

Lunar Sabbath? Solar Sabbath? (Part 2)

Home

A closer look at the word “also” in Genesis 1:16

[This is an advanced study for those who have already completed the basic Sabbath study material from our 1989 – 94 packet. It is being added here in order to accommodate the inquiries of the many excellent questions that are still coming in to the ministry via email questions]

Genesis 1:14 "And God said, Let there be lights (luminaries) in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:"

16 "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: He made the stars also."

This essay is a continuation of Part One where we have seen that an elementary literal English translation of Genesis 1:16 according to Hebrew/English lexicon research reads:

"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: the stars."

The Moon is never implied in these verses, either directly or indirectly, since it simply is not included within the parameter of Scriptural qualifications for God’s appointed signs of Genesis One. The Moon is not a light (that is: a luminary) nor does it divide the day from night, neither does it determine a day or a year, and it is not a factor in setting the seasons. This vital truth in determining the actual Saxon Israelite calendar, with its Sabbaths and Feasts, becomes even more apparent when we go a step further into a detailed examination of the finer points of the Scriptural Hebrew text of Genesis chapter One.

The ancient Hebrew language (pre Masoretic minus the vowel points), penned long before the English King James Version or other English versions existed, went a long way to make it clear that only the Sun and Stars are used as God’s basis given to us for the purpose of correctly noting important times within the divine calendar for Israel. The Moon is out of the picture quite bluntly because following Moon orbits in relation to the Earth produces a chaotic attempt at normal time keeping. We would be hard pressed to set daily routines and appointments by Moon phases, as to do so would prove to be an utter disaster. In fact, there is no such thing as a “lunar year”. That term is merely a term of convenience which only counts how many times the Moon orbits the Earth in a REAL year, that is --- a solar year (as the Earth rotates completely once around the Sun). The term “lunar year” is a comparative term only, and it is understood by those using it to be considered within reference of what a true Earth year is in our solar system. A true year, a real year defined, for Earth is precisely one full orbit of Earth from “point A” in space, all the way back to “point A” again, going around the Sun. A so called “lunar year”

has nothing to do with this whatsoever. The Moon therefore cannot determine a year. It is not a yearly calendar sign, and the Hebrew text plainly eliminates the Moon forever from being a fixed standard for time keeping.

Virtually all Bible scholars agree that the “greater light” of verse 16 is the Sun which is used to divide day from night and to divide the seasons, God’s appointed astronomical times. On this we are in agreement.

But more emphatically, when verse 16 tells us that God made “two great lights” (being the greater and lesser) the word for “two” here is the Hebrew word *shen-ah-yim* (Strong’s # 8147, 8145). It means “double again, second time, both, twice, duplicate”. Gesenius’ Hebrew Lexicon cites this word on page 840 to mean “two, dual, a two-kind”. (As in poker “two of a kind”) In other words the SAME THING AGAIN - DUAL. This is quite revealing because Genesis 1:16 is explaining that the “lesser light” (starlight) is the same kind of repeated luminary source as is the “greater light” – the Sun. Today we now know that the stars are “suns” and that the Sun is a star. They are *shen-ah-yim* to each other, namely, dual original light source giving luminaries. Thus the Moon could not be, and is not, a duplicate kindred of the hydrogen fireball and atomic exploding Sun. The Hebrew text made this point a matter of distinction for a reason. However this has evidently been glossed over by the various church translators of the denominational Bibles, translators who have been endlessly besieged by Rabbinic Talmudic doctrines, in this case, the mistaken theory that “the Pharisaic lunar times” are some how Gospel truth, and that the Edomite Rabbis are Israelites clerics (they aren’t).

But this isn’t all. For the serious Bible investigators and language buffs among the readers there’s yet more to be obtained by way of a precise “fine tuning”, where we gain even more evidence to confirm that God’s Holy Writ eliminates the Moon from verses 16-18.

What exactly have we, with the inclusion of the word “also” in the latter part of verse 16 as translated in English Bibles”? Let’s quote verse 16 again from the KJV:

16 "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: He made the stars also."

As pointed out in Part One, we now know that “*He made*” was not in the original text, and that Strong’s Concordance does not include a dictionary reference for “*also*” as a correct translation in that verse. Strong’s considers “*also*” to be non-existent here, at least as far as a comprehensible English translation would be considered. Still, English versions tend to include some sort of rendering of this verse using an “and”, or at least hinting at the word “also” to some degree or another.

Examples:

The King James Version has it: *He made the stars also*

The Rotherham Bible has it: *Also the stars*

The English Masoretic Text has it: *And the stars*

Young's Literal Translation has it: *And the stars*

Strong's Concordance has it: *The stars*

The NIV Interlinear has it: *He also made the stars*

Why do we find such discrepancy regarding this matter? And why the inconsistent placement of “also” or “and” in the phrase from translation to translation? It has become more than obvious that the denominational translators were at a loss concerning what to do with the latter phrase in verse 16 pertaining to “the stars”, and that there has been no consensus about this entry for the past 2000 years. Could it be that an unbending insistence that the Moon is part of the equation, when it isn't, is the cause of the never ending dilemma? We shall see that this is precisely the root of the problem after all.

The puzzle of why nearly all church translators have tried to insert an “also” or an “and” somewhere in the star phrase but seem confused as to its word application, can be attributed to a few basic facts. 1) They have overlooked the Scriptural precision which explains that the “greater light” of the day and the “lesser light” of the night are the same kind of dual kindred light. Both are luminous light emitted from exploding fireballs we call stars or suns. 2) They have failed to understand that the Rabbinic lunar dogma and theology is not of Israelite origin but rather it is Babylonian Talmudic by religion. 3) They still feel compelled to imply that the Moon must be somewhere included in Genesis 1:14 -18 because they mistakenly look to Rabbinic lunar interpretations of Scripture as a source of truth. 4) They can readily view Hebrew Genesis 1:16 text scripts that show a certain Hebrew word (*vawth*) which looks like it could be translated either “also” or “and” in this verse so they have taken the liberty to do so, although inconsistent and haphazard as to where it should be inserted.

It is point #4 above with which we shall now deal.

For those who have access to an Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament with the Hebrew in the sublinear, it is easy to see that in verse 16 of Genesis chapter one we find the inclusion of the Hebrew word VAWTH. There are several Interlinear Hebrew-English Bible versions available. In their side columns some of the

Interlinear Bibles translate this word as “also” and some have “and”. That is – “and the stars” or “also the stars”. However, Dr. James Strong in 1890 correctly understood that there are times when a Hebrew word usage does not have a direct English equivalent of a “single word translation”, and therefore he astutely did not enter a reference for “also” at 1:16 in his well known Hebrew-Greek-English language concordance. This is because the Hebrew word *vawth* has a more specific connection to the rest of the context of 1:16 than a mere “also” or “and”. Dr. James Strong, in this instance, caught the difference where other translators did not.

Therefore we see that Strong’s translation would correctly guide us to the conclusion that the “lesser light” is starlight, which deduction happens to be compatible with the first part of 1:16 where we note that the two lights mentioned are *shen-ah-yim* (dual, same) as being related in apposition of kindred lights with each other. *Vawth* in such a case does not merely mean “and” or “also” but rather it is used to connect two similar parts of a phrase to show that said parts are actually of the same kind.

This is known as a copulative conjunction word in sentence syntax, and its usage is clear. It describes the union of two similar parts or words in a sentence. Simply put, the “and” (*vawth*) here means more than our generic “and” in our English language. We are not, however, at any loss as to what the Hebrew *vawth* actually does mean in Genesis 1:16.

Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, 1846 (which I have in my reference library) lays it out just fine, with the explanation being easy to understand.

On pages 233 and 234 of that language lexicon, in defining the use of the 6th letter of the Hebrew alphabet “Vauv”, it is explained that this letter is used in many cases as a copulative, a connector of like words. Furthermore, since the word we see as “and” in 1:16 Interlinear Hebrew texts begins with the “vauv” letter, (spelled *vauv-aleph-tau* pronounced *vawth*) it can take on a copulative power itself – connecting two like words in the sentence.

When connecting two like parts or like words of a sentence, “and” (*vawth*) in this case actually becomes “*by way of explanation*” in its copulative meaning, and changes from its basic meaning of “and”. If *vawth* is used in a sentence where the connecting words are not alike, then it still means “and”. Let’s clarify a bit. For example we could say: “Hot *vawth* [and] cold”. These are different so *vawth* is still “and”. Then we could say “Hot *vawth* [by way of explanation] heat”. “Hot” and “heat” are dual similar words so *vawth* takes on an expanded meaning.

That being the case, let’s remember --- the “great and lesser light” are *shen-ah-yim* (dual, duplicate, same kind) of each other. This means that the context of the sentence will influence how the *vawth* is to be understood in meaning. Furthermore, in Genesis 1:16, *vawth* (“and/also” or “by way of explanation”) additionally connects the “lesser light” to be the same copulative kind as “the stars”.

Condensed, the Gesenius' Lexicon comments are below [excerpt, pages 233,234]:

“ Copulative conj. and --- its use – in which sentences required to be connected – made use of this one copula, --- (c) The copulative is inserted by way of explanation between words in apposition. (d) -- Gen.49:25 “from the God of thy father, *and* He helped thee” (i.e. who helped thee) and (from) the Almighty *and* He blessed thee (who blessed thee)” [Emphasis added]

[Note: The underlined “and (from)” is the word VAWTH in the 49:25 Hebrew text, same as 1:16]

It is excellent that Gen.49:25 is used as an example by Gesenius' Lexicon above since the same concept applies to 1:16. In the above Hebrew explanation of the 49:25 “*and*” used as a copulative, it is clear that the two words in apposition (duality) are God and the Almighty (the same thing) although they are different words. Note that Gesenius' Lexicon now expands the simple “and” to mean FROM too, relating it back to the first words; that is to literally say “*by way of explanation* – from”. The precise grammatical translation is “*the God of thy father,-- by way of explanation, the Almighty*”, yet most English versions just have it “the God of thy father – *and* the Almighty”.

Cited here in the lexicon the grammatical “fine point” of 49:25 makes no real difference because we automatically know that God IS the Almighty. But in Genesis 1:16 regarding the “lesser light and the stars”, a lack of understanding of the copulative use of *vawth* (“*and*” or “*also*” or “*by way of explanation*”) becomes crucial. Dr. James Strong had observed the verse correctly. The words “He made” weren't in the original text of Genesis 1:16, and “also/and” was incorrect, so Strong's Concordance won't reference that meaning of *vawth* at all. Therefore Strong's concordant observation of Genesis 1:16 is genuine as it preserves the intent:

16 "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: the stars." [Note: The colon having been retained in substitution of the copulative “and/also/vawth”]

By re-discovering the excellent language lessons that have existed all along in the more extensive Hebrew-English lexicons, the literal grammatical Hebrew translation of Genesis 1:16 clearly appears in proper syntax (as with Gen.49:25, etc.)

16 "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: by way of explanation the stars."

The original intent of Genesis 1:16 was to rule out the Moon, not to include it as a celestial sign for telling time. Most of the work concerning questionable Bible verses has already been done for us as God, in His great plan, has blessed our Christian family with past scholars who endured their tedious labor of love in compiling their reference works for posterity. It is our job to now re-discover what has laid dormant right on church and seminary book shelves for many generations. May The Almighty greatly be with all those who seek His truth.