In the Beginning.
The interrelationship of Genesis 1 and Genesis 6-9.
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1.1. Abstract

The Flood narrative evidences many connections with the creation stories of Genesis 1-2. Indeed, it has often been said that the flood is an act of de-creation that returns the world to the watery void of Genesis 1:2, only to be re-created to give humanity a new start in a new world. However, a careful intertextual study of the creation and flood narratives reveals that the links between the stories arise almost completely from Genesis 1:20b-1:31, the work of the sixth day. This paper explores in detail the semantic links between the passages.

1.2. Intertextual Study of Creation and Flood Narratives

Discerning the historical interrelationship of texts is a tricky business, all the more so when we cannot be sure of their dating and provenance. Connections and allusions in the biblical text may have been intentional or merely accidental. Moreover, as modern intertextual studies have shown, connections are always, to a certain extent, within the purview of the reader, visible to one and not to another. It is possible, of course, to make a virtue of such a fact and this subjectivity has become an asset to creative new intertextual and canonical readings, albeit at the expense of allowing the text to set its own boundaries to
interpretation. This paper is not intending to give a completely free intertextual reading, but neither does it make any claims to uncover the actual, original authorial intentions. Rather it seeks a middle way. It seeks to ask, within a canonical context, what interconnections can be made between the creation narratives of Genesis 1-2 and the flood narrative of Genesis 6-9, and then to assess the strengths of those interconnections and their faithfulness to the dimensions of the text itself. It is hoped that this will provide suitable data from which responsible but also valuable readings of the flood narrative, in relationship to the creation account, can emerge.

The data that might be utilised for such a study has varying degrees of reliability. The strongest connections occur when texts share a specialised vocabulary or unusual phrases. More generally, shared language and then language pairs, synonyms and antonyms may provide weaker links between passages. More subjectively, links can be established by shared images and themes or indeed the deconstruction or reversal of such images. Quantity and quality are both significant in assessing the connections created by these characteristics.


The connections between the P account of creation and the P flood narrative have long been evident and the quantity and quality of such language, theme and image links suggest that there may, indeed, be a deliberate authorial interrelationship. However those links have usually been pressed to the service of some theory or theology rather than studied in their own right, with the result that the nuances and contours of the relationship has not been given its due consideration. A full study of the imagery cannot be carried out in the confines of this paper, but a study of the vocabulary links will be undertaken in an attempt to outline the parameters of the interconnections between the texts against which differing interpretations of the connections can be proposed and assessed.

---

1 See comments of {Childs 03, p. 177} for a brief critique of the subjectivity of some modern intertextual studies. He argues that, rather than allowing free association and endless permutations of meaning, canonical intertextuality was intended ‘as a means by which the coherence of the developing canonical corpus was sustained’.

2 Are there are any other factors I should be considering? A fuller account of the types and methods of intertextuality and their critique would be needed for a proper study falling under this brief. Other intertextual studies should also be acknowledged – comparisons have been carried out with Sodom and Gomorrah {Wenham91, p. 108}, Korah {Baitner 99} and Moses (Moberly 83).

3 {Rendsburg 86} has one of the most comprehensive lists of similarities, although substantial lists can be found in several authors e.g. {Sarna 89, p. 49}, {Harland 96} Chap 4, {Brodie 01b, p.171-173}. The comparisons in this paper have been made independently and thus differ in minor ways from the lists outlined by Rendsburg et al.

4 {Rendsburg 86} is uncertain whether the purpose of the connections is theological or literary but his real concern is to demonstrate the unity of the text. {Sarna 89, p. 49} and {Harland 96} Chap 4 set out the connections simply to demonstrate the theme of de-creation and re-creation although they do not always make clear how the connections indicate this theme.
1.3.1. **God's creation**

The first point of note is that the narrative appears very explicitly to link itself to Genesis 1-2 from the outset. At the start Genesis 6:7 reads:

\[\text{יֵאָנֵהוֹ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים בָּשָׂר בָּאָדָם אֲשֶׁר בָּרָא} \]

and YHWH said 'I will blot out the adām which I created (בָּרָא)'

At this point in the primeval narrative, there can surely be little doubt that the (final?) writer is deliberately calling to mind Genesis 1-2. בָּרָא ('create') is a comparatively rare word in the Hebrew Bible that appears not only in the opening verse of Genesis but seven times in the P creation account and hardly at all, elsewhere in the Pentateuch.⁵

Once we are awakened by this very strong reference to Genesis 1 at the commencement of the flood narrative, all sorts of lesser links to the creation account become more noticeable.⁶ Not surprisingly, given that 6:7 is ascribed to J, many of these links are to the account of Genesis 2, and these will be explored below.⁷ Nevertheless the links to Genesis 1 are surprisingly strong as is evident by the use of the verb בָּרָא,⁸ the list of animals in a form more akin to Genesis 1 than Genesis 2,⁹ and the juxtaposition of an evil world against the good world of creation.¹⁰ Whether this is the work of a glossator¹¹ is for these purposes irrelevant, the evidence that the final form of the narrative establishes a direct link to the creation accounts of Genesis 1 and 2 appears quite strong. It would seem that an attentive reader would be quite justified in juxtaposing the world of Genesis 1-2 with the flood story as they read. What may be made of these juxtapositions and why creation should be recalled is not yet clear, but the overall tenor of the opening verses has an ominous feel and the good work of Genesis 1 is seriously threatened.

---

⁵ Gen 1:1 God created heavens and earth, 1:21 God created the great sea monsters and birds, 1:27 God created (3x) humanity, male and female, 2:3 'the work' which God had created 2:4 God created heavens and earth. Gen 5:1-2 has the verb 3x which again seems a very strong connection back to Gen 1. Other Pentateuchal references are only to be found in Ex 34:10, Nums 16:30 neither of which, in context so obviously recalls Gen 1, although the use in Dt 4:32 does. The word appears 34x outside of the Pentateuch, the majority of which are in Deutero-Isaiah, and the Psalms.

⁶ For the moment it will be assumed that the (combined) flood narrative begins at Gen 6:5. There are reasons for seeing the narrative starting at 6:1 or 5:28/29 or indeed at 6:9, but in the final form it is 6:5 that launches the text into the flood narrative itself.

⁷ e.g. בָּרָא adām 2:5,7,8 etc. כָּל הַנַּחַל (face of the) adāmāh/ground 2:5,6,7,9 etc. see Error! Reference source not found. Error! Reference source not found.

⁸ BDB 135 notes that the verb is rare except for P and Deutero-Isaiah. Ex 34:10, Nums 16:30 are the only other two uses assigned to J and, as was noted above fn5, these two verses do not recall Gen 1, whereas 6:7 appears strongly linked to Gen 1:1.

⁹ Gen 6:7 lists 4 categories of living things to be blotted out - מְמָטָע (domestic?) animals, רָצִי, creeping things and עִנָּיִים birds of the air, which is more reminiscent of 1:26, than the two J references to animals in 2:19-20.

¹⁰ See below where the similarities of 6:5 'God saw that the evil (was) great' to the Gen 1 refrain 'God saw that it was good'

¹¹ The obvious P links of בָּרָא and the creaturely enumerations (which are not in fact inimical to J) have led many to see these phrases as glosses see e.g. [Gunkel 1910, p. 61]. does anyone disagree with significant reason?
Although the word הָלַךְ (‘make’) does not appear again in the flood narrative, its widely used synonym הָיוֹשֵׁל (‘make’) does and as a result of the links established by 6:7 it begins to take on significance. In Genesis 1 הָיוֹשֵׁל is the verb used for the creation of all the inanimate parts of the created order, and it is used in parallel with מָצָא (for the creation of people and animals. It is, of course, a very common verb and of itself would be a fairly weak link between the chapters. Nevertheless, in the light of 6:7, the use of the verb הָיוֹשֵׁל with God as subject (as in 6:6,7; 7:4(J); 9:6(P)) is once more suggestive of that initial act of creation in Genesis 1-2, rather than any of God’s later creative acts. Indeed these verses again seem to highlight that these passages should be read together.

Less obvious is whether we should also make connections to the creation accounts when Noah, rather than God is the subject of the verb, as in the commands for Noah to make the ark (6:14,15,16,22 (P); 7:5; 8:6(J)). The links are much more tenuous yet there are echoes of the way God commands the earth to bring forth and be part of the co-creative process, as indeed the fruit trees are to 'make' (תָּהְוֶא) fruit (1:11,12). The text makes space for the reader to conceive of Noah as being commanded to join with God in whatever new work of creation is to be achieved in this narrative, and in this respect the תֹּבָה (‘ark’) which is to be made may signify rather more than simply a large wooden box, although just what it might signify is far from clear. If so, this would be the first time in the canon that God has delegated his creative powers to human beings. Only once before have humans tried to make (תָּהְוֶא) something (clothes of fig leaves 3:7), and that abortive attempt to 'make' was speedily replaced by God's creation of suitable clothing (3:21).

1.3.2. A good creation corrupted

If the text opens the way for the reader to make connections between the flood narrative and the creation account, the most obvious connection is the contrast between the 'good' (טבּ) world of Genesis 1 and the 'evil' (עֵרַ) world of Genesis 6. This is highlighted in the opening verse 6:5

יָשָׁבֶד הָאָדָם עַל הַשָּׂרָה הַנָּשִׁי הַקְּלֵי הַרָּעָה
And YHWH saw that great (was) the evil of the ādām on the earth. (6:5)

כֹּפֶרֶת אֶלְוָיָה כַּרְפָּלָה
c.f. And God saw that (it was) good (1:10,12,18,21,25,31)

12 1:7 God made the רֹאֲקָא הָהֲרָא (firmament), 1:11,12 fruit trees make fruit, 1:16 God makes the sun and moon, 1:25 God makes the animals, wild and domestic, 1:26 God makes humanity; 1:31, 2:2,3 God surveys all he has made.
13 This connection is noted by many scholars e.g. {Waltke 01, p. 118}, {Brueggemann 82, p. 76} {Fretheim 05, p. 81}, {Hartley 00, p. 97}
Even more noticeable is the connection between 6:12 and 1:31:14

and God saw the earth and behold it was corrupted (6:12)

and God saw all that he had made and behold it was very good (1:31)

As Hendel points out this grammatical construction is found only in Genesis 1:31, 6:12 and Exodus 39:43.15 Hendel argues that this makes for a strong link between the three verses with the "syntax and diction [making] the plot reversal [in Genesis 6] emphatic".16 An intertextual reader is thus bought up against the utter contrast between the world God proclaimed 'very good' at the end of Genesis 1 and the current great wickedness of the ādām, the final climax of that creation. Such wickedness is no great surprise to the canonical reader, although it may have been to the reader of P.17 Nevertheless, the extent of the evil and its comprehensive tainting of all humanity has never been pronounced so starkly, nor has anything evil been 'seen' thus far.18 In 1:28 humanity was instructed to fill (מלאה) the earth; 6:11,13 indicates they have, indeed, filled (מלאם) the earth but with violence (כוס). Allusions to Genesis 1-2 may well lead the reader to ponder how far from the intentions and hopes of creation, the world of the flood has moved. Moreover, by being reminded repeatedly that this world is created and made by God, his sovereign right to dispose of what he has created, especially if it has failed its purpose, is inferred. Thus the evocation of the creation narratives at the start of the flood narrative gives added justification and entitlement to the actions and intentions of God.

1.3.3. The heavens and the earth

The connections between the narratives are not, however, limited to the overt echoes of the opening verses. A much more subtle and pervasive connection can be found in the fact that some of the major components of the creation narratives are also the main elements of the flood narrative. Earth (ארץ), God (אלהים), waters (מים) ādām (אדם), and animals (under the following four headings: דָּעַת נוֹהֵר נְשָׁתָה נְפָשׁוֹת) are all key words in both sets of stories.

---

14 This connection is noted by inter alia [Walker 06, p. 380] [Turner 00, p. 46]
15 In Ex 39:43 Moses "sees" that the people have built the tabernacle exactly as commanded.
16 [Hendel 95b, p. 46]
17 The P source as currently reconstructed has little or no intimation of things having gone wrong with creation until 6:11.
18 [Turner 00, p. 45] points out that until 6:5 all seeing has been seeing of 'good' (1-4,10 etc. 3:8, 6:2)
In particular הָאָרְץ ‘earth’ appears 29 times in Genesis 1-2 and 48 times in Genesis 6-9, making it one of the most frequently repeated words in both stories.\(^{19}\) Admittedly it is an elemental, common noun with a range of meanings that is easily overlooked and would not normally be deemed a significant link between texts. Nevertheless the role and frequency of the word in these two stories suggest subtle interconnections.

Habel argues that הָאָרְץ is more than just a theme in Genesis 1 but a ‘central character or subject of the story’:

"I discovered that... the primary subject of the primordial setting and subsequent days of creation was not the entire cosmos, nor humanity, but הָאָרְץ Earth;... It is my contention, after reading the text with ecojustice eyes, that Genesis 1 is about the origin, appearance and activation of Earth – albeit within the context of a framework about creating Earth and sky. At the heart of the story is a 'geophany', a manifestation or revelation of Earth."\(^{20}\)

While many may want to argue that the ecojustice lens distorts Habel’s reading of Genesis 1, nevertheless, he provides a helpful counterbalance to an overly anthropocentric reading of it. Even if the creation of humanity not the earth is considered the climax of the account, (and it might well be argued that the Sabbath, not humanity is the climax) it must be noted that Genesis 1, itself, sees humanity only, ever within the framework of the whole of creation. The inclusio that brackets the P creation account mentions not humanity but the creation of the heavens and the earth (1:1, 2:4a) - almost certainly as merismus for all that heaven and earth contain.\(^{21}\)

Similarly, a too anthropocentric reading of the flood narrative may often occur. Certainly we are repeatedly told of Noah and his wife, his sons and their wives, but the story reserves even more space for the enumeration of the differing classes of animals and their preservation. The final covenant of Genesis 9 is not just with Noah but also with all living things (9:5, 9:10). Yet, even more frequent than either of these, is the use of the term הָאָרְץ. The word הָאָרְץ, earth, is liberally sprinkled throughout the tale, more often than is strictly needed for comprehension.\(^{22}\) There seems, then, to be a deliberate desire to continually stress and forefront the relationship of animals, rain and flood to the earth. If we take the

\(^{19}\) Within Genesis the only other chapters which contain such a preponderance of the noun are Gen 41 and 47 but in these verses the word is used with and subordinate to a place name with the meaning 'the land of Egypt, Canaan' etc. i.e. in these chapters the earth itself is not a major player in the narrative despite the frequency of the word.

\(^{20}\) \{Habel 00, p. 35\}

\(^{21}\) Of course exactly how Gen 1:1 should be understood is an interesting question (see \{Barr 98\}) but however it is settled does not impact on the fact that there is an obvious chiastic inclusio between 1:1 and 2:4a.

\(^{22}\) E.g. in 6:11 and 6:12 'earth' is repeated in a way not necessary for the sense, but providing a kind of poetic parallelism. In 7:3 it is not immediately obvious what is added to the verse by 'on the face of the earth'; 7:4,6,10,12,17 stress repeatedly that rain and the flood 'comes on the earth'; although that is surely fairly obvious and need not have been repeated.
focus off Noah, for a moment, then it may not be too far fetched to see earth and its synonym adāmāh (ground) as, at the very least, another significant character or subject in the narrative. Indeed it is possible to see the ground as not just being another player but one of the key targets of the flood. The earth has been corrupted by all flesh (7:11-12) and it is the earth that God intends to destroy along with all flesh in it (7:13). Earth/ adāmāh is also the first beneficiary of the post-diluvian promises of God. 'And God said in his heart "I will not again curse the adāmāh on account of the ādām…”' (8:21). At the very least, this intertextual reading may have enabled us to recognise, and thus explore more fully the significance of 'earth' in the flood narrative. More than that, however, because we have two stories that share a major character we may be led, once again, to reading them together.

Of course, earth and adāmāh are not necessarily synonymous in Genesis 1-2, nor is the referent for earth in the flood story quite identical to that of Genesis 1-2. Indeed even within either narrative, earth appears to move through its various shades of meaning from the cosmic totality of the created order to a local plot of soil. Caution will need to be exercised in comparing the passages and further study undertaken. We might also ponder the significance of prefixing the earth (and the waters) with the phrase 'on the surface of' or in more literal Hebrew 'upon the face of' (וְעַל־חַашַׁמְתֵּךְ) which frequently recurs in Genesis 1, 4 and 6-8.

Another major difference is that Genesis 1 concerns the heavens and the earth, while the heavens hardly feature at all in the flood except in the stock phrase 'birds of the air' (שַׂרְפֹּת־אֵיזֶה) and as the source of one half of the deluge waters (7:11, 8:2). Indeed it is made clear that what happens in the flood only happens to things under the heavens (6:17, 7:19). The flood narrative links to the creation account through the key characters but not in its fullness. Already the flood narrative narrows its focus to that which exists under the heavens and upon the earth. The narrative provides a focal lens on only a portion of the creation narrative.

---

23 {Miller 78, p. 37} sees 'the role of the ground or soil in relation to the human creature [as] a significant sub-theme or motif' but the significance may be even stronger than he recognises.
24 or possibly 'I will not further curse…'
25 The distinctions between earth and adāmāh in Genesis 1-2 have been much debated see e.g. {Castellino 57, p. 79}. There is still room for similar studies of earth in the flood narrative. Further study of the differences in meaning and the way earth is transformed in the flood narrative might be revealing of what is happening to creation in the narrative.
1.3.4. The waters and the deep

If the earth is a character in the flood narrative then the waters too, as arch-enemy of the land is another contender for significant player in this story.\textsuperscript{26} Again this fairly common noun is strongly clustered around Genesis 1 (11 uses) and Genesis 7-8 (18 uses) with a similar referential identity as a large body of water.\textsuperscript{27} Yet once again it is a nuanced similarity, the waters of the flood are not identical to the waters of creation.

Tsumura has argued persuasively that in Genesis 1:2 the tēhôm (תֶּהוֹם traditionally translated the 'deep') should not be seen as some mythological chaos entity but as the 'primordial ocean' which is identical to the waters mentioned in the closing section of 1:2.\textsuperscript{28} This undifferentiated mass of waters which make up the tēhôm is separated by God in 1:6 through the creation of the rāqî/uni02BFah (עָרָקִי the 'dome' or 'firmament' in most English translations). That portion of the waters beneath the rāqî/uni02BFah are gathered together to reveal the dry land (צָבָא) which is earth (1:9-10), apparently lying dormant beneath. Later these lower waters are made to swarm with sea creatures, while, implicitly, the waters above the firmament swarm with birds.\textsuperscript{29}

In the flood narrative, the waters are no longer exactly equivalent to the tēhôm, rather they are a subset of it, as may perhaps be the case by the end of Genesis 1 when the tēhôm has been, apparently, subdivided.\textsuperscript{30} In Genesis 6-9 the tēhôm is, it seems, pictured as behind a permanent dam which is allowed to burst open so that springs break through and thus the waters escape from the tēhôm (7:11). Windows in the rāqî/uni02BFah are also, apparently, opened and the waters above the rāqî/uni02BFah come pouring down as rain.\textsuperscript{31} Once again the dry land becomes covered by the waters. Indeed all the high mountains are covered, even to 15 cubits deep (7:19-20). The picture of 7:19-24 thus bears many similarities to the original

\textsuperscript{26} The labelling of the waters as an enemy does not necessarily imply that the waters are to be seen as the forces of chaos or rivals to God. In the narrative the waters are the enemy of the earth and particularly all living things upon the earth, they are never an enemy of God.

\textsuperscript{27} When the word צָבָא occurs elsewhere in Genesis it refers to much smaller bodies of water e.g. a spring 16:7, a water bottle 21:14, or more usually a well 21:25, 24:11. It occurs in the primeval account only in Gen 1 and 6-9.

\textsuperscript{28}[Tsumura 05]. Although Tsumura has not had a universal following (see e.g. Day 85) nevertheless many have been persuaded. He also sees the tēhôm as an hyponymous word pair with earth i.e. a subset of earth rather than an entity over against it. The whole consists of the heavens and the earth. The earth consists of dry land and tēhôm ocean.

\textsuperscript{29} It has been suggested that an original J had the waters above the firmament bringing forth the birds, but that this was edited out. There is no need to resort to such reconstructions or 'literalism', but the connection is useful to explain why birds and sea creatures can be envisaged as created on the same day (just as seas and sky were created on the same day) and separate from the land animals. (Gowan 88) As will be noted, in the flood narrative land animals and birds are united as earth creatures while sea animals are separated out and of no concern.

\textsuperscript{30} see [Lowenstamm 84, p. 307] who argues that the waters of the flood are not the waters of creation, as these include the sea as a major component, while the waters of the flood come, not from the sea, but the subterranean abyss.

\textsuperscript{31} Note there is some dispute as to whether 7:11 is a poetic, hyperbolic description of rain so [Lowenstamm 84, p. 302], (Fretheim 05, p. 392) or envisaged as something other than rain the totally unique deluge of the waters above the rāqî/uni02BFah. so [Sutcliffe 53, p. 99-103][Towner 01, p. 90]. Whatever may have been envisaged by P originally, in the final form of the text 7:11 becomes rain by virtue of 7:4 and 7:12.
picture of a water covered earth in Gen 1:2. Moreover, after that decisive moment when God remembers Noah and sends again a רוח (wind, spirit) over the waters (8:1, 1:2) the waters recede leaving dry earth (בשם and בָּהֵמ 8:13-14), just as God commanded in 1:9. These are indeed strong echoes of Genesis 1 and many scholars have made connections.  

Nevertheless we should also, once again, pay attention to the dissimilarities. The world of the creation account is recalled in the flood narrative and the flood is pictured in many similar terms, but it is not, apparently, a simple return to the original watery state of Genesis 1:2. Indeed, it will be argued, despite the mention of the wind in 8:1, that the imagery in the flood narrative fits the situation at the beginning of 1:9 better than that of 1:2. First, the שֵׁם itself does not again cover the earth, only the waters that have sprung forth from it. Moreover the waters have a much stronger identity of their own in the flood narrative than in creation. In Genesis 1:1 things happen to the waters (they are gathered together 1:9, they swarm with sea creatures 1:20), but they take no action themselves. In the flood narrative the waters are frequently the actor, the subject of verbs, so it is the waters that lift up the ark (7:17) and cover the mountains (7:19). It is the waters that are strong and become great (7:17-20,24) and are then forced to retreat (8:1,3,5). It is the waters, in fact, who now fulfil the command, given to humanity in 1:28 to multiply (יִרְבֶּא). The enmity between land and water is thus a theme of the flood narrative in a way that it never is in Genesis 1.

The שֵׁם, meanwhile, seems to remain in its boundaries and eventually its springs are stopped up (8:2). The dam walls are restored.

In the same way the רָאקִית is not, it would seem, dissolved, indeed it is not explicitly referred to in the narrative. It is the heavens (בָּהֵמ) that have their windows opened (7:11) and closed (8:2). Thus, when the time comes for the second revelation of the dry land in

---

32 e.g. {Brown W 99, p. 59}, {Waltke 01, p. 127}. the connection is fairly universally made in commentaries.
33 Thus it is suggested that the NRSV translation of 1:20 "Let the waters bring forth swarms..." matching 1:24 "Let the earth bring forth..." is inaccurate and too influenced by LXX. In MT 1:24 the verb is a causative Hiphil suggesting some active involvement of the earth. In 1:20 the verb is a plain Qal so that the waters have no necessary involvement in what happens to them. c.f. {Westermann 76, p. 136}
34 This does not imply that the waters are thus seen by the story as an independent force in opposition to God. There is no suggestion that the waters go beyond God's intentions for them. Rather the point being made is that God's causation of the flood is here implicit rather than explicit. The author has chosen to portray the flood with the waters as the active character rather than God, even if God is understood to be pulling the strings. This raises the interesting question in 7:23 as to who is the subject of the singular verb. Many English translations insert God as subject although God has not been mentioned since 7:16 {Gunkel 1910, p. 63} and others want to introduce מִי into the verse, or alternatively translate the verb as a niphal, passive to avoid giving a subject.
35 {Kruger 01, p. 439} building on rabbinic interpretations, sees the ark as a kind of plug or stopper, that wedges closed the שֵׁם. Although such an image may be in the cultural background, the ark apparently rests after the שֵׁם has been closed by God. 8:2-4.
Genesis 8 there is no separation of the waters above and below and no creation of another rāqi‘ah. Therefore, it could be more accurate to say that the world returns not to the watery void of Genesis 1:2 but to the water covered earth under the dome of heaven portrayed in Genesis 1:9.

Certainly the wind of 8:1 echoes Genesis 1:2 to a certain extent, yet, as is well known the interpretation of the rû’āh šĕlohîm (יהוה והprit ה sim of God? mighty wind?) in 1:2 is fraught with difficulty. If, indeed, 1:2 describes a state in which the rû’āh šĕlohîm 'hovers' like an eagle over the whole of the tĕhôm then the image is very different from the rû’āh of 8:1 which God 'causes to pass over', or 'brings upon the waters' and which immediately causes the waters to abate. Indeed the rû’āh of 8:1 is not the only image from the flood narrative that has been equated with the rû’āh šĕlohîm of 1:2. It has variously been suggested that the ark and the raven form a similar function, but again the language links between these verses are fairly tenuous. 36 There are certainly echoes of creation language here but the connections are not so strong as elsewhere.

Yet, even allowing for a flood that is portrayed as returning the world to the state it was in, in Genesis 1:9, the match between the accounts is not identical. The flood narrative does not portray the waters being gathered together again in one place to suddenly reveal a new earth. Rather, as the waters have gradually encroached upon the earth, encircling it like a conquering host until not one of earth's living inhabitants remains alive, so the tide turns and it is the waters that are now slowly beating a retreat, gradually soaking from the land. By contrast, what happens on day three of creation at the command of the Lord, in the flood narrative takes five months or more (8:4 – 8:13-14). 37

Moreover we are never told in the flood story where the waters go. 38 They simply subside and drain away. Comments to the effect that they return to the reservoirs from whence they came, go beyond the narrative and it is, anyway, hard to envisage how the waters from above might have been perceived to return to the heavens. 39 If anything, the waters of the flood just seem to run out and dry up, almost as if they no longer have a place in the

---

36 For the suggestion that the ark hovers like the rû’āh šĕlohîm see (Brown W 99, p. 55) and for the raven see (Moberly 00)
37 See (Turner 00, p. 49-50) for a similar point.
38 See (Lowenstamm 84) for a discussion of this subject and the way interpreters have sought to fill this gap in the narrative.
39 e.g. (Hartley 00, p. 104) “God employed the wind to drive the waters back to their reservoirs”.
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cosmos. Certainly they do not appear to form a new entity that remains in creation after the flood, unlike the waters of creation which become the seas of the world.  

Like the earth, the waters are a significant shared character in the plots of creation and flood. There is much in the flood narrative that echoes and links the two stories and yet there are significant differences that suggest the flood narrative is rearranging, retelling, and re-envisioning aspects of the creation story.

1.3.5. **Luminaries, vegetation and sea creatures**

Thus far we have noted the explicit link to the creation account created by the opening verses of the final form of the flood narrative. We have also noted how the stories share core characters who are portrayed in many similar but not identical ways. The connections are significant enough to suggest the stories can profitably be read alongside each other. However, when we begin to read the stories in parallel the most immediate observation is that there are so very few resonances between the first half of Genesis 1 (the first five days of creation) and Genesis 6-9.

Light and darkness, morning and evening, sun and moon and stars to rule over them are the primary concerns of 1:3-5 and 1:14-19, yet none of these themes appear explicitly in the flood. Certainly there are days, nights and years in the Flood. Chronology is highly significant, but it is not presented in such a way as to draw close connections to the creation story, indeed, the flood chronological expressions are quite new to the story thus far. Time is measured relative to the birth of Noah and by time periods, without any attempt to trace dates back to creation. The phrase 'forty days and nights' (7:4,12,17, 8:6) is but a dim echo of Genesis 1 and resonates much more with Exodus.

Similarly, darkness may be implicit in the narrative yet the language of light and dark, sun and moon is never used. The ark may be a pitch black box with no windows save a hatch, apparently in the roof, (8:6) with the effect that Noah has to remove the 'covering' (ם"סש ספ).
the roof?) in order to see out (8:13) and let in the light, but the writer is not concerned to mention these details.\textsuperscript{44} This is in sharp contrast to the ANE Flood narratives which make much of the darkness of the storm flood and rejoice in the reappearance of the sun.\textsuperscript{45} It is only later Jewish interpretations such as 1 Enoch 89 which explicitly state that the flood was dark.\textsuperscript{46} Whether for polemical reasons or otherwise, light and dark are not mentioned and no express link is made to the creation luminaries.

Likewise vegetation, the subject of 1:11-13, and all its associated vocabulary (grass, trees, fruit, seeds etc.) has little place in the flood narrative. As far as seed (знания) is concerned, the writer is more interested in the seed of animals and humans than plants (7:3, 9:9).\textsuperscript{47} When the vegetation vocabulary is used in the flood, it is always in the context of food (8:22, 9:3) so that the resonance is rather more with 1:29-30 than 1:11-13 and the focus is, once again, on animals and humans. As many have observed, vegetation seems miraculously to survive the flood and emerge apparently unscathed.\textsuperscript{48} The effect of the flood on vegetation is no concern of the authors.

Moving further on through the Genesis 1 account, the flood narrative also shows little interest in the seas and sea creatures (1:10-11, 1:20-23). This is perhaps hardly surprising given that a watery world causes sea creatures no difficulty. Nevertheless it is worth noting, at least in passing, that the flood waters come from the tēhôm and the heavens and not from the seas (знания), a word which might, if Tsumura is correct, have had greater connotations of chaos and/or powers not quite within the control of YHWH.\textsuperscript{49} The seas may be hyponymous with earth in Genesis 1; they are certainly not in the flood narrative.\textsuperscript{50}

Additionally, we should note that when God declares all earth and all flesh corrupt and due for corruption (7:13), the sea creatures do not appear to be part of this indictment. They certainly appear in no lists before 9:2. They are not marked for extermination nor mentioned for salvation but when relationships are restored and reordered after the flood,

\textsuperscript{44} See {ter Linden 96, p. 35} as an example of a reader who fills the gap and envisages the ark as in darkness.
\textsuperscript{45} Eridu Genesis 135-136'after the evil wind had tossed the big boat about on the great waters, the sun came out spreading light over heaven and earth [Jacobsen 81] Atrahasis III: ii "No one could see anyone else... The darkness was total, there was no sun... The goddess watched and wept..."Let daylight (?) let it return..."[Dalley 00] Gilgamesh: ... the god of the storm turned daylight to darkness... a man could not see his brother... the storm subsided... I opened a hatch and the light fell on my face" [Gilgamesh, p. 111]
\textsuperscript{46} 1 Enoch 89:1 And the water, the darkness, and mist increased upon it;... 8-9: but that vessel settled on the earth, and the darkness retired and light appeared.
\textsuperscript{47} Seed знания is used in 8:22 as an antonym for harvest which is the closest the flood gets to Gen 1:11-13. However it is contended that the focus is not on vegetation in 8:22 but in agricultural seasons and food production
\textsuperscript{48} Much is made of the olive leaf/twig being fresh and thus indicating that life is 'growing again' [Walke 01, p. 141]. However the etymology and connection with 'fresh' are not certain. The adjective הָרָעָן is unused elsewhere and the verbal form חַלָּם concentrates on the idea of tearing more than freshness or newness. Olive trees are obviously above the water sufficiently to have a branch torn from them but what state those trees are in is only a matter of inference rather than major concern.
\textsuperscript{49} {Tsumura 05}
\textsuperscript{50} See {Tsumura 05} Certainly Tsumura's claim is that the tēhôm is hyponymous rather than the seas, but in the final analysis these are simply synonyms for Tsumura.
the sea creatures reappear having clearly survived by some means or other to take their place in the repetition of the commands of 1:16/28.

In summary, we have, thus far, found little significant connecting vocabulary with Genesis 1:3-1:20a (the first five and a half days of creation), with the exception of 1:9b-10a with its earth and dry land arising from the gathered waters on the third day. Looking more thematically at this section of Genesis 1 it has often been noted that it is concerned as much with differentiation as creation, or perhaps creation via differentiation.\textsuperscript{51} The key verb is יָּרְאָה (‘divide or separate’).\textsuperscript{52} This word, likewise, does not appear at all in the Flood narrative, although many scholars see the flood as returning the world to its former undifferentiated watery state, e.g:

"While Genesis 1 depicts creation as largely a matter of separation and distinction, Genesis 6f. portrays the annihilation of distinctions."\textsuperscript{53} However such a statement is surely an oversimplification of the more nuanced approach of the flood narrative. It has already been argued that the separations of רָעַק (têhôm) remain. How much more, then are the other divisions of Genesis 1 untouched – light and dark (1:4, 18) day and night (1:14). The waters from above and below do mingle (7:11) to form one, threatening, force but the basic distinctions of above and below remain and the waters are never separated again in order to restore life at the flood's conclusion. So, rather than returning to an undifferentiated pre-creation state, as is claimed, the flood narrative keeps all the main differentiations (night-day, earth-sky, human-animal, male-female) and if anything adds a new and rather different element of separation – the separation of the righteous (Noah) from the wicked (all other human beings) and the separation of the saved remnant (those in the ark) from the perishing majority. These flood separations have tangible physical effects but, unlike the creation partitions, are not based on tangible physical differences.

Moreover, it can hardly be said that anything physical is created, or bought forth for the first time in the flood story. There are no new divisions of the tangible world, no new naming of any new things (the root כָּרַפ is absent from the flood narrative\textsuperscript{54}).

\textsuperscript{51} e.g. {Waltke 01, p. 56}, {Brown W 99, p. 37}
\textsuperscript{52} The verb רָעַק appears in 1:4,6,7,14,18
\textsuperscript{53} {Clines 76, p. 500} This comment is typical of many such comments e.g. {Turner 00, p. 48} although others may make the more limited claim that it is only the separation of the waters that is undone e.g. Clements {TDOT 74, p. 275}, {Towner 01, p. 80}
\textsuperscript{54} see 1:5,8,10
1.3.6. Animals, humans and all living things

From 1:20b onwards, however, we have a very different state of affairs. The vocabulary and syntax of Genesis 1:20b-30 (itself, fairly repetitive) is constantly recycled in the Flood narrative in endlessly different combinations. Whether we view this as pedantic repetition or skilful literary emphasis the resulting echoes of Genesis 1 can hardly be missed. The interest in humans and animals over the rest of creation, that we have already noted, now becomes glaringly obvious.

This decisive change begins very definitely at 1:20b. In Genesis 1:20-23 birds and sea creatures are created together on the fifth day in order to fill the seas and skies which were separated on the second day (1:6-8). The flood narrative, however, detaches birds from sea creatures and includes birds as part of all 'flesh' alongside (land) animals and humans, the work of the sixth day.55 While Genesis 6-9 studiously ignores the sea creatures, birds or perhaps more precisely all winged, flying creatures have a very central place in the narrative. Birds appear in every single deluge list except the very truncated 8:1, unlike the terms used to describe the animals which are mixed and omitted in various combinations.56 Moreover, in 7:14b the presence of birds in the ark is emphasised by three different synonyms for 'bird' (נֶפֶשׁ הַצִּיפָּה) given in apposition. Is this simply an attempt to balance the birds against the three fold mention of 'wild animals, domestic animals and creeping things' in 7:14a57; is it a prelude to the importance of the dove and the raven; or is there, some, as yet obscure reason for highlighting the saving of the birds through the use of the creation language of Genesis 1:21?58

Despite the emphasis on the birds, it is, essentially, the work of day six, the animals and humans, that seems to concern the flood story most. As already noted, animals are described, in both the creation and flood accounts, under three categories: 'living things' (נֶפֶשׁ) which may denote wild animals; 'animals' (נֶפֶשׁ הַצִּיפָּה) which may denote domestic animals; and 'creeping things' (נַחֲלָת הַנֶפֶשׁ).59 These three terms are used in varying combinations

55 6:19-20(P) uses נֶפֶשׁ (living thing) and רֹצֵחַ (flesh) as collective terms which appear to cover birds (6:20), ditto 7:15-16,21-23; 8:17(P)
56 birds appear in 6:7(J), 6:20(P), 7:3,8,23 (J), 7:14,21 (P), 8:17,19 (P), 8:20(J), 9:2,10(P). The next most frequent term נְסִיסָה does not appear in 8:19 or 9:2 although it is used as an apparently more generic term in 8:1. Creeping things are omitted from 9:10 and is hinted at only in verbal form in 9:2, 7:21, 7:8
57 so {Clark 68, p. 440} but one may wonder why it was not felt necessary to address the balance elsewhere in the story.
58 While the first and the third terms and the syntax of the sentence are to be found in Genesis 1. The middle term involves the sacrificial language of Leviticus 14 and the concept of clean and unclean birds found in 7:3(J)
59 In 7:21 'swarming things' are also mentioned as land animals whereas the term is reserved for sea creatures in Genesis 1
in the narratives, with no obvious internal pattern or intertextual matching. Some scholars have sought to amend the lists to restore them to some, allegedly original, logical order or sequence. However it may be better to see these combinations as simply a literary interplay of the various terms in ways that strongly echo each other without the use of rigidly identical repetition. Thus, although the phrasing of the seven lists of 1:20-1:30 is nowhere repeated in the eleven lists in the flood narrative, one cannot miss the constant connections.

If the flood narrative is repeatedly a story about the animal species created in Genesis 1, it includes alongside the animals, the ādām that finishes the work of the sixth day, the day that was very good. Indeed it is the ādām, no longer good, that causes problems for the animals (6:6-7). In Genesis 1 the ādām is both a creature alongside the other land based living things made on the sixth day, but also unique in the image and likeness of God. If anything, the flood narrative lessens the distinctiveness and highlights the connections between animals and humanity. This is not just because the animal world, alongside the earth, stands or falls with humanity (7:5) but because humanity and animals all come under the one category of ‘existence’ (םֶּשֶךְ 7:4,23); they are all living things. Indeed the terms 'male and female' (הגָּפֶן וַעֲלֵיהֶם), that in Gen 1:27 describe human beings created in the image of God, exclusively describe animals in the flood narrative (6:19; 7:3,9,16).

However image language and the distinctiveness of humanity are not completely absent from the flood narrative, and 9:6 is another of the explicit but non-identical repetitions of Genesis 1. Once again the creation language is taken up and utilised for a new purpose within the flood narrative, this time as justification for a new prohibition against killing...
designed, it would seem, to alleviate the problems that have caused the human image of God to be obliterated from the earth.\footnote{\text{Frymer-Kensky 77}}

1.3.7. **Blessings and commands**

Blessings and commands are also a key concern of the section 1:20b-30, that reappear in the flood narrative. The blessings of 1:22 and 1:28 are taken up, once again in identical language but differing word order. In fact, it is possible to view the flood narrative as overtly extending the blessing/fruitfulness command of creation to the animals (8:17), who were originally omitted, explicitly if not implicitly, from the blessings on sea-creatures and birds (1:22) and humanity (1:28) in Genesis 1.\footnote{so e.g. \{Wenham 87, p. 187\} although he later, and surely mistakenly, labels this a blessing on humanity. p192} In 8:17 Noah is to bring out the animals so that they may swarm on the earth, be fruitful and be many, the vocabulary reiterating the language of 1:22a addressed to the 'swarming things that swarm the waters'.

That human remnant that leaves the ark also receives a renewed blessing and a set of commands that echo those of 1:28.\footnote{\text{Frymer-Kensky 77}, \{Sarna 89, p. 58\} stress that the injunction multiply is primarily a polemic against the Atrahasis moral of population control. The two suggestions are not however incompatible and the verse may do double duty to stand against Atrahasis and be a new version of Genesis 1:28, which itself may have had a polemical intent.} But unlike the animals, whose blessing remains essentially unaltered from Genesis 1, the new blessing on humanity is subtly different. There is the same command to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth (9:1,7), but in the place of the injunction to subdue the earth and have dominion we are suddenly faced with announcements of fear and dread. Whether this is an abrogation of the original command to subdue the earth, or simply the result of humanity fulfilling the original command in a world where evil intentions prevail, is a moot point and perhaps exactly the question an intertextual reading should face us with.\footnote{e.g. \{Turner 00, p. 52\} comments 'relations are brutalised… The curse of 3:17-19… countered the original command [to 'subdue' the earth] and makes human subjugation of the earth problematical…\'. \{Fretheim 05, p. 80\} in contrast views Noah as the exemplary steward of creation in his salvific provisions. See also \{Schüle 06\} who 'concludes that the dominium terrae has been abrogated and replaced by God's law, which he interprets as a form of the immanent presence of God.' (from JBL review by \{Möller, p. 3\})} The constant echoes of the creation narrative emphasise more strongly the divergences that take place in the flood narrative and cause us to ask the bigger purpose questions.

Just as these blessings lead into the provision of food in Genesis 1 so they do in Genesis 9 with yet another direct allusion, if not quote, in 9:3. But this time the departure from Genesis 1 is made exceedingly clear. Whereas Genesis 1:29-30 grants humans and animals the right to be vegetarian, Genesis 9 grants humanity the right to be carnivores, making sense of the previously predicted fear and dread. Of all gifts of creation to humans and
animals the provision of food is clearly considered important enough to have a significant repetition. Indeed the provision of food for the ark was also expressly noted (6:21) – in the only hint of consideration for the realities of a floating zoo.

This brings us to the end of the section 1:20b – 30, a section in which every major element and all significant vocabulary appears in some form or other in the Flood narrative, with the exception of only three key words – likeness (ד"מ), rule (ר"ר) and subdue (כָּלַשׁ) 1:28). Whereas the key components of Genesis 1:3-20a were found to be largely absent from the flood narrative except for the core characters or earth and waters, practically all the elements of 1:20b-30 appear therein. The flood story is not so much a story linked to P’s creation account as a story linked specifically to day six of that creation account (with the birds being subtly shifted back one day.)

1.3.8. Rest and Shabbat

If the first five days of creation are largely unconnected to the flood narrative, while the sixth day is strongly intertwined with it, then day seven stands somewhere between the two. There is no explicit reference to Sabbath, no direct quotes from 2:1-4 and much of the significant vocabulary such as work (מלאך), hallowing (כֹּכָב) and the hosts (כָּלַשׁ) is not to be found in the flood.

Yet, besides the basic centrality of earth to both passages there are more implicit references that become noticeable once the reader is sensitised to an intertextual reading. Seven days is a key time period in the flood narrative: seven days warning is given to Noah (7:4), the dove is sent out at seven day intervals (8:10,12) and many of the dates involve a seven. More remote but still tapping into the same rich symbolism is the command to take seven pairs of animals on board (7:2,3). The significance of seven traces back, at least in part to the seven days of creation.

More subtle yet much more interesting is the comment in 8:22 that the seasons shall not rest (כָּלַשׁ) for all the days of the earth’s existence. God's creative work may come to an end, and God may have rested (כָּלַשׁ) but in the post-diluvian world there is no rest for the seasonal round. Even more subtle and possibly too remote, is the play on the synonym for כָּלַשׁ, כֹּכָב ’rest’ to be found in 8:4 where the ark rested (כֹּכָב) in the seventh month on the

---

70 The flood begins on the 17th day of the 2nd month (7:11), the ark grounds on the 17th day of the 7th month (8:4) and the story finally ends on the 27th day of the second month of the following year (8:14). The seven is more prominent in Hebrew than in English in these dates.
seven and tenth day. This synonym, of course, recalls Noah's name and is itself is used in a pun on his name in 5:29, weaving an elaborate set of potential interconnections.

1.4. Conclusions concerning Genesis 1:1-2:4a and Genesis 6-9

In conclusion we can summarise the interconnections we have found between the P creation account and the flood narrative, as follows:

At the outset the narrative establishes a strong link to the P creation account (6:5-7) that invites an intertextual reading of the two narratives. The flood story is about the works that God created and made in Genesis 1. It is also about God delegating to human beings, for the first time, the right to create, for a new thing needs to be made on earth - an ark (6:14).

This ominous creation is the net result of a sharp contrast between the good world of Genesis 1 and the desperately corrupt world of Genesis 6, a contrast marked by a repeated syntax and vocabulary with significant antonyms at the appropriate points (6:5,12). At least one important implication of this set of interconnections is that God's authority to deal with the corrupt world of Genesis 6 is affirmed. This is God's world, his creation, which he has always fashioned as he wished, but, as it clearly no longer represents those intentions, it can be refashioned.

Alerted now to intertextual possibilities it becomes obvious that the two narratives involve substantially the same characters – God, the earth, the waters, the animals and the ādām. The narrative is, in many ways, a continuation narrative, a 'what-happens-next' story, which develops the characters further and involves them in a new plot – primarily the divinely controlled take-over of the earth by the waters, with the consequent planned destruction of the animals and ādām. One of the significant results of this intertextual reading is a new awareness that these are indeed central characters to whom attention should be paid. The one new character in the chapter, Noah, with his family appended, becomes the means of salvation for ādām, animals and earth, a righteous, obedient but otherwise fairly passive actor in the unfolding drama.71

71 Noah righteousness (6:9,7:1) and his obedience (6:22, 7:5,9,16) is constantly stressed, but his actual actions amount to making an ark, entering it with his family and the animals (whether he had any part to play in acquiring the animals is very ambiguous 7:8,15), sending out the raven and the dove, removing the covering and exiting when instructed and finally offering a burnt offering on the altar he builds. He never speaks and takes no part in the central drama. His task is essentially to provide the safe haven for the elect, the remnant of ādām and animals.
In seeing the connections, the differences between the accounts become obvious. Many elements of the creation narrative have little place in the flood narrative. The creation story was about the making of the heavens and the earth, the flood narrative is only about what is under the heavens: the earth and adâmāh. The waters, minor characters in the creation account become more significant actors in the flood narrative.

Far more significant is the fact that the majority of the created works of the first five days are completely disregarded by the flood narrative, while the elements of the sixth day: animals (with birds attached), the ādām (male and female in the image of God), the blessings, commands and provision of food are constantly recalled, rearranged, and at times reinterpreted. The quantity and quality of the interconnections here are remarkable and surely central to any assessment and interpretation of the intertextual readings. The only substantial connection that can made with days one to five is the separating of the waters from the dry land in 1:9. The re-separation of land and waters in the aftermath of the flood, however, is accomplished very differently from Genesis 1 and there is clearly a complex relationship between the flood and creation narratives at this point.

Finally it was noted that connections with the seventh day of creation are elusive but possible.
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72 The connection with 1:9 and none of the rest of 1:3-20a may at first seem strange. However many scholars view Genesis 1 as a two part narrative. 1:3-13 involve the separation of day and night, the heavens and the earth, the earth with plants and the seas. The second part of the chapter 1:14-31 involves the population of these 3 divisions the luminaries for the day and night, the birds and sea creatures for the sky and watery earth, the animals and ādām for the dry land. e.g. (Wenham 87, p. 7). (Brown W 99, p. 37) has a tripartite structure with a similar effect. Under either schema, 1:9 the creation of dry land and seas is connected to the work of day six – the creation of land animals. Accordingly the recalling of 1:9 in the flood narrative alongside reference to the works of day six makes imminent sense. (Brown W 99, p. 55) wishes to take this further and see in the three storied ark an imitation of the 3 storied universe. However it is not at all clear that Genesis 1 does depict a three storied universe. It is much more concerned with binary divisions (Clines 76, p. 501) and if Tsumura is right the tēhôm is a subset of the earth rather than a third level of creation. (Tsumura 05)