

The Genesis Flood

Mark F. Rooker

Mark F. Rooker is Professor of Old Testament and Hebrew at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. He previously taught at Criswell College and Dallas Theological Seminary. Dr. Rooker is the author of numerous articles and books. His most recent work is a commentary on Leviticus in the New American Commentary Series.

Introduction *History of Flood Accounts in the Ancient World*

The memory of a massive deluge of water is attested in many distinct and varied cultures of the world. Accounts of the occurrence of a great flood has been found in Greece, Mesopotamia, Australia, India, Malaya, Polynesia, China, Japan, and among the cultures of the Western Hemisphere. In all there are sixty-eight different legends of a massive flood.¹ No other event in biblical history has as much extra-biblical attestation.

The flood stories that most closely resemble the biblical narrative come from southern Mesopotamia. Three distinct legends have been discovered. The best known is the Gilgamesh Epic, which relates how a certain Utnapishtim² was arbitrarily chosen and warned of a coming deluge. Some scholars associated with the Comparative Religion School have not only attempted to link the Mesopotamian and biblical floods but have also suggested that the Genesis account is dependent on the Mesopotamian prototypes.

Indeed, the shared details between the Mesopotamian stories and the Genesis narrative are striking. They share the following features: (1) only one man is warned of the coming deluge and instructed to build a vessel; (2) the water vessels are lined with pitch for insulation (Heb. *koper*; Akk. *kupru*); (3) the chosen man is commanded what he is to bring into his boat; (4) specific mention is made of closing the door of the boat; (5) the deluge exterminated both man and beast; (6)

mountains appear before the flood waters begin to abate; (7) the boat lands on top of a mountain; (8) birds are released from the opening of a window; and (9) sacrifices are offered after the flood is over.³

Attempts to relate the accounts, however, have not produced a consensus, and claims of direct literary dependence have been largely abandoned. As G. von Rad stated in 1972: "Today, forty years after the height of the Babel-Bible controversy, the dossier on the relation of the biblical tradition to the Babylonian story of the Flood as it is in the Gilgamesh Epic is more or less closed. A direct dependence of the biblical tradition on the Babylonian is no longer assumed."⁴ Each account has distinctive elements and the differences are often more significant than the similarities.⁵ The contrast between the ethical monotheism of the biblical account and the pagan polytheistic outlook of the Mesopotamian versions is particularly distinctive. The gods of the Babylonian accounts are often vindictive, capricious, and deceive both humans and each other. Even the writers of these accounts display little reverence for these gods.⁶ Consistent with the lack of ethics among the pagan gods is the lack of moral and ethical explanations for the purpose of the deluge.⁷ There are no ethical or moral reasons provided for the selection of the lone individual surviving the flood. Moreover, the gods are ultimately subservient to nature as they are somewhat startled by the conditions that resulted from the deluge. They are appalled at conditions over which they have no control.

But how does one account for the specific terminological and literary connections between the Mesopotamian and biblical accounts? It is quite possible that some of the memories of Noah's flood were carried to different cultures such as Mesopotamia where they were corrupted from the true and inspired description now faithfully recorded in the Genesis narrative.

Interest in the Flood and Noah's ark transcends the biblical narrative and has been a continual subject of fascination. As early as the first century A.D. Flavius Josephus, the Galilean General turned historian, cites a common belief that relics of the ark were known to be preserved in Armenia. Similar evidence may be found in Rabbinic Literature and from Berossus, a Babylonian priest who wrote in Greek ca. 275 B.C.⁸ Late last summer, an expedition sponsored by the National Geography Society discovered remnants of human habitation, apparently inundated by a great flood several thousand years ago, under the Black Sea. Many believe this discovery is independent evidence of the biblical flood.⁹

The Flood and Critical Scholarship

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, critical biblical scholars had a field day with the story of the Flood. The Flood narrative in the Book of Genesis was a test case for the critical source theory of the Pentateuch popularized by J. Wellhausen in 1878.¹⁰ Because of the repetition that occurs in the account the critics were quick to assign the repeated events to different sources, the alleged J and P sources. The repeated events were often listed as follows:

	J	P
Male and Female animals	7:2	6:19; 7:9, 16
God sees man's wickedness	6:5-7	6:11-13
God commands to enter ark	7:1-3	6:18-20
Noah enters ark	7:7-9	7:13-16
Flood comes	7:10	7:11
Waters increase	7:17b	7:18-20
All flesh destroyed	7:22-23	7:21
God rules out future destruction	8:21-23	9:9-11

Since the mid-twentieth century, however, this method has increasingly fallen out of favor even among critical scholars. Rather than indicating another source, repetition has been demonstrated as an effective way of indicating emphasis.¹¹

Another criterion for dividing the Pentateuch into various sources was based on the different names for God, i.e., Yahweh and Elohim. In Genesis 1-11, the name Yahweh was said to belong to the alleged J source while Elohim was said to be the name of God in the P source. H. Leupold pointed out the flaw with this criterion long ago when he observed that the different names for God were not to be attributed to hypothetical sources but rather were intentionally used by the author for specific reasons. The name Yahweh was used in the text when God's gracious dealings with Noah and mankind are emphasized while Elohim was used to focus on God's role as Almighty Ruler of heaven and earth, who brings judgment upon the disobedient.¹²

Assuming the literary cohesion of the account of the Flood, B. W. Anderson maintains that the Flood narrative was arranged according to a pattern of antithetical parallelism, in which the second half of the story reflects the sections of the first half but in reverse order. This parallelism, which is common in the Old Tes-

tament, accounts for the repetition. He analyzes the repetition in the following manner, suggesting that God's graciousness to Noah is the central theme of the story:

Transitional introduction (6:9-10)

1. Violence in God's creation (6:11-12)
 2. First divine address: resolution to destroy (6:13-22)
 3. Second divine address: command to enter the ark (7:1-10)
 4. Beginning of the flood (7:11-16)
 5. The rising flood waters (7:17-24)
 - GOD'S REMEMBRANCE OF NOAH
 6. The receding flood waters (8:1-5)
 7. The drying of the earth (8:6-14)
 8. Third divine address: command to leave the ark (8:15-19)
 9. God's resolution to preserve order (8:20-22)
 10. Fourth divine address: covenant blessing and peace (9:1-17)
- Transitional conclusion (9:18-19)¹³

The Flood Is Universal

In the Bible the Flood is the primary archetypal act of judgment on fallen humanity. For at least eight reasons the Flood described in Genesis 6:9-9:17 should be considered world-wide rather than local:

1. The phrase "under the whole heaven" (Gen 7:19) cannot be reduced to a local situation.
2. The purpose of the Flood was to judge the entire population of humanity apart from righteous Noah.
3. The large size of the ark would not be necessary if the Flood were restricted to a local domain.
4. Second Peter 3:3-7 describes an overwhelming catastrophic event.
5. A local flood could not cover the Ararat Mountains, which reach 17,000 feet, for over a year.
6. The promise never to destroy the earth again with a flood has universal implications. Many have died in local floods since the time of Noah.

7. If the Flood were local, Noah and his family could have easily migrated to another country rather than build an ark.
8. Only a worldwide flood could account for the attestation of legends in virtually all regions of the world.¹⁴

The Narrative of the Flood Account

Introduction

While the account of the Genesis Flood begins properly at Genesis 6:9, the narrative of Genesis 6:1-8 clearly supplies the immediate historical background, since Noah, who will survive the great deluge, was already introduced in Genesis 5:32. In the latter text we are told that Noah was the son of Lamech and that he would bring relief (*nhm*)¹⁵ to the world, which was cursed since the Fall (5:29). In addition, Noah represented the tenth generation from the creation (1 Chr 1:1-4; Luke 3:36-38). He was five hundred years old when he became the father of Shem, Ham, and Japheth (Gen 5:32).

The Sons of God Marry the Daughters of Men (Gen 6:1-4)

Genesis 6:1-4, which forms the immediate background to the Flood account, is one of the most disputed passages in the Bible. The account speaks of "the sons of God" who took¹⁶ "the daughters of men" as their wives. The debate centers on the identity of "the sons of God." Of the numerous interpretations, the two most common proposals are to identify "the sons of God" as fallen angels or as the godly line of Seth.¹⁷

Two supports for taking "the sons of God" as angels are the use of the phrase "sons of God" to refer to angels in Job 1:6; 2:1; and 38:7, and the Septuagint's translation of Genesis 6:2 as "angels of God." The apocryphal book 1 Enoch (6:2) also

seems to point in this direction. In addition, proponents of this view cite 1 Peter 3:19, 20; 2 Peter 2:4-6; and Jude 6 as New Testament references to Genesis 6 that show “the sons of God” to be angels. Prominent church fathers such as Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Lactantius, as well as prominent Jewish interpreters such as Philo and Josephus, and several rabbinical writers also take this position. One objection to this view is that in Matthew 22:30 Jesus teaches that angels do not marry (cf. Mark 12:25; Luke 20:34–36).¹⁸

The alternative interpretation argues that “the sons of God” and “the daughters of men” represent two different families of mankind; “the sons of God” are the descendants of Seth while “the daughters of men” are the offspring from Cain. The line of Seth were those characterized by a pure worship of God. They may have received the appellation “sons of God” from the fact that early on they began to call upon the name of the LORD (Gen 4:26). The designation of God’s true worshippers as His sons is common in the Old Testament (Exod 4:22; Deut 14:1; 32:5, 6, 18, 19; Isa 1:2; 43:6; 45:11; Jer 31:20; Hos 11:1; Ps 73:15) and is a common motif in the New Testament as well (Rom 8:14-17; Gal 3:26; 4:6; Eph 1:5; Heb 12:7). The line of Cain, on the other hand, represented those who had rejected the worship of the one LORD. These two distinct groups that had been differentiated by character (see Gen 4:26; 5:22, 29) were now beginning to commingle, and thus the moral distinctions between the two lines were on the verge of being obliterated.¹⁹ The great sin in the account of Genesis 6:1-8 is thus that the godly line of Seth had compromised its faith and began to intermarry with the ungodly line of Cain. In essence they

became unequally yoked with unbelievers (2 Cor 6:14).²⁰ F. Schaeffer summarizes the violation from the larger context: “The history of divided humanity develops from the two main lines delineated in Genesis 4:16-24 (the line of Cain) and Genesis 4:25-5:32 (the line of Seth). In the account which follows these genealogies, we are introduced to a world in which moral decay comes to so permeate society that only one man is left in the godly line.”²¹ Early church fathers such as Chrysostom and Augustine advocated this interpretation. Additional support for this view include the following observations: (1) there is no other reference to angels anywhere in the context. The judgment of the Flood is upon men not angels; and (2) the combination of the verb *lqh* (take) with *ishah* (a wife) is a common expression in the Old Testament for the act of marriage (Gen 24:4; 21:21; 11:29; 12:19), and Jesus said angels do not marry.²² This view is in keeping with the later prohibition of intermarriage with the Canaanites (Deut 7:1-4) and with unbelievers (2 Cor 6:14). “There is a constant prohibition throughout the Old and New Testaments against the people of God marrying those who are not of the people of God.”²³ Thus the Jewish rabbis argued that in addition to violence (Gen 6:11), the immorality described in Genesis 6:1-4 was also a cause for the Flood.²⁴

God’s Plan to Judge the World (Gen 6:5-7)

In Genesis 6:5 it is apparent that the human condition has sunk to new depths. Man’s thoughts are described as continually evil. This situation demands a universal judgment upon man’s rebellion. The wickedness of man in this verse was correctly observed by Martin Luther as the

locus classicus for the natural depravity of the human heart. The expression “the Lord saw” invites comparison with the Creation account, most notably by contrast with the affirmative declaration that “God saw” all He had made and it was good (Gen 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31).²⁵ This emphatic declaration came only after the creation process was complete and God had made man and woman in His own image. Now, in this expressive statement about the condition of the human heart God saw that the human intentions were only evil (see Rom 7:18). This statement is a pointed conclusion to what began with the Fall. As Skinner stated: “The ground of the pessimistic estimate of human nature so forcibly expressed in v. 5 is rather the whole course of man’s development as hitherto related, which is the working out of the sinful knowledge acquired by the Fall.”²⁶ This working out of sinful knowledge would include the murders of Cain and Lamech, as well as the marriages of the godly line with the ungodly line.

As a result God was sorry²⁷ that He made man (Gen 6:6).²⁸ This effect upon God communicates something of the incomprehensibility of the intrusion of sin into the world.²⁹ Human evil has reached its ultimate depths. The limits of divine tolerance being breached, the world must now be purged of its corruption.³⁰ The just punishment for such a perversion of the original creation is the blotting out of life which the Lord God had made (6:7). Man’s morality has adversely affected the natural created order. Thus the creation now awaits its final redemption along with fallen humanity (Rom 8:19-22). Yet in the midst of this section dominated by the themes of sin and punishment there is a ray of hope based solely on God’s

grace: “Noah found favor in the eyes of God” (6:8).³¹ The word translated favor (*hen*) is from the root *hmn*, which refers to “grace” or “unmerited favor.”³²

Structure of the Flood Account

U. Cassuto breaks down the structure of the Flood account into twelve paragraphs. Each paragraph deals with a given episode in the sequence of events, and all the paragraphs are linked together by literary connections between words and expressions. The series of paragraphs is composed of two basic groups, each comprising six paragraphs. The first six depict, step by step, the acts of Divine justice that bring destruction upon the earth, which had become filled with violence (6:9-12, 13-22; 7:1-5, 6-9, 10-16, 17-24). The second group shows us the various consecutive stages of the Divine compassion that renews life upon the earth (8:1-14, 15-17, 18-22; 9:1-7, 8-11, 12-17).³³ This paper will follow a four-point outline, with the main divisions coming after the second point. This divides the Flood account in two main sections, similar to Cassuto’s analysis.

In the larger context of the primeval history of mankind described in Genesis 1-11 Skinner noted that the author’s primary interest in the Flood account is to mark a departure of God’s dealings with the world, to explain the modification of the original constitution of nature (9:1-7), and to provide the immediate historical background for the establishment of the first of the three great covenants, 9:8-17.³⁴

God Instructs Noah to Build an Ark to Escape the Judgment of the Wicked (6:9-22)

Noah Walked with God, but the Wicked Corrupted the Earth (Gen 6:9-12)

Three things are said about Noah in this section: he was righteous, blameless, and he walked with God.³⁵ Several scholars see in the description of Noah as righteous and blameless the opposite of what characterizes the rest of humanity: violence and corruption (Gen 6:11). The virtues of righteous (*tsaddiq*) and blameless (*tamim*), used here for the first time, are virtues favored by God. Righteousness is often understood as a legal term applying to the person who is declared righteous in a court (Exod 23:7; Deut 25:1; and Prov 17:15). This indicates that the individual is above reproach when measured against God's standards. The term blameless is often found in ritual texts describing an animal with no blemish or defect that qualified for sacrificial use (Exod 12:5; Lev 1:3, 10). When applied to the moral sphere, it refers to one without moral or ethical blemish, one with unimpeachable integrity. According to Psalm 15:2 and 101:6, this person, like Noah, is one who walks with God.³⁶ The latter description was also used of Enoch, an ancestor of Noah who walked with God and was delivered from death (Gen 5:22-24).³⁷ This connection between Enoch and Noah may foreshadow Noah's deliverance from death while the rest of humanity was destroyed by the Flood.³⁸ Ezekiel recognizes Noah as one of the outstanding illustrations of righteous living in all antiquity (Ezek 14:14, 20).

Noah was unique in his day because the rest of mankind was corrupt and had filled the earth with violence (6:11). The concept of "corruption" (root, *shat*) may be viewed as a general term describing the violation of the divinely appointed order God had established in Creation.³⁹ "Violence" (*hamas*) gives a more specific explanation of the corruption that existed dur-

ing Noah's time. While the term *hamas* is normally translated "violence," because of its use here and in other contexts, some have suggested that the term should be understood to apply to any action that disregards the sanctity and inviolability of human life. The term occurs in parallelism with terms for "falsehood," "deceit," or "bloodshed," and is applied to such sins as idolatry (Ezek 8:17), deceptive business methods (Ezek 28:16), divorce (Mal 2:16), and slanderous words (Ps 140:1-3 [Heb. 2-4], 11 [Heb. 12]; Prov 3:31-32; 16:29).⁴⁰ Man had been commanded to "multiply and fill (*ml'*) the earth" (Gen 1:28), but now, because of man, "the earth was filled (*ml'*) with violence." The earth's inhabitants had corrupted their way—they had transgressed the natural bounds God had established in Creation. These sins are against nature (Rom 1:26).

The use of the inclusive terms "the earth," and "all flesh"⁴¹ indicates that a universal judgment was unavoidable. Although God created everything and declared it "good," it is now apparent that circumstances have radically changed. In humanity, the pinnacle of God's creation, the change is unmistakable. Sailhamer noted the connections of this section, which focuses on the extent of the Fall and man's corruption, to the original Creation:

Here (6:5-7) and throughout the Flood story, there are numerous ties established with the Creation account in chapter 1. The effect is to show that the Flood was a reversal of God's good work of Creation. In chapter 1 God is shown as the one who prepared the *good land* for man and his family. In the account of the Flood, on the other hand, God is shown as the one who takes this good land from man when he acts corruptly and does not walk in God's way. . . . The cause for the

Flood is tied directly to the earlier account of the fall of man in chapter 3. As a result of the Fall, man had obtained the “knowledge of good and evil” (*tov wara’*, 3:22). It is clear from the previous narratives that the author does not consider man’s having obtained a knowledge of “good and evil” to be beneficial for man. . . . After the Fall, when man had to find the “good” on his own, what God “saw” (*wayyar’*, v. 5) was not that his Creation was *good*; but rather, the Lord “saw” (*wayyar’*) how great man’s wickedness (*ra’at*) on the earth had become, and that every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil (*ra’*).⁴²

God Distinguishes the Righteous from the Wicked (6:13-22)

Verses 13-22 of chapter 6 open with the phrase “Then God said to Noah.” This phrase, which occurs seven times in this narrative (Gen 6:13; 7:1; 8:15; 9:1, 8, 12, 17), is an extension of the choice and selection of Noah and is continuing evidence that Noah had found favor with God. This section contains the instructions for building the ark, which at four hundred fifty feet long, seventy five feet wide, and forty five feet high, has dimensions similar to some modern sea-going vessels.⁴³

The term for the ark (*tebah*) suggests a box-like craft with no rudder or sail or any other navigational device. The fate of the occupants of this vessel was solely in God’s hands. The only other occurrence of the term *tebah* in the Old Testament is in Exodus 2 where the term is used for the small basket that transported the baby Moses through the water. Cassuto has commented on the significance of this correlation:

The exclusive occurrence of ark here and in Exod 2:3-5 is certainly no coincidence. By the verbal parallel, the Torah wished, apparently, to draw attention to the parallelism of

theme. In both cases there is to be saved from drowning one who is worthy of salvation and is destined to bring deliverance to others; here it is humanity that is to be saved, there it is the chosen people; here it is the macrocosm that has to be preserved, there it is the microcosm. The experiences of the fathers foreshadow the history of the descendants.⁴⁴

After announcing that He will bring the Flood upon the earth and destroy all flesh from under heaven (Gen 6:17), God avowed that He would establish a covenant with Noah and his family (Gen 6:18). This is the first occurrence of the important theological word “covenant” (*berit*) in the Bible. (This covenant, which is spelled out in Genesis 9:9-17 after the Flood, is founded on grace, just like the Mosaic covenant [Exod 19:4, 5] and the New covenant [Matt 26:28].⁴⁵) God instructed Noah to bring male and female pairs of every living creature into the ark so as preserve each species (Gen 6:19-20). The precise enumeration of the species of animals clearly evokes the order of animals in Genesis 1. Details of this process are not provided but we must assume that God controlled this operation by stimulating the animals to preserve their lives and their species. This section closes with the announcement that Noah exercised complete obedience to God’s demands (Gen 6:22).

The Lord Destroys the Wicked by the Flood but Preserves Noah and His Family (7:1-24)

The Lord Preserves Noah from Judgment (Gen 7:1-9)

The beginning of this new section is marked by the phrase, “Then the LORD said to Noah” (Gen 7:1). In Genesis 7:2 further information is provided about the

animals to be taken into the ark. The single pairs were unclean (Gen 6:19-20), but here Noah is commanded to take seven pairs of clean animals. This difference is attributed to the fact that it was the clean animals only that would be a food source for the humans on the ark. Thus there is an assumption that the distinctions between clean and unclean animals were understood before they were delineated later in the Mosaic law (Leviticus 11; Deuteronomy 14).⁴⁶

The reason for taking these animals into the ark is explicitly stated in Genesis 7:4: God was to send rain on the earth for forty days and nights to blot out every living thing on the earth.⁴⁷ The rest of this section continues the theme of Noah's obedience to the Lord's command to take the animals into the ark (Gen 7:5, 9).

The Lord's Judgment Destroys the Wicked (7:10-24)

In the second month of the six hundredth year of Noah's life the fountains of the great deep and the floodgates of the sky burst open (7:10-11). The description of the great upheaval of the flood is clearly reminiscent of Genesis 1 where the waters above and below the firmament were separated. Now they are merged again, as if to reverse the work of creation and place the earth back into its original chaotic state (Gen 1:2).⁴⁸

After the Flood Recedes Noah Left the Ark and Offered a Sacrifice to God (8:1-22)

God Restores His Creation after Judgment (8:1-19)

"God remembered"⁴⁹ Noah and the animals in the ark and sent a "wind" (*ruah*) to pass over the earth (8:1). As God begins to fashion the earth after the del-

uge there is a clear terminological connection with the Creation account where God's wind or spirit (*ruah*) was at work over a submerged earth (Gen 1:2).⁵⁰ The conditions God brought forth in Genesis 7:11 were abruptly terminated as the fountains and floodgates were closed and the rains came to an end (8:2). The waters of the Flood thus steadily receded until the seventeenth day of the seventh month when the ark came to rest on Mount Ararat (8:4). By the first day of the tenth month the tops of the mountains became visible (8:5). To investigate the extent to which the water had receded, Noah sent out a raven from the ark, which made repeated forays (8:7) as it apparently fed upon vegetation and carrion that it might have obtained from floating carcasses.⁵¹ Next Noah sent out a dove, but it soon returned. After another seven days he sent the dove from the ark again, but this time the bird returned with a freshly picked olive leaf. The olive tree, which does not grow in great altitudes, indicated that the waters had sufficiently abated (8:11). When the dove was sent out again seven days later, it did not return (8:12), indicating that it found suitable living conditions.

When the land itself was sufficiently dry, God commanded Noah to leave the ark with his sons and their wives, along with the living creatures (8:13-17). In a clear allusion to the creation account (Gen 1:22), the animals are let out "so they can multiply on the earth and be fruitful and increase in number upon it" (Gen 1:17). This allusion, combined with the image of Noah's family emerging from the ark, indicate that God's plan and program are about to commence.

The Restored Remnant Acknowledges Their Gratitude by Sacrifice (8:20-22)

Noah's immediate response to his deliverance from destruction was to build an altar to the LORD. Thus man's first act in response to divine deliverance was one of worship (see Gen 2:1-3). On this altar Noah offered a burnt offering sacrifice to the LORD. The burnt offering (root *'olah*), which literally means "that which ascends," was a sacrifice that not only was a means of expiation but was also particularly distinguished as a dedicatory sacrifice to the LORD. Noah offered a burnt offering in gratitude for the Lord's work on his behalf. God was pleased with this offering: "God smelled the soothing aroma."⁵² The latter technical formula was often used in cultic texts (Exod 29:18, 25, 41; Lev 26:31) to indicate God's approval of the sacrifice. In expressing satisfaction with Noah's offering God vowed never to curse the ground again on account of man,⁵³ even though "the intent of man's heart is evil from his youth" (8:21). This latter statement is virtually identical to the description of human depravity in 6:5, which justified the coming of the judgment in the Flood. Here, after the Flood, the statement functions like a divine observation of the nature of the human predicament. The Flood has not improved man. Though the motivation for the Flood still remains, God will never again take the same course of action. In spite of human depravity, God commits Himself to His world.⁵⁴ This is an indication of the graciousness of God who kindly tolerates sinful humanity.⁵⁵

In his forbearance, the Lord pledges a regular flow in the course of nature (Gen 8:22). The order of nature is indicated by

four series of environmental and temporal contrasts. The rhythm of life reflected in these ordered processes indicates that a flood will never again disrupt this consistency.⁵⁶ There will certainly be natural catastrophes after the Flood, but these will be on a local, not universal, level. The aftermath of the Flood is thus an affirmation of Creation and speaks ultimately not of divine punishment but of God's faithfulness to preserve his creation.⁵⁷

God's Covenant with the New World (9:1-17)

Life Is to be Produced and Preserved on Earth (9:1-7)

With God's relationship with mankind reestablished after the Flood, God now calls on Noah to be fruitful and multiply (Gen 9:1, 7), just as He commanded Adam (Gen 1:28). Mankind is in effect to start anew. Man's dominion over the animal kingdom (Gen 1:28) is reestablished and the animal world will now fear the presence of man (Gen 9:2). The meat or flesh of animals is permitted for food as long as the blood has been drained (Gen 9:3-4; cf. Lev 17:11, 14; Deut 12:23). This is the first important, biblical statement made about the theological significance of the term blood. Delitzsch summarized the reason for the dietary restriction on blood:

Blood and life are one, inasmuch as they are in one another in a relation of intercausation; the blood is not the same as the life, but it is before all other constituents of the animal corporeality the manifestation, material and vehicle of that life, which pervades, fashions and continuously regenerates the corporeality. This relation of the life to the blood, a far more direct one than to the flesh (for the blood is the medium of life to the latter), is indicated by the juxtaposition of *nfshv* and *dmv*, which at the same time suggests the reason for

this prohibition of the blood, viz. a sacred reverence for that principle of life flowing in the blood, which even as that of the animal is derived from God, who bestows a participation in His all-animating life. . . . This prohibition of blood is repeated seven times in the Mosaic legislation besides Lev 19:6; 3:17; 7:25-27; 17:10-14; Deut 12:16, 23, 24; 15:23, and gives as a further reason, Lev 17:11, that the blood is an atonement, *bannefesh*, by reason of the life that is in it.⁵⁸

While it is permissible to shed the blood of animals for food, man should not become calloused so as to think he could also shed the blood of a human being (Gen 9:6). The significance of human life needed to be stressed at this juncture since all but eight members of the world's population had just lost their lives. Moreover, the explicit sin that necessitated the Flood was violence. Capital punishment for murder limits man's violent acts. Those who take a life made in God's image commit such an atrocity that they forfeit their privilege to live. Furthermore, human beings are responsible for carrying out the sentence of capital punishment (Gen 9:6b).⁵⁹ This responsibility certainly led to the establishment of courts and other legal means to carry out justice and punishments not only in ancient Israel but also in other cultures under the influence of biblical revelation.

God Promises to Preserve Creation (9:8-17)

This section is divided into two subsections—9:8-11 and 9:12-17—by the occurrence of two divine proclamations “God spoke to Noah” (Gen 9:8), “And God said” (Gen 9:12). The key term, is the term *berit*, “covenant,” which occurs seven times, resuming the promise made before the Flood in Gen 6:18. The promise is that

God would never again destroy the earth by a flood. As the Flood affected both man and the animal world, this pledge is established with both man and beast (Gen 9:9-11).

The sign of this covenant is the rainbow (Gen 9:12-13), which is mentioned elsewhere in Scripture in connection with the glory of God (Ezek 1:28; Rev 4:3; 10:1). The rainbow serves as a sign for God to remember His promise not to judge the earth with a worldwide flood ever again (Gen 9:14-17). As the term for rainbow (*qeshet*) was most frequently used for the bow in warfare, the appearance of this sign may be a token to indicate that God will no longer make man the target of His anger as He did in the Flood.⁶⁰

Conclusion

The Flood: The Undoing of Creation

The profound significance of the Flood may be indicated from the fact that there are numerous allusions to the Creation account in the Flood narrative. Various elements in the account of the Flood echo terms and concepts from the Creation narrative. The two primary verbs used in the Creation account (*'asah* and *bara'*; Gen 1:26-27) are employed in the announcement of the decision to wipe out the human race, but in reverse order (Gen 6:7). This may be an early hint in the narrative that what is taking place in the Flood is a reversal of the process of Creation, or Creation's undoing. Whereas Creation in Genesis 1 was largely a matter of separation and distinction, the Flood reversed this order. Based on similar observations, Kruger well stated: “The flood replays the creation account in reverse.”⁶¹

The reference to the animals that were to be taken into the ark (Gen 6:20; 7:14)

are clear allusions to the organizational categories that had been delineated in the Creation week (Gen 1:21, 24-25). The destruction caused by the waters of the Flood followed the same sequence of the Creation: the water first covers the earth and its high mountains, then birds, cattle, beasts, all swarming creatures and finally man (Gen 7:13-22).⁶² The provision of food Noah was to take in the ark (Gen 6:21) depends on the earlier reference on what God had provided for man to eat (Gen 1:29-30).

For several reasons Noah should be considered a second Adam. First of all, he was apparently the first man born after the death of Adam (5:28-29), an indication that he will be the second father of humanity. Like Adam, Noah had three sons, one of whom rebelled against the law of God. Additional connections to the Creation account include the role of the wind in Genesis 8:1 in sweeping back the flood waters as in Genesis 1:2, the rhythm of life established in Genesis 1:14 being resumed in Genesis 8:22, the blessing of Genesis 9:7 which repeats Genesis 1:28, and the fact that both narrative accounts are followed by a genealogical list of the Table of Nations (4:17-26; 5:1-32; 10).⁶³ Ross also noted additional associations of the Flood account to the early chapters of Genesis:

The parallels to the beginning of Genesis must not be missed in these next few units of the book. In this first unit the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven brought a flood over the whole earth (chaos), but then the waters abated and dry land appeared as the seas were once again gathered into their places (creation). In the next unit, Noah was commissioned to be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, for he now was the new man of the earth. But then in the following unit

Noah's failure was displayed in his lying naked, just as the knowledge of nakedness was evidence of the fall. In both cases curses resulted from the failures. There is thus a deliberate parallel between Adam and Noah and between Adam's world and Noah's world. With Noah there is a new beginning of God's creation, but there is also a new beginning of evil.⁶⁴

Timeless Truths from the Flood Narrative

The Human Heart Is Depraved

In the preface to the Flood account (Gen 6:5), man is described as wicked and the intent of his thoughts as continually evil. After the Flood waters have subsided (Gen 8:21), the same essential portrait of man is given. The Flood has not radically changed man's basic nature. Even Noah himself, the only righteous and blameless man prior to the Flood, became drunk and his son Ham committed the sin of looking upon his father's nakedness (Gen 9:20-27). The human race is characterized by sin (Jer 17:9; Ps 5:9; 14:3; Rom 3:10-18). Jesus himself depicted the human race as evil (Luke 11:13).

God Is Displeased with Sin and Must Judge It

We are told that when God saw the pervasive wickedness of man He was grieved in his heart that He had made man (Gen 6:6). The nature of God requires that He judge man's sin. Because God is holy He cannot wink at sin. For man, this judgment is a judgment of death, which God promised would be the outcome for violation of His commands (Gen 2:17). This judgment is fair and just based on the fact that God created man (Gen 6:7). We clearly see in this sequence of events that sin and judgment are thus inter-related. Judgment is the outcome of sin.

The verb used for “destroy” in the Flood account (*shahat*, 6:13) is the same root for the word corrupt in 6:11, indicating the intrinsic relationship between crime and punishment. “What God decided to destroy (v. 13) had been virtually self-destroyed already.”⁶⁵ The punishment is commensurate with the crime.

But in judging man, a purpose of Creation has been undone, since man, the pinnacle of Creation, was to be God’s representative and have dominion over what God had created (Gen 1:28-30). Instead, because of man’s degradation, what God had made must be destroyed. One purpose of man’s creation in the image of God was to have communion with God (Gen 2:1-3). Man’s evil heart has thwarted this purpose, and so “death in the Flood is no more than the outworking of man’s behavior.”⁶⁶

God’s act of judgment is as personal as His creation of man. God stated in the Creation, “Let us make man in our image” (Gen 1:27), but in the Flood God states “I will destroy man whom I created” (Gen 6:7); “I will destroy them with the earth” (Gen 6:13); “I Myself am bringing the floodwaters on the earth” (Gen 6:17). The personal judgment is necessary because man, who alone is made in God’s image, is the only creature that can have fellowship with God. Of all God’s creation, only man was to enjoy a unique communion with the Creator. This makes man’s sin, which breached God’s law and fractured the personal relationship man had with God, all the more deplorable.

Sin and judgment as well, as the recognition of Noah’s righteousness, are based on the existence of an accepted, universally binding morality. This conventional morality is acknowledged in the Genesis narratives before Israel received

the Law from God on Mount Sinai. This assumption of an assumed moral code is necessary to condemn such actions as murder (Cain, Lamech) and homosexuality (Sodom and Gomorrah) as evil. That a moral law is binding on all humanity is confirmed in the eschatological judgment of the earth in Isaiah 24:5. In the New Testament we find the same teaching in Paul’s recognition of the universal, innate consciousness of sin (Rom 2:14).

In the subsequent revelation of Scripture, the themes of sin and judgment are addressed in terminology associated with the Flood. The Pentateuch uses the terminology of washing with water as a symbol for purging of sins (Lev 8:6, 21). The New Testament picks up the same connection (Titus 3:5). Peter makes a comparison between the flood of water and the end of the world (2 Pet 3:6-7). Conditions preceding the Flood serve as a type and warning of the events at the end of time (Matt 24:36-42; Luke 17:26-27).

At the outset of biblical revelation we have this word about God’s deadly anger over sin. This must be in the back of every reader’s mind as he studies subsequent revelation. God is angry with sin and must judge it. As Mark Twain reportedly said, “It is not the difficult things in the Bible that bother men. It is the things I do understand that keep me up at night.” Certainly what principally disrupts the sleep and rest of all sinners is that we are ultimately accountable to God in judgment (Heb 9:27). The doctrine of judgment for sin is one that cannot be avoided.

God Is a God of Mercy and Grace

It is not by mistake that the first occurrence of the word “grace” in the Bible should come in the narrative of the

Flood—the greatest display of judgment the world has ever witnessed—as grace can only be understood in the context of man’s depravity and God’s righteous anger. The tumultuous judgment of the Flood stands at the beginning of the Bible to provide the necessary setting for God to demonstrate His grace. Noah, to be sure, is undeserving, but he finds favor with God. Every subsequent mention of grace in the succeeding pages of Scripture must be understood against this backdrop of man’s just condemnation.

In the Flood account we also find the first occurrence of the word, “remember” (*zkr*). God remembering Noah is also an aspect of God’s grace. According to C. Westermann, to remember is to apply mercy toward the one threatened with death.⁶⁷ Grace demonstrated by the Flood is found in the New Testament, which sees the Flood as a type of baptism (1 Pet 3:18-22). Both the Flood and water baptism symbolize a way through death into life.

By saving only a remnant of people God was saving man from himself. Clearly, the Flood portrays mankind on the brink of destruction and extinction. God’s concern for man is shown after the Flood as He affixes the most severe penalty to those who commit murder (Gen 9:6). The ordained establishment of capital punishment for murder conveys the high value the Bible places upon human life. This is essential in view of the savage atrocities already committed by Cain and Lamech before the Flood (Genesis 4). The post-flood legislation is meant to limit human violence.

Those Who Receive God’s Grace Should Live Godly Lives

It is only after Noah received God’s grace that we hear of his godly character

(Gen 6:8-9). Righteousness and blamelessness pertain to two distinct aspects of a life with which God is pleased. These qualities were demonstrated by Noah in his obedience (Gen 6:22; 7:5, 9, 16; 8:15-19, 20). In this text righteousness refers to societal faithfulness and loyalty in personal relationships while blamelessness normally refers to ritual purity. Noah found favor with God and man (see 1 Sam 2:26; Luke 2:52). He loved God with his whole being and his neighbor as himself (Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18; Matt 22:34-40).⁶⁸ He is distinct from those of his generation, who are corrupt and violent. He alone stood against the values and morality of his culture. It was disobedience to God’s command that brought on the tumult of the Flood, and it is obedience to God that enabled mankind to survive. Thus obedience to God affects our own lives, our families, the creatures of the world, and the entire earth. Noah had to obey God to avoid the judgment. Every event that determines the course of human history is set in motion by God’s command and man’s obedience.⁶⁹

Because Noah found favor in the eyes of the Lord, God spared him, his family, and many animals from the judgment of the Flood (Heb 11:7; 1 Pet 3:20). Noah’s finding favor at the outset of the narrative (Gen 6:8) is no doubt significant as the qualities Noah then demonstrates flow from this initial electing grace. The Apostle Paul makes the identical point in Ephesians 2:1-10. We are saved by faith alone, but faith that saves is not alone; it is verified by good works.

Extended grace and favor leads to fellowship with God. Seven times in the narrative the statement is made that God spoke to Noah (Gen 6:18; 7:1; 8:15; 9:1, 8, 12, 17). Grace was the foundation of

Noah's life as it is the foundation of every believer's life today. "It was grace alone that gave Noah his spiritual position before God. He was saved by grace alone."⁷⁰ Those who receive this grace like Noah should walk in righteousness, that is, in obedience. Noah did all that God commanded him (6:22; 7:5, 9). Believers are to do the same today (John 14:15; 1 John 2:3).

The choice of Noah and the instruction he received stem solely from God's grace. Later in Israel's history the Law was given to the nation also in the context of grace, coming immediately after the formative saving event of the Old Testament, the Exodus from Egypt. Grace, and only grace, can provide a way of escape. As in the giving of the Law to the nation of Israel, the commands given to Noah should be seen in this context of grace. Indeed, these commands were given for Noah's survival: "Make for yourself an ark"(Gen 6:14); "Take for yourself all the food that is eaten" (Gen 6:21); "Come into the ark" (Gen 7:1); and "Go out of the ark" (Gen 8:16). The commands are not heavy burdens for those who receive grace, the commands are for their good. In obeying God's ordinances and commands man can then experience abundant life (Deut 32:47; John 10:10). As Jesus said, "My yoke is easy and My burden is light" (Matt 11:30).

The People with Whom God Is Pleased May Be Few

Noah had separated himself from the wicked and was separated from sinners in judgment (Psalm 1). The solitary obedience and survival of Noah address the biblical theme of a faithful remnant that occurs throughout the Scripture. We find the remnant theme in the time of Elijah

(1 Kgs 18:22; 19:14) and particularly in the writing prophets Amos and Isaiah.⁷¹ Throughout Israel's history, a select number have identified themselves with the people of God. The New Testament continues this theme in that only a remnant of the Jewish nation responds with belief upon the arrival of their Messiah (Rom 9:6). Only a remnant of the nation of Israel belongs to God. This theme is also reflected in Jesus' statement that those who find life will be few (Matt 7:14). In church history men like Athanasius, Luther, and Knox felt that they were alone in their faithfulness to God and His Word. The biblical Flood is the earliest reference to the remnant theme in the Bible.

God Is Sovereign over Creation and Has Control of the Forces of Nature

Perhaps no other narrative in Scripture, outside the Creation event itself, illustrates this truth more forcibly. As with no other event in world history, the earth stood at the brink of annihilation, sovereignly determined by God in response to human wickedness. Yet, there was never a time when conditions were outside of God's control. He not only brought on the deluge, but also preserved Noah's rudderless ship amid the annihilation.

God shut the ark's door on the very same day the Flood began (Gen 7:13-16). He is not only sovereign over matter but over time as well. The Flood illustrates God's complete control of nature and all the circumstances of life. He preserves and sustains His Creation (Gen 8:21-22; Matt 5:45); the wind and the sea still obey Him (Mark 4:41). God knows how to deliver the godly out of temptation and reserve the unjust for punishment at the day of judgment (2 Pet 2:9).

ENDNOTES

- ¹J. Lewis, "Flood," *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 2:798. For a helpful geographical layout of the various traditions, see J. Boice, *Genesis: An Expositional Commentary Volume 1, Genesis 1:1-11:32* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982) 285-287.
- ²In other Mesopotamian accounts he is called Ziusudra or Atrahasis.
- ³See S. E. Loewenstamm, "mabbul," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 4:601-602 [In Heb.], and N. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis: The Heritage of Biblical Israel* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966) 43-47.
- ⁴G. von Rad, *Genesis*, rev. ed., Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972) 123. See also N. Sarna, *Genesis*, JPS Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989) 48.
- ⁵Lewis, 799.
- ⁶J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, 2nd ed., International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910) 178.
- ⁷One Mesopotamian tradition relates the cause of the flood to the noise of the people.
- ⁸See L. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Noah and its Parallels in Philo, Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities, and Rabbinic Midrashim," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 55 (1988) 31-57, and L. Ginzburg, *The Legends of the Jews: Notes to Volumes I and II From the Creation to the Exodus* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1968) 5:186, n. 48.
- ⁹Tim Friend, "Evidence Possibly Tied to the Biblical Flood Found in Sea," *USA Today*, 13 September 2000, 4A.
- ¹⁰J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1878; reprint, New York: World, 1957).
- ¹¹For a recent analysis of the source critics' approach including a discussion of the analysis of the flood, see M. Rooker, *Leviticus*, New American Commentary 3B (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000) 23-39.
- ¹²H. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1942) 1:281.
- ¹³B. Anderson, "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1-11," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978) 38. Similarly, a more detailed chiastic arrangement may be found in G. Wenham, "The Coherence of the Biblical Flood," *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978) 336-348.
- ¹⁴See H. Vos, "Flood (Genesis)," *ISBE* 2:317-318; J. Davis, *Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis* (Salem, WI: Sheffield Publishing Company, 1998) 126; and H. Morris, *The Genesis Record* (Grand Rapids: Baker/San Diego: Creation-Life, 1976) 182.
- ¹⁵The etymology seems to be a word-play on the similarly sounding roots *nhm*, meaning "comfort," and *nh* (Noah), meaning "rest."
- ¹⁶The wording of Gen 6:2 recalls the account of the Fall in Gen 3:6 where Eve saw that the tree was good, and took and ate.
- ¹⁷For an excellent layout of the major interpretations regarding the identity of "the sons of God," see J. Walton, *Chronological and Background Charts of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994) 98.
- ¹⁸This objection may be countered by the observation that Jesus refers to angels in heaven whereas the Genesis 6 passage pertains to fallen angels that may not have been hindered from marrying and having sexual relations with humans. It is of interest, however, that in Luke 20:36 angels and sons of God are distinguished by Jesus.
- ¹⁹Leupold, 1:249. Leupold is somewhat distinctive in that he holds that "the daughters of men" may have been of either line, and thus refer to women who lack spiritual qualities (1:252).
- ²⁰See J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses*, trans. J. King (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979) 1:237-239.
- ²¹F. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space & Time* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1972) 127.
- ²²Jude 6, 7 is concerned with fornication, whereas Gen 6:1-4 specifically deals with marriage (see Davis, 111-112).
- ²³Schaeffer, 132.
- ²⁴See especially Feldman, 37, and Ginzburg, 5:173, n. 17.
- ²⁵It is not an accident that the declaration that all God made was good occurs seven times. For an exhaustive treatment of the use of symbolic numbers in the Book of Genesis, particularly in the Creation and Flood accounts, see U. Cassuto, "biqqoret," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 2:318-335 [In Heb.].
- ²⁶Skinner, 150.
- ²⁷Frequently we find in Scripture the expression "God was sorry" or "God repented" (Exod 32:14; 1 Sam 15:11; Jer 18:7-8; 26:3, 13, 19; Jonah 3:10). The meaning of the phrase is qualified here by the expression "He was grieved in His heart."

²⁸The three roots of the three verbs in Gen 6:6 *nhm* (sorrow), *'sh* (made), and *'sb* (grieved) are the same verbal roots employed in Gen 5:29 in introducing Noah, suggesting that it is Noah who has been chosen to bring some remedy to this intolerable situation. Moreover, the root *'sb* occurs twice in the discourse on the curse (Gen 3:14-19) to describe the new condition of man and woman brought about by the Fall (Gen 3:16, 17). The term thus links terminologically with the Creation account and the experience of the first man and woman, suggesting that in some way Noah's purpose is to remedy the effects of the Fall.

²⁹Von Rad, 117.

³⁰Sarna, *Genesis*, 47.

³¹The words for grace or favor (*hn*) and Noah (*nh*) form an anagram in Hebrew (one term is the reverse spelling of the other).

³²The use of the root demonstrates the idea of "without reason," "without cause," or "unmerited favor" (see 1 Sam 19:15; 25:31; Job 1:9; 2:3; 9:17; 22:6).

³³U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, 2 vols., trans. I. Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1984) 2:30-31.

³⁴Skinner, 149.

³⁵By the placing of the phrase "with God" first in the final phrase (Gen 6:9) the author underscores that the source of Noah's righteous and blameless living is his relationship with God.

³⁶It is worth noting that in Ps 15:2 the quality of being blameless, often translated as "integrity," is placed in the foremost position of those

qualities necessary to maintain fellowship with God.

³⁷Significantly, Enoch was the seventh in line from Adam, while Noah was the tenth. These indicate significant places in the genealogy just as Boaz and David occupy the seventh and tenth positions in the genealogy of Perez (Ruth 4:18-20).

³⁸See J. Sailhamer, "Genesis," in *The Expositors Bible Commentary*, ed. F. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990) 2:81.

³⁹See Skinner, 159.

⁴⁰See Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, 2:52-53, and Sarna, *Genesis*, 51.

⁴¹It is probable that the animals are to be included in the phrase "all flesh." Man's sins have affected animals and the earth (Hos 4:2-3; Isa 1:2-7; Jer 23:10; Rom 8:19-22). Sin often leaves in its wake a host of innocent victims.

⁴²Sailhamer, 80.

⁴³See Skinner, 161, and Sailhamer, 83-84.

⁴⁴Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, 2:59.

⁴⁵D. Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (London: Tyndale/Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1967) 89.

⁴⁶The same point could be made also from Genesis 15 were it is only clean animals that are sacrificed in the covenant making ceremony.

⁴⁷The number forty is a symbolic number in the Bible often associated with a trial and purging from evil (Num 14:33; Exod 24:18; 1 Kgs 19:8; Jonah 3:4; Matt 4:2; Acts 1:3).

⁴⁸This reversal of Creation is also sup-

ported from the use of the term *ṯhom* to describe the waters (Gen 1:2; 7:11). For a defense that God's original creation is described in Gen 1:2, see M. Rooker, "Genesis 1:1-3: Creation or Re-Creation?" Part 1, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (July-September 1992) 316-323, and *ibid.*, Part 2, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (October-December 1992) 411-427.

⁴⁹In the Bible remembering, especially when God is the subject, is not a recollection of thought but a focusing on the object of the memory and faithful intervention on behalf of the object (Gen 9:15; 19:29; 30:22; Exod 2:24; 6:5; Luke 1:54, 55).

⁵⁰Sailhamer notes a parallel to the Exodus as well in the wording of the Genesis 8. Just as God remembered his covenant (Exod 2:24) and sent a strong wind to dry up the Red Sea to allow dry land to appear (Exod 14:21-22), so also in the Flood God remembered Noah, sent a wind so the people may eventually come out of the ark on dry ground (p. 89).

⁵¹Sarna, *Genesis*, 57.

⁵²Hebrew *nihoh*, "soothing aroma," sounds much like *noah*, "Noah." For discussion of the significance of the burnt offering, see Rooker, *Leviticus*, 84-93.

⁵³The occurrence of the terms *'adam* (man) and *'adamah* (ground) recall the original creation in Genesis 1-2.

⁵⁴D. J. Clines, "Noah's Flood: The Theology of the Flood Narrative," *Faith and Thought* 100 (1972-73) 140.

⁵⁵Alternatively, Kidner argues that the resolution not to destroy man again is based on Noah's sacrifice, which typifies the sacrifice made once for all by Jesus Christ (Rom 3:25, 26)

(p. 93).

⁵⁶Skinner, 158.

⁵⁷Clines, 140.

⁵⁸F. Delitzsch, *A New Commentary on Genesis*, 2 vols. (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, 1978) 1:284-285.

⁵⁹Poetic justice is established in the putting to death of one who takes another human life. The first three Hebrew words of Gen 9:6 describe the crime and are placed in reverse order in the announcement of the sentence (see Sarna, *Genesis*, 61).

⁶⁰See Von Rad, 134.

⁶¹H. A. J. Kruger, "Creation-Uncreation Reflection of Reversal Motifs in Genesis 9:18-24 (25-29)," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999) 129.

⁶²For a discussion of other biblical texts that allude to the Creation pattern, see M. Fishbane, "Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern," *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971) 151-167.

⁶³Sarna, *Genesis*, 49-50.

⁶⁴A. Ross, *Creation and Blessing* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1988) 189.

⁶⁵Clines, 134-135.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, 137.

⁶⁷C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Continental Commentary*, trans. J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994) 441.

⁶⁸The Ten Commandments also exhibit this twofold division (see Rooker, *Leviticus*, 65-77).

⁶⁹Westermann, 424.

⁷⁰W. H. Thomas, *Genesis: A Devotional Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946) 72-73.

⁷¹G. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972).

