

at least. He said, Let there be light, let light come into being. Light came into being, and then he looked upon what He had made, and it was good. You don't say it had become good. Now, you have described the process, light came into being. He had made it. Now you look at what is there, and you see it is good, and we don't need any hayah anymore. You just see something stated.

WA: But hayah ~~is~~ is used as a copula in these noun clauses, a few times anyway.

AAM: Well, let's leave Chronicles and the very latest books out of consideration. Would you still make the statement?

WA:8... Gesenius, he gives a couple reference.

AAM: I wonder where they would be? What references? Do you remember what heading it was under?....page 453, the noun clause, he says "the syntactical relation between subject and predicate of ~~the~~ noun clause is [∞] a rule expressed by simple8½....without a copula of any kind/. What period of time the statement implies must be inferred from the context." ~~Ex~~ Then he says, "N_t infrequently, however, a connection is established between subject and predicate, a. by adding the separate pronoun^g of the third person, singular, ~~plur~~ or plural. Or b, especially for the sake of a more exact specification of time, by the help of the verb hayah.?" Then he says, examples of a. Then we say b. "Naturally this does not apply to the examples of ~~xxx~~ which hayah in the sense of to become, to fare, to exist, still retains its full force as a verb." You see, retains its full force. His idea is that originally it is the verb showing become, and then it may lose its force and become a copula. "And where according the sentence is verbal and not a noun clause, especially when the predicate precedes the subject." And then he speaks about Gen. 1:2 where he ~~ex~~ takes the view that it is merely a copula there, which I think ~~is~~ without any justification. Then he says,9.... might also appear ~~xxx~~ in the form of a pure noun clause, cf. Gen. 3:1. Well, what is Gen. 3:1, and the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field? I believe that's it, isn't it? And there, I don't think you have any copula.