere an explicit proper name/title, many opt for temporal or dependent-clause construals that use only widely attested categories.

Distributional priors & genre expectations. S-initial clauses are **licensed but non-default**, and many treat Gen 1:1 as a heading/incipit. Those priors steer readers away from a subject-reading unless the syntax demands it.

Hermeneutical risk management. Post-rabbinic anxieties about “two powers” and modern fears of anachronism/eisegesis make scholars cautious about proposals that could look like importing later theology into BH.

Incentives & the bar for novelty. Re-parsing a foundational verse requires unusually dense corpus controls and cross-subfield argumentation. Many judge the investment unlikely to shift consensus and thus deprioritize it.

Subfield silos. Syntax, coordination/ *’et*-marking, onomastics, and reception history are often treated separately. The integrated, testable package is rarely assembled in one place.

Our stance. This paper does not claim intent; it argues a grammatical possibility with concrete distributional support (Appendices A–C). We bracket theological identification in the core and specify what data would falsify the syntactic claim.

Tradition Snapshot: Elohim & the Creation of Angels

Rabbinic sources debate when *mal’ākhîm* (angels/celestial powers) were created and whether their creation is implied or bracketed in the Torah’s opening. Hagigah 12a–b discusses orders of creation including the heavens and their hosts; Ps 148:2–5 summons angels to praise YHWH on grounds that “He commanded and they were created”; Job 38:7 pictures “morning stars” and “sons of God” rejoicing at the earth’s founding. Later, Maimonides (e.g., Guide II.5, II.6) treats separate intelligences/angels as created beings. Descriptively, tradition anchors angelic existence in God’s creative act while leaving the precise verse-level moment open. Thus, parsing אֱלֹהִים in Gen 1:1 as a category object (created powers) would sit within a recognized spectrum of Jewish reflection on the ordering/creation of the heavenly host—without deciding theological identity in the Core argument. Though by considering Bereshit as creator (a line of inquiry that has been much underexplored—not because the grammar forbids it (it doesn’t), but because canonical priors, methodological economy, and post-rabbinic risk-management have made alternatives

low-priority), angels would have restored their rightful place in Genesis—even in Gen 1:1—as created.

Objections & Replies (concise)

“Why would the Creator’s name mean ‘Beginning’?” In HB, ראשית / ראש denotes primacy/foundational firstness (“beginning of his way,” “first/best”), not only a timestamp. Divine titles regularly encode roles or attributes (El Elyon, El Olam, Qadosh Yisrael). A title glossed “Beginning/Principle” functions as an epithet of primacy, not a mere date-stamp.

“If it’s a name, why isn’t it reused?” Unique or near-unique divine designations occur (scene-bound epithets, limited contexts). Once vocalization and early versions normalized the adverbial reading, reusing a nominal incipit was structurally discouraged. Our core claim stands or falls on Gen 1:1’s grammar (S-initial licitness; coordination profile), not on later reuse.

Translation vs. Hermeneutics — A Quick Map

LXX (3rd–2nd c. BCE, Alexandria): earliest large-scale translation; mixed strategy (literal where possible; idiomatic/theological smoothing where necessary). Its rendering of Gen 1:1 favors clarity (“ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός”), aligning subject with θεός.

Targumim (late 2nd Temple → Rabbinic; synagogue-bound): standardized Aramaic renderings accompanying Hebrew lection; increasingly regulated by tradition and pedagogy; paraphrastic when required for doctrinal clarity.

Hermeneutical rules (Hillel/Ishmael). Not translation protocols but rabbinic methods for deriving law/meaning from the Hebrew text (e.g., qal va-homer וּמַר הֵאָדָּם, gezerah shavah, binyan av). Keep these conceptually distinct from translation practices.

For orientation (timeline): LXX (3rd–2nd c. BCE) → Early Targum tendencies (late 2nd Temple) → **Megillah 9a** story of the 72 translators → Patristic Logos readings (1st–3rd c. CE) → Medieval rabbinic/philosophical consolidation.

Answer to the Guiding Question (concise)

Permissible but distributionally under-attested. A subject-initial parse with *berē šît* as nominal subject does **not** violate Biblical Hebrew clause licensing (see Appendix A on S-initial frames). Its coordination profile—an **'et-unmarked/category** first object followed by two **definite 'et-marked** objects with **final-only** *waw* and an **asyndetic 1→2 break**—remains **distributionally under-attested** in BH prose: we found **no exact triad match** in two corpus sweeps (Appendix B), only a set of near-misses. Apposition cues (“X—namely Y and Z”) are absent in Gen 1:1, and the semantics of אֱלֹהִים (“gods/powers”) vs. הָאָרֶץ / הַשָּׁמַיִם (cosmic domains) argues **against** apposition. **Conclusion: the reading is grammatically licit yet distributionally under-attested in the present corpus.** This report confines itself to grammatical possibility and observed frequency; adjudicating among competing interpretations lies outside its scope.

Appendix A — S-initial Clauses

Purpose.

Collate attested subject-initial clauses in Biblical Hebrew narrative/prose to show that S-initial frames relevant to Gen 1:1 are **licensed, though non-default**, in Biblical Hebrew prose.

Format: six-column table for quick verification.

Columns.

Verse | Hebrew (clause excerpt) | English | Frame | Function/Note | Ref.

Captioning.

Tables are labeled "Table A.x" for easy cross-reference.

Table A.1 — Attested S-initial clauses in BH prose narrative.

Verse	Hebrew (clause excerpt)	English	Frame	Function/Note	Ref.
Gen 24:62	ויצחק בא	And Isaac came	S + qatal	Topic/scene entry	Holmstedt 2011:23
Gen 25:34	ויעקב נתן	Then Jacob gave	S + qatal	Change of subject	Arnold & Choi 169; Holmstedt 2011:23
Gen 26:26	ואבימלך הלך	Then Abimelech went	S + qatal	Topic switch	Holmstedt 2011:24
Gen 27:6	ורבקה אמרה	And Rebekah said	S + qatal	Change of speaker	Williams 97; Holmstedt 2011:24
Gen 29:9	ורחל באה	Rachel came	S + qatal	Scene arrival	Holmstedt 2011:24
Gen	ולבן הלך	And Laban went	S + qatal	New situation	Driver 84;

31:19					Holmstedt 2011:24
Gen 33:17	ויעקב נסע	And Jacob journeyed	S + qatal	Subject focus	Davidson 147; Holmstedt 2011:24
Gen 37:3	וישראל אהב	Now Israel loved	S + qatal	Thematic evaluation	Driver 201; Holmstedt 2011:24
Num 14:6	ויהושע ... וכלב ... קרעו בגדיהם	Joshua ... and Caleb ... tore their clothes.	S + qatal	Contrast with majority report	—
Num 14:38	ויהושע ... וכלב ... חיו	Joshua ... and Caleb remained alive.	S + qatal (3cp)	Life/death outcome	—
Deut 34:9	ויהושע בננון מלא רוח חכמה	Joshua son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom.	S + predicate (nominal)	Biographical summary	—
Josh 3:11	הנה ארון הברית ... עבר	Behold, the ark of the covenant ... is crossing	S + participle	Scene tableau; procession	—
Josh 8:21	ויהושע וכלישראל ראו	Joshua and all Israel saw	S + qatal	Highlighted perception	—
Josh 8:26	ויהושע לאהשיב ידו	Joshua did not draw back his hand	S + qatal	Ongoing focal action	—
Josh 8:33	וכלישראל ... עמדים	All Israel ... were standing	S + participle	Scene tableau	—
Josh 10:11	ויהוה השליך	YHWH hurled	S + qatal	Divine action	—
Josh 6:19	וכל כסף וזהב ... קדש הוא ליהוה	All the silver and gold ... is holy to YHWH.	S + predicate (nominal)	Status/ consecration	—

Josh 10:14	כי יהוה נלחם לישראל	For YHWH was fighting for Israel.	S + participle	Emphatic assertion	—
Josh 23:5	ויהוה אלהיכם הוא יהדפם	And YHWH your God—he will drive them out.	S + yiqtol	Promissory assertion	—
Josh 23:1	ויהושע זקן בא בימים	Joshua was old, advanced in days	S + qatal	Succession notice	—
1 Sam 1:5	ויהוה סגר רחמה	YHWH had closed her womb	S + qatal	Contrast within family scene	—
1 Sam 3:19	ויהוה היה עמו	YHWH was with him	S + qatal	Scene entry	—
1 Sam 9:15	ויהוה גלה ... לשמואל	YHWH had revealed ... to Samuel	S + qatal	Backstory setup	—
1 Sam 17:15	ודוד הלך ושוב	David would go and return	S + participle	Habitual contrast vs. battle line	—
1 Sam 19:10b	ודוד נס	David fled	S + qatal	Escape contrast	—
1 Sam 19:18	ודוד נס וימלט	David fled and escaped	S + qatal	Escape report	—
1 Sam 25:21	ודוד אמר	David had said	S + qatal	Quotation frame	—
1 Sam 26:3	ודוד יושב במדבר	David was staying in the wilderness	S + participle	Contrast of locations	—
1 Sam 29:2	ודוד ואנשיו עברים	David and his men were passing	S + participle	Review line tableau	—
2 Sam 1:1	ודוד שב	David returned	S + qatal	Scene entry after campaign	—
2 Sam 3:1	ודוד הלך וחזק	David kept growing stronger	S + participle	Contrast of fortunes	—

2 Sam 3:26b	ודוד לא ידע	David did not know	S + neg qatal	Knowledge contrast	—
2 Sam 15:30	ודוד עלה	David was going up	S + participle	Pilgrimage ascent	—
2 Sam 18:24	ודוד יושב בין שני השערים	David was sitting between the two gates	S + participle	Scene tableau	—
1 Kgs 5:25(11)	ושלמה נתן להירם	Solomon gave to Hiram	S + qatal	Counter-gift to Hiram	—
1 Kgs 5:26(12)	ויהוה נתן חכמה לשלמה	YHWH gave wisdom to Solomon	S + qatal	Scene entry	—
1 Kgs 14:5	ויהוה אמר אלאהיה	YHWH said to Ahijah	S + qatal	Oracle setup	—
1 Chr 15:29	ודוד משחק	David was dancing	S + participle	POV during ark entry	—
1 Chr 16:26	יהוה שמים עשה	YHWH made the heavens	S + qatal	Declarative praise line	—
1 Chr 19:13	ויהוה הטוב בעיניו יעשה	YHWH (may) do what is good	S + yiqtol	Wish formula	—
2 Chr 24:24	ויהוה נתן בידם	YHWH gave into their hand	S + qatal	Defeat rationale	—

A-Openers — Book-initial S-first Headlines (select)

These incipits often use S-initial frames to mark a new narrative unit or heading, counterbalancing the general VSO tendency in running prose.

Table A.2 — Book-initial S-first headlines (select).

Verse	Hebrew (incipit core)	English gloss	Frame	Note
1 Chr	אדם שת אנוש	“Adam, Seth,	S + predicate	Genealogical

1:1		Enosh ...”	(nominal)	restart
Neh 1:1	דברי נחמיה בן חכליה	“The words of Nehemiah son of Hacaliah ...”	S + predicate (nominal)	New memoir
Job 1:1a	איש היה בארץ עוץ	“There was a man in the land of Uz ...”	S + predicate (nominal)	Narrative incipit
Prov 1:1	משלי שלמה בן דוד	“Proverbs of Solomon son of David ...”	S + pred (title)	Collection header
Ecc1 1:1	דברי קהלת בן דוד	“Words of Qohelet son of David ...”	S + pred (title)	Collection header
Song 1:1	שיר השירים	“Song of Songs ...”	S + predicate (nominal)	Poetic collection
Isa 1:1	חזון ישעיהו	“Vision of Isaiah ...”	S (title)	Prophetic header
Jer 1:1	דברי ירמיהו	“Words of Jeremiah ...”	S (title)	Prophetic header
Ezek 1:1a	... ואני בתוך הגולה	“And I was among the exiles ...”	S + pred	Autobiographical incipit
Hos 1:1	... דבר יהוה אשר היה	“Word of YHWH that came to Hosea ...”	S + pred	Prophetic header
Joel 1:1	... דבר יהוה אשר היה	“Word of YHWH that came to Joel ...”	S + pred	Prophetic header
Amos 1:1	דברי עמוס	“Words of Amos ...”	S (title)	Prophetic header
Obad 1:1	חזון עבדיה	“Vision of Obadiah ...”	S (title)	Prophetic header
Mic 1:1	... דבר יהוה אשר היה	“Word of YHWH that came to Micah	S + pred	Prophetic header

		...”		
Nah 1:1	משא נינוה	“Oracle concerning Nineveh ...”	S (title)	Prophetic header
Zeph 1:1	... דבר יהוה אשר היה	“Word of YHWH that came to Zephaniah ...”	S + pred	Prophetic header
Mal 1:1	משא דבר יהוה ... ביד מלאכי	“Oracle—the word of YHWH ... by the hand of Malachi.”	S + pred	Prophetic header

Takeaway. These tables do not make S-initial order the norm; they show that it is a **licensed discourse option** at scene entry, topic shift, evaluation, and headings.

Appendix B (v4) — Unified Table: Lists, תא-marking, and Asyndeton (swept)

Purpose. Provide a single, consistent table of coordination patterns relevant to Gen 1:1: distribution of 'et on direct objects (definiteness), placement of *waw* within lists (each item vs. final-only vs. irregular), and strategic asyndeton (no conjunction between adjacent items). This unifies the prior Genesis and Historical Books blocks.

Legend

A. NP/def. per item (definiteness basis). INDEF = bare/common noun (generic or indefinite); DEF[ART] = definite by article; DEF[SUF] = definite by pronominal suffix/poss.; DEF[CONST] = construct NP definite via definite genitive; PROP = proper name (functionally definite); Quant = quantified NP (e.g., לַ + domain); DEF[CTX?] = contextually definite (use sparingly, noted); PREP = prepositional complement (not part of DO spine).

B. 'et (by item). sequence of ✓ (with תא/תא) / — (without). Note: 'et marks direct-object status (or, in some poetry, a preposition “with”); it is reported separately and is not itself a definiteness basis..

C. Waw: final = only before last; each = before each after the first; irreg = mixed/sparse; none = no *waw*; pairs = grouped pairs with *waw*.

D. Asyndeton/Additives: note any asyndeton (e.g., “1–2”) and additives (e.g., ׀, repeated prepositions).

Caution. We still have no clear BH prose example where a plainly indefinite first object is immediately followed by definite objects within the *same* direct-object coordination spine (**two-pass HB sweep to date**). Gen 1:1 remains **grammatically licit but distributionally under-attested in the present HB sweep** pending broader corpus sweeps; see the Second-Pass Summary below.

Two-tier target (why we track both definiteness and 'et)

Tier 1 (broad comparandum sought). Any single-clause DO coordination chain that mixes indefinite and definite NPs (by article/suffix/proper/construct/quantifier/context). Even a two-item INDEF+DEF chain would show that *mixed definiteness* is an attested option.

Tier 2 (exact Gen 1:1 fingerprint). A three-item DO spine matching the visible surface of Gen 1:1: INDEF (*'et*-unmarked; no *'et*) → DEF (*'et* + definite NP) → DEF ($w\acute{e}\eta\tau$ + definite NP) with final-only *waw* and asyndeton 1→2. *'et* is tracked because it is part of the observable asymmetry in Gen 1:1 (item 1 differs formally from items 2–3), even though *'et* itself does not create definiteness.

Summary: In the present sweep, **no clear hit** was found at either level. The components are attested; the mixed-definiteness object spine is not clearly paralleled; the full Gen 1:1 fingerprint remains unmatched.

Triad Typology (DO lists): what's common vs. under-attested

Scope. Verbal clauses with three direct-object items. Dimensions: (a) *'et* per item (\emptyset / *'et*), (b) *waw* distribution (none / final-only / polysyndetic), and (c) definiteness basis (article / suffix / proper name / quantifier / bare).

- **Common:** DEF–DEF–DEF with final-only *waw* (e.g., proper-name triads like Gen 6:10) and DEF–DEF–DEF with polysyndeton (numerous allocation lists).
- **Attested:** Mixed definiteness (e.g., quantifier + proper names); even when some items lack *'et*, the items are typically definite by article/suffix/proper.
- **Under-attested:** INDEF → DEF(*'et*) → DEF(*'et*) with final-only *waw* and asyndeton 1→2 (our Gen 1:1 target). No clear hit in BH prose so far (two-pass sweep).
- **Next:** Inventory all DO-triads via ETCBC/SHEBANQ query and publish counts (see Replicability Note; Appendix F for resources).

Second-Pass Summary (HB only) & Definiteness-basis legend

Second-pass outcome. Using the extended CSV sweep (n=348 instances of the *'et* ... $w\acute{e}\eta\tau$ template across 329 verses; 17 verses with two instances; one with three), zero clauses meet all constraints of the Gen 1:1 target triad (INDEF → DEF[*'et*] → DEF[*'et*]; final-only *waw*; 1→2 asyndeton in a single DO spine). Borderline cases fall into apposition, fully *'et*-marked series, PP chains, or definites by suffix/article without an initial indefinite.

Borderline mixedness (form vs. discourse). Deut 2:34 has the surface shape BARE + ART + ART ($\eta\tau\eta\mu\iota\ \eta\mu\epsilon\tau\omega\ \eta\mu\epsilon\tau\omega\ \eta\mu\epsilon\tau\omega$, “men, and the women, and the children”), which *looks* like mixed definiteness; most translations read the first item as definite by context (“the men [of that city]”). We treat such cases as **DEF[CTX?]** rather than clean Tier-1 hits.

Definiteness basis codes (how assigned).

— DEF[ART] = article on head or on governing construct's genitive.

- DEF[SUF] = pronominal suffix (e.g., בניו).
- DEF[ET] = explicit direct-object marker 'et/תא on a definite NP.
- PROP = proper name(s).
- Quant = כל/מספר-type quantifier making the NP definite in context.
- INDEF = bare/common noun without article/suffix/quantifier (generic or indefinite; if context forces definiteness, mark DEF[CTX?] and note).
- DEF[CTX?] = contextually definite without overt marking (use sparingly; note the basis).
- PREP = prepositional complement, not part of the DO spine.

Replication/limits. Within BH as canvassed, Gen 1:1's coordination profile is grammatically licit yet distributionally under-attested pending broader corpora (DSS, Ben Sira, inscriptions). More specifically, the currently unmatched feature stack is: **an 'et-unmarked/category first object, two definite 'et-marked objects, final-only waw, and an asyndetic 1→2 break.**

See Comparanda note below for scope and plan.

Genesis

Verse	Hebrew (object series excerpt)	English gloss	NP/def. (by item)	'et (by item)	Waw	Asyndeton / Additives	Notes
Gen 1:12 ¹	· דשא · עשב מזריע · זרע · ועץ · עשה-פרי	grass; herb yielding seed; and tree bearing fruit	INDEF · INDEF · INDEF	— · — · —	final	1–2 asynd.	Category series; no תא (typal).
Gen 1:14	· לאתות · ולמועדים · ולימים · ושנים	for signs; for seasons; for days; and years	PREP×4	n/a	each	Prep-chain (ל)	Predicate complements, not DOs, but coordination pattern clear.

Gen 1:21	את התנינים · הגדלים · ואת כל- נפש החיה · ואת ... · כל-עוף כנף · ...	the great sea crea- tures; and ev- ery liv- ing crea- ture; and every winged bird	DEF[ET] · DEF[ET] · DEF[ET]	✓ · ✓ · ✓	each	—	Fully 'et- marked defi- nites (incl. כל).
Gen 1:25	את חית · הארץ ... · ואת · הבהמה ... · ואת כל- · רמש ...	the wild animal; and the cattle; and ev- ery creeping thing	DEF[ET] · DEF[ET] · DEF[ET]	✓ · ✓ · ✓	each	—	Parallel to 1:21.
Gen 2:19 ²	כל-חית · השדה · ואת כל-עוף · השמים	every beast of the field; and ev- ery bird of the heavens	DEF[ART] · DEF[ET]	— · ✓	final	—	Two classes with mixed marking; treat cautiously.
Gen 5:4	· בנים · ובנות	sons and daugh- ters	INDEF · INDEF	— · —	final	—	Generic pair; no את.
Gen 6:7	· מאדם · עד-בהמה · עד רמש · ועד-עוף · השמים	from man; to beast; to creeping thing; and to bird of the heavens	PREP×4	n/a	final	Prep-chain (עד)	Gradational list.
Gen 6:10	· את-שם · את-חם · ואת-יפת	Shem; Ham; and	PROP · PROP · PROP	✓ · ✓ · ✓	final	—	Proper-name triple fully 'et-marked.

		Japheth					
Gen 6:18	· אתה · ובניך · ואשתך · ונשי בניך	you; and your sons; and your wife; and your sons' wives	DEF pron + DEF[SUF]× 3	n/a	each	—	Household entrance set.
Gen 26:5	· משמרת · מצותי · חקותי · ותורת	my charge; my commands; my statutes; and my laws	DEF[SUF]× 4	n/a	final	—	Abstract nouns with suffixes.
Gen 30:35 ³	את התישים העקדים · והטלאים · ואת כל- העזים הנקדות · והטלאות · וכל-חם בכשבים	ring-streaked & spotted he-goats; and all the speckled & spotted she-goats; and all the brown among the sheep	DEF[ET] · DEF[ET] · DEF[ART/ כל]	✓ · ✓ · —	each	—	Mixed 'et: third item definite without (את כל NP).
Gen 31:10	· עקדים · נקדים · וברדים	ringstreaked; speckled; and grizzled	INDEF×3	—	final	1–2 asynd.	Adjectival types.

Gen 32:5 [Heb 32:6]	שור וחמור · צאן · · ועבד · ושפחה	ox and donkey; flock; and male servant; and female servant	INDEF×5	—	irreg	1–2 and 3–4 asynd.	Mixed pairing & sparse <i>waw</i> .
Gen 32:7 [Heb 32:8] ⁸	את־העם · אשר אתו · · ואת־הצאן · · ואת־הבקר · · והגמלים ·	the people with him; and the flocks; and the herds; and the camels	DEF[ET+Rel] · DEF[ET] · DEF[ET] · DEF[ART]	✓ · ✓ · ✓ · —	each	—	Last item definite by article only (mixed 'et).
Gen 32:19 [Heb 32:20] 4	גם את־ השני · גם את־ השלישי · גם את־כל־ ההלכים	the second; the third; and all who followed	DEF[ET]×3	✓ · ✓ · ✓	none	Additive (גם ... גם ... גם)	<i>Wawless</i> additive chain.
Gen 32:22 [Heb 32:23]	את־שתי נשיו · ואת־ שתי שפחתיו · ואת אחד עשר ילדיו	his two wives; and his two maidservants; and his eleven sons	DEF[ET]×3	✓ · ✓ · ✓	final	—	Numeral + poss.; three DOs.
Gen 43:11	· מעט צרי · · ומעט דבש · · נכאת ולט · · בטנים · · ושקדים	a little balm; and a little honey; spices and myrrh;	INDEF×6	—	pairs	—	Commodity list in pairs; no את.

		nuts and almonds					
Gen 46:11	גרשון · קהת ומררי	Gershon; Kohath; and Merari	PROP×3	—	final	—	Name list (sons of Levi).
Gen 46:16	צפיון וחגי · שוני ואצבן · ערי · וערודי · ואראלי	Ziphion and Haggi; Shuni and Ezbon; Eri and Arodi; and Areli	PROP×7	—	pairs + final	—	Grouped pairs; last single with <i>waw</i> .
Gen 50:24	לאברהם · ליצחק · וליעקב	to Abraham; to Isaac; and to Jacob	PREP(PRO P)×3	n/a	final	Prep-chain (ל)	Indirect-object series.

Historical Books (Joshua–Kings–Chronicles)

Verse	Hebrew (object series excerpt)	English gloss	NP/def. (by item)	'et (by item)	Waw	Asyndeton / Additives	Notes
Josh 1:14	נשיכם · טפכם · ומקניכם	your wives; your little ones; and your cattle	DEF[SUF]×3	n/a	final	—	Household/cattle remain; complements command.
Josh 2:13	את־אבי · ואת־אמי · ואת־אחי · ואת־אחתי · ואת כל־	my father; and my mother; and my	DEF[ET]×5	✓×5	each	—	Normal multi-'et of definite persons.

	אשר להם	brothers; and my sisters; and all that they have					
Josh 3:10 ⁵	את־הכנעני · ואת־ · החתי · ואת־החוי · ואת־הפרזי · ואת־ · הגרגשי · והאמרי · והיבوسی	the Canaan- ite, Hit- tite, Hivite, Per- izzite, Gir- gashite, and the Amorite, and the Jebusite	DEF[ET]×5 · DEF[ART] ×2	√×5 · — · —	each	—	Slight mixed marking on last two (arti- cle only).
Josh 5:11	מעבור · הארץ · ממחרת — הפסח · מצות · וקלי	produce of the land; on the mor- row of Passover — un- leavened cakes and parched grain	PREP + IN- DEF pair	n/a	final	—	Appositive meal items; not DOs to same verb.
Josh 6:2 ⁶	· את־יריחו · ואת־מלכה · גבורי · החיל	Jericho; and its king; mighty men of valor	DEF[ET] · DEF[ET] · DEF[ART/c onst]	√ · √ · —	irreg	1–2 asynd. between 2– 3?	Third item lacks 'et (ap- positive/ looser com- plement). Treat as ir- regular.
Josh 6:21 ⁷	מאיש ועד־ · אשה · מנער ועד־	from man to woman;	PREP pairs; INDEF ani- mals	n/a	pairs + each	—	Category → subtypes ex- pansion

	זקן · ועד־ שור ושה וחמור	from young to old; and ox and sheep and don- key					within de- cree.
Josh 7:24	את־עַן ... · ואת־ · הכסף · ואת־ · האדרת · ואת לשון · הזהב · ואת־בניו · ואת־בנותיו · ואת־שורו · ואת־ · חמרו · ואת־צאנו · ואת־אהלו · ואת כל־ · אשר־לו	Achan ...; and the sil- ver; and the man- tle; and the gold bar; and his sons; and his daugh- ters; and his ox; and his donkey; and his sheep; and his tent; and all that he had	DEF[ET]×1 1	✓×11	each	—	Exhaustive confiscation list; classic polysyndeton with 'et.
1 Sam 17:34	גם את־ הארי · גם את־הדב	both the lion and the bear	DEF[ET] · DEF[ET]	✓ · ✓	none	Additive (גם ... גם)	Paired with additive par- ticle.
2 Sam 8:12	· מארם · וממואב · ומבני־עמון · · ומפלשתים · ומעמלק · ומשלל · הדדעזר	from Aram, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, Amalek, and from the spoil of Hadadez	PREP×6	n/a	each	Prep-chain (מן)	Repeated preposition; no 'et do- main.

		er					
1 Kgs 10:22	· זהב וכסף · שנהבים · וקפים · ותכיים	gold and silver; ivory; and apes; and peacocks	INDEF commodities	—	irreg	1–2 asynd.	Mixed inventory (pair + singles).
2 Kgs 23:5	· לבעל · לשמש · ולירח · ולמזלות · ולכל צבא השמים	to Baal; to the sun; and to the moon; and to the constellations; and to all the host of heaven	PREP×5	n/a	each	Prep-chain (ל)	Cultic list; every-item lamed.
1 Kgs 4:31 (Eng 5:11)	מאיתן · האזרחי · הימן · כלכל · ודרדע	than Ethan the Ezrahite ; Heman; Calcol; and Darda	PROP×4	—	final	—	Comparative list; last-only <i>waw</i> .

Takeaway for Gen 1:1

The unified table shows (a) variable *waw* placement (final-only, each, irregular, pairs), (b) fully definite series with multi- 'et marking, and (c) genuine mixed- 'et-marking cases where one definite item lacks את (e.g., כל-NPs). What we do not yet see is a clean INDEF → DEF[ET] → DEF[ET] DO triad with an asyndetic break after item 1. Accordingly, a Gen 1:1 parsing with אלהים as an 'et-unmarked category object remains **grammatically licit but distributionally under-attested** in the presently surveyed corpus, pending further corpus probes.

Comparanda note — extra-biblical Hebrew (status & replication)

Match definition (what we're looking for). A single simple DO coordination chain with:

1. Item 1 = indefinite NP (plain, no תא).
2. Item 2–3 = definite NPs (with תא / תא).
3. Coordination = final-only *waw* (i.e., no *waw* between items 1–2; *waw* only before the last item).
4. All three objects governed by the same verb in the same clause (no apposition/resumption; no PP chains).

Preliminary canvass (non-biblical corpora). Spot-checks and catalog scans against major resources (e.g., Ma'agarim / Academy of the Hebrew Language, published indexes to Qumran/Late Hebrew and DSS transcriptions, inscriptional wordlists) have not yielded a clear example of this exact pattern outside the HB. This does not imply ungrammaticality; each component (S-initial licensing; mixed תא-marking; final-only *waw*) is independently attested in BH prose. It does support describing Gen 1:1's coordination shape as **distributionally under-attested** pending fuller corpus sweeps.

Common near-misses (to exclude):

- Lists where all items are definite and each takes תא (or none do).
- Lists with final-only *waw* but all items are indefinite.
- Apposition (“NP, namely NP, and NP”) or resumptive restatement (new clause).
- PP chains (e.g., ך + NP, ך + NP) rather than direct objects.

Replication plan (recommended).

- **Primary BH corpus search:** Run an ETCBC/BHSA query (e.g., in SHEBANQ / MQL) for: a verbal clause with three direct objects; obj1 lacking the DO-marker; obj2/obj3 with תא/תא; the conjunction present only before obj3.
- **Later Hebrew:** Repeat on Qumran Hebrew (sectarian texts), Ben Sira, and inscriptions (Iron Age → Persian/Hellenistic) via Ma'agarim/IAA indexes for coordination patterns with תא.
- **Report outcomes:** Log hits, near-miss classes, and any ambiguous cases (e.g., definiteness by pronominal suffix vs. article).

Interpretive upshot. Absent extra-biblical matches, the proposal remains **grammatically licit but distributionally under-attested**. Additional BH-internal convergences (our tables of mixed-’*et*-marking and final-only *waw* lists) increase plausibility; a direct “INDEF → DEF, DEF (final-only *waw*)” exemplar would materially strengthen the case but is not a prerequisite for grammatical possibility.

SHEBANQ screening note. As part of the replication plan, a SHEBANQ-based export workflow was used to screen Genesis for candidate object-series clauses and verses. The workflow helped identify repeated ’*et*, internal parallelism, apposition, and clause-split candidates; it also showed that BHSA often compresses visible object series into a single complex *Objc* phrase or distributes them across multiple clauses. Accordingly, SHEBANQ results were treated as a screening layer, not as direct proof.

Near-misses

— Exod 1:11 — ויבן ערי מסכנות לפרעה את-פתם ואת-רעמסס → Direct object with appositive naming (“store-cities, namely Pithom and Raamses). Close to INDEF → DEF[’*et*] → DEF[’*et*], but items 2–3 are apposition, not a single DO spine.

— Deut 12:6 — והבאתם שמה עלתיכם וזבחיכם ואת מעשרתיכם ... → Mixed ’*et* in one coordination, but the early items are definite by suffix (-כם), not an indefinite first item.

— Ps 146:6 — עשה שמים וארץ את-הים ואת כל אשר-בם → Predicate/nominal header; a final ’*et*-cluster follows earlier ’*et*-unmarked items; not a simple DO triad under one verb.

*These illustrate proximity to the sought profile without satisfying all constraints (INDEF → DEF[’*et*] → DEF[’*et*] with final-only *waw* in a single DO chain).*

Negative Controls (compact)

Terminology note. In this appendix, **annotated** / **tagged** / **labeled** refers to database-assigned features. **Distributionally under-attested** refers to patterns that are grammatically licensed in Biblical Hebrew but rare or presently unmatched in the surviving corpus.

Use. Quick contrasts that *do not* match the Gen 1:1 target pattern (INDEF → DEF[’*et*] → DEF[’*et*] with **final only *waw*** in a *single* DO chain). These help readers avoid false positives.

Verse	Hebrew Excerpt	Pattern class	Why not our pattern
Gen 1:21	את התנינם · ואת כל-נפש · ואת	All definite, multi ’ <i>et</i>	All items definite and ’ <i>et</i>

	כל-עוף		marked; no INDEF first item
Gen 1:25	את חית הארץ · ואת הבהמה · ואת כל-רמש	All definite, multi 'et	As above
Exod 2:24	את-בריתו · את-אברהם · את-יצחק · ואת יעקב	All definite, multi 'et (final <i>waw</i>)	No INDEF item; classic 'et stack with final <i>waw</i>
Gen 6:10	את-שם · את-חם · ואת-יפת	Proper names, all with 'et	Proper list; not mixed definiteness
Hos 2:10 [Eng 2:8]	הדגן · והתירוש · והיצהר	Articulated nouns, each with <i>waw</i>	Not DOs in our sense; all definite by article; no 'et
Gen 5:4	בנים · ובנות	All indefinite	Final only <i>waw</i> but no following definites
2 Sam 8:12	... · מארם · וממואב	PP chain (ן + NP)	Not direct objects; repeated preposition
Josh 6:2	את-יריחו · ואת-מלכה · גבורי החיל	Irregular/mixed; appositive last	Third item lacks 'et and functions more loosely (not clean triad)

Takeaway. These negatives show that each *component* of the Gen 1:1 hypothesis is common (final only *waw*; multi 'et; mixed 'et-marking; S initial clauses), but the **specific triad shape** (INDEF → DEF['et] → DEF['et] with 1–2 asyndeton) remains **under-attested**—hence our designation: *grammatical but distributionally under-attested*.

Extended Diagnostics & Sweeps (addendum)

Quantitative sweep (HB 'et-template snapshot)

- **Count:** 348 instances in 329 verses (17 verses with two instances; one with three).
- **Shape sought:** INDEF → DEF['et] → DEF['et] in a single DO chain, with final-only *waw* and asyndeton 1→2.
- **Result:** None in BH prose match all constraints. Many near-miss classes exist (fully 'et-marked triads; pairs; apposition; PP chains; predicate lists). See the Extended Sweep — Working Table (CSV) for row-level notes.

Apposition vs. Coordination — Quick Diagnostic (Gen 1:1)

Purpose. Distinguish apposition (renaming/resumption) from simple coordination of direct objects.

1. **Markers.** Apposition in BH DO-chains typically repeats *'et* before each appositive name/title (e.g., ויזכר אלהים את־בריתו את אברהם את יצחק ואת יעקב). Mixed *'et*-marking within apposition is uncommon.
2. **Prosody/shape.** Apposition often follows a summary head (e.g., “three sons—Shem, Ham, Japheth”; Gen 6:10), or a head term (“his covenant—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob”; Exod 2:24).
3. **Semantics.** Appositives are generally co-extensive with the head NP (same semantic type).
4. **Coordination profile.** Simple DO series may be fully *'et*-marked (*'et* on each), final-only *waw*, or show asyndeton between early items.
5. **Gen 1:1 check.** The sequence ואת הארץ, את־השמים, אלהים lacks appositive cues (no summary head; semantic mis-match between אלהים ‘gods/powers’ and cosmic domains), while its coordination features (mixed *'et*, final-only *waw*, asyndeton 1→2) **fit a licensed but distributionally under-attested coordination profile whose components are attested separately.**

Bottom line. On formal/semantic grounds, Gen 1:1 is better modeled as coordination than as apposition.

Near-misses (additional)

Representative places where the **surface resembles** our target but fails one criterion (homogeneous definiteness; apposition; fully *'et*-marked series; not simple DO chain):

- Gen 1:16 — fully *'et*-marked; not INDEF → DEF, DEF.
- Gen 1:21; 1:25 — triple fully *'et*-marked *'et*-series (no 1→2 asyndeton).
- Gen 6:10 — appositive names after “three sons”; *'et* repeated before each name (classic apposition).
- Gen 8:1 — fully *'et*-marked triad.
- Exod 2:24 — covenant head + patriarchs (apposition), *'et* before each name.
- Exod 9:25 — PP chain (עַד ... עַד ...) + *'et*-objects; not a simple three-item DO list.

Apposition exemplars (for contrast)

- Gen 6:10 — ויולד נח שלשה בנים—את־שם את־חם ואת־יפת → head + appositives, all *'et*-marked.
- Exod 2:24 — ויזכר אלהים את־בריתו—את אברהם את יצחק ואת יעקב → apposition/resumption pattern.

Yud-Mem (-ים) sweep — Negative controls & near-misses

Surveying verses with an early -ים NP followed by *'et* ... ואת later in the clause yielded no exact matches to INDEF → DEF(*'et*) → DEF(*'et*) with final-only *waw*. Typical outcomes:

- Fully *'et*-marked pairs/series: Gen 8:1; Gen 41:51; Exod 2:24; Jer 51:28 (*'et* on each definite).
- Ditransitive frames (IO + DO pairs): Gen 20:17 → וירפא אלהים את אבימלך ואת אשתו ואמהתיו (last plural w/ suffix without *'et*).
- Mixed structures (PP chains, action nouns, resumption): Gen 19:10; Exod 9:25.

Feminine-plural (-ות) sweep — Negative controls & contrasts

A) Infinitival complements (fully *'et*-marked; not simple DO triads)

- Deut 11:32 — לעשות את כל־החקים ואת המשפטים (pair fully *'et*-marked).
- Deut 26:16 — מצוך לעשות את החקים ואת המשפטים ... (pair fully *'et*-marked).
- Josh 22:5 — לעשות את המצוה ואת התורה ... (pair fully *'et*-marked).
- 1 Kgs 3:1 — לבנות את ביתו ואת בית־י" ואת חומת ירו' ... (series fully *'et*-marked).
- 1 Kgs 9:1 — לבנות את בית־י" ואת בית־המלך ואת כל־חשק שלמה ... (series fully *'et*-marked).
- 1 Kgs 9:15 — long fully-*'et*-marked building list.

B) Nomen actionis + *'et* complements (NP-internal)

- Gen 14:17 — מאחרי שובו מהכות את כדרלעמר ואת המלכים ... (action noun with two *'et*-objects).

C) Dative/IO + DO pairs (two objects, both *'et*-marked)

- 2 Kgs 11:10; 2 Chr 23:9; Neh 5:5 — ditransitives with pair fully 'et-marked.

D) Abstract/attribute pairs

- Deut 3:24; 1 Chr 22:13 — pair fully 'et-marked (גדלך/יִדְרְךָ; החקים/המשפטים).

E) Date pair

- Esth 9:21 — Esth 9:21 — את יום י"ד ... ואת יום ט"ו (pair fully 'et-marked).

Outcome (-וּ sweep): still no instance of INDEF ('et-unmarked) → DEF ('et) → DEF ('et) with final-only *waw* and asyndeton 1→2 in a single simple DO chain. These function as negative controls (infinitival series; NP-internal complements; apposition; fully 'et-marked pairs/triads).

Footnotes on unpointed forms (disambiguation)

¹ Gen 1:12 — עץ עושה פרי read as “tree bearing fruit” (Qal participle עושה within an NP), not a finite verb; likewise מזריע is a participle. Items are nominal categories, not clauses.

² Gen 2:19 — את כל־השדה is definite by construct with a definite genitive (השדה), then את כל־השמים is explicitly 'et-marked. Hence “mixed marking,” not indefinites.

³ Gen 30:35 — כל־חם בכשבים is definite via כל + domain NP; lack of 'et does not imply indefiniteness in this environment.

⁴ Gen 32:19 [Heb 32:20] — גם functions as an additive coordinator; the chain is *waw*less but coordinated (גם ... גם ... גם ...).

⁵ Josh 3:10 — Final items lacking 'et are definite by article; list mixes 'et-marked with article-only definites (attested pattern).

⁶ Josh 6:2 — גבורי החיל is a construct definite via the article on החיל; likely an appositive/looser complement rather than a third direct object (hence irregular profile).

⁷ Josh 6:21 — The animal trio (שור, שה, חמור) sits inside a PP (ועד ...); not a triad of direct objects. The verse also features a category → subtypes expansion.

⁸ Gen 32:7 [Heb 32:8] — Final item והגמלים is definite by article; a typical mixed-marking list (earlier items 'et-marked, last by article only).

Appendix C — Onomastic Plausibility

Purpose. This appendix asks a limited question: does Hebrew onomastics leave open the possibility that בראשית (*berē šît*) could function **nominally** in Gen 1:1? It does **not** attempt to prove that **berē šît** is a name there. Its narrower task is to test whether such a reading is excluded **in principle** by Hebrew naming practice.

C.1 Narrow Question

The Core argues that Genesis 1:1 can be read as a **subject-initial clause** without violating Biblical Hebrew grammar, provided that **berē šît** is allowed to function as a **nominal subject**. Appendix C addresses only the **onomastic** side of that claim. The question is not whether בראשית must be a name, nor whether its ordinary historical analysis as a prefixed form is false. The question is simpler: **can Hebrew, in principle, lexicalize phrase-like or preposition-initial material as a proper name or title?**

If the answer is yes, then a nominal value for **berē šît** cannot be dismissed as impossible merely because the form is phrase-like. Onomastics would not establish the Gen 1:1 reading by itself, but it would keep that reading within the range of grammatical plausibility.

C.2 Core Evidence

Biblical Hebrew onomastics does allow **phrase-like** and **preposition-initial** material to lexicalize as names. Most relevant are forms such as בצלאל and בסודקה, which show that a prefixed preposition can be absorbed into a proper name rather than functioning only as a freely compositional phrase.

These examples matter because they establish a limited but important point: Hebrew naming practice does not forbid a form that begins with a prepositional element from functioning **nominally**. That does **not** mean every such form is automatically a name. It does mean that a phrase-like surface form is not, by itself, a decisive objection to nominal usage.

The relevance to Gen 1:1 is therefore cautious and analogical. If Hebrew can lexicalize preposition-initial or phrase-like forms as names or titles elsewhere, then the claim that **berē šît** is **incapable** of nominal force is too strong. Onomastics cannot prove that בראשית is a proper name in Genesis 1:1, but it does preserve that option as grammatically conceivable.

Table C.1 — Preposition-initial lexicalized names relevant to Appendix C

Name	Reference(s)	Morphology (gloss)	Non-onomastic parallel	Note
בצלאל (Beṣal'ēl)	Exod 31:2; 35:30	ב + צל + אל (“in the shadow/ protection of God”)	Ps 91:1 בצל שדי (“in the shadow of Shaddai”)	Clear be- + noun + theonym pattern
בסודיה (B'sōd·yāh)	Neh 3:6	ב + סוד + יה (“in the counsel of Yah”)	Jer 23:18 בסוד יהוה (“in the counsel of YHWH”)	Parallel phrase; divine short form

C.3 Illustrative note (not probative)

Some Hebrew names simply begin with **ב**, for example **בעז** (*Boaz*). Such forms are **not** evidence for the Gen 1:1 proposal, since in their own contexts they do not present a live grammatical choice between a proper name and a free prepositional expression. They are mentioned only as a reminder that initial **ב** and historical **segmentation** are not identical with **lexicalization**. The stronger comparanda for this appendix are forms such as **בצלאל** and **בסודיה**, where preposition-initial or phrase-like material has clearly lexicalized as a name. The claim here is therefore **not** that **בראשית** is not etymologically analyzable as **ב + ראשית**, but only that Hebrew onomastics does not forbid a form with that surface shape from functioning **nominally in context**.

C.4 What This Appendix Does Not Claim

This appendix does **not** claim:

- that **בראשית** is certainly a proper name in Gen 1:1;
- that the ordinary historical segmentation of the form is false;
- that onomastics alone can determine the syntax of the verse;
- that authorial intent can be inferred directly from naming analogies.

The argument of Appendix C is therefore deliberately modest. Its force is **negative** rather than **demonstrative**: it removes an overly strong objection. Hebrew onomastics does **not** rule out nominal force for a phrase-like or preposition-initial form. That is enough for the Core argument, whose main burden remains syntactic and distributional rather than onomastic.

C.5 Relation to the Core Argument

The Core does not depend on Appendix C to prove the reading. The Core's main argument rests on:

1. **subject-initial licensing** in Biblical Hebrew;
2. the **coordination profile** of the object chain in Gen 1:1;
3. the absence of decisive **appositional** cues;
4. the grammatical possibility of local **homograph resolution** across Gen 1:1–3.

Appendix C supports that argument only at one point: it keeps a **nominal reading** of **berē'šit** open **in principle**. The appendix therefore functions as a guard against premature dismissal, not as the central proof.

C.6 Takeaway

The force of Appendix C is **limited but real**. Hebrew onomastics shows that phrase-like or preposition-initial forms can function as names or titles. Therefore, a nominal value for **berē'šit** in Gen 1:1 cannot be rejected as impossible on onomastic grounds alone.

That conclusion remains deliberately narrow. Appendix C supports **onomastic plausibility in principle**. It does not settle the syntax of Gen 1:1, prove authorial intent, or establish a theological conclusion. Those questions remain downstream from the Core argument.

C.7 Bibliographic Note

For the names cited here and for broader discussion of Hebrew onomastics, see **Appendix D — Notes & Bibliography**.

Appendix D — Reception & Composition Notes (Timeline + References)

Purpose. Give readers a compact orientation to reception/translation history around Gen 1:1 and a minimal bibliography keyed to the superscript footnotes in the Core (Composition & Dating — Working Neutrality).

Pointers. For methods and reproducibility, see **Appendix F — Replicability Note**. For coordination/list tables, see **Appendix B (v4)**. For S-initial clause exemplars, see **Appendix A**. For lexeme/“bet-forms” comparanda, see **Appendix C**.

For orientation — one-line timeline

LXX (3rd–2nd c. BCE) → Early Targum tendencies (late 2nd Temple) → **Megillah 9a** story of the 72 translators → Patristic Logos readings (1st–3rd c. CE) → Medieval rabbinic/philosophical consolidation → Modern translation streams (19th–21st c.).

Pre-modern snapshots (ultra-compact)

- **LXX** (*en archē epoiēsen ho theos...*) sets the classic **main-clause** template (“In the beginning God created...”), echoed in much later Christian tradition and shaping intertextual links (e.g., John 1:1).
- **Targumim: Onkelos** keeps a straightforward rendering (“At/From the beginning the Lord created...”). **Neofiti/Fragment Targums** occasionally paraphrase with **wisdom/oracle** motifs (“with wisdom”), signaling interpretive trends without fixing syntax.
- **Megillah 9a**: the 72 translators narrative underlines the perceived need for clarity/avoidance of misunderstanding in rendering Torah for a Hellenistic audience.
- **Rashi (Gen 1:1)**: influential **construct/temporal** reading (“At the beginning of God’s creating...”), tied to discourse considerations (v.2–3) and syntactic observations (absence of the article with *b^erē`šit*).

- **Medieval philosophy (e.g., Maimonides):** creation theology (e.g., creation *ex nihilo*) is argued conceptually; syntax of Gen 1:1 is treated within broader doctrinal aims rather than as a stand-alone grammatical proof.

Recent translation tendencies (compact note)

Modern versions cluster into three well-known streams:

1. **Main-clause** (“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth...”): classic church-Bible lineage (e.g., KJV → RSV/ESV/NIV lines) and some Jewish editions.
2. **Temporal/construct** (“When God began to create... / At the beginning of God’s creating...”): prominent in 20th-century Jewish and academic circles (e.g., **NJPS 1985**; many commentators), often linking vv.1–3 as a single opening complex.
3. **Ambiguous/hyphenated compromises** (e.g., “At the beginning—when God created...”), signaling the live syntactic debate.

Observation. Across major modern translations, **none** adopt a reading that treats *berē’šīt* as a **proper-name subject**; our study asks only whether such a parse is **grammatically** licit in Biblical Hebrew usage, keeping reception/homiletic/theological questions separate (see Core).

Minimal bibliography (keyed to Core footnotes)

¹ **Spinoza (1998).** *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, Gebhardt ed. 1925. Trans. S. Shirley. Hackett Publishing Company.

² **Cassuto (1961; 1967).**

- (1961) *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Part 1: From Adam to Noah*. Trans. I. Abrahams. The Magnes Press.
- (1967) *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Trans. I. Abrahams. The Magnes Press.

³ **Sarna (1966; 1989).**

- (1966) *Understanding Genesis*. The Melton Research Center, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- (1989) *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis*. The Jewish Publication Society.

⁴ **Westermann (1984).** *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Trans. J. J. Scullion. Augsburg Publishing House.

⁵ **Brueggemann (1982)**. *Genesis: Interpretation—A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. John Knox Press.

⁶ **Harris (2009)**. “The Torah and Its Clearly Ambiguous Message.” Jewish Theological Seminary. (Accessible online.)

Notes: The items above are intentionally minimal and representative, matching the Core’s superscript references. Readers wanting a fuller reception-history list (e.g., patristic/medieval Jewish sources) can be directed to a longer working bibliography if needed later.

Core Grammars & Reference Works (for labels/tagging)

The following references guided category labels (e.g., definiteness, clause/frame types) and tagging conventions used across Appendices A–B:

- **Arnold, Bill T., & John H. Choi**. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (2nd ed.).
- **Waltke, Bruce K., & M. O’Connor**. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*.
- **Joüon, Paul, & Takamitsu Muraoka**. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (rev. ed.).
- **Davidson, A. B.** *Hebrew Syntax* (classic reference).
- **Driver, S. R.** *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (classic reference).
- **Van der Merwe, C. H. J., J. A. Naudé, & J. H. Kroeze**. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (2nd ed.).
- **Holmstedt, Robert D.** Representative studies on BH word order/definiteness/clause structure (e.g., work on VS/SV order and the relative clause).

Usage note. Appendix F (Replicability) gives operational definitions for labels (e.g., “Definiteness basis”) and the CSV column schema; this list simply identifies the grammar baselines that informed those choices.

Appendix E — Theological Notes & Implications (Unified)

Illustrative only; not part of the grammatical evidence. This appendix gathers the prior **Theological Notes** and **Theological Implications** into one place. It aims to describe how “Word” language has been understood across traditions and to sketch implications *if* Gen 1:1 is read with **Bereshit (berē’šît)** as a nominal subject. Nothing here is used to prove the syntax.

E.1 Scope & Guardrails (non-evidentiary)

- **Descriptive, not doctrinal.** We summarize live theological options without adjudicating them.
- **Grammar stays in the Core.** The Core establishes only *grammatical possibility* and observed *distribution*. Theology is downstream.
- **One God.** In all frames below, the **Word** is God’s own effective agency, not a second deity.
- **Reflexive stance.** Readers (including this author) bring priors; rigor means naming them and inviting falsification. Novel ≠ false. These notes remain transparent and bracketed from the grammatical Core.

- **Terminology.** In this appendix we write **Bereshit** (first mention: **Bereshit (berē’šît)**); Hebrew **בראשית** appears in cited Hebrew lines.

E.2 Promise Spoken, Written, Enacted — A Working Analogy for “Word”

A compact analogy for how Scripture depicts God’s **Word** as His effective self-expression:

1. **Spoken** — God speaks; reality responds (e.g., “And God said...”).
2. **Written** — Torah as durable, public word-made-text anchoring covenant life.
3. **Wise ordering** — Creation “by wisdom” (Prov 8) = the world reflects God’s wise intent.
4. **People & mission** — Derash traditions (“for the sake of *rē’šît*” = Torah/Israel) locate purpose in God’s chosen instrument.
5. **Embodied agency** — In Christian readings, the Word is personally enacted (John 1), still God’s self-expression, now personal.

Unifying idea. Across these modalities, the Word is **from God, oriented toward God**, accomplishing what God purposes. Speech, Scripture, wisdom, people, and (for Christians) the personal Logos are ways the one God makes His will effective in the world.

English note on with. English *with* can also convey **alignment/participation** (“get with the program”), approximating the orientation we summarize as “from God, oriented toward God.” See §E.4 on *πρός* vs. *μετά*.

E.2a Authority of the Word — Working Thesis (descriptive)

By “authority of the Word” we mean the **performative efficacy** of God’s self-expression: what God utters, inscribes, or enacts **takes effect** in the world (creation/ordering, covenant legislation, prophetic decree, judgment and renewal; cf. Ps 33:6; Isa 55:11). **Working thesis:** (i) the Word’s authority is **sourced in God alone** (not a second deity); (ii) it is **effective** across modes—spoken fiat, written Torah, wise ordering, mission/embodiment—so that reality conforms to God’s intent; (iii) it is **character-constrained** (truthful, good, life-giving), so its effects are accountable to God’s character. In this sense “authority” names **God’s own agency rendered audible, visible, durable**, not an independent power. *Illustrative only; not part of the grammatical evidence.*

Sidebar — Seeing the Unseen: Public Signs, the Word, and “Named Gods” (concise)

Working definition. A *public sign* is a **material, shareable, durable pointer** that ties a **name** to a **claim** (about will, character, or act). It “binds meaning to matter” in a way multiple observers can examine.

A minimal visibility taxonomy (from weakest to strongest)

1. **Ephemeral phenomena (witnessed).** *Medium:* Light/sound events, weather, lots. *Strength:* Multi-witness; low durability. *Risk:* Coincidence; projection.
2. **Visibilized speech.** *Medium:* **Writing** (inscriptions, scrolls), oaths/edicts, liturgical scripts. *Strength:* Durable; citable; auditable. *Risk:* Misreading; forgeries. *Note:* Turns *hearing* into something *seen* (letters on material).
3. **Covenant performance (name-bound acts).** *Medium:* Public deeds done **in a Name** (deliverance, reforms, worship). *Strength:* Links name and event; communal memory. *Risk:* Post-hoc attribution.
4. **Formed objects & places.** *Medium:* Altars, architecture, calendars, mapped landscapes. *Strength:* Enduring; communal. *Risk:* Idolatry/domestication—object mistaken for deity.
5. **Persons as signs.** *Medium:* Prophets, sages, kings; for Christians, the incarnate Word. *Strength:* Integrated life-sign (teaching, deed, character). *Risk:* Charisma without truth/fruit.

Least common denominator of visibility: Writing. Of all media, written word is both material and audibly stable—the most “portable” way the invisible will is made publicly inspectable.

Beauty & hearing—are they “visible” signs?

- **Beauty.** Beauty is a *quality*, not the footprint itself; the **object’s form** is the footprint, and beauty is the **pattern** by which the form discloses order/fit. Treat beauty as a **clue**; test by fruit and truth.
- **Hearing.** Sound isn’t visible, but it becomes a **public sign when inscribed** (transcript, covenant text) or **corroborated by multiple witnesses**. In law and liturgy, “we heard” becomes “**as it is written.**”

Diagnosing a named god: a six-point filter

1. **Name–claim coherence.** What the name claims (power, domain, character) matches what adherents enact.
2. **Moral fruits.** Justice, mercy, truth vs. coercion, predation, deceit over time.
3. **Non-domestication.** The sign points beyond itself; the object is not treated as the god.
4. **Universality without erasure.** Embraces all peoples while honoring the particular (e.g., Israel’s vocation).
5. **Continuity with prior revelation.** New signs *fulfil* rather than *nullify* earlier trustworthy ones.
6. **Resilience under scrutiny.** Endures examination across languages, centuries, crises.

Why many readers find YHWH most persuasive (descriptive)

- **Textual durability:** The Hebrew Bible as a sustained, public *word-event* anyone can read and test.
- **Ethical monotheism:** A God who ties holiness to justice and refuses images—**word over statue.**
- **Covenant history:** Israel’s survival/return patterns as *name-bound* memory.
- **Prophetic critique of idols:** Gods you can carry vs. the God who carries you.
- **For Christians:** The **Word enacted in a life**, remembered in texts, rites, and transformed communities.

How objects connect to God

By **naming** (explicit reference), by **covenant** (oaths/commands enacted in time), and by **fruit** (outcomes matching the Name's published character). Statues tend to *collapse* the sign into the referent; **scrolls, songs, and just deeds** leave the sign *open*—they point beyond themselves.

E.2b Uniqueness as Mode of Revelation (descriptive, not doctrinal)

Illustrative only; not part of the grammatical evidence.

Claim (descriptive). In Scripture and reception, *uniqueness* often marks vehicles of God's agency. A thing can be singular without constituting a second deity. Its legitimacy is measured by its **orientation to righteousness** (alignment with YHWH's will), not by frequency.

- **Bereshit (as Name/incipit).** A once-only textual act can function as a unique title/launch point. If read as a nominal subject, its *singularity* would be expected for an incipit-epithet rather than a reusable appellation.
- **Torah.** A unique covenant corpus—one charter, one public rule of life—through which God's will is durably made effective.
- **Wisdom (Prov 8).** A singular, personified register of God's wise ordering—language that marks role, not a second deity.
- **Logos (John 1).** In Christian reading, a unique register where God's effective Word is personally enacted—*from God, oriented toward God*, accomplishing what God purposes.
- **Jesus (for Christian readers).** A unique historical instantiation of that Word; uniqueness signals mission, not polytheism.

Righteous-orientation test. Uniqueness is not a defect to be discarded but a strength to be honored *when* it consistently advances justice, mercy, and truth. In that sense, uniqueness can serve revelation.

Why it belongs here. Our linguistic claim is narrower: Gen 1:1's coordination profile remains distributionally under-attested in the present sweep. This sidebar simply notes that Scripture's economy often assigns **unique** forms or figures to carry God's agency. Grammar licenses the possibility; theological evaluation remains bracketed to Appendix E's scope.

E.3 Theological Implications (if *berē'šît* is read as subject)

1) **Creator agency (non-dual).** Reading *Bereshit* as a proper title/Name of the Creator's effective agency does **not** posit a second god. It mirrors HB practice where divine epithets encode role (e.g., *El Elyon, Qadosh Yisrael*).

2) **Created powers.** Treating אֱלֹהִים in Gen 1:1 as a **category object** (“gods/powers”) coheres with texts that locate celestial powers/hosts within creation (e.g., angels/hosts summoned to praise because “He commanded and they were created”).

3) **Created things as witnesses and rivals.** In biblical rhetoric, creation can serve as witness to God's covenant (e.g., “heaven and earth” summoned to testify), yet the same creation can become the site of misdirected worship (sun, moon, stars, wood, stone). Thus, the issue in idolatry is not the material itself but the transfer of ultimate allegiance from Creator to creature. In that sense, created realities can function as “gods” in practice while remaining created and unworthy of worship.

4) **Discourse shift without rupture.** The move from אֱלֹהִים as an object in v.1 (created powers) to **Elohim** as acting **subject** from v.3 is normal BH discourse behavior (topic pivot), not a theological contradiction (see Core, Homography Note).

5) **Revelation modes cohere.** Spoken fiat (“And God said”), written Torah (public word), wise ordering (Prov 8), and for Christians the embodied Logos can be seen as **modes** of one divine *Word* rather than competing claims.

6) **Inter-tradition hospitality.** The grammar allows a range of canonical theologies (Jewish and Christian) to articulate how God's **Word** operates without forcing a single dogmatic reading inside the philological argument.

7) **Hermeneutical caution.** The subject-reading—while grammatically licit—remains **distributionally under-attested**. Theological construction should acknowledge that under-attestedness and avoid over-claiming from grammar alone.

E.4 Note on “with” — πρὸς vs. μετὰ (and why English can mislead)

- **μετὰ + gen.** “with/among” in the sense of company (“with the disciples”).
- **πρὸς + acc.** “to/toward/with” often signals **relational orientation/proximity** (face-to-face, in concert).

Thus “the Word was πρὸς God” can be understood as **aligned toward/with God**—not merely nearby but **actively oriented** to God's will. English *with* often defaults to “accompanying,”

which can obscure this orientational nuance. We therefore summarize the theological thrust here as: **from God, oriented toward God.**

E.5 Author’s Reflection (personal; non-evidentiary)

This project was sparked by a lifelong question: *what is “the Word” that was “in the beginning,” and how does that constrain how we read Gen 1:1?* The Core argues only for a **grammatical possibility**—that **berē’šît** can function as a nominal subject within attested BH clause patterns and coordination behavior. Personally, the author has found that possibility illuminating for how Scripture portrays God’s **Word** as His own effective agency: spoken, inscribed, wisely ordering, missionally enacted—and, in Christian confession, personally embodied—always **from God and oriented toward God**. This reflection is offered to situate the scholarly work within a lived inquiry; it makes **no** claim on the grammatical analysis.

E.6 Cross-references

- **Core:** “Word Terminology” pointer (Method section) and “Homography Note: אֱלֹהִים across Gen 1.”
 - **Appendix B:** Coordination/apposition diagnostics relevant to excluding “Elohim, namely the heavens and the earth.”
-

E.7 Revealed Names/Titles (Revelation 19:12-13)

Revelation 19:12–13 is conceptually resonant with this project’s concern for **Name, Principle, and Word**. Christ bears a **written name** known fully only to Himself, yet He is also publicly named “**The Word of God,**” and in verse 16 publicly designated “**King of kings and Lord of lords.**” The passage therefore distinguishes between the **hidden fullness** of divine identity and its **revealed names/titles**. That distinction fits the project’s broader observation that a divine name may be truly manifested in writing and speech without being fully exhausted by any single public designation.

Appendix F — Replicability Note

Purpose. Enable any reader to reproduce the corpus observations that underwrite the claim of **grammatical licitness** and **distributional under-attestation**.

Data Sources (publicly checkable)

- **Biblical Hebrew base text:** BHSA/ETCBC (morphologically annotated Hebrew Bible).
- **Secondary witnesses (for cross-checking verse shapes):** MT (BHS/BHQ), DSS transcriptions where available, and major English translations for quick alignment only (not for analysis).
- **Grammars used for category labels:** Holmstedt; Arnold & Choi; Waltke & O’Connor; Joüon–Muraoka; Davidson; Driver; BHRG (Van der Merwe). See Notes/Bibliography.

Why BHSA/ETCBC? It provides a morphologically and syntactically **annotated** Hebrew Bible, allowing us to query clause constituents (verb, subject NP, direct objects) and test for the presence/absence of *’et* and *waw*. In this appendix, **annotated / tagged / labeled** refers to features assigned by the database; **distributionally under-attested** refers to patterns that are grammatically licensed but infrequent or presently unmatched in the surviving corpus.

Tagging Rules (what each column means)

- **Frame.** S + qatal / S + participle / S + predicate / S + yiqtol, etc., following ETCBC clause function labels; “w+S+...” indicates prefixed *waw* on the clause or verb.
- **NP/definiteness per item.** INDEF (bare noun), DEF [ART] (with ה-), DEF [ET] (governed by *’et*), DEF [SUF] (possessive suffix), PROP (proper name), PREP (prepositional object—not counted as DO).
- **’et (by item).** ✓ means item is marked with *’et* / *w’et*; – means *’et*-unmarked.
- **Waw.** final (only before last item), each (before each item after the first), pairs (grouped couples), irreg (mixed), none (no coordinating *waw* on items).

- **Asyndeton/Additives.** Note when no *waw* appears between adjacent items (e.g., “1–2”) or when additive particles (e.g., ׀א) or repeated prepositions (e.g., ׀ן ,־ל) run the chain.

How to Verify (step-by-step)

1. **Open the base text.** Use an interface to BHSA/ETCBC or a morphologically tagged MT.
2. **Locate the verse.** Confirm Hebrew word order and identify the target clause (avoid subordinate/appositive spill-over).
3. **Mark constituents.** Identify the **verb**, the **subject NP** (if explicit), and each **direct object**. Distinguish DOs from prepositional complements.
4. **Record definiteness & markers.** For each object, record: presence of *'et*; article ׀-/pronominal suffix; whether it is a proper name; any ל־ constructions.
5. **Record coordination.** Note where *waw* appears (each item vs. final-only), and any **asyndeton** (adjacent items without *waw*).
6. **Classify the pattern.** Assign the legend codes (NP/def., *'et*, *Waw*, Asyndeton) and add a short functional note (e.g., “category → subtypes,” “household roster,” “polysyndeton”).
7. **Cross-check.** Compare the classification with at least **one reference grammar** for that construction type and glance at **two parallel examples** in our tables.

Tip. For mixed-marking cases, double-check whether the “*'et*-unmarked” but definite NP is actually definite by article or suffix (e.g., ל־NP with article) rather than truly indefinite.

Query Templates (conceptual)

- **S-initial narrative frames.** Find clauses with explicit **subject NP before verb** (e.g., *waw* + NP + qatal/participle/copular). Sample query idea: *clause where role = Subj precedes role = Predication/Verb; domain = narrative.*
- **Lists with DOs.** Find **verbal clauses** that have ≥ 3 **direct objects**; then filter where **obj1 lacks 'et**, **obj2/obj3 have 'et**, and **coordinator waw** appears **only** before obj3 (final-only).

- **Negative controls.** Pull “all-definite multi- *’et’*” lists and “all-indefinite” lists to contrast with the target shape.

Replication caveat. Different databases may segment clauses and phrase boundaries differently; visible object series can therefore appear either as one complex Objc phrase or as several linked clauses. Always verify against the visible Hebrew.

SHEBANQ as a Replication and Refinement Tool

The project developed an extended, reproducible SHEBANQ workflow that materially improved candidate harvesting and clarified the limits of the underlying annotation model. In addition to SHEBANQ’s online query interface, exported CSV results were further processed with a custom VBScript developed collaboratively during this project. The script aggregated phrase- and clause-level **annotations** to both clause and verse levels, distinguished **free** from **suffixed** object-marker forms, and assigned provisional candidate labels (for example, **appositional control**, **coordination only**, and **internal-mix near-miss**). This extended workflow proved more informative than raw online query results alone, especially where BHSA encodes visible object series as a single complex Objc phrase or distributes them across multiple clauses.

In the book of Genesis, verse-level provisional labels yielded the following counts: **COORDINATION_ONLY 160; APPOSITIVE_CONTROL 277; INTERNAL_MIX_NEAR_MISS 21; NOISE 1075**. Clause-level provisional labels yielded: **COORDINATION_ONLY 176; APPOSITIVE_CONTROL 279; INTERNAL_MIX_NEAR_MISS 12; NOISE 2222**. The verse-level set proved more useful for screening, since it recovered cases whose relevant structure is distributed across multiple clauses; the clause-level set remained more useful for tight citation and grammatical discussion.

Illustrative examples include: **Gen 1:1** as a possible core target; **Gen 1:16** as an appositional control; **Gen 1:21** as a verse-level internal-mix near-miss; **Gen 1:29** as an internal-mix near-miss; **Gen 2:7** as a mixed clause-level artifact requiring caution; **Gen 2:19** as coordination only; and **Gen 6:10** as a repeated- *’et’* triad that is still not a true Gen 1:1 match.

Conclusion. SHEBANQ 2021 proved highly valuable for harvesting and structuring candidates, but its annotation model does not directly recover all the fine-grained object-chain distinctions relevant to Gen 1:1. Visible object series may be **annotated** as

a single Objc phrase with internal substructure, or distributed across multiple clauses. Its strongest use in this project is therefore not direct proof, but **candidate harvesting, annotation diagnosis, and replicable screening**.

Versioning & Cross-Refs

- **This appendix syncs to: Appendix B (v4) — Unified Table (swept, 2nd-pass summary).** Key sections for verification: “**Negative Controls (compact)**,” “**Second-Pass Summary & Legend**,” and the “**Comparanda**” note.
 - **Core pointers:** Method box includes the “**Apposition vs. Coordination — Quick Diagnostic (Gen 1:1)**” pointer; the Core’s “**Replication status**” paragraph mirrors the language here.
 - **Change-tracking:** If Appendix B increments to v5+, update this section header list so replicators land on the right subsections.
 - **Resources.** Working CSVs and supporting scripts referenced in this appendix are available via the website Downloads menu.
-

What Counts as a Match (for the Gen 1:1 test)

A **single verbal clause** whose **three direct objects** form: **INDEF (no *'et*) → DEF (*'et*) → DEF (*waw 'et*)**, with **no *waw*** between items 1–2 and a **single final *waw*** before the last item. Apposition, resumptive lists, and prepositional chains do **not** count.

Current status. Our unified tables (see Appendix B (v4)) display all **components** (mixed *'et*-marking; final-only *waw*; asyndeton). After a second-pass sweep with tighter apposition detection, no exact BH exemplar of **INDEF → DEF[*'et*] → DEF[*'et*]** with **asyndeton 1→2** and **final-only *waw*** has been found. We therefore describe the Gen 1:1 coordination profile as **grammatically licit but distributionally under-attested**, pending broader corpus sweeps. More specifically, the presently unmatched feature stack is: **an *'et*-unmarked/category first object, two definite *'et*-marked objects, final-only *waw*, and an asyndetic 1→2 break**.

Box F.1 — Falsifiable Counter-Reads (How this proposal could fail)

Purpose. Make the claim testable. The subject-reading of **בראשית** (as nominal subject) is **permissible but distributionally under-attested**. The following findings would **undercut** the proposal; conversely, none of these is assumed true by the argument.

A) Clause-shape & coordination falsifiers

1. **No S-initial licensing.** A corpus-level demonstration that BH narrative does **not** license the S-initial frames we cite (e.g., the Appendix-A exemplars are misparsed or genre-bound such that Gen 1:1 cannot analogize) would remove the word-order plank.
2. **Coordination ban.** Evidence that a three-item **direct-object** chain **cannot** take the shape **INDEF → DEF('et) → DEF('et)** with **final-only waw** and **1→2 asyndeton** (i.e., a principle-level prohibition, not just rarity) would collapse the coordination plank.
3. **Apposition is forced.** A formal cue in Gen 1:1 showing **אֱלֹהִים** is **head + appositionive re-naming** ("namely *the heavens and the earth*")—or a semantic argument that *gods/powers* and *cosmic domains* are necessarily **co-extensive** in BH usage—would defeat the simple-coordination analysis.

B) Lexeme & onomastics falsifiers

4. **Onomastic impossibility.** A strong, rule-based case that prepositional/adverbial bases (כ/ל/ב- forms, *rē šît*-type) **cannot** function as names/titles in BH—i.e., that our nominalizing comparanda are illusory—would remove the name-value plank.
5. **Local אֱלֹהִים constraints.** A grammatical constraint in Gen 1:1 specifically that **forces** proper-singular *Elohim* as subject (agreement, pronominal binding, prosodic evidence) would preclude reading **אֱלֹהִים** as a common plural **object** ("gods/powers").

C) Textual/para-textual falsifiers

6. **Pre-Masoretic disambiguation.** Early Hebrew witnesses (e.g., pre-MT orthography/accents) that **unambiguously** encode a subject-first "God" reading, beyond translator smoothing, would weigh against the alternative parse being live in antiquity.
-

What does not falsify the claim (controls)

- **Frequency alone.** Rarity (even possible uniqueness) does not equal ungrammaticality in a finite corpus.
 - **Translation traditions.** LXX/Targum choices show public stabilization, not the only licit BH parse.
 - **Re-use of “בראשית.”** The lack of reuse as a title is not decisive; incipit-epithets can be unique.
-

Claim (A) note — distribution of *rē'šît/berē'šît*

The proposal does **not** depend on frequent nominal use of **בראשית** elsewhere. Outside Gen 1:1, *berē'šît* typically occurs in construct-like contexts ("at the beginning of X"), and *rē'šît* functions as a common noun ("first/primacy"). Our argument is narrower: **BH onomastics does allow** nominalization/epithet-like titles, so treating **בראשית** as a **proper/nominal subject** in Gen 1:1 is **possible in principle**; the question is distributional plausibility, handled by the clause-shape and coordination tests above.

Quick Access — Data & Replicability (compact)

If you want the shortest path to replicate the tables and claims:

1. **Base text/interface.** Open BHSA/ETCBC (e.g., SHEBANQ) and display *clause*, *phrase*, and *word* features. In this workflow, database features are treated as **annotations** to be checked against the visible Hebrew; they are a screening aid, not a substitute for philological judgment.
2. **S-initial frames (Appendix A).** Filter clauses where a **Subject phrase precedes the verbal/predicative phrase** (e.g., S + qatal / S + participle / S + predicate). On ETCBC this means finding a *phrase* with **function=Subj** that **occurs before** a *phrase* with **function=Pred** (or a verbal *Pred*). Then sample verses from Appendix A to confirm the pattern.
3. **DO-list extraction (Appendix B).** In verbal clauses, collect **direct-object phrases** (ETCBC **function=Objc**). Record, per item: presence of **'et** (token = וְאֵת / אֵת), **article** (ה- at word level), **suffix/pronoun**, and whether the item is a **proper name**. Note **coordination** by observing *waw* on items; mark **asyndeton** where adjacent objects lack *waw*.

4. **Target triad test (Gen 1:1 shape).** Among clauses with ≥ 3 **direct objects**, check for the sequence **INDEF (no 'et)** \rightarrow **DEF['et]** \rightarrow **DEF[*w^e'et]***, with **no waw** between items 1–2 and **final-only waw** before the last item. Exclude **apposition/resumption** (ETCBC often marks apposition with *rela=Appo* at phrase/word links).
5. **Negative controls & comparanda.** Also pull:
- *All-definite* multi- 'et chains;
 - *All-indefinite* chains;
 - Clear **apposition** sequences (e.g., repeated 'et with proper names) to contrast with simple coordination.
6. **Definiteness basis (legend).** Use: **ART** (article), **SUF** (pronominal suffix), **ET** ('et-marked direct object), **PROP** (proper name), **BARE** (none of the above). See the legend in Appendix B (v4) for quick codes.

Minimal MQL sketch (conceptual) — not copy-paste ready, but a guide for SHE-BANQ:

- **S-initial:** select *clause* c where **exists** phrase p1 (*function=Subj*) **before** phrase p2 (*function=Pred* or verbal) within c.
- **Obj-triples:** select verbal clauses where **count(Objc)** ≥ 3 ; harvest the three left-to-right object phrases; test each for 'et token and article/suffix; check inter-item *waw*/token sequence.

Pointers. Appendix B (v4) holds: **Negative Controls (compact), Second-Pass Summary & Legend, and Comparanda**; Appendix F (this page) states **what counts as a match and falsifiable counter-reads**. The Core's **Method** box links to the **Quick Diagnostic** for Gen 1:1.

Notes & Bibliography

See **Appendix D — Notes & Bibliography** for the consolidated “Core Grammars” list and other works cited.