

Copyright © 2019 Kenneth William Lovett

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA
IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Kenneth William Lovett

May 2019

APPROVAL SHEET

THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA
IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Kenneth William Lovett

Read and Approved by:

Terry J. Betts (Chair)

Duane A. Garrett

Russell T. Fuller

Date _____

For the glory of God.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	1
Thesis	2
Outline	4
Methodology	5
2. HERMANN GUNKEL	7
Significant Works	9
Challenges	24
Conclusion	28
3. HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP	29
Significant Contributors	30
Conclusion	48
4. THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA IN ANE LITERATURE	50
ANE Myths about the Sea	51
ANE Myths and OT Scripture	66
Conclusion	68
5. THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA IN OTHER ANCIENT LITERATURE	69
Flood Myths	70
Creation Myths	76

Chapter	Page
Other Sea-Focused Myths	79
Conclusion	81
6. THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	82
The Sea is Opposed to Creation	82
The Sea as Judgment	96
The Sea is the Abode of the Enemy	115
The Sea, Death, and Darkness	127
7. CONCLUSION	142
Appendix	
OCCURRENCES OF TEHOM IN THE OT	148
BIBLIOGRAPHY	155

PREFACE

I would not be writing the preface to this dissertation were it not for the unfailing endurance of my wife, Sarah. Reading that sentence, you might imagine the countless nights and weekends that she kept the kids, alone, in order to allow me to research and write without distraction. What you might not know is that I was at the same time a US Army National Guard Chaplain required to be out of town on a regular basis for training and deployments that have totaled one full year out of the last six years. No one deserves more recognition and thanks than she does. Our children, Luke, Hudson, and Lauren, have also been incredibly patient and encouraging to me.

Dr. T. J. Betts essentially became my supervisor before I had even decided to pursue a Ph.D. He gave me the unexpected opportunity to be the grader and occasional teacher for an Elementary Hebrew class during the second semester of my M.Div. studies at SBTS, and he continued to afford me that opportunity and the valuable experience that accompanied it in several Hebrew and Old Testament courses for the rest of my M.Div. and Ph.D. work. His encouragement and guidance have influenced the direction of all my graduate studies.

Ken Lovett

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2019

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

The sea is an inanimate part of creation and has no volition to rebel against its creator. But the OT speaks of God defeating the sea, driving it away, restraining it behind prison bars, stopping the advance of its proud waves, and splitting it as one would split a snake with an ax.¹ At the time of creation, the sea was driven away by God so that he could create the dry land. During the flood, the sea covered the dry land, killed all the people, and destroyed their property. In Exodus, the sea killed Pharaoh's army while they pursued the Israelites. The sea also served as an apt image for prophets to warn of the imminent destruction of the Holy Land. In Jonah, it was the place of his punishment and would have been the place of his death if God had not intervened. Evil beasts and uncontrollable monsters find their home in the sea. The shadowy unknown of the dark depths of the sea also associate it with *Sheol*, the place of the dead. The OT is so consistently negative about the sea that one would think that the sea is an enemy of God.

The enemies of God and humanity in the OT are not difficult to catalog. Satan would top the list as the first enemy to come to mind for most people.² Death is another enemy that would be on such a list.³ Death and Satan are not the only biblical enemies of humanity and God's good purposes in the universe. Others on the list would include Babylon; Egypt; and the Philistines, who were enemies more often than not in the biblical

¹ See Pss 89:9-10, 104:6-7; Job 38:8-11; and Isa 51:9-11.

² He is the serpent who deceived Adam and Eve, seducing them to sin, who continues to tempt humans to sin and who makes accusations against them before God to this day (Gen 3; Matt 4; Jas 1:13-15; Rev 12:9-10).

³ Death came through sin just as God told Adam it would (Gen 2:17; Rom 5:12ff.). The Bible also says that death will be the last enemy that will be defeated (1 Cor 15:26).

story. The sea is an unlikely candidate for an enemy of God and humanity in the OT. However, this dissertation will demonstrate that the OT uses the sea as a negative motif and that God treats the sea as an enemy. The sea is opposed to God's purposes in the biblical narrative and finds itself on the receiving end of God's rebuke and restraint (Ps 104:6-7; Job 38:8-11).

Thesis

This dissertation argues that the sea is consistently—although not universally—a negative motif in the OT. The OT does not present the sea as a personal being or force like the ancient Near Eastern (ANE) myths that involve a god or goddess of the sea at war with the creator god. However, the sea represents chaos in the OT and opposes the orderly work that is initiated by God in creation and is continued by humans who work to spread order across the land. The sea is a negative motif because it is the abode of Satan. It also harbors his representatives Leviathan, Rahab, and the beasts of Daniel's vision. These beasts are guises of Satan and find their home in the sea. The sea is a negative motif because it is a place of death and darkness.

The sea was also understood with similar negativity throughout the ANE. Several ANE myths have similarities with the OT in their negative depiction of the sea as an opposing force against the creator.⁴ Outside of the ANE, ancient myths and stories from around the world also reveal that similar beliefs were held by peoples on every continent of the globe. The sea is a negative motif in the stories of ancient peoples from the Aztecs to the Chinese and from the Vikings to the Africans. Generally, those negative feelings about the sea are revealed in a creation story or a flood story from each group.

This dissertation examines the evidence against the character of the sea in the

⁴ There are undeniable similarities and even matching phrases between certain passages from the Bible and ANE myths. This dissertation will also discuss what that does and does not mean regarding the text of the Bible. One must use caution in drawing conclusions based solely on the overlap of a few words. The evidence and arguments for this subject are examined in chap. 4.

OT and suggests certain implications for NT studies.⁵ One interpretational application is the absence of the sea from the new creation in Revelation 21:1, which should be understood in light of the OT's negativity about the sea. The OT presents the sea in such negative terms that John believed that its chances of being found in the new creation were similar to those of death or Satan.

Although this dissertation demonstrates that ANE myth is generally in agreement about the negativity of the sea, this dissertation demonstrates that the content of the OT indicates the negative reputation of the sea. Much of the scholarship that is dedicated to the discussion of the sea in the OT has turned to ANE mythology to find explanations for passages in the OT that refer to the sea in negative terms.

The OT is not exclusively negative about the sea—a few verses are positive about the sea, but the scope of this dissertation is to discuss the ways in which the biblical authors used the sea as a negative motif. The sea has existed in tension from the time God created it. It is a beautiful part of the earth and is a gift that God gave to people. Genesis 49:25 speaks of the blessings of the great deep. Deuteronomy 8:7 anticipates the promised land being filled with springs of water from the great deep (the waters under the earth). Ezekiel 31:4 speaks of the great deep causing a figurative tree to grow abundantly, but at the tree's death the same great deep is closed over it in 31:15 to seal its fate. The sea is full of life forms but is also a fearful place of death. The biblical authors consistently use the sea as a negative motif that connotes the threat of destruction, chaos, death, and darkness.

⁵ A full discussion of NT interpretational applications is outside the scope of this dissertation, which focuses almost exclusively on the OT. Further work should be done on the connections between this dissertation's conclusions about the sea in the NT teaching about baptism (Rom 6:3-4), Jesus walking on the rough waters (John 6:16-21), calming the sea (Mark 4:35-41), and other water-related themes in the NT.

Outline

Chapter 2 introduces the works of Hermann Gunkel, who has written extensively on the sea in the OT in comparison with the Babylonian myth *Enuma elish*. His first major publication on the topic was *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*, in which he has gone into detail concerning his theories about the Babylonian myth as the origin of the negative material about the sea that ended up in the OT. Gunkel has proposed that the conflict between Marduk and Tiamat in *Enuma elish* is assumed in the OT passages about creation even though it is not stated. The conflict motif was known as *chaoskampf*, “the struggle against chaos.” Chapter 2 discusses all of Gunkel’s publications that are relevant to the sea in the OT. Finally, chapter 2 will present the challenges that Gunkel faced from other scholars and from the church.

Chapter 3 introduces the scholars who came after Gunkel and studied the ANE myths discovered in Mesopotamia and Canaan. Some of them have developed Gunkel’s work, and others have rejected Gunkel’s conclusions. The primary modification to Gunkel’s theories that has been made by later scholars who agreed with him was that the Ugaritic Baal cycle, rather than *Enuma elish*, was the source of the biblical negativity about the sea. The purpose of chapters 2–3 is to show that the negative motif of the sea has been discussed and demonstrated by biblical scholars over the past 150 years.

Chapter 4 introduces the content of the ANE myths about the sea that have been explored by Gunkel and the other scholars from chapters 2 and 3. Chapter 4 explores the similarities and differences between those myths and the OT material. In some cases, there is close parallel between some of the ANE myths and the stories recorded in the OT. Chapter 4 includes a discussion of whether parallel subject matter indicates that one text has influenced the other. This chapter also demonstrates how OT scholars have dealt with stories in the ANE literature and the OT that share parallels.

Chapter 5 widens the exploration of ancient myths about the sea to a global scale. Negativity about the sea is found in the ancient literature of peoples from every corner of the world. First, there are flood myths from groups all over the world. These

myths depict the sea as negative because it can destroy life and property. Many of the flood myths have similarities to the OT flood story, such as a small group of survivors and birds who are released to find dry ground. Second, many peoples' creation myths begin with the earth covered by the sea. The creator in the story must remove the sea to produce dry ground for the creation.⁶ The purpose of chapters 4–5 is to show that many ancient myths from the ANE and around the world were negative about the sea. Thus, the OT was not introducing an idea that was unheard of in the ancient world.

The purpose of chapter 6 is to examine the OT material that is negative about the sea. First, the chapter depicts the sea as anti-creation. Second, it also depicts the sea as a tool of judgment against God's people. Third, chapter 6 describes the sea as the abode of the enemy. Then chapter 6 identifies the sea as an abyss that is the place of death and paints the sea as a place of darkness. Finally, chapter 6 applies the above conclusions about the negativity of the sea in the OT to the interpretation of Revelation 21:1, where John observes that the sea will be no more in the new creation.⁷

Methodology

Before exploring the OT material about the sea, this dissertation starts with an examination of Hermann Gunkel's work, because he provided the first thorough treatment of the OT negativity about the sea. After him, several scholars built upon or responded to his work. Then, having surveyed their work, this dissertation examines the ANE myths and the ancient stories from around the world that are also negative about the sea. It was not unusual for the ancient world to have presented the sea as a fearful, dark,

⁶ The fact that negativity about the sea is found in the ancient stories of many peoples around the world should serve as further caution against the assumption that either the ANE literature or the OT has had influence on the content of the other.

⁷ John's observation in Rev 21:1 does not mean that there cannot be a sea of any kind in the new creation. For John also sees in Rev 4:6 and 15:2 that before the throne is a sea of glass.

unknown, chaotic place that is incompatible with life on the dry ground.⁸

The biblical material that addresses the reputation of the sea is not confined to a particular book, author, or section of the OT.⁹ This negativity about the sea is a motif that the biblical authors refer to in differing situations. Therefore, this study is not limited to a specific range of text. As a starting point, the study focuses on the occurrences of the word תְּהוֹם (*tehom*, “the great deep,” 36 total occurrences) and other words that are from the same semantic range, including “sea,” “waters,” “depths,” and “floods.” This dissertation generally uses “the sea” to refer to *tehom* or one of its synonyms, regardless of which Hebrew word is in the text.¹⁰

Each section of Chapter 6 investigates a characteristic of the sea in the OT. The first demonstrates that the sea is antithetical to God’s creation purposes on the earth—the sea is anti-creation. The sea is incompatible with God’s plans to create dry ground as a place of life for humans. The next step demonstrates the sea’s close association with God’s judgment on sin—the sea is an enemy like those who surrounded Israel in the biblical story and is a tool that God used to bring punishment for the sins of his people. The sea is an agent of destruction that is devoid of grace. The next step maps out the sea as the harbor of the enemy. The sea is the home base of wicked characters and beasts in the OT that are the representatives of Satan. The sea is also the place of death and darkness. These negative elements (the sea, death, and darkness) are all mentioned together in certain passages in the OT and ultimately in John’s vision of the new heavens and new earth (Rev 21–22), where death, darkness, and the deep will be absent.

⁸ Rarely does one find ancient stories that are positive about the sea, although they do exist.

⁹ All quoted Hebrew Scripture is from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). English translations are from the English Standard Version (ESV), unless otherwise noted.

¹⁰ The parallel relationship of these terms is discussed in chap. 6.

CHAPTER 2

HERMANN GUNKEL

Hermann Gunkel's name is inseparable from the history of scholarly study of the OT. His extensive impact on the field has been described by Ernest Nicholson, who writes, "It is no exaggeration to say that there has not been an area of OT research in the twentieth century that has not been indebted directly or indirectly to Gunkel's work."¹ Numerous dissertations, books, and scholarly articles have presented or responded to Gunkel's work.² This chapter focuses on his contributions to the study of the sea in the

¹ Ernest W. Nicholson, "Foreword to the English Translation," in *Genesis* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), [9].

² The following are a sampling of publications that are heavily dependent upon Gunkel's work, not including those publications that will be introduced in chapter 3. Dissertations: Robert Harold Beatty, "The History of Tradition Criticism with Special Reference to the Works of Hermann Gunkel, Hugo Gressmann, and Sigmund Mowinckel" (Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, 1962); Leonard J. Coppes, "Hermann Gunkel: A Presentation and Evaluation of His Contributions to Biblical Research—Chiefly in the Area of Old Testament" (Th.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1968). Books: Walter E. Rast, *Tradition History and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); Martin J. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Harry Peter Nasuti, *Defining the Sacred Songs: Genre, Tradition, and the Post-Critical Interpretation of the Psalms* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Timothy J. Sandoval, Carleen Mandolfo, and Martin J. Buss, *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible* (London: T & T Clark International, 2003). Articles: Kemper Fullerton, "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 41, no. 1–2 (1922): 1–101; Harold Forshey, "Apologetics and Historical Criticism," *Restoration Quarterly* 6, no. 4 (1962): 217–28; Alexander Rofé, "Classification of the Prophetic Stories," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89, no. 4 (December 1970): 427–40; Friedemann W. Golka, "Aetiologies in the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 27, no. 1 (January 1977): 36–47; Sean M. Warner, "Primitive Saga Men," *Vetus Testamentum* 29, no. 3 (July 1979): 325–35; D. F. Murray, "The Rhetoric of Disputation: Re-Examination of a Prophetic Genre," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 12, no. 38 (June 1987): 95–121; Edward L. Greenstein, "The Formation of the Biblical Narrative Corpus," *AJS Review* 15, no. 2 (1990): 151–78; Gordon Mitchell, "War, Folklore and the Mystery of a Disappearing Book," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 20, no. 68 (December 1995): 113–19; Anne E. Gardner, "Daniel 7,2-14: Another Look at Its Mythic Pattern," *Biblica* 82, no. 2 (2001): 244–52; John H. Walton, "Creation in Genesis 1:1-2:3 and the Ancient Near East: Order Out of Disorder After Chaokampf," *Calvin Theological Journal* 43, no. 1 (April 2008): 48–63; Paul Michael Kurtz, "Waiting at Nemi: Wellhausen, Gunkel, and the World Behind Their Work," *Harvard Theological Review* 109, no. 4 (2016): 567–85; David S. Farkas, "Etiologies in the Bible: Explicit, Double, and Hidden," *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 45, no. 4

OT. Because Gunkel’s work has been so foundational, all subsequent scholars addressing this topic have responded to his work to some degree, and those interactions are discussed in the next chapter. The present chapter presents Gunkel’s positions and arguments, along with the challenges that he faced during his lifetime. His work is relevant to the negative motif of the sea in the OT because he argues that the biblical passages that present the sea in a negative light are remnants of myths from ANE peoples outside of Israel (specifically the Babylonians), which came into Israel through international interactions and by way of oral traditions being passed down through the generations.³

Gunkel was born in 1862 and died in 1932. Nicholson has summarized his academic career: “He studied at Göttingen University and taught Old Testament at Halle University and then Berlin and was appointed professor at Giessen in 1907. He returned to a professorship at Halle in 1920 from which he retired in 1927.”⁴ Gunkel worked in a period during which the so-called “documentary hypothesis,” articulated by Julius Wellhausen during the late 1800s, had achieved wide acceptance among OT scholars and had come to dominate research in this field.⁵ The documentary hypothesis separated the Pentateuch into literary pieces that had been contributed by different authors or schools. In response to the emphasis given, under the documentary hypothesis, to the

(October 2017): 229–36.

³ According to Debra Ballentine, Gunkel technically denied that there was myth in the OT in accordance with a definition of myth that limited it to polytheism exclusively. She wrote, “Hermann Gunkel, who worked extensively with ancient West Asian myth and mythic imagery in the Hebrew Bible, upheld the Grimm brothers’ definition and denied that there was any myth in the Hebrew Bible.” Debra Scoggins Ballentine, “You Divided the Sea by Your Might: The Conflict Myth and the Biblical Tradition” (Ph. D. diss., Brown University, 2012), 7. See her thorough discussion of myth theory. *Ibid.*, 5–14. This chapter uses a broader definition of myth to discuss Gunkel’s arguments for the presence of myth in the OT.

⁴ Nicholson, “Foreword to the English Translation,” [3].

⁵ Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies (Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885).

compositional stages of the Pentateuch, Gunkel and his colleague Albert Eichhorn delved into the study of the pre-compositional stages of the literature that would make up the Pentateuch, a project which led Gunkel to the study of extrabiblical ANE myths, which he suggested were older versions of some of the stories in the OT.⁶

Gunkel's ultimate goal was to be faithful to the biblical text and to the scientific examination of evidence. He wrote of himself, in the third person, "But he also begs the readers, if they are of a different opinion in many things, at least to believe that he seeks the truth with all his might, and that in expressing it to a greater circle he has no wish but to serve our beloved Evangelical Church."⁷ His love for the church and his concern for the potentially negative impact of theories improperly handled were made evident in his opposition to Friedrich Delitzsch, which is recounted below in the discussion of Gunkel's book *Israel and Babylon*. His examination of the evidence led him to the conclusion that the biblical text is not true in everything that it says. Yet he was also humble in recognition of his own limitations and potential for error. He wrote, "Since I do, here and there, journey untraveled paths, I have the responsibility to apologize should large or small errors creep in. I would be grateful for critical comment and reasonable contradiction."⁸

Significant Works

This section introduces *Creation and Chaos*, *Genesis*, and *Israel and Babylon*, Gunkel's most significant publications relevant to the study of the sea in the OT.⁹ In these

⁶ Gunkel would dedicate *Creation and Chaos* to Eichhorn, who was his colleague at Halle University.

⁷ Hermann Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, trans. E. S. B. (Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey, 1904), 14.

⁸ Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*, trans. K. William Whitney (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), xxxix.

⁹ The works to be discussed in this section are in order of publication date but are also

works he argues that the reason the OT consistently presents the sea in a negative light is that the older ANE myths inherited by the biblical authors feature a central story in which the chaotic sea is the enemy in a major battle against the gods prior to creation.¹⁰

Creation and Chaos, 1895

Gunkel's first groundbreaking work relating to the subject of the sea in the OT was *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*.¹¹ In this book he presents a thorough and well-documented argument that the biblical authors must have adapted the Babylonian *Enuma elish* into a myth about Yahweh. Respect must be accorded to Gunkel's detailed knowledge of the ANE literature available to him as well as of the biblical text. His work with *Enuma elish*, which at the time of his writing had only relatively recently been discovered, laid a foundation that would be used by generations of scholars in ANE literary studies. Subsequent scholars, discussed in the next chapter, have applied Gunkel's essential arguments to the Ugaritic literature that was discovered around the time of Gunkel's death in 1932.

Nicholson recounts that Gunkel was reacting against Wellhausen and the documentary hypothesis because of its focus on the compositional state of the biblical text. He writes, "Gunkel's preliminary remarks [in *Creation and Chaos*] concerning his approach are directed specifically against Wellhausen's handling of Genesis 1."¹² Gunkel

generally in order of greater to lesser direct relevance to the study of the sea in the OT.

¹⁰ Gunkel was indebted to the work of George Smith, who published and translated the Babylonian myths. George Smith, *The Chaldean Account of Genesis: Containing the Description of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the Times of the Patriarchs, and Nimrod: Babylonian Fables, and Legends of the Gods; From the Cuneiform Inscriptions* (New York: Scribner, Armstrong, 1876).

¹¹ Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*, trans. K. William Whitney (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2006).

¹² Nicholson, "Foreword to the English Translation," [5].

desired to examine the Babylonian stories that he believed were the literary ancestors of the stories in the OT. He argued that the biblical authors had inherited ANE stories and adapted them where necessary to fit the monotheism of the OT.

Gunkel begins *Creation and Chaos* by arguing that Genesis 1 could not have originated with the biblical author because there are elements in Genesis 1 that resemble elements of Babylonian myths. In Genesis 1 he finds faded references to the conflict motif that is prominent in *Enuma elish*. He writes, “We thus recognize in Genesis 1 a series of mythologically resonant features. It follows from this that Genesis 1 is not the composition of the author, but rather the written deposit of a tradition.”¹³ In his commentary on Genesis he further explains, “The description of Chaos and certain other elements which exhibit a poetic tone are...not attributable to the author P, but rather to his exemplar.... In antiquity, one did not create cosmogonies.”¹⁴ Thus, Gunkel concludes that the author of Genesis could not have written the creation story in Genesis 1 because ancient creation stories were exclusively inherited from earlier sources.¹⁵

In addition to the presence of a conflict motif, Gunkel also points to the first-person plural in Genesis 1:26, which is a remnant of the polytheistic tradition from which the story derives. He writes, “Now since we have, furthermore, found a polytheistic echo in the myth (‘we’), it seems appropriate to hypothesize that the narrative was once polytheistic.”¹⁶

Gunkel then explains what the Babylonians believed about the primordial chaos of the sea being defeated as creation ensued, a concept he terms *chaoskampf*. He

¹³ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 11.

¹⁴ Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle, Mercer Library of Biblical Studies (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), 119.

¹⁵ His statement begs the question, “Did the exemplar create a cosmogony?” Gunkel did not address this question.

¹⁶ Gunkel, *Genesis*, 121.

holds up *Enuma elish* as typical of ANE myths in the way it includes a significant struggle against chaos that leads to creation.¹⁷ Gunkel was unique in arguing that the author of the cosmogony that became Genesis 1 was not an Israelite. K. William Whitney, Jr. writes, “Unlike his scholarly contemporaries, Gunkel does not hesitate in his resolve to discern the origins of the biblical creation account outside of the immediate historical locus of Israel.”¹⁸ The motifs, characters, and sequences of events in Genesis 1 and the Babylonian myth are similar enough for Gunkel to claim that Babylonian mythology was a source from which the biblical authors drew the core elements of the creation story.¹⁹

When Gunkel compares the events of the Tiamat-Marduk episode from *Enuma elish* to several OT texts outside of Genesis 1, he notes that the biblical authors also referenced other elements of *Enuma elish*, such as a dragon that has been defeated, in addition to the sea which ruled prior to creation.²⁰ Gunkel intends to show the influence of the Babylonian myth on the biblical writers even where the only commonality between the two texts is a single word, such as the mention of a dragon. Consider the following: “The way in which the [*chaoskampf*] myth is not described, but rather is presumed in every text which speaks of the dragon, proves that it was quite probably known and accepted among the people.”²¹ In other words, the biblical authors knew and believed the *chaoskampf* myth to such an extent that they did not need to make explicit reference to it in the text itself; but in their minds, behind the text, they must have been thinking of it whenever they wrote a verse that mentioned a dragon. In this way, Gunkel uses the very

¹⁷ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 13-20.

¹⁸ K. William Whitney, Jr., “Translator’s Preface,” in *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), xxvii.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 78-111.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 21-77.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 59.

lack of evidence in the biblical text as evidence to support his claim about its connection to the *chaoskampf* myth: the absence of direct reference to the myth proves, in this reading, how strongly the myth had influenced the biblical authors.²²

Gunkel also points to the process of demythologization in order to show OT reliance upon *Enuma elish*. Demythologization involves the explanation of the presence of mythological creatures and events named in the OT, such as Rahab and Leviathan. Gunkel argues that the biblical authors used the mythological stories of their neighbors for the purpose of declaring the supremacy of Yahweh over pagan deities. They would use the borrowed myth but replace the triumphant deity in the story with Yahweh or otherwise removed mythological elements of the story to make it fit in with the overall corpus of the Scriptures. For example, concerning Psalm 46 Gunkel writes,

The theory can hardly be denied that, in this case, the myth, eschatologically applied, provides, in the final analysis, the basis for the poems. All the concrete features of the poems are in agreement with the myth: the arrogant, raging sea, which finally takes drastic action against YHWH's holiness, and which YHWH brings to peace while he proves his unique mastery.²³

He contends that the original version of the poem would have shown the arrogant, raging sea taking action against some other deity or group of deities and ultimately being defeated. Gunkel argues that the psalmist replaced the deities with Yahweh but otherwise preserved the structure of the story.

The concept of demythologization is not foreign to Scripture, for Paul performed essentially the same operation when he referred to the shrine to an unknown god and declared "what you worship as unknown I proclaim to you."²⁴ Thus, it would not

²² Gunkel could not believe that the biblical authors would use the words chosen except if the *chaoskampf* myth were in the background. In his treatment of Isa 50:2-3, he stated, "It should be supposed that the prophet had our myth in mind. . . . The parallels prove, however, that these motifs are taken from the creation myth. . . . Without these assumptions the prophetic text would be more than peculiar. How could these descriptions be thought up unless they are generally common?" Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 66.

²³ *Ibid.*, 67.

²⁴ See Acts 17:23.

be categorically offensive to suggest that the OT authors had taken the religious stories of their neighbors and proclaimed that the true God was greater than Marduk, Baal, and so on. Gunkel claims that the OT authors practiced demythologization in texts that name certain potentially mythological creatures. One such name was the Hebrew word תְּהוֹם (*tehom*), the great deep, which Gunkel argues must have derived from the Babylonian *Tiamat*, which in the Babylonian myth is the name of the goddess of the sea. He supports this idea by pointing out that if *tehom* is or was once a proper name in Hebrew, then it must have been the name of a mythical figure: “The invariable use of this term *without* the definite article allows us to conclude that it was once a proper name and hence designated a mythical figure.”²⁵ Nicholson summarizes Gunkel’s understanding of *tehom*, writing, “The term *tehom* (‘deep’) without the definite article betrays itself as having come down from a much more ancient myth.”²⁶ Gunkel revisits the discussion of *tehom* in his commentary on Genesis, in which he is even more direct about *tehom* having originally been the name of a goddess, writing, “The fact that the word *tehom* in the singular is never employed in the determinate state, and thus is treated as a proper name, implies that *T^ehom* was originally a mythological entity, that is, a goddess. . . . The Babylonian *Tiamat* = Hebrew *Tehom* demonstrates the accuracy of this conclusion. *Tiamat* is the primordial sea, represented as a goddess or feminine monster.”²⁷ His conclusion is that whenever the biblical authors mention *tehom* they must have been thinking about the ANE *chaoskampf* myth and that they intentionally demythologize certain elements of the ANE myth which would not have been palatable for the Israelite reader.

Whenever the biblical text mentions the sea in the same context as creation, the

²⁵ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 76, emphasis original. Earlier in the work he stated that the lack of definite article indicated *Tehom* was an “ancient word” rather than a proper name. *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁶ Nicholson, “Foreword to the English Translation,” [6].

²⁷ Gunkel, *Genesis*, 105.

ANE myth, Gunkel believes, is in the background: “These parallels prove that in the above testimonies concerning the creation of the sea we have before us our myth, from which only the specifically mythological feature, the defeat of the monsters, has been stripped away.”²⁸ Gunkel not only states that the mythological features have been “stripped away”; he also argues that demythologization was most likely not a direct process in which an author would start with the completely pagan version of a story and scrub it of pagan deities, replacing each with various functions of Yahweh. Lest the reader misunderstand Gunkel’s idea that the Babylonian myth was the source from which Israel derived its creation story, he explains that he is referring to a long, slow process of oral tradition. He writes,

It does not follow from our limited knowledge of ancient Israel and the fact that we know the creation account first in P—that is, in the period after the Exile—that the material became known in Israel only then or shortly before. Now, for internal reasons, the arrival of such cosmogonic myths in later times is very improbable. First of all, the assumption that P himself translated and reworked the Babylonian myth disregarding substantial material variations—is already extraordinarily difficult on religio-historical grounds. A man of such marked Jewish character, filled with Jewish abhorrence for pagan gods, would have hated and disdained such a narrative of the Babylonian gods, certainly such a grotesque and fantastic one. He would have never adapted it. It is equally unlikely that such myths will have made their way into Yahwism in the period of Assyrian domination over Judah when Babylonian culture flooded into Judah. Then the full consciousness of the peculiarity of Yahwism was already awakened in prophecy and prophecy conducted a passionate opposition to everything foreign. We may assume that the prophecy of the time would not have adopted the newly arrived accounts of foreign gods, whose foreign origins would have been obvious at first glance, but would have eradicated them root and branch. If such creation myths first became known then, they would certainly have experienced nothing different at the hand of the prophets than the Babylonian altars and the steeds of Shamash did.²⁹

Gunkel’s goal in this paragraph is to clarify that the Israelites would not have adopted foreign ideas quickly from pagan, polytheistic mythologies and that therefore the Babylonian myth could not have come to Israel at a late date. He argues that the Babylonian creation story must have traveled to Canaan long before Israel and seeped

²⁸ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 65. See list of passages there.

²⁹ Gunkel, *Genesis*, 131.

gradually into Israelite theology in such diluted form as to temper any stark remnants of pagan teachings, which the Israelites would have been sure to detect and reject.

Much of the remainder of the book argues that Revelation 12 is also of Babylonian origin.³⁰ Gunkel made a permanent impact on OT and ANE studies with the book *Creation and Chaos*. Although not without fault, the book deserves the foundational role it has been accorded in subsequent scholarship on the subject of the sea in the OT.

Genesis, 1901

Gunkel's commentary on Genesis was published shortly after the turn of the century. In it he applies many of the arguments proposed in *Creation and Chaos* to relevant texts in Genesis, such as the creation story and the story of the flood. Gunkel's introduction to the work stands as a treatise in its own right and has in fact been published and translated as a separate volume entitled *The Legends of Genesis* or *The Stories of Genesis*.³¹

In this introduction, Gunkel discusses the kinds of literature that are found in the book of Genesis, with the goal of defining the characteristics that distinguish "history" in the biblical text from "legend."³² This differentiation is important for the study of the sea in the OT because Gunkel's presuppositional disbelief in the inspiration of Scripture and divine revelation directly influences his conclusions about how the OT came to present the sea in negative terms.

On the first page of *The Legends of Genesis*, Gunkel states clearly that he does

³⁰ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 151–250. The relevance of the negative motif to the dragon in Rev 12 will be discussed in chap. 6.

³¹ Hermann Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, trans. William Herbert Carruth, History of religion (Chicago: Open Court, 1901); Hermann Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History*, trans. William Herbert Carruth (New York: Schocken Books, 1964); Hermann Gunkel, *The Stories of Genesis*, ed. William R. Scott, trans. John. Scullion (Vallejo, CA: BIBAL Press, 1994).

³² Although included with his commentary on Genesis, Gunkel's definition of history and his categories of legends are impactful on the understanding of any OT text.

not believe that ancient peoples had the ability to record history as modern scholarship defines it: “Uncivilized races do not write history; they are incapable of reproducing their experiences objectively, and have no interest in leaving to posterity an authentic account of the events of their times. Experiences fade before they are fairly cold, and fact and fancy mingle.”³³ From this perspective, there are few parts in the entirety of the OT that can be considered history, although Gunkel also cautions his reader against equating ‘legend’ with what is ‘untrue.’³⁴

Gunkel’s goal is to delineate the difference between history and legend. The primary difference, according to Gunkel, is that legend is transmitted orally whereas history is usually written: “One of the chief points of difference is that legend is originally oral tradition, while history is usually found in written form. The writing down of an historical tradition serves to fix it, whereas oral tradition cannot remain uncorrupted for any length of time and is therefore inadequate to be the vehicle of history.”³⁵ He adds: “Between the origin of the primitive races of southwestern Asia and the appearance of the People of Israel upon the stage of life had rolled unnumbered millenniums; hence *there is no room for serious discussion over historical traditions* said to be possessed by Israel regarding those primitive times.”³⁶ On this basis, Gunkel strictly categorizes all of the text of Genesis as legend rather than history because of the amount of time intervening between the occurrence of the ancient events and the recording of them in a written document by the biblical author.³⁷ It follows that Gunkel considers the creation narrative and the flood narrative, to be legend and not history.

³³ Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 1.

³⁴ See the discussion of Gunkel’s inconsistency about whether legends are untrue in the Challenges section below.

³⁵ Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 3–4.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 6. Emphasis added.

³⁷ It should be noted that Gunkel’s approach to the biblical text had no category for divine

In the commentary proper, Gunkel, following the documentary hypothesis, completely subdivides the text by source, first commenting on the verses determined to be from J, next on the verses from P, and so on. This differentiation does not have a significant impact on the discussion of Genesis 1, since all of Genesis 1:1–2:4 is considered to be from P. Concerning the flood story, however, Gunkel states, “The distinction between the J and P sources is a masterpiece of modern criticism.”³⁸ The text of the flood story is surgically separated, verse by verse, to distinguish between the J and P sources, and Gunkel’s comments about them consider the flood story from J separately from the flood story from P.

Concerning the creation story in Genesis 1 Gunkel argues that the biblical author received much of the content from older traditions which had gradually diluted to the point that unacceptable elements such as polytheism and primordial monsters had faded away. He also addresses the connection between darkness and the sea that appears in Genesis 1:2, writing, “The concept of darkness belongs with *Tehom*. In the Babylonian tradition, too, primordial sea and darkness appear together.”³⁹ But Gunkel does not ignore the fact that many other cosmogonies also present darkness in the beginning. He states, “We also find the doctrine that the world developed out of darkness among the Babylonians, Egyptians, Indians, Phoenicians, Greeks, Chinese, etc. The night is the first, the original, the light the beginning of the current world.”⁴⁰

Gunkel considers it significant that there is a contrast between the goodness of the light and the negativity that surrounds darkness and the sea. He explains: “Light is the first creation. Without light there can be no life and no order. Before light the world was

revelation to the biblical author. Refer to the section “Challenges” below.

³⁸ Gunkel, *Genesis*, 138–39.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

dark, lifeless, chaotic. Darkness and Chaos are horrible. Sheol, where there is no light, is also horrible. Light is good and beneficial.”⁴¹ Gunkel sees a connection between the chaotic sea, darkness, and Sheol in Genesis 1. His commentary in *Genesis*, including in the introduction *The Legends of Genesis*, contains much material relevant to the study of the sea as a negative motif in the OT.

Israel and Babylon, 1903

In *Israel and Babylon* Gunkel joined many other scholars of the first few years of the twentieth century in responding to Friedrich Delitzsch’s lectures on the influence of Babylonian myths upon the biblical authors.⁴² Gunkel’s responses to Delitzsch reveal his commitment to the church and shed light on his desire to present scholarly findings about the relationship between the Bible and ANE myth in a way that would not harm the faith of the common church member.

Delitzsch had delivered a series of lectures entitled “Babel and Bible” that had attracted much public attention and ignited a debate about the impact of the recent Babylonian discoveries upon the study of the OT. Even the German Emperor, Kaiser Wilhelm II, was interested, and he arranged for Delitzsch to deliver the first lecture before him twice.⁴³ Delitzsch intentionally positioned ‘Babel’ before ‘Bible’ in his title to indicate the priority of the Babylonian sources that he argued were influential to the

⁴¹ Gunkel, *Genesis*, 107.

⁴² Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, trans. E. S. B. (Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey, 1904). For the text of Delitzsch’s two lectures, see Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible: Two Lectures on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion, Embodying the Most Important Criticisms and the Author’s Replies*, trans. Thomas J. McCormack and William Herbert Carruth (Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co., 1903). Many publications made up the scholarly conversation that followed Delitzsch’s lectures, of which Gunkel and Delitzsch were only a part. Delitzsch responded to several who published articles or books on the subject. For a list of several publications that were part of the scholarly conversation, see Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, 117ff.

⁴³ See Herbert B. Huffman, “Babel Und Bibel: The Encounter Between Babylon and the Bible,” in *Backgrounds for the Bible*, ed. Michael Patrick O’Connor and David Noel Freedman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 125–36.

biblical authors. Gunkel, in turn, showed opposition to Delitzsch in the title of his publication *Israel and Babylon*, reversing Delitzsch's order to emphasize his belief that the biblical account was more important than the Babylonian sources.

Although Gunkel and Delitzsch agreed that the Babylonian myths formed part of the background of the biblical texts, Gunkel disagreed with Delitzsch's manner of presenting the information as well as on many points of biblical interpretation about which he believed Delitzsch was patently wrong. He remarked that Delitzsch should have stayed in his lane as an Assyriologist and left biblical interpretation to theologians, and he begged Delitzsch to consult a theologian in order to redress the problems that were to be found in his lectures.⁴⁴

One of the differences between Gunkel and Delitzsch lay in their estimations of the value of the Babylonian literature relative to that of the OT. Gunkel's response to Delitzsch demonstrates that although he (Gunkel) believed the Babylonian traditions to be the source of the biblical material, he considered the OT to be a greater testimony to God's work in the world. Gunkel wrote,

How incomparably superior the Hebrew legend is to the Babylonian! Should we not really be delighted at having found in this Babylonian parallel a criterion for estimating the real sublimity of the conception of God in Israel, a conception of so much intrinsic power that it can purge and recast in such a manner material so repellent and outlandish? And this also we may say, that the Babylonian legend strongly impresses us by its barbaric character, whereas the Hebrew legend is far nearer and more human to us. Even granting that we have been accustomed from childhood to the Hebrew legends, we yet learn from this example that in our whole

⁴⁴ Gunkel wrote, "May the Assyriologist, who wishes to speak on Old Testament matters, call the theologian into consultation if he does not feel himself absolutely firm in this subject! So Delitzsch, whom we prize highly as Assyriologist and Hebraic philologist, would have done well, perhaps, if he had used the advice of some expert and cautious specialist in the Old Testament before he offered his opinion on Old Testament religion to the general public. Perhaps the specialist would have pointed out to him in time where some linguistic oversight had escaped him, or where he had quite omitted to consult the original text. He would not have allowed hazardous opinions concerning the interpretations of many Biblical passages to escape him [Delitzsch], or otherwise would have pointed out incorrect or dubious assertions of all kinds, he would have taken pains to explain our understanding of the Old Testament by the history of religion, he would have tried to show him [Delitzsch] that he far undervalued the Old Testament religion, and he would have warned him against entering into questions of systematic theology." Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 20.

world of ideas we owe far more to these Hebrews than to the Babylonians.⁴⁵

Delitzsch, on the other hand, esteemed the Babylonian literature as preserving a purer and better teaching about God than that found in the OT. Perceiving Delitzsch's low regard for the OT, Gunkel wrote a letter to the editors at the Chicago publishing company that had printed Delitzsch's first lecture in English in order to express his grave concern over the direction in which Delitzsch was moving theologically.⁴⁶ He wrote,

You are to be commended for having made the American public acquainted with Delitzsch's *Babel and Bible*, for the little book contains an extraordinary amount of stimulating and instructive matter, and it has been cleverly constructed, so as to appeal at once to the great reading public. Yet while there is no direct polemical attack made in it against the Bible, you will nevertheless understand that we theologians have witnessed the appearance of this essay and the great sensation which it has made with solicitude, nay even with distress; for the impression which it is inevitably destined to make on the unprepared reader is one that we could never wish to see.⁴⁷

Gunkel's response to the first lecture proved an accurate prediction of Delitzsch's future developments on the subject. What had begun as the efforts of a well-known professor of Assyriology to praise the achievements of research and archaeology in the field and to garner public support for those efforts developed into a platform from which Delitzsch would assert the superiority of Babylonian cultural, moral, and legal systems over those found in the OT. He would eventually call for the ejection of the OT from the Bible and deny that it was the inspired Word of God.⁴⁸ Gunkel, in spite of his evident concern that Delitzsch's lectures might have negative effects on the unprepared public, also stated, "We hail Delitzsch as a colleague in the battle against the delusion of assuming that the Old Testament is verbally inspired, as though its religion were in some way fallen from

⁴⁵ Quoted in Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, 136.

⁴⁶ But see also below the section on the challenges Gunkel faced because of his own disbelief that the OT was the inspired word of God.

⁴⁷ Quoted in Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, 136.

⁴⁸ See Huffman, "Babel Und Bibel."

heaven, and had grown without human aid and without history.”⁴⁹

Thus, Gunkel’s primary reservation about Delitzsch’s work was not that it was contrary to Christian belief about the historicity of the OT, but rather that his lectures were prematurely delivered to the untrained, non-academic public too soon and without including the perspective of theologians.⁵⁰ A second theologian who took issue with Delitzsch for failing to reference the contributions that OT scholars had already brought to the study of ANE literary findings was C. H. Cornill, who wrote,

Babel and Bible offers nothing essentially new to Old Testament scholars. There is doubtless not a single professor of Old Testament research in any German university that has not already told all these things to his students in his lectures on Genesis. And Delitzsch does not gainsay this. He maintains only that the world at large has as yet heard very little of the silent labors of the Assyriologists and that it is now time for this knowledge to burst the barriers of the scholars’ study and enter the broad path of life.⁵¹

The reader can perceive the irritation felt by Gunkel and Cornill at Delitzsch’s way of taking credit as if he alone had made a groundbreaking discovery in a realm in which OT theologians had been working for some time. Yet the scholarly debate between Gunkel and Delitzsch also highlights their agreement that the negative representation of the sea in the OT has its source in Babylonian mythology.

Articles and Other Work

Gunkel published several journal articles on a variety of texts. One series of these, published in *The Biblical World* in 1903, comprised short interpretations of various Psalms, some of which relate directly to the study of the sea in the OT.⁵² For example, in

⁴⁹ Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 46.

⁵⁰ It may also be noted that resulting from the lecture series Delitzsch achieved fame across the world, access to the German Emperor (including a private meeting at the Emperor’s residence), that the material in the lectures had significant overlap with the material Gunkel published six years prior in *Creation and Chaos* and *Genesis*, and that Delitzsch did not mention Gunkel or any theologian’s work in the lectures. The following statement from C. H. Cornill likely reflects Gunkel’s sentiments.

⁵¹ Quoted in Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, 132.

⁵² Hermann Gunkel, “Psalm 46: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 1 (1903): 28–

an article on Psalm 8 that specifically focuses on his understanding of verse 2, Gunkel incorporates the OT negativity about the sea to compare the strength which God established from the mouths of babies to the situation of the great deep being restrained by the sand of the sea shore. He writes, “To the infinite fury of the sea he set as a limit the sand: that which is scattered by each breeze must, according to God's will, restrain the primeval power of the waves.”⁵³

Gunkel’s contributions to the categorization of the psalms for the most part fall outside the scope of this dissertation, but the small book *Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction* has had a vast impact on the study of the book of Psalms.⁵⁴ Gunkel states in *Psalms* that his intention is to “disregard the more or less fortuitous context in which the materials have come down to us, and instead see them in their original context.”⁵⁵ Thus, he sought to understand each psalm in relationship to the circumstances surrounding its composition and use in worship, its *sitz im leben*, rather than according to its position in the Psalter. He believed that if a psalm was primarily composed for use in a specific festival, then that information should influence its interpretation. Gunkel would go on to spend the balance of his lifetime working on Psalms, a labor which culminated in a book that had to be completed by Joachim Begrich, who wrote, “Hermann Gunkel died 11 March 1932 without being able to complete his great work on Psalms. While he was still

31; Gunkel, “Psalm 1: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 2 (1903): 120–23; Gunkel, “Psalm 8: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 3 (1903): 206–9; Gunkel, “Psalm 103: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 22, no. 3 (1903): 209–15; Gunkel, “Psalm 19:1-6: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 4 (1903): 281–83; Gunkel, “Psalm 137: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 22, no. 4 (1903): 290–93; Gunkel, “Psalm 24: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 5 (1903): 366–70; Gunkel, “Psalm 149: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 22, no. 5 (1903): 363–66; Gunkel, “Psalms 42 and 43: An Interpretation,” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 6 (1903): 433–39.

⁵³ Gunkel, “Psalm 8: An Interpretation,” 207.

⁵⁴ Hermann Gunkel, *The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction*, trans. Thomas M. Horner (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.

living, the great suffering of his last years forced him to give up one section of his *Introduction to Psalms* after another, until finally when I last saw him at Christmas, 1931, he placed the entire work in my hands.”⁵⁶

Challenges

During his lifetime, Gunkel faced opposition from the church to his arguments and conclusions. The first reason for this opposition was the fact that Gunkel could not maintain the traditional doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture.⁵⁷ Second, Gunkel was inconsistent and self-contradictory in certain areas, which are listed and discussed below.

Sacrifice of Inspiration

Gunkel was aware that his work had jettisoned the traditional doctrine of inspiration, and he accepted this result. According to him, the doctrine of inspiration had long been dead among theologians; “Theology,” he wrote, “has on all sides dropped that orthodox belief in inspiration, and dropped it long ago.”⁵⁸ He anticipated the rebuttal to his position, which was the argument that Jesus, the Apostles, and the NT authors had all accepted the OT as inspired Scripture, including such ‘unbelievable’ stories as the flood narrative and the story of Jonah’s three days and nights in the belly of a fish. He responded,

The objection is raised that Jesus and the Apostles clearly considered these accounts to be fact and not poetry. Suppose they did; the men of the New Testament are not presumed to have been exceptional men in such matters but shared the point of view

⁵⁶ Hermann Gunkel and Joachim Begrich, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*, trans. James D. Nogalski (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), vii.

⁵⁷ Gunkel had no interest in holding to the established doctrines of the church. He wrote, “What is left of the Old Testament? This question takes for granted that much of the Old Testament which was a matter of faith for past generations has ceased to hold that position in our minds, and that we are neither able nor anxious to retain all that our forefathers thought they possessed in the Old Testament.” Hermann Gunkel, *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, trans. A. K. Dallas (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2016), 13.

⁵⁸ Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 46-47.

of their time. Hence we are not warranted in looking to the New Testament for a solution of questions in the literary history of the Old Testament.⁵⁹

In other words, he believed that the Apostles were uneducated, common men whose opinions about the truthfulness of the OT are not to be trusted.

Gunkel was also aware of the opposition in the church to the prevailing scholarly understanding of the OT, including the documentary hypothesis and Gunkel's own theories about the presence of legend and myth in the OT. He summarized it thus:

Among the accusations made by churchfolk against contemporary Old Testament research none is so frequently heard or so serious as the charge that Old Testament criticism is destroying belief in divine revelation. What is meant by this is that modern Old Testament scholars interpret so much of the narrative of the Old Testament as legend or myth; deny the historicity of so many individuals mentioned in its pages, or reveal them in a new secular light; show that so many of the sacred writings of the Old Testament were written not by the highly respected authors to whom they have hitherto been ascribed, but by unknown writers; break up so many of the books into a confusing number of individual "written sources" and a still greater abundance of emendations and glosses; that they have reduced the sacred history of the Old Testament . . . to a disordered chaos . . . in which it is impossible to discern the hand of the powerful God.⁶⁰

In response to this opposition, Gunkel did not deny that his research implied the things listed. He did not claim the accusations to be inaccurate or unfounded. Instead he apologized that perhaps his and his colleagues' presentation of information had not been conducted in a gentle enough spirit to avoid offense. He wrote,

What response does Old Testament Criticism have for this charge? It may also be admitted that the Old Testament critic has sometimes gone a bit too far, and that possibly in the future many biblical traditions, which at present are discarded or are regarded as from a late date, will return to their honored place. Finally, it cannot be denied that here and there a destructive and profane spirit has been allowed to intrude itself into our work.⁶¹

But Gunkel also argued, in the introduction to *Creation and Chaos*, that his conclusions were not at odds with the concept of divine revelation: "Thus, I believe myself to be

⁵⁹ Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 3.

⁶⁰ Hermann Gunkel, *Elijah, Yahweh, and Baal*, trans. K. C. Hanson (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014), 1–2.

⁶¹ Gunkel, *Elijah, Yahweh, and Baal*, 1–2.

protected against misunderstanding, as if perhaps by proving that Israel did not lie outside the realm of world culture, I deny the particularity of Israelite religion and, in turn, lead to the destruction of the belief that in this history God has revealed himself in a special way.”⁶² Gunkel did not think his conclusions were incompatible with the premise that God had revealed himself and that the divine revelation had ended up in the pages of the OT.

Inconsistency

A second problem that exists in Gunkel’s work is inconsistency. The first example of this regards the question of whether legends are true or untrue. In a single work, Gunkel both states that people should not understand legends as untrue and also defines legends as stories that everyone knows are untrue. He writes that “the senseless confusion of ‘legend’ with ‘lying’ has caused good people to hesitate to concede that there are legends in the Old Testament.”⁶³ Then, only a few pages later, he explains that one of the ways to identify legends in the text is to look for incredibility—the sections that simply cannot be true. Offering several examples of incredibility, he explains,

Thus many things are reported in Genesis which go directly against our better knowledge: we know that there are too many species of animals for all to have been assembled in any ark; that Ararat is not the highest mountain on earth; that the “firmament of heaven,” of which Genesis 1:6 ff. speaks, is not a reality, but an optical illusion; that the stars cannot have come into existence after plants, as Genesis 2:10–14 reports; that the rivers of the earth do not come chiefly from four principal streams, as Genesis 2 thinks; that the Tigris and the Euphrates have not a common source; that the Dead Sea had been in existence long before human beings came to live in Palestine, instead of originating in historical times; and so on. . . .

Any other conclusion is impossible from the point of view of our modern historical science, which is not a figment of imagination but is based upon the observation of facts. And however cautious the modern historian may be in declaring anything impossible, he may declare with all confidence that animals—serpents and she-asses, for instance—do not speak and never have spoken, that there is no tree whose fruit confers immortality or knowledge, that angels and men do not have carnal connection, and that a world-conquering army cannot be defeated—as

⁶² Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, xl.

⁶³ Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 2–3.

Genesis 14 declares—with three hundred and eighteen men.⁶⁴ Finally, in *Elijah, Yahweh, and Baal*, Gunkel states, “Modern research . . . is unable, out of respect for truth, to accept the present tradition in the Old Testament without alteration.”⁶⁵ In spite of his brief statements that the identification of a story as legend does not necessarily mean the story is untrue, the fact remains that Gunkel spends much more time demonstrating that the testimony of the OT cannot be true. In a confusing conclusion to the matter, Gunkel writes, “The evangelical churches and their chosen representatives would do well not to dispute the fact that Genesis contains legends—as has been done too frequently—but to recognize that the knowledge of this fact is the indispensable condition to an historical understanding of Genesis.”⁶⁶

Another internal conflict in Gunkel’s work regards how broad the intersection needs to be between a biblical text and ANE myth for one to argue for the influence of the latter on the former. The arguments in *Creation and Chaos* for the relationship between the OT and ANE myth are often based on the commonality of a single name or a descriptive phrase that occurs in both the Babylonian text and the OT. Peter Jensen, a contemporary, described the problem: “Wherever the Old Testament mentions a struggle of Yahveh against serpents and crocodile-like creatures, there is no occasion to assume with Delitzsch and with a goodly number of other Assyriologists [add: also with Gunkel and most Old Testament theologians] a reference to the Babylonian myth of the struggle with Tiamat.”⁶⁷ Jensen argued in 1902 that the leading OT theologians and Assyriologists, including Delitzsch and Gunkel, were too anxious to find points of connection where none existed.

⁶⁴ Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 7–8.

⁶⁵ Gunkel, *Elijah, Yahweh, and Baal*, 3.

⁶⁶ Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 12.

⁶⁷ Quoted in Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, 160. Bracketed statement inserted by Delitzsch.

Interestingly, Gunkel also states, “Modern criticism has, up to the present, often overlooked the significance of oral tradition, and is, all too often, inclined to conclude a *literary* dependence in the case of every point of tangency between two writings!!”⁶⁸ His primary point here is that there is no need to argue for the OT authors’ having had a physical copy of *Enuma elish* in front of them when they wrote, because such stories can spread from one person to another by word of mouth.⁶⁹ But his statement also reiterates the point made by Jensen, namely that there exists a temptation to propose dependence anywhere the OT and the Babylonian myth have the slightest intersection, and that he himself is not immune from that temptation.

Conclusion

Examination of the negative motif of the sea in the OT calls attention to many biblical passages that were also examined by Hermann Gunkel. Gunkel contended that the OT had inherited its negativity about the sea from the faded myths of pagan peoples in the ANE. His work has been both praised and opposed by OT scholars of each generation. The next chapter introduces those scholars’ responses to Gunkel as well as their distinctive contributions to the study of the negative motif of the sea in the OT.

⁶⁸ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 306n100. Emphasis original.

⁶⁹ Gunkel expressed similar frustration with Delitzsch: “Delitzsch seems here as in other cases to incline to the opinion that the Biblical authors had the Babylonian legend lying before them in writing, and that it was translated and revised by them with full deliberation.” Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 30–31.

CHAPTER 3

HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP

Gunkel's work prompted deeper investigation into the negative motif of the sea in the OT and the proposed hypothesis that biblical authors inherited that negativity from older myths. Around the time of Gunkel's death, archaeologists recovered ancient literature from the Canaanite city of Ugarit that included myths about a divine battle between Baal and Yam (the sea).¹ The content of these stories is discussed in the following chapter on ANE myths. The discovery at Ugarit caused scholars to pick up where Gunkel's work left off and rework his ideas in light of the "new" material. This chapter introduces the rest of the scholars who have contributed to the study of the sea in OT and ANE literature. Their work, like Gunkel's, is relevant because the biblical texts that have been attributed to ANE mythological sources are the texts that reveal this motif the most clearly. It is the OT negativity about the sea that has led some scholars to believe that the biblical authors were influenced by ANE myths in which the sea is also negatively portrayed. Other scholars have attempted to dismantle Gunkel's arguments, to

¹ For an account of the rediscovery of the ancient city of Ugarit, also known as Ras Shamra, see Peter C. Craigie, *Ugarit and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 7ff. The content of the Ugaritic myths will be discussed in chap. 4. Noteworthy works on the Ugaritic myths that will not be individually discussed in this chapter include the following: Arvid S. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1952); Norman C. Habel, *Yahweh versus Baal: A Conflict of Religious Cultures; A Study in the Relevance of Ugaritic Materials for the Early Faith of Israel*, (New York: Bookman Associates, 1964); Helmer Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973); John C. L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, ed. G. R. Driver, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1978); Carola Kloos, *Yhwh's Combat With the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorschot; Brill, 1986); Izak Cornelius, *The Iconography of the Canaanite Gods Reshef and Ba'al: Late Bronze and Iron Age I Periods (C 1500-1000 BCE)* (Fribourg, Switzerland: University Press, 1994); Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary of KTU 1.3-1.4*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1994); N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilmilku and His Colleagues* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

display the lack of evidence for an actual connection between the OT text and ANE myths, and to discuss this negativity without attributing it to the influence of pagan myths.

Significant Contributors

The scholars in this chapter have written the most significant works on the subject of the sea in the OT and the ANE context of myths that involve the sea.² John Ray is the only scholar introduced in this chapter who predates Gunkel. Arent Wensinck's work and the lectures by Leonard King were published during Gunkel's lifetime, but neither mention him in any significant way. Conversely, all the scholars who have written after Gunkel's death include his work as a foundational basis of their research.

John Ray, 1693

John Ray's *Three Physico-Theological Discourses Concerning I. The Primitive Chaos, and Creation of the World. II. The General Deluge, Its Causes and Effects. III. The Dissolution of the World, and Future Conflagration* was published over 200 years prior to Hermann Gunkel's *Creation and Chaos*.³ In addition to writing theological texts, Ray traveled extensively and studied plants and animals.⁴ He had no access to Babylonian or Canaanite Ugaritic myths, but he compared OT texts about the watery deep to statements from the ancient sources available to him, which describe the

² The sections below are separated by scholar and include the date of their most significant publication on the subject of the sea in the OT. Lesser contributions made by them and other scholars have been included in footnotes where they are related to the primary scholar of the section. Commentaries and other works that are not primarily about the sea in the OT or ANE myth will be included when relevant OT verses are discussed in chap. 6.

³ John Ray, *Three Physico-Theological Discourses Concerning I. The Primitive Chaos, and Creation of the World. II. The General Deluge, Its Causes and Effects. III. The Dissolution of the World, and Future Conflagration*, 2nd ed. (London: Printed for William Innys, at the West End of St. Paul's, 1693).

⁴ See Charles Earle Raven, *John Ray: Naturalist, His Life and Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950).

chaotic sea that covered the world in the beginning.⁵ For example, Hesiod writes, “First of all there was a chaos. . . . From chaos proceeded Hell and Night (or Darkness).”⁶ Ray explored what the ancient writers meant by “chaos” and included Lactantius’ explanation, which, disapprovingly, says of Hesiod, “[He does not take] his beginning from God the creator of all things, but from the chaos, which is a rude and inordinate heap of confused matter.”⁷ Thus, Ray demonstrates that the ancient writers, both religious and nonbelieving, looked with no favor on the initial chaos.

Ray also argues that the ancients who describe the chaos before creation were not necessarily at odds with the teachings of Scripture, depending on whether they attributed the chaos itself to the hand of the creator. What he disapproved of in ancient teachings about creation was the implication that the chaos was preexistent matter, not formed by God. Ray states, “That which I chiefly dislike in this opinion of theirs is, that they make not mention of the Creation of this Chaos, but seem to look upon it as self-existent and improduced.”⁸ Nonetheless, he did not categorically disapprove of ancient writers describing the world at the beginning as a chaotic mess similar to what is found in Genesis 1:2. Ray continues,

This opinion of a chaos, if soberly understood, not as self-existent and improduced, but in the first place created by God, and preceding other beings, which were made out of it, is not, so far as I can discern, any way repugnant to the Holy Scripture, but on the contrary rather consonant with it and agreeable thereto. For Moses in history and description of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis, saith not that God created all things in an instant in their full state and perfection, but that he proceeded gradually and in order, from more imperfect to more perfect beings, first beginning with the Earth, that is, the terraqueous globe, which was made *tohu vabohu*, without form and void, and waters covering the face of the land, which were afterwards

⁵ Ray includes quotes from Hesiod (ca. 700 BC), Anaxagoras (500–428 BC), Euripides (484–406 BC), Aristophanes (450–388 BC), Ovid (43 BC–AD 17), Lucan (AD 39–65), and Lactantius (AD 240–320). Ray, *Three Physico-theological Treatises*, 2–4.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 2–3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 4–5.

separated from the land, and gathered together in one place.⁹

The ancient writers believed that the world began with chaos. Ray indicates that if they mean a chaos that was itself created by God, then they are in agreement with the testimony of the OT. However, if this chaos is said to preexist God's creative work, then they are at odds with Scripture. In a short chapter of only a few pages, Ray introduces what the OT and several ancient writers have said about the negativity that surrounds the chaotic sea in biblical and extrabiblical literature.

Arent Wensinck, 1918

Arent Jan Wensinck was a Dutch scholar whose work on the sea and other motifs in the OT written a century ago has gone almost completely unnoticed.¹⁰ *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites* is the second of three works that he published that examine motifs in the OT and ancient Western Semitic literature.¹¹

In *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites*, Wensinck compiles all the available information about the sea from ancient writings in the Western Semitic languages.¹² He includes the myths, legends, and pedagogy of all Western Semitic peoples from the earliest known sources up to Syriac Christian and Arabic Muslim teachings. He tracks what ancient literature has said about the ocean in terms of

⁹ Ray, *Three Physico-theological Treatises*, 5.

¹⁰ One of the only scholars to reference Wensinck in biblical scholarship from 1918–2018 was B. S. Childs, who noted Wensinck's work on the Navel of the Earth. See Brevard S. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* (Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1960), 86. Outside of biblical scholarship, several Islamic studies have referenced Wensinck because of his work with ancient Arabic sources and his contributions as an Islamicist.

¹¹ Arent Jan Wensinck, *The Ideas of the Western Semites Concerning the Navel of the Earth* (Amsterdam: Müller, 1916); Wensinck, *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites* (Amsterdam: Müller, 1918); and Wensinck, *Tree and Bird as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia* (Amsterdam: Müller, 1921).

¹² Note also that the Ugaritic myths were not discovered until well after he published *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites*. See also Leonard William King, *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition. The Schweich Lectures, 1916*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1918).

cosmogony and cosmography and what these stories reveal about the character of the ocean. He demonstrates that the sea was frequently portrayed negatively in literature, although some ancient sources also depict positive characteristics.

Wensinck mentions that Gunkel had previously collected several scattered verses about the sea in the OT that were potentially myth-related, but he does not directly interact with Gunkel's arguments.¹³ Gunkel had published *Creation and Chaos* just over 20 years prior to Wensinck's work on the sea, and the latter indicates his appreciation for the quality of the former's text. However, Wensinck does not react in support of or in opposition to Gunkel's conclusions about the Babylonian influence on the OT, even though they both reference many of the same passages in their analysis.¹⁴

Wensinck first describes the sea in terms of cosmogony, an aspect present in all the ancient sources. He recounts that, in the biblical story of creation, the sea is described as covering the whole world before it is rebuked by God and contained within boundaries that it cannot cross. Wensinck writes, "The earth, in the beginning, is covered by the waters; the creation of the earth into a cosmos consists really in God's rebuking away the water, the chaotic element. The hostile character of the water, its fiendish nature, is accentuated by the addition: Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over."¹⁵ He considers the fact that God rebuked the sea and restrained it to be a significant testimony against the character of the sea.

Wensinck also summarizes the Semitic cosmography of the sea based on

¹³ Wensinck, *The Ocean*, 1.

¹⁴ It is possible that Wensinck intentionally avoided discussing Gunkel and the Babylonian material because the scope of his work was restricted to the Western Semitic languages.

¹⁵ Wensinck, *The Ocean*, 2. He also referenced literature that mentioned God's restraint of the sea at creation. In addition to the biblical text, he quoted Bereshit Rabba in which a mountain fortress holds back the sea, and Midrash Tanhuma in which God restrained the ocean with the Torah itself. Cf. H. Freedman et al., *The Midrash Rabbah*, compact ed. (London: Soncino Press, 1977), and John T. Townsend, *Midrash Tanhuma* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1989).

several biblical and extrabiblical sources:

We find that according to Semitic cosmography, the three parts of the universe: heaven, earth and nether world, each have their ocean. . . . Still, it would be wrong, I think, to say that the Semitic peoples, or some of them, have known three oceans. The word Tehom, which the Northern Semites use, is not a *nomen appellativum* but a proper noun. This in itself points to the unity of the ocean. They speak of the nether Tehom and of the upper Tehom; but it is apparently one, with three divisions.¹⁶

Wensinck draws on the consensus of several ancient sources to describe what the Western Semites generally believed about the cosmogony and cosmography of the ocean.

Wensinck highlights the relationship between the creation account and the story of the flood, writing, “The relation between the cosmogony and the deluge is of so close a nature that one can almost be considered as a repetition of the other. . . . The water of the deluge is the return of the primaeval ocean.”¹⁷ He also describes the creation and flood accounts as the restraining of the rebellious ocean and directly connects these OT stories to the absence of the sea in Revelation 21:1.¹⁸ He concludes with the following:

So we find literary remains of the old strife between the creating god and the rebellious ocean. The latter has been tamed in the beginning, but it has not been annihilated. It is only in the end of days that this will happen; when the ocean is annihilated, the world will have rest; therefore it is said in the Apocalypse: And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.¹⁹

Wensinck also reveals that the sea fulfills multiple roles in the OT. In some passages, it is portrayed rebellious and deserving of rebuke and restraint. In others, it is an instrument in God’s hands that serves to accomplish His will exactly as He desires. Wensinck highlights a pattern: the passages in which the sea plays a negative or rebellious role are related to ANE myths, whereas those in which the sea is an instrument

¹⁶ Wensinck, *The Ocean*, 36.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 13.

¹⁸ See discussion of Rev 21:1 in chap. 6.

¹⁹ Wensinck, *The Ocean*, 5.

in the hands of God are purely monotheistic without evidence of demythologization. He writes,

Comparing the nature of the ocean as it is described in mythological and semi-mythological passages, with its character in those literary products which might be styled monotheistic, a point of difference is to be noted at once: in the former class of passages the ocean bears the character of a being hostile to the creating god; in the latter class it has become the one god's instrument, or his resting-place.²⁰

Wensinck indicates that the sea is negative and hostile in passages that have likely been influenced by pagan mythology, in which many gods vied for dominance, and the sea was often a force that fought against them in battle.²¹ In the “purely monotheistic” passages, the sea does not have the ability to rebel, because only one being has ultimate authority.

Wensinck describes the sea as a negative entity because of its association with darkness, death, and chaos in the OT. Concerning the two-sided nature of the sea, Wensinck explains, “On the one hand it appears as the chief enemy of the god of the creation; on the other, as an instrument in the hands of almighty God. . . . On the one hand it is an ungodly, negative, chaotic power, . . . the realm of death. . . . On the other hand it is a productive, positive, cosmic power, . . . the place of paradise where the fountain of life springs.”²² He reveals that the sea is also at times portrayed with certain positive characteristics in Western Semitic literature. However, it should be noted that in the section on the sea as a positive power, he does not reference any OT passages but only extrabiblical materials.²³ For example, Jacob of Edessa describes God’s hovering over the waters in Genesis 1:2 as like the brooding of a hen. Wensinck further explains

²⁰ Wensinck, *The Ocean*, 1.

²¹ Several ocean-related ANE myths will be introduced in chap. 4.

²² Wensinck, *The Ocean*, 40.

²³ Although he had mentioned Gen 49:5 (“the blessings of Tehom beneath”) earlier in the treatise, he did not refer back to it in the section on Tehom as a positive power.

that, in “The Cave of Treasures,” God’s brooding over the waters blesses them with the ability to produce.²⁴ Wensinck highlights the sea as the source of the fountain of life in Semitic literature, but again, this positivity is found only in extrabiblical literature, including the book of Enoch and the Romance of Alexander, rather than in the canonical OT.²⁵

Mary K. Wakeman, 1973

The 1960s and 70s saw a resurgence of scholarly conversation about the OT motifs related to the sea and the possible influence of ANE myths.²⁶ Mary Wakeman

²⁴ Wensinck, *The Ocean*, 56.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 57. He points to Enoch 17 (Hebrew/Aramaic), to Pseudo-Callisthenes’ “Romance of Alexander” (Greek), to the teachings the Talmud (Hebrew), and to Ibn al-Wardi (Arabic) who locate the fountain of life in places that are either explicitly or implicitly identified with Tehom.

²⁶ B. S. Child’s *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* may have precipitated the renewed interest in the subject. The following resources demonstrate the level of scholarly interest in the subject of the sea, chaos, and myth in the OT in the 1960’s and 70’s, not individually introduced elsewhere: Books: Brevard S. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* (Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1960); S. G. F. Brandon, *Creation Legends of the Ancient Near East* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963); Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963); Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963); Norman C. Habel, *Yahweh versus Baal: A Conflict of Religious Cultures; A Study in the Relevance of Ugaritic Materials for the Early Faith of Israel* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1964); K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Chicago: InterVarsity Press, 1966); Bernhard W. Anderson, *Creation Versus Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible* (New York: Association Press, 1967); Walter E. Rast, *Tradition History and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973); Helmer Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East*. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973); J. W. Rogerson, *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974); Bruce K. Waltke, *Creation and Chaos: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Biblical Cosmogony* (Portland, OR: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1974); Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*, Harvard Dissertations in Religion 9 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976); Peter C. Craigie, *Ugaritic Studies, 1972-1976* (Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary, 1976); John C. L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, ed. G. R. Driver, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1978); Othmar Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (New York: Seabury Press, 1978). Chapters: Frank Moore Cross, “The Divine Warrior in Israel’s Early Cult,” in *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 11–30; Cyrus H. Gordon, “Leviathan: Symbol of Evil,” in *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 1–9; John G. Gammie, “Behemoth and Leviathan: On the Didactic and Theological Significance of Job 40:15–41:26,” in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), 217–31; Hans Gottlieb, “Myth in the Psalms,” in *Myths in the Old Testament*, trans. Frederick Cryer (London: SCM Press, 1980), 62–93; Knud Jeppesen, “Myth in the Prophetic Literature,” in

published *God's Battle with the Monster* in 1973. In it, she recaps Gunkel's earlier work, adding the Ugaritic material and proposing a different approach to the analysis of the impact of ANE myths on the OT.²⁷ Wakeman recounts all of the relevant ANE myths in which a deity battles against a monster, underlining the common themes to consolidate these elements into a generic ANE myth about a divine battle against a monster.²⁸ She then looks for traces of that myth in the OT. She states the following: "I have attempted to arrive at a general understanding of what the myth of a battle between monster and god

Myths in the Old Testament, trans. Frederick Cryer (London: SCM Press, 1980), 94–123; Benedikt Otzen, "The Concept of Myth," in *Myths in the Old Testament*, trans. Frederick Cryer (London: SCM Press, 1980), 1–21; Benedikt Otzen, "The Use of Myth in Genesis," in *Myths in the Old Testament*, trans. Frederick Cryer (London: SCM Press, 1980), 22–61. Journal articles: Umberto Cassuto, "Baal and Mot in the Ugaritic Texts," *Israel Exploration Journal* 12, no. 2 (1962): 77–86; Harold Forshey, "Apologetics and Historical Criticism," *Restoration Quarterly* 6, no. 4 (1962): 217–28; Loren R. Fisher, "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 15, no. 3 (July 1965): 313–24; Dennis J. McCarthy, "Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (July 1967): 393–406; Joseph Gutmann, "Leviathan, Behemoth and Ziz: Jewish Messianic Symbols in Art," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 39 (1968): 219–30; Mary K. Wakeman, "Biblical Earth Monster in the Cosmogonic Combat Myth," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88, no. 3 (September 1969): 313–20; Errol M. McGuire, "Yahweh and Leviathan: An Exegesis of Isaiah 27:1," *Restoration Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (1970): 165–79; Peter C. Craigie, "Egyptian Expression in the Song of the Sea (Exodus 15:4)," *Vetus Testamentum* 20, no. 1 (January 1970): 83–86; Walter Brueggemann, "Kingship and Chaos: A Study in Tenth Century Theology," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (July 1971): 317–32; J. V. Kinnier Wilson, "Return to the Problems of Behemoth and Leviathan," *Vetus Testamentum* 25, no. 1 (January 1975): 1–14; Bruce K. Waltke, "Creation Account in Genesis 1:1-3," *Bibliotheca sacra* 132, no. 527 (July 1975): 216–228; David M. Gunn, "Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, no. 4 (December 1, 1975): 493–508; Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky, "Atrahasis Epic and Its Significance for Our Understanding of Genesis 1-9," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 40, no. 4 (December 1977): 147–55; Friedemann W. Golka, "Aetiologies in the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 27, no. 1 (January 1977): 36–47; Elmer B. Smick, "Another Look at the Mythological Elements in the Book of Job," *The Westminster Theological Journal* 40, no. 2 (1978): 213–28. Dissertations: Robert Harold Beatty, "The History of Tradition Criticism with Special Reference to the Works of Hermann Gunkel, Hugo Gressmann, and Sigmund Mowinckel" (Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, 1962); Leonard J. Coppes, "Hermann Gunkel: A Presentation and Evaluation of His Contributions to Biblical Research--Chiefly in the Area of Old Testament" (Th.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1968); Johannes C. de Moor, "The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu, According to the Version of Ilmilku" (Ph.D. diss., Vrije Universiteit, 1971); Stanley V. Udd, "An Evaluation of the Mythological Hermeneutic in Light of the Old Testament Usage of the Leviathan Motif" (Th.D. diss., Grace Theological Seminary, 1980).

²⁷ Mary K. Wakeman, *God's Battle with the Monster* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1973).

²⁸ Frank Moore Cross noted that there existed a "ubiquitous motif of the cosmogonic battle between the creator god and the Sea in West Semitic mythology." Frank Moore Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," in *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 16.

is about. I have gathered together many different versions from diverse sources in order to avoid the error of taking any one as authoritative, as ‘the’ myth.”²⁹ Wakeman’s goal to combine all combat myths and produce a generic version depends on the assumption that all the known ANE myths in which a god battles a monster are related to each other in some way because of their common subject matter.³⁰ Wakeman’s work is unique in that she also considers the stories about a land-based monster, namely Behemoth, rather than just focusing on sea creatures. She writes, “Whereas [previous scholars] have restricted their consideration to an aquatic monster, I hope to show that an alternative account of the precreation conflict involving an earth monster also finds its way into the biblical poetic tradition and serves the same function as do the references to the battle with the sea monster.”³¹

Wakeman then attempts to demonstrate that remnants of the conflict myth must have been known in Israel because of the OT texts that mention the names of various monsters.³² She proposes that the biblical authors and their readers must have been generally aware of the ANE stories associated with these names. For example, Wakeman lists all the passages in the OT that mention the name Rahab.³³ Then, she discusses whether these passages refer to “the myth” or not. Wakeman also analyzes the parallels with other significant words, like serpent or sea, and examines the similarities

²⁹ Wakeman, *God’s Battle with the Monster*, 4. Her intention in the process of consolidating all myths into one generic plotline was to show no favoritism to one myth as the best example of the conflict motif. But as a result, all of her discussion and analysis was about a ‘myth’ that never actually existed as a unit on any tablet, parchment, or scroll from any language or people group.

³⁰ It would not make sense to reassemble the disparate versions of the plotline into a whole unless one assumes that the myths have descended from a common, more-ancient source.

³¹ Mary K. Wakeman, “Biblical Earth Monster in the Cosmogonic Combat Myth,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88, no. 3 (September 1969): 313.

³² Names mentioned in the OT that might be allusions to monsters from ANE mythology include Rahab, Leviathan, Behemoth, Tannin, and Tehom.

³³ Wakeman, *God’s Battle with the Monster*, 56-62.

between what the OT says about Rahab and how it is portrayed in ANE myths. She also addresses the actions taken by Yahweh against Rahab in the passages (crushing, piercing, and splitting) to demonstrate how they connect to the generic ANE myth where a deity performs similar actions against a monster.

The evidence that Wakeman presents is clear; there is no doubt that the OT texts she lists do include the name Rahab and that Yahweh destroys the monster using the action that she describes. However, one problem with this comparison is that neither Rahab nor an etymologically-related name is used in any ANE myth discovered to date.³⁴ Wakeman argues for a connection between OT texts and the generic ANE myth based only on the common plot elements of a god battling against a monster and the specific manner in which the deity defeats that monster.

H. W. F. Saggs, 1978

In 1978, H. W. F. Saggs published *The Encounter with the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel* in which he examines the evidence of previous scholars concerning the relationship between the Israelite religion and that of neighboring ANE peoples. Specifically responding to Gunkel's work, Saggs expresses that he is not satisfied with the quantity or quality of the evidence supporting a connection to ANE mythology. He states that Gunkel's conclusions exceed the evidence available:

What Gunkel proved was that there were on the one hand many fragmentary references to Yahweh overcoming a monster or the primordial sea, and on the other references to Yahweh operative in creation. The evidence that Gunkel actually adduced for an essential connection between the two series of mythological concepts is very slight; it consists of two passages from Psalms in which God's ownership and control of the world is mentioned alongside his victory over Leviathan or Rahab. These two themes are not necessarily causally connected, and the two series of myths could have existed side by side unrelated.³⁵

³⁴ Wakeman wrote, "Rahab is the (masculine) proper name of a mythological beast. It is found only in Israelite tradition and is in some passages identified with Egypt." Wakeman, *God's Battle with the Monster*, 59.

³⁵ H. W. F. Saggs, *The Encounter with the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel* (London: Athlone Press, 1978), 54.

According to Saggs, Gunkel's claims go further than the evidence allows. The fact that the Bible mentions a particular character, element of creation, or series of events that also appears in other ANE literature does not necessarily mean that the OT author intended to import all, or any, elements found in other literature. Demonstrating the presence of a common subject matter does not prove that one source had an influence on the other.

Saggs also responds to Gunkel's claim that the Babylonian goddess *tiamat* appears in Genesis 1:2 behind the word *tehom*. Saggs states, "Gen 1:1-2:4a . . . is completely free of personal beings other than God. Since Gunkel, many have accepted the view that this is the result of a demythologization of an earlier form in which *tehom* ('the deep') and possibly other elements in the story were personal beings. There is, however, little evidence to support such a hypothesis."³⁶ His statement summarizes the point God makes in Job 38–41: no other person, being, or force was present or involved in creation except for God.

Saggs criticizes Wakeman's reasoning. He highlights the way that she, at times, uses the absence of certain elements to prove a hypothesis. Many of Saggs's points also apply to Gunkel's work. Saggs writes the following:

The existence of something called "the myth"—a single all-embracing myth—is postulated, and the assumption is also made that we know substantially all the details of this hypothetical myth. The absence of particular details of the hypothetical myth where they might be expected is then taken not as a ground for querying the hypothetical reconstruction but, on the contrary, as *proof of the accuracy* of the reconstruction. Formally analysed, the argument appears to run thus:

X is absent.

If present, X would have been objectionable.

Therefore X must have been deleted because of its objectionable nature.

Therefore X must originally have been present.

The basic assumption of Gunkel and his many followers, that there was one myth which included both divine combat with a primordial monster and cosmic creation causally related to the god's victory, requires to be re-examined.³⁷

Saggs was one of the voices in opposition to the foundational work of Gunkel and the

³⁶ Saggs, *The Encounter with the Divine*, 52.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 57, emphasis added.

writing of Wakeman, which builds on this foundation. He presents the evidence that they provide in support of their hypothesis and concluded that it is lacking and inconclusive.

John Day, 1985

John Day started with Gunkel's conclusions and developed the connection between *chaoskampf* and creation in the OT. His primary work, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, was published in 1985 and heavily referenced Gunkel, Saggs, and Wakeman who preceded him in this field.³⁸ His goal in this text is to demonstrate the connection between *chaoskampf* and creation in the Ugaritic Baal Cycle: "I shall consider the question of divine conflict with the dragon and the sea in relation to the creation of the world. It will first be established that there are passages in which a causal relation exists between this divine conflict and the creation."³⁹ His second aim is to demonstrate the OT reliance on Ugaritic rather than Babylonian literature. Instead of proving the presence of *chaoskampf* in the biblical passages, Day takes its presence for granted based on Gunkel's work. He argues that other similar texts must imply *chaoskampf* because of its clear presence in the first set of passages. According to David Tsumura, who is discussed in the following section, this logic is circular.⁴⁰

Day indicates that the main problem with merely supplanting the *Enuma elish* with the Ugaritic Baal Cycle is that the latter does not contain a creation account.⁴¹ Day

³⁸ John Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985); see also Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Day, *From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1-11* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013); Day, "God and Leviathan in Isaiah 27:1," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155, no. 620 (October 1998): 423–36.

³⁹ Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, 1.

⁴⁰ Referring to John Day, Tsumura wrote, "His argument is highly speculative and circular." David Toshio Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 144.

⁴¹ Loren Fisher provided an interesting perspective on the problem of the Ugaritic myths lacking creation after the conflict. He argued that the establishment of Baal's kingship should be considered to be part of the category of creation theme. Loren R. Fisher, "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old

agrees with Gunkel's conclusion that OT authors used ANE myth as a source, but suggests that it was the Ugaritic Baal Cycle rather than *Enuma elish* that served as inspiration. To resolve the absence of a creation story in the Baal Cycle, he reasons, "The creation of the world would naturally have been regarded as occurring at the time of the very first New Year."⁴² Furthermore, Day proposes that certain agricultural references in the Baal Cycle may indicate that the story took place the end of a year and, therefore, "This provides evidence that the Canaanites may have associated the creation with the conflict with the dragon."⁴³ Thus, the conflict story at the end of one year may have immediately preceded the creation story at the beginning of the following year, if it is recounted each year at the same time. Day adds as evidence the "fact" that creation follows conflict in the OT, and, therefore, it can be assumed that the Canaanites believed the same. He states, "In any case, quite apart from this line of argument it must be strongly emphasized that the fact that the Old Testament so frequently uses the imagery of the divine conflict with the dragon and the sea in association with creation, when this imagery is Canaanite, leads one to expect that the Canaanites likewise connected the two themes."⁴⁴ Thus, Day's progression of proof comes full circle. Gunkel had proven that *Enuma elish* and *chaoskampf* lay in the background of passages where the OT references the defeat of the sea in the same context as creation. Day argues that since the OT connects *chaoskampf* to creation, the Canaanites likely thought the same thing, even though they did not include creation explicitly in the text of the Baal Cycle. Therefore, he concludes that the Canaanite Baal Cycle was the source that influenced the biblical authors rather than the

Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 15, no. 3 (July 1965): 313–24.

⁴² Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, 17.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid. In addition, Day later stated, "Although the Baal-Yam text . . . is not concerned with the creation of the world, there was also a primordial conflict between Baal and Leviathan, Yam and others, which probably was connected with the creation." Ibid., 61.

Babylonian *Enuma elish*.⁴⁵

Day believed that the influence of this myth extended to every biblical text about Satan. Notably, he writes, “The use of this Canaanite myth-imagery to describe the future defeat of the enemy is carried through from the Apocalypse of Isaiah to the Apocalypse of John.”⁴⁶ He argues that there is a connection between the OT and the Canaanite myth because both stories include an enemy serpent that is defeated by a deity.

There is another problem with Day’s attempt to adopt Gunkel’s conclusions and modify the source myth to be Ugaritic instead of Babylonian. Gunkel had anticipated that biblical scholars may object and question whether the *Enuma elish* was influenced by the OT rather than the other way around. In response, Gunkel provides evidence that the myth is geographically inseparable from Babylon based on the climate described within. Gunkel explains, “For the experts there is hardly any need for a demonstration of how to assess which side is dependent on the other. The Babylonian myth corresponds to the features of the Mesopotamian climate and thereby proves itself to be genuinely Babylonian, while the Hebrew myth should be judged as specifically *non-Palestinian*.”⁴⁷ Gunkel’s final argument that the Babylonian myth was the original rather than the OT was that the most original could not have come from the West. Day agrees with Gunkel’s suggestion that the OT authors borrowed material from ANE mythology, but he does not

⁴⁵ Day also added, “There are grounds for believing, therefore, that the Canaanites may have associated the creation of the world with Baal's victory over the dragon and the sea, even though the Ugaritic Baal-Yam text (CTA 2 = KTU 1.2) is not concerned with the creation.” Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, 17.

⁴⁶ John Day, “God and Leviathan in Isaiah 27:1,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155, no. 620 (October 1998): 435–36. He also connected the demise of Satan to the absence of the sea in the new creation. He continued, “In Revelation Satan is described both as the Great Dragon (ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, 12:3, 9) with seven heads and as the Ancient Serpent (ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, v. 9)56 who will receive his eternal end (20:10). This decisive triumph is further hinted at in 21:1, for, whereas in 13:1 the beast with seven heads will arise from the sea, the climax of the Apocalypse asserts, ‘And I saw a new heaven and a new earth . . . and there was no more sea’ (21:1).” *Ibid.*, 436.

⁴⁷ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 77, emphasis original.

address Gunkel's claim that the original version of the story could not have been Canaanite any more than it could have been Israelite.

David Tsumura, 2005

David Tsumura's *Creation and Destruction* was a significant revision and expansion of his earlier work *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2*.⁴⁸ He analyzes the evidence and arguments provided by Gunkel and his followers and concludes there is a trend of assuming connections between the OT and ANE myths that the text does not support. He suggests that this trend is the result of a fundamental misunderstanding:

Because water imagery in the poetic texts of the Old Testament is often negative and even destructive, many scholars have taken such destructive images as a sign of "creation" (e.g. Ps. 46; see ch. 9). This, however, is due to a misunderstanding of the nature of the imagery. Such a hypothesis does not work for the Genesis creation story (see part 1). Neither does it work for individual poetic texts when they are carefully interpreted on their own merits (see part 2).⁴⁹

Like Saggs, Tsumura rejects Gunkel's conclusions about the relationship between the Hebrew *tehom* and the Babylonian *tiamat*, but for different reasons. He explains that, philologically, *tehom* could not have derived from *tiamat*, and, therefore, the basis for the argument that the former is a demythologization of the latter in the OT is invalid:

A certain confusion seems to exist in the use of the term etymological by some scholars. When one says that *tehom* is etymologically related to Tiamat, no clear distinction is made between the fact that *tehom* and Tiamat are cognate, sharing the common Semitic root *thm, and the popular supposition that *tehom* is a loanword from the Akkadian divine name Tiamat, hence implying a mythological relationship. Because the latter is *phonologically impossible*, the idea that the Akkadian Tiamat was borrowed and subsequently demythologized is mistaken and should not be used as an argument in a lexicographical discussion of the Hebrew *tehom*. It should be pointed out that the Akkadian term *ti'amtum* > *tamtum* normally means "sea" or "ocean" in an ordinary sense and is sometimes personified as a divine being in

⁴⁸ David Toshio Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 83 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989); Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005).

⁴⁹ Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction*, 1.

mythological contexts. Therefore, the fact that *tehom* is etymologically related to Tiamat as a cognate should not be taken as evidence for the mythological dependence of the former on the latter.⁵⁰

The nature of language development over time is contrary to the progression required to get from *tiamat* to *tehom*.⁵¹

Tsumura also addresses the argument that the lack of a definite article related to *tehom* indicates that it is the faded name of a deity. He writes, “There is no evidence that the term *tāhôm* in Gen 1:2 is a depersonification of an original Canaanite deity as Day assumes. This Hebrew term *tāhôm* is simply a reflection of the Common Semitic term **tihām*- ‘ocean’ and there is no relation between the Genesis account and the so-called *Chaoskampf* mythology.”⁵² In direct opposition to Gunkel and Day, Tsumura states, “The lack of the definite article for *tehom* in Gen 1:2 has nothing to do with personification or depersonification of the original term.”⁵³ One of Tsumura’s primary goals has been to deconstruct the arguments of Gunkel and Day. He has published several

⁵⁰ Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction*, 38, emphasis added. K. A. Kitchen similarly stated, “Another complete fallacy is the belief that the word *tehom*, ‘deep’, in Genesis 1:2, shows dependency of the Hebrew upon the Babylonian. In fact the Hebrew word is linguistically a zero form (unaugmented by formative elements) and cannot be derived from the Babylonian word *Ti’amat* which is itself a derived form, principally a proper name, and in any case shows different contextual usage. In fact, *tehom* is common Semitic, as shown by Ugaritic *thm*, ‘deep’ (also in plural and dual) from early in the second millennium BC, in contexts that have no conceivable link with the Babylonian epic. Thus there is no evidence here for Hebrew borrowing from Babylonian, and even the existence of any real relationship at all between Genesis and *Enuma Elish* is open to considerable doubt.” K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Chicago: InterVarsity Press, 1966), 89–90.

⁵¹ Later in Tsumura’s work, he also explained the impossibility that *tehom* derived from the Canaanite cognate either: “The linguistic form of Hebrew */tehom/* is older than Ugaritic */tahamu/* as noted above, it is unlikely that the Hebrew term is a depersonification of the earlier Canaanite divine name Taham and therefore unlikely that Genesis is dependent upon the Ugaritic mythology.” Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction*, 140. Additional information about the term can be found on pp. 45–47. Consider the following: “Thus, Ugaritic *thm(t)*, Akkadian *tiamtum*, *tamtum*, and Eblaite *ti-a-ma-tum* all appear as a common noun, ‘sea’ or ‘ocean,’ from their earliest attestation. If all these cognates can mean ‘sea’ or ‘ocean’ in the ordinary sense, there is no reason to think that Proto-Semitic **thm* was not a common noun ‘sea/ocean.’ In light of the above, the Hebrew term *tehom* also should normally be taken as a common noun.” *Ibid.*, 47.

⁵² Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2*, 65.

⁵³ Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction*, 49.

articles relevant to the study of the sea in the OT.⁵⁴

Rebecca Watson, 2005

Rebecca Watson contributes the volume *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of “Chaos” in the Hebrew Bible* in which she systematically analyzes every passage in the Psalms that had been connected to the chaos motif in previous scholarship.⁵⁵ Her purpose was to determine whether the biblical text itself reveals a connection to chaos or whether *chaoskampf* had been forced upon it from the outside. She states,

It is becoming apparent that this interpretive strategy [of Gunkel and Day] has resulted in a tendency to force the Hebrew material into a “*Chaoskampf*” straitjacket, and in particular to place disproportionate emphasis on comparisons with Babylonian and Canaanite (especially Ugaritic) mythology (so much so that concepts from these wider ancient Near Eastern backgrounds are arguably sometimes “read into” the Old Testament). This has resulted in an approach whereby a divine conflict with the sea, characteristically resulting in creation, is often assumed in passages where the presence of such allusions could hardly be supposed on the basis of the biblical text itself.⁵⁶

Watson’s work on the Psalms is thorough, and she furthermore includes a chapter on the chaos theme in the rest of the OT. In it, she examines other passages that she believes have been misinterpreted by scholars who forced *chaoskampf* where it was not present in the text.

Debra Ballentine, 2012

Debra Ballentine recently wrote a dissertation on the conflict motif in the OT.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ David Toshio Tsumura, “Tōhū in Isaiah 45:19,” *Vetus Testamentum* 38, no. 3 (July 1988): 361–64; Tsumura, “Ugaritic Poetry and Habakkuk 3,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 40, no. 1 (May 1989): 24–48; Tsumura, “Janus Parallelism in Hab. Iii 4,” *Vetus testamentum* 63 (2013): 113–16; Tsumura, “The Creation Motif in Psalm 74:12-14?: A Reappraisal of the Theory of the Dragon Myth,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 3 (2015): 547–55.

⁵⁵ Rebecca Sally Watson, *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of “Chaos” in the Hebrew Bible* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁵⁷ Debra Scoggins Ballentine, “You Divided the Sea by Your Might: The Conflict Myth and

She argues that the conflict motif was used to legitimate persons and political ideas by associating them with the winning deity and, conversely, to cast a person or idea in a negative light by associating them with the sea or the defeated monster. She explains, “The conflict topos serves as a foundation for discourse about what deities and/or polities are favored and disfavored, specifically articulated through ideological claims about the relative legitimacy or illegitimacy of their power, which is indicated by their association with either the victorious warrior deity or a defeated divine enemy.”⁵⁸ For example, Psalm 77 and Psalm 106 tell the story of the exodus across the Red Sea with an emphasis on God’s rebuke of and victorious control over the sea, presenting a comparison between the sea and Egypt. Egypt is equated to the sea to highlight the illegitimacy of Egypt’s power over Israel.

Ballentine demonstrates that OT authors frequently refer to God’s past victory over the sea and sea monsters to suggest a comparison with a current enemy over which the author is asking God for victory. She provides the examples of Isaiah 30:7; Ezekiel 29:2–6; 39:2–15; Jeremiah 51:34–37; Habakkuk 3; Isaiah 51:9–15; Psalm 87:4; and Psalms 74 and 89, in which contemporary situations are compared to God’s past defeat of the sea.⁵⁹ She also writes, “Authors continue to use the theme of combat as they promote favored deities (Yahweh and Jesus/Christos) and characterize negatively disfavored divine figures (Satan, the dragon, beasts, and the Lawless One).”⁶⁰ Ballentine’s primary goal was not to prove that the OT is negative about the sea, but rather to demonstrate that the OT negativity about the sea was used as a means of poetic slander against the character of adversaries.

the Biblical Tradition” (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2012).

⁵⁸ Ballentine, “You Divided the Sea by Your Might,” 103.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 134.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 290.

Scurlock and Beal, 2013

JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal edited *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration or Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, a volume of papers that were presented during an annual meeting of the Midwest branch of the American Oriental Society.⁶¹ Several of these texts are relevant to the study of the negative motif of the sea in the OT. One of Scurlock's contributions to the book is a paper on Genesis 1:2 in which she addresses the creation story as it appears in the text, excluding the notion of *chaokampf*.⁶² There are also several chapters in this volume that delve into the Babylonian, Hittite, Egyptian, Sumerian, and Greek myths that are relevant to the study of the sea in the OT and its ANE context.⁶³ Finally, Batto's discussion of Rebecca Watson's work on the subject of *chaokampf* in the OT also contains much relevant material for the study of the negative motif of the sea in the OT.⁶⁴

Conclusion

The negative motif of the sea in the OT has been recognized by the scholars introduced above, and each of them has approached this topic from a unique angle.

⁶¹ JoAnn Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, ed. JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013).

⁶² JoAnn Scurlock, "Searching For Meaning in Genesis 1:2: Purposeful Creation Out of Chaos Without Kampf," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 48–61.

⁶³ Karen Sonik, "From Hesiod's Abyss to Ovid's Rudis Indigestaque Moles: Chaos and Cosmos in the Babylonian 'Epic of Creation,'" in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 1–25; Dennis R. M. Campbell, "On the Theogonies of Hesiod and the Hurrians: An Exploration of the Dual Natures of Teššub and Kumarbi," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 26–43; W. G. Lambert, "Creation in the Bible and the Ancient Near East," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 44–47; Douglas Frayne, "The Fifth Day of Creation in Ancient Syrian and Neo-Hittite Art," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 63–97; Amir Gilan, "Once upon a Time in Kiškiluša: The Dragon-Slayer Myth in Central Anatolia," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 98–111; Joanna Töyräänvuori, "The Northwest Semitic Conflict Myth and Egyptian Sources from the Middle and New Kingdoms," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 112–26; Brendon C. Benz, "Yamm as the Personification of Chaos? A Linguistic and Literary Argument for a Case of Mistaken Identity," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 127–45.

⁶⁴ Bernard F. Batto, "The Combat Myth in Israelite Tradition Revisited," in Scurlock et al., *Creation and Chaos*, 217–36. See also Rebecca Sally Watson, *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of "Chaos" in the Hebrew Bible* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005).

Biblical academia continues to seek new applications for the study of this subject. Eric Ortlund wrote a dissertation in which he traces a connection between theophanic warfare and the concept *chaoskampf* in several OT texts in Isaiah and the Minor Prophets. He concludes, “The basic dimensions of the defeat of chaos and renewal of divine rule from the cosmic center, together with divine appearance and reaction, are found again and again, but appear in repeatedly creative ways as the myth of the *Chaoskampf* is given continued application in the unfolding development of prophetic vision and thought.”⁶⁵ In a similar way, modern scholars continue to find creative ways to study the negative motif of the sea in the OT. Allan Dyssel’s dissertation specifically examines the sea monsters present in the OT and their relationship to ANE mythological monsters.⁶⁶ Most recently, Sidney Greidanus published a biblical theology of the chaos-to-order theme throughout the Bible.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Eric Ortlund, “Theophany and Chaoskampf: The Interpretation of Theophanic Imagery in the Baal Epic, Isaiah, and the Twelve” (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2006).

⁶⁶ Allan Dyssel, “Sea Monsters and Other Mythical Creatures Associated with the Primeval Flood in the Old Testament. A History of Denial?” (Th.D. diss., University of South Africa, 2017). The thesis he wrote for the Master of Philosophy degree is also relevant to the study of the sea in the OT. Dyssel, “Reading the Creation Narrative in Genesis 1-2:4a against Its Ancient Near Eastern Background” (M.Phil. thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 2007).

⁶⁷ Sidney Greidanus, *From Chaos to Cosmos: Creation to New Creation*, Short Studies in Biblical Theology (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018).

CHAPTER 4
THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA
IN ANE LITERATURE

The sea is a negative motif in ancient literature from all corners of the ANE.¹ Examination of extrabiblical ANE texts is valuable for the study of the sea in the OT because Israel’s immediate neighbors on all sides also viewed the sea with deep negativity. As a result, ANE scholarship has produced a large amount of writing about the sea in ANE mythology and comparative studies of the biblical material regarding the sea. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the content of the ANE literature and to demonstrate that the sea was a consistently negative motif in the ANE literature outside of the OT. Before examining the negative motif of the sea in the OT, it is helpful to examine the wider ANE landscape on this topic.

Bernard Batto has stated that the OT owes much of its content to ANE literature: “The Hebrew Bible, at least in its origins, is a product of the ancient Near East.”² Christopher Hays agreed and taught that the OT is essentially an edited volume of ANE literature: “The Hebrew Bible (commonly called the Old Testament) is a compendium of ancient Near Eastern texts. . . . The goal of reading the Bible in its context is simply to gain cultural literacy, a basic prerequisite for any interpreter who

¹ This chapter introduces the major sea-related literature of Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Egypt. Other minor ANE literature referenced to the sea in varying degrees of significance. For a discussion of the positive and negative presentation of the sea in other ANE literature, see Arent Jan Wensinck, *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites* (Amsterdam: Müller, 1918), 40–66; and Y. S. Chen, *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe: Origins and Early Development in Mesopotamian Traditions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 70–121.

² Bernard F. Batto, *In the Beginning: Essays on Creation Motifs in the Ancient Near East and the Bible*, vol. 9, Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 7.

aspires to any authority.”³ Hays went on to compare the failure to read ANE texts to the illiteracy in the Hebrew language in terms of the detriment caused to OT studies. Familiarity with the ANE myths is valuable to the study of the sea in the OT because although the OT and ANE myths differ drastically on many points of theology, they agree that the sea is a threat to creation and humanity, is rebuked (or defeated) by a deity, and is associated with darkness and death.

Some of the ANE stories bear a striking resemblance to stories found in the OT. Certain OT passages may allude to the content of these ANE stories. The biblical writers did not live or write in a vacuum. If the OT authors used examples and references from well-known literature to explain a point, then OT scholarship ought to examine the available sources to have the best understanding of the meaning of the biblical text.⁴ It is also important to note what the Bible teaches about the inspiration of Scripture: that men wrote as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet 1:21), and that all Scripture is breathed out by God (2 Tim 3:16).⁵

ANE Myths about the Sea

ANE texts that involve the sea are generally about either creation or the flood. ANE stories about a great and terrible flood are negative about the sea because of its natural power to destroy many lives and cities.⁶ Alan Dundes wrote, “Quantitatively speaking, the flood myth must surely be the most studied narrative ever. No other myth or folktale or legend has been subjected to anything like the intensive scrutiny that has been

³ Christopher B. Hays, *Hidden Riches: A Sourcebook for the Comparative Study of the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 3.

⁴ Paul drew upon the teachings of popular pagan poetry in Acts 17:28.

⁵ See Wayne A. Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1994), 73–85.

⁶ For a single volume on the flood motif in ANE literature, see Chen, *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe*.

lavished on the story of the cataclysmic deluge.”⁷ The ANE flood stories that are introduced in this chapter are the Sumerian King List, the Eridu Genesis, Atrahasis, the Epic of Gilgamesh, and the Egyptian flood story.

Y. S. Chen has contributed a discussion of flood terminology. He demonstrated the differences between the use of “flood” as a general term versus “flood” as the primeval catastrophe.⁸ In many publications, the two uses of “flood” are distinguished by capitalizing the word to refer to the primeval catastrophe. Chen has also discussed how the ANE literature is usually (but not universally) negative about the sea in the flood stories. He has attested that there are negative and positive aspects of the flood in the ANE:

Most of the references to the flood focus on its destructive aspect. The flood also often associated with battle and weaponry, especially in compositions deal with warrior deities such as Inana and Ninurta. But when it comes to storm god Iškur, both the negative and positive aspects of the flood or tempest are presented in an intertwining fashion. . . . On the one hand, Iškur is the provider of storm rain necessary for irrigation and the growth of agriculture. So his beneficent presence may ensure abundance and harvest. On the other hand, he was also worshipped as a warrior god using violent storms for the devastation of rebellious cities and lands. No doubt the dual character of Iskur portrayed in these sources reflects the delicate condition of precipitation in lower Mesopotamia which may lead to either drought or overflowing.⁹

The ANE creation narratives generally agree that the removal or defeat of the sea was necessary. The ANE creation narratives that are introduced in this chapter are *Enuma elish*, the Canaanite Baal Cycle, and the Egyptian cosmogony.

Sumerian King List

Sumer was the southwest region of Mesopotamia, and Eridu was the city of the

⁷ Alan Dundes, *The Flood Myth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 1. Therefore, the resources referenced in this chapter are only a sampling of the number of publications regarding the flood in ANE myth.

⁸ Chen, *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe*, 21–66.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 64.

kingship in the Sumerian king list.¹⁰ Two Sumerian texts include the flood. The first is the Sumerian king list, which references when the flood happened.¹¹ The second is a flood narrative known as the Eridu Genesis, which is discussed in the following section. The Sumerian literature is negative about the sea because it was a destructive force that wiped out life on earth.

The Sumerian king list began with a list of eight kings followed by the phrase “then the flood swept over (the land).”¹² The eight kings before the flood had extraordinarily long lives. However, after the statement about the flood, the lifespan of each king listed was much shorter, similar to the lifespans of people recorded in the OT pre- and post-flood.¹³ Kenton Sparks noted, “The biblical genealogy that begins in Gen 5 and ends in Gen 11 is obviously similar to the [Sumerian King List] tradition. Both exemplars are linear in form, both begin with creation, both are interrupted by the flood,

¹⁰ Bill T. Arnold and Bryan Beyer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East: Primary Sources for Old Testament Study*, Encountering Biblical Studies (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 150–151.

¹¹ For further information about the Sumerian king list including extensive bibliography, see Kenton L. Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005), 345–48. See also Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939); A. Leo Oppenheim, “Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts,” in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. James B. Pritchard, 3rd ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 265–66; Helmer Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973), 1; Arnold and Beyer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East*, 150–51; M. B. Rowton, “The Date of the Sumerian King List,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19, no. 2 (1960): 156–62; Thomas C. Hartman, “Some Thoughts on the Sumerian King List and Genesis 5 and 11B,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91, no. 1 (1972): 25; John H. Walton, “The Antediluvian Section of the Sumerian King List and Genesis 5,” *The Biblical Archaeologist* 44, no. 4 (1981): 207–8; Piotr Michalowski, “History as Charter Some Observations on the Sumerian King List,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, no. 1 (1983): 237; Daniel Hämmerly-Dupuy, “Some Observations on the Assyro-Babylonian and Sumerian Flood Stories,” in *The Flood Myth*, ed. Alan Dundes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 49–59; Dwight W. Young, “A Mathematical Approach to the Sumerian King List,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (1988): 123–29; Dwight W. Young, “The Incredible Regnal Spans of Kish I in the Sumerian King List,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 23–35.

¹² Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East*, 1.

¹³ Cf. Genesis 5:3–31 and Genesis 11:10–26.

and both include very long life spans prior to the flood.”¹⁴ There are also similarities between the eight individual kings listed before the flood and the ten generations listed from Adam to Noah in the OT.¹⁵ The Sumerian king list is relevant to the study of the sea in ANE literature because it records the flood as a major event that disrupted the progression of the kingdom.

Eridu Genesis

The names of hundreds of deities in the Sumerian pantheon have been found in various lists. The purpose of these deities was to prevent the world from falling into chaos.¹⁶ Four of them appear to be the chief gods, according to Ringgren’s listing: “An the god of heaven, Enlil the god of the atmosphere, Enki the god of water, and Ninhursag the mother-goddess.”¹⁷ Although Ninhursag, also known as Nintur, was the mother of humanity, it was Enki, also known as Ea, who masterminded the plan to create man. The two of them were essentially the mother and father of humankind.¹⁸ Enki was also the lord of the great deep, including both the water under the earth and the ocean.

The Sumerian Eridu Genesis contains a version of the flood story, of which there are a few fragmentary versions that have been pieced together to understand the narrative.¹⁹ Nintur cared for humans like a mother and directed them to make cities and

¹⁴ Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 346–47.

¹⁵ Sparks stated, “In Genesis, as in the Mesopotamian lists, the seventh figure (in this case Enoch) was unique because he ascended into heaven.” *Ibid.*, 347. Sparks also referred the reader to James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, Studies on personalities of the Old Testament (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 6–14.

¹⁶ Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East*, 4–18.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹⁸ For more information, see the myth “Enki and Ninhursag” in Bill T. Arnold and Bryan Beyer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East: Primary Sources for Old Testament Study*, Encountering Biblical Studies (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 15–19.

¹⁹ Edmond Sollberger, *The Babylonian Legend of the Flood* (London: British Museum, 1962), 22–23; S. H. Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology* (New York: Penguin Books, 1963), 30–32; Thorkild

cult-places.²⁰ In time, Enlil became dissatisfied with the noise made by humans and led the council of the gods in a decision to destroy all humankind with a flood. After the council's decision, Nintur mourned the fate of her creatures, but Enki devised a plan to save them. He secretly went to Ziusudra, who was a king and a priest, and called him over to a wall to privately warn him of the coming flood.²¹ If Enki gave specific instructions concerning the building of a boat and what to take on it, that part of the text is lost. The next remaining lines recount that many stormy winds gathered and pushed the flood over the cities for seven days and seven nights. The myth states, "After the flood had swept over the country, after the evil wind had tossed the big boat about on the great waters, the sun came out."²² Ziusudra made sacrifices and kissed the ground before the sun god. It appears that An and Enlil were initially upset about Ziusudra's survival, but Enki made a speech, most of which is lost, to convince An and Enlil to accept the survival of humankind. An and Enlil decided to grant Ziusudra immortality. The broken text also references small animals disembarking and refers to Ziusudra as the preserver of the small animals and the seed of humankind. The Eridu Genesis is negative about the sea that flooded and destroyed the human cities. It also makes a clear judgment about the evil of the storm and winds of the flood.

Jacobsen, "The Eridu Genesis," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, no. 4 (December 1981): 513–29; Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Harps That Once...: Sumerian Poetry in Translation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987), 145–150; Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994), 32–53; Robert M. Best, *Noah's Ark and the Ziusudra Epic: Sumerian Origins of the Flood Myth* (Fort Myers, FL: Enlil Press, 1999); Arnold and Beyer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East*, 13-15.

²⁰ Thorkild Jacobsen, "The Eridu Genesis," 515.

²¹ Compare to the divine warning in the Epic of Gilgamesh, in which Enki (Ea) spoke to the wall in the hearing of Utnapishtim and told the wall all that was about to occur and how one might be saved.

²² Arnold and Beyer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East*, 14.

Atrahasis and the Epic of Gilgamesh

Kenton Sparks has described Atrahasis as an etiology: “Atrahasis was. . . an etiological tale that explained both the origins of humanity and its mortality, and it did so by combining the creation and flood traditions into a single narrative framework.”²³

Atrahasis is a flood story from Mesopotamia and is almost identical to the eleventh tablet of the Epic of Gilgamesh.²⁴ Therefore, this paper considers both myths together.²⁵

Carolina Lopez-Ruiz has said that the discovery of the Mesopotamian flood stories was an important event in the history of ANE studies about the sea: “[The Epic of Gilgamesh] brought to scholarly attention the existence of a pre-biblical Flood tradition, establishing the study of the Ancient Near East as an essential foundation for understanding the world of the Hebrew Bible and resulting in the development of Assyriology as an independent field of study.”²⁶ Versions of Atrahasis have been found that date to as early as 1700

²³ Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 313. See Gunkel’s discussion of etiology in Hermann Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, trans. William Herbert Carruth (Chicago: Open Court, 1901).

²⁴ For Atrahasis, see Sollberger, *The Babylonian Legend of the Flood*, 24–26; James B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 42–44; W. G. Lambert, “New Evidence for the First Line of Atrahasis,” *Orientalia* 38, no. 4 (1969): 533–38; Helmer Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East*, 68–76; Matthews and Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels*, 16–27; George Smith, “The Chaldean Account of the Deluge,” in *The Flood Myth*, ed. Alan Dundes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 29–48; Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky, “Atrahasis Epic and Its Significance for Our Understanding of Genesis 1–9,” *The Biblical Archaeologist* 40, no. 4 (December 1977): 147–55; Clifford, *Creation Accounts*, 73–82; W. G. Lambert, A. R. Millard, and Miguel Civil, *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999); Piotr Bienkowski and A. R. Millard, *Dictionary of the Ancient Near East* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 119–20; Arnold and Beyer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East*, 21–31; Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 313–14; Batto, *In the Beginning*, 24–27.

²⁵ For the Epic of Gilgamesh, see Sollberger, *The Babylonian Legend of the Flood*, 26–30; Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 224–69; Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 72–99; Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology*, 46–56; Matthews and Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels*, 35–40; J. F. Bierlein, *Parallel Myths* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1994) 125–26; Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 275–78 and 316–17; Hays, *Hidden Riches*, 75–95.

²⁶ Tablet XI, the piece of the Epic of Gilgamesh that is the flood story of Utnapishtim, is almost word-for-word an earlier version of the flood story in which Atrahasis is the Noah character. In fact, the Epic of Gilgamesh calls the hero Atrahasis rather than Utnapishtim in one place, further proving its

BC.²⁷ The Epic of Gilgamesh was later, in the second half of the second millennium BC.²⁸ The Noah character in the former is Atrahasis, but in the Epic of Gilgamesh, the Noah character is called Utnapishtim.²⁹ Victor Matthews and Don Benjamin have stated, “The most significant difference between the two episodes is the reason for the flood. There is no clear reason given in ‘The Gilgamesh Epic,’ but in ‘The Atrahasis Story,’ the noise of an overpopulated earth is disturbing the gods.”³⁰

It was revealed in the Atrahasis myth that Enki was responsible for the gatekeeper’s role of holding back the ocean to keep it from flooding the earth.³¹ Therefore, Enki was well aware of the flood and how one might escape its destruction. Also, that the sea required a locked bar that required oversight by a deity and a team of creatures indicates that the people regarded the sea as an enemy.

Tablet XI of the Gilgamesh Epic tells of how Gilgamesh spoke to a man named Utnapishtim in an attempt to find out how to attain immortality. Utnapishtim told Gilgamesh the story of how he attained immortality, which is the story of the flood. Utnapishtim was warned by Ea (Enki) that Enlil was sending a flood to destroy all living things: “Tear down this house, build a ship! Give up possessions, seek life. Forswear worldly goods and keep the soul alive! Take the seed of all living things aboard the ship.

reliance upon that story.

²⁷ Carolina López-Ruiz, *Gods, Heroes, and Monsters: A Sourcebook of Greek, Roman, and Near Eastern Myths in Translation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 68.

²⁸ John H. Walton, Victor H. Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 37.

²⁹ The Epic of Gilgamesh actually calls the hero Atrahasis instead of Utnapishtim in one place, which provides further evidence of the relationship between the two myths.

³⁰ Matthews and Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels*, 16.

³¹ Atrahasis, tablet I, column 1: “The bolt which bars the sea was assigned to far-signed Enki.” Also tablet II, column 3: “As for the bolt that bars the sea, Ea with his *lahmu*-creatures kept it locked.” Arnold and Beyer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East*, 22.

The ship that you shall build, her dimensions shall be to measure. Equal shall be her width and her length.”³² Thus, much like God instructed Noah, the god Ea instructed Utnapishtim on how to build the giant boat and what to take on it. Afterward, Utnapishtim left the place he lived and began preparations for building the giant boat. Utnapishtim has described building the boat as follows: “The little ones carried bitumen while the grown ones brought all else that was needful. On the fifth day I laid her framework. One whole acre was her floor space, ten dozen cubits the height of each of her walls, ten dozen cubits each edge of the square deck.”³³ He has also recounted the people and animals that he brought on board: “All my family and kin I made go aboard the ship. The beasts of the field, the wild creatures of the field, all the craftsmen I made go aboard.”³⁴

When the flood began to subside, Utnapishtim’s boat came to rest on a mountain. Then he “sent forth and set free a dove. The dove went forth, but came back; since no resting place for it was visible, she turned around. Then I sent forth and set free a swallow. . . . Then I sent forth and set free a raven. The raven went forth, seeing that the waters had diminished, he eats, circles, caws, and turns not around.”³⁵ After exiting the boat, Utnapishtim offers seven sacrifices to the gods, and “the gods smelled the sweet savor.”³⁶

The sea was an enemy in the Epic of Gilgamesh. Tablet XI column 3 describes the advancing flood as an army in battle. The story calls the flood a weapon and elaborates that even the gods were terrified of the flood-weapon. When the flood was

³² Epic of Gilgamesh, tablet XI. Cf. Gen 6:14.

³³ Epic of Gilgamesh, tablet XI. Cf. Gen 6:15ff.

³⁴ Ibid. Cf. Gen 7:13-16.

³⁵ Ibid. Cf. Gen 8:6-12.

³⁶ Ibid. Cf. Gen 8:20-21.

unbarred, it invaded the land of the living and wiped out everything that was alive. The sea was the destroyer of life that was wielded by the god Enlil, who was furious afterward that it failed to destroy all of humanity.³⁷

Irving Finkel has recently analyzed and translated a tablet of Atrahasis and concluded that it contains a detail not seen before on other tablets of the myth. The tablet revealed that the animals loaded onto the boat “two by two.”³⁸ Both the biblical story and the Epic of Gilgamesh also record the birds that were sent out to survey whether the waters had receded. K. A. Kitchen wrote,

In the case of Genesis 6 to 8 and the Mesopotamian stories of the flood, the situation is different [from the lack of evidence for a relationship between Tehom and Babylonian Tiamat]. A series of basic general similarities suggests a definite relationship between the two traditions; but there are also many detailed differences (form of the Ark, duration of the Flood, the birds) and the Hebrew version is again simpler and less evolved. The Hebrew and Babylonian accounts may go back to a common ancient tradition but are not borrowed directly from each other.³⁹

The similarities between the Epic of Gilgamesh and the biblical story of the Noahic flood are so detailed that there is an undeniable connection between the two. However, the nature of that connection is left largely to conjecture because of the lack of evidence on which story was written first and whether one had knowledge of the other. Both could have derived from a common source, or the two could represent differing traditions passed down from the descendants of Noah.

³⁷ Nintur, the womb-goddess, who had given birth to the first fourteen humans (seven males and seven females), was horrified at the sight of the flood because she thought all humans had been killed. She was angry at Enlil that he caused a flood to destroy them without consulting her or the council of the gods. Afterward she used a lapis lazuli necklace to remind her of the terrible event of the sea’s destructive flood. Atrahasis, tablet III, column 6. Cf. Gen 9:11-17.

³⁸ Irving L. Finkel, *The Ark before Noah: Decoding the Story of the Flood* (New York: Nan A. Talese/Doubleday, 2014), 187–89.

³⁹ K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Chicago: InterVarsity Press, 1966), 90. He also refers the reader to the discussion in Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 224–69.

Enuma Elish

The Babylonian myth *Enuma elish* was first discovered when archaeologists found fragments in the library of King Ashurbanipal at Nineveh between 1848 and 1876.⁴⁰ The tablets were composed between the fourteenth and twelfth century BC.⁴¹ *Enuma elish* is the story of Marduk destroying Tiamat in order to be proclaimed as the chief of the gods. Tiamat was the personification of salt water, and Apsu was the personification of fresh water. Their union produced all of the other gods. The multiplying of younger gods eventually made enough of a disturbance that Apsu decided to destroy all of the younger gods. His son, Ea, killed him and saved the rest of the gods from destruction.

Tiamat decided to kill all of the gods, even though she had given birth to them, to avenge the death of her husband Apsu. Tiamat's threat was serious enough that all the gods became concerned and searched for a hero to rescue them from her wrath. Marduk, the son of Ea, proposed to the gods that he would defeat Tiamat if they would proclaim him as chief of the gods. He defeated her, and the gods built the city of Babylon as the temple of Marduk and proclaimed him to be the chief of the gods.

Tiamat was the personification of the primordial sea.⁴² In *Enuma elish*, the sea was an enemy to the gods that had to be defeated. Tiamat's body was shaped like a

⁴⁰ Willaim Lansdell Wardle, *Israel and Babylon*, 3rd ed. (London: Holborn, 1925), 1–10; Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 1; Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology*, 41–46; Matthews and Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels*, 7–15; Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 314–16; Donna Rosenberg, *World Mythology: An Anthology of the Great Myths and Epics*, 3rd ed. (Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Publishing Group, 1999), 3–11; Thorkild Jacobsen, “The Battle between Marduk and Tiamat,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88, no. 1 (1968): 104–8; Andrea Seri, “The Role of Creation in Enūma Eliš,” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12, no. 1 (2012): 4–29; Andrea Seri, “Some Notes on Enūma Eliš,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 137, no. 4 (October 2017): 833–38; Susan Niditch, *Chaos to Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 15–24; Batto, *In the Beginning*, 28–39; Clifford, *Creation Accounts*, 82–92.

⁴¹ Clifford, *Creation Accounts*, 83.

⁴² The discussion has been introduced in the previous chapter concerning whether the name Tiamat is etymologically related to the Hebrew Tehom.

dragon. During the battle with Marduk, she also created several monsters that were various kinds of serpents and dragons. When Marduk defeated her, he split her body in two and used the two halves to fashion heaven and earth. *Enuma elish* has prompted the study of the defeat of chaos monsters in ANE mythology.⁴³ The defeat of the chaos monsters in ANE mythology is a part of the negativity about the sea.⁴⁴

Ugaritic Baal Cycle

Archaeologists discovered the Baal Cycle in the ancient city of Ugarit, which is located on the coast of the Mediterranean in 1929.⁴⁵ The tablets were in a library or school located between two temples, which are believed to have been temples of Dagan and Baal.⁴⁶ The tablets date to the first half of the fourteenth century BC, and internal evidence on the tablets corresponds to the same period.⁴⁷

⁴³ Batto, *In the Beginning*, 213–26.

⁴⁴ A section of chap. 6 will address the sea monsters of the OT. There are also ANE depictions that represent a deity fighting against a sea monster with seven heads. See Othmar Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*, trans. Timothy J. Hallett (New York: Seabury Press, 1978).

⁴⁵ Adrian Curtis, *Ugarit (Ras Shamra)* (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 1985), 19.

⁴⁶ The authoritative volumes on the Ugaritic Baal Cycle are Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2*, vol. 1 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1994); and Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary of KTU 1.3-1.4*, vol. 2 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1994). See also Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 333–34; Batto, *In the Beginning*, 39–42; Clifford, *Creation Accounts*, 119–26; Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 129–55; Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology*, 80–86; Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East*, 131–35; Arnold and Bayer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East*, 50–62; Bernhard W. Anderson, *Creation Versus Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible* (New York: Association Press, 1967), 24–26; Arvid S. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1952); Peter C. Craigie, *Ugarit and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 67–90; N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilmilku and His Colleagues* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 34–146; John C. L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, ed. G. R. Driver, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1978), 2–8.

⁴⁷ Tablet 1.6 mentions king *nqmd*, which is believed to refer to Niqmaddu II who ascended to the throne circa 1380 BC. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, 1:1.

Baal was the chief of the Ugaritic gods, although El was the elder of the gods whose permission even Baal had to acquire when he desired to build a palace. Baal also fought for a long time to achieve his position as the chief of the gods. Arvid Kapelrud wrote, “It was clear from Baal’s relationship with Dagan, Anat, Asherah, and Ktr-w-Hss that there must have been some struggle between Baal and [El] about who was to be the leading god in the pantheon. It is not a struggle which was fought out in a single battle; on the contrary, it seems to have been a long out-drawn struggle.”⁴⁸

The Baal Cycle tells of the great battle between Baal Hadad and the dragon god Yam (Sea).⁴⁹ Yam insisted that he deserved to have a palace and to take Baal’s place at El’s side. Yam sent messengers to El to demand that El hand over Baal so that Yam to take Baal’s inheritance. El complied, but Baal rebuked him for bowing to the Yam’s wishes and launched an attack on Yam. When Baal was victorious, he declared himself chief of the pantheon and successor to El, similar to the outcome of Marduk’s battle against Tiamat in *Enuma elish*.

Baal was also called “the rider on the clouds” and was the god of rain and storm.⁵⁰ In one depiction of him, he holds a club over his head in his right hand and a thunderbolt in his left hand.⁵¹ Alberto Green has conducted a lengthy discussion of the role

⁴⁸ Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*, 86.

⁴⁹ The following summary is derived from the version translated by Arnold and Bayer, *Readings from the Ancient Near East*, 50-62.

⁵⁰ Norman C. Habel, *Yahweh versus Baal: A Conflict of Religious Cultures; A Study in the Relevance of Ugaritic Materials for the Early Faith of Israel* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1964), 73–75.

⁵¹ Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*, 93.

of Yahweh as the storm god in the OT in comparison to Baal.⁵² Later in the texts, Baal also warred against Mot (death) to maintain his rule.⁵³

Egyptian Mythology

Ancient Egyptian literature contains both a creation story and a flood story in which the waters of the great deep are presented negatively.⁵⁴ Egyptian Heliopolitan cosmogony begins with a negative outlook on the sea as chaotic and incompatible with ordered creation.⁵⁵ The sun god Re (also Ra or Atum) emerged from Nun (or Nu), who was the personification of the watery abyss of primeval water. Re's first act was to get rid of the chaos and darkness by making light.⁵⁶ However, Nun was considered both the source of life and the embodiment of chaotic disorder. Vincent Tobin wrote,

The symbol of the primeval waters appears to have been the basic principle of all the Egyptian systems of cosmogony, for it was common to all the myths of creation. The logic of water as a primeval symbol is evident immediately when one considers the yearly phenomenon of the rising of the Nile as the potential source of the life and rebirth of nature. Hence Nun, the primeval water, must have presented itself as the most dramatic and graphic symbol to express the ultimate life source from which the creation had emerged. At the same time, despite the positive potential for life and order, the primeval waters of Nun essentially represented a principle of chaos for the very reason that such a shapeless and formless mass implied an absence of the order and stability required in a created cosmos. The Hermopolitan

⁵² Alberto R. W. Green, *The Storm-God in the Ancient Near East*, vol. 8, Biblical and Judaic Studies (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 219–80.

⁵³ Chap. 6 will discuss the biblical relationship between the sea and death. See Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, 14–19; and Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, 115–46.

⁵⁴ Additionally, Egyptian mythology includes a story about the slaying of a dragon that represents the darkness of each night. Re (the sun) defeats the darkness each morning. Hooke drew attention to the comparison with Marduk's victory over Tiamat in *Enuma elish*. Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology*, 74–75. See also Matthews and Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels*, 28–31.

⁵⁵ There exist multiple versions of cosmogonies in Egyptian mythology. See Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology*, 70–73; Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 3–10; Veronica Ions, *Egyptian Mythology* (New York: Peter Bedrick Books, 1983), 21–33; Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 323–29; Clifford, *Creation Accounts*, 101–16.

⁵⁶ A. Rosalie David, *The Ancient Egyptians: Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), 47.

tradition especially stressed this negative aspect of the primeval waters.⁵⁷

The Egyptian conception of the sea was both positive and negative. It was positive because of the provision of life that comes with water. However, it was negative because the sea was uncontrollable and represented disorder. Atum created eight chaos gods from Nun that were called the Heh gods.⁵⁸ Each of them negatively represented the primeval waters.⁵⁹

Nun was not destroyed at creation and remained a constant threat to human existence on earth. Although Nun was a god, the people did not see the need to worship it. George Hart stated, “No temples were ever built to honor it. . . . This vast expanse of lifeless water never ceased to be and after creation was imagined to surround the celestial firmament guarding the sun, moon, stars, and earth as well as the boundaries of the

⁵⁷ Vincent Arieh Tobin, *Theological Principles of Egyptian Religion* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 60.

⁵⁸ In a different version of the Egyptian myth, Nun was the creator. In that version, Nun orders chaos rather than represents chaos. S. H. Hooke wrote, “In that part of this remarkable text which concerns creation, Ptah is equated with Nun, the primeval ocean, and is presented as bringing Atum and all the gods of the Heliopolitan Ennead into existence by his divine word. . . . By his thought and speech Ptah brings the gods into existence, bring order out of the chaos. . . . This description of Ptah’s creative activities closes with the words, ‘And so Ptah rested (or, was satisfied), after he had made everything’, a phrase which cannot fail to suggest a comparison with the closings words of the Priestly account of creation in Genesis 1.” Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology*, 72–73.

⁵⁹ Tobin demonstrated that each of the eight Heh gods represented the negative aspects of the primeval waters. He wrote, “Nun was symbolic of the primaeval water itself, the undefined source from which all things were to come; Huh was indicative of boundlessness, infinity, chaos, the absence of shape and form in the time before the creation: Kuk was the negative force of darkness; Amun was the hidden one, the mystery of the divine force which in the chaotic state of pre-creation was not yet manifest or evident. . . . Their importance lay in the fact that, through the characteristics which they symbolized, they expressed the negative nature of the primaeval chaos. They were the actualization of the nothingness which existed in Nun, a nothingness which, due to the principle of completeness in Atum, would become the source of all that exists. Thus, nothingness and totality were balanced in the primaeval waters, two contradictory and opposing principles which encompassed all that would eventually exist. The Heh gods were the foundation principle of the Egyptian mytho-theology of creation, symbolizing the reality of chaos, but at the same time pointing to the creative potential within it.” Tobin, *Theological Principles of Egyptian Religion*, 61–62.

underworld. There was always a fear in the Egyptian mind that Nu would crash through the sky and drown the world.”⁶⁰

The Egyptian geography of the world has similarities to the description of the world in Genesis 1. In both descriptions, the great deep surrounds the dry land and is held back by defined borders of protection. Batto wrote,

Although there is no direct dependency upon Egyptian literature evident in the Genesis narrative, there are significant motifs common to both traditions. Principal among these is the conception of a living space for both humans and animals within the void formed on the vase of a solid earth underfoot and a rigid sky overhead, which together hold back the chaotic waters that engulf our ‘created world’ on all sides.⁶¹

Thus, in Egyptian cosmography, the sea was a threat that surrounded the dry land.

The Egyptian flood myth also demonstrated negativity about the sea.⁶²

However, the Egyptian flood myth is significantly different from the other ancient flood stories. Nun, the great deep, was involved in urging Re to destroy all humankind but told him to send the Eye of Re to kill them. Thus, it was not the sea that ended many human lives. While the Eye of Re carried out the punishment of humanity, he became so bloodthirsty that he was uncontrollable, and Re began to pity the humans who were being slaughtered. Re decided to flood a large area of land with a red beer that looked like human blood so that the Eye of Re would find it and drink it. The Eye of Re did so and was unable to find the rest of the humans because he was drunk. Therefore, the remaining humans survived. Re then decided to leave Earth and placed Thoth as the governor of Earth.⁶³

⁶⁰ George Hart, *Egyptian Myths* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990), 11.

⁶¹ Batto, *In the Beginning*, 2.

⁶² Hart, *Egyptian Myths*, 46–49; Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 135; Hooke, *Middle Eastern Mythology*, 73–74.

⁶³ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 135.

The unique aspect of the Egyptian flood myth was that although the god of the sea was an instigator in the destruction of humanity, it did not directly carry out the task. The flood that did happen was not a flood of the invading sea but rather a flood of beer that saved humanity by intoxicating the Eye of Re.

ANE Myths and OT Scripture

This chapter introduces several ANE texts that have similarities to passages in the OT. Those similarities are the reason for the scholarly discussion that is introduced in the previous two chapters concerning whether there was a literary relationship between the OT and the ANE myths. After the content of the ANE myths has been examined, it would be helpful to examine what a few scholars have written regarding the implications of the similarities and potential relationship between the ANE myths and OT Scripture.

John Collins' commentary on Daniel includes a section where he discusses the religio-historical background of Daniel 7.⁶⁴ He has written that the general ANE negativity about the sea may have found its origins in Canaanite thought, but that in the biblical text "the symbolism of the sea is familiar from the Hebrew Bible and does not itself require direct acquaintance with Canaanite sources."⁶⁵ In other words, the OT's negativity about the sea provides sufficient background for the reader to understand the negative references to the sea in later OT passages. Although Collins has recognized the possibility that the OT authors were aware of ANE mythology, he has also argued that the reader is not handicapped if they do not have access to the ANE myths.

Robert Fyall's commentary on Job also includes a discussion of the Christian understanding of ANE myth: "If biblical use of Canaanite and other motifs were simply evidence of common mythology, then it would be difficult to maintain a doctrine of

⁶⁴ John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 280-94.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 289.

special revelation. What we do have, here and elsewhere in the Bible, is creative use of such motifs to present a distinctive message.”⁶⁶ Fyall has recognized the similarities between the OT Scripture and ANE myth without abandoning essential doctrines concerning the authorship and inspiration of the biblical text.⁶⁷

Kenneth Mathews’ commentary on Genesis contains a section titled, “Genesis 1–11 and Ancient Literature,” which includes cautions to take heed of when considering a possible parallel in ANE literature.⁶⁸ He cautions the reader against turning to the ANE literature for explanations that may or may not contain valid information for the understanding of OT passages. He writes,

The point is not that ancient Near Eastern literature and languages have no bearing, only that the common practice of the comparative method *has often made ancient literature the interpretive template for the biblical account of beginnings*. This is done at times for the slightest reason and often without due regard to the contextual function of either the biblical account or the alleged nonbiblical parallel. We would reject the extremes of either overplaying the value of the comparative materials or of flatly ignoring them.⁶⁹

The existence of a myth that closely parallels a story in the Bible *may* provide helpful information, although it neither necessarily nor probably does so. ANE myth may provide background information about or explain biblical texts but may also steer the reader in the wrong direction. Mathews has contended that “Parallels, even where they are exact, do not guarantee a significant meaning for interpretation.”⁷⁰ To use ANE myths to alter anything that the OT claims is to poorly handle the biblical text.

⁶⁶ Robert S. Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 28.

⁶⁷ See the section in chap. 2 on Hermann Gunkel’s rejection of the doctrine of inspiration.

⁶⁸ Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, New American Commentary, vol. 1A (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 86-101.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 86, emphasis added.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

Conclusion

It would be foolish to unquestioningly incorporate the information provided by ANE myth into the understanding of OT passages. But it would also be foolish to assume that the biblical authors had no knowledge of the sacred stories of the pagan peoples around them. That God's people in the OT frequently abandoned faithfulness to Yahweh in favor of worshiping other gods indicates that they were well aware of the mythological stories of their neighbors. The OT does not hide how pagan religious practices frequently infiltrated the people of Israel. But it is also clear that they were condemned and rooted out rather than adopted. Even where there is near-exact parallel between the OT and ANE texts, there is insufficient evidence to definitively claim that one was influenced by the other. The agreement does, however, demonstrate that the OT's use of the sea as a negative motif was not unique to the Bible. Therefore, it is helpful to examine the ANE texts and the history of scholarly discussion about the potential points of connection between the OT text and ANE myths.

CHAPTER 5

THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA IN OTHER ANCIENT LITERATURE

The sea is a negative element of many ancient myths and teachings from peoples all over the world. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that negativity about the sea is a universal motif in ancient literature from cultures across the globe.¹ There are far more ancient myths from across the nations that are negative about the sea than could be included in a single chapter. Therefore, the myths included here are examples from ancient cultures of each continent and region of the world.²

J. F. Bierlein's *Parallel Myths* has examined common threads in ancient myths all over the world.³ He included nine categories of myths, and flood myths make up one of those categories. The negativity about the sea in the flood myths across the world demonstrates the commonality of the motif across cultures, languages, and ethnicities. Flood myths are not the only type of myth that is negative about the sea. Creation stories from many groups of people are negative about the sea, because the world's initial state was inundated with water that needed to be removed before creation could continue.⁴

¹ For a definition of myth and resources on the subject of myth theory, see the discussion in Debra Scoggins Ballentine, "You Divided the Sea by Your Might: The Conflict Myth and the Biblical Tradition" (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2012), 7–14.

² The division of myths by continent or geographic region is unavoidably awkward. Not only did the modern designations for these places not exist in ancient times, but also the descent of ethnic and language groups has never been separated by the lines on a map, not to mention the spread of stories that results from interactions between people groups. The places currently known as North America and South America will be considered as one, along with ancient Mesoamerica. Ancient Pacific peoples, to include the Indonesian Islands, will be considered separately from either Asia or America regardless of present political affiliation. There are no known myths from ancient Antarctica.

³ J. F. Bierlein, *Parallel Myths* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1994).

⁴ Many of the myths in this chapter are of unknown age. It is also unknown to what extent the

Flood Myths

Stories of great floods and a world-wide flood exist in the ancient writings of peoples in every region of the world. The global universality of the flood myth could be attributed to the story of the world-wide flood being passed down through the generations of all the people who descended from Noah. On the other hand, the human need for water has historically meant that settlements and cities needed to be established in close proximity to water, which led to the risk of local floods destroying lives and property.⁵ Some of the ancient flood stories are explicitly about local floods. All flood stories, whether global or local, are negative about the destructiveness and uncontrollability of the waters.

Ancient African Flood Myths

The Mande creation myth from Mali contains a flood story.⁶ Two of the first created beings were Faro and Pemba. Pemba wanted to rule over creation and improperly produced a race of humans. God sacrificed Faro to atone for Pemba's sins but later brought Faro back from the dead and sent him to earth in a boat. A blacksmith who was with Faro hit a rock and produced rain that began to overflow the lake where Faro lived. Faro gathered all the proper humans and the animals onto an ark before the rain flooded

myths may have been influenced by interactions with missionaries who brought biblical stories to the native people.

⁵ Bierlein additionally mentioned an unusual theory for the universality of the flood myth: "Geza Roheim, a Hungarian disciple of Sigmund Freud, attributed the universality of flood myths to dreams that occurred while the sleeper had a full bladder." Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 124. See Géza Róheim, "The Flood Myth as Vesical Dream," in *The Flood Myth*, ed. Alan Dundes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 151–65.

⁶ David Adams Leeming and Margaret Adams Leeming, *Encyclopedia of Creation Myths* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 1994), 180–81. Harold Scheub, *A Dictionary of African Mythology: The Mythmaker as Storyteller* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 138; Barbara C. Sproul, *Primal Myths: Creation Myths Around the World* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 66–75.

the whole world.⁷ Pemba's humans were all destroyed, but Faro's humans survived and repopulated the earth. The flood was used to destroy all of the illegitimate humans.

Ancient American Flood Myths

In ancient Aztec literature, the fourth sun (or age) was the water sun. Tlaloc was the rain god who had presided over the age of the third sun. His wife, Chalchiuhtlicue, was the goddess of streams and standing water, and she presided over the fourth sun. One version of the story has been recorded by Karl Taube: "A great flood destroys the world, and its people are transformed into fish. So massive is the flood that the mountains are washed away, causing the heavens to crash down upon the earth."⁸

Another version of the Aztec story of the fourth sun is the story of Tata and Nena.⁹ Humans had grown very wicked and stopped worshipping the gods. The god of rains, Tlaloc, decided to destroy the world with a flood. But Tata and Nena were devout, and Tlaloc loved them. He warned them of the flood that was coming and instructed them to hollow out a log and get in. He instructed them to each take a single ear of corn to eat and strictly ordered them not to eat anything but the corn. After the flood subsided, they were excited to have survived and forgot the instruction: they caught a fish and ate it. This was a terrible mistake because the fish were the humans who had not been saved from the flood. When Tlaloc returned, he turned Tata and Nena into dogs for their disobedience. Then, the gods destroyed the world and ended the age of the fourth sun.

The Incan flood myth also tells of the world and all humans except for a small group of survivors being destroyed by the flood waters.¹⁰ People everywhere were corrupt and wicked, except for two brothers who lived high in the Andes mountains of

⁷ Scheub, *A Dictionary of African Mythology*, 51.

⁸ Karl A. Taube, *Aztec and Maya Myths* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993), 34–36.

⁹ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 128.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 134.

Peru. Their llamas learned that a terrible flood was coming and stopped eating. The brothers asked the llamas what was wrong, and the llamas told them about the flood. Then, the brothers took their families and flocks and hid in a cave on the mountain. The rains came and flooded the whole earth, and all the wicked humans died. The brothers and their families repopulated the earth.

The North American Algonquin people also have a myth in which the sea flooded and destroyed the whole world.¹¹ What sets the Algonquin flood story apart is the similarity between the end of the flood story and the biblical and ANE flood stories: in all these stories, a raven was sent out to find dry ground.¹² The god Michabo and his wolves were hunting when the wolves went into a lake. He went in to get them, and suddenly the whole world flooded. Michabo needed soil to create a new earth, so he sent a raven to find some. The raven came back without any, so Michabo sent out an otter. It failed also, and Michabo sent out a muskrat. The muskrat returned with soil, and Michabo was able to re-create the world. Then he married the muskrat, and their offspring were humans.

The Salinan, a Californian tribe, also have a flood myth.¹³ The Old Woman of the Sea wanted to become more powerful than the eagle, so she came to him and poured sea water out of a basket. She eventually poured out enough sea water to flood the land. The eagle was able to stop her so that the water stopped rising. Then, he sent a dove to fetch some earth with which the eagle would make a new world. The conclusion of the flood is similar to the Algonquin myth, except that the dove was sent instead of the raven. However, both are reminiscent of Noah's use of birds at the end of the flood.

¹¹ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 133.

¹² See also R. W. L. Moberly, "Why Did Noah Send out a Raven?" *Vetus Testamentum* 50, no. 3 (2000): 345–56.

¹³ Sproul, *Primal Myths*, 236.

The Wyot, a second tribe from California has a creation and flood myth.¹⁴ God created “people” but was dissatisfied with his creation because they were furry and unable to speak. He therefore decided to destroy them with a flood. Two of them, Condor and his sister, found out about God’s plans, made a basket, and hid in it to survive. They emerged after the flood subsided, and their children were the first humans. The new humans were satisfactory in God’s eyes.

The Kristeneaux flood myth is brief.¹⁵ It recounts a great flood that covered all the land and forced all the people from different tribes to climb onto a plateau together. However, the flood waters still rose and killed them all. A girl had been carried away from the flood by an eagle, by whom she later became pregnant. She gave birth to twins who were able to repopulate the earth. The plateau where the tribes had gathered went on to become a neutral meeting ground.

The Cree tribe’s flood myth also recorded a raven being sent to find dry land as the flood ended.¹⁶ A conflict between Wisagatcak and the Great Beaver resulted in the beaver magically flooding the whole world. Wisagatcak made a raft and loaded animals onto it. At the end of the flood, the muskrat went out to find dry land and drowned. Then, a raven went out to find dry land and found none. Finally, Wisagatcak and a wolf used magic to cause the raft to grow moss that gradually expanded until the raft was a giant floating land mass. Like the ANE descriptions of Tehom, the water of the great deep comes up through springs that are holes in the raft.

The Choctaw flood story additionally involves a plague of darkness.¹⁷ Darkness covered the whole world for so long that the people thought they would never

¹⁴ Sproul, *Primal Myths*, 236–37.

¹⁵ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 130.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 132–33.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 130–31.

see light again. When they thought they saw light coming from the north, it turned out to be giant waves of water that came and destroyed everyone. The few survivors had built a giant raft before the flood arrived.

The Creek-Natchez flood myth involves a single male survivor.¹⁸ His dog warned him that a flood was coming and that he needed to build a raft. He did so, and they were lifted on the waters up into the clouds. The dog then told his owner that he had to throw him overboard to cause the waters to subside. The man did so with great remorse, but the waters subsided. When he landed, he was approached by the spirits of all the people who died in the flood. The myth does not tell how the world was repopulated.

The Mojave-Apache flood story tells the story of a single female survivor.¹⁹ The wise people knew that a flood was coming because they found water rising in a hole. They decided to hollow out a tree and put a girl inside. The tree floated on the waters until the flood subsided, and she emerged alone. Later, she was impregnated by magical water and gave birth to a daughter. Her daughter was also impregnated by magical water, and her children repopulated the world.

The Nootka Native Americans of Vancouver Island have also relayed a flood myth.²⁰ The chief and many tribespeople loaded onto canoes with provisions. It is not clear whether they were warned about the flood. They may have been going on a normal whaling mission. The rain came, and the water rose until there was no more land. They made several attempts to get to mountain peaks but were unsuccessful until they performed a ritual of song with a whale fin that they had brought with them.

¹⁸ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 131.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 131–32.

²⁰ E. Sapir, “A Flood Legend of the Nootka Indians of Vancouver Island,” *The Journal of American Folklore* 32, no. 124 (1919): 351.

Ancient Asian Flood Myths

“Manu and the Fish” is a flood myth from India.²¹ Manu reached his hands into a water jar to wash them and pulled out a fish. The fish warned him of a future flood that would kill all people. The fish promised that if Manu protected it until it was fully grown, the fish would deliver him safely through the flood. Manu did so, and the fish grew into one of the largest in the sea. It instructed him to build a large boat, and the flood waters covered the whole world. During the flood, the fish pulled Manu’s boat by a rope and delivered him to a mountain, where the boat rested.

China has many variations of the flood myth.²² Derk Bodde has written, “Of all the mythological themes of ancient China, the earliest and by far the most pervasive is that of the flood. It appears in the writings belonging to the beginning of the Chou dynasty, . . . and thereafter the references are too numerous to be listed here.”²³ The general storyline is that a great flood was causing massive destruction to the land. But unlike other flood stories, the people were not killed by the flood because it was not deep enough to drown everyone. The first hero, Kun, tried in vain to dam up the waters. He was put to death either because of his failure or because he stole magical soil from the gods. His son, Yu, took up the task, but he dug channels to drain the water into the sea instead of damming up the waters.

As Bodde has pointed out, there is a basic difference between the Chinese flood myths and most others from around the world. He writes, “In the Chinese version the flood is not inflicted as divine retribution for human sin, but simply epitomizes the condition of the world before there yet existed an organized human society.”²⁴

²¹ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 125; Leeming and Leeming, *Encyclopedia of Creation Myths*, 350.

²² Derk Bodde, “Myths of Ancient China,” in *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, ed. Samuel Noah Kramer (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), 398–403.

²³ *Ibid.*, 398.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 402–3.

Ancient European Flood Myths

The Roman flood myth occurred during the Iron Age.²⁵ Good had been overcome by evil, and there were many wars in heaven. After the wars ended, the gods decided to destroy humanity with a flood. Deucalion and Pyrrha were the only survivors because they were blameless.²⁶ Zeus instructed them to throw stones over their shoulders, and after they obeyed, the stones became men and women.²⁷

Ancient Pacific Flood Myths

The indigenous Hawaiian people had two different flood myths.²⁸ Bierlein has recorded, “It would appear that Hawaii had its own indigenous flood myth before the arrival of the missionaries. But there are two versions, one clearly influenced by the Bible story and one that preceded it.”²⁹ The version of the flood myth that Beckwith has claimed to be native to Hawaii involves two people being spared from the flood by climbing a mountain rather than getting on a boat.³⁰

Creation Myths

Many of the creation stories from around the world begin with the world covered by the sea. The creator must remove the sea or otherwise overcome it to create the world. In most of the creation stories, that means the sea was displaced by the dry

²⁵ Leeming and Leeming, *Encyclopedia of Creation Myths*, 236; Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 128; Yves Bonnefoy, *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 94.

²⁶ See also W. M. Calder, “New Light on Ovid’s Story of Philemon and Baucis,” in *The Flood Myth*, ed. Alan Dundes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 101–11.

²⁷ Jan Bremmer has discussed many scholarly views on the relationship between ANE flood stories and those of the Greek literature. Jan N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible, and the Ancient Near East*, vol. 8, Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 101–16.

²⁸ Martha W. Beckwith, *Hawaiian Mythology* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996), 314–20.

²⁹ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 126–27.

³⁰ Beckwith, *Hawaiian Mythology*, 315.

ground. In a few of them, the dry ground floated on top of the water either on a raft or on the back of a giant tortoise. Some of these creation myths have already been introduced in the section on flood myths because they were part of the same story.

The Maidu, a Native American tribe in modern California, have a creation myth which bore resemblance to certain elements of the biblical creation story.³¹ For example, they believed that darkness and water covered the world prior to creation. The myth begins, “In the beginning there was no sun, no moon, no stars. All was dark, and everywhere there was only water.”³² The creator in the myth also arrived on a raft that floated on the waters. Like other Native American myths, an animal was dispatched to fetch soil that the deity used to create the habitable world, which contrasts the uninhabitable chaos of the sea. Barbara Sproul has written, “This Californian Maidu myth has as its creator a marvelous guide and helper, Earth-Initiate. Descending from heaven, shining like the sun, this dazzling power brings order to the world, forming land and calling forth his sister sun, brother moon, and the stars until the watery, dark chaos of the beginning is dispelled.”³³

Several other creation myths follow the general plot of an animal diving down into the great deep to fetch soil that the creator used to make the world.³⁴ First, in the Blood tribe’s version, the creator began by floating on top of the waters.³⁵ The myth states, “Napioa, the Old Man, floated upon a log in the waters, and had with him four animals: Mameo, the fist; Matcekupis, the frog; Maniskeo, the lizard; and Spopeo, the

³¹ Sproul, *Primal Myths*, 237–42.

³² *Ibid.*, 238.

³³ *Ibid.*, 237.

³⁴ Leeming and Leeming, *Encyclopedia of Creation Myths*, 79–80.

³⁵ Sproul, *Primal Myths*, 244–45.

turtle.” The creator sent them all down into the water in order, and the first three did not return. The turtle brought back a mouthful of mud that Napioa fashioned into the earth.

The Huron tribe from modern Ontario also told a similar creation myth:³⁶ “In the beginning there was nothing but water, a wide sea, which was peopled by various animals of the kind that live in and upon the water.”³⁷ In the myth, a woman fell from above through a rift in the sky. As she fell, she was caught by a pair of birds that delivered her to a tortoise. A toad brought some earth up to her from the depths and put it on the back of the tortoise. The earth continued to expand until it made land that was big enough to be farmed. The land mass still floats on the back of the tortoise.

The Joshua tribe from modern Oregon also envisioned the pre-creation world as a landless mass of water.³⁸ Their creation myth is similar to the earlier-mentioned myths in which something dives into the primordial sea to get soil, except in reverse. In their creation myth, the creator dropped soil down into the depths to build up land: “In the beginning there was no land. There was nothing but the sky, some fog, and water. The water was still; there were no breakers.”³⁹ The creator lived in a house on the water. He dropped cakes of mud deep into the water until land rose out of the ocean. He created people after land was firmly established.

A Chinese creation myth was identical to Hesiod, who was introduced briefly in Chapter 4: “In the beginning there was chaos.”⁴⁰ The Chinese statement does not mention if water was involved. But the concept of an initial state of unformed and chaotic

³⁶ Sproul, *Primal Myths*, 245–48.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 246.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 232–36.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 232.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 128.

disorder was common to creation stories whether that disorder involved a world that was usually covered by the sea or not.

Other Sea-Focused Myths

This section contains various kinds of stories that involve the sea. Some of them are positive about the sea in creation, which demonstrates that the negative motif of the sea is not universal to ancient literature.

Maui Myths

Many pacific peoples from Hawaii to Indonesia have myths about Maui.⁴¹ These myths significantly involved the sea. Maui was born prematurely, and his mother decided that she could not care for him, so she wrapped him in a wisp of her hair and tossed him into the sea. The sea gods took care of him and provided for him. Unfortunately, the stormy sea ripped him away from them and threw him on shore. Tamamui-ki-te-rangi, the sea ancestor, found him and raised him.⁴² Maui grew up to be a great trickster and had many adventures.

Oceana Gomawe

The god Gomawe in Oceana was the creator of humankind, and one of his forms was a sea serpent.⁴³ A spring of life would come up wherever he placed his foot. He was also accompanied by Toririhnan, the goddess of the thunderstorm and flooding. The sea in the stories of Oceana is generally positive and life-giving.

⁴¹ Leeming and Leeming, *Encyclopedia of Creation Myths*, 25. See also Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 33. The recent Disney movie entitled *Moana* includes certain elements of Polynesian Maui mythology.

⁴² Summarized from Leeming and Leeming, *Encyclopedia of Creation Myths*, 25.

⁴³ Yves Bonnefoy, *American, African, and Old European Mythologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 95.

Poseidon

The Greek god of the sea, Poseidon (Roman Neptune), was the brother of Zeus and Hades.⁴⁴ Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades were the gods of the sky, sea, and underworld, respectively. Walter Burkert recounts a scene from the *Iliad* that demonstrates Poseidon's kingship over the sea: "He harnesses his horses, steps on his golden chariot, and drives across the waves. . . . The sea opens up joyfully in his path, and the sea beasts, the monsters of the deep, come and play beneath him in the water: they know their master."⁴⁵ Poseidon's tendency toward violence and destruction can also be observed in a scene from the *Odyssey*. Burkert describes the episode: "From the heights of the Solymoi mountains Poseidon catches sight of Odysseus on his raft: grimly he grips his trident, gathers up the sea, rouses the winds, clouds over the earth and sky, and finally summons a gigantic wave to smash the raft to pieces."⁴⁶ The Greeks and Romans continually sought after Poseidon's blessing for protection and mercy because they lived on the shore of the Mediterranean and traveled often across the sea.

Ragnarök

The Norse legend of Ragnarök involves a sea serpent that causes great harm.⁴⁷ The legend states that the great serpent of the sea will rise up during the end times. Thor will battle against the sea serpent and kill it. However, that will be Thor's last battle because when he kills the sea serpent, it will spit venom on Thor and kill him.

⁴⁴ Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985); Roger D. Woodard, *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture*, 101–16.

⁴⁵ Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 137.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Bierlein, *Parallel Myths*, 246–48.

Conclusion

Although it is not negative in every instance, the sea is often a negative motif in the ancient myths and stories from peoples of every corner of the world. Negativity about the sea was not unique to the OT and the ANE. The prevalence of ancient negativity about the sea cautions against the conclusion that the OT borrowed the motif from ANE myth. For example, no scholar has argued that the OT borrowed the negative motif of the sea from the ancient Aztec, Chinese, or other peoples who wrote about the destructiveness and uncontrollability of the sea when it flooded the land. No scholar has argued that the creation stories of Native American tribes influenced the biblical writers; however, both depict the world in its initial state as being covered by the great deep, and both cast the great deep as a problem that was solved by producing dry land. Therefore, a connection between two pieces of literature that is based on common subject matter cannot be blindly assumed.

On the other hand, that the nearly universal conception of the sea as negative agrees with the OT presentation of the sea also provides a wider context for understanding the OT's negativity about the sea. The OT is similar to the beliefs of many peoples from around the world and explains what God has revealed about the sea.

CHAPTER 6

THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The focus of this chapter is on תְּהוֹם (*tehom*) in the OT.¹ The word *tehom* occurs 36 times in the OT; these instances are listed and translated in Appendix 1.² This chapter aims to demonstrate that the sea is a negative motif in the OT by showing its opposition to the ordered creation, its use as an instrument of judgment, its association with Satan, and its connection to death and darkness.

The Sea is Opposed to Creation

The purpose of this section is to demonstrate the negative motif of the sea in the OT by highlighting the OT presentation of the sea as antithetical to creation and to God's purposes for the earth. The argument of this section, that the sea is opposed to creation, does not imply that the sea itself is not a part of God's creative work.³ Genesis

¹ Francis Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*, Break Through the Language Barrier Series (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1979), 1062–63; Ronald F. Youngblood, “2495 תְּהוֹם,” in *Theological Workbook of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Walke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1999), 964–66; E. J. Waschke, “תְּהוֹם,” in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, vol. 15 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 574–81.

² *Tehom* is also used by the biblical authors in parallel with other related words such as “sea,” “waters,” “depths,” and “flood,” in several passages. Consider the following examples: Gen 1:2; Exod 15:8; Job 28:14; 38:16; 41:31; Pss 33:7; 69:17; 78:15; 104:6; 106:9; 135:6; Prov 8:28; Isa 51:10; Ezek 26:19; 31:4; Jonah 2:3; Hab 3:10.

³ The translation of Gen 1:1 has significant bearing on whether the text means that God created from nothing (*creatio ex nihilo*) or if there is a possibility that the unformed earth, as it is described in Gen 1:2, preexisted the creation actions of God. The most common traditional translation is “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” an independent clause. The JPS Torah, NRSV, and others, noting the potential influence of the Babylonian myth *Enuma elish* on the Genesis creation story, translate Gen 1:1 as a dependent clause—“When God began to create heaven and earth”—followed by v. 2 as a parenthetical phrase, and the sentence concludes with v. 3. The dependent-clause translation implies the possibility that the formless and void earth preexisted God's creative activities that begin with the creation of light in v. 3.

1:1 makes clear that God created the heavens and the earth, including the sea. There is no indication in the OT that any element of the world preexists the creation work of God.⁴ This section does, however, focus in on the point of time, mentioned in Genesis 1:2, when the earth is formless and void, a moment that takes place *during* creation. Genesis 1:2 describes a moment which certainly occurs *after* God created, but it could also be said that it describes the state of the world *before* God created, if one takes creation to mean the entire six-day process of creating, forming, and arranging. Therefore, when this section proposes that the sea opposes God’s creation, it means that world-wide sea and dry land are mutually exclusive.

In the OT, the sea consistently opposes the purposes of God in creation, and God treats the sea in the same way as he treats his enemies. The world in Genesis 1:2 is good, but it is not how God ultimately wants the world to be.⁵ The OT creates a distinction between the sea and the dry ground—the sea is consistently a place of death, whereas the dry ground is consistently a place of life.⁶ After creation is complete, the OT presents the sea as a destructive force ready to wipe out all life and roll creation back to the state described in Genesis 1:2, which is what happens when God removes the walls of protection around the dry ground at the time of the flood.⁷

For a full discussion of the translation of Gen 1:1, see Joshua Daniel Wilson, “A Case for the Traditional Translation and Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 Based Upon a Multi-Leveled Linguistic Analysis” (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2010). Mathews also includes a helpful excursus on the topic. Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, New American Commentary, vol. 1A (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 137–44. See also John H. Walton, *Genesis: From Biblical Text . . . to Contemporary Life*, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 67–70.

⁴ Exod 20:11; Jonah 1:9; and Neh 9:6 specifically list the sea as God’s creation. For perspectives on Creation *ex nihilo*, see Gerhard May, *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of “Creation out of Nothing” in Early Christian Thought*, trans. A. S. Worrall (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994); David B. Burrell, *Creation and the God of Abraham* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Gary A. Anderson and Markus Bockmuehl, *Creation Ex Nihilo: Origins, Development, Contemporary Challenges* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2018).

⁵ As evidenced by his continued activities for the rest of Gen 1.

⁶ See the section below concerning the sea’s consistent association with death.

⁷ Mathews writes, “The ‘deep’ (and ‘waters’) often is portrayed as a threat to life and to the people of God.” He refers the reader to Gen 7:11; 8:2; Exod 15:8; Amos 7:4; Jonah 2:5; Ps 107:26, but also

The representation of the sea as being opposed to creation is similar to the OT presentation of Satan: God rebukes the sea in the same way he rebukes Satan. Satan is actively opposed to God, whereas the sea passively opposes God's creative work, but God rebukes both. After rebuking the sea, God restrains it so that it cannot do damage to the rest of creation.

To prove that the sea is antithetical to the purposes God has for the dry ground, this section begins by examining God's purpose in creation, which Wayne Grudem has summarized concisely: to glorify God.⁸ All of creation, the animate and the inanimate, serves the purpose of revealing the glory of God. The OT presents the sea as antithetical to these good purposes that God intends for creation. On the second day of creation, the sea hides the beauty of the earth by covering it with a chaotic deep that is incompatible with the dry ground that God is about to reveal. To display his glory in the ordered creation of the world, God drives away the sea, relegating it to occupy a limited space with clearly defined borders.

The sea also initially stands in the way of God's plans for mankind. While the sea covers the dry ground, there is nowhere for God to place man and woman and no garden in which to give them responsibilities. The Bible makes clear that God already intends to create humans before he begins to create the world.⁹ Thus, God intends from the beginning to evict the sea, establish the Garden of Eden on the dry ground, and place man and woman there.

lists verses that are positive about the deep: Gen 49:25; Deut 8:7; 33:13; Ps 78:15. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 134.

⁸ Wayne A. Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1994), 270.

⁹ 1 Pet 1:20 and Rev 13:8 speak of God's establishing his plans prior to the creation of the world for Christ to create a way of salvation for humans, which assumes God's foregone plan to create humans.

Tohu and Tehom

When Genesis 1:1 describes God’s creating of the heavens and the earth, the text immediately gives more detail about the state of the earth, describing it as תהו ובהו.¹⁰ Most English translations render this phrase as “formless and void.” The earth at this stage is disordered, physically present but functionally pointless. The earth has been created, and it is good, but it is not *good for* anything. That is, it cannot yet serve the purposes for which God intended it.

The state of תהו ובהו is the opposite of how God ultimately wants the earth to be. It is not ordered, completed, and ready to fulfill God’s purposes. The next section will discuss in more detail the differences between the initial state of the earth and the finished product; this section establishes a relationship between תהו (*tohu*) and תהום (*tehom*) as they are used in the OT.

In Genesis 1:2, a syntactical parallel connects the terms *tohu* and *tehom*.¹¹ The earth is *tohu* and is covered with *tehom*. This particular parallel is perceptible not only from the structure of the Hebrew sentence, but also from the morphology of the two words. On the page, without cantillation marks, the un-pointed Hebrew words are nearly identical: תהו and תהום. The syntactical parallel is highlighted by visual similarity of the morphology of the words. The connection between these words is confirmed by their meaning and use in the OT. The entry for תהו in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* suggests the possibility that the words are related etymologically and semantically:

¹⁰ The term תהו (“formless, empty”) occurs 20 times in 19 verses in the OT. Isaiah accounts for more than half of the occurrences, having 11 of the 20, while the second-most occurrences in a single book are 3 in Job. The term בהו (“emptiness, void”) occurs 3 times and is always preceded by תהו, although in Isa 34:11 they are separated by a word in a sequential parallel structure.

¹¹ The term תהום (“the great deep”) occurs 36 times in 35 verses in the MT. In all but two occurrences, *tehom* is without the definite article and is treated grammatically as a proper noun like *Sheol* [שְׁאוֹל]. Sarna notes, “It is instructive that *tehom* is treated as a Hebrew proper name; like all such names, it never appears with the definite article.” Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with New JPS Translation*, The JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 6.

Despite the majority view that *tohu* is a West Semitic primary noun, one cannot rule out the possibility of a connection with the Egyptian base *thm* or an etymological relationship with the base *thy/3*. Egypt. *thm* can be a complementary form of *thy/3*. In an inscription of Pharaoh Merneptah, the two verbs even appear together as terms for military actions conducted by Egypt's enemies and therefore are closely related semantically.¹²

The parallel between *tohu* and *tehom* in the syntax of Genesis 1:2 is supplemented by the similarity of their meaning and usage in the OT. The earth is *tohu* and it is covered with *tehom*. One aspect of the earth's formlessness is that it is covered by *tehom*, which is the most obvious feature of the formless earth. To be covered in *tehom* is to be *tohu*. As the following sections emphasize, God does not intend for the earth to remain in that state, as he demonstrates by immediately changing it.

In addition to their relationship in the description of the earth in Genesis 1:2, both *tohu* and *tehom* are used by the OT authors to communicate threats of destruction.¹³ When foretelling an impending disaster, the prophets use *tohu* to describe the future state of the land. The implication of their prophecies is that the good things God has done after Genesis 1:2 are about to be undone. It is as if creation itself is going to be rolled back to its unformed state. There is no picture of more extensive destruction of the land than to say it will return to *tohu*, as it was in Genesis 1:2. The following texts demonstrate that *tohu* communicates destruction in the OT:

Isaiah 24:10.¹⁴ This chapter begins a section that is called the "Isaiah

¹² G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 15:568.

¹³ *Tohu* includes threat of destruction in the following verses: Deut 32:10; Job 6:18; 12:24; Ps 107:40; Isa 24:10; 34:11; 40:17, 23; 45:18; Jer 4:23.

¹⁴ See John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 437-57; J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 196-207; Barry G. Webb, *The Message of Isaiah: On Eagles' Wings*, The Bible Speaks Today (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 106-8; Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary*, ed. William P. Brown, Carol A. Newsom, and Brent A. Strawn, The Old Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 171-81; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, rev. ed., Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 24 (Nashville, TN: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2005), 309-27; Gary V. Smith, *Isaiah 1-39*, The New American Commentary, vol. 15A (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2007), 405-27; J. A. Motyer, *Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 20 (Nottingham, England:

Apocalypse” because it deals with the eschatological triumph of God over his enemies for the sake of his people.¹⁵ Oswalt writes, “the overriding theme of the segment is the triumph of God, not only over his enemies but for his people.”¹⁶ Isaiah 24:1 identifies the LORD as an “emptier” of the land, and 24:3 describes vast destruction and a complete emptying of the land such that absolutely nothing remains. The first verses of Isaiah 24 use הָאָרֶץ (*ha'arets*) ambiguously to refer to either the whole earth or to the land—that is, the land of Israel and Judah.¹⁷ All people in the land will be affected by its impending demise.

In verse 10, the author uses *tohu* to describe what the city will be like after the destruction has come upon it: “The *tohu* city is broken down; every house is shut up so that none can enter.” Thus, the reader is able to understand that when the devastating events of this chapter come to pass, the city will be left in a state of *tohu*. The word is used to describe the extent to which the land will have been destroyed. It will look as the world looked before God ordered and developed it into a place that was fully functioning for his purposes. When it is in a state of *tohu*, the city will no longer glorify God because of the complete devastation.

Isaiah 34:11.¹⁸ This verse describes the destruction that God will bring against Edom, and it also uses *tohu* and *bohu* to explain the extent to which Edom will be destroyed, as if it had never been created. “But the hawk and porcupine shall possess

InterVarsity Press, 2009), 182–90.

¹⁵ The “Isaiah Apocalypse” is Isaiah 24–27. See excursus in Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 309–12.

¹⁶ Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1–39*, 443.

¹⁷ See Watts’ excursus on “land” in this passage. Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 316–17.

¹⁸ See Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, 609–18; Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 268–72; Webb, *The Message of Isaiah*, 142–44; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 25 (Dallas: Word, 1998), 10–13; Childs, *Isaiah*, 256–57; Smith, *Isaiah 1-39*, 569–76; Motyer, *Isaiah*, 239–43.

[Edom],” warns the verse, and “the owl and the raven shall dwell in it. He shall stretch the line of *tohu* over it, and the plumb line of *bohu*.” Amid a passage describing the extreme disaster that is coming against Edom, the LORD uses the language of *tohu* and *bohu* to communicate the extent of the destruction that will occur. Oswalt writes,

The line of chaos and the plummet of destruction have an ironic tone about them. Normally the line and the plumb bob would be tools of construction, not of destruction. But here God has compared the crooked and deformed structures of the world to his own righteousness and has decreed demolition (1:21–24; 28:17; 2 K. 21:13; Lam. 2:8; Amos 7:7–9). Edom will return to the chaos from which she came, there to remain forever (Mal. 1:4–5).¹⁹

Edom will be so far gone that it might as well be described as *tohu* and *bohu*, a description that recalls the earth in its initial, unformed state of disorder.

Jeremiah 4:23.²⁰ Jeremiah 4:23 also uses *tohu* and *bohu* to communicate the extremity of the threat against the land. In his description of devastation, Jeremiah shows that the earth will be returned to its state on the second day of creation. As it was in Genesis 1:2, the land will be a formless void and covered in darkness.²¹ In Jeremiah 4:23, *tohu* is used to communicate the threat of un-creation.²²

Tehom communicates the same level of threat. Like *tohu*, it is used by the biblical authors to convey a threat of un-creation. The flood demonstrates the un-creation

¹⁹ Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, 615, emphasis original.

²⁰ J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 229–30; Peter C. Craigie, *Jeremiah. 1-25*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 26 (Dallas: Word Books, 1991), 80–82; F. B. Huey, *Jeremiah, Lamentations*, The New American Commentary, vol. 16 (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1993), 84–85; J. Andrew Dearman, *Jeremiah and Lamentations*, The NIV Application Commentary Series (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 87; Leslie C. Allen, *Jeremiah: A Commentary*, Old Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 67–70.

²¹ In 4:27, the LORD further describes the devastation in the land, but thankfully he adds that he will stop short of complete destruction.

²² Mathews writes, “Jeremiah 4:23–26 clearly reflects the creation language of Genesis 1, and the prophecy has been commonly understood as a metaphorical ‘reversal’ of creation that leads to primordial ‘chaos.’ Thus Jeremiah announced that Judah would be ‘uncreated’ as a consequence of God’s judgment. Rather than a primordial ‘chaos,’ however, Jeremiah used the similar imagery of creation so as to announce that the ‘land’ (‘eres) of Judah will become a ‘desolate’ place as was the ‘earth’ (‘eres) before its creation, that is, a land lifeless without the blessing of God. This is explicated in the following oracle (Jer 4:27–29), where the ‘whole land (kol-hā’āres) will be ruined.’ Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, 132.

that can be caused by the sea. In Genesis 7, the sea bursts forth and all that had been created is destroyed. The prophets use the sea and flood-related language to describe the same threat of un-creation, hearkening back to the state of the world on the second day of creation, when the earth was *tohu* and covered with *tehom*. *Tehom* and *tohu* are both used in passages of threat against God's completed creation.

The Sea Was Out of Place

The newly created earth is initially defined as *tohu* and covered with *tehom*, and both of those terms come to be associated with threats of returning to such a state. *Tohu* and *tehom* are already negative in Genesis 1, because the earth is not supposed to be *tohu* and covered with *tehom*. Isaiah 45:18 says, "For thus says the Lord, who . . . formed the earth and made it . . . he did not create it *tohu*, he formed it to be inhabited."²³ Genesis states that God created the earth *tohu*, but Isaiah says that God did not create the earth *tohu*, which would appear to be a contradiction. But Isaiah 45:7 shows that the author agrees with the Genesis creation story.²⁴

The important distinction between Genesis 1:2 and Isaiah 45:18 is the stage of creation to which each is referring. Genesis 1:2 speaks of the earth before God ordered it and gave it purpose,²⁵ whereas Isaiah speaks about God's final intentions for the earth. Concerning Isaiah 45:18, Oswalt writes, "Chaos did not exist before God, and God did

²³ See Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 364; John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 211-19; Watts, *Isaiah 34-66*, 158-63; Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary*, 344-56; Gary V. Smith, *Isaiah 40-66*, The New American Commentary, vol. 15B (Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group, 2009), 275; Motyer, *Isaiah*, 327-28.

²⁴ Isa 45:7 stated that God had even created the darkness. It is not simply what exists when light is not present. Sarna writes, "Here it seems to be not just the absence of light but a distinct entity, the origin of which is left unclear. Isa 45:7, however, explicitly ascribes its existence to divine creation." Sarna, *Genesis*, 6.

²⁵ The rest of Gen 1 contains the actions God took to complete and order the earth for his purposes. Therefore, to speak of the *tohu* earth of Gen 1:1-2 in terms such as "before creation" is not to imply that the earth preexisted God's creation or that God did not create the *tohu* earth itself, upon which he creates and forms for the rest of Gen 1.

not bring a meaningless chaos into existence.”²⁶ When Isaiah 45:18 states that God did not create the world *tohu*, it is not implying that Genesis 1:2 is inaccurate, but rather that Genesis 1:2 is not how God intends the world to be.²⁷ Youngblood writes, “Isa 45:18. . . goes on to say that God ‘formed (the earth) to be inhabited,’ thereby assuring the reader that *tōhû* was not his ultimate purpose in creation.”²⁸

After the initial creation of the world, and prior to the rebuke of the sea, the status of the earth is not the way God ultimately wants it to be. This raises the questions of why God does not create the planet with the sea already in its permanent location and, more broadly, why God creates in six days instead of one. Sarna writes, “That God should create disorganized matter, only to reduce it to order, presents no more of a problem than does His taking six days to complete creation instead of instantaneously producing a perfected universe. The quintessential point of the narrative is the idea of ordering that is the result of divine intent.”²⁹ God reveals his intent by creating the world as he does not want it to be and then changing it to reflect his intention.

Psalm 104:6 shows that God deliberately covers the earth with the sea as with a garment, then proceeds to rebuke and push the sea off the dry ground.³⁰ This detail

²⁶ Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40–66*, 218.

²⁷ Consider also the precedent that God declared something to be “not good” even in the midst of the refrain that each step of creation was good. Hamilton writes, “Everything thus far in Genesis that has been scrutinized by God has been given a positive assessment. Every situation has come through as either good or very good. For the first time we encounter something that is not good: man’s lack of a corresponding companion.” Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1990), 175. God declared the aloneness of Adam to be not good because God was not finished creating humans until he made woman. Each other day of creation also holds the same tension—it is good, but it is not finished.

²⁸ Ronald F. Youngblood, “2494 תהוה,” in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1999), 964.

²⁹ Sarna, *Genesis*, 6.

³⁰ Psalm 104 will be discussed below in the section on the rebuke of the sea. See Mitchell J. Dahood, *Psalms*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 17A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 31–48; Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 21 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 34–49; Nancy L. DeClaissé-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*, The New

reveals not only how God wants creation to be, but also how he does not want creation to be. He creates the earth covered in the sea and then rearranges it in order to highlight the significance of the dry ground.

The sea is not the only thing God creates and then pushes away. Genesis 1:2 reveals that $\aleph\psi\aleph$ (*hoshek*, ‘darkness’) was also over the face of the sea.³¹ The *tohu* earth was covered with *tehom*, and *tehom* was covered with *hoshek*. Genesis 1:3 reveals that God immediately pushes back and limits the darkness.³² Walton writes, “In the ancient Near East the existence of chaos was a central concern. Within the cosmos, the raging sea and darkness are the forces of chaos.”³³

The Sea versus Dry Ground

The OT contrasts the sea and the dry ground. In creation, God makes the dry ground as a place of life for humans and animals. Until the dry ground is revealed on Day 3, there is no suitable place for humans to live. The dry ground is a place of life for humans. The OT refers to the whole of the earth as “the sea and the dry land.”³⁴ The two realms are distinguished in the text by more than simply their locations on a map; the dry ground is consistently shown to be a place of life, whereas the sea is consistently a place

International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 769–81.

³¹ Darkness is also a negative motif in the OT, which will be discussed in a section below.

³² *Tehom* and *hoshek*, which are created and then pushed away, are also consistently distinguished in the OT as “made” versus “formed.” The initial element is “made” [$\aleph\psi\aleph$], and the result of rearranging is “formed” [$\aleph\psi\aleph$]. Concerning the sea, Psalm 95:5 says, “His is the sea, for he made [$\aleph\psi\aleph$] it, and as for the dry ground, he formed [$\aleph\psi\aleph$] it.” Concerning the darkness, Isaiah 45:7 says, “I form light [$\aleph\psi\aleph$], and I make darkness [$\aleph\psi\aleph$].” God made the darkness and he formed the light. God made the sea and he formed the dry ground.

³³ Walton, *Genesis*, 72.

³⁴ “The sea and the dry land” was a phrase used to refer to the whole earth in a summarized statement. Earth is divided into two realms: the dry land and the sea. Jonah says he is a servant of “the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land” (1:9). In Hag 2:6, God makes the same dual reference to the earth: “I will shake the heavens and the earth, the sea and the dry land.”

of death.

At creation, God's plans for human life necessitate the dry ground. When God pushes the sea off to uncover the dry ground, he makes a limit that the sea cannot cross without wiping out life.³⁵ But in Genesis 7:11, when God has determined to put an end to all human life except the family of Noah, "*tehom* burst forth." The way God chooses to end all life on earth is to remove the border of protection around the dry ground and allow the sea back upon it. Without that border, the dry ground and all life on it are destroyed by the sea. There can be no life for humans without the dry ground, which is a place of life, while the sea is a place of death.

In the story of the exodus, the sea is contrasted with the dry ground. When God makes a way through the Red Sea for his people to escape Pharaoh and his army, the text repeatedly emphasizes that they pass through the sea on dry ground.³⁶ The dry ground is a path of life for them through the middle of the Red Sea. Without the dry ground they all would have died, either upon the swords of the soldiers or by drowning in the deep. But God provides dry ground for his people to escape with their lives. When Pharaoh and his men attempt to follow, God removes the walls that hold back the sea and Pharaoh's men are overwhelmed.

The story of Jonah also contrasts the sea and the dry ground. The narrative tells how Jonah and the sailors were surrounded by the sea, which was growing more and more tempestuous. They "struggled to get back to dry land" (Jonah 1:13), but they could not. When they threw him overboard, Jonah sank into the sea.³⁷ This story, like that of the

³⁵ See Job 38:8–11: boundaries, bolt, and doors.

³⁶ See Exod 14:16, 21, 22, 29; and 15:19.

³⁷ In his prayer, Jonah makes no distinction between the sea and death as he felt that he was slipping out of life. Jonah uses many of the biblical words that are connected to the sea while describing his situation: distress, *Sheol*, the deep, seas, flood, waves and billows, and pit (Jonah 2:1–9). Jonah sees the flood around him like a besieging army, saying, "The flood surrounded me," (Jonah 2:3). The sea wrapped weeds around his head like chains, and the bars closed upon him. Jonah thought of his condition in the sea as a watery dungeon where he would ultimately die. But God provided a means of rescue from the sea as he

flood, describes the stark contrast between the sea and the dry ground. The dry ground is a place of life where Jonah can carry out the mission the Lord had given him, whereas the sea is a place of death. In the OT events of creation, the flood, the exodus, and the story of Jonah, the text makes a specific distinction between the dry ground and the sea. The dry ground is a place of life, and the sea is a place of death.

The Sea as Un-Creator

The most direct way that the sea threatens the completed creation is through its consistent character as an un-creator. During creation, the sea was rebuked and restrained as part of God's good, creation-completing actions upon the previously unformed world. But during the flood, the sea bursts forth as an un-creator (Gen 7:11). Mathews writes, "The deluge is described in creation language. . . . *The Lord sets in motion the un-creation of the world by releasing the powers that always stand ready to overwhelm life.* The waters once separated will now be rejoined for the purpose of destruction. Earth's disruption is comprehensive; "all" the waters of the "great deep" came forth."³⁸

When God allows the sea to burst forth, his explicit purpose is to punish human sin by removing his creation. The flood un-creates humanity and the rest of the ordered creation with it. Hamilton writes, "There is no doubt that the two sources of water are intended to recall the 'waters above and below' of 1:6-7. The Flood un-creates and returns the earth to a pre-creation period when there was only 'waters.'"³⁹ God rolls creation back to its initial state.

did with Noah. God delivered Jonah out of the sea to live again on the dry ground. At the conclusion of Jonah's prayer, God spoke to the fish "and it vomited him out upon the dry land" (Jonah 2:10). The fish not only preserved Jonah's life in the depths of the sea, it delivered him safely to the dry ground.

³⁸ Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 376, emphasis added.

³⁹ Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 291.

The flood reveals why God had set a wall around the dry ground (Job 38:8–11): without the wall, bars, and doors protecting the dry ground, the sea would destroy all of creation. Gordon Wenham writes, “In releasing the waters pent-up below and above the earth, God is undoing his great acts of separation whereby the dry land was created and the waters were confined in the seas (Gen 1:9). The earth is going back to Gen 1:2, when the waters covered its face.”⁴⁰ The flood story records that the waters stand above the mountains. As in Genesis 1:2, the sea covers the entire face of the earth so that there is no dry ground.⁴¹

At the end of the flood, God makes a covenant with Noah, as the representative of all mankind, that he will never again cut off all flesh by the waters of a flood (Gen 9:11). At creation, God had set a border that the sea was not permitted to cross. After the flood, God reestablishes that border and promises that the sea will not cross it again to destroy all flesh on the earth. In the flood God demonstrates that the sea is incompatible with his purposes for the earth.

Rebuke of the Sea

The actions of God toward the sea are similar to his actions toward Satan. In Genesis 1, God tells the sea to be gathered into one place so that dry ground appears. The OT also elaborates on that interaction and reveals that God’s actions against the sea are

⁴⁰ Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1 (Dallas: Word, 1998), 180–81.

⁴¹ Cf. Ps 104:6, “the waters stood above the mountains.” This may strike the reader as referring to the flood, because of the detail in comparison to Gen 7:19–20, which states that the waters of the flood stood above the mountains. However, Ps 104 is about creation; it follows the progression of the creation narrative of Gen 1. Thus, the point is that the only appropriate time for waters to cover the mountains was before God put them in their right place. The flood returned the earth to its initial state without order and without dry ground. The psalmist specifically meant that if the waters are above the mountains, the situation is like it was before God rebuked the great deep. Waters above the mountains was the situation before order was established. In Gen 7:11–18, the wall of protection around the dry ground had been removed, and the waters once again covered the tops of the mountains. Creation in almost every respect had been undone.

the same actions he takes against his enemies. Psalm 104:5–9 states that God rebuked the sea and that the sea took flight.⁴² The verb used in Psalm 104:7 to communicate what God does to the sea in Genesis 1 is an action that is elsewhere exclusively used to describe God’s actions toward his enemies: God rebuked the sea. רָעַר (“rebuke”) occurs sixteen times as a noun and fourteen times as a verb in the OT.⁴³

When the subject is human, the verb usually refers to instruction of another human who is the object, as when a wise person rebukes a fool.⁴⁴ When the context is not instruction, rebuke indicates threat, such as the threat of an attacking army.⁴⁵ In twenty-one of its thirty occurrences, the word “rebuke” has God as its subject, and in all of them the meaning is that of a threat to the object.⁴⁶ When God is the subject, the direct objects of his rebuke are limited to Satan, the sea, and other enemies.⁴⁷ For example, in Isaiah 17:13 God announces that he will rebuke the nations that oppose his purposes. He will treat them as enemies, and they will flee. Also, in Psalm 9:5 the nations are called wicked, and God’s rebuke causes them to perish. When God is the verbal subject, rebuke is a threat to the object.

Because all other recipients of God’s rebuke are his enemies, it is reasonable to

⁴² Dahood, *Psalms*, 31–48; Allen, *Psalms 101-150*, 34–49; DeClaissé-Walford, Jacobson, and Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*, 769–81.

⁴³ See the entry for רָעַר in Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 172. Verb: Gen 37:10; Isa 17:13; 54:9; Jer 29:27; Nah 1:4; Zec 3:2 (x2); Mal 2:3; 3:11; Pss 9:6; 68:31; 106:9; 119:21; Ruth 2:16. Noun: 2 Sam 22:16; Isa 30:17 (x2); 50:2; 51:20; 66:15; Pss 18:16; 76:7; 80:17; 104:7; Job 26:11; Prov 13:1; 13:8; 17:10; Eccl 7:5. Technically, a noun does not have a subject. But in a statement like “God’s rebuke of the sea,” the noun “rebuke” implies the verb. In this example, “God rebuked the sea.” Therefore, in this section the owner of the rebuke will be considered the subject of the implied verb.

⁴⁴ Subject is Human: Gen 37:10; Jer 29:27; Ruth 2:16; Isa 30:17 (x2); Prov 13:1; 13:8; 17:10; and Eccl 7:5.

⁴⁵ Two verses (Prov 13:8 and Isa 30:17) use “rebuke” to communicate a human threat to a human recipient.

⁴⁶ Subject is God: 2 Sam 22:16; Job 26:11; Pss 9:6; 18:16; 68:31; 76:7; 80:17; 104:7; 106:9; 119:21; Isa 17:13; 50:2; 51:20; 54:9; 66:15; Nah 1:4; Zec 3:2 (x2); and Mal 2:3; 3:11.

⁴⁷ E.g., the wicked, nations who oppose God, armies fighting against God.

conclude that when God rebukes the sea, the text is showing that the sea is an enemy.⁴⁸ There are six verses in which God rebukes the sea: 2 Sam 22:16; Isa 50:2; Nah 1:4; Ps 18:16; 104:7; 106:9. Not only does God's rebuke of the sea indicate that it is being treated like an enemy, but the sea's response is one we might expect of an enemy in the face of the Lord's rebuke: it flees.⁴⁹

The Sea as Judgment

This section demonstrates the negative motif of the sea in the OT by showing the frequency and consistency with which God uses the sea as an instrument of judgment against sin. In addition to its reputation as a destroyer of creation, the sea is used by God as a means of administering punishment in response to human sin. This chapter examines situations in which the sea is used as a tool of God's judgment against sin and texts in which the author makes comparison to a past judgment event.

A natural question is whether a tool of judgment against sin should be called "negative" in the first place. The tool is accomplishing God's good and righteous judgment against sin.⁵⁰ It is doing so passively, in the case of an inanimate tool of judgment like the sea. The fact that a thing causes destruction and death does not necessitate the conclusion

⁴⁸ God also held back the sea in the same way that one would hold back an enemy. God made a wall to keep it off the dry ground. Ps 104:9 and Job 38:8–11 reveal that after rebuking the sea, God set a boundary for it and shut it in with barred doors. God restrained the sea so that it would not again cover the face of the dry ground. Rebuking, driving away, and barring from re-entry are the kinds of actions one takes against an enemy.

⁴⁹ In some of the examples above, the Lord is referring to his rebuke of the Red Sea during the Exodus from Egypt. In others, he refers to the rebuke of the great deep that covered the whole world at the beginning of creation. Genesis 1 and the rest of the OT do not indicate any level of struggle between God and the sea during creation that scholars have termed *chaoskampf*. Ps 104:7 demonstrates that the method by which God separated the waters under the heavens was a rebuke. He drove the great deep away the same way he drives enemies away.

⁵⁰ One aspect of the righteousness of God is that he punishes sin. Wayne Grudem explains, "As a result of God's righteousness, it is necessary that he treat people according to what they deserve. Thus, it is necessary that God punish sin." Wayne A. Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1994), 204.

that the text presents it negatively. For example, when the Earth opens and swallows Korah, the text is not presenting the Earth negatively.⁵¹ Rather, negativity is reputation, and like any reputation it is earned by the consistency and frequency. Tools of judgment that God uses only one time in the text do not carry a negative reputation. However, a means of judgment that God used consistently earns a negative reputation in the text.

Death certainly carries a negative connotation. It is the direct result of Adam's sin in the Garden, and every death since the time of Adam is an event of judgment against sin.⁵² Leprosy is another means by which God punishes numerous people in the OT. Not every case of leprosy is the result of sin, just as not every flood in the history of the world is dispatched by God to punish sin.⁵³ Where leprosy is mentioned in the text, the text presents it negatively both by the nature of leprosy and by the reputation of its use in the OT as a tool of judgment against the wicked.

The Philistines likewise come to carry a negative reputation in the OT. God uses the Philistines several times for the purpose of punishing his people in response to their sin.⁵⁴ In addition to being a tool of judgment against the sin of God's people, the Philistines earn a negative reputation in the text because of their pagan worship and their seduction of God's people to join them in the worship of false gods. Judges 2:11–15 describes the typical progression of God's judgment against his people for their sin.

⁵¹ See Num 16:30 and Philip J. Budd, *Numbers*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 5 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), 179–91; R. Dennis Cole, *Numbers* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 261–68; Timothy R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 298–321.

⁵² Immediately following the fall in Gen 3, the phrase “and he died” reverberates through every generation of Adam's descendants except Enoch. See Gen 2:7; 3:19; 5:5, 8, 11, 14, and so on.

⁵³ For example, 2 Kgs 5 gives no indication that Naaman's leprosy was directly the result of sin. In stark contrast is Elisha's servant Gehazi in the same chapter, whose leprosy was a direct punishment on him and his family. See T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 13 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), 55–69; Paul R. House, *1, 2 Kings*, New American Commentary, vol. 8 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 269–74.

⁵⁴ Particularly in the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. Cf. Judg 10:7; 13:1; 16:21; 1 Sam 4:1–10; etc.

When his people abandon him in order to worship the Baals, God removes protection from his people, gives them into the hands of their enemies, and even strengthens their enemies against them. In the same way, the narrative of the flood describes God removing the boundary that he had established when he pushed back the sea during creation and which holds back its proud waves; God strengthens the sea and gives it dominion over the dry ground to punish the sins of the world.

The sea, like death, leprosy, and the Philistines, earns a negative reputation in the text of the OT as a tool of judgment against sin. In the event of the flood, the sea destroys all of the ordered creation on the dry ground, along with humans and all creatures that have the breath of life in them (Gen 6:9–9:17). The sea also destroys the wicked at the conclusion of the exodus, when Pharaoh and his army encounter the wrath of God by means of the sea crashing down on them to take their lives (Exod 14:1–15:21). Isaiah uses the image of the flooding sea to communicate the imminent destruction of Israel and Judah at the hands of enemies who would carry them into exile.⁵⁵ Finally, Jonah experiences punishment for his sins when he is buffeted by a great storm on the sea and then thrown into the sea to terminate his life, although God delivers him from death (John 1:7–2:10). Thus, the biblical authors make a connection between the waters of the sea and God’s wrath against sin.

Judgment against the World

This section examines the negative role of the sea in the narrative of the flood in Genesis 6–9. The flood is the broadest application of God’s judgment against sin in the OT. Every other instance of God’s judgment against sin is a local event, and many times even an individual event. Only in the flood does God destroy the whole world, along with every human (except Noah and his family) and everything that has the breath of life in it

⁵⁵ See Isa 8:5–8; 9:17; 28:2, 14–22; 44:27–28; 51:9–10; and 54:9–10.

(except for the specimens preserved on the ark).⁵⁶ The extent of damage the sea does to the whole world can only be described, however inadequately, as catastrophic. In addition to its physical impact on the world, the flood makes an impact on later writers of Scripture that can be seen throughout the remainder of the OT.

The sea is the tool God uses to kill all flesh and remove the corruption and violence that have been brought upon the earth through human sin. Genesis 7 articulates in several ways the effects that the sea has upon the dry ground.⁵⁷ God allows the sea to destroy all living things because of the sin of humans. The phrase “*tehom* burst forth” reveals that the only reason the sea had not already killed everything is that God had been restraining it from doing so.

The bars that hold the sea back are removed, and God uses the sea to carry out his judgment and wrath against the whole world. The waters of the flood come from the sea. In addition to the rain that falls from above, God removes the restraints that previously held back the sea’s destructive power. At the command of the Creator, the sea bursts its barriers and floods the face of the planet, returning to the global coverage it had in Genesis 1:2, before God separated it from the dry land. God uses the sea to flood the world and remove the wickedness of mankind, and after the flood God reestablishes the boundaries that hold back the sea. Once again it is permitted to come only to a certain place and no further. Once again there are boundaries that cannot be overrun by the waters of the sea.

⁵⁶ John Walton and Tremper Longman have recently argued that the historical event recounted in Gen 6–9 was a localized flood rather than a global flood in a unique way. Although they state that the biblical text cannot be used to argue for a localized flood, they contend that the biblical authors used hyperbolic language as a rhetorical device that would have been perceived by the ancient Near Eastern audience even if it is undetectable to the modern reader. Tremper Longman and John H. Walton, *The Lost World of the Flood: Mythology, Theology, and the Deluge Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2018).

⁵⁷ The waters “prevailed,” “increased greatly,” “prevailed mightily,” “prevailed above the mountains,” and “prevailed on the earth” (vv. 18–20, 24). Everything on land died: “All flesh . . . all mankind . . . everything on dry ground . . . every living thing that was on the face of the ground . . . [died].” (vv. 21–23).

Isaiah later picks up on this motif of the flood to explain his prophecy concerning the imminent exile (Isaiah 8:5–8; 9:17; 28:2, 14–22; 44:27–28; 51:9–10; and 54:9–10). The flood serves an important role for him in the explanation of the events that are to come.⁵⁸

Being the only biblical judgment event that directly and immediately affects the entire world and every human on it, the flood is the premier event of judgment in the OT, and it echoes throughout the OT text in similar events, comparisons, and allusions. No other event of God’s judgment on sin so impacts the biblical story until the crucifixion of Jesus on the cross.

Judgment against Pharaoh

The exodus is a second example of God using the sea as a means of judgment.⁵⁹ God has just demonstrated his power over the waters of the Nile River and delivered a series of destructive blows against Egypt, culminating in the death of every first-born son (Exod 7:14–12:32).⁶⁰ As the Hebrew people exit the land of Egypt, Pharaoh chases them to the edge of the Red Sea, where the Hebrews will certainly drown in the sea if they try to cross (Exod 14:11–12). However, God demonstrates his power over the sea by separating the waters from the dry ground to provide a path of egress for his people (Exod 14:21–31).

⁵⁸ David Gunn writes, “Deutero-Isaiah saw the exile and the imminent deliverance as being essentially of the same order as the events of the flood and what followed, and that for him the flood, like the exodus, was an event of great paradigmatic value for the people in exile.” David M. Gunn, “Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, no. 4 (December 1975): 493.

⁵⁹ As discussed in the previous section, the flood is the OT archetype of God’s judgment against sin in the world, and the exodus from Egypt is the OT archetype of God’s deliverance for his chosen people. That is not to say that the flood lacks deliverance, for the main point of the story is that God saved Noah and his family on the ark, and the exodus story of saving God’s people from slavery in Egypt is not a story without judgment against the wicked. Deliverance from captivity cannot happen without the defeat of the captor.

⁶⁰ John I. Durham, *Exodus*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 3 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 89–168; Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus*, The JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 38–52.

There are striking similarities between the way the text tells of God's power over the waters of the Red Sea, over the sea at Creation, and over the great deep during the flood. As in the story of creation, God begins the episode of the crossing of the Red Sea by rebuking the waters, driving them back, and setting limits on them. The waters stand up like walls on the right side and the left side of the dry path that the people of Israel travel upon. Over this dry ground the people of God are able to pass alive without fear of death from the waters, much like the dry ground that God separates from the sea at Creation, when he establishes boundaries around the dry ground that the sea cannot overflow.

As in the story of the preservation of Noah and his family through the flood, in the story of the exodus through the Red Sea God preserves for himself a selection of people who are to be protected from the imminent destruction of the waters. But the enemies of God, who will be the recipients of his wrath, are drowned in the deep. When Pharaoh and his army pursue the Israelites across the Red Sea, God removes the restraints upon the sea and allows it to burst forth again, causing great destruction to his enemies. Once again, he uses the waters of the sea to carry out his judgment and wrath against the ungodly.

Both the waters of the Red Sea and the waters of the flood before them carry the motivic resonance established for the sea throughout the text. Gunn writes, "The flood story both rehearses the story of creation (the world is, in effect, re-created) and prefigures, in the deliverance of Noah, the redemption theme that is so characteristic of the Reed-Sea tradition."⁶¹ The typological nature of these two events is also picked up by Isaiah, who uses them to explain the coming exile, to be discussed in the next section (cf. Isa 8:5–8; 9:17; 28:2, 14–22; 44:27–28; 51:9–10; and 54:9–10). The text of Exodus 14–15 hearkens back both to Creation and to the flood, and there is much similarity of

⁶¹ Gunn, "Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood," 502–3.

language to examine in these texts.

Exodus 14–15.⁶² Numerous words in Exodus 14:21 deserve specific analysis. First, there are similarities between this verse and the account of Creation. In Exodus 14:21, God uses a strong east wind [רִיחַ] to drive away the sea during the course of a night and to reveal dry ground, which recalls God’s spirit [רוּחַ] hovering over the waters immediately prior to their separation in Genesis 1.⁶³ God divides the waters at creation to reveal the dry ground that will serve as a place of life for his creatures. In Exodus 14:21, God again produces dry ground that serves as a path of life.⁶⁴

Second, there is similarity between the wording of this verse and that of the flood event. Mathews writes about Genesis 7:11: “The word for ‘burst forth’ (bāqa‘) is used of Israel’s experience that witnesses the ‘divided’ waters at the Red Sea (Exod 14:16, 21; Ps 78:13; Isa 63:12) and the earthquake that ‘split apart’ and swallows the members of Korah’s rebellion (Num 16:31).”⁶⁵ “Burst forth” is used in a variety of

⁶² Durham, *Exodus*, 194–198; Sarna, *Exodus*, 73–75.

⁶³ Targum Onkelos and Targum Psuedo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch both use the verb דָּבַר “to lead, to drive, to plow” to translate the Hebrew הָלַךְ “to walk,” which in most English versions is “to drive back.” One may notice the possibility of a play on ‘words’ between the verb דָּבַר “to drive away” and the noun דְּבָר “word” in relation to the creation account where God used only his word [דְּבָר] drive back [Aramaic דָּבַר] the waters. In Exod 14:21, he used his רִיחַ to דָּבַר the waters. Concerning the verb דָּבַר Brown writes, “Only Aramaic meaning *go away*, sustained by Arabic دَبَّرَ بِه (dabara bihi) *go away with it*, would best explain the four branches of usage.” (Francis Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 180)

⁶⁴ Mathews also makes a connection between the flood and the Red Sea based on both emphasizing the dry land:

The flood narrative points ahead to Moses and the escape of the Hebrews through the Red Sea. This is evidenced again by the term “dry land” (hārābā) in our passage (v. 22) rather than the customary “dry ground” (yābāšā). This infrequent term occurs eight times, only once more in the Pentateuch at Exod 14:21, where it describes the transformation of the sea into “dry land” by a “strong east wind.” This exodus parallel is confirmed by 8:1b, which speaks of God’s sending a “wind” upon the waters. Later Israel identified itself with Noah and the tiny group of survivors who escaped the wicked by the awesome deeds of God. (Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 381–82)

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 376.

contexts. In Genesis 7:11, the sea bursts forth to the detriment of all mankind. In Korah's rebellion, the ground splits open to his destruction.⁶⁶

In Exodus 15, when the people reach the far side of the Red Sea safely and Pharaoh's army has just been destroyed, Moses and the people sing a song that includes these lines:

The floods [תְּהוֹם] covered them; they went down into the depths like a stone. . . . At the blast [רִיחַ] of your nostrils the waters piled up; the floods stood up in a heap; the deeps [תְּהוֹם] congealed in the heart of the sea. . . . You blew with your wind [רִיחַ]; the sea covered them; they sank like lead in the mighty waters. . . . For when the horses of Pharaoh with his chariots and his horsemen went into the sea, the LORD brought back the waters of the sea upon them, but the people of Israel walked on dry ground in the midst of the sea. (Exod 15:5, 8, 10, 19).

The events of the flood are replayed on a smaller scale in the Red Sea. The LORD again uses the sea to destroy the wicked. The list of plagues against Egypt, designed to deter Pharaoh and demoralize the people of Egypt, do not end with the tenth plague of the death of every firstborn son. As an eleventh plague, God sends the waters of the sea to destroy Pharaoh and his charioteers because of Pharaoh's wicked attempt to recapture the people of Israel.⁶⁷

The author of Exodus uses the language of Creation and the flood to describe the way the LORD controls the sea during the exodus. He drives away the sea to create dry ground, which will be a place of life for his people. The waters are like walls on the right and left of Israel, just as the sea at creation is given a wall that stops its proud waves from

⁶⁶ However, in Exod 14:21, it is not the great deep bursting forth to kill, but God turns בָּקַע around on the waters and they are split open for the deliverance of God's people. Mathews also points out that the word is used another time in reference to תְּהוֹם: "It occurs with 'deep' (tēhôm) once more at Ps 78:15, which alludes to God's 'splitting' the rock in the wilderness (Exod 17:6)." Ibid. The Psalmist recounts that God bursts the rock for the benefit of God's people in the wilderness in order to allow waters from *tehom* to come out and refresh his people, contrasting with Gen 7:11 where תְּהוֹם burst forth as a tool of judgment. Thus, God can use even the overwhelmingly negative תְּהוֹם for a positive purpose if he so chooses.

⁶⁷ Augustine also described the Red Sea event as an eleventh plague against Pharaoh: "The eleventh plague [was when] the Egyptians, while following the Hebrews with hostility, perished in the Red Sea when the people of God passed through on dry land." Augustine of Hippo, "The City of God," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, trans. Marcus Dods, A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, vol. 2 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 393.

destroying life on the dry ground. Then, in a reprisal of the flood, the LORD causes the waters of the sea suddenly to destroy the wicked.

Judgment against Israel

To communicate the grave news of the impending destruction of the Promised Land and subsequent exile of God's people, Isaiah makes frequent reference to the flood and the exodus in order to draw on the motif of the destructiveness of the sea. He understands the flood event to be a paradigmatic example of God's judgment, and he sees the sea as an archetype of the destructive force that the present enemies will bring with them. Throughout his prophecies against Judah, he uses the flood as an illustration of the doom coming to the Promised Land.

The following texts illustrate Isaiah's use of the negative motif of the sea as he communicates his message of judgment against the people of God who have squandered their time in the Promised Land by disobeying the commands of the LORD.

Isaiah 8.⁶⁸ When speaking to Ahaz about his ill-advised allegiance to Assyria, Isaiah uses the imagery of the flood to describe the coming demise of the kingdom. He assures Ahaz that the Assyrian army will come, but not as an aid. They will come, rather, as a flood which washes away Israel and Judah.

The announcement in Isaiah 8:5–8 begins with a contrast. Ahaz refuses the life-giving water of Shiloah that the Lord provides and turns instead to Assyria, which will be comparable to the destructive flooding waters of the Noahic flood and of the Red Sea crashing across the land.⁶⁹ The troubling difference of this episode from the Red Sea

⁶⁸ See Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, 219–29; Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 90–98; Webb, *The Message of Isaiah*, 64–67; Childs, *Isaiah*, 69–77; Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 110–121; Smith, *Isaiah 1-39*, 219–234; Motyer, *Isaiah*, 92–99.

⁶⁹ The “waters of Shiloah” refers to a gentle spring that flowed along the side of the city of Jerusalem. They were life-giving waters and may be compared to the water God provided out of the rock at Horeb. Cf. Exod 17. After leaving Egypt through the Red Sea, the people passed through the Desert of Sin on the way to Horeb. Having run low on water, the people grumbled, and the Lord provided saving water

crossing is that in the imminent invasion, it is most of Israel and Judah that drowns in the deep flood of waters rather than walking through safely on dry ground.

The waters of the Euphrates river in the east are coming to destroy the land. God describes the Assyrian army in this passage as “mighty and many,” using the same words that describe Israel in Exodus 1:9 when Pharaoh fears the growing numbers and power of the Hebrew people. Later, in Numbers 22:3–6, the text specifies that Moab dreads the people of Israel because they are “many” and “too mighty.” However, Isaiah warns Ahaz that this time it will be their enemies who are mighty and many, just as the waters of a flood bring vast destructiveness to the land.

Isaiah 9:17.⁷⁰ These terrifying events are set to occur because the depravity of God’s people has reached unprecedented levels. The language of this verse is reminiscent of Genesis 6:5. The most shocking aspect of Isaiah 9:17 is that the Lord “has no compassion on their fatherless and widows.” In general, God’s compassion for orphans and widows is revealed throughout the Bible: Isaiah 10:1–2, for example, pronounces a woe against those who would take advantage of orphans and widows. Therefore, if the situation in Israel is bad enough that the Lord shows no compassion for their orphans and widows, it has reached levels similar to Genesis 6, and the flood is imminent.

from the rock. Moses used the same staff which divided the deep sea in Exod 14–15 to divide the rock and bring the gentle flow of life-giving water from the rock, which was provided by the Lord for their sustenance.

⁷⁰ See Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, 255; Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 109; Webb, *The Message of Isaiah*, 117–23; Childs, *Isaiah*, 81–87; Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 138–44; Smith, *Isaiah 1-39*, 247–50; Motyer, *Isaiah*, 105–6.

Isaiah 28.⁷¹ In Isaiah 28, Isaiah reveals the purpose of the exile in terms of the cleansing power of the flood waters that will wash the land.⁷² There is a clustering in this chapter of the Hebrew word **רָטַף**,⁷³ which means “overflow” and which is also found in Isaiah 8:8, where Isaiah offers the image of the Euphrates overflowing its banks. The word has a second meaning, however, which is “to rinse, to wash off.” The double meaning is appropriate to the situation of the exile: on the one hand, God is bringing an overflowing river to obliterate the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, drowning them locally just as the flood had drowned the whole earth, and on the other hand the purpose of the exile is to cleanse the land of the filth that Israel and Judah have put there. The flood will wash the wickedness from the land, after which the exile will eradicate wickedness from the land once again, removing the evildoers along with their evil deeds. Isaiah 28:2 describes God as the master of a mighty storm of overflowing and cleansing waters that he is going to cast down from his hand. Later, verses 15–18 contain a cluster of three instances of **רָטַף**. In verse 15, the scoffers who rule Jerusalem defiantly insist that the overflowing or washing punishment will pass through but not come to them. The group of rulers addressed surely includes Ahaz, who mistakenly believes that the destruction of Israel will stop at the borders of Judah. However, the coming flood will not be shored up there. In verse 17, the LORD GOD responds that he will not allow such an abundance of lies in his land. He is about to sweep away and wash out the filth. Verse 18 repeats the

⁷¹ See Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, 501–23; Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 228–36; Webb, *The Message of Isaiah*, 69–70; Childs, *Isaiah*, 201–21; Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 357–78; Smith, *Isaiah 1-39*, 473–94; Motyer, *Isaiah*, 207–13.

⁷² Note also that Isa 28 follows just behind a section known as Isaiah’s Apocalypse in Isa 24–27, which contains numerous references to the flood. Daniel Streett writes, “Flood typology is most prominent in the so-called Isaianic Apocalypse (Isaiah 24–27).” Daniel R. Streett, “As It Was in the Days of Noah: The Prophets’ Typological Interpretation of Noah’s Flood,” *Criswell Theological Review* 5, no. 1 (September 2007): 39.

⁷³ See the entry for **רָטַף** in Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 1009.

same idea, using שָׁטַף again to describe the overwhelming, overflowing, washing scourge that is about to pass through the land.

Isaiah 44. In Isaiah 44 comes the announcement that the exile will not last forever. Like the flood, these waters will not always cover the earth. The armies that overwhelm and wash away Israel and Judah will dry up, and the people of God will be able once again to live in the land God has set aside for them. In Isaiah 44:27–28 the word for “deep” is not תְּהוֹם, but rather צוּלָה, which is used only here in the MT.⁷⁴ צוּלָה means “ocean-deep” and thus is a synonym of תְּהוֹם. Concerning this verse Watts writes, “Yahweh’s control of the waters is a recurrent motif in the Vision. Usually it speaks of water in the desert. But here it refers to the control of the mystic deep like that which made created order possible (Gen 1:6) or which, when released, produced the Flood (Gen 7:11).”⁷⁵ Here again Isaiah refers to the waters of the sea, using the imagery of the flood to teach Israel and Judah about the duration of the exile. The exile will not last forever; it will be of limited duration, like the flood, and the remnant of Israel will return home afterward, like Noah and his family.

God will be in control of the beginning of this flood that will carry away the people of Israel and Judah, releasing the restraints that hold the billows at bay. God will also be in control of the end of this flood, when, by his command, the waters will flee. At his rebuke, the sea will retreat to its former borders, and God’s select people will be able to live on the dry land once again.

Isaiah 51. Further comfort for God’s people is found in Isaiah 51, which begins with reassurance that God’s people should look back to Abraham and Sarah, from whom they have grown into such a large nation. Though only a remnant will witness the

⁷⁴ Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 486.

⁷⁵ Watts, *Isaiah 34-66*, 155.

end of the exile, a few is more than one—and Abraham was but one when God chose him.

The encouragement continues in Isaiah 51:9–10, as Isaiah 51:9 refers to primeval mythology that was commonly believed in the ANE. Concerning the author’s usage of mythological creatures that are not consistent with biblical teachings about creation, Watts writes, “The references clearly relate Yahweh to a great victory over these primeval sea monsters in a form that is not included in Scripture and which is probably not acceptable in biblical doctrine. Yet it obviously played a role in popular thought.”⁷⁶ By alluding to these myths the text does not endorse or give credence to them but rather uses them as a recognizable reference point for the sea that God rebuked and pushed back to create the dry land.

Verse 10 goes on to refer to both the flood and the Red Sea. The more visible of the two is the Red Sea, for the text states that the redeemed passed over as God made the depths of the sea to be a way for them. However, the flood must also be in the prophet’s mind, since the specific combination of תְּהוֹם with רָבָה, meaning “great deep,” is used only here and in Genesis 7:11.⁷⁷ Thus, there is reason to believe Isaiah is referring in these verses to the primeval תְּהוֹם, the תְּהוֹם רָבָה of the flood, and תְּהוֹם of the Red Sea that made an end of Pharaoh and his charioteers.

The purpose of Isaiah 51:9–10 is to encourage the exiles-to-be that, just as God had power in the past over תְּהוֹם in previous situations, he also has power over the coming flood which is about to wash them away. The point is driven home in verse 11, in which God assures them that the remnant will also return to Zion. Gunn writes, “A reference to the flood in vs. 10a would be a highly apposite element in a progression, linked neatly by the water imagery, from creation (strictly the *Chaoskampf*, vs. 9b) and the flood (vs. 10a)

⁷⁶ Watts, *Isaiah 34-66*, 211.

⁷⁷ Cf. Gunn, “Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood,” 502.

to the climactic event of redemption, the crossing of the Red Sea (vs. 10b), itself a prelude to the new exodus to come (vs. 11).”⁷⁸ Just as he was able to drive back the waters in the past, he will drive back the waters of the imminent flood and give them once again dry land upon which to live, multiply, and rebuild.

Isaiah 54. In Isaiah 54, Isaiah envisions God looking back on his execution of judgment against the wickedness of his people and looking forward to days of peace. The text emphasizes that even though he will desert his people for a little while, he will then gather them again with compassion. Verse 8 describes God’s prophesied actions as literally “a flood of wrath” that will last only for a short time. If this statement does not remind readers of the wrath poured out in the flood, God’s words go on to reference directly the promises he made at the end of the flood.

One of the most explicit references to the flood in Isaiah’s prophecy comes in Isaiah 54:9–10, which is both a climactic point of citing the flood and a pinnacle of promise that God will deliver his people from the flood that has drowned them. God solidifies the promise of Isaiah 54:9–10 by comparing it to the promise given to Noah. Streett writes of these verses, “Indeed, it might be said that the new covenant promise is even more permanent, if possible, than the promise to Noah. This may be the message of 54:10, where the Lord vows that even if the mountains and hills were removed (i.e. even if the flood were repeated), still this promise would remain.”⁷⁹ God says, in effect, that he is more likely to break his promise never to repeat the worldwide flood than he is to break his promise not to repeat the exile and rejection of his people. Isaiah 51:9–10 is both a very explicit reference to Noah and the flood and an important encouragement to

⁷⁸ Gunn, “Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood,” 502.

⁷⁹ Streett points out the allusion to the flood story: “Just as God turned his back on his creation in the flood, so in the exile he has turned his back on his creation, Israel. But God’s wrath lasts only for ‘a little while’ ([Isa] 54:8). Noah’s flood gave way to a new creation, a replenished earth, and a new covenant that contained an everlasting promise from God. Likewise, the exile will come to an end when God re-creates Israel, causes her to multiply, replenishes the land, and renews his covenant with her.” Streett, “As It Was in the Days of Noah,” 48.

the remnants while they are in exile.

Judgment against Jonah

Jonah exiles himself in order to flee from the presence of the LORD and from the task the LORD has given him to do. The story of Jonah is another example of how God uses the sea as a tool of judgment against sin. It is the instrument by which the LORD nearly brings Jonah's life to an end so that he will repent. In response to Jonah's continued disobedience, the LORD orchestrates judgment against Jonah. That judgment comes in the form of the raging sea. First, under the direction of the LORD, a great wind causes a storm on the sea so fierce that the ship begins to break apart. Several aspects of the sea's involvement in the story should be examined: its size, strength, destructiveness, and comprehensiveness.

First, consider the size of the sea. The sea is incomparably larger than the tiny boat that holds the mariners and Jonah and that is all that protects them from death. Just as Noah and his family do not perish in the sea because of the ark that the LORD provides for them, Jonah stands only mere feet above the sea that could destroy him.

Second, consider the strength of the sea. As the waters grow more and more tempestuous, the boat's inferior strength becomes increasingly apparent. It simply cannot last in the face of such mighty power. None of the efforts of the mariners makes any difference as they fight against the sea. They throw the boat's cargo into the sea; they dig in and row with all their might toward land; they fight until they can fight no more; but their strength is nothing compared to the massive force behind the waves of the sea. As T. Desmond Alexander comments, "In the face of the storm their own inadequacy is all too apparent, and so they turn to their gods for help."⁸⁰

Third, consider the destructiveness of the sea. It has already begun to destroy

⁸⁰ Desmond Alexander, *Jonah*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 26 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988), 114.

the boat, which will soon be ripped apart by the sea. The sea has also swallowed cargo of untold value and possessions to be delivered to merchants in Tarshish. As the men know all too well, the next target of the sea's destruction is their very lives. If they do not find a way to make the storm relent, all of them will surely die. If they throw Jonah in, he will die, but, if Jonah is right, the rest of them might have a chance of living. Consequently, they call out to God for forgiveness and throw Jonah to his death in the depths. From the mariner's perspective, there is no possibility that Jonah will survive the destructiveness of the sea. Likewise, Jonah himself is sure that he will die. The sea is a destroyer of life.

Fourth, consider the comprehensiveness of the sea. God's judgment is against Jonah; it is the result of his sin and designed for him. But the sea is a threat to all of the mariners. Jonah's sin has put them all in danger of losing their lives.

God's plan is not to kill Jonah. In his omniscience, he knows that Jonah will repent, and God gives him plenty of opportunities to do so, but the sea itself has a singular purpose in the story: to destroy. It is intended to disable the boat and bring the prophet to repentance.

Jonah 2. The text does not reveal how much time passes between Jonah 1:16 and 1:17. It may seem to some readers that the fish swallows Jonah shortly after he is thrown into the water. However, there are several indicators that Jonah is not swallowed immediately. First, Jonah 2:5 states that Jonah sinks into the depths of the sea and that the seaweed wraps around his head, and Jonah 2:6 likewise indicates that he reaches the floor of the sea. Thus, Jonah must be sinking for some time before he is swallowed. Jonah does not repent and call out to the LORD until he is just about to pass out of consciousness (Jonah 2:7).

The prayer psalm that makes up the bulk of chapter 2 reveals the severity of what it means to be on the receiving end of God's wrath carried out by means of the

sea.⁸¹ In the desperation of his final moments, he repents and calls out to the LORD. In his prayer he recounts the experience of receiving the judgment of God in the depths of the sea. In Jonah's experience, the reader gets a glimpse of what the flood must have been like for those who were not aboard the ark. Without intervention, there would have been no hope, because the sea is a destroyer of life.

Jonah 2:2 reveals how distressed Jonah is in the waters, along with some of the details of what happens to Jonah after the sailors throw him overboard and before the LORD appoints a fish to swallow him. First and most importantly, he considers himself to be dead, in the belly of *Sheol*. Alexander writes, "It is not annihilation in death that Jonah fears here, but rather the prospect of being abandoned in Sheol, and consequently separated thereafter from God."⁸² He is in the process of gaining first-hand, experiential knowledge of תהום as a killer. His situation is grave, and his chances of survival are bleak. *Tehom* and *Sheol* are almost synonymous.

In 2:3, Jonah realizes that even though it had been his own idea for the men to throw him into the sea, and it had been their hands that carried out the task, God is the one conducting the entire event of judgment against him because of his sin. Jonah expounds upon "the deep" to describe it as "the heart of the seas," "the flood surrounding me," and "waves and billows passing over me." He has no ability to change his situation. The sea will certainly kill him, but in this verse he begins to arrive at a moment of clarity. He says, "*Your* waves and *your* billows passed over me." The waves belong to the LORD, and Jonah trusts that the LORD does have the ability to change his situation. Jonah 2:4 continues that hope-filled realization that even though he has been driven far away from the LORD's sight, and even though it was his own sinful decision to run away from the LORD's sight, he is confident in the grace of God to allow him to live and to see the holy

⁸¹ Also compare Jonah 2 to Ps 18.

⁸² Alexander, *Jonah*, 125.

temple again.

Jonah 2:5 repeats the same idea that the previous verses communicated—that Jonah in the sea is sure he is dying. Alexander writes, “Try as he may, Jonah cannot free himself from his watery prison. Death by drowning seems inevitable.”⁸³ Jonah identifies *tehom* surrounding him, and he has no power to stop the sea from taking his life.

Verse 6 continues by stating that Jonah believes he will be in the abyss forever. He is restrained by bars that have closed over him. Jonah considers the sea his eternal resting place, yet God pulls him out of the pit. Page writes about this verse:

While this phrase is an expression of despair on Jonah’s part, it is not certain what “bars” are referring to. In Job 38:10 is found an idea of bolts and doors of the ocean. There it seems the bolts of the sea are the walls of the sea basin, which set bounds to the sea that it cannot pass over. Consequently, the bolts of the earth may be such barriers as restrain the land from spreading over the sea. Jonah felt the weight of the waves or the great masses of water pressing upon him when he sank to the bottom of the sea, refusing him access back to the earth.⁸⁴

Jonah’s perception of his situation is that he has as much of a chance of walking the dry ground as the sea has of crossing its restraining bars (Job 38:10) and covering the dry ground again. The end of verse 6 and verse 9 proclaim God’s salvation. Even though the sea has been a destroyer of life and a restraint against Jonah’s escape from the pit, God is able to save him from it and return him to dry ground.

Conclusion

The authors of the OT repeatedly use the sea as a negative motif, showing its destructive power as a tool of judgment against the enemies of God and against the

⁸³ Alexander, *Jonah*, 127.

⁸⁴ Franklin S. Page, *Jonah*, The New American Commentary, vol. 19B (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 249. He continues: “The expression also may refer to the gates of Sheol, the underworld, conceived to be a fortified city (cf. Ps 9:13; Isa 38:10). If these bars were closed behind a human being, they remained finally shut. Jonah had a sense of being entombed by the sea. These verses express Jonah’s extreme depth of despair, his utter hopelessness. As in v. 2, Jonah may have been expressing his feeling that he was virtually dead. Even beyond the deepest sea, he felt that he had passed into the underworld from which he would never escape.” Ibid.

people of God when they rebel against him. The flood is the most prominent example of the sea as a means of judgment: it bursts forth onto the dry ground to destroy everything that has the breath of life in it. No person can stand against its great and terrible power. The only method of escape from the horrors of the sea is revealed to Noah so that a remnant will be preserved.

A similar event occurs, but on a smaller scale, to Pharaoh and his army. After dividing the waters to provide a path of escape for his own people, God uses the sea to destroy the lives of his enemies. The sea had stood up like walls on both sides of the dry ground while his people walked through the midst of the sea, but when the Egyptian army tries to pursue them, they are hindered and then destroyed by the sea. The OT shows that the sea is a destroyer of life.

As Isaiah explains the events that are going to happen immediately to Israel and shortly thereafter to Judah, he uses a variety of poetic means to communicate his message to the people of God. Isaiah makes regular reference to the stories of the flood and the exodus in order to show the people what is to come. The destructive waters of the great flood and of the Red Sea offer an appropriate comparison for the invasion that is about to sweep away Israel and Judah. As in those stories, the waters of the sea will cause devastation to the enemies of God. The purpose of the exile, like the purpose of the flood, is to wash the land of the filth that its inhabitants have become. However, according to the prophecy, the flood waters will recede after a time. God will bring back his people and allow them to live and thrive on dry land and multiply once again, just as he had done for Adam, for Noah, and for Abraham. Isaiah alludes and makes explicit reference to the stories of the flood and of the exodus as he uses the water imagery of the sea to explain the exile that is about to take place.

Finally, Jonah also experiences the great and terrible power of the sea. He attempts to flee from the mission God has given him, and when he sets out across the sea, his mistake threatens his life and the lives of everyone else on the ship. The churning sea

is going to destroy the entire crew until Jonah confesses and allows himself to become the sole casualty. As Jonah descends into the depths of the sea, he believes that he is sinking into a grave with no chance of escape. Yet, as in the other situations described in this section, God demonstrates his ability to save, even from the sea. The OT consistently reinforces the sea as a negative motif. The sea is a destroyer of life and is therefore used by God as a tool of judgment against sin.

The Sea is the Abode of the Enemy

This section discusses the intersections of the sea and Satan in the OT. One point of intersection between the sea and Satan is the beast Leviathan. The divine speeches in the book of Job reveal the strength and uncontrollability of Leviathan, the great and terrible sea monster. The OT creates a negative representation of the sea by consistently associating it with such shadowy figures as Leviathan and the other representatives of Satan who find their home there. There is little distinction between Leviathan, who embodies the uncontrollable and destructive nature of the sea, and the sea itself.⁸⁵ This section demonstrates the ties between the sea and Leviathan and the ties between Leviathan and Satan, thereby demonstrating Leviathan as a point of intersection in the OT between the sea and Satan.

Yet Leviathan is not the only sinister character in the OT who finds his home in the sea. The beasts in the book of Daniel are servants of the evil one who also come from the sea. In the OT, the sea earns a reputation for being a source of evil beings and should be considered enemy territory.⁸⁶ That is not to say that the sea commits evil acts of its own volition, or that it generates evil, but rather that Satan has set up the sea as his base of operations. The beasts of Daniel's night vision appear to be the same beasts that

⁸⁵ That is, Leviathan is frequently in direct grammatical parallel to the sea, and the actions done against Leviathan (crushing, splitting, etc.) are the same as the actions done against the sea. Cf. Pss 74:13–14; 89:9–10.

⁸⁶ Leviathan, Rahab (if distinct from Leviathan), the beasts in Daniel, and the Tanninim.

John sees in the book of Revelation, which he goes on to identify as direct representatives of Satan (cf. Rev 11–13). Revelation and Daniel reveal points of connection between the beasts and Leviathan, Satan, and the sea. This section explores the negative motif of the sea in the OT in its relationship with the negative characters Leviathan, Satan, and the beasts.

Leviathan

Leviathan is mentioned in only five verses.⁸⁷ Yet despite his rarity and obscurity, he has captured the imaginations of readers and scholars who are intrigued by his role in the biblical narrative. The aim of this section is to identify that role to the extent that the limited evidence of the OT allows.⁸⁸ In particular, this section demonstrates that the connection between Leviathan and Satan contributes to the negative motif of the sea in the OT.⁸⁹

For the purposes of this section, nothing is gained by discussing whether Leviathan refers to an animal presently or previously found on earth. Wallace writes, “While the author of Job may have included some of the characteristics of the crocodile in

⁸⁷ Isa 27:1 (twice); Pss 74:14; 104:26; Job 3:8; and 40:25.

⁸⁸ Because the biblical material on Leviathan is limited and many of the questions one might have about Leviathan are not answered in the biblical text, many scholars turn to ANE mythology to find out additional information about Leviathan. Certain phrases about Leviathan are nearly word for word between biblical passages such as Isa 27:1 and the ANE myths. See the cautions raised in chap. 4. One example of the influence of ANE myth on the understanding of the Bible beyond what is actually found in the biblical text is found in the *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* entry for Leviathan. The author states, “Further allusions to Leviathan appear in Job 7:12; 26:12f. (cf. also 9:13; 38:3–11). Here Leviathan is pictured as a sea monster subjugated by Yahweh after a long battle.” Botterweck and Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 506. The problem with this statement is that although the passages listed refer to the subjugation of Leviathan or Rahab, none of these passages indicate the length of the battle. Yet TDOT states that *in the biblical text* Leviathan is shown to be subjugated after a long battle. That is false. Outside information sourced from the ANE corpus of mythology has been assumed in this statement as if that information were found in the biblical text.

⁸⁹ Stanley V. Udd has published a thorough work on Leviathan including mythological and non-mythological approaches to the biblical passages that mention Leviathan. Stanley V. Udd, “An Evaluation of the Mythological Hermeneutic in Light of the Old Testament Usage of the Leviathan Motif” (Th.D. diss., Grace Theological Seminary, 1980).

his description of Leviathan, certainly those characteristics are incidental to what he was trying to picture.”⁹⁰ It has been argued that Leviathan is a crocodile, a whale, a dinosaur, a dragon of some kind, a sea serpent, and so on.⁹¹ In relation to the purpose of this section, however, such arguments are as immaterial as discussing what species of serpent approached Adam and Eve in the Garden. The physical animal is not the point of the text; the animal represents Satan, the locus of all the negativity in the text. The outcome of Genesis 3 is not enmity between humans and snakes, but rather enmity between a descendant of the woman and Satan. In Job also, regardless of the specific reflections of Leviathan in the physical animal kingdom, the negativity of the text is directed at Satan, whose destructive powers have wrecked Job’s life and killed his children. After the divine speeches, Job does not suspect that a crocodile has eaten his family. His hatred would have been directed at Satan, who was behind the evil forces expressed in Leviathan’s unrestrained destructiveness.⁹²

Psalm 104:26 establishes a few basic facts about Leviathan: “There go the ships, and Leviathan, which you formed to play in it [the sea].”⁹³ First, the reader is introduced to Leviathan as a creature of the sea. He is seen here as a normal part of creation. The context of the verse is about the myriad of creatures, great and small, that the LORD has

⁹⁰ Howard Wallace, “Leviathan and the Beast in Revelation,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 11, no. 3 (September 1948): 63.

⁹¹ See the discussion of scholarly opinions in Jan Michael Cowles, “A Context for Understanding the Old Testament Sea Dragon: Unmasking Leviathan” (M.A. thesis, Denver Seminary, 2005), 6–11.

⁹² Care should be taken in the study of sinister characters of the Bible such as Leviathan not to find Satan under every mention of any kind of serpent in the OT. For example, there is no indication that the serpents transformed from Moses’ and the magicians’ staves represent Satan or are related to the serpent in the Garden (cf. Exod 7:8–13). And Jesus explained the serpent that Moses lifted up on a pole for the healing of the people foreshadowed his own crucifixion for spiritual healing of many (cf. Num 21:4–9; John 3:14). The same bronze serpent had also become an idol of false worship. See 2 Kgs 18:14. The mere mention of a serpent in the biblical text does not always indicate that Satan is involved.

⁹³ Dahood, *Psalms*, 31–48; Allen, *Psalms 101-150*, 34–49; DeClaissé-Walford, Jacobson, and Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*, 769–81.

made. The previous verse turns to the sea, which is full of living things, and verse 26 continues the thought by pointing to Leviathan as one example of a sea creature.⁹⁴ The remarkable aspect of this verse is that in spite of what the OT suggests about Leviathan in other passages, which are discussed later in this section, he is ultimately a creature as inferior to his creator as an ant or a hummingbird. The Psalm goes on in the following verses to explain that Leviathan and all other creatures depend upon God for food (v. 27) and their every breath, the lack of which would mean their immediate death (v. 29).⁹⁵

Psalm 74:14 also gives only brief information about Leviathan: “You crushed the heads of Leviathan; you gave him as food for the creatures of the wilderness.” The specific information provided by this verse is that Leviathan has plural “heads.” Compare the previous verse (13), specifically the phrase “you broke the heads of the sea monsters.” “Heads” in that verse is not unusual because the word “sea monsters” [תַּנִּינִים] is also plural.⁹⁶ But in verse 14, Leviathan (singular) is said to have heads (plural), which is unusual.⁹⁷

Job 3:8 mentions Leviathan almost in passing.⁹⁸ Job is in a severely depressed state because of the evil that Satan has just done to him. He wishes he had never been born and calls for “those who are ready to rouse Leviathan” to curse the night of his conception.⁹⁹ This verse does not provide any description or information about Leviathan.

⁹⁴ Leviathan may have been singled out because he is particularly large or unique in some other way that is unspecified.

⁹⁵ Cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 302–3.

⁹⁶ Also, both words are inarticulate and treated grammatically as proper names.

⁹⁷ This verse is discussed in more detail in the section on the relationship between the beasts in Dan 7 and the beasts in Rev 11–13.

⁹⁸ See Rebecca S. Watson, *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of “Chaos” in the Hebrew Bible* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 319–27.

⁹⁹ Gunkel has proposed for יוֹ [day] in this verse to be emended to יָ [sea], and many have followed his lead. Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-*

However, the fact that Job specifically asks for individuals who are rousers of Leviathan to curse the night of his conception at least informs the reader that such people are the sort of dark characters Job requires to utter curses against the day of his birth. Therefore, this verse supports the connection between Leviathan and the dark negativity of the sea.

Isaiah 27:1 reads, “In that day the LORD with his hard and great and strong sword will punish Leviathan the fleeing serpent, Leviathan the twisting serpent, and he will slay the dragon that is in the sea.”¹⁰⁰ Robert Fyall writes about this verse:

In this passage, the smiting of Leviathan is eschatological and occurs in the so-called “Isaiah Apocalypse” (chs. 24–27). There are also unmistakable allusions to Canaanite mythology. What is different here is that this verse looks to the new creation and the final destruction of the beast when the returned exiles “will come and worship the Lord in the holy mountain in Jerusalem” (v. 13). . . . Leviathan here sums up all that is evil and opposed to God, no matter if its earthly manifestation is Assyria, Babylon, Edom or any other power.¹⁰¹

Fyall recognizes the similarities between this verse and the ANE writings, but he also recognizes the differences, pointing out that Isaiah looks forward to an eschatological event, not back to a pre-creation event. Isaiah describes Leviathan as a fleeing and twisting serpent that will be pierced and ultimately destroyed by the LORD. The verse also refers to Leviathan as the “dragon that is in the sea.” Reading this verse alongside the other biblical material about Satan, especially that in the book of Revelation, the reader can understand that it speaks of the demise of Satan at the end times, although it probably

Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12, trans. K. William Whitney (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2006), 37n101. This proposed emendation is to be rejected because it is without manuscript evidence and is not warranted. Gunkel uses as proof the vocal pronunciation of ‘yam’ in certain verses where it may have been pronounced ‘yom.’ However, none of the verses have יָ spelled with a holem-vav as here in Job 3:8; even in an unpointed text, a vav is present in יָ but not in י. The original יָ also fits the context of Job cursing the day of his birth and should not be questioned. John Day, who has been shown in chap. 3 to be in general agreement with many of Gunkel’s conclusions, rejects Gunkel’s emendation of the Masoretic Text in Job 3:8 and provides additional discussion. John Day, *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 44–48.

¹⁰⁰ See Watson, *Chaos Uncreated*, 327–32.

¹⁰¹ Robert S. Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job*, ed. D. A. Carson, *New Studies in Biblical Theology*, vol. 12 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity; Leicester, England: Apollos, 2002), 171.

also speaks of the fall in the near term of a specific enemy of Israel, noted by Fyall to be likely to have been Assyria, Babylon, or Edom.¹⁰²

Job 40:25–41:34 contains an extensive description of Leviathan in which the LORD lists his physical characteristics, actions, and impact on those who encounter him.¹⁰³ The LORD describes Leviathan as one who cannot be conquered, contained, or controlled by anyone on earth.

The connection between the sea and Satan via Leviathan is strong in the book of Job.¹⁰⁴ The two passages in Job that mention Leviathan are introduced in the previous section, but the divine speech elaborates on Leviathan for an entire chapter. After describing Behemoth in chapter 40, the LORD turns his speech to the evil represented by Leviathan. The underlying idea is that if God is able to control Leviathan and treat him as a plaything (Ps 104:26), then God is able to restrain the evil one who has been destroying Job's life.

Job's speeches reveal that he is confused about who has done evil to him, and he fearfully suspects that the good God of the universe may have done it, since he is not aware of any other who has the power to coordinate the targeted strike he has experienced, described in the opening chapters of the book. Concerning Job's outcry Fyall concludes, "His protests are not those of the atheist but of the baffled believer."¹⁰⁵ Job knows that God has great power to change the course of history, but he is ignorant of any other being who is so powerful and active in the world. Therefore, when so many terrible

¹⁰² Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You*, 171.

¹⁰³ See Watson, *Chaos Uncreated*, 333–66.

¹⁰⁴ Sungjin Kim argues primarily that Satan is the whisperer to Eliphaz in Job 4:12–21, but he also argues that Leviathan in Job 40–41 represents Satan. He writes, "Satan, with his malicious influence throughout the book, is finally brought to justice, as God pronounces judgment on Leviathan." Sungjin Kim, "The Identity of the Spirit in Eliphaz's Vision (Job 4:12–21) and Its Significance for Understanding the Book of Job" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017), 201. See also pp. 198–201.

¹⁰⁵ Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You*, 23.

things happen to him, his only conclusion is that God must have done these evil things to him, since he has no previous, direct experience of the evil forces in the world, namely, those of Satan.¹⁰⁶

The divine speeches at the end of the book achieve the purpose of revealing to Job the answer to his questions. The LORD uses a series of images to demonstrate his control over the universe. In Job 41:34 (Heb 41:26), God looks beyond the physical and reveals that Leviathan is a metaphor for the evil one. Concerning Leviathan, Fyall writes, “Along with Behemoth, he is the embodiment of cosmic evil itself, that power ceaselessly opposed to God and his purposes. As Behemoth probably is to be identified with Mot, god of death, so it appears that in Leviathan we have another guise of Satan.”¹⁰⁷

Fyall points to Ezekiel 28:1–19 as an analogy. Those verses are about the fall of the prince of Tyre and are commonly understood to refer to Satan rather than merely an earthly prince. Fyall explains, “So here [in the descriptions of Leviathan in Job 41], we have descriptions which echo the crocodile and the whale but go far beyond them.”¹⁰⁸ Fyall summarizes, “The evidence, then, identifies Leviathan with Satan, the culmination of

¹⁰⁶ Leviathan is in a few places in the OT used to represent the sea where it finds its home: the smiting or dividing of the sea and the splitting of Rahab or Leviathan are the same event. The negativity of the OT about the sea can be applied to Leviathan, and the negativity of the OT about Leviathan can be applied to the sea. For example, Ps 74:13–15 recounts, “You divided the sea by your might; you broke the heads of the sea monsters on the waters. You crushed the heads of Leviathan; you gave him as food for the creatures of the wilderness. You split open springs and brooks; you dried up ever-flowing streams.” These verses couch the crushing of Leviathan between two verses that tell of the dividing of the waters and seem to represent them as all being the same event. Also, Isa 51:9–10 show the cutting of Rahab and drying up the sea to be the same event. In such a way, Leviathan, Satan, and the sea are tied together in a web of negativity.

¹⁰⁷ Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You*, 157.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 158.

various guises in which he has appeared, for example: Leviathan (3:8); Yam and Tannin (7:12); Sea (9:8 and 38:8–11); Rahab (9:13 and 26:12); the gliding serpent (26:13).¹⁰⁹

Gunkel has written about the relationship in Job 41:23–26 between Leviathan, the sea, and Satan:

The word now appears which links the two conceptions and leaves its mark upon our view of Leviathan. That word is Tehom... Leviathan rules over the Tehom. This means that he is the monster of the great depths of water which once covered the earth. He is the Chaos Monster. This also corresponds to what is said concerning him. He is the kind of “those who are exalted,” “the proud.” These words are underscored as names for the unruly beings of Chaos. One recalls that “pride” is also the characteristic quality of the sea and its monster at other places.¹¹⁰

Job 41 references the negative motif of the sea that has been consistent in the OT and here finds embodiment in the beast called Leviathan.

Rahab

Rahab [רָהַב] is mentioned in seven OT verses in Isaiah, Psalms, and Job.¹¹¹

Rahab may be an alternate name for Leviathan, although some scholars believe they are distinct beings.¹¹² Based on the biblical material, Rahab seems to be indistinct from Leviathan. As an example, examine Psalm 89:9–10 (10–11 in Hebrew): “You rule the raging of the sea; when its waves rise, you still them. You crushed Rahab like a carcass; you scattered your enemies with your mighty arm.” Consider the similarity of that verse to Psalm 74:13–14: “You divided the sea by your might; you broke the heads of the sea monsters on the waters. You crushed the heads of Leviathan; you gave him as food for the creatures of the wilderness.” If either of these texts had Leviathan in the place of

¹⁰⁹ Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You*, 168. He has also included Yam as a guise of Satan.

¹¹⁰ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 35.

¹¹¹ Isa 30:7, 51:9; Pss 40:5, 87:4, 89:11; Job 9:13; 26:12. Rahab is not to be confused with the woman Rahab [רָחַב] from Jericho (Josh 2).

¹¹² Cowles has a thorough treatment of each Rahab passage in the OT, including discussion of scholars who distinguish between Rahab and Leviathan. Cowles, “A Context for Understanding the Old Testament Sea Dragon,” 126ff.

Rahab, or *vice versa*, no one would suspect that they were out of place because of how similar they are. The biblical text does not make significant distinction between Rahab and Leviathan. Both occur in parallel to the sea, are defeated by Yahweh, are described as dragons, and are used figuratively to represent enemies of God such as Egypt and Babylon. Therefore, it is not logical to conclude that Rahab and Leviathan are distinct beings unless one is sourcing information from outside of the biblical text.

The Beasts in Daniel

Daniel's dream in chapter 7 reinforces the negative motif of the sea that has been consistent in the OT. In Daniel's vision, the sea itself does not burst forth onto the land as it had in Noah's day, but it is the source of great beasts who conquer, destroy, and consume. These wicked beasts carry out their mission as representatives of Satan, and it is as if they had been dispatched by him from their common base of operations, the sea. The wicked beasts that come out of the sea in Daniel's dream align with the consistently negative picture of the sea in the OT. Collins ties the beasts of Daniel directly to the rest of the biblical negativity about the sea: "The biblical tradition, which used the sea and its monsters as symbols for the enemies of Israel, is especially relevant here."¹¹³ Goldingay extends this idea to all of Daniel's vision: "These motifs suggest supernatural forces: the winds, the power of God effecting his will (cf. Gen 1:2); the sea, the dense concentration of energy that threatens to disrupt and overwhelm order; the animals, the embodiment of that threatening energy in particular beings (cf. Rev 13:1–7; 17:8)."¹¹⁴ The beasts are the embodiment of the sea's threats against God's work in history.

The verb *גיא* that tells what the winds do to the sea is used only here in the MT,

¹¹³ John J. Collins, *Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 294–95.

¹¹⁴ John Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 30 (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 160.

and is defined in Brown, Driver, Briggs as “breaking forth,”¹¹⁵ although most translations render it “churn up.” Miller comments on Daniel 7:2: “The participle ‘churning up’ can also mean ‘bursting forth,’ and the idea seems to be that these winds suddenly burst forth upon the sea.” The Aramaic word used in Daniel 7:2 is not the same word as the Hebrew for “burst forth,” from Genesis 7:11, that has been discussed in previous sections, but the words are certainly synonymous.¹¹⁶ The word is used, however, in Job 38:8, as Collins points out, “The verb ‘to stir up’ (רָגַע) is used in Job 38:8 with reference to the sea, when God confined it at creation.”¹¹⁷ Job 38:8 recounts when the sea “burst forth from the womb” and God shut it up with doors and set bars to restrain it.

Daniel’s vision of the beasts coming out of the sea continues the motif of the sea as a source of evil. Collins writes, “The basic character and significance of the beasts, then, is determined by the fact that they rise from the sea.”¹¹⁸ When Daniel sees the beasts, he knows their nature because of where they come from.

The Beasts in Revelation

The same beasts are seen later by John as he records the book of Revelation. In Revelation 11–13 there is a significant merging of the various pieces of the negative motif of the sea, as the beasts from Daniel’s vision make their eschatological appearance. By examining the eschatological texts in Revelation, one gains greater understanding of the beasts in Daniel and the consistency of the biblical motif of negativity regarding the sea.

¹¹⁵ Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 1086.

¹¹⁶ Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel*, The New American Commentary, vol. 18 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 195.

¹¹⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 294.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 289.

Revelation 11:7 is part of a section about two witnesses who will appear and prophesy. The beast rises from ἀβύσσου, which is translated “bottomless pit” or “abyss.” In the OT, 35 out of 36 occurrences of *tehom* are translated ἄβυσσος in the Septuagint.¹¹⁹ Therefore, it would appear that the sea lies in the background of Revelation 11:7 as the source of the beast who kills the two prophets. Beale writes, “The ‘sea’ (θάλασσα) is synonymous with the ‘abyss’ (ἄβυσσος), which is *the spiritual storehouse of evil*, where wicked spirits are confined under God’s sovereignty.”¹²⁰ The sea has been the source of many evils in the OT, and, at the end times, it will continue to be the source of evil beasts.

The beasts appear again in Revelation 12:3: “And another sign appeared in heaven: behold, a great red dragon, with seven heads and ten horns, and on his heads seven diadems.” In this verse, the seven heads and ten horns are a clear connection to the beasts in Daniel 7. John explicitly explains that the dragon is “that ancient serpent, who is called the devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world” (Rev 12:9).

Revelation 12:15–16 introduces another element of Satan’s war on the church: “The serpent poured water like a river out of his mouth after the woman, to sweep her away with a flood. But the earth came to the help of the woman, and the earth opened its mouth and swallowed the river that the dragon had poured from his mouth.” Satan uses the waters of a flood as a weapon to destroy the lives of the saints. But the flood waters are not able to conquer the dry ground that swallows up the flood waters in order to protect the church. Chapter 12 concludes with another mention of the beast standing on the sand of the sea (Rev 12:17).

In Revelation 13, the dragon leads more beasts out of the sea: “And I saw a

¹¹⁹ The sole exception is Gen 49:25: “The blessings of the deep that crouches below,” which the Septuagint renders, “the blessings of all the land that you hold.” This statement also excludes Prov 8:27 and 28, where the Septuagint does not translate the sea at all.

¹²⁰ G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans; Carlisle, England: Paternoster, 1999), 684, emphasis added.

beast rising out of the sea, with ten horns and seven heads, with ten diadems on its horns and blasphemous names on its heads” (v. 1). Beale connects this verse to Job 40–41, comparing the two beasts of chapter 13 with Behemoth and Leviathan: “The depiction of the two beasts in ch. 13 is based in part on Job 40–41, which is the only OT depiction of two Satanic beasts opposing God.”¹²¹ The details in Revelation 11–13 provide the connections needed to draw together the beasts in Daniel, Leviathan, and Satan and see them as one evil that finds its home in the sea.

However, Beale resists the suggestion that the beasts could be based on ANE mythology, arguing, “While aspects of the beast’s description could partially derive from allusion to ancient Near Eastern mythology, the depiction of the sea monster in 13:1–7 is primarily drawn from Daniel 7.”¹²² Beale explains Scripture in light of other Scripture rather than turning to pagan religious writings for explanations of biblical texts.

Finally, Beale summarizes the negative motif of the sea found in the OT: “Without exception the imagery of the sea monster is used throughout the OT to represent evil kingdoms who persecute God’s people. . . . This is clearly the case in Daniel 7. The dragon in Revelation 12 was seen as the ultimate force behind the earthly kingdoms of the world.”¹²³ Beale states that the reader knows its nature because of where

¹²¹ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 682.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 683. In greater detail, Beale also states, Vv 1–2 are a creative reworking of Dan. 7:1–7. The “beast coming up from the sea” and his “ten horns” are based respectively on Dan. 7:2–3 and Dan. 7:7, 20, 24. Many understand the “seven heads” as a reference to an ancient Near Eastern sea monster myth from before the time of Daniel (Leviathan with seven heads in CTA 5.I, 1–3; 3.III, 37–39; cf. also Job 40–41; Pss. 74:13–14; 89:10; Isa. 27:1; 51:9; Odes Sol. 22:5). While this is possible, it is better to view the “seven heads” as a composite of the heads of the four beasts in Daniel 7 because other features of the Danielic beasts are also applied to the beast in v 2 (the ancient Near Eastern image could be in mind secondarily). In addition, the “ten diadems” on the “ten horns” are a reference to Daniel’s fourth beast, whose “ten horns” are interpreted as “ten kings” (Dan. 7:24). Likewise, the “blasphemous names” are connected with the blaspheming figure of Dan. 7:8ff., who is also associated with the fourth kingdom (cf. Rev. 13:5–6). (*Ibid.*, 683)

¹²³ *Ibid.*

it is from: “That the sea beast of 13:1–2 arises from the watery, dark home of the dragon shows it to be of the same devilish nature and to be on the devil’s side.”¹²⁴ Whether it is used by the biblical authors to represent an enemy kingdom that contends against Israel or to represent Satan and the source of Satanic beasts, the sea is consistently a negative element of the biblical story.

The Sea, Death, and Darkness

The biblical presentation of the sea is as a place of darkness and death. This section will demonstrate the consistency of the negative motif of the sea in its close connection to death and darkness in the OT. This is not to say that the ancient Israelites are unable to recognize the beauty of creation, including the beauty of the sea and of sea creatures,¹²⁵ but much more often the sea is described in terms of gloom, darkness, and death.¹²⁶ Philip Johnston writes, “Though a source of life and blessing, [water] is also a source of death and destruction.”¹²⁷ Nicholas Tromp’s work on the OT understanding of death asserts that *tehom* is intimately related to *Sheol* [שְׁאוֹל] throughout.¹²⁸ Recall also that almost all occurrences of *tehom* in the Hebrew are translated in the Septuagint as ἄβυσσος, “abyss.” The translators of the Septuagint make explicit the connection between *tehom* and the underworld of *Sheol*. Darkness in the OT is also closely associated with the sea and with death.

¹²⁴ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 684.

¹²⁵ In Ps 8, the psalmist marvels at the works of God’s hands (v. 3), and later in the Psalm he makes a list of some of those wonderful works which includes, “the birds of the heavens, and the fish of the sea, whatever passes along the paths of the seas” (v. 8).

¹²⁶ Although darkness is generally a negative motif in the text, it is not universally negative. See Ps 18:11 and Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 133–34.

¹²⁷ Philip Johnston, *Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament* (Leicester, England: Apollos, 2002), 123.

¹²⁸ Nicholas J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 59–62.

The OT creates a close connection between the sea and *Sheol*, but as Johnston cautions, the two are not equivalent to each other: “Various terms for water, depths and mire are images of and metaphors for the underworld, but hardly underworld names. Water, like earth, is associated with the underworld, but is not confused with it.”¹²⁹ Death and the deep are related to each other in many OT texts, but this is not to say that the sea is *Sheol*, nor that *Sheol* is definitely (or only) located in the sea.

Othmar Keel and Silva Schroer discuss the realm of the dead, concluding, “It is not to be definitively localized.”¹³⁰ Yet there are certain location-based descriptions of the place of the dead in the OT. The text does not give a definite geographic location, but *Sheol* is closely associated with a few places, one of which is the sea. Martin-Achard writes,

Many Old Testament texts bear witness to the fact that for the Hebrew, *Sheol* is associated with water in its most dreadful and destructive aspect, it is in some way present in the Abyss [Psalm 42:7; 71:20; 77:16; Exodus 15:5, 8], in the sea [Psalm 46:2; Lamentations 2:13; Job 26:5ff], or again in the turbulent waters [Psalm 18:16; 32:6; 69:1f; 144:7], in the depths [Psalm 68:22; 69:2, 15; 88:6; 107:24], and even in springs [Psalm 60:23; 69:15].¹³¹

Johnston discusses several passages in which other scholars have claimed that *tehom* literally means the underworld. In almost every case, he concludes that the other words are associated with the underworld but do not mean “underworld,” and he cautions against trying to prove *tehom* or the sea is equivalent to *Sheol*:

Death may be present (Exod. 15) or feared imminent (Jonah 2), or despair experienced (Ps. 42), and hence underworld descent may be implied (though Pss. 42–43 lack obvious underworld reference). But this hardly demonstrates that ‘the deep’ itself means the underworld. When all nature responds to divine action (Ps.

¹²⁹ Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 123–24.

¹³⁰ Othmar Keel and Silvia Schroer, *Creation: Biblical Theologies in the Context of the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 39.

¹³¹ Robert Martin-Achard, *From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960), 43–44.

77), ‘the deep’ indicates the extremity of the physical world rather than the underworld.¹³²

In heed of this kind of caution, the intention of this section is not to show that the sea *is* the underworld or is equivalent to darkness, but that the sea is associated with death and darkness to such an extent that the concepts come to overlap. The obvious negativity associated with death—there is nothing positive about death—begins to extend to the sea because of the many texts that associate the sea with death, the underworld, the shadow of death, and so on. Darkness also is frequently understood in negative terms, and this section will show that the sea’s association with darkness leads some of that negativity to be applied to the sea.

Genesis

In its discussion of the term אַחֲרָיִם (“darkness”), the *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* states, “Any theological discussion of the concept of darkness must begin with Gen. 1.”¹³³ The second verse of the OT shows a world covered in darkness and by the deep. The creation of darkness is not recorded in Genesis 1, but it would be incorrect to assume that God does not create darkness. Darkness is often understood to be the privation of light and not to be a “thing” at all. That is, darkness exists by default wherever light is not. Yet the Bible says that God creates even darkness: “I form light and create darkness” (Isa 45:7).¹³⁴ In the OT, “[darkness] is more than the absence of light. . . . It possesses a quality of its own that unmitigated makes it inimical to life.”¹³⁵

When God creates light in the next verse, the text states that he separates the light from the darkness (1:4), the same action [בְּרָא] he performs upon the waters above

¹³² Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 120.

¹³³ Botterweck and Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 5:248.

¹³⁴ Thus, prior to creation there was *nothing*, not even darkness. “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth” (Gen 1:1), must have included the creation of darkness in addition to the raw earth covered in the deep. The timing of the creation of the angels is not revealed.

¹³⁵ Botterweck and Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 5:248.

and below (1:6–7). When God creates the heavenly bodies to rule over the day and the night (1:14), he states that one of their purposes is to separate [בְּדַל] light from darkness. Interestingly, God creates the firmament [רְקִיעַ] to separate [בְּדַל] the waters above from the waters below. He later creates lights and places them in the firmament [רְקִיעַ] to separate [בְּדַל] the day from the night (1:14). The text then relates how God makes the lights and puts them in the firmament [רְקִיעַ] to separate [בְּדַל] the light from the darkness. Their role in separating is described using the same wording that in verse 4 describes the role of the firmament separating the waters from the waters. Therefore, the darkness is viewed by the text as being as “real” as the waters, as if the darkness and the light are held back from each other by the lights. Mathews writes,

“Darkness” and the “deep” prevailed over the landscape. Much is made of the metaphorical significance of darkness, meaning “evil” (e.g., Isa 5:20); its imagery in the Old Testament often represents whatever jeopardizes life, and it also pertains to the realm of the dead. Darkness, however, is treated as an actual entity in Genesis, not as a symbol for evil, and its existence is recognized by its naming (1:5).¹³⁶

Darkness and the sea both cover the earth in Genesis 1:2. They are also the only two things in the creation story that get “separated” and driven back. It is worth noting that Revelation 21:1 and 22:5 show that the sea and the darkness are two of the things that will not be present at all in the new creation. This fact is discussed further in the section on Revelation.

Exodus

Each of the plagues against Egypt is severe in and of itself, but in the list of ten plagues there is an overall progression of increasing severity.¹³⁷ If the destruction of

¹³⁶ Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 133. He also refers the reader to Job 3:4–8; 10:21; 17:13; and 1 Sam 2:9.

¹³⁷ That is not to say the progression is perfectly linear, but only that the later plagues, such as the hail, locusts, and death of the firstborn, were stronger blows against Egypt with more permanent effects than the earlier plagues such as the water turned to blood, the frogs, and the gnats. Given the opportunity to decide when the frogs would go away, Pharaoh did not mind keeping them until “tomorrow” (Exod 8:10), but when his firstborn son died, Pharaoh immediately summoned Moses and Aaron while it was still night in order to send them away (Exod 12:31). Also, the magicians were able to reproduce the first and second

Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea can be added to the list as an “eleventh plague,” then the progression of increasing severity culminates with the following plagues: darkness (ninth), death (tenth), and the deep (eleventh).

That the darkness would be felt (Exod 10:21) supports the fact that God created darkness as a thing in and of itself, rather than allowing its existence by default anywhere light is not. The text of Exodus 10:21–29 does not say that God removes all the light and as a result it is dark. God put darkness on the Egyptians, and only on the Egyptians, as if laying a blanket on top of them.¹³⁸

As the Hebrew people leave the land after the tenth plague and before the crossing of the Red Sea, God again uses darkness to keep the Egyptians at bay. Exodus 14:19–20 says that the cloud and the darkness stood between Israel and Egypt so that neither could approach the other. Therefore, all three, death, darkness, and the deep, intersect on that day. The darkness is part of the protection against the Egyptians by night. The next day, after the Israelites have passed safely across the Red Sea, the sea crashes down on Pharaoh and his army, bringing death to them all.

In Joshua 24, the LORD recounts the events of the exodus and emphasizes the darkness and the sea. This text further explains that the darkness that night was not just because of the time of day. God uses darkness as a physical separator to keep Egypt from reaching the Israelites. The text of Exodus 14 uses the basic Hebrew word for darkness, but when the LORD speaks to the people in Joshua 24 he uses the word for “pitch darkness,” which shares the same root with the word used during the ninth plague. Butler

plague (Exod 7:22 and 8:7), but at the third they said to Pharaoh, “this is the hand of God,” (Exod 8:19), and they did not attempt any of the others. John Durham has expressed his disagreement with the idea of a progression, saying, “The mighty acts are not weighted from mild to serious, and the application to their sequence of ‘logical’ patterns of increased or decreased power or intensity of effect is misleading. Each of the accounts is to the same end, and their cumulative effect is a magnification of repetition, not increasing degree.” Durham, *Exodus*, 103.

¹³⁸ Cf. Ezek 32:7–8, where the LORD revisits the idea of putting darkness on Egypt as a part of the judgment against them.

comments about this verse: “Rather than the regular term for darkness (cf. Exod 14:20), the writer uses a term akin to the plague narrative (Exod 10:22) to intensify the aura of divine action and power.”¹³⁹

In the book of Exodus, darkness is a negative experience for those on the receiving end of its oppressive energy. God uses darkness as a tool of judgment against the Egyptians, much like the frogs, gnats, and other things that readers would have no trouble understanding as physical elements that could be weaponized in the hands of an angry God. Yet when God uses darkness as another such weapon, the biblical authors show darkness to be a negative thing, and they associate it with the sea in the escalation of force that God executes against the Egyptians, building toward the direct involvement of the sea in holding back the Egyptians in their pursuit of God’s people just before they are put to death in the depths of the sea.

Isaiah

Compared to the frequency with which Isaiah uses imagery of flooding in his prophecy, he rarely points to darkness. Only one verse is worthy of note in regard to death and darkness. Isaiah 45:7 says, “I form light and create darkness; I make well-being and create calamity.”¹⁴⁰ This verse sets up two oppositions: light [אור] and darkness [חֹשֶׁךְ], and peace [שְׁלוֹם] and calamity [רָע]. The word רָע means “evil, distress, misery, injury, calamity.”¹⁴¹ It is translated as “evil” in Job 30:26, which states, “But when I hoped for good, evil came, and when I waited for light, darkness came,” and makes use of the same oppositions seen in Isaiah 45:7.¹⁴² Regardless of the specific connotations of

¹³⁹ Trent C. Butler, *Joshua*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 7 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1998), 271.

¹⁴⁰ A natural question about this verse is what is meant by God creating calamity/evil. The discussion is out of scope for the present work, but see Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66*, 204–5.

¹⁴¹ Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 948.

¹⁴² In Job 30:26, the word translated ‘darkness’ is אֶפְסֵל, which is a synonym of חֹשֶׁךְ which was

רע in these passages, there is nothing good about it.¹⁴³ Whether רע in these verses means “evil,” “calamity,” or any of the other possible glosses, the biblical authors are equating darkness with a negative concept.

Ezekiel

Ezekiel contains two passages that concentrate together the sea, darkness, and death. The first is chapter 26, which is a rebuke of Tyre. A key paragraph in that chapter is verses 19–21. In verse 19, the LORD states that he will bring the sea over Tyre, as in the flood, and reiterates that the great waters will cover the city. The verses leading up to this paragraph had distinguished Tyre as being “inhabited from the seas” and “mighty on the seas,” but the same sea will destroy it. Next, the LORD assures them that they will go down “with those who go down to the pit,” a phrase that has been used elsewhere in the OT to mean descending into *Sheol*.¹⁴⁴ The fact that covering with the sea means certain death is also reinforced by the contrast with “the land of the living” in verse 20. Lamar Cooper writes about this paragraph: “The last two verses of this chapter use a new series of images to convey the concept of judgment. Tyre’s trip to the ‘pit’ will not be one that will lead to peace and rest but to a ‘horrible end’ (v. 21).”¹⁴⁵

Ezekiel 31–32 also uses a concentration of negative elements in its pronouncement of judgment against Egypt. Ezekiel 31 explains that Egypt is like a cedar that grows tall and becomes full of pride. In verse 15, *Sheol* (death), darkness, and the sea are all brought together in judgment against Egypt. The biblical text weaves death,

used in Isa 45:7.

¹⁴³ Job 2:10 is another verse that makes clear the antonymous relationship between good and רע: “Shall we receive good from God, and shall we not receive evil [רע]?”

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Pss 30:4; 88:5; Prov 1:12; and for further study see the entry for בֹּרַחַ in Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 92.

¹⁴⁵ Lamar Eugene Cooper, *Ezekiel*, The New American Commentary, vol. 17 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 256.

darkness, and the deep into a web of negativity.

In Ezekiel 32, the LORD describes Pharaoh as “a dragon in the seas” who “burst forth” in the rivers (v. 2),¹⁴⁶ going on to say that he will drag up the dragon in a net (v. 3), which is reminiscent of pulling Leviathan up with a fish hook.¹⁴⁷ Verses 7 and 8 say in no fewer than seven ways that the LORD will cast Egypt into darkness. The ways are numbered here:

1. When I blot you out [חָצַףְ, cover, hide]
2. I will cover the heavens
3. And make their stars dark
4. I will cover the sun with a cloud
5. And the moon shall not give its light
6. All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over you
7. And put darkness on your land.

The entry in the *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* for חָשֶׁךְ [darkness] states, concerning Ezekiel 32, that “[darkness] furnishes the background for a proper understanding of Ezekiel’s lament over Pharaoh (Ezk 32:1–16), an incantation designed to send Egypt and all it represents to the netherworld. . . . Thus, darkness and other portents become harbingers of judgment.”¹⁴⁸ Ezekiel 31–32 ties death, darkness, and the deep together with God’s judgment against his enemies.

Psalms

Several verses in the Psalms associate the negative concepts of death, darkness, and the deep. Psalm 68:20–22 places *Sheol* in the depths of the sea: “Our God is a God of

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Jer 46:8, where Egypt (presumably Pharaoh specifically) pridefully boasts that the Nile will cover the earth and destroy the cities and inhabitants, just as the sea did during the flood.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Job 40:25.

¹⁴⁸ Botterweck and Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 5:250–51.

salvation, and to GOD, the Lord, belong deliverances from death. . . . The Lord said, ‘I will bring them back from Bashan, I will bring them back from the depths of the sea.’”

Deliverance from death is figured in this Psalm as being brought back from the depths of the sea.

Psalm 88 includes many more references to the negative concepts of death, darkness, and the deep. In verses 3–7, the psalmist understands himself to be so near to death that he is partially in *Sheol*, as Jonah in the belly of the fish also felt himself to be. The phrases he uses to describe the grave are “the depths of the pit,” “regions dark and deep,” and being overwhelmed by “waves.” The psalmist creates a negative representation of the sea by associating it with the dark place of the dead. He goes on in verses 10–12 to describe the grave in terms of darkness. Finally, verses 15–18 draw together death, darkness, and the flood of troubles and afflictions that surround the psalmist.

Psalm 139 does not equate the elements of death, darkness, and the deep, but it does list all three of them together as places where it is surprising to find the extent of God’s reach. It says in verses 7–12 that a dead person in *Sheol* is not too far gone for God to rescue him. The farthest reaches of the sea are not too far away for God to find a person. Neither can darkness hide a person from God, who sees in the darkness as if it were as bright as noon. This Psalm creates a negative atmosphere around the sea, darkness, and death by grouping them as places which would seem on the surface to be outside the realm of God’s presence and salvation.

Job

Job 3:8 has been discussed above in relation to Leviathan. Job’s state of depression is readily felt in this passage, as he curses the day of his birth and the night of his conception. Here and throughout Job, Robert Fyall sees a connection between the “shadow of death” (צֶלְמָוֶת, familiar to many from Ps 23:4) and death [מָוֶת] as a force or character. Fyall makes several important points in the section about Job 3:4–5:

The imagery of shadows and darkness is introduced in 3:4ff. where a veritable cataract of pictures create a cumulative sense of menace. The nouns ḥōšēk (“darkness”) and ’opēl (“gloom”) are not mere rhetoric but sinister and shadowy presences. Ḥōšēk is used both of the primeval darkness in Genesis 1:2 and of the darkness over Egypt in Exodus 10:21–22. It is also used in an eschatological sense of the Day of the Lord in Amos 5:18 and 20 and in Zephaniah 1:15.

Also, for the first time, the word ṣalmāwet occurs (v. 5). Traditionally translated “shadow of death,” it is best known from its use in Psalm 23:4, “the valley of the shadow of death.” Its use here in 3:5 suggests that the poet sees it as one of the powers of darkness that Job is summoning. It would be possible to render the word “shadow of Mot” to bring out the mythological nuances of the word. However that may be, the powers of darkness have been presented in a sinister and personalized manner. What emerges is a cry for an ‘uncreating act’ which will return the universe to primordial chaos; an altogether more sinister picture than the deep peace of the grave.¹⁴⁹

Fyall draws out the connections in these verses between darkness and death. The entire section heavily emphasizes darkness; Job 3:3–10 includes fourteen references of various kinds to darkness and night.¹⁵⁰ The prevalence of terms relating to darkness reveals the darkness of Job’s thoughts. Death is explicit in מָוֶת and it is implicit in the idea of wishing he had never been born. The connection between Leviathan and the sea in verse 8 has already been explored. Here we see, further, how Job draws together death, darkness, and the deep as he reflects upon his despair.

Job 26:5–6 includes both water and *Sheol* in what appears to be a parallel that connects them, but caution is required when building arguments based solely on grammatical parallels. The text reads, “The dead tremble under the waters and their inhabitants. *Sheol* is naked before God, and Abaddon has no covering.” Philip Johnston urges caution about this verse in particular, writing, “It is possible that 26:5 portrays a watery underworld. However, this would be exceptional in the ancient Near East. The rest of the poem consists mostly of short, single verse units, so vv. 5 and 6 could well be

¹⁴⁹ Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You*, 113.

¹⁵⁰ Verse 3 “night”; v. 4 “darkness” and “nor light shine upon it”; v. 5 “gloom,” “deep darkness,” “clouds dwell on it,” and “blackness”; v. 6 “night,” “thick darkness,” v. 7 “night,” v. 8 “it” (referring to night); v. 9 “let the stars of its dawn be dark,” “let it hope for light but have none,” “nor see the eyelids of the morning.”

distinct ideas.”¹⁵¹ But Johnston also returns to the idea that the text may be referring to a connection between the sea and *Sheol*, even if that means it is a unique instance of such an idea: “Job 26:5 possibly pictures the shades in water, which would make it one instance where ‘water’ means ‘underworld.’”¹⁵² The other OT passages already addressed in this section, which connect death and the deep, provide sufficient precedent for the intersection of *Sheol* and the sea, but Johnston’s caution is nonetheless wise.

Finally, the divine speech in Job 38–41, which has already been discussed in relation to Leviathan, also contains references to darkness and death in close relationship to the sea. For example, Job 38:16–17 says, “Have you entered into the springs of the sea, or walked in the recesses of *tehom*? Have the gates of death [מְוֵת] been revealed to you, or have you seen the gates of deep darkness [צִלְמָוֶת]?” In these two verses, the LORD challenges Job on his experience of the sea, death, and darkness.

Later in the divine speech, God speaks of Behemoth. Fyall writes about the transition from Behemoth (Job 40:15–24) to Leviathan in Job 40:23–24, which states, “Behold, if the river is turbulent he [Behemoth] is not frightened; he is confident though Jordan rushes against his mouth. Can one take him by his eyes, or pierce his nose with a snare?” Fyall comments, “Plainly the structure [of Job 40:23–24] has been crafted carefully to connect Behemoth both with the world of the dead and that of Leviathan.”¹⁵³ The world of Leviathan is the sea. Thus, the mighty power of Behemoth stands on the border of death and the sea.

Gunkel has a helpful comment about the last few verses of the divine speech about Leviathan, in which he sees a connection between the sea and *Sheol*. He writes about Job 41:23–26 (Job 41:31–34 English): “Here the places of Leviathan are named:

¹⁵¹ Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 117.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 119.

¹⁵³ Fyall, *Now My Eyes Have Seen You*, 131.

deep, sea, foundations of the current—which alternate with names of the underworld, as though underworld and sea normally coincide.”¹⁵⁴

Application to Revelation

Death, darkness, and the deep are also linked in a unique way at the end of the book of Revelation, and the OT connections between the sea, death, and darkness can be used to aid in understanding the text of Revelation 21–22. Each of these elements “will be no more” in the new creation. The Greek phrase οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι “[something] will be no more” occurs five times in the GNT. All five of the occurrences are in Revelation 21–22, and all of them reveal things that will not exist in the new creation. Table 1 offers a list of these things.

Table 1. Things that “will be no more” in Revelation 21–22

Verse	Greek and English Text
21:1	ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι - “ the sea will be no more”
21:4	ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι - “ death will be no more”
21:4	οὔτε πένθος οὔτε κραυγή οὔτε πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι - “neither shall there be mourning , nor crying , nor pain anymore”
22:3	πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι - “ Anything accursed will be no more”
22:5	νύξ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι - “ night will be no more”

As John records the final two chapters of Revelation, he sees the new heavens and new earth and points out that these five things, which were previously a part of human experience, will no longer exist in the new creation: the sea, death, mourning/crying/pain, anything accursed, and darkness.

The absence of death from the new creation makes sense. Death entered creation as a result of human sin, and the penalty for sin has been fully paid by Jesus Christ (see Gen 2:17; Rom 5:12). First Corinthians 15:26 states that the last enemy to be destroyed will be death, and Revelation 20:14 shows Death and Hades being thrown into the lake of

¹⁵⁴ Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos*, 35.

fire.¹⁵⁵ John would not have been surprised to see that death was absent from the new creation, because the metanarrative of the Bible has been directed at solving the problem of sin and death since their entry into creation in the first chapters of Genesis.

Neither should it be surprising that mourning, crying, and pain will be removed from human experience in the new creation. Isaiah looks forward to such a day in Isaiah 35:10; 51:11; and 65:19. The fact that “anything accursed” will be excluded from the new creation is also to be expected. This phrase is a catch-all that includes things the reader already knows will be absent, such as Satan and his demons and those individuals whose names are not found in the Lamb’s book of life (see Rev 20:15). The absence of night (Rev 22:5) accords with the negative biblical presentation of darkness, which has been discussed above, and with the biblical connections between God and light (see 1 John 1:15). G. K. Beale writes,

The subsequent similar sayings that “there will no longer be any curse” (22:3) or “night” (22:5) also indicate that none of the evils and threats of the old world can hinder the saints from fully enjoying the consummate presence of God (in both the formula of a noun with οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι [“there will be no longer”] occurs, as in 21:1, 4). The “curse” of “death” and its associated sufferings, which were introduced in the first Eden, will be removed in the last Eden.¹⁵⁶

However, the absence of the sea in the new creation is surprising to the modern reader. It does not seem on the surface to fit into the set comprising death, darkness, cursed things, mourning, crying, and pain. The oddness of the absence of the sea has led some commentators to imagine explanations for why it would be gone.

Henry Swete’s commentary on Revelation has been used and referenced by many scholars over the past century. However, his comments on Revelation 21:1 concerning the absence of the sea in the new creation are without biblical evidence or

¹⁵⁵ See also Rev 20:13: “And the *sea* gave up the dead who were in it, *Death and Hades* gave up the dead who were in them, and they were judged, each one of them, according to what they had done.” Death and the deep are the only places listed as giving up the dead that are in them, with no definite distinction between them.

¹⁵⁶ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 1049.

biblically-based reasoning. He writes, “The Sea has disappeared, because in the mind of the writer it is associated with ideas which are at variance with the character of the New Creation. . . . St. John, an exile in seagirt Patmos, regarded with no favour the element which mounted guard over his prison, and parted him from the Churches of Asia.”¹⁵⁷ This argument has a few serious flaws. First, there is no biblical basis for the assumption that John dislikes the sea on account of it holding him back from the churches of Asia. It is more likely that he held the imprisoning authorities responsible for his imprisonment than the sea, which was not involved in the process. Second, the book of Revelation is a revelation to John, which he observed and recorded. To argue that John’s personal feelings about the sea are the reason the sea is to be eliminated from the new creation is to fundamentally misunderstand the book of Revelation.

A better explanation for the exclusion of the sea from the new creation can be derived from the consistently negative treatment of the sea throughout the OT. Given the pervasive negativity of this motif, which has been explored in this dissertation, it stands to reason that John would no sooner have expected to see the sea in the new creation than to see death there. In the context of the Bible, the sea forms part of a set with death, darkness, mourning, crying, pain, and cursed things. The sea is shrouded in negativity, much like death, pain, and the other elements grouped together in Revelation 21–22.

David Aune writes a summary of the negative motif of the sea in the OT in his discussion of the exclusion of the sea from the new creation.¹⁵⁸ However, the most thorough discussion of this issue in its relation to the negative representation of the sea in the OT is found in Beale’s commentary.¹⁵⁹ He writes, “The assertion that ‘the sea is not

¹⁵⁷ Henry Barclay Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John: The Greek Text* (London: Macmillan, 1909), 272.

¹⁵⁸ David E. Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 52C (Dallas: Word, 1998), 1119–20.

¹⁵⁹ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 1039–51.

any longer' is further explained in 21:4: 'death will not be any longer, neither will there any longer be mourning or crying or pain.' The close parallels between 21:1 and 21:4 show that the latter develops the former."¹⁶⁰ Beale lists several points about the negativity surrounding the sea in the biblical text and then summarizes,

The use here probably summarizes how all these various nuances of "sea" throughout the book relate to the new creation. Therefore, it encompasses all five meanings. That is, when the new creation comes there will no longer be any threat from Satan because he will have been permanently judged and excluded from the new creation. Nor will there be any threat from rebellious nations, since they will have suffered the same fate as Satan. Neither will there be death ever again in the new world, so that there is no room for the sea as the place of the dead.¹⁶¹

Beale supports the fact that the OT has been negative about the sea by joining it to *Sheol* such that any negative sentiment one would feel toward the place of the dead can also be applied to the sea. As a result, the sea will lose its place among the elements of creation, having been destroyed alongside death, darkness, mourning, crying, pain, and anything accursed.

The OT pulls together death, darkness, and the deep in several texts that are negative about all three. The association with death and darkness is further proof that the OT is consistently negative about the sea. If *Sheol* were to have a physical, geographical location on earth, the sea is the place that it would be. The sea is also a place of darkness and gloom, associations that can be understood literally as well as conceptually. If a person were to descend into the sea, he would eventually find it to be his own personal place of death. And the farther one travels down into the depths of the sea, the more darkness there is until there is no light at all. The OT picks up these literal characteristics of the sea and uses them to reinforce a symbolic connection between the negative ideas of the sea, death, and darkness.

¹⁶⁰ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 1042.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

The sea is a negative motif in the OT. From the first verses of the Pentateuch, continuing in prophetic warnings of pending destruction, and in the poetic pen of the psalmists, the OT is consistently negative in its representation of the sea. That negativity about the sea can also generate hope, however, when other negative things, such as sin, are negated with it. Ralph Smith summarizes the book of Micah in this way: “Micah is composed of twenty pericopes loosely connected into three cycles of judgment and hope.”¹ Micah alternates between judgment and hope, and his final words of hope weave in the negative motif of the sea to communicate the Lord’s grace to remove sin.² Micah states, “You will cast all our sins into the depths of the sea.”³ The conclusions of this dissertation do not indicate new meaning for Micah 7:19, but the reader of this argument can find deeper appreciation for the physical and figurative distance to which God removes the sins of the faithful remnant. Isaiah had prophesied the arrival of a flood of

¹ Ralph L. Smith, *Micah–Malachi*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 32 (Dallas: Word, 1998), 59.

² Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 390–404; Kenneth L. Barker, *Micah*, The New American Commentary, vol. 20 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1998), 133–36; Ralph L. Smith, *Micah–Malachi*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 32 (Dallas: Word, 1998), 56–59; Bruce K. Waltke, *Micah: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 26 (Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 221–26.

³ Concerning “our sins” versus “their sins” in this verse, Barker comments, “Most Hebrew manuscripts of the MT actually read ‘their iniquities (better, ‘sins’)’ instead of ‘our iniquities.’ However, ‘our’ is supported by some Hebrew manuscripts and the versions (LXX, Syr., and Vg.), as well as by perhaps the context. A few commentators prefer to retain ‘their’ and refer it to the nations of vv. 16–17. Then the forgiveness spoken of here would include both Jews and Gentiles. Of course, this is ultimately true anyway, whether or not the text explicitly states it here. Kenneth L. Barker, *Micah*, The New American Commentary, vol. 20 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1998), 135.

invading armies, and Micah, who was a contemporary of Isaiah, sees that after God brings his people back from the depths, he will graciously hurl their sins into *tehom*.

Several commentaries have drawn out connections between Micah 7:19 and the Exodus story of Pharaoh's army being hurled into *tehom*. Leslie Allen writes, "[God will] drown their sins forever, just as Pharaoh's charioteers were 'hurled' into the sea and sank 'down into the depths like a stone' (Exod. 15:5). The black shadow of guilt for past sin that had dominated their experience would disappear from their lives, never to threaten them again."⁴ The dark depths of the sea are the only fitting place for God to dispose of sin. Micah 7:19 draws upon the negative motif of the sea and adds to the motif a layer of color that paints the sea as a kind of trash dump for the sin that God has removed from his people.

Hermann Gunkel's work at the end of the nineteenth century contends that a form of the ANE *chaoskampf* myth finds an outlet in the Babylonian myth *Enuma elish* and that it also appears, transformed, in certain passages of the OT.⁵ In the century and a quarter that have passed since Gunkel published *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*, several scholars have taken up the task of confirming or denying Gunkel's conclusions. Scholars who generally agree with Gunkel have nevertheless argued that the Canaanite myths, specifically the Ugaritic Baal Cycle, parallel the OT material more closely than do the Babylonian myths.⁶ Chapters 2 and 3 of this dissertation discuss Gunkel's work and that of the scholars who have continued the work

⁴ Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*, 403. On this verse, Bruce Waltke writes, "As God began Israel on her journey by hurling the Egyptians into the Red Sea, so he will restore them on their pilgrimage and hurl all their iniquities into the metaphorical *depths*." Waltke, *Micah*, 225, emphasis original.

⁵ Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*, trans. K. William Whitney (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2006).

⁶ Recall that Gunkel had no access to the Canaanite myths because they remained undiscovered until the time of his death.

he started. They are in agreement that the OT is negative about the sea. The main point of disagreement concerns whether ANE myths were the source of the biblical authors' use of the sea as a negative motif.

The conclusion of Chapters 4 and 5 is that one must be cautious of short phrases that match between two documents, even in cases of identical wording. As an example, consider Ezekiel 26:7, in which the LORD GOD himself calls Nebuchadnezzar the "king of kings." Jesus is also referred to as the king of kings in Revelation 17:14, but it would be faulty logic to argue that where the NT names Jesus in this way it implies that Jesus is like Nebuchadnezzar.⁷ Yet many of the proposed connections between the biblical text and ANE myth involve wording less exactly matched than in the case of "king of kings" in Ezekiel and Revelation.⁸ If one must be cautious between the covers of the Bible itself not to draw false conclusions based on an identical phrase describing two different characters, then one must certainly be cautious about equating two stories or two beings based on a few identical words in separate documents, such as an OT book and a myth from a pagan religion to which the OT is explicitly opposed.

The sea is a negative motif in the OT partly because of its destructive tendencies. It is a part of creation, but it is shown to be opposed to creation as well, as God consistently removes and restrains it so that it cannot destroy the life that exists on the dry ground. The OT recounts the dividing of the sea during creation as if God were defeating and driving away an enemy (Nah 1:4; Pss 18:15, 104:7, 106:9), after which he sets restraining bars to hold it back from the dry ground, giving the sea borders that it

⁷ The phrase "king of kings" in the OT is only applied to Nebuchadnezzar (Ezek 26:7; Dan 2:37) and Artaxerxes (Ezra 7:12, self-proclaimed). The NT uses the phrase exclusively to refer to Jesus (1 Tim 6:15; Rev 17:14; and 19:16). The "Old Greek Version" of the Septuagint also uses the phrase in Dan 4:37, where Nebuchadnezzar has regained his sanity, recognized the authority of the LORD, and called him the "king of kings," translating the Hebrew for "king of heaven."

⁸ One example is the equation of Leviathan in Isa 27:1 and Leviathan in ANE myth is based almost entirely on the fact that both serpents are described as "fleeing" and "crooked." See chap. 6 for further discussion.

cannot cross (Job 38:8-11). During the flood, when God does allow the sea to cross those restraining borders, it destroys without mercy all human and animal life on the dry ground (Gen 7–9). Thus, the sea proves itself to be a negative force in the OT by destroying life and opposing the creative purposes of God.

That very destructiveness of the sea is often targeted in order to punish sin. Another way that the OT uses the sea as a negative motif is as a tool of God's judgment against sin. The most sweeping judgment against sin in a single event is the flood, in which God uses the sea to kill every creature on dry ground that has the breath of life in it, except for the specimens that he preserves in the ark. During the exodus, God delivers his people through the sea by making *tehom* stand up like walls on both sides of the dry ground, then punishes Pharaoh and his army by causing *tehom* to burst forth on them.

The flood and the exodus are such central events in the OT storyline that later prophets use them to paint a picture of the destruction and judgment against sin that is still to come. Isaiah does this throughout his writing, describing the flood of invading armies that is going to cleanse the land of wickedness just as the first flood had done. Only a remnant will return, according to Isaiah, just as Noah and his family are few in number compared to the multitudes drowned in the deep.

Finally, Jonah finds himself on the receiving end of God's wrath as he attempts to run away from the mission God has given him. The means of correction God uses against Jonah is a strong tempest on the sea, which leaves the sailors no choice but to deliver Jonah into the overwhelming hands of *tehom*. Jonah plunges into the deep, and he knows he will certainly die, as *tehom* and *Sheol* became synonyms to him. The sea is thus a negative motif in the OT because God uses it as a tool of judgment against sin.

The sea is a negative motif in the OT, also, because it provides safe harbor for Satan and his representatives Leviathan and the beasts of Daniel's vision. The OT reveals Leviathan to be a monster of great power, too great for any man to overcome. Only God is able to tame Leviathan, and to him the dragon is a mere plaything of the waters (Cf.

Job 40-41 with Ps 104:26). God warns Job that he should respect the great and awesome power of Leviathan, and his description of the dragon blurs the lines between a physical creature and the spiritual enemy Satan.

The beasts of Daniel 7 are also natives of the sea. The eschatological vision describes four beasts that come from the sea to wreak havoc on the land in what looks like a geopolitical version of the flood, one that burst forth onto the dry ground. The book of Revelation also includes a vision of the same beasts, in which they involve themselves in all kinds of evil. The beasts in Daniel and Revelation intersect with the descriptions of Leviathan as a dragon, and Revelation 12:9 explicitly defines them as “that ancient serpent, who is called the devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world.” The same serpent who in the first days tempted Adam and Eve to sin in the Garden of Eden will in the last days find himself evicted and destroyed. The sea is a negative motif in the OT because it is implicated with all these actions of Satan and his representatives.

Finally, the sea is a negative motif in the OT because of its close relationship with death and darkness. All three—death, darkness, and the deep—are shrouded in negativity, especially in passages that draw them together in one place. Chapter 6 discusses several passages in which the sea is closely associated with death and darkness. In many of these cases, the sea is parallel to death in such a way that they appear to be synonymous.

Chapter 6 concludes with a discussion of Revelation 21–22, in which the sea, death, and darkness are conjoined as elements that will be absent from the new creation. In these two chapters the text states that in the new creation five things “will be no more”: (1) the sea [21:1]; (2) death [21:4]; (3) mourning, crying, or pain [21:4]; (4) anything accursed [22:3]; and (5) night [22:5]. The absence of most of these things makes perfect sense to the reader. Death has no place in the new creation after sin and temptation to sin have been removed with Satan. The picture of the new creation would not make sense if it included accursed things, and God has in other places promised that

there will be no mourning, crying, or pain. However, the sea may not at first seem to fit in this set of negative elements. Why is the sea stricken from the new creation?

The thesis of this dissertation, that the sea is a negative motif in the OT, means that the sea does in fact fit with the other four things that are removed from the new creation in Revelation 21–22. All five things have earned negative reputations in the text of the Bible. In the same way that anyone would be surprised to see death in the new creation, John would have been surprised to see *tehom* in the new creation because of the negative motif that spans biblical history back to the time of creation.

The OT authors consistently used the sea as a negative motif. The wider context of ANE literature (and ancient literature from across the world) was also negative in its presentation of the sea, the element of creation that is set against life on the dry ground. The destructive tendencies of *tehom* make it ripe to become a tool of God's judgment against sin, as the OT shows repeatedly. It harbors the arch-enemy of the OT, Satan, and his representatives Leviathan, Rahab, and the beasts of Daniel 7. Finally, the sea is closely linked in the OT to death and darkness, and it will be removed with them in the new creation.

APPENDIX
OCCURRENCES OF TEHOM IN THE OT

Genesis 1:2

וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם:

“The earth was without form and void, and darkness was over the face of **the deep**. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters.”¹

Genesis 7:11

בְּשָׁנַת שִׁש־מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה לְחַיֵּי־נֹחַ בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשֵּׁנִי בְּשִׁבְעָה־עָשָׂר יוֹם לְחֹדֶשׁ בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה נִבְקְעוּ כָּל־מַעְיֵנֹת תְהוֹם רַבָּה וְאַרְבַּת הַשָּׁמַיִם נִפְתְּחוּ:

“In the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on that day all the fountains of **the great deep** burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened.”

Genesis 8:2

וַיִּסְכְּרוּ מַעְיֵנֹת תְהוֹם וְאַרְבַּת הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיִּכְלָא הַגֶּשֶׁם מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם:

“The fountains of **the deep** and the windows of the heavens were closed, the rain from the heavens was restrained,”

¹ Hebrew Scripture is from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. English translations are from the English Standard Version.

Genesis 49:25

מֵאֵל אָבִיךָ וַיַּעֲזֹרְךָ וְאֵת שְׂדֵי וַיְבָרְכֶךָ בְּרִכַּת שָׁמַיִם מֵעַל בְּרִכַּת תְּהוֹם רַבָּצַת תַּחַת בְּרִכַּת שָׁדַיִם וְרַחֵם:

“by the God of your father who will help you, by the Almighty who will bless you with blessings of heaven above, blessings of **the deep** that crouches beneath, blessings of the breasts and of the womb.”

Exodus 15:5

תַּהֲמַת יִכְסִימוּ יַרְדּוֹ בְּמִצּוֹלֹת כְּמוֹ-אֶבֶן:

“**The floods** covered them; they went down into the depths like a stone.”

Exodus 15:8

וּבְרוּחַ אֶפְיֶיךָ גִּעְרָמוּ מַיִם נִצְבּוּ כְּמוֹ-גֵד נִזְלִים קָפְאוּ תַּהֲמַת בְּלִבַיִם:

“At the blast of your nostrils the waters piled up; the floods stood up in a heap; **the deeps** congealed in the heart of the sea.”

Deuteronomy 8:7

כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מְבִיאֶךָ אֶל-אֶרֶץ טוֹבָה אֶרֶץ נַחֲלֵי מַיִם עֵינַת וְתַהֲמַת יִצְאִים בְּבִקְעָה וּבְהָר:

“For the LORD your God is bringing you into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and **springs**, flowing out in the valleys and hills”

Deuteronomy 33:13

וּלְיוֹסֵף אָמַר מִבְּרַכַּת יְהוָה אֶרֶצוֹ מִמְּגַד שָׁמַיִם מִטָּל וּמִתְהוֹם רַבָּצַת תַּחַת:

“And of Joseph he said, ‘Blessed by the LORD be his land, with the choicest gifts of heaven above, and of **the deep** that crouches beneath,’”

Isaiah 51:10

הֲלוֹא אַתָּה-הִיא הַמַּחְרַבֶּת לָם מִי תְהוֹם רַבָּה הַשְּׁמָה מֵעַמְקֵי-יָם דָּרַךְ לַעֲבֹר גְּאוּלַיִם:

“Was it not you who dried up the sea, the waters of the great **deep**, who made the depths of the sea a way for the redeemed to pass over?”

Isaiah 63:13

מוליכם בתהומות כסוס במדבר לא יכשלו:

“Who led them through the **depths**? Like a horse in the desert, they did not stumble.”

Ezekiel 26:19

כי כה אמר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה בְּתַתִּי אֶתְךָ עִיר נְחֻרֶבֶת כְּעָרִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נִוְשְׁבוּ בְּהַעֲלוֹת עָלֶיךָ אֶת־תְּהוֹמוֹ וְכִסּוּךָ הַמַּיִם הַרְבִּיִּים:

“For thus says the Lord GOD: When I make you a city laid waste, like the cities that are not inhabited, when I bring up **the deep** over you, and the great waters cover you,”

Ezekiel 31:4

מִיִּם גִּדְּלוּהוּ תְהוֹמוֹ רִמְמָתָהּ וְאֶת־נְהַרְתֶּיהָ הִלְךָ סְבִיבוֹת מִטְּעָה וְאֶת־תְּעֻלֶּתֶיהָ שִׁלְחָה אֵל כָּל־עֵצֵי הַשָּׂדֶה:

“The waters nourished it; **the deep** made it grow tall, making its rivers flow around the place of its planting, sending forth its streams to all the trees of the field.”

Ezekiel 31:15

כֹּה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה בַּיּוֹם רָדְתָּ שְׂאוּלָה הָאֲבֵלֶתִי כִסְתִי עָלֶיהָ אֶת־תְּהוֹמוֹ וְאֶמְנַע נְהַרְתֶּיהָ וַיִּכְלְאוּ מַיִם רַבִּים וְאֶקְדֶּר עָלֶיהָ לְבָנוֹן וְכָל־עֵצֵי הַשָּׂדֶה עָלֶיהָ עֲלִפָה:

“Thus says the Lord GOD: On the day the cedar went down to Sheol I caused mourning; I closed **the deep** over it, and restrained its rivers, and many waters were stopped. I clothed Lebanon in gloom for it, and all the trees of the field fainted because of it.”

Amos 7:4

כֹּה הִרְאֵנִי אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה וְהִנֵּה קָרָא לְרֵב בְּאֵשׁ אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה וְהִנֵּה וְהִנֵּה אֶת־תְּהוֹמוֹ רָבָה וְאָכְלָה אֶת־הַחֶלֶק:

“This is what the Lord GOD showed me: behold, the Lord GOD was calling for a judgment by fire, and it devoured the great **deep** and was eating up the land.”

Jonah 2:6

אֶפְפוּנֵי מַיִם עַד־נַפְשִׁי תִהְיוּ יִסְבְּבֵנִי סוּף חֲבוּשׁ לְרֹאשִׁי:

“The waters closed in over me to take my life; **the deep** surrounded me; weeds were wrapped about my head.”

Habakkuk 3:10

רָאוּ אֲרָצוֹת יַחֲלִילוּ הַיַּיִם יָרִים מִיִּם עָבַר נָתַן תְּהוֹם קוֹלוֹ רוֹם יִדְהוּ נְשָׂא:

“The mountains saw you and writhed; the raging waters swept on; **the deep** gave forth its voice; it lifted its hands on high.”

Psalms 33:7

כִּגְס בְּיַד מֵי הַיָּם נָתַן בְּאֶצְרוֹת תְּהוֹמוֹת:

“He gathers the waters of the sea as a heap; he puts the **deeps** in storehouses.”

Psalms 36:7

צְדִקְתְּךָ | כְּהַרְרֵי־אֵל מְשֻׁטָּף תְּהוֹם רַבָּה אָדָם־וּבְהֶמָה תוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה:

“Your righteousness is like the mountains of God; your judgments are like the great **deep**; man and beast you save, O LORD.”

Psalms 42:8 (x2)

תְּהוֹם־אֶל־תְּהוֹם קוֹרָא לְקוֹל צְנוּרִיד בְּלִמְשֻׁבְרִיד וְגִלְיָד עָלַי עָבְרוּ:

“**Deep** calls to **deep** at the roar of your waterfalls; all your breakers and your waves have gone over me.”

Psalms 71:20

אֲשֶׁר הִרְאִיתָנִי | צָרוֹת רַבּוֹת וְרַעוֹת תְּשׁוּב תְּשׁוּב וּמִתְהוֹמוֹת הָאָרֶץ תְּשׁוּב תַעֲלֵנִי:

“You who have made me see many troubles and calamities will revive me again; **from the depths** of the earth you will bring me up again.”

Psalm 77:17

רָאוּךָ מַיִם | אֱלֹהִים רָאוּךָ מַיִם יַחֲלֹוּ אֵף יִרְגְּזוּ תְהוֹמוֹת:

“When the waters saw you, O God, when the waters saw you, they were afraid; indeed, **the deep** trembled.”

Psalm 78:15

יִבְקַע צְרִים בַּמִּדְבָּר וַיִּשְׁק בְּתְהוֹמוֹת רַבָּה:

“He split rocks in the wilderness and gave them drink abundantly as from **the deep**.”

Psalm 104:6

תְּהוֹם כָּל־בּוֹשׂ כִּסְתּוֹ עַל־הָרִים יַעֲמְדוּ־מַיִם:

“You covered it with the **deep** as with a garment; the waters stood above the mountains.”

Psalm 106:9

וַיִּגְעַר בַּיַּם־סוּף וַיַּחֲרַב וַיּוֹלִיכֶם בְּתְהוֹמוֹת כַּמִּדְבָּר:

“He rebuked the Red Sea, and it became dry, and he led them through **the deep** as through a desert.”

Psalm 107:26

יַעֲלֹוּ שָׁמַיִם יִרְדּוּ תְהוֹמוֹת נַפְשָׁם בָּרַעָה תִתְמוּגַג:

“They mounted up to heaven; they went down to **the depths**; their courage melted away in their evil plight;”

Psalm 135:6

כָּל אֲשֶׁר־חָפֵץ יְהוָה עָשָׂה בַשָּׁמַיִם וּבָאָרֶץ בַּיַּמִּים וְכָל־תְּהוֹמוֹת:

“Whatever the LORD pleases, he does, in heaven and on earth, in the seas **and all deeps**.”

Psalm 148:7

הִלְלוּ אֶת־יְהוָה מִן־הָאָרֶץ תַּנְיִנִים וְכָל־תְּהוֹמוֹת:

“Praise the LORD from the earth, you great sea creatures and **all deeps**,”

Job 28:14

תְּהוֹם אָמַר לֹא בִי־הִיא וַיִּם אָמַר אֵין עִמָּדִי:

“The deep says, ‘It is not in me,’ and the sea says, ‘It is not with me.’”

Job 38:16

הֲבָאתָ עַד־נְבִי־יָם וּבַחֲקֹר תְּהוֹם הִתְהַלַּכְתָּ:

“Have you entered into the springs of the sea, or walked in the recesses of the deep?”

Job 38:30

בְּאֶבֶן מַיִם יִתְחַבְּאוּ וּפְנֵי תְּהוֹם יִתְלַכְּדוּ:

“The waters become hard like stone, and the face of the deep is frozen.”

Job 41:24

אֲחֵרָיו יָאִיר נִתְיָב יַחֲשֵׁב תְּהוֹם לְשִׁיבָה:

“Behind him he leaves a shining wake; one would think the deep to be white-haired.”

Proverbs 3:20

בְּדַעְתּוֹ תְּהוֹמוֹת נִבְקְעוּ וְשִׁחֲקִים יִרְעַפּוּ־טַל:

“by his knowledge the deeps broke open, and the clouds drop down the dew.”

Proverbs 8:24

בְּאֵין־תְּהוֹמוֹת חוֹלַלְתִּי בְּאֵין מְעִינֹת נִכְבְּדִי־מַיִם:

“When there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no springs abounding with water.”

Proverbs 8:27

בְּהִכִּינוּ שָׁמַיִם שָׁם אָנִי בְּחֻקּוֹ חוּג עַל־פְּנֵי תְּהוֹם:

“When he established the heavens, I was there; when he drew a circle on the face of the deep,”

Proverbs 8:28

בְּאַמְצוֹ שְׁחָקִים מִמַּעַל בְּעֲזוֹ עֵינֹת תְּהוֹם:

“when he made firm the skies above, when he established the fountains of **the deep**,”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahuis, Ferdinand. "Behemot, Leviaton Und Der Mensch in Hiob 38-42." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 123, no. 1 (2011): 72–91.
- Alden, Robert L. *Job*. The New American Commentary, vol. 11. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Alexander, T. Desmond. *Jonah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 26. Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2009.
- Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- _____. *Jeremiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- _____. *Psalms 101-150*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 21. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. *Creation in the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press; London: SPCK, 1984.
- _____. *Creation Versus Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible*. New York: Association Press, 1967.
- Anderson, Gary A., and Markus Bockmuehl. *Creation Ex Nihilo: Origins, Development, Contemporary Challenges*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2018.
- Angel, Andrew. "The Sea in 4Q541 7.3 and in Daniel 7:2." *Vetus Testamentum* 60, no. 3 (2010): 474–78.
- Anthonioz, Stéphanie. *L'eau, Enjeux Politiques et Théologiques, de Sumer à la Bible*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Arnold, Bill T., and Bryan Beyer. *Readings from the Ancient Near East: Primary Sources for Old Testament Study*. Encountering Biblical Studies. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Augustine of Hippo. "The City of God." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Philip Schaff, translated by Marcus Dods. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, vol. 2. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

- Averbeck, Richard E. "The Three 'Daughters' of Ba'al and Transformations of Chaokampf in the Early Chapters of Genesis." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 237–55. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Ballentine, Debra Scoggins. "You Divided the Sea by Your Might: The Conflict Myth and the Biblical Tradition." Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2012.
- Barker, Kenneth L. *Micah*. The New American Commentary, vol. 20. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1998.
- Barth, Christoph. *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des Alten Testaments*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Zollikon, Switzerland: Evangelischer Verlag, 1947.
- Barton, George A. "Tiamat." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15 (1893): 1–27.
- Batto, Bernard F. "The Combat Myth in Israelite Tradition Revisited." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 217–36. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- _____. *In the Beginning: Essays on Creation Motifs in the Ancient Near East and the Bible*. Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures, 9. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- _____. *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
- Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Carlisle, England: Paternoster Press, 1999.
- _____. *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- _____. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Beale, G. K., and D. A. Carson. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Beatty, Robert Harold. "The History of Tradition Criticism with Special Reference to the Works of Hermann Gunkel, Hugo Gressmann, and Sigmund Mowinckel." Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, 1962.
- Beaulieu, Marie-Claire. *Sea in the Greek Imagination*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Beckwith, Martha W. *Hawaiian Mythology*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996.
- Benz, Brendon C. "Yamm as the Personification of Chaos? A Linguistic and Literary Argument for a Case of Mistaken Identity." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 127–45. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

- Best, Robert M. *Noah's Ark and the Ziusudra Epic: Sumerian Origins of the Flood Myth*. Fort Myers, FL: Enlil Press, 1999.
- Beyerlin, Walter. *Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Bienkowski, Piotr, and A. R. Millard. *Dictionary of the Ancient Near East*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Bierlein, J. F. *Parallel Myths*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1994.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries. New York: Doubleday, 2002.
- Bodde, Derk. "Myths of Ancient China." In *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, edited by Samuel Noah Kramer, 367–408. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.
- Bonham, Scott. "Order from Chaos." *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 69, no. 3 (September 2017): 149–58.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1-3*. New York: Macmillan, 1959.
- Bonnefoy, Yves. *American, African, and Old European Mythologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- _____. *Asian Mythologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- _____. *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Bonting, Sjoerd L. "What Creation Theology? Creation from Nothing v. Creation from Chaos." In *Creation and the Abrahamic Faiths*, edited by Neil Spurway, 29–38. Newcastle, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *Revelation. Interpretation*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1989.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Cosmos: The World and the Glory of God*. Petersham, MA: St. Bede's Publications, 1988.
- Bradley, Ian C. *Water: A Spiritual History*. London; Bloomsbury, 2012.
- Brandon, S. G. F. *Creation Legends of the Ancient Near East*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
- Bremmer, Jan N. *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible, and the Ancient Near East*. Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture, 8. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Bronner, Leila Leah. *The Stories of Elijah and Elisha as Polemics against Baal Worship*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

- Brooke, George J. "Creation in the Biblical Tradition." *Zygon* 22, no. 2 (June 1987): 227–48.
- Brown, Francis, Edward Robinson, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Break Through the Language Barrier Series. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1979.
- Brown, William P. *Wisdom's Wonder: Character, Creation, and Chaos in the Bible's Wisdom Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- _____. "Kingship and Chaos: A Study in Tenth Century Theology." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (July 1971): 317–32.
- Budd, Philip J. *Numbers*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 5. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984.
- Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Burrell, David B. *Creation and the God of Abraham*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Buss, Martin J. *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Butler, Trent C. *Joshua*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 7. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Calder, W. M. "New Light on Ovid's Story of Philemon and Baucis." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 101–11. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Callahan, Scott N. "The Bible among the Myths: Unique Revelation or Just Ancient Literature?" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20, no. 4 (2010): 576–78.
- Campbell, Dennis R. M. "On the Theogonies of Hesiod and the Hurrians: An Exploration of the Dual Natures of Teššub and Kumarbi." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 26–43. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Campbell, Maura. "Symbol and Reality: Water, Life, Death and Christian Baptism." *Dialogue & Alliance* 4, no. 1 (March 1, 1990): 48–60.
- Caquot, André. "Le Léviathan de Job 40:25-41:26." *Revue biblique* 99, no. 1 (January 1992): 40–69.
- _____. "Léviathan et Behémoth Dans La Troisième 'Parabole' d'Hénoch." *Semitica*, vol. 25: 111–22. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1975.
- Carvalho, Corrine L. "The Beauty of the Beast: Leviathan and Behemoth in Light of Catholic Theology." In *The Whirlwind: Essays on Job, Hermeneutics and Theology in Memory of Jane Morse*, edited by Stephen L. Cook, Corine L. Patton, and James W. Watts, 142–67. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

- Cassuto, Umberto. "Baal and Mot in the Ugaritic Texts." *Israel Exploration Journal* 12, no. 2 (1962): 77–86.
- _____. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, pt. 1, 1st English ed. Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, vol. 1. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1961.
- _____. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, pt. 2, 1st English ed. Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, vol. 2. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1964.
- Cavendish, Richard, and Trevor Ling. *An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Mythology*. New York: Crescent Books, 1984.
- Chavalas, Mark W. *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*. Blackwell Sourcebooks in Ancient History. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2006.
- Chen, Y. S. *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe: Origins and Early Development in Mesopotamian Traditions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Childs, Brevard S. "Enemy From the North and the Chaos Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78, no. 3 (September 1959): 187–98.
- _____. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. Edited by William P. Brown, Carol A. Newsom, and Brent A. Strawn. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- _____. *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*. Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1960.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994.
- Clines, David J. A. *Job. 1-20*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 17. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- _____. *Job. 21-37*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 18A. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2006.
- _____. *Job 38-42*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 18B. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2011.
- Cohen, Matityahu. "More on the Subject 'Behemoth and Leviathan' in God's Second Lecture to Job." In *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, July 29-August 5, 1997, Division A: The Bible and Its World*, 65–78. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999.
- Cohn, Norman. *Cosmos, Chaos, and the World to Come: The Ancient Roots of Apocalyptic Faith*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Cole, R. Dennis. *Numbers*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 9. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.

- Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Cooper, Lamar Eugene. *Ezekiel*. The New American Commentary, vol. 17. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Coppes, Leonard J. "Hermann Gunkel: A Presentation and Evaluation of His Contributions to Biblical Research—Chiefly in the Area of Old Testament." Th.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1968.
- Cornelius, Izak. *The Iconography of the Canaanite Gods Reshef and Ba'al: Late Bronze and Iron Age I Periods (C 1500-1000 BCE)*. Fribourg, Switzerland: University Press, 1994.
- Cowles, Jan Michael. "A Context for Understanding the Old Testament Sea Dragon: Unmasking Leviathan." M.A. thesis, Denver Seminary, 2005.
- Craigie, Peter C. "Egyptian Expression in the Song of the Sea (Exodus 15:4)." *Vetus Testamentum* 20, no. 1 (January 1970): 83–86.
- _____. *Ezekiel*. The Daily Study Bible Series. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1983.
- _____. *Jeremiah. 1-25*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 26. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.
- _____. *The Old Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1986.
- _____. *Twelve Prophets*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.
- _____. *Ugarit and the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- _____. *Ugaritic Studies, 1972-1976*. Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary, 1976.
- Craigie, Peter C., and Marvin E. Tate. *Psalms 1-50*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 19. Nashville, TN: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2004.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- _____. "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult." In *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, edited by Alexander Altmann, 11–30. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- _____. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Crouch, Carly L. "Ezekiel's Oracles Against the Nations in Light of a Royal Ideology of Warfare." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130, no. 3 (September 2011): 473–92.
- _____. "Made in the Image of God: The Creation of אֱלֹהִים the Commissioning of the King and the Chaokampf of YHWH." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 16, no. 1 (2016): 1–21.

- _____. *War and Ethics in the Ancient Near East: Military Violence in Light of Cosmology and History*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Curtis, Adrian. *Ugarit (Ras Shamra)*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 1985.
- Dahood, Mitchell J. *Psalms*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 17A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- David, A. Rosalie. *The Ancient Egyptians: Religious Beliefs and Practices*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Davis, John D. *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Day, John. *From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1-11*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.
- _____. "God and Leviathan in Isaiah 27:1." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155, no. 620 (October 1998): 423–36.
- _____. *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- _____. *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Day, Peggy Lynne. "Šātān in the Hebrew Bible: A Thesis." Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1986.
- Dearman, J. Andrew. *Jeremiah and Lamentations*. The NIV Application Commentary Series. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002.
- DeClaissé-Walford, Nancy L., Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. The New International commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Babel and Bible: Two Lectures on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion, Embodying the Most Important Criticisms and the Author's Replies*. Translated by Thomas J. McCormack and William Herbert Carruth. Chicago: Open Court, 1903.
- Demetrio, Francisco. "The Flood Motif and the Symbolism of Rebirth in Filipino Mythology." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 261–80. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Dennefeld, L. "La Personnalité de Tiamat." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 2, no. 1 (January 1922): 1–12.
- DeRoche, Michael. "Isaiah XLV 7 and the Creation of Chaos." *Vetus Testamentum* 42, no. 1 (January 1992): 11–21.
- Dillmann, August, and August Wilhelm Knobel. *Die Genesis*. Leipzig, Germany: S. Hirzel, 1882.

- Dundes, Alan. *The Flood Myth*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Durham, John I. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 3. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Dyssel, Allan. "Reading the Creation Narrative in Genesis 1-2:4a against Its Ancient Near Eastern Background." M.Phil. thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 2007.
- _____. "Sea Monsters and Other Mythical Creatures Associated with the Primeval Flood in the Old Testament. A History of Denial?" Th.D. diss., University of South Africa, 2017.
- Ellison, H. L. *Exodus*. Daily Study Bible--Old Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982.
- Emerton, John A. "Leviathan and Ltn: The Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon." *Vetus Testamentum* 32, no. 3 (July 1982): 326–31.
- Enns, Peter. *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Farkas, David S. "Etiologies in the Bible: Explicit, Double, and Hidden." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (October 2017): 229–36.
- Feinberg, Charles Lee. *The Minor Prophets*. Combined ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1976.
- Feinman, Peter. "Where Is Eden? An Analysis of Some of the Mesopotamian Motifs in Primeval J." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaaskampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 172–89. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Finkel, Irving L. *The Ark before Noah: Decoding the Story of the Flood*. New York: Nan A. Talese/Doubleday, 2014.
- Finkelstein, Jacob J. "Bible and Babel: A Comparative Study of the Hebrew and Babylonian Religious Spirit." In *Essential Papers on Israel and the Ancient Near East*, edited by Frederick E. Greenspahn. Essential Papers on Jewish Studies. New York: New York University Press, 1991.
- Fisher, Loren R. "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 15, no. 3 (July 1965): 313–24.
- Follansbee, Eleanor. "The Story of the Flood in the Light of Comparative Semitic Mythology." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 75–87. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Forshey, Harold. "Apologetics and Historical Criticism." *Restoration Quarterly* 6, no. 4 (1962): 217–28.
- Forsyth, Neil. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Fox, Michael V. "Behemoth and Leviathan." *Biblica* 93, no. 2 (2012): 261–67.

- Frayne, Douglas. "The Fifth Day of Creation in Ancient Syrian and Neo-Hittite Art." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaaskampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 63–97. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Frazer, James George. "The Great Flood." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 113–23. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Freedman, H., Maurice Simon, S. M. Lehrman, J. Israelstam, Judah J. Slotki, Joseph Rabinowitz, A. Cohen, and Louis I. Rabinowitz. *The Midrash Rabbah*. Compact ed. London: Soncino Press, 1977.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *God and World in the Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2005.
- Freund, Philip. *Myths of Creation*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1966.
- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva Simone. "Atrahasis Epic and Its Significance for Our Understanding of Genesis 1-9." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 40, no. 4 (December 1977): 147–55.
- Fullerton, Kemper. "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 41, no. 1–2 (1922): 1–101.
- Fyall, Robert S. *Now My Eyes Have Seen You: Images of Creation and Evil in the Book of Job*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- Galter, Hannes D. "The Mesopotamian God Enki/Ea." *Religion Compass* 9, no. 3 (March 2015): 66–76.
- Gammie, John G. "Behemoth and Leviathan: On the Didactic and Theological Significance of Job 40:15-41:26." In *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*, 217–31. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Gardner, Anne E. "Daniel 7,2-14: Another Look at Its Mythic Pattern." *Biblica* 82, no. 2 (2001): 244–52.
- George, A. R., and F. N. H. Al-Rawi. "Tablets from the Sippar Library VI. Atra-Ḥašīs." *Iraq* 58 (1996): 147–90.
- Geyer, J. B. "Twisting Tiamat's Tail: A Mythological Interpretation of Isaiah Xiii 5 and 8." *Vetus Testamentum* 37, no. 1–4 (1987): 164–79.
- Gibson, John C. L. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edited by G. R. Driver. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1978.
- _____. "A New Look at Job 41.1-4 (English 41.9-12)." In *Text as Pretext: Essays in Honour of Robert Davidson*, 129–39. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Gilan, Amir. "Once upon a Time in Kiškülüša: The Dragon-Slayer Myth in Central Anatolia." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaaskampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 98–111. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

- Goldingay, John. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Golka, Friedemann W. "Aetiologies in the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 27, no. 1 (January 1977): 36–47.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. "Leviathan: Symbol of Evil." In *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, edited by Alexander Altmann, 1–9. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Gottlieb, Hans. "Myth in the Psalms." In *Myths in the Old Testament*, translated by Frederick Cryer, 62–93. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- Green, Alberto R. W. *The Storm-God in the Ancient Near East*. Biblical and Judaic Studies, vol. 8. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Greenspoon, L. J. "Behemoth and Leviathan." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 32, no. 2 (2006): 20.
- Greenstein, Edward L. "The Formation of the Biblical Narrative Corpus." *AJS Review* 15, no. 2 (1990): 151–78.
- Gregersen, Niels Henrik, and Ulf Görman. *Design and Disorder: Perspectives From Science and Theology*. London; New York: T & T Clark, 2002.
- Greidanus, Sidney. *From Chaos to Cosmos: Creation to New Creation*. Short Studies in Biblical Theology. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018.
- Groenbaek, Jakob H. "Baal's Battle with Yam: A Canaanite Creation Fight." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33 (October 1985): 27–44.
- Grudem, Wayne A. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*. Translated by K. William Whitney. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- _____. *Elijah, Yahweh, and Baal*. Translated by K. C. Hanson. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014.
- _____. *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- _____. "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion." *The Expository Times* 38, no. 12 (1927): 532–36.
- _____. *Israel and Babylon*. Translated by E. S. B. Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey, 1904.
- _____. "Jesaia 33, Eine Prophetische Liturgie: Ein Vortrag." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 42 (1924): 177–208.
- _____. *The Legends of Genesis*. Translated by William Herbert Carruth. Chicago: Open Court, 1901.

- _____. *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History*. Translated by William Herbert Carruth. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- _____. “Nahum 1.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 13 (1893): 223–44.
- _____. “Psalm 1: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 2 (1903): 120–23.
- _____. “Psalm 8: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 3 (1903): 206–9.
- _____. “Psalm 19:1-6: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 4 (1903): 281–83.
- _____. “Psalm 24: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 5 (1903): 366–70.
- _____. “Psalm 46: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 1 (1903): 28–31.
- _____. “Psalm 103: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 22, no. 3 (1903): 209–15.
- _____. “Psalm 137: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 22, no. 4 (1903): 290–93.
- _____. “Psalm 149: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 22, no. 5 (1903): 363–66.
- _____. “Psalms 42 and 43: An Interpretation.” *The Biblical World* 21, no. 6 (1903): 433–39.
- _____. *The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction*. Translated by Thomas M. Horner. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- _____. *The Stories of Genesis*. Edited by William R. Scott. Translated by John Scullion. Vallejo, CA: BIBAL Press, 1994.
- _____. *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*. Translated by A. K. Dallas. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2016.
- Gunkel, Hermann, and Joachim Begrich. *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Translated by James D. Nogalski. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Gunkel, Hermann, and Mark E. Biddle. *Genesis*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- Gunn, David M. “Deutero-Isaiah and the Flood.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, no. 4 (December 1, 1975): 493–508.
- Gutmann, Joseph. “Leviathan, Behemoth and Ziz: Jewish Messianic Symbols in Art.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 39 (1968): 219–30.
- Habel, Norman C. *The Earth Story in the Psalms and the Prophets*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- _____. *Yahweh versus Baal: A Conflict of Religious Cultures; A Study in the Relevance of Ugaritic Materials for the Early Faith of Israel*. New York: Bookman Associates, 1964.

- Habel, Norman C. "The Two Flood Stories in Genesis." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 13–28. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Hamilton, Virginia, and Barry Moser. *In the Beginning: Creation Stories from around the World*. 1st ed. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988.
- Hämmerly-Dupuy, Daniel. "Some Observations on the Assyro-Babylonian and Sumerian Flood Stories." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 49–59. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Handy, Lowell K. "Joining Leviathan, Behemoth and the Dragons: Jonah's Fish as Monster." *Proceedings (Grand Rapids, Mich.)* 25 (2005): 77–85.
- Hart, George. *Egyptian Myths*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.
- Hartley, John E. *Genesis*. New International Biblical Commentary, vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Hartman, Thomas C. "Some Thoughts on the Sumerian King List and Genesis 5 and 11B." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91, no. 1 (1972): 25.
- Hayes, John H., and Frederick C. Prussner. *Old Testament Theology: Its History and Development*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Hays, Christopher B. *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament, vol. 79. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- _____. *Hidden Riches: A Sourcebook for the Comparative Study of the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.
- Hefner, Philip J. "God and Chaos: The Demiurge Versus the Ungrund." *Zygon* 19, no. 4 (December 1984): 469–85.
- Heidel, Alexander. *The Babylonian Genesis*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- _____. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Heiser, Michael S. *I Dare You Not to Bore Me with the Bible*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.
- Hess, Richard S., and David Toshio. Tsumura. *I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Hobbes, Thomas, and W. G. Pogson Smith. *Hobbes's Leviathan*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1909.
- Hobbs, T. R. *2 Kings*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 13. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.

- Hooke, S. H. *Middle Eastern Mythology*. New York: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Horcasitas, Fernando. "An Analysis of the Deluge Myth in Mesoamerica." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 183–219. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- House, Paul R. *1, 2 Kings*. New American Commentary, vol. 8. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Huchingson, James E. "Chaos and God's Abundance: An Ontology of Variety in the Divine Life." *Zygon* 32, no. 4 (December 1997): 515–24.
- Huey, F. B. *Jeremiah, Lamentations*. The New American Commentary, vol. 16. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1993.
- Huffman, Herbert B. "Babel Und Bibel: The Encounter Between Babylon and the Bible." In *Backgrounds for the Bible*, edited by Michael Patrick O'Connor and David Noel Freedman, 125–36. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Huntington, Ronald M. "Leviathan." In *Tradition as Openness to the Future: Essays in Honor of Willis W Fisher*, 45–53. Lanham, MD: Univ Press of America, 1984.
- Ions, Veronica. *Egyptian Mythology*. New York: Peter Bedrick Books, 1983.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. "The Battle between Marduk and Tiamat." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88, no. 1 (1968): 104–8.
- _____. "The Eridu Genesis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, no. 4 (December 1981): 513–29.
- _____. *The Harps That Once...: Sumerian Poetry in Translation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987.
- _____. *The Sumerian King List*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jeppesen, Knud. "Myth in the Prophetic Literature." In *Myths in the Old Testament*, translated by Frederick Cryer, 94–123. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- Johnson, Dan G. *From Chaos to Restoration: An Integrative Reading of Isaiah 24-27*. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Johnson, Dru, Craig G. Barthomoew, and David Beldman. *The Universal Story: Genesis 1-11*. Transformative Word. Ashland: Lexham Press, 2018.
- Johnston, Gordon H. "Genesis 1 and Ancient Egyptian Creation Myths." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165, no. 658 (April 2008): 178–94.
- Johnston, Philip. *Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament*. Leicester, England: Apollos, 2002.

- Kähler-Meyer, Emmi. "Myth Motifs in Flood Stories from the Grasslands of Cameroon." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 249–59. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
- _____. *Isaiah 13-39: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.
- Kaminski, Carol M. *Was Noah Good? Finding Favour in the Flood Narrative*. T & T Clark Library of Biblical Studies. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Kapelrud, Arvid S. *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1952.
- Kawashima, Robert S. "Violence and the City: On the Yahwist's Leviathan." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 78, no. 4 (December 2015): 264–72.
- Kee, Min Suc. "A Study on the Dual Form of Mayim, Water." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (July 1, 2012): 183–89.
- Keel, Othmar. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Translated by Timothy J. Hallett. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.
- Keel, Othmar, and Silvia Schroer. *Creation: Biblical Theologies in the Context of the Ancient Near East*. Translated by Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Keil, Carl Friedrich, and Franz Delitzsch. *Isaiah*. Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes, vol. VII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Keller, Catherine. "'Be This Fish': A Theology of Creation out of Chaos." *Word & World* 32, no. 1 (2012): 15–20.
- Kelsen, Hans. "The Principle of Retribution in the Flood and Catastrophe Myths." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 125–49. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Kidner, Derek. *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 1. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008.
- Kilian, Rudolf. "Gen 1:2 Und Die Urgötter von Hermopolis." *Vetus Testamentum* 16, no. 4 (October 1966): 420–38.
- Kim, Sungjin. "The Identity of the Spirit in Eliphaz's Vision (Job 4:12-21) and Its Significance for Understanding the Book of Job." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017.
- King, Leonard W. *A History of Sumer and Akkad: An Account of the Early Races of Babylonia from Prehistoric Times to the Foundation of the Babylonian Monarchy*. A History of Babylonia and Assyria, vol. 1. London: Chatto & Windus, 1910.
- _____. *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition. The Schweich Lectures, 1916*. London: Oxford University Press, 1918.

- Kinnier Wilson, J. V. "Return to the Problems of Behemoth and Leviathan." *Vetus Testamentum* 25, no. 1 (January 1975): 1–14.
- Kirk, J. R. Daniel, and Stephen L. Young. "'I Will Set His Hand to the Sea': Psalm 88:26, LXX and Christology in Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133, no. 2 (2014): 333–40.
- Kitchen, K. A. *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*. Chicago: InterVarsity Press, 1966.
- Kline, Meredith G. "Death, Leviathan, and Martyrs: Isaiah 24:1-27:1." In *Tribute to Gleason Archer*, 229–49. Chicago: Moody Press, 1986.
- Kloos, Carola. *Yhwh's Combat With the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel*. Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorschot; Brill, 1986.
- Knappert, Jan. *The Encyclopaedia of Middle Eastern Mythology and Religion*. Shaftesbury, Dorset; Rockport, MA: Element, 1993.
- Knight, George A. F. *Psalms*. Vol. 1. The Daily Study Bible Series. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- _____. *Psalms*. Vol. 2. The Daily Study Bible Series. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Kolig, Erich. "Noah's Ark Revisited: On the Myth-Land Connection in Traditional Australian Aboriginal Thought." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 241–48. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Koperski, Jeffrey. "God, Chaos, and the Quantum Dice." *Zygon* 35, no. 3 (September 2000): 545–59.
- Koppers, Wilhelm. "The Deluge Myth of the Bhils of Central India." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 281–91. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary*. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1989.
- Kuhr, Amélie. *The Ancient Near East, c. 3000-330 BC*. Routledge History of the Ancient World. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Kurtz, Paul Michael. "Waiting at Nemi: Wellhausen, Gunkel, and the World Behind Their Work." *Harvard Theological Review* 109, no. 4 (2016): 567–85.
- Lambert, W. G. "Creation in the Bible and the Ancient Near East." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 44–47. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- _____. "New Evidence for the First Line of Atra-Ḥasīs." *Orientalia* 38, no. 4 (1969): 533–38.
- Lambert, W. G., A. R. Millard, and Miguel Civil. *Atra-Ḥasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

- Lammel, Annamaria. "Historical Changes as Reflected in South American Indian Myths." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 221–39. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Lee, Jessica N. T. "The Rhetorical and Theological Function of Leviathan's Defeat in Isaiah 27:1." Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 2013.
- Leeming, David Adams, and Margaret Adams Leeming. *Encyclopedia of Creation Myths*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 1994.
- Lloyd-Jones, Sally. *The Jesus Storybook Bible: Every Story Whispers His Name*. Grand Rapids: Zonderkidz, 2007.
- Long, Charles H. *Alpha: The Myths of Creation*. Patterns of Myth. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Longman, Tremper, and John H. Walton. *The Lost World of the Flood: Mythology, Theology, and the Deluge Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018.
- López, René A. "The Meaning of 'Behemoth' and 'Leviathan' in Job." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 173, no. 692 (October 2016): 401–24.
- López-Ruiz, Carolina. *Gods, Heroes, and Monsters: A Sourcebook of Greek, Roman, and Near Eastern Myths in Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Lundström, Steven. "Gunkel and His Times: Hermann Gunkel between Establishing the 'History of Religions School,' Acknowledging Assyriology, and Defending the Faith." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 147–71. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Luyster, Robert. "Wind and Water: Cosmogonic Symbolism in the Old Testament." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93, no. 1 (1981): 1–10.
- Maclagan, David. *Creation Myths: Man's Introduction to the World*. Art and Imagination Series. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.
- Martin, Oren. "Bound for the Kingdom: The Land Promise in God's Redemptive Plan." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013.
- Martin-Achard, Robert. *From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.
- Mason, Steven D. "Another Flood? Genesis 9 and Isaiah's Broken Eternal Covenant." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32, no. 2 (December 1, 2007): 177–98.
- Mathews, Kenneth A. *Genesis 1-11:26*. New American Commentary, vol. 1A. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1996.
- Matthews, Victor H., and Don C. Benjamin. *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.
- May, Gerhard. *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of "Creation out of Nothing" in Early Christian Thought*. Translated by A. S. Worrall. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.

- May, Herbert G. "Some Cosmic Connotations of Mayim Rabbim, 'Many Waters.'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74, no. 1 (March 1, 1955): 9–21.
- Mayhue, Richard L. "Scripture on Creation." *The Master's Seminary Journal* 23, no. 1 (2012): 1–6.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (July 1967): 393–406.
- McGovern, John J. "The Waters of Death." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (July 1, 1959): 350–58.
- McGuire, Errol M. "Yahweh and Leviathan: An Exegesis of Isaiah 27:1." *Restoration Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (1970): 165–79.
- McIver, Tom. "Whence the Flood Waters? The Rise and Fall (and Likely Return) of the Pre-Flood Water Canopy." *Skeptic* 8, no. 4 (January 1, 2001): 76–81.
- Melvin, David. "Making All Things New (Again): Zephaniah's Eschatological Vision of a Return to Primeval Time." In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 269–81. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Michalowski, Piotr. "History as Charter Some Observations on the Sumerian King List." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, no. 1 (1983): 237.
- Miller, Robert D. "What Are Thte Nations Doing in the Chaokampf?" In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 206–15. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Miller, Stephen R. *Daniel*. The New American Commentary, vol. 18. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Mitchell, Gordon. "War, Folklore and the Mystery of a Disappearing Book." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 20, no. 68 (December 1995): 113–19.
- Moberly, R. W. L. "Why Did Noah Send out a Raven?" *Vetus Testamentum* 50, no. 3 (2000): 345–56.
- Mobley, Gregory. *The Return of the Chaos Monsters and Other Backstories of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Moo, Jonathan. "The Sea That Is No More Rev 21:1 and the Function of Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John." *Novum Testamentum* 51, no. 2 (April 2009): 148–67.
- Moor, Johannes C. de. "The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu, According to the Version of Ilmilku." Ph.D. diss., Vrije Universiteit, 1971.
- Morris, Henry M. "Water and the Word." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 118, no. 471 (July 1, 1961): 203–15.
- Motyer, J. A. *Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 20. Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

- _____. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Murray, D. F. "The Rhetoric of Disputation: Re-Examination of a Prophetic Genre." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 12, no. 38 (June 1987): 95–121.
- Nasuti, Harry Peter. *Defining the Sacred Songs: Genre, Tradition, and the Post-Critical Interpretation of the Psalms*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Neville, Richard. "Differentiation in Genesis 1: An Exegetical Creation Ex Nihilo." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130, no. 2 (2011): 209–26.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. "Foreword to the English Translation." In *Genesis*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- Niditch, Susan. *Chaos to Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Niehaus, Jeffrey Jay. *Ancient Near Eastern Themes in Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2008.
- Nixon, Rosemary A. *The Message of Jonah: Presence in the Storm*. The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.
- Norsker, Amanda. "Genesis 6,5-9,17: A Rewritten Babylonian Flood Myth." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 29, no. 1 (2015): 55–62.
- Nürnberg, Klaus. "The Conquest of Chaos: The Biblical Paradigm of Creation and Its Contemporary Relevance." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 98 (July 1997): 45–63.
- Obermann, Julian. "Wind, Water, and Light in an Archaic Inscription from Shechem." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57, no. 3 (January 1, 1938): 239–53.
- O'Brien, Joan V., and Wilfred Major. *In the Beginning: Creation Myths from Ancient Mesopotamia, Israel, and Greece*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Oden, Robert A. "Divine Aspirations in Atrahasis and in Genesis 1-11." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93, no. 2 (1981): 197–216.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. "Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts." In *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, edited by James B. Pritchard, 265–74. 3rd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Oppenheim, Alan. "Chaos and Creation." *The Reconstructionist* 65, no. 1 (September 2000): 84–91.
- Ortlund, Dane. "The Old Testament Background and Eschatological Significance of Jesus Walking on the Sea (Mark 6:45-52)." *Neotestamentica* 46, no. 2 (2012): 319–37.
- Ortlund, Eric. "The Identity of Leviathan and the Meaning of the Book of Job." *Trinity Journal* 34, no. 1 (2013): 17–30.

- _____. “Theophany and Chaoskampf: The Interpretation of Theophanic Imagery in the Baal Epic, Isaiah, and the Twelve.” Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2006.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- _____. *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 40-66*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. *Isaiah*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.
- Otzen, Benedikt. “The Concept of Myth.” In *Myths in the Old Testament*, translated by Frederick Cryer, 1–21. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- _____. “The Use of Myth in Genesis.” In *Myths in the Old Testament*, translated by Frederick Cryer, 22–61. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- Page, Franklin S. *Jonah*. The New American Commentary, vol. 19B. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Page, Hugh Rowland. *The Myth of Cosmic Rebellion: A Study of Its Reflexes in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature*. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1996.
- Pelham, Abigail. *Contested Creations in the Book of Job: The-World-as-It-Ought-and-Ought-Not-to-Be*. Biblical Interpretation Series, vol. 113. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Pfeiffer, Charles F. “Lotan and Leviathan.” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (October 1960): 208–11.
- Pitard, Wayne T. “The Binding of Yamm: A New Edition of the Ugaritic Text KTU 1.83.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57, no. 4 (October 1998): 261–80.
- _____. “The Combat Myth as a Succession Story at Ugarit.” In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel’s Chaoskampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 199–205. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Poe, Harry L. “The English Bible and the Days of Creation: When Tradition Conflicts with Text.” *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 66, no. 3 (September 2014): 130–39.
- Pope, Mick. “The Sea Is Eating the Ground: A Theology of Sea Level Rise.” *Anglican Theological Review* 100, no. 1 (2018): 79–92.
- Poythress, Vern S. “Three Modern Myths in Interpreting Genesis 1.” *The Westminster Theological Journal* 76, no. 2 (2014): 321–50.
- Pritchard, James B. *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. 2d ed. with supplement. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- _____. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Translated by John H. Marks. Rev. ed. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.

- Ramantswana, Hulisani. "Conflicts at Creation: Genesis 1-3 in Dialogue with the Psalter." *Old Testament Essays* 27, no. 2 (2014): 553–78.
- Rast, Walter E. *Tradition History and the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Raven, Charles Earle. *John Ray: Naturalist, His Life and Works*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950.
- Ray, John. *Three Physico-Theological Discourses Concerning I. The Primitive Chaos, and Creation of the World. II. The General Deluge, Its Causes and Effects. III. The Dissolution of the World, and Future Conflagration*. 2nd ed. London: Printed for William Innys, at the West End of St. Paul's, 1693.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Deo Pub., 2005.
- Reymond, Philippe. *L'eau, sa vie, et sa signification dans l'Ancien Testament*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 6. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *Religions of the Ancient Near East*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Classification of the Prophetic Stories." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89, no. 4 (December 1970): 427–40.
- Rogerson, J. W. *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974.
- _____. "'Myth' in the Old Testament." In *Myth and Scripture: Contemporary Perspectives on Religion, Language, and Imagination*, edited by Dexter E. Callender, 15–26. Resources for Biblical Study, vol. 78. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- Róheim, Géza. "The Flood Myth as Vesical Dream." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 151–65. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Rosenberg, Donna. *World Mythology: An Anthology of the Great Myths and Epics*. 3rd ed. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Publishing Group, 1999.
- Ross, Allen P. *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Ross, Allen P., and John N. Oswalt. *Genesis, Exodus*. Edited by Philip Wesley Comfort. Cornerstone Biblical Commentary. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2008.
- Routledge, Robin L. "Did God Create Chaos?: Unresolved Tension in Genesis 1:1-2." *Tyndale Bulletin* 61, no. 1 (2010): 69–88.
- Rowold, Henry. "'Mī Hū' - Lī Hū': Leviathan and Job in Job 41:2-3." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105, no. 1 (March 1986): 104–9.
- Rowton, M. B. "The Date of the Sumerian King List." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19, no. 2 (1960): 156–62.

- Rudman, D. “Animadversiones - The Crucifixion as Chaokampf: A New Reading of the Passion Narrative in the Synoptic Gospels.” *Biblica*. 84, no. 1 (2003): 102.
- Saggs, H. W. F. *The Encounter With the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel*. London: Athlone Press, 1978.
- Sandoval, Timothy J., Carleen Mandolfo, and Martin J. Buss. *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Sapir, E. “A Flood Legend of the Nootka Indians of Vancouver Island.” *The Journal of American Folklore* 32, no. 124 (1919): 351.
- Sargent, Benjamin. “‘The Coastlands Wait for Me, and for My Arm They Hope’: The Sea and Eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah.” *Expository Times* 126, no. 3 (2014): 122–30.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Exodus*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
- _____. *Genesis*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Sasson, Jack M. *Jonah: A New Translation with Introduction, Commentary, and Interpretation*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible, vol. 24B. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- Scatolini, Silvio Sergio. “Two Strange Beasts: Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism.” *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 82, no. 4 (December 2006): 498–500.
- Scheub, Harold. *A Dictionary of African Mythology: The Mythmaker as Storyteller*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Scott, James W. “The Inspiration and Interpretation of God’s Word, with Special Reference to Peter Enns Part II The Interpretation of Representative Passages.” *The Westminster Theological Journal* 71, no. 2 (2009): 247–79.
- Scurlock, JoAnn. “Chaokampf Lost—Chaokampf Regained: The Gunkel Hypothesis Revisited.” In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel’s Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 257–68. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- _____. “Searching For Meaning in Genesis 1:2: Purposeful Creation Out of Chaos Without Kampf.” In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel’s Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 48–61. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Scurlock, JoAnn, Karen Sonik, Dennis R. M. Campbell, W. G. Lambert, Douglas Frayne, Amir Gilan, Joanna Töyräänvuori, et al. *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel’s Chaokampf Hypothesis*. Edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Seely, Paul H. “The Geographical Meaning of ‘Earth’ and ‘Seas’ in Genesis 1:10.” *The Westminster Theological Journal* 59, no. 2 (1997): 231–55.

- Seri, Andrea. "The Role of Creation in Enūma Eliš." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12, no. 1 (2012): 4–29.
- _____. "Some Notes on Enūma Eliš." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 137, no. 4 (October 2017): 833–38.
- Shulman, David. "The Tamil Flood Myths and the Cankam Legend." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 293–317. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Simon, Uriel, and Lenn J. Schramm. *Jonah: the traditional Hebrew text with the new JPS translation*. JPS Bible Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1999.
- Smick, Elmer B. "Another Look at the Mythological Elements in the Book of Job." *The Westminster Theological Journal* 40, no. 2 (1978): 213–28.
- Smith, Gary V. *Isaiah 1-39*. The New American Commentary, vol. 15A. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2007.
- _____. *Isaiah 40-66*. The New American Commentary, vol. 15B. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group, 2009.
- Smith, George. *The Chaldean Account of Genesis: Containing the Description of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the Times of the Patriarchs, and Nimrod: Babylonian Fables, and Legends of the Gods; from the Cuneiform Inscriptions*. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, 1876.
- _____. "The Chaldean Account of the Deluge." In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 29–48. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Smith, James E. *The Major Prophets*. Old Testament Survey Series. Joplin, MO: College Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Minor Prophets*. Old Testament Survey Series. Joplin, MO: College Press, 1994.
- Smith, Mark S. "Is Genesis 1 a Creation Myth? Yes and No." In *Myth and Scripture: Contemporary Perspectives on Religion, Language, and Imagination*, edited by Dexter E. Callender, 71–102. Resources for Biblical Study, vol. 78. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- _____. *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities In Ancient Israel*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990.
- Smith, Mark S., and Wayne T. Pitard. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2*. Vol. 1. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1994.
- _____. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary of KTU 1.3-1.4*. Vol. 2. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1994.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah-Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 32. Dallas: Word, 1998.
- Sollberger, Edmond. *The Babylonian Legend of the Flood*. London: British Museum, 1962.

- Sonik, Karen. "From Hesiod's Abyss to Ovid's Rudis Indigestaque Moles: Chaos and Cosmos in the Babylonian 'Epic of Creation.'" In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaostkampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 1–25. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Sparks, Kenton L. *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.
- Sperber, Daniel. "On Sealing the Abysses." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 11, no. 2 (1966): 168–74.
- Sproul, Barbara C. *Primal Myths: Creation Myths Around the World*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991.
- Srokosz, Meric, and Rebecca Sally Watson. *Blue Planet, Blue God: The Bible and the Sea*. London: SCM Press, 2017.
- Streett, Daniel R. "As It Was in the Days of Noah: The Prophets' Typological Interpretation of Noah's Flood." *Criswell Theological Review* 5, no. 1 (September 1, 2007): 33–51.
- Strine, C. A., and Carly L. Crouch. "YHWH's Battle Against Chaos in Ezekiel: The Transformation of Judahite Mythology for a New Situation." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132, no. 4 (2013): 883–903.
- Stuart, Douglas K. *Hosea-Jonah*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 31. Dallas: Word, 2002.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Apocalypse of St. John: The Greek Text*. London; New York: Macmillan, 1909.
- Sylva, Dennis D. "The Rising NHRWT [Unpointed Hebrew Characters] of Psalm 93: Chaotic Order." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 36, no. 4 (June 2012): 471–82.
- Tamfu, Dieudonné. "The Water Imagery in the Psalms: An Inner-Biblical Interpretation." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014.
- Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms. 51-100*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 20. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
- Taube, Karl A. *Aztec and Maya Myths*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993.
- Thompson, J. A. *The Book of Jeremiah*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Thweatt-Bates, Jennifer J. "Chaos and the Problem of Evil." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 6, no. 1 (2003): 53–70.
- Tobin, Vincent Arieh. *Theological Principles of Egyptian Religion*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Toorn, K. van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

- Townsend, John T. *Midrash Tanhuma*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1989.
- Töyräänvuori, Joanna. “The Northwest Semitic Conflict Myth and Egyptian Sources from the Middle and New Kingdoms.” In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel’s Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 112–26. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Tromp, Nicholas J. *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Tsumura, David Toshio. *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaokampf Theory in the Old Testament*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- _____. “The Creation Motif in Psalm 74:12-14?: A Reappraisal of the Theory of the Dragon Myth.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 3 (2015): 547–55.
- _____. *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, vol. 83. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- _____. “Janus Parallelism in Hab. iii 4.” *Vetus Testamentum* 63 (2013): 113–16.
- _____. “Tōhû in Isaiah 45:19.” *Vetus Testamentum* 38, no. 3 (July 1988): 361–64.
- _____. “Ugaritic Poetry and Habakkuk 3.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 40, no. 1 (May 1989): 24–48.
- Tugendhaft, Aaron. “Babel-Bible-Baal.” In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel’s Chaokampf Hypothesis*, edited by JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, 190–97. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Udd, Stanley V. “An Evaluation of the Mythological Hermeneutic in Light of the Old Testament Usage of the Leviathan Motif.” Th.D. diss., Grace Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Uehlinger, Christoph. “Leviathan Und Die Schiffe in Ps 104:25-26.” *Biblica* 71, no. 4 (1990): 499–526.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- Vos, Geerhardus. *The Eschatology of the Old Testament*. Edited by James T. Dennison. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Pub., 2001.
- Wakeman, Mary K. “Biblical Earth Monster in the Cosmogonic Combat Myth.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88, no. 3 (September 1969): 313–20.
- Wakeman, Mary K. *God’s Battle with the Monster: A Study in Biblical Imagery*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Wallace, Howard. “Leviathan and the Beast in Revelation.” *Biblical Archaeologist* 11, no. 3 (September 1948): 61–68.
- Waltke, Bruce K. “Creation Account in Genesis 1:1-3.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132, no. 527 (July 1975): 216–28.

- _____. *Creation and Chaos: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Biblical Cosmogony*. Portland, OR: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1974.
- _____. *Micah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 26. Nottingham, England: InterVarsity Press, 2009.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Cathi J. Fredricks. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
- Walton, John H. *Ancient Israelite Literature in Its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library, 1989.
- _____. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- _____. "The Antediluvian Section of the Sumerian King List and Genesis 5." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 44, no. 4 (1981): 207–8.
- _____. *Chronological and Background Charts of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
- _____. "Creation in Genesis 1:1-2:3 and the Ancient Near East: Order Out of Disorder After Chaoskampf." *Calvin Theological Journal* 43, no. 1 (April 2008): 48–63.
- _____. *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- _____. *Genesis: From Biblical Text ... to Contemporary Life*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
- _____. *Genesis: From Biblical Text to Contemporary Life*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
- _____. *How to Read Job*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015.
- _____. "Human Origins and the Bible." *Zygon* 47, no. 4 (December 2012): 875–89.
- _____. *The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2-3 and the Human Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015.
- _____. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.
- _____. *The Lost World of Scripture: Ancient Literary Culture and Biblical Authority*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013.
- Walton, John H., Victor H. Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Wardle, Willaim Lansdell. *Israel and Babylon*. 3rd ed. London: Holborn, 1925.
- Warner, Sean M. "Primitive Saga Men." *Vetus Testamentum* 29, no. 3 (July 1979): 325–35.

- Waschke, E. J. “תְּהוֹם.” In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, vol. 15, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, 574–81. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Watson, Rebecca S. *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of “Chaos” in the Hebrew Bible*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1-33*. Rev. ed. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 24. Nashville, TN: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2005.
- _____. *Isaiah 34-66*. Rev. ed. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 25. Nashville, TN: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2005.
- Webb, Barry G. *The Message of Isaiah: On Eagles’ Wings*. The Bible Speaks Today. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996.
- Weeks, Noel. “The Bible and the ‘universal’ Ancient World: A Critique of John Walton.” *The Westminster Theological Journal* 78, no. 1 (2016): 1–28.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- Wensinck, Arent Jan. *The Ideas of the Western Semites Concerning the Navel of the Earth*. Amsterdam: Müller, 1916.
- _____. *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites*. Amsterdam: Müller, 1918.
- _____. *Tree and Bird as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia*. Amsterdam: Müller, 1921.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Whatham, A. E. “The Yahweh-Tehom Myth.” *The Biblical World* 36, no. 5 (1910): 329–33.
- Whitney, K. William. “Translator’s Preface.” In *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- _____. *Two Strange Beasts: Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Wiersbe, Warren W. *The Bible Exposition Commentary*. Colorado Springs, CO: Victor, 2003.
- Wikander, Ola. “Job 3,8: Cosmological Snake-Charming and Leviathanic Panic in an Ancient Near Eastern Setting.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 122, no. 2 (2010): 265–71.

- Wilson, Joshua Daniel. “A Case for the Traditional Translation and Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 Based Upon a Multi-Leveled Linguistic Analysis.” Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2010.
- Witzel, Michael. “Pan-Gaeon Flood Myths: Gondwana Myths—and Beyond.” In *New Perspectives on Myth: Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of the International Association for Comparative Mythology, Ravenstein (the Netherlands), 19-21 August, 2008*, edited by Wim M. J. van Binsbergen and Eric Venbrux, 5:225–42. Papers in Intercultural Philosophy and Transcontinental Comparative Studies. Haarlem, Netherlands: Shikanda, 2008.
- Wolde, Ellen van. “Separation and Creation in Genesis 1 and Psalm 104, A Continuation of the Discussion of the Verb בָּרָא.” *Vetus Testamentum* 67, no. 4 (2017): 611–47.
- Woodard, Roger D. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Woods, Fred E. *Water and Storm Polemics Against Baalism in the Deuteronomistic History*. New York: P. Lang, 1994.
- Woolley, Leonard. “Stories of the Creation and the Flood.” In *The Flood Myth*, edited by Alan Dundes, 89–99. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Wyatt, N. *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilmilku and His Colleagues*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Yoshikawa, Scott T. “The Prototypical Use of the Noahic Flood in the New Testament.” Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2004.
- Young, Dwight W. “The Incredible Regnal Spans of Kish I in the Sumerian King List.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 23–35.
- _____. “A Mathematical Approach to the Sumerian King List.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (1988): 123–29.
- Youngblood, Ronald F. “2494 תהה.” In *Theological Workbook of the Old Testament*, edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Walke, 964–66. Chicago: Moody Press, 1999.
- _____. “2495 תהם.” In *Theological Workbook of the Old Testament*, edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Walke, 964–66. Chicago: Moody Press, 1999.
- Zlotowitz, Meir, and Nosson Scherman. *Bereishis = Genesis: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic and Rabbinic Sources*. 1st ed. ArtScroll Tanach Series. New York: Mesorah Publications, 1977.

ABSTRACT

THE NEGATIVE MOTIF OF THE SEA IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Kenneth William Lovett, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2019
Chair: Dr. Terry J. Betts

This dissertation demonstrates that the sea is consistently a negative motif in the OT. Chapter 2 introduces Hermann Gunkel because he wrote the foundational work on the topic of the chaotic sea in the OT. He argued that Babylonian myth lies in the background of the OT passages that are negative about the sea. Chapter 3 brings into the conversation the rest of the major contributors in the history of scholarship on the sea in the OT. Many of them, like Gunkel, have relied heavily on the ANE myths, although some have dissented and demonstrated that the OT does not use ANE myths as a source. Chapter 4 recounts the relevant ANE myths to show that they are negative about the sea like the OT, but the chapter also includes cautions about what that does and does not mean for OT studies. There are many other ancient myths from around the world (outside of the ANE) that present the sea negatively, which are introduced in chapter 5. Therefore, negativity about the sea is common in the ancient world. Chapter 6 shows that within the text of the OT itself, the sea is consistently a negative motif. The sea is a negative motif because it is the un-creator. Although a part of God's creation, it is posited against creation in its destructive and uncontrollable nature. The sea is also a negative motif because of its consistent involvement in killing and destroying when God uses the sea as a tool of judgment against sin. Because of its consistent use as a tool of judgment, it gains a negative reputation in the biblical text. The sea is also the home of the enemy, Satan, who is represented by Leviathan and other beasts that come out of the sea in Daniel's

eschatological vision. Finally, the sea is a negative motif in the OT because it is the place of death and darkness. Death, darkness, and the deep intersect in texts that are thick with negativity and anticipate Revelation 21–22, where John declares that all three “will be no more” in the new creation.

VITA

Kenneth William Lovett

EDUCATIONAL

B.A., University of Mobile, 2007

M.Div., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012

MINISTERIAL

Youth Pastor, Sunrise Baptist Church, Mobile, Alabama 2005-2006

Associate Pastor, Vine Street Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, 2014-2015

Chaplain, US Army National Guard, 2012-

ACADEMIC

Garrett Fellow and Online Teaching Assistant, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009-

Adjunct Faculty, Boyce College at SBTS, 2013

Adjunct Faculty, University of Mobile, 2018

Director of Network Services, Campus Technology, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013-

ORGANIZATIONAL

Evangelical Theological Society

Society of Biblical Literature