

Re-Reading רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ in Genesis 1:26-28 from Ecological Perspective

Simeon Folorunso Kehinde, Ph.D. & Emem Opoku-Agyeman

Perez University College, Pomadze-Winneba, Ghana

Received: 20.09.2025 | Accepted: 26.10.2025 | Published: 28.10.2025

*Corresponding Author: Simeon Folorunso Kehinde, Ph.D.

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.17467153](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17467153)

Abstract

Original Research Article

Two words, רָדָה “to rule” and כָּבַשׁ “to subdue” have been found as culprits in discussing the relationship between Christianity and environmental abuse. These words have always been alleged as supporting environmental exploitation through their emphasis on human dominance from רָדָה, and subjugation from כָּבַשׁ. While dominion and subjugation cannot be removed from their lexical ranges, to what extent can they be held responsible for human maltreatment of the environment? Are there other possible meanings of these words deducible in the context of Genesis 1:28 apart from how they have been read? Through lexical analysis, רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ are re-read in that context in the light of their relationship with other words in the verse, with emphasis on the royal connotation of רָדָה, the throne imagery of כָּבַשׁ, and their ecological connotations. The analysis revealed that the ability to rule and subdue is part of a divine blessing, which should not be violated. Moreover, all creatures share in divine blessings and should be cared for. Human dominance is also a blessing with responsibility, which will demand accountability. The creation is part of the human royal throne that adds value to human existence and well-being. Therefore, “to rule” and “to subdue” in Genesis 1; 1-26-26 should not be held responsible for environmental abuse. In actual sense, they promote responsible stewardship and a sustainable environment. “To subdue” in this context is not destructive but a constructive delegation of oversight function.

Keywords: Ecology, Sustainable Environment, Dominion, Subdue and Stewardship.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Introduction

The alliance between religion and ecology has remained at the front burner of academic discussions. Since the inter-connection was identified in the 20th century, it has received attention at local and international scenes. There have been calls for more interdisciplinary platforms of discussion on how religion has contributed to environmental abuse and, on the other hand, how it can be used to achieve environmental sustainability. This is because human behaviour and actions are products of social, economic, political and religious affiliations. Although religion is often considered a personal or private phenomenon, it has its cooperative dimension, where adherents, by mutual consent, operate with a common

belief, doctrines and tenets.

The contents and practice of such doctrines emanate primarily from the adherents' interpretations of their sacred scriptures, which serve as the ethical compass for all they do. Sometimes, religious adherents operate with narrow lenses of scriptural interpretation to determine whether something is right or wrong without considering the overall implications of their scriptures. There are times when non-adherents of a particular religion, by access to religious scripture, cherry-pick specific passages as the basis for misdemeanours in society. For example, Christianity has been accused of promoting environmental degradation through the concept of dominion רָדָה and subjugation, כָּבַשׁ in Genesis 1:26-28. This observation

requires re-examining the scriptural references in their context to understand their meanings before affirming or rejecting such assertions. Are there other lexical meanings besides these words' negative and destructive connotations? If “rule” and “subdue” mean subservient exploitation and subjugation in the context of Gen. 1:26-28, would that agree with the divine intent and blessing of fruitfulness and multiplication of the ecosystem? Is there an imagery connotation in the two verbs, and how does it contribute to their interpretation? Therefore, this paper aims to interpret these concepts within ecological debate through contextual lexical analysis. The aim is to discuss *רָדָה* and *כָּבַשׁ* in their literary contexts and draw implications for sustainable ecology.

Ecology and the Bible

The common understanding of the Christian Bible is that it contains the written word of God. This opinion often restricts its message and impacts the religious context. Its religious orientation is undeniable, but its contents and message extend to all human endeavours- agriculture, geography, geology, economics, politics, etc. Although the Bible does not detail these subject matters' principles, it presents them from the socio-cultural and religious worldviews of the writers and their audiences. The biblical accounts begin with cosmogony, the earth's origin and other aspects of life are discussed. The Bible talks about the aquatic ecosystem as a handwork of a divine creator. The Bible talks about waters *מַיִם* and the abyss *תְּהוֹמוֹת* as the primordial contents of the earth out of which the terrestrial ecosystem evolved (Gen. 1:3). The depth of seas *yam* and the fascinating continental shelf formation is described in Job 38:4. The marine bio-diversity as described in the Bible refers to various species of floras and faunas that populate the oceanic and freshwater ecosystems. Genesis 1:20 speaks about *נֶפֶשׁ שָׂרִץ* “creeping creatures” to refer to all aquatic beings in their different shapes and sizes as products of divine fiat. This idea is reflected in *הַתַּיִּימָנוֹת הַגְּדֹלִים* “the great sea creatures” such as whales, sea cows and hippopotamus and *הַרֹמְשֹׁת* “all creeping creatures” (v. 21). Their design, operation and functions within the ecosystem are clearly defined for sustainable

growth and environmental equilibrium.

The terrestrial ecosystem has both plants and animals. They are also products of divine pronouncement *יְהי-וְיִהְיֶה* “Let there be...And it was” formula of Genesis chapter one. Even the other creation account in Chapter 2, the planting of the garden and the creation of animals from the ground, though not as explicit as that of Genesis 1, was divinely designed and executed (cf. 2:8, 18-18). The plants are collectively referred to as *צֶמַח עֵשֶׂב* “green vegetation,” which comprises of *עֵץ* and *צֶמַח* “herbs and trees” (cf. Gen. 1:12). The animals are called *חַיָּה* “living creatures.” They are made up of *בְּהֵמָה* “the creatures that creep” and *חַיֵּי-הָאָרֶץ* “livestock of the earth.” (Gen. 1:24). This also include *כָּל-עוֹף* “the birds in the air” (1:23). There is emphasis on *לְמִינֵהּ* “according to its kind” to indicate the uniqueness of each species and biodiversity (Gen. 1:21, 24). They are parts of the broad earthly ecosystem. The creator also set the plenary system that controls seasons and times. The Bible specifically mentioned Orion and Pleiades in Job 38:31-33, Amos 5:5, and other plenary constellations as products of divine creation. The ice sheets of Antarctica and Greenland are also made by God (Job 38:21-24). In each of these ecosystems, the specific niche of organisms, the food web and sustainable processes are divined and maintained.

Contextual Discourse on Genesis 1:26-30

The creation of human beings was the second work of the sixth day and occupies a unique place in the whole narrative. It is remarkably different from other previous creative works of God in sequence, process and purpose. It does not follow the fiat command that brought all other creatures into existence. Verse 26 begins with a solemn introduction in the imperative sense in *נִצְוָה* a *Qal* imperfect of *נָצַח* with voluntative *ה*, that stresses the deliberate and strong expression of interest and can be translated as “let” or “may.” Out of several possibilities of translating this word, the deliberative sense seems appropriate to the context and the transcendent theology of the Priestly editors. According to Gesenius, Kautz and Cowley, “While the corresponding forms of

the indicative express a mere announcement that an action will be undertaken, the cohortative lays stress on the determination underlying the action and the personal interest in it.”ⁱ As a deliberative word in the first-person plural form, God spoke to himself in a cohortative sense. However, the usual characteristic ending *נָה*, which has an emphatic purpose, is not used. Bruce Walke asserts, “The cohortative expresses the will or strong desire of the speaker.”ⁱⁱ Therefore, the onus of creating human beings was solely on God’s initiative and execution.

The object of the imperative is *אָדָם*, a generic term for humanity by virtue of its essential meaning as “reddish brown” from *אָדָם* “ground.”ⁱⁱⁱ The term for human beings is void of gender distinction but implies a significant association between them and the ground. In an actual sense, humanity bears the name from the material they are made up of. It probably relates to the original ruddiness of man’s complexion. This indicates the need for a perpetual reminder that man is made out of the ground. Furthermore, God gave a further clarification of the nature of *אָדָם* that is, he is to be made in an “image” *צֶלֶם*, and “likeness” *דְּמוּת* with 1st person pronominal suffix to correspond to *בְּעֵצָהּ*. The two verbs are sometimes considered as hendiadys, an expression of one idea with two words in a complimentary manner as in *תְּהוּ וְבָהוּ* (cf. Gen. 1:2). This decision was greatly influenced by the LXX which introduced the conjunction *καὶ* in between the two words in *εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν*.^{iv} This has opened up diverse meanings, such as “image” in this context as possession of rational ability and “likeness” as possession of spiritual ability.^v In other climes, the image of God is seen as the functional relationship between human beings, human dominance over lower orders of creation and a high sense of morality.^{vi} On the other hand, the two terms have been treated as *בְּדְמוּתָנוּ בְּצֶלְמָנוּ* without the conjunction to convey the idea of divine resemblance in the Masoretic Text.

In another perspective, the two terms are seen as different, yet they have overlapping tendencies because they both have a similar semantic force. Both “image” and “likeness” are used of physical representations,

where there is a correspondence between a drawing and the object it represents.”^{vii} This implies that the image of God has more than one meaning within the mind frame of P editors. *דְּמוּת* connotes “likeness and similitude of external appearance,” while *צֶלֶם* connotes “something cut out.”^{viii} The emphasis on translating the image of God in terms of domination is often stressed by *וַיִּרְדּוּ* “and to have dominion.” The verb *רָדָה* presupposes jurisdiction of a royal dominion.^{ix} This is a royal imagery to describe the consequence of the unique creation of human beings. By this verb, humanity has been vested with controlling power. All animals, irrespective of their habitation, must be controlled by humanity. They are listed in the verse with the use of conjunction to have a connection with the verb *כָּבַשׁ*. This implies that all creatures are to be subservient to man.

After the declaration of divine intent in verse 26, the next verse explains how it was fulfilled. However, this verse is presented in introverted parallelism or an inverted chiasmic form.^x There is a striking similarity between the first two lines and the third line. The synonymous relationship between the first two lines is demonstrated with the repetition of their contents interchangeably. In the three lines:

- a. *God created man in his image*
- b. In the **image of God**, *he created him*
- c. Male and female, *he created them*

The first two lines are synonymous except in the inverted form and arrangement and the use of a noun and pronoun. The third line explains the gender of *הָאָדָם* that God had created in his image as *זָכָר* “male” and *נִקְבָּה* “female.” The repetitious use of *בָּרָא* in verse 28 suggests a distinct connotation of unique creation. As indicated before, P uses the verb distinctly to denote the unique creation of things that have never existed.^{xi} Its usage in the second line is for emphasis, while in the third line, it points to the fact that males and females are products of God’s special creation. The repetition of *צֶלֶם* “image” in the two lines is also for emphasis. The use of *זָכָר* and *נִקְבָּה* for distinguishing male and female gender is an attempt by P to show equal humanity through the image of God.^{xii} Another

fundamental issue in this verse is the disparity in the use of pronouns; the possessive pronoun 'his' is used for God without reflecting the previous plural usage in verse 26.

Also, the singular pronoun in the objective case "him" is used for אֱדָקָה in the second line, while the plural sense is used for the same thing in the third line. Concerning God, the singular pronoun points to P's monotheistic idea. The change in the use of pronouns for אֱדָקָה "can only be explained as P's understanding of humanity as one entity by nature. With the use of the plural pronoun "them," P editors convey the idea that humanity can also be divided into male and female, but both share similar nature and origin by אֱלֹהִים and בְּרָא respectively. Unlike J editors, P redactors present the creation of man and woman simultaneously. Upon the fulfilment of God's command, humanity, as conveyed by זָכָר "male" and נְקֵבָה "female" are blessed. The words of the blessing in the two verses are similar, with an addition of וַיְרַבּוּ verse 28. Both verses have פְּרוּ "be fruitful," וַרְבוּ "multiply" and וּמִלְאוּ "and fill." Both animals and humanity have been given the capacity to reproduce and become abundant. However, רָדָה is used in conformity with the divine intent in verse 26 to mean to rule over all animals.

An Interpretative Survey of רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ

Apart from the lexical definitions and their cognates presentations by popular Hebrew lexicographers such as Brown, Driver and Briggs,^{xiii} William Holladay,^{xiv} and J. P. Tregelles^{xv} that generally consider רָדָה as dominion, authority, and כָּבַשׁ as "subdue" or the trampled upon, many commentators have explained these words differently in their contexts. Typically, many lexicons relied heavily on the Assyrian, Akkadian, and Arabic variants stems *rd* to underpin their meanings outside their contextual meanings, which is very important. Much attention has been given to the interpretation of רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ by commentators. John Skinner, in *The International Critical Commentary* (1910), posits that:

To claim that the divine message consists of dominion over creatures, as argued for by

Gregory of Nyssa and Chrysostom, cannot be held without an inconceivable weakening of the figure; it is inconsistent with the sequel, where the rule over the creature is, by a separate benediction, conferred on humans, already made in the image of God. The truth is that the Image of God marks the distinction between man and the animals, and so qualifies him for dominion. In other words, dominion is a consequence of divine image.^{xvi}

This implies that רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ should be considered as the implied benefits of *Imago Dei* and a blessing, "benediction" to humanity. He is not regarded as having any destructive tendencies. However, no clear lexical or semantic clarification is given about them in the commentary.

Furthermore, C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch in *Commentary on the Old Testament* (1986), assert that רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ imply supremacy of humanity over nature in terms of control and consumption. He remarks that the idea of subduing is probably removed from the Syriac version because of its negative connotations.^{xvii} Matthew Henry opines that the combination of רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ implies human superiority and dominance. He asserts,

God gave to man when he made him, domination over inferior creatures, the sea fish and the air's fowls. Though man provides for neither, he has power over every living thing that moves upon the earth, which is under his care and within his reach. God's design put man in an honour upon man so that he might find himself the more strongly obliged to bring honour to his maker.^{xviii}

The superior-inferior relationship structure of Henry supports the damaging exploitation by the superior (human) at the detriment of the inferior (creation). Nevertheless, he concludes that the purpose of the dominion is to honour God, the Creator. Tremper Longman III posits that "dominion in the context of Genesis 1:26-28 implies power, mastery, rulership and authority. As the cosmic king, God has appointed human beings as his image bearer to rule over creation... Human rulership is intended to be a stewardship for God, a stewardship of development, not domination."^{xix}

R. R. Reno, in *Brazos Theological Commentary*,

remarks, “Our royal power does not set up the human creature as a petty satrap. Instead, dominion is a natural vocation of headship that guides and governs so things can flourish according to their proper purposes. Parents’ guide children in their development. The head of a working group coordinates others toward a productive purpose.”^{xx} Claus Westermann shares this view that the ultimate well-being of the human environment is the integral focus of *רָדָה* and *כָּבַשׁ*. He remarks, According to the ancient view, however, there is no suggestion of exploitation; on the contrary, the king is personally responsible for the well-being and prosperity of those he rules. His rule serves the well-being of his subjects. This is what is meant here by humanity’s rule over the rest of creation (in contrast to Sumerian and Babylonian creation stories, where humanity was created “to bear the yoke of the gods,” that is, to serve the gods through the cult).^{xxi}

Re-reading of *רָדָה* and *כָּבַשׁ* from Ecological Perspective

One major points of allegations against Christianity on environmental abuse centers around the interpretation of the second part of God’s blessing in verse 28. It reads thus:

וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת-
הָאָרֶץ וּכְבֹּשׁוּהָ וּרְדּוּ בָדָגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל-חַיַּת
הָרֶמֶשׂ עַל-הָאָרֶץ

“God blessed them and said to them, ‘Be fruitful and increase in number fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground.’” The emphasis here is on *רָדָה* and *כָּבַשׁ* which have been labelled as the basis for human exploitation due to dominion mentality. The basic idea of *רָדָה* in the *Qal* is “to rule,” “govern”, or “have dominion.” It has its roots in the Akkadian *redu* which refers to “an attendant,” “army” or “a troop of police.”^{xxii} The verb points to act of dominance by force with some overlapping tendencies with the stem *משל* “to ruled.”^{xxiii}

Its usage with *מָשַׁל* in I Kings 4:24 emphasises the dominance of Israel’s kings over their enemies.

רָדָה has both positive and negative meanings. The negative connotation of the verb correlates with *שָׁלַט* “have power” or “lord over,” and it implies overpowering somebody (Neh. 5:15; Eccl. 8:9;12:19). Its destructive dimension is conveyed in the *Piel* to mean “to dominate or oppress.”^{xxiv} As used in Genesis 1:26 and 28, it connotes supervision, direction, control or administration. Whenever these words are used, they aim to maximise potential and productivity. In this light, the idea of rulership as commanded by God should be understood. However, its relationship with *כָּבַשׁ* in Genesis 1:26 and 28 has positive meanings in the covenant context as to supervise.^{xxv}

Closely related to *רָדָה* is *כָּבַשׁ*, the fourth verb of the imperative in verse 28. *כָּבַשׁ* is much stronger in connotation than its second counterpart. It has commonly been translated in the *Qal* as “subdue,” “to subject someone or make subservient” (Jer. 34: 16), “to serve as slaves (Jer. 34: 11) “to violate or rape (a woman)” (Est. 7:8). In the *Niphal*, it connotes “to be subjugated (of land) (Num. 32: 22), “to be degraded (sexually?)” (Neh. 5: 5). P editors used two significant terms in discussing human status and relationships with other creatures. The first, *רָדָה* “have dominion” has been treated as ‘to govern’ or “to dominate.” The second *כָּבַשׁ* has the idea of “tramping down,” “footstool,” “subduing a particular thing.”^{xxvi} The object of the verb is all-inclusive. The use of *רָדָה* and *כָּבַשׁ* suggests a forceful treatment on the part of man and has always been taking in support of human exploitation of earth resources.

There is a need to reconsider some lexical and semantic re-interpretation of these words before subscribing to the common exploitative deductions. If *רָדָה* and *מָשַׁל* are semantically synonymous, it suggests rulership and the nominal form of the latter is *מֶלֶךְ* “king.” Then, *רָדָה* is therefore used as an imagery for a human position as kings. In other words, *רָדָה* in the context of verse 28 implies a royal imagery context. Royal dominion is not inherently for destructive ability but for judicious administration and management of resources. Therefore, the divine intent for granting human dominion over the environment of resources is

constructive. Secondly, how should *רָדָה* and *כָּבַשׁ* be understood in the context of royal imagery? If *רָדָה* is a constructive administration of the environment, *כָּבַשׁ* with its multiple negative connotations, it cannot be interpreted destructively.

Humans, as “kings of the environment, cannot be constructive and destructive simultaneously. Rather, the subjugative idea in *כָּבַשׁ* is to tame and keep the environment within its borders. This implies environmental sustainability. Thirdly, the two verbs should also be interpreted in the context of divine blessing in verse 28. The three verbs *וַיְבָרֶכְהוּ*, *וַיְרַבּוּ*, and *וַיִּמְלְאוּ* convey the divine blessedness of the earth's ecosystem. In other words, God desires the earth's ecosystem to flourish and be productive. He never wished the environment to be depleted. Therefore, the negative sense of *כָּבַשׁ* will be antithetical in the context of verse 28. Furthermore, the sequence of those verbs, in addition to *כָּבַשׁ* and *רָדָה* indicates control and constructive management of the earth and its resources. The first three verbs are for growth and abundance, while *רָדָה* “dominion” and *כָּבַשׁ* “subdue” are for responsible management. This agrees with Mike Weinstein’s Planet Boundary Concept, which suggests a model that defines the limit of disturbances to the earth system without causing danger.^{xxvii}

All Living Creatures Share in God’s Blessing

The special place of all living creatures is emphasised through divine blessing in verses 22 and 28. Although the blessing in verse 28 is more complex than the former, animals also, share in the divine declaration of multiplicity and abundance like human beings. They both share in the *נִפְשׁוֹתָיִם* “the animating principle of life.” This implies that other living creatures deserve fair treatment in an ecosystem. The basic connotation of *וַיְבָרֶכְהוּ* in this context presupposes a blissful wish and intention from their creator. Any attempt to cause biodiversity extinction is a violation of divine order.

Human Dominance over other Creatures Is a Blessing

The use of *וַיְרַבּוּ* “have dominion” in

verse 28 is located within the blessing of humanity. The first verb of verse 28, *וַיְבָרֶכְהוּ* coordinates all other verbs in the subordinate clauses. The use of “and” in connection with other verbs in the sentence presupposes their dependence on the first. Therefore, the verb should not be treated as in command context, for such would imply a despotic and authoritarian dimension. Rather, the context of *וַיְבָרֶכְהוּ* suggests a cordial and acceptable condition that brought about positive declaration of intention. Therefore, the entire creation should be seen as part of God’s blessing to humanity that must be judiciously used.

The Power to Subdue is not absolute but a Constructive Delegation

In line with the verb “to have dominion,” a stronger verb *כָּבַשׁ* “subdue” is used for man in maintaining a relationship with the earth. The verb does not imply that man has the right to exploit and treat nature anyhow. The context of blessing in which the two verbs “have dominion” and “subdue” are used suggests that the narrator would not have considered an adverse treatment to the environment within which humans inhabit. Rex Ambler has asserted that “the environment is, so to speak, the house created on the earth by living things for living things.”^{xxviii} Among the living things, humanity occupies a vantage position, and greater responsibility lies on him. Therefore, the use of “subdue” puts greater responsibility on humans and, at the same time, demands accountability. It is a delegated dominance from God that demands accountability.

To Subdue Should Be Understood in the Context of Royal Imagery

As shown in the exegesis, God’s instruction to humanity to subdue is used in connection with the verb “to have dominion,” a verb with royal connotation. The usage presupposes man as a king on royal throne with his feet on the footstool, which is a part of royal adornment. In that case, the basic idea of the verb *וַיְכַבְשֵׁהוּ* denotes “a footstool” from the nominal *כַּבֵּשׂ* upon which the king “stamped down,” but

not necessarily to destroy it. Therefore, the earth is a royal footstool for humanity, adding glamour and value to their existence. By that position, humanity is responsible for supervising and watching over the Earth that God gave him.

Conclusion

The two controversial words in the relationship between Christianity and ecology are רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ will always be demanding continuous research. At the same time, diverse opinions have been expressed as exploitative. On the other hand, there is the opinion that the dominion concept implies responsible

stewardship. However, many of the conclusions need lexical and exegetical bases to establish that the “to rule and subdue” command that God gave to humanity does not presuppose exploitation and subjugation. This paper has shown that the combination of רָדָה and כָּבַשׁ should be read from royal imagery of humans as kings and, as such, implies responsible management and exercise of power. Also, the relationship of the divine blessing with the idea of dominion is cast within the positive divine intent for all God made. Therefore, it is void of destructive intention. Furthermore, the power to dominate is a delegated responsibility with accountability.

Endnotes

ⁱW. F. Gesenius, E. Kautz and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), § 108 (322).

ⁱⁱBruce Waltke, “The Literary Genre of Genesis, Chapter One,” *Cruxi* 27 (1991):2-10.

ⁱⁱⁱRonald B. Alden, רָדָה in *Theological Word Book of the Old Testament*, edited by G. L. Harris, Gleason Archer Jr., and Bruce Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 15.

^{iv}James Smith, כָּבַשׁ in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, edited by Harris, R. L. Gleason J. Archer, Jr. and Bruce Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 766.

^vClaus Westermann, *Genesis: A Practical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 567.

^{vi}*Ibid.*

^{vii}*Ibid.*

^{viii}H. Wildberger, רָדָה in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by Ernst Jennis and Claus Westermann, translated by Mark E. Biddle (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 108.

^{ix}William White, רָדָה in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, edited by Harris, R. L. Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce K. Waltke. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 234.

^xKenneth Matthews, “Genesis 1-11:26,” *The American Commentary* (Np. Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1996), 112.

^{xi}David Cline, רָדָה in *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* vol. II, ed. Edited by John Elwonde (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 258.

^{xii}*Ibid.*

^{xiii}Francis Brown, C. A. Briggs and S. R. Driver, רָדָה in *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 672.

^{xiv}William A. Holladay, רָדָה *Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), 235.

^{xv}Samuel P. Tregelles, *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1896), 748.

^{xvi}John Skinner, “Genesis,” in *The International Critical Commentary*, edited by Briggs, C. H., S. R. Driver and A. Plummer, (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1912), 32.

^{xvii}Freidrich C. Keil, and F. Delitzsch, “Pentateuch” in *Biblical Commentary on the Old*

Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), 70.

^{xviii}Leisle F. Church (Ed.) *Matthews Henry Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992), 231.

^{xix}Tremper Longman III, *Baker Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2013), 1016.

^{xx}R. R. Reno, "Genesis," *Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos Press, 2010), 58.

^{xxi}Westermann, 108.

^{xxii}Brown Driver and Briggs, 665.

^{xxiii}William White, חַדָּשׁ in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, edited by Harris, R. L. Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago:

Moody Press, 1980), 465.

^{xxiv}Anna Case-Winter, *Reconstruction of a Christian Theology of Nature* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 833.

^{xxv}Philip Nel, חַדָּשׁ in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, edited by Willem VanGemeren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 345.

^{xxvi}*Ibid.*

^{xxvii}Mike Weinstein, "Sustainability Science: The Emerging Paradigm and the Ecology of Cities," *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy*, Vol. 6. Issue 1. (Spring 2010):1-5.

^{xxviii}Rex Ambler, *Global Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 55.