

Chapter 5

This “Optional” Translation (Part I)

In an effort to promote, and increase familiarity, permit me to present you the Fourth Directive’s text, as it traditionally is seen in translation. For this is the scripture, which says God “rested”, traditionally as verse 11 shows below:

(RSV Exodus 20:8-11) ⁸“Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. ⁹Six days you shall labor, and do all your work; ¹⁰but the seventh day is a sabbath to the Lord your God; in it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your manservant, or your maidservant, or your cattle, or the sojourner who is within your gates; ¹¹for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, *and rested the seventh day*; therefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it”.

As you can see, and observe for yourself, Exodus 20:11, the final verse here seems to state unequivocally, that Yahweh God “rested” (as is italicized) on the seventh day: Beginning with a brief account of his creation schedule, verse 11 reports of his having “‘rested’ the seventh day”.

A. In the Translation

Concerning itself with this very same narrative, Genesis 2:2 reads, as follows (RSV):

“And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had done, *and he rested* on the seventh day from all his work¹ which he had done”...

An attentive look at the Bible’s Hebrew² in Genesis 2:2 and Exodus 20:11 discloses their use of two different Hebrew verbs to narrate Yahweh’s above mentioned seventh day activity.

Applying one English verb, “to rest” to translate these two italicized verbs, the above cited renderings have disguised each scripture’s use of a different Hebrew verb: While Genesis 2:2

actually speaks of God's having "ceased" on the seventh day", Exodus 20:11 employs a different verb to tell of his having "rested" the seventh day". And to this, we should briefly give at least some attention.

B. As Is the Case...

In Exodus 20:11, this verb, translated so as to tell of God's having "rested" is somewhat similar to the English verb, "to rest": With this same Hebrew verb, one could speak of someone's having "rested" from labour. At the same time, however, one could also use it to tell of someone's having "rested" the book on the table, beside his chair.

In Hebrew, the former would be in the "Qal" tense, which performs approximately the same function as the English simple past, present and future tense. For the latter, the Hebrew tense would be the "Hiphil" or causative tense. And here, please permit me to caution, and advise:

Do not assume, that what awaits
Much expertise necessitates
As if demand it must of you
What unprepared are you to do

But rather, just attentive be
To this. And quickly will you see
Your simple use of "common sense"
To you discernment will dispense.

In the first of these two above tenses, one rests because of fatigue. In the second tense, one "causes" the book "to rest" on the table. Or one "places" it on the table, which has absolutely nothing to do with fatigue.

Again, Exodus 20:11 does *not* use the same Hebrew verb to tell of God's having "rested", where Genesis 2:2 recalls God's having "ceased". And a good example of the contrast in the significance of these verbs is exhibited, and displayed by their simultaneous use in Exodus 23:12 (deMSby³):

"Throughout six days, you will do your activities. And on the seventh day, *you will cease*, so that your ox and your donkey *may rest*. And the son of your maidservant and the visitor may be restored".

As is the case in Exodus 20:11, the verb, “to rest”, the second of the two italicized verbs is the one, that is used, and is the object of our focus.

C. For Yourself

In Exodus 20:11, however, this verb is applied in such a way as to allow its being “parsed”, or conjugated as *either* the Qal or the Hiphil tense⁴: Yes, speaking strictly and exclusively in terms of linguistics, its translation will admit, and will present as correctly rendered through its assignment with two meanings and two different sorts of import.

And my intention here is not to prefer the one at the expense of the other, or to criticize the one through commendation of the other: In God Did *Not* “Rest” and in its elaboration, I do not presume to promote either one, or dismiss either one, or to indicate implicitly, that one is better.

On quite the contrary, my intention here is simply, that *you* might *yourself* make this choice *for yourself*, and do it more observantly, astutely and studiously. You can yourself manage your own selection of that particular option, which best appeals *to you*, when you *yourself* make inspection of the evidence.

D. Effectively, It Has Concealed

Because until now, simple tradition has acted in your behalf, and has selected in your behalf, and has thus denied your option and even awareness of this option: In truth, in its having chosen for “he ‘rested’” instead of this alternative, “optional” translation, tradition has all but hidden, and concealed one of these options through its presentation and exhibition of the other.

Effectively, it has obscured, and has obliterated the one by way of emphasis, utter devotion and partiality to the other. And I believe, that you would like to become apprised, and be made aware of what has been thus far concealed, and truly eclipsed by tradition.

And again, this is so, that you might exercise the option to decide for yourself, and make selection for yourself.

Until now, this option
To you was unknown

In obscurity was it
 Suspended
In vines of tradition
 It long overgrown
Has remained in concealment
 Extended

But passing is such
 Like the seasonal course
Whose duration can not
 Ever last
And despite its enduring
 Momentum and force
Dissipate will it soon
 In the past

For a far greater Force
 Has assembled us here
That himself he might make
 Better known
More distinctly shall he
 On these pages appear
When this scriptural option
 Is shown

And specifically thus
 He directs as a guide
Which the reader, who prudent
 Is heeds
Time it is, that you now
 For yourself can decide
When advised of the Almighty's
 Deeds

And in the simple interest of accurate biblical presentation, it is my purpose and single aspiration, that you might be introduced to this “optional” translation of Exodus 20:11 of the Fourth Directive.

¹This scripture epitomizes the unavoidable inconsistency of any biblical recall, that God, the Almighty could ever have “rested”: For how could God have “finished his work which he had done” “on the seventh day”?

While he as well “rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had done”, as this scripture is translated here (RSV Genesis 2:2): “And on the

seventh day God finished his work which he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had done”...

²Hopefully, you are aware, that the Bible’s Old Testament was originally written mainly in Hebrew. Unlike the New Testament, which was originally written in Greek.

Which obviously means: Someone, who reads neither Greek nor Hebrew must be reliant on biblical translation.

Examples of which are the KJV (King James Version) or RSV (Revised Standard Version). Of which, you are probably aware. And through which, many can read biblical Scripture, despite inability to read Greek and Hebrew.

³Again, this representation, “deMSby” is signification of the use of the de MontSabbathby Version, the author’s translation of biblical Scripture. (And again, incidentally, de MontSabbathby is phonetically pronounced, and accented as if spelled “d’Maunt Sábbathbee”). *But* any scripture quoted by this book, which is *not* from the de MontSabbathby Version will *always distinctly* be cited *as such*, while denoting that version from which it *is* cited, KJV (King James Version) or RSV (Revised Standard Version) etc.

⁴To readers, who have had no introduction to biblical Hebrew, some of this Chapter’s text could well be at least somewhat arcane.

Chapter 6

This “Optional” Translation

(Part II)

Before further considering Exodus 20:11, though, a particular characteristic of biblical Hebrew’s grammar should now be allotted some brief consideration.

And here again, attentive be
Observe astutely, that you see
By instance and by demonstration
All will turn to revelation

Among biblical Hebrew’s properties and traits, one necessarily finds frequent use of a transitive (thus very often Hiphil or causative) verb, borrowing prior objects of a previous verb, without reminder, repetition or re-statement of prior objects.

Because the sort of verb in question is transitive, its “object-requiring” nature is in itself proof of the verb’s requiring, and having an object. If, then, this verb is part of a phrase or sentence, wherein the object or objects have already been stated, its transitive or “object-requiring” nature eliminates the need to make review of these objects, or make additional repetition of these objects.

A. “What”, You May Ask...?

“What”, you may ask, “does all of that mean?”...Should you find, that the foregoing remarks of this chapter do not seem clear to you, and are somewhat vague, please examine, and consider these following few scriptures...

Many of them are familiar passages, and provide simple and informative example and instruction: Genesis 2:19, for instance, reads (from right to left, as Hebrew reads).

מִן־הָאָדָמָה
ground the from

אֱלֹהִים
God

יְהוָה
Yahweh

וַיִּצַר
formed And

השמים ואת כל־עוף השדה כל־חית
heavens the of fowl the all and field the of thing living every

אל־האדם ויבא
human the to (come to caused) brought he and

Examine carefully the interlinear translation, provided for your inspection.

Literally, it reads: “And Yahweh God formed from the ground every living thing of the field and all the fowl of the heavens and he brought (caused to come) ___ to the human...”

RSV Genesis 2:19 translates this verse: “So out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the air, and brought them to the man...”

B. Simply a Necessary Procedure

Take a moment; and be attentive to these translated words of Genesis 2:19. For your comprehension of what here follows will be greatly enhanced by your merely understanding a particular trait of grammar found here, and recurrently used by the authors of the Bible and certainly its first five books.

Observe how the RSV’s correct translation of Genesis 2:19 provides an object, “them” for the verb, here rendered, and translated “brought”...

“So out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the air, and brought ‘them’ to the man...”

In the Hebrew, being translated here, the word for “them” is actually not used; and it is actually not present....

To make the verse readable in English, however, must necessitate a translator’s supplying such a word, and is perfectly acceptable, appropriate and proper: This approach to translation of the Hebrew text is not addition to the text or “compensation” for some textual inadequacy...

Any more than it abuses, or misuses, or conceals what the Bible’s Old Testament Hebrew text actually says: This is simply an essential and necessary procedure of translation and presentation for comprehension in English.

One's reading of the Old Testament's Hebrew text and certainly the words of Moses often presents one with a verb, which requires, and needs an object. Though the object of this verb is bodily absent, and textually missing.

Transitive or object-requiring verbs, however, should alert an attentive reader to the fact, that such a verb must have an object, by virtue of its being a "transitive" or object-requiring verb. And this in fact is the case with Genesis 2:19 above, as instructively exhibited is, and corroborated.

(In truth, the verb, here translated "brought" is actually from the Hebrew verb, "to come". Genesis 2:19, however, applies the verb, "to come" in its Hiphil or causative conjugation. And because of this, its correct translation is "he caused to come", or "he brought").

C. Due to Its Very Nature

Use of a transitive or object-requiring verb such as the one, translated "brought" in Genesis 2:19 negates the need to re-write the verb's objects in Hebrew: Due to its very nature, a transitive verb assumes its having an object. And because of this, there is no need to repeat prior objects...

Readable English, on the other hand, must translate Genesis 2:19 and the following examples in such a way as to implement some reminder of such objects. As you can see from Genesis 2:19, its English translation would read rather awkwardly in the absence of the word, "them" through which RSV correctly notes a transitive verb's recall of prior objects.

D. This Syntax

Anyone, reading any of the Old Testament's books, and certainly those of Moses would be faced frequently by Hebrew, using this syntax or word arrangement. Unavoidably, therefore, one would become well acquainted with it, and well accustomed to it...

Frequently availing himself of this syntax, for instance, the author of Exodus writes in Exodus 12:7:

ונתנו מן־הדם ולקחו
put will they and blood the from take will they And

המזוזות
doorposts

על-שתי
two the on

הבתים
houses the

על
on

ועל-המשקוף
lintel the upon and

(Of Exodus 12:7, the interlinear translation reads, as follows: “And they will take from the blood and they will put ___ [this blank line recalls the object] on the two doorposts and upon the lintel on the houses...”)

RSV translates Exodus 12:7 as: “Then they shall take some of the blood, and put ‘it’ on the two doorposts and the lintel of the houses...”

Leviticus in turn is not without its many examples of this syntax. And one of these is Leviticus 8:30, as the following well demonstrates:

המשחה
anointing the of

משמן
oil the from

משה
Moses

ויקח
took And

על-המזבח
altar the on

אשר
is which

ומן-הדם
blood the from and

על-בגדו
garments his upon

על-אהרן
Aaron on

ויז
sprinkled he and

(Of Leviticus 8:30, the interlinear translation reads, as follows: “And Moses took from the oil of the anointing and from the blood which is on the altar and he sprinkled ___ on Aaron upon his garments...”)

RSV translates this as: “Then Moses took some of the anointing oil and of the blood which was on the altar, and sprinkled ‘it’ upon Aaron and his garments...”

Numbers also reserves among its grammatical inventory frequent occurrences of this ordering of words. And one such instance is Numbers 19:9:

את אפר
ash the

טהור
clean is who

איש
man a

ואסף
gather will And

והניח
(rest to cause) place will he and

הפרה
heifer the of

טהור	במקום	למחנה	מחוץ
clean	place a in	camp the of	outside

(Of Numbers 19:9, the interlinear translation reads, as follows: “And a man who is clean will gather the ash of the heifer and he will place [cause to rest] ___ outside of the camp in a clean place...”)

This in turn, RSV translates: “And a man who is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and deposit ‘them’ outside the camp in a clean place...”

Lastly, Deuteronomy is not the exception to the Pentateuch’s books, employing this syntax, as is evidenced by Deuteronomy 14:28:

תוציא	שנים	שלש	מקצה
forth bring will you	years	three of	end the At
ההיא	בשנה	תבואתך	את-כל-מעשר
that	year in	produce your of	tithe the all
בשעריך	והנחת		
gates your within	(rest to cause) place will you and		

(Of Deuteronomy 14:28, the interlinear translation reads, as follows: “At the end of three years you will bring forth all the tithe of your produce in that year and you will place [cause to rest] ___ within your gates...”)

RSV translates this as: “At the end of every three years you shall bring forth all the tithe of your produce in the same year, and lay ‘it’ up within your towns...”

As in all the rest of the above cited passages, here in Deuteronomy 14:28, there is no need for the Hebrew to repeat an object. Because: A transitive or object-requiring verb assumes an object. That is, a transitive verb such as “to place” or “to cause to rest” must borrow a previous verb’s object, “all the tithe of your produce”.

Reading the Hebrew literally, however, the interlinear translation signifies with a blank line (___), where an English translation must supply some reminder of previous objects for the sake of readability. When translated into English, the Hebrew reads awkwardly in the absence of such a reminder.

Chapter 7

This “Optional” Translation (Part III)

Presented among the above passages are two scriptures, Numbers 19:9 and Deuteronomy 14:28, which each employ the Hebrew verb, “to rest” in its Hiphil or causative conjugation. As you can see from them, its meaning thus becomes “to cause to rest” or “to place”.

Being so used, this otherwise intransitive (requiring no object) verb is converted to become one, which is transitive or object-requiring: Subjected to this conversion, this verb, which allows inactivity and idleness can well be transformed to become a verb of possible vigorous or strenuous activity. And in this particular instance, such is deserving of special attention.

A. Numbers 19:9 and Deuteronomy 14:28

Observe here, how both Numbers 19:9 and Deuteronomy 14:28 use the Hebrew verb, “to rest” in its Hiphil or causative conjugation (as is italicized in the interlinear translation):

את אפר	טהור	איש	ואסף
ash the	clean is who	man a	gather will And
	והניח		הפרה
	<i>(rest to cause) place will he and</i>		heifer the of
טהור	במקום	למחנה	מחוצ
clean	place a in	camp the of	outside

And here it is likewise in Deuteronomy 14:28.

תוציא	שנים	שלוש	מקצה
forth bring will you	years	three of	end the At
ההיא	בשנה	תבואתך	את-כל-מעשר
that	year in	produce your of	tithe the all

בשעריך	והנחת
gates your within	<i>(rest to cause) place will you and</i>

In both of these scriptures, the pertinent verb recalls prior objects, which are not restated by the Hebrew's written text, as is also true with the Fourth Directive's Exodus 20:11.

Translated as "he rested" in the Hebrew Qal conjugation (which is the approximate equal of the English simple past, present and future tense), Exodus 20:11 uses the same verb in a form, which also doubles as a member of the Hiphil or causative conjugation. And as Numbers 19:9 and Deuteronomy 14:28 above show, this allows the verb's being just as correctly translated "to cause to rest" or "to place" ("to deposit" in RSV Numbers 19:9 and "to lay up" in RSV Deuteronomy 14:28, as shown in Section D of the previous chapter)...

B. I Samuel 10:25

Another occurrence of the Hebrew verb, "to rest", outside of the Pentateuch is also worth our attention: In I Samuel 10:25, there is an example of this verb's use, which is remarkably similar to its use in Exodus 20:11 of the Fourth Directive. Observe I Samuel 10:25:

את משפט	אל־העם	שמואל	וידבר
judgment the	people the	Samuel	told And
בספר	ויכתב	המלכה	
book a in	wrote he and	kingship the of	
יהוה	לפני	וינח	
Yahweh	before	(rest to caused) placed he an	

(Of I Samuel 10:25, the interlinear translation reads, as follows: “And Samuel told to the people the judgment of the kingship and he wrote ___ in a book and he placed [caused to rest] ___ before Yahweh...”)

RSV translates this: “Then Samuel told the people the rights and duties of the kingship; and he wrote ‘them’ in a book and laid ‘it’ up before the Lord”...

My calling your attention to I Samuel 10:25 is due to its use of the Hebrew verb, translated above (by the interlinear translation) as “he placed” or “caused to rest” (RSV “to lay up”). Which of course is the same verb, traditionally translated in Exodus 20:11 so as to tell of God’s having “rested”...

As you can see quite readily above, I Samuel 10:25 uses this verb in its Hiphil or causative conjugation. And this must construe linguistically to implement its consequence: Necessarily and naturally, its meaning thus becomes “he caused to rest”, or “he placed”...

C. Identical

Note, however, that the consonants of this verb in I Samuel 10:25 are identical to the consonants of the verb, translated as “he rested” in Exodus 20:11. If you look at the Hebrew verb, translated above in the interlinear translation as “he placed”, you will at the same time look upon a verb with consonants, which are precisely those, traditionally translated in the Fourth Directive as “he rested”....

Even though the Masoretic “dots” restate¹ in themselves this verb’s having yet another, correct translation, this parity of consonants is of more notable and substantive significance: Because the Masoretic “dots” were added to the Hebrew text long after its original authorship, the Hebrew consonants are of a great deal more age, and are

of much more authority. And for this reason, they stand as an enduring witness to a most revealing truth and fact, concerning in particular the Bible's Fourth Directive...

An objective consideration of the use, which I Samuel 10:25 makes of the pertinent verb, as well as both this verb's Masoretic vowel pointing and identical consonants verifies its having yet another, totally different and correct translation and meaning in this verse, Exodus 20:11: In fact, as can be seen from either I Samuel 10:25 above or Numbers 19:9 and Deuteronomy 14:28, the same verb in Exodus 20:11 is no more correctly translated "he rested", than it is "he placed". And you perhaps begin to recognize this for yourself, and perceive more intelligibly this for yourself...

D. II Chronicles 4:8

An even more dramatic example of potential similarity with the Exodus 20:11 use of the Hebrew verb, "to rest" is to be found, and is observable in II Chronicles 4:8: Here again, a different meaning for this verb, being in total contrast to its traditional translation in Exodus 20:11 is foreseen, and is proposed. Examine II Chronicles 4:8:

עשרה	שלחנות	ויעש
ten	tables	made he And
בהיכל	וינח	
temple the in	placed he and	

(Of II Chronicles 4:8, the interlinear translation reads, as follows: "And he made ten tables and he placed [caused to rest] ___ in the temple...")

RSV translates this: "He also made ten tables, and placed 'them' in the temple..."

For the verb in II Chronicles 4:8, translated above as “he placed”, consonants, which are identical to the same verb in Exodus 20:11 are not the only such similarity: Notice also, how both syntax (word arrangement) *and* vocabulary have a singular likeness to a portion of Exodus 20:11.

E. Compare Briefly

Examine Exodus 20:11, and compare briefly the wording of II Chronicles 4:8 above:

יהוה	עשה	ששת־ימים	כי
Yahweh	made	days six throughout	Because
את־הים	ואת־הארץ	את־השמים	
sea the	earth the and	heavens the	
ואת־כל־אשר־בם			
them in is which all and			
השביע	ביום	וינה	
seventh	day the in	(placed) rested he and	

(Of Exodus 20:11, the interlinear translation reads, as follows: “Because: Throughout² six days Yahweh made the heavens³ and the earth the sea and all which [who] are in them and he rested [placed ___] in the seventh day...”)

Even at first glance, the parity of syntax and to some extent vocabulary of Exodus 20:11 and II Chronicles 4:8 are rather remarkable: They are something, truly singular in their unique similarity...

Take a moment; and observe (above), how both verses use the verb, “to rest” in its apocopated or shortened Hiphil form. Consider also, how both verses position this verb, immediately following prior objects of a previous verb, and how this applies the particular verb in question...

F. Their, Mutual Use

Perhaps, though, the most noteworthy similarity of these two scriptural clauses is their, mutual use of precisely the same verbs: Each of these two verses begins its pertinent action narration with the Hebrew verb, “to make”...

Both conclude this action narration with the verb, “to rest” or “to place”. Using the same verbs, in the same order, the object of the first verb in II Chronicles 4:8 serves also as the object of the second verb...

Were this not the case, and the Masoretic vowel pointing of the verb, “to place” was slightly different, II Chronicles 4:8 could be just as accurately translated: “And he made ten tables and he ‘rested’ in the temple...”

Because, nevertheless, the syntax, vocabulary and use of the Hebrew verb, “to rest” in both II Chronicles 4:8 and Exodus 20:11 of the Fourth Directive share their, particular similarities and likeness, an “optional” translation is thereby confirmed for Exodus 20:11. Considering, furthermore, this verb’s overall biblical use⁴, noticing specifically its occurrences in Judges 6:18, 20 and II Kings 17:29, as well as those previously cited in this chapter only corroborates, and affirms this usable, “optional” translation...

G. This “Optional” Translation

Through this verb’s mirrored appearance in Exodus 20:11 and II Chronicles 4:8, the following “optional” translation for Exodus 20:11 is acknowledged, recognized, and linguistically confirmed. In fact, due to the identity of this scripture’s main character, this “optional” translation is much recommended, and very much preferred:

“Because: Throughout six days, Yahweh made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all, which is in them. *And he placed them* in the seventh day. Bountifully, therefore, did Yahweh bestow upon the day of the sabbath, and had made it holy” (deMSby Exodus 20:11).

¹Because the Masoretic vowel pointing is merely restatement and affirmation of this text’s content, I have elected not to make display of such, and thereby to forego any additional complication.

²“*Throughout* six days”, not “*in* six days” is the accurate translation and proper presentation, displaying these words of Exodus 20:11:

“*Throughout* six days, Yahweh made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all, which is in them. And he placed them in the seventh day” (deMSby Exodus 20:11).

For this alone can accurately translate this Hebrew wording, and render it in English.

But all the standardized versions of Scripture (and that includes whatever version you read) have suspended, and subordinated accuracy here. They have instead acquiesced, and deferred to the prevalent traditional display of this scripture...

For since at least the time of the Septuagint (early mid third century BC), the preposition, “in” has been used to translate this Hebrew expression, which accurately rendered is “*“throughout”* six days” (deMSby Exodus 20:11), *not* “*“in”* six days” (KJV Exodus 20:11):

“*Throughout* six days, Yahweh made the heavens and the earth...” (deMSby Exodus 20:11).

And likewise using this preposition, “in”, your preferred version of biblical Scripture has, therefore, preserved an enduring and long-standing aberrant tradition. The which derives ultimately *not* from linguistics...

But unlike the phrase translated “*“in”* the seventh day” (deMSby Exodus 20:11),

“And he placed them *in* the seventh day”,

the Hebrew preposition, “in” is *not* present in this expression, “‘throughout’ six days” (deMSby Exodus 20:11), which typically, traditionally is thus presented:

(KJV Exodus 20:11) “For *in* six days, the Lord made heaven and earth...”

And tradition is the only reason "in" is included here.

There is no linguistic justification, approving, or authenticating its use here. And this can be shown recognizably and plainly...

Twice appearing in the Fourth Directive, this expression, “‘throughout six days’” first occurs, and appears in Exodus 20:9 (deMSby):

"Throughout six days shall you labour, and do all your work".

As you can read, and determine for yourself, its correct translation must obviously be “‘throughout’ six days”, or something, which requires six days' continuity, and nothing less accepts than such continuity. In this verse, Exodus 20:11, then, an effectively identical Hebrew expression, which has an identical syntactic attribute should be identically displayed to the reader:

"Throughout six days, Yahweh made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all, which is in them. And he placed them in the seventh day” (deMSby Exodus 20:11).

It should equivalently be translated, and thus displayed for the sake of consistence.

Use, then, of this preposition, “in” to interpret, and to translate Exodus 20:11 can be nothing more than a mistranslation and misrepresentation:

(RSV Exodus 20:11) “For *in* six days, the Lord made heaven and earth...”

Because: As you can discern for yourself, rightly translated is this verse, as follows:

"Throughout six days, Yahweh made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all, which is in them. And he

placed them in the seventh day” (deMSby Exodus 20:11).

For this accurately and more consistently presents Scripture’s Hebrew in translation here.

(Where, incidentally, tradition has not eclipsed linguistic accuracy, traditional versions show rightly and accurately an all but identical expression, in use [e. g. Exodus 23:12; 31:15 and 34:21]. The which must mean, that, they inconsistent to themselves are, as they inconsistently represent Scripture, in their contradictory display of these scriptures. But to learn more of traditional resort to this preposition, “in”, where it inappropriately is on display, please have a look at Note #3, which instructively examined, and considered can be in the Notes, which are subsequent to Chapter 10’s text).

³Incidentally, this is the same word, often translated “heaven”, “the heavens”, “sky”, “the skies” etc. But in this context, “sky” is quite plainly acceptable.

⁴Concerning an exposé of the pertinent Hebrew verb’s potential transitivity or intransitivity, you might be somewhat misled by this chapter’s brevity and apparent paucity and even “insufficiency” of scriptural exhibition: Initially, you might suspect the author’s having adduced only those few and select scriptures, which seem to support the accuracy of this proposed, “optional” translation...

While deliberately omitting a possible multitude of others, which do not lend it credence, and which perhaps might even refute it: “Why not exhibit more representatively”, you might ask, “a greater sampling of this verb’s scriptural occurrences, so that the reader can more objectively and conclusively determine the appropriate translation of Exodus 20:11”?

At a cursory and hasty consideration, this might at first appear to be a reasonably informed question. Somewhat essentially, however, this question is provoked exclusively by a lack of practical observation of the particular Hebrew verb, which traditionally is rendered in Exodus 20:11, to be presented by this English verb, “to rest”.

Yes, these two verbs do have a comparable spread and spectrum of meaning, and do share at least some intent in common. Where Exodus 20:11 is concerned, however, the potentially synonymous intent of these verbs is not in itself reliable for translation purposes: While in truth, both verbs can encompass a corresponding scope of intention, the modern English verb, “to rest” and the pertinent biblical Hebrew verb can only marginally and sparingly express the same action.

Throughout one's reading of the books of Moses, for example, the Hebrew verb in question would be encountered thirty-three times in its various conjugations (Genesis 2:15; 8:4; 19:16; 39:16; 42:33; Exodus 10:14; 16:23, 24, 33, 34; 17:11; 20:11; 23:12; 32:10; 33:14; Leviticus 7:15; 16:23; 24:12; Numbers 10:36; 11:25, 26; 15:34; 17:19, 22; 19:9; 32:15; Deuteronomy 3:20; 5:14; 12:10; 14:28; 25:19; 26:4, 10). From these, a useful demonstration of its overall biblical use can be observed.

Of these thirty-three occurrences, eight (Genesis 8:4; Exodus 10:14; 20:11; 23:12; Numbers 10:36; 11:25, 26; Deuteronomy 5:14) deploy the Hebrew Qal conjugation, the most likely conjugation to extract from the verb the idea of "rest" due to fatigue. If, however, you inspect these eight instances, you will see, that only two (Exodus 23:12 and Deuteronomy 5:14) could possibly have any pertinence to anyone's being literally and physically tired and wearied. All of the remaining six have various other significances.

You will also notice in your investigation of these above cited thirty-three scriptures a consistent characteristic of this particular Hebrew verb's use: When applied in a form, which could be *either transitive or intransitive*, its subject, object (if applicable) or overall context will always clarify its meaning (unless its transitivity or otherwise is of no practical consequence, as, for instance, in Exodus 10:14). For these reasons, then, any, further listing of scriptural exhibition was deemed non-essential, excessive and superfluous to this chapter's text.