DOES GENESIS 1:1-3 TEACH A CREATION OUT OF NOTHING?

ROBERT L. REYMOND*

Attention is drawn to two recently published and widely acclaimed modern translations of the first book of the Bible. After mention of two reasons for the traditional translations of Genesis 1:1-3, two reasons (cultural and grammatical) are given for sweeping alterations in the traditional expressions.

Careful examination of each clause found in the verses under discussion is presented with clear references made to rules normally followed in Hebrew syntax.

The author meets objections of gap theorists which he anticipates as consequential to discourse on the meaning of verse one and verse two and the relationship of each to verse three. He concludes in the affirmative that these opening verses of Genesis do teach a creation out of nothing.

The first three verses of Genesis have fallen upon hard times in recent years. Two widely acclaimed modern translations of the first book of the Bible, representing the consensus of many internationally known Old Testament scholars (Harry M. Orlinsky, H. L. Ginsberg, the late Ephraim A. Speiser, William F. Albright, and David Noel Freedman, to name only a few) have rejected the traditional translation found in the older English versions. The traditional translation in the King James Version, the Revised Version, and the American Standard Version has been replaced by another translation that does away, by the proverbial stroke of the pen, with the doctrine of *creotio ex nihilo* in the first and second chapters of Genesis.

One Modern Translation

The first of these two translations is a distinctly Jewish publication. In 1955 the Jewish Publication Society of America appointed a committee of seven scholars to prepare a new English translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, the first English translation of the Hebrew Scriptures to be sponsored by the Society since 1917. Late in 1962 the first part appeared under the title, *The Torah, The Five Books of Moses: A New Translation of the Holy Scripturcs according to the Masoretic Text.* This New Jewish Version (NJV) translates the first three verses of Genesis as follows:

1 When God began to create[a] the heaven and the earth--2 the earth being unformed and void, with darkness over the surface of the deep and a wind from[b] God sweeping over the water--3 God said, "Let there be light", and there was light.

a Or "In the beginning God created"
b Others "the spirit of"

A careful examination of the two footnotes will reveal that footnote (a) does acknowledge the traditional translation as a possibility by the little introductory word "Or." By the word "Others" in footnote (b) the editor-in-chief.

*Robert L. Reymond is Professor of Old Testament at Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina 29614, from which institution he holds the PhD. degree.

Harry M. Orlinsky, in his article, "The New Jewish Version of the Torah," *(Journal of Biblical Literature,* LXXXII, 1963, pp. 252-253), explains that the traditional reading was "excluded altogether as an alternate rendering." It is not my purpose at this time to defend the traditional translation of *ruach elohim,* although two reasons for the traditional translation may be noted:

(1) Whenever the phrase *ruach elohim* occurs in the Old Testament, it refers to the Spirit of God and never to a mighty wind. Cf., for example, Ex. 31:3; Num. 24:2, I Sam. 10:10; II Chr. 24:20; and Ezek. 11:24.

(2) The participle *(merachepheth),* traditionally translated "moved" and describing the action of *ruach elohim,* does not describe the action of wind. In Deut. 32:11 the verb from the same root describes the action of an eagle hovering over her young. The idea in Gen. 1:2 is that of the Holy Spirit, as an active Agent in the creation, hovering over the uninhabited earth, ready to carry out the divine fiat. It is a most revealing fact that in his defense of the NJV translation in an article "The Rage to Translate," Prof. Orlinsky says not one word about the participle used with *ruach elohim,* an amazing (and, no doubt, an embarrassing) omission, but rather collects ancient testimony to the correctness of his translation. In every case, this testimony may be discounted as either weak and unconvincing or simply indicating that "wind" rather than "spirit" enjoyed some acceptance among Jewish scholars.

Let us then concentrate on the particular problem raised in footnote (a) and the variant reading found in the body of the text of NJV. Orlinsky's explanation points up the fact that the traditional translation--recognized in footnote (a) by the word "Or''--is at least grammatically possible in the opinion of these translators. Or at least they thought so in 1962, for since then, a 1965 revision of the NJV has appeared in which footnote (a) is introduced by the word "Others." This change indicates, according to Orlinsky in his article, "The Rage to Translate: The New Age of Bible Translations," *Genesis* (Harper Torchbooks. Harper &

Row, Publishers, New York, 1966), "a traditional rendering no longer considered tenable, but worth mentioning because of its familiar and sometimes significant character" (p. xiv).

Such a revision points up, if nothing else, the rapidity of change which modern scholarly opinion constantly undergoes. But be that as it may, the body of the text suffered no essential change. It still regards verse 1 as a temporal clause, verse 2 as containing three circumstantial clauses, and verse 3 as the main clause of the opening statement of Genesis. This means that the first two verses are subordinated grammatically and connotatively to verse 3.

The implications of this rendering are, of course, quite clear. The Hebrew text thus states absolutely nothing about a creation out of nothing or about the beginning of time. To the contrary, these verses now teach the preexistence, if not the eternality, of matter. The influence of such a teaching on Christian theology hardly need be stated. Ultimately, it would alter all Christian thought in every area of dogmatics, the religious and spiritual no less than the biological and scientific.

Second Modern Translation

The second modern translation of Genesis which affords a change in the traditional rendering of Genesis 1:1-3 is in *The Anchor Bible* series, published by Doubleday and Company, which purports to be "a project of international and interfaith scope: Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish scholars from many countries [will] contribute individual volumes," all under the general editorship of William F. Albright and his former student, David Noel Freedman. The volume on Genesis was contributed by the late Ephraim A. Speiser of the University of Pennsylvania and was published in 1964. That translation opens with the following words:

> 1 When God set about to create heaven and earth—2 the world being then a formless waste, with darkness over the seas and only an awesome wind sweeping over the water—3 God said, "Let there be light." And there was light.

Again note that verse 1 is rendered as a temporal clause, verse 2 as circumstantial thoughts, and verse 3 as the independent thought of the sentence.

Now these quite similar translations are by no means new. With minor variations this "subordination [of the first two verses to verse 3] view" was suggested by the Jewish expositor Rashi, later by Heinrich Ewald, and then by other scholars in our time. Theophile J. Meek in his translation of Genesis for *The Bible, An American Translation,* published by the University of Chicago Press in 1931, adopted this construction. *The Westminster Study Edition of the*

Holy Bible, published by the Westminster Press in 1948, states in a footnote a preference for this construction over the traditional one. James Moffatt's translation also follows this view. The Revised Standard Version, though following the traditional construction in the body of its text, inserts the footnote, "Or *When God began to create."* Even Dr. Merrill F. Unger of Dallas Theological Seminary, in his article, "Rethinking the Genesis Account of Creation," *(Bibliotheca Sacra,* Vol. 115, No. 457, p. 28), and more recently in his *Unger's Bible Handbook* (Moody Press, Chicago, 1966), suggests that the first three verses of Genesis say nothing about the original creation *ex nihilo,* escaping however the odious implications of the suggestion by affirming that a period of time should very likely be postulated *before* Genesis 1:1 wherein the Bible student should insert the original creation and the fall of the angels.

Reasons for such a sweeping alteration of the meaning of these verses by these scholars away from the traditional meaning attached to them certainly must be compelling. What are they? They are basically two: the *cultural* and the *grammatical.*

The Cultural Reason

The Genesis account of creation, so this reason asserts, being an ancient Near Eastern cosmogony, must be placed within its cultural *milieu.* When this is done, a remarkable similarity is seen to exist between the Biblical account of creation and other ancient Near Eastern cosmogonies, particularly in that they all agree on the preexistence of matter at the time of the first creative act. Specifically, (1) the Babylonian account, popularly titled *Enuma Elish,* and (2) the "second" account of creation allegedly found in Genesis 2:4b-25 are cited as proofs of this fact. (Unger, of course, does not affirm this cultural reason.)

It is true that *Enuma Elish* does begin with a temporal clause—''when above the heavens had not [yet] been named, [and] below the earth had not [yet] existed as such," and it is also true that lines 3-8 may be construed either as another temporal clause (or possibly two) or as circumstantial thoughts, with the main clause introduced at line 9: "Then were the gods created . . . ." Too, the Bible student must frankly recognize that similarities between Genesis 1 and *Enuma Elish* do exist. But are mere similarities sufficient reason to insist that the Genesis account recognizes, as does *Enuma Elish,* the preexistence of matter? May not these similarities be traced back to a common source of fact, which originated in an actual occurrence?

There is very good reason to believe that Moses was enabled by the inspiration of the

Holy Spirit of God to record the true account of creation accurately, purged of all the crude mythological and polytheistic incrustations replete in the other accounts. Certainly one cannot find a primitive polytheism in the Mosaic record. Why then insist that the Mosaic record must teach the preexistence of matter?

Perhaps those who do so insist ought to recognize that they do so, not on an empirically-established, objective basis founded on unimpeachable exegesis, but rather on an *a priori* assumption received by faith—the assumption that the Genesis account of creation is *not* unique among ancient cosmogonies, the assumption that Genesis 1 is *not* an inspired account of what actually took place at the beginning of earth history, but rather the combined efforts of the so-called Priestly School of late Israelite history.

Regarding the use of Genesis 2:4b-25 as another illustration of a creation account which begins with a temporal clause, followed by circumstantial thoughts, the main clause being introduced at verse 7, I unhesitatingly affirm that this passage may **not** in good faith be employed as a parallel to Genesis 1:1-3 for three reasons.

(1) Such usage assumes at the outset that Genesis 2:4b-25 is a second account of creation, an assumption far from being proved or universally accepted; rather, Genesis 2 is a more detailed treatment of the sixth creative day of Genesis 1.

(2) The division of Genesis 2:4 into two parts is both arbitrary and unbiblical. The first part (2:4a) is regarded as a subscription to the creation account of Genesis 1:1-2:3, and the second part (2:4b) is construed as the opening temporal clause of the second creation account (a division, by the way, which is absolutely essential to the view that Genesis 2:4b ff. is a precise parallel to Genesis 1:1-3).

It is arbitrary in that the division is made only in the interest of the theory of two parallel accounts of creation. It is unbiblical in that, if the phrase in Genesis 2:4a–''These are the generations of . . . "–be construed as a postscript to the preceding passage, it is the *only* time out of eleven different times that the phrase is used in Genesis where it is appended to a preceding passage rather than serving as a superscription to a following passage.

(3) The syntax in the two accounts actually differs, Genesis 2:4b containing a Hebrew infinitive construct in a very crucial place, whereas Genesis 1:1 contains the finite verb in the same place, a fact which can easily make all the difference in the world in the way the two verses are translated. In any translation Genesis 2:4b would have to be regarded as subordinate, while Genesis 1:1 may be rendered as an independent state-

ment, a fact which footnote (a) of the NJV (1962) of Genesis 1:1 readily recognized.

Thus we conclude that the cultural reason for the "subordination view" of Genesis 1:1-3 is not compelling. But what about the grammatical reason? Actually, the major reason for accepting or rejecting a particular rendering of any passage of Scripture must be based on sound grammatical and exegetical considerations found in the passage itself. Consequently, we need to look now at the grammatical reason for the proffered change in translation.

The Grammatical Reason

Briefly stated, the grammatical reason is as follows: the particular form of the first word of Genesis 1:1 *(bereshith,* taken to be in the construct state) demands that verse 1 be translated as a temporal clause—literally, "In the beginning of God's creating . . . ," which normally is smoothed out to "When God began to create"; and the clauses of verse 2, interpreted as noun or circumstantial clauses, require a rendering which shows the circumstances which they speak of as existing at the time of the divine fiat of verse 3. Let us now draw nearer to the actual text of Genesis 1:1-3 for a critical examination of the Hebrew. I find, needless to say, no fault in either of the two modern translations with the rendering of verse 3; verse 3 is not really germane to the problem before us. But the first two verses do need examining, which we shall now do in reverse order.

The Meaning of Verse 2

If the reader is to understand what we are about to say regarding the meaning of verse 2, a short lesson in Hebrew syntax is in order regarding the significance of noun and verbal clauses, and the relation of noun clauses to adjoining clauses. Note the following rules:

(1) *Noun clause:* "Every sentence, the subject and predicate of which are nouns or their equivalents (esp. participles), is called a *noun-clause" (Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar,* 140a), and the fundamental meaning of the noun clause is to "represent something *fixed, a state* or in short, *a being* so and so" *(ibid.,* 140e).

(2) *Verbal clause;* "Every sentence, the subject of which is a noun (or pronoun included in a verbal-form) and its predicate a finite verb, is called a *verbal-clause" (ibid.,* 140b), and its fundamental meaning is to represent "something *moveable* and in *progress,* a n *event* or *action" (ibid.,* 140e).

(3) *Syntactical relation of the noun clause to the verbal clause:* "The noun-clause connected . . . to a verbal clause, or its equivalent, always describes a state *contemporaneous* with the

principal action . . . " *(ibid.,* 141e; cf. *ibid.,* 156a-c).

With these three rules we are ready to proceed; we shall hereafter refer to these rules as "rule l," "rule 2," and "rule 3."

Verse 2 is comprised of three clauses, namely (1) "and the earth was empty and formless"; (2) "and darkness was upon the face of the deep"; and (3) "and the Spirit of God hovered upon the face of the waters." In the English translation each of these three clauses might appear to be a verbal clause, possessing a subject and a finite verb, but the Hebrew text discloses that the situation is actually quite different.

Beginning with the last clause and working forward to the front of the verse, an analysis reveals that the third clause is actually comprised of a noun subject-"Spirit"-and a participal predicate—"hovered," thereby establishing this third clause as a Hebrew noun clause denoting a state (cf. rule 1).

The middle clause is actually nothing more than a noun subject-"darkness"--and a prepositional phrase–"upon the face of the deep"-with the verb "was" understood. The King James Version, wherein words not in the original are indicated by italics, will verify this fact. Thus this clause is also a noun clause denoting a state (cf. rule 1).

The first clause is somewhat more problematical, in that it is composed of a noun subject—"earth," a finite verbal form—"was" (specifically the Qal perfect third person feminine singular), and the adjectives "empty and formless," Does not the presence of the finite verb form necessitate at least the first clause of verse 2 be construed as a verbal clause representing an action (cf. rule 2)? In my opinion it does not and cannot, and for the following reasons:

(1) This clause is so written in the Hebrew that the subject--"earth"--precedes the verbal "was," contrary to the normal word order of the verbal clause in which the verb normally precedes the subject. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* states:

> . . . the subject does sometimes precede . . . in the verbal clause proper, . . . especially so if there is special emphasis upon it . . . . In the great majority of instances, however, the position of the subject at the beginning of a verbal-clause is to be explained from the fact that the clause is not intended to introduce a new fact carrying on the narrative, but rather to describe a *state.* Verbal-clauses of this kind approximate closely in character to noun-clauses, and not infrequently . . . it is doubtful whether the writer did not in fact intend a noun-clause. (142a)

Thus the word order is greatly in favor of this clause being construed as a noun clause describing a state of being—"the earth was in a state of emptiness and formlessness." In fact, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* actually lists this particular clause as a noun clause (141i, 142c).

(2) If the verb *hayethah* (translated "was" in KJV) had been intended to be more than a mere copula, that is, if it had been intended to convey the idea of "becoming so and so," it would most likely have been inflected as an imperfect verb form followed by the *lamedh* preposition as in Genesis 2:7. The verb *hayah,* while it may at times be translated with a transitive sense, that is, "come to be," is here in the perfect aspect of the verb, which denotes actions, events, or states, not in progress, but from the point of view of completion. I agree with J. Wash Watts, when he writes in *A Survey of Syntax in the Hebrew Old Testament:* "A translation [of *hayethah* in Genesis 1:2] like 'came to be' would be contrary to the nature of the perfect" (pp. 35-36). Thus its correct translation is "was," denoting a state.

(3) Even if the verb could possibly be translated "became," thereby construing this clause as a verbal clause, this is usually done in the interest of teaching the intrusion of a divine judgment upon something, usually said to be the fallen angel horde, with a gap of indeterminate duration inserted between verse 1 and verse 2. But such a gap in turn would separate verse 1 in time from the first creative day, which is clearly at variance with Exodus 20:11 which affirms in no uncertain terms that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is. " Here is clear Biblical proof that verse 1 must be viewed as standing within and encompassed by the time limits of the creation week itself and that the creation week was not preceded by a divine judgment.

The first clause of verse 2 should be taken, then, as a noun clause, and is so regarded by a vast majority of Hebrew grammarians, i.e., *hayethah* is used in Genesis 1:2 "only for the purpose of referring to past time a statement which, as the description of a state, might also appear in the form of a pure noun-clause" *(Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar,* 141i)

In the light of this discussion, then, we may conclude that verse 2 does, in fact, contain three noun or circumstantial clauses, all describing states of being existing at a particular time. But the particular time when this threefold condition existed will be determined by the principal action with which it is construed by the interpreter (cf. rule 3).

The existing state of things described in verse 2 may quite conceivably be construed as existing contemporaneously with the action expressed

in verse 1 (if verse 1 is an independent clause) or with the action of God expressed in verse 3. But before this decision can be made, verse 1 must be examined to determine if its grammar and syntax demand that it be regarded as a temporal (and thus a subordinate) clause or as an independent clause.

The Meaning of Verse 1

The entire problem of whether to translate verse 1 as it has been traditionally rendered, that is, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," or to render it as a temporal clause, that is, "When God began to create the heaven and the earth," revolves around the first Hebrew word in Genesis– *bereshith,* traditionally translated "In the beginning."

This word is composed of the Hebrew preposition *beth* meaning "in," and the noun *reshith* meaning "beginning." It has no article. In Hebrew the noun may be placed in either of two states which the grammarian, for lack of better terminology, calls the absolute state and the construct state. As far as its form is concerned, *bereshith* could be either.

Admittedly, however, when a definite noun is in the construct state, it is anarthrous and derives its definiteness from the following definite noun or verbal idea. Hence it is argued by many modern scholars that since *bereshith* is anarthrous, (1) it is standing in a related sense to what follows, (2) it is thus made definite by the following verbal idea, and (3) it is thus to be translated (literally). "In the beginning of God's creating," which resolves itself quite naturally into the temporal thought: "When God began to create." (N.B. The noun in the construct state is normally followed by another noun, while here it is followed by the finite verb *bara;* but that this is a genuine Semitic usage is evident from constructions in Ex. 4:13, 6:28; Lev. 14:46; Deut. 4:15; I Sam, 5:9, 25:15; Psa. 16:3, 58:9, 81:6; Isa. 29:1; and Hos. 1:2.)

But does the mere omission of the article in *bereshith* demand that *reshith* be regarded as standing in a construct relation to the following verbal idea? Not necessarily, for in Isaiah 46:10 this very word is anarthrous, and yet is clearly in the absolute state: "the one declaring from [the] beginning the end." Thus the mere absence of the article is not enough evidence, standing alone, for determining the state of this noun in Genesis 1:1. The decision must be based upon other considerations, and here I follow Edward J. Young's thought in his *Studies in Genesis One* (pp. 5-7):

(1) In the Hebrew text *bereshith* is accented with the disjunctive *tiphcha,* indicating that the word has its own independent accent and is thus construed by the Masoretes as an absolute.

(2) Though this comes *ab extra,* it is significant that without exception the ancient versions regarded *bereshith* as an absolute.

(3) In the Old Testament when a construct noun precedes a finite verb, the fact of constructness is apparent, either from the form of the noun in construct, or from the demand of the context that the noun be so taken. But in Genesis 1:1 neither of these conditions is present. In fact, the context, specifically the finite verb *bara* ("create"), favors the absolute state, because *bara* in the Qal stem, as it is here, is employed exclusively of the divine activity.

Further, while the word is frequently employed with the accusative of the *product produced,* it is *never* used in a context where the accusative of the *material employed* in the creative act is mentioned, which would be the case if *bereshith* were construed as a construct noun, thereby rendering verse 1 as a temporal clause. Even Gerhard von Rad, the form-critical Old Testament scholar, feels obliged, in his *Old Testament Theology,* to write: "Since pre-existent matter is never mentioned in connexion with this activity [denoted by *bara],* the idea of *creatio ex nihilo* is connected with it" (I, 142)

I conclude, therefore, that *bereshith* is an absolute noun (as *en arche* in John 1:1) and view verse 1 as a simple declaration of the fact of absolute creation–as it has been traditionally translated.

Syntactical Relation of Verse 2

We may now decide whether verse 2 is to be construed as describing a state existing contemporaneously with the action of verse 1 or with the action of verse 3. If the former alternative is followed, the meaning would be that the threefold condition described in verse 2 was present as God began the activity expressed in *bara* of verse 1, but this would not make for good sense and is unsuitable to the significance of *bara.* The presence of *bara* makes it clear that the chapter is not concerned merely with the transformation of already existing material; the concern of the chapter is far grander than that.

The only meaningful interpretation is to regard verse 2 as describing the state of the created earth as it stood at the time of the divine fiat of verse 3, with verse 1 serving as a grand summary statement of all that follows in the chapter.

But why regard verse 1 as a grand summary statement of all that follows? First, because "the heaven and the earth" is a peculiar Hebrew idiom, known as an antonymic pair, standing

for the universe, but more than that, for the well-ordered universe. Second, because in the verses that follow verse 1, the reader actually sees, there described, God's consecutive acts whereby He created the heaven and the earth of verse 1. Admittedly, this view of the matter, in the words of Edward J. Young *(Studies in Genesis One)* sees, regarding verse *2,* "no explicit statement of the creation of the primeval material from which the universe we know was formed" (p. 11), but we may assume that this great event is included in the broad statement of verse 1.

We are now ready to offer the following paraphrase of Genesis 1:1-3, in which we will gather together the several points and nuances which we have made throughout this discussion:

> 1 In the beginning God created the well-ordered universe. 2 Now the earth, being empty and formless with darkness upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God hovering over the face of the waters [a condition, the result of the first creative act, existing in the past but not in existence at the time of the recording of the event], 3 God said, "Let there be light." And there was light.

Immediately, the gap theorist will object that if the creative activity of God should be so conceived, then God's first creative act produced a "chaotic, desolate waste," an act unbecoming to the perfections of the divine nature. And too, does not Isaiah 45:18 distinctly state that God created the earth "not in vain"?

As for Isaiah's statement, such an interpretation as the gap theorist places on his words overlooks the true significance of the final phrase of this verse: "he formed it to be inhabited." The real point of the passage is that God did not ultimately intend the world to be devoid of life, but rather that it should be filled with living things. In John C. Whitcomb's words,

> Thus, He did not allow it to *remain* in the empty and formless condition in which He first created it, but in six creative days filled it with living things and fashioned it as a beautiful home for man. The verse thus speaks of

God's *ultimate purpose* in creation, and the contrast in this verse between *"tohu"* ["in vain"] and "inhabited" shows clearly that *"tohu"* means empty or *uninhabited,* rather than judged, destroyed, or chaotic" ("The Ruin-Reconstruction Theory of Genesis 1:2," *Creation Research Society Annual,* 1965, p. 3).

As for the objection that this view of things would make God create a chaos, an act insulting to the divine nature, two things may be said. First, such an objection is based on a finite *a priori* assumption of what God should or should not do in keeping with the perfection of His nature. Second, I suggest that expositors should exercise caution before they designate the condition of Genesis 1:2 for which the Spirit of God is obviously tenderly caring and which is under his complete control as a chaos or in a topsy-turvy condition. This charge really is insulting to the God of order.

The presence of the Holy Spirit in verse 2, I feel to the contrary, is beautifully explained by Keil and Delitzsch when they perceive of the Holy Spirit as standing, so to speak, in a state of readiness to carry out the divine fiats of the Logos of God and to bring the creation to a habitable state for man *(Pentateuch,* I, 49). Such a view of the matter has the advantage too of giving more prominence than has been done in the past to the role which the Holy Spirit played in creation and which is borne out in other parts of Scripture (Psa. 104:30; Job 26:13).

In answer, then, to the question posed in the title of this essay, I am prepared to answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative: yes, the opening verses of Genesis do teach a creation out of nothing. Furthermore, the emphasis of Genesis 1 appears to be, not so much on God's *power* to create–that is assumed, but on His *ability* as an architect to "build" from originally-created material, supplemented with subsequently-created material, a beautiful world for mankind. The two modern translations, herein discussed, have thus grievously erred.

PUBLICATION YEAR MODIFIED

This is to notify readers that the publication year for the *Creation Research Society Annual* and *Quarterly* has been changed. The first number will continue to be the Annual which now appears in June, and will be followed by second, third, and fourth numbers, which will be Quarterlies appearing in September, December, and March, respectively. Also the page numbering system will be continuous through the four numbers of the publication year. By this means a simplification of the Index published at the close of each year will be accomplished.