

## ARTIGOS

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CREATION AND REDEMPTION IN OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLARLY DEBATE

**Reinaldo W. Siqueira, Ph.D.**

Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Theology  
Centro Universitário Adventista de São Paulo, Campus Engenheiro Coelho  
reinaldo.siqueira@unasp.edu.br

**ABSTRACT:** The relationship between Creation and Redemption in the Bible has been a controversial issue in the theological debate. Divergent views have been proposed on this issue such as: Creation as subordinated to Redemption (von Rad); as related but in polarity with it (Westermann); as an independent tradition (Crüsemann and Lindeskog); or as the "broad horizon" upon which Redemption was built (Schmid and Anderson). These views were usually built upon the interplay of the concepts such as the Documentary Sources hypothesis, the development of the traditions in Ancient Israel as presented by Form and Tradition Criticism, and the belief in Israel's dependence on the other Ancient Near East religions. The idea of Creation as mythological, and therefore unhistorical, plays an important role in the modern views on the subject. However, the very basis upon which much of these theological approaches are built is highly conjectural and difficult to prove. The concept that Creation as mythological is totally foreign to the Bible. Henceforth, this paper questions if any of these views is really satisfactory to understand the relationship between Creation and Redemption in the Old Testament. The analysis of the biblical text evidences that Creation in the Old Testament was always seen as a fully historical event. For the Bible, Creation stands in the line of the history in its extreme points (beginning and end [New Creation]). In order to do justice to the biblical material, Creation and Redemption, together with the Fall, must to be seen in their historical and related dimensions.

**KEYWORDS:** Creation, Redemption, Biblical Theology, Old Testament, History.

**RESUMO:** O relacionamento entre os temas da Criação e Redenção na Bíblia tem sido uma questão controversa no meio teológico. Pontos de vista divergentes têm marcado a questão como: o tema da Criação está subordinado ao da Redenção (von Rad); estão relacionados em termos de polaridade (Westermann); são tradições independentes (Crüsemann e Lindeskog); ou o tema da Criação é a "base geral" sobre a qual foi estabelecido o tema da Redenção (Schmid e Anderson). Estes pontos de vista geralmente se fundamentam em uma visão baseada no inter-relacionamento de conceitos tais como a Hipótese Documentária, o desenvolvimento das tradições no Antigo Israel tal como descrito pelas Críticas da Forma e da Tradição, e a crença na existência de uma dependência direta por parte de Israel em relação às outras religiões do Antigo Oriente Médio. A visão do tema da Criação como mitológico, e, portanto, não-histórico, tem também um papel importante nos conceitos modernos sobre a questão. No entanto, a própria base sobre a qual essas interpretações teológicas do problema foram construídas é altamente especulativa e difícil de ser provada. A idéia de que o tema da Criação seja um mito é totalmente contrária à visão bíblica sobre o assunto. Portanto, esse estudo questiona se essas interpretações teológicas do tema realmente provêm uma compreensão satisfatória do relacionamento entre os temas da Criação e da Redenção no Antigo Testamento. A análise do texto bíblico evidencia a crença vetero-testamentária na Criação como um evento plenamente histórico. Para a Bíblia, a Criação pertence à linha da história e se localiza nas extremidades dessa linha (início e fim [Nova Criação]). Para se fazer justiça ao texto bíblico, os temas da Criação e da Redenção, juntamente com o tema da Queda, devem ser considerados como dimensões inter-relacionadas dentro de uma mesma realidade histórica.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Criação, Redenção, teologia bíblica, Antigo Testamento, história.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

The question of the relationship between Creation and Redemption has raised some deep debates in the milieu of Old Testament scholarship. Many have questioned if Yahweh was seen originally as a Creator God or not by the people of Israel?<sup>1</sup>

Gerhard von Rad<sup>2</sup> in 1936 argued that originally the faith of Israel was restricted to Yahweh's historical acts of liberation, and Creation in a cosmic sense was peripheral if not absent altogether from the early Israelite faith. Since von Rad a passionate debate on this issue has inflated the theological discussions on Creation.

It is the purpose of this study to evaluate the theological debate on the issue, and to propose an essay of an answer to the question on the relationship between Creation and Redemption.

This study follows the delineation of the debate as presented by Reventlow in his book *Problems of Old Testament Theology in the Twentieth Century*.<sup>3</sup> In a first step, it will present the main positions on the question, starting with von Rad in 1936. In the second moment, it will analyze critically what seems to be the main basis of the views proposed by Old Testament theologians. Finally, it will present a proposal of an answer to the question in focus.

## 2. MAIN VIEWS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CREATION AND REDEMPTION

### 2.1. Creation as a Doctrine Subordinated to Soteriological Considerations

Gerhard von Rad in his article "The Theological Problem of the Old Testament Doctrine of Creation" in 1936<sup>4</sup> launched the thesis that the doctrine of Creation was subordinated in the OT to soteriological considerations. For von Rad, "the Yahwist faith of the Old Testament is a faith based on the notion of election and therefore primarily concerned with Redemption"<sup>5</sup>. In his view such a statement needs "no justification here."<sup>6</sup> He then raised questions concerning the relationship between the belief in Yahweh as a Creator and the belief in Election and Redemption. He also questioned if Creation was a motive for faith in the Prophets and Psalms, and if the doctrine of Redemption presupposed a doctrine of Creation as its indispensable theological basis.<sup>7</sup>

Looking for answers to the questions he raised, von Rad observed first all that in their struggle against the Canaanite Baal religion and its connection with Nature, Hosea and Deuteronomy did not argue that Nature and all its forces were a Creation of Yahweh. They rather objected the Canaanite aberration with terms from Israel Redemption history. Yahweh was pointed out as the One who promised and granted the land to Israel, as the Giver of the blessing of a settled life.<sup>8</sup> After dealing with the question in Hosea and Deuteronomy, von Rad focused on the Psalms. He remarked that in Ps 136 while vs. 5-9 deal with the Creation of the world, in vs. 10 the Psalmist makes an abrupt change to the mighty deeds of Yahweh in history. The same phenomenon happens in Pss 33 and 148. In these psalms the doctrine of Creation and that of Redemption stand side by side, wholly unrelated one to the other as the rigid form as the litany shows. However, these hymns press beyond Creation into the theme of the saving acts of God. The statements about the saving acts of God can be taken as the climax of these psalms.<sup>9</sup>

Going further, von Rad analyzed the doctrine of Creation in relation to Deutero-Isaiah, who is usually quoted by some scholars with the purpose of providing a foundation for such a faith.<sup>10</sup> For von Rad, however, Deutero-Isaiah is little concerned with the doctrine of Creation for its own sake. This can be seen in the fact that in the passages that deal with Creation, the prophet quickly passes over a particular act of God in Creation and goes at once to speak about the manifestations of God's power in history. The doctrine of Creation performs therefore only an ancillary function by providing a foundation for the message of Redemption.<sup>11</sup> Deutero-Isaiah, however, goes beyond such ancillary function and juxtapose Creation of the world and the Redemption of Israel as if they belonged to the same divine dispensation.<sup>12</sup> For the prophet both result from the one and same divine purpose of Redemption.<sup>13</sup> In his analysis of Isa 51:9-10, von Rad observed what seems to be an incredible transposition: The prophet starts speaking about the Creation of the world by Yahweh, then he brings it in direct contact with the deliverance that took place at the Red Sea. For von Rad, in Deutero-Isaiah, Creation belongs to the same category of that of the Red Sea's event. Both acts are in fact one and the same act of



the universal redemptive purpose of God.<sup>14</sup> This kind of relationship between the doctrine of Creation and the doctrine of Redemption can also be found in Pss 74 and 89.

Hence, von Rad concluded that one cannot find in the Yahwistic faith a doctrine of Creation that stands in its own, as the main theme of a passage in its own right. Rather, it is all together swallowed up in the doctrine of Redemption. This soteriological interpretation of the doctrine of Creation is the most primitive expression of the Yahwistic belief of Yahweh as Creator of the world.<sup>15</sup>

After dealing with the Yahwistic material, von Rad went on and treated the question of Creation in the Priestly's writings. He observed that in Gen 1 the Priestly view of Creation also follows the same pattern of subordination to the doctrine of Redemption observed in the Yahwistic's writings. Gen 1 is a great dogmatic treatise which moves in an ever-narrowing circles. The writer stands in the innermost circle (the Creation of man) representing the redemptive relationship between Yahweh and Israel. The different circles are guarantees of the Redemption of the people of God. So here also, the doctrine of Creation is not considered for its own sake, or as having a value in itself; but, on the contrary, it is motivated by considerations of the divine purpose of Redemption.<sup>16</sup>

von Rad covered also Pss 8, 19 and 104 which are for many as a proof of a Yahwistic belief in Creation as an independent doctrine. He observed, however, that the thought in these psalms is quite foreign to the Yahwistic belief. They show a deep similarity with Wisdom Literature, especially with the Egyptian wisdom (*Wisdom of Amenemope and the Hymn of Amun*). The Yahwist seems to have appropriated some thoughts from Egyptian wisdom, they do not therefore represent an authentic Yahwistic point of view on the subject. von Rad concludes that to quote these psalms as proof of an independent doctrine of Creation only betray the lack of profound knowledge of OT religion in those who quote them.<sup>17</sup>

von Rad formulated his main thesis as following:

Our main thesis was that in genuinely Yahwistic belief the doctrine of Creation never attained to the stature of a relevant, independent doctrine. We found it invariably related, and indeed subordinated, to soteriological considerations. This is not to say, however, that it is necessarily of later origin. Evidently a doctrine of creation was known in Canaan in extremely early times, and played a large part in the cultus in the pre-Israelite period through mythical representations of the struggle against primeval chaos. Yahwistic faith early absorbed these elements, but because of the exclusive commitment of Israel's faith to historical salvation, the doctrine of Creation was never able to attain to independent existence in its own right. Either it remained a cosmic foil against which soteriological pronouncements stood out the more effectively, or it was wholly incorporated into the complex of soteriological thought.<sup>18</sup>

Later in an article in 1938,<sup>19</sup> von Rad stated that the Yahwist placed the pre-patriarchal history before the beginning of the redemptive history (Gen 12:1-3) with the goal of providing an "*aetiology of all Israelite aetiology*" [italic his]. The purpose of the Redemption God would bring about in Israel was that of providing a bridge to the gulf between God and the entire human race.<sup>20</sup> Here again, Creation stands in subordination to soteriological considerations.

von Rad further expressed his views in his OT theology and in his commentary to the book of Genesis.<sup>21</sup> His view was accepted by many theologians both in the biblical and systematic fields, as, for example, Karl Barth, Edmond Jacob, Robert Martin-Achard, Jürgen Moltmann, Carroll Stuhlmueller, Walter Zimmerli and others.<sup>22</sup>

## 2.2. Creation as Related to but in Polarity with Redemption

Claus Westermann's views in the relationship between Creation and Redemption<sup>23</sup> pointed to new directions on the subject. He first made a distinction between God's act of blessing and His redemptive work. While God's redemptive action is related to history and the mode of existence of a people, the act of blessing is unhistorical and has an universal scope.<sup>24</sup> Blessing is different of saving in so far as it is not experienced in individual events or in a sequence of events as the latter is. It is the quiet, continuous, unnoticed work of God manifested in the ceaseless routine of day and night, of the seasons, of the physical maintenance and health, in the food and clothing, in social and economic stability, in the matters of the flow of daily life. Blessing is the continuous action of God, while saving is the action that



occurs once.<sup>25</sup> The act of blessing is however deeply related to the act of saving. The God who saves is the God who blesses, and blessing is necessary to salvation in so far that it allows the individual to relate his whole life to God.<sup>26</sup>

In the Bible, both activities are deeply related one to another. Such relationship can be seen in the way the Pentateuch was structured: The history of salvation from Exodus to Numbers is framed by two contexts in which God's blessing is dominant — the blessing of the Creator in Gen 1-11, and the blessings in the sphere of the family and in the life of the people in Gen 12-50 and Deuteronomy.<sup>27</sup>

Creation is conceived by Westermann as belonging to the context of blessing. God's activity of blessing is based in the blessing bestowed on humanity within the context of Creation. Creation provides an universal basis for the activity of the blessing of God. In Creation one encounters an element common to all humanity, an element that unites all human beings.<sup>28</sup> Because of this universal and common basis provided by the concept of Creation, it is not surprising to find out that the Creation accounts in the Bible has so many common points with other Creation accounts, and it happens not only with the ones from neighboring religions to Israel but with most religions of the world anywhere and at any time. And what renders these different accounts of Creation from different religions all around the world so related one to the other, is the basic function accomplished by a myth of the origins. A myth about the origin of the world and of man has everywhere the function of establishing and ensuring the continuity of human life and society by relating them to the primordial act of foundation.<sup>29</sup> The primary function of the myth is therefore to maintain the stability of the present state of the world. An account of Creation is not primarily an answer of the human spirit to the question of the origin of the world and man, this is of secondary importance, but rather it stems from the concern for security in face of the existing situation. The question of the existence itself takes precedence.<sup>30</sup>

The biblical accounts of Creation are therefore primarily concerned with the stability of the present life in this world. The myth of Creation belongs to the same area of that of blessing which has the same goal (stability of present life and world). Creation provides a basis for enjoying life and having confidence in the future. As a myth it is universal and unhistorical.

For Westermann, the traditions about Creation developed as independent traditions in Israel. These traditions grew and were adapted for hundred of years before the Yahwist and the Priestly writers put it in written form. J and P for sure adapted and refashioned their material, but they were also heirs of an already established tradition.<sup>31</sup> However, for Westermann, when J and P prefixed the primeval history (Gen 1-11) to the history which begins with the call of Abraham the whole primeval history was freed from the realm of myth. All the motives in Gen 1-11 were woven into a continuous whole which stretched from Adam to Abraham in a succession of generations. The primeval history was transformed and took a resemblance to the history that begins with Abraham. The primeval events were taken out of their original setting in life (mythology), they lost their immediate and direct link with the present and resumed its connection with it (the present) through the medium of history.<sup>32</sup>

In this shift from an independent mythological tradition into a historical dimension related to the history of salvation, Westermann does not see Creation as been subordinated to Redemption. He rather presents their relationship as being in polarity. One must speak of them as being side by side. The attempt is nowhere made to bring both under the same motive. There is no all-embracing notion of revelation or belief. They cannot be brought under one label. What is common to Creation and Redemption is not a notion of belief or of revelation, it is God Himself.<sup>33</sup> Both OT and NT speak of God and Jesus as a blessing/Creator God and as a Savior. The God who saves forms the center of the OT as well as the message of salvation in Christ stands as the center of the NT. But the saving acts of God cannot be told without relating it with what has gone before, and it is extended back to the very beginning of mankind.<sup>34</sup> Creation and Redemption are firmly bind together. However, one does not swallow the other.

Westermann stated:

The polarity of Creation and Redemption can be traced through the whole Bible, Old and New Testament. Their relationship to each other is extremely varied. They cannot be constrained under the one notion, but neither can they be separated from each other.<sup>35</sup>



### 2.3. Creation as an Independent Tradition with a Place for its Own

Among the scholars who defend such a position one finds Frank Crüsemann.<sup>36</sup> He sees the primeval history as an independent tradition originated in a settled, rural society of believers in Yahweh who experienced the acts of God in the living world of the land far from history. Creation's accounts as well as the other primeval accounts sprout out from naturalistic concerns. They were concerned with questions about the human condition and about the world in which man lives. Questions about the relationship between man and God, man and animals, man and the land, between man and woman, violence and sin, etc.<sup>37</sup> For Crüsemann, Gen 12:1-3 is only a secondary bridge between originally independent traditions.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, the primeval history claims a place for its own in the theological considerations.<sup>39</sup>

For Gösta Lindeskog,<sup>40</sup> the doctrine of the Creation of the world and of man came to the Israelite Religion under the influence of the Canaanite cults. Under this influence a typically Israelite El-religion came to be.<sup>41</sup> In Ancient Israel, there was a period of syncretism between this new Israelite El-religion and the older Mosaic Yahwism (Mosaic Yahwism was based in the belief of a personal, ethical and active God, with its attention turned to election of the people of Israel and to the covenant).<sup>42</sup> From this syncretism sprout out the belief in an Yahweh-El God who became a high god of the general near-Eastern type. As such, He became the Creator-God, and Creation became a theme in the religious life and cult.<sup>43</sup> This kind of conception of Creation is more of a naturalistic nature rather than historical. Creation is thought in term of a cyclical process of renewal of nature.<sup>44</sup>

Lindeskog believes that under the influence of reformist prophetism a new era began in the religious thinking of Israel. History counterbalanced nature, and the ethical and personal dimension assumed a predominant importance. The histories of Creation and of the election of the people were related to each other. *Ktisiology*<sup>45</sup> became "historized", the work of Creation became an act of election. God made a covenant with the first man, created in His image. Man's dignity and value lay in the manner he was created. Ethical thinking found its determining themes in *Ktisiology*.<sup>46</sup> The nationalistic conception of the Mosaic Yahwism was brought to a more universal view which was successively expanded later on by Deutero-Isaiah, by the Priestly writer, by the intertestamental Jewish writers, but which has only reached its full dimension in the NT.<sup>47</sup>

However, for Lindeskog, even if Yahwism took the central place in the Israelite religion, and Creation cannot be understood in isolation of it, it does not imply that Creation must be relegated to a subordinated place. Creation still a very important element in Hebrew religion, and it plays a central role in OT faith.<sup>48</sup> He illustrated the important role of Creation by asking what kind of relationship could exist between the history of the Exodus and Creation. For him there can be only two answers: In the first one, Creation would be subordinated as the background and a pattern of the central event in Israelite history; in the second one, a parallel would be drawn between both in order to emphasize the importance of the Exodus by equating it with the Creation of the world. Lindeskog personally prefers the second possibility, for only so the importance of the Creation of the chosen people can be sufficiently expressed.<sup>49</sup>

Hence, for him, the doctrine of Creation in the Bible was originated as an independent tradition which came to Israel under the influence of the Canaanite religion. It stood by its own sake and originated an syncretic Yahweh-El religion in which naturalistic concepts formed the basis. Under the reformist prophetism the old Mosaic Yahwism came to predominance and historized the concept of Creation in such way that Creation could not be dissociated from Redemption. However, in such new religious way of thinking Creation was not subordinated to Redemption. It continuous to play a central and important role in the Hebrew religion and thinking, and it stand by its own sake as a theological theme.

E. Zenger, W. H. Schmidt, R. Hillmann, F. Stolz and others follow the view of Creation as an independent tradition, with a place for its own sake in the Bible.<sup>50</sup>

### 2.4. Creation as the Large Horizon in Biblical Theology

H. H. Schmid in an article in 1973<sup>51</sup> argued against seen Creation as a peripheral theme in Biblical Theology, he rather sees it as its fundamental theme.<sup>52</sup> Schmid started his study by making some observations from the field of the history of the religions in the Ancient Near East. He noticed that there was no culture in the Ancient Near East that did not speak extensively of Creation in various literary forms and contexts. One of this form was the myth which, through its recitation in the annual ritual of the New Year's festival, was the assurance given that the new



year would begin its course anew and that there would be a revival of nature and fertility. This points to the first important element about Creation in the Ancient Near East faith: Creation was not concerned primarily with the origin of the world, but rather with the present world and the natural environment of humanity now.<sup>53</sup> The second point which Schmid argued for is that the order established through Creation and renewed every year is not only the renewal of nature but also the order of the state. The motif of the battle against the Chaos, for example, does not appear only in cosmological context but also and frequently in political. The repulsion and the destruction of the enemies, and therefore the maintenance of the political order, constitutes one of the major dimensions of this motif.<sup>54</sup> As a third point, he pointed out that the legal order also belonged to the order of Creation. The gift of the law comes in the Ancient Near East in the context of Creation. The law enacts the establishment of the order of Creation seen in its juristic aspects.<sup>55</sup>

Schmid concludes therefore that in the Ancient Near East the cosmic, the political, and the social orders find their unity in the concept of Creation. Nature, law and politics are only aspects of one comprehensive order of Creation.<sup>56</sup> It is only in such way of thinking that one can understand how the transgression of one of these three realms brings consequence upon the other two. For example, the transgression of the legal realm has effects on nature (drought, famine) and in the political (threat of enemies).<sup>57</sup>

To this way of thinking, it is also relevant the notion of "expiation". Whoever transgresses against this order inflicts on it an objective damage that must be repaired. The Hebrew term for this *shillem* ("to make intact, to restore *shalom*") already denotes such a concept. Therefore, whoever does what is right conforms to the created order and stands under blessing. Whoever acts wrongly transgresses this order, and he must then bear the consequences and stand under the curse.<sup>58</sup>

This pattern of thought can be detected for example in the preaching of the pre-exilic prophets who, according to Schmid, criticized the people in terms of what is "order" in the sphere of interpersonal relationship. Schmid sees therefore the context of Creation faith as a more broad basis for the prophetic preaching than the two other contexts (law and wisdom) which have usually been suggested by other scholars.<sup>59</sup> The same is true for Deuteronomic material, the exilic and postexilic prophets, in whom the prediction of punishment and restoration can be equated with the concept of restoration of the order in Creation faith.<sup>60</sup> In wisdom literature the concept of righteousness which play a dominant role is synonymous to the concept of the harmonious order of the world.<sup>61</sup> Even in the Yahwist and Deutero-Isaiah, which are so fundamental to von Rad's view, the concept of Creation and the order of the world play the fundamental role.<sup>62</sup>

Schmid concludes therefore that:

...the controlling background of the OT thought and faith is the view of a comprehensive world order and, hence, a Creation faith in the broad sense of the word — a Creation faith that Israel in many respects shared with her environment. It must have become clear, however, that this does not amount to putting the faith of the OT on the same level as the religions of the ancient Near East. On the contrary: in this way the unique elements of Israelite religion stand out more clearly against the ancient Near East background. To be sure, it is not as Gerhard von Rad perceived: that Israel first of all began with a more or less purely historical faith, and later combined with this soteriological faith other ancient Near Eastern traditions, such as the Creation faith. Just the opposite: Israel participated fully in the thought world and in the Creation faith of the world of the ancient Near East and understood — and indeed could only understand — her particular experiences of history and experiences of God in this horizon. As would be expected, Israel's historical experiences necessitated some modifications, but that was the case also with other cultures of ancient Near East which likewise gave their own relative independent expression to the common way of thinking...<sup>63</sup>

Schmid therefore takes the right opposite view to von Rad: It was the history of Redemption that was subordinated to the doctrine of Creation.

Bernhard W. Anderson seems to present a similar view. Although he does not state that the history of Redemption was subordinated to the Creation faith as Schmid does, he maintains that Creation is the "broad horizon" which Israel shared with the peoples of the Ancient Near



East.<sup>64</sup> What is specially interesting in Anderson's study is that by going through almost the same passages that von Rad used in order to establish his view, Anderson identifies in them a whole different context and dimension. He points out to 5 major theological traditions as following:

A) Creation of a People — this tradition can clearly be seen in the "Song of the Sea" (Exod 15: 1-18). Here the cosmological language of the *Chaoskampf* is used in connection with the deliverance of Israel. There is no suggestion here of Creation in a cosmic sense. Similar idea appears in the "Song of Moses" (Deut 32: 1-43). These early poems belong to the Mosaic covenant tradition. In this circle of tradition, the people is reminded of their existence, their Creation out of the chaos.<sup>65</sup> This view is also found in Hosea and in the poem of the Deutero-Isaiah where Yahweh is extolled as the "Creator of Israel," as his "Maker."<sup>66</sup>

B) Creation and Order — this second theological tradition stresses the correspondence between the cosmic order and the social order. The theological perspective of this context is not fundamentally the Mosaic age but primarily that of the Davidic king and the choice of Zion as the divine dwelling place. The main axis of the Davidic (royal) covenant theology was vertical (cosmic) rather than horizontal (historical). The security, health, and peace of the society depended upon the cosmic, created order, whose saving benefits were mediated through the Davidic monarch.<sup>67</sup> An example of this is Ps 89:9-12 where the mythological language on Creation is used to place the Davidic kingdom in a vertical, cosmic dimension (vss. 24-25). No reference is made to Creation of a people as in the "Song of the Sea". Other psalms which reflect such context are Pss 74, 47, 91, 93-99.<sup>68</sup> For sure, there is here the notion of Redemption, for Yahweh's kingship was closely associated with His function as Creator and Defender. But it must be said that these psalms display a definite cosmological interest concerning the cosmic and social order.<sup>69</sup>

C) Creation and Creaturely Dependence — to this context of thought belong clearly Ps 104. In this psalm Creation faith stands by itself, without being related to Redemption. Contrary to von Rad, Anderson opposes disregarding this psalm as "wholly original to Yahwistic belief". For him we do have here an authentic expression of Israelite faith at a relatively early period in the monarchy.<sup>70</sup> This psalm, similarly to wisdom literature, is concerned with "the foundations of the orders of the world". It presents a reflection on Yahweh's creative activity in the past as well as on the continuation of such activity in the present. The psalm expresses therefore a cosmological interest, not just in the order of Creation but in its origination.<sup>71</sup>

D) Creation as Origination — this tradition belongs to the Priestly cycle. The Priestly Creation history of Genesis displays some of the cosmological dimensions which is present in other contexts especially in the Ps 104. God's Creation, first of all, is a cosmic order which is without blemish and is harmonious in all its parts.<sup>72</sup> The Genesis account stresses also the radical dependence of the cosmic order upon the transcendent Creator. God created out of chaos, which was not destroyed but put within bounds. If God so determines, these bounds may be removed, allowing the earth to return to chaos (as almost happened during the Flood).<sup>73</sup> The Priestly Creation account also touches contemporary concerns as the equality of status between man and woman, the relationship between the human being and nature which implies into ecological issues, the question of the origin of the universe and of man, etc.

E) Creation and New Creation — this theological dimension can be found in the poetry of the Deutero-Isaiah. Against von Rad and his followers who have seen here a proof to the fact that Creation was subordinated to Redemption, Anderson questions if one should really see Creation as a "subsidiary theme" or whether, as it has been proposed by P. B. Harner, it plays "a major role" in the prophetic thinking.<sup>74</sup> Commenting passages like Isa 40:25-26; 43:18-19; 45:18, 22; 51:9-10, Anderson remarks the importance of God as a Creator. Sometimes it is related to the Exodus traditions, sometimes not at all.<sup>75</sup>

Commenting on the passages above in the Deutero-Isaiah, Anderson argues for a much more comprehensive understanding of the doctrine of Creation, as he states:



Here we find a complete synthesis of the theological dimensions of Israel's Creation faith. The God who Israel worships and to whom she bears witness is the creator who originated the cosmos, who maintains order in face of threats of chaos, and who created — and now re-creates — a people out of the chaos of bondage. In a time of historical tragedy, this people was called to bear witness to the "new thing" that God creates in history and to anticipate prophetically a new Creation.<sup>76</sup>

Anderson also argues that the traditions he has pointed out were not isolated from one another, but they rather interacted and were interrelated one to the other.<sup>77</sup>

### 3. EVALUATION OF THESE VIEWS

Most of the arguments advanced in the different views above are built upon the interplay of the Documentary Sources hypothesis, a scholar's view on the development of the traditions in Israel, and the belief of the dependence of the biblical account upon the mythological parallels found mainly in the Ancient Near East religions. In view of the importance of such elements for the question, each one of them will be addressed below in order to better evaluate the relationship between Creation and Redemption.

#### 3.1. Problems Raised by the Documentary Sources Hypothesis

Can one easily accept the existence of the different sources as J and P which play such an important role in the debate of the relationship between Creation and Redemption? Actually the dating and even the existence of such sources have been questioned by many scholars.

H. H. Schmid in 1976<sup>78</sup> argued that J shows so much affinities with the Deuteronomistic material and the later prophets that a date in the late 7th century B.C. should be preferred for J (in place of the usually accepted 10th century B.C.). Rolf Rendtorff<sup>79</sup> questions the existence of J, as well as any source documents running all through the Pentateuch, preferring instead a traditio-historical approach. For him the material ascribed to J is so heterogeneous that its arrangement cannot be credited to only one hand. For him, it would be wiser therefore to stop talking altogether about J. Other scholars have argued against the existence of J on the basis of the evidences of the literary unity of the passages,<sup>80</sup> or in internal evidences of a Mosaic authorship for the Pentateuch.<sup>81</sup>

Doubts have also been raised about P. It has been questioned if really all the material ascribed to P come from the same source; if it is really a document or rather an editorial layer; if it is really from the time of the Exile or it belong to a much earlier time. It has been argued that P reflects first-temple practices and therefore must come from that period. Yehezkel Kaufmann debated at length that P evidences a time much earlier than the Deuteronomist, challenging therefore all the theological construction based in a late date for P.<sup>82</sup> Scholars such Cross, Rendtorff, and Tengström argued that P was never an independent document but only a later edition or a later editorial addition.<sup>83</sup>

The problems related to the Documentary Sources can be illustrated, for instance, in the analysis of Gen 6:9-9:29, the history of the Flood. It has been usually proposed that the Flood's history is composite of the two sources J and P, which were put together by a redactor, but which can be separated one from the other.<sup>84</sup> However, recent studies has demonstrated that what has been taken as a proof for the two sources are instead a proof of a well elaborated literary structure. Scholars such as Anderson and Wenham argue therefore that the Flood's history must be taken as an unity that cannot be broken into two different sources.<sup>85</sup>

In view of the uncertainties and difficulties raised by the Documentary Sources hypothesis, the entire enterprise of establishing a theological point on its basis seems to be an "hazardous operation" since there is the great element of conjecture involved. The last decades of Old Testament studies has seen a growing consensus that the final text is the only sure basis upon which to built a theology.<sup>86</sup>

It is difficult therefore to state with von Rad that J and P subordinated the doctrine of Creation to the doctrine of Redemption. Or with Westermann that J and P adapted an already formed mythological tradition and rendered it into the historical dimension in polarity with Redemption. After all, it is highly probable that J and P never existed at all.



### 3.2. Problems Raised by the Question of Tradition

The different views concerning the development of the tradition of Creation, which were covered above, shows the difficulty that those who accept the Form Criticism or the Tradition Criticism approaches have when establishing the *Sitz im Leben* or the process of the development of a tradition. These difficulties increase due to the fact that we know very little about the early stages of the people of Israel besides that which we have in the Bible. For example, very little is known to us prior to the Iron Age IIA (which starts around 1000 B.C.), and the little we know raises much controversy concerning its interpretation. Different backgrounds, points of view, and methodologies on the part of the scholars lead to completely different conclusions.<sup>87</sup> Since so little attention is paid to the biblical witness in its face value, the reconstruction of the original setting or of the process of development of a tradition becomes highly speculative with little control whatsoever concerning its reliability. The scholar runs the risk of finishing by reconstructing its own socio-cultural context or process which by the end becomes his norm for the interpretation of the Bible.<sup>88</sup> He works therefore in a sphere "in which essentially only hypothesis and conjectures can thrive."<sup>89</sup>

Here again, in view of the uncertainties and the highly hypothetical character of the Form and Tradition approaches, it seems that it is a much sound theological venture to try to understand a biblical concept under the light of the context and witness of the biblical text itself and of the Bible as a whole. Biblical theology must be a theology of the Bible and not a theology of a supposed development of traditions.<sup>90</sup>

It seems difficult therefore to define Creation either as a tradition of secondary importance in Israel, as von Rad does; or either as a tradition of unhistorical, mythological character which was "historized" by J, as Westermann does; or as an naturalistic independent tradition of Israelite or Canaanite origin as Crüsemann and Lindeskog do; or even as the broad Ancient Near East tradition background, as suggested by Schmid and Anderson. All these are but hypothetical reconstructions which have serious difficulties to establish themselves with some degree of certainty.

### 3.3. Problems Raised by the Comparative Religion Approach

The different views on the issue of the relationship between Creation and Redemption usually make strong usage of the comparative approach between the Creation passages in the Bible and what has been called the "Creation accounts" in other religions (specially the ancient Near East religions from the Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Canaanite regions). Israel has been seen as digging or inheriting her conception from her neighboring religions. The similarities between the biblical account on Creation and its Ancient Near East parallels seems to provide for many the key for the interpretation of the biblical material. Thus, the mythological accounts of Ancient Near East religions are used to unlock the origin of the Israelite Creation faith, its function, and its place in the history and belief of Israel.<sup>91</sup>

However, as some have observed, the similarities are overshadowed by the differences in such a way that it is difficult to prove any direct dependence of the Bible upon any other religion.<sup>92</sup> The biblical material stands therefore in a completely different theological and religious context. It seems, therefore, to be methodologically unsound to interpret the theme of Creation in the Bible under the light of other ancient religions.<sup>93</sup> Despite the help whatsoever the understanding of the ancient religions may have to the understanding of the biblical material, whenever someone is trying to establish a theological point the only context which is of decisive value is the biblical context as depicted in the Bible itself.

## 4. The Relationship Between Creation and Redemption: A Proposal

Much of the discussion on the relationship between Creation and Redemption stem from the fact that while Creation is seen as unhistorical, as a mythological account, Redemption is believed to belong to the historical realm. Therefore, either Creation was "historized" since it is not presented as a myth in the Bible, or it stands as an independent tradition and keeps its mythological function, or it is history that is built upon the myth and not the contrary.

If however, Creation in the Bible is shown never to have belonged to the mythological realm, but rather that it was conceived only as a historical and factual event, the whole issue seems to tumble down. As it was seen above, it is highly questionable that Israel borrows or inherited her conception of Creation from the neighboring nations of the Ancient Near East. It results therefore that Creation in the Bible cannot be judged to be mythological because in other



religions it had a mythological nature. The proof for a supposed mythological character of Creation in the Bible need to be demonstrated by the biblical text itself.

By looking into the passages with deal with Creation in the Bible one cannot speak of mythology. Rather, the doctrine of Creation in the Bible does not possess any mythological character and it is even antimythical.<sup>94</sup>

There is no notion of a struggle between God and the chaos in the Bible, which is so common in the mythological accounts. All the elements, here included the *tehôm*, were created by God and are passive elements in His hands in Gen 1 and 2. Even in contexts such as the Flood, the chaos is not depicted as an independent destructing power which was only *allowed* by God to acts momentarily. The water of the Flood, in Gen 6-9, is the very instrument of God to destroy the world and its inhabitants. It is God who acts not the chaos, the water is nothing but God's instrument.

There is no cyclical concept of Creation, as it is usually presented in the myths of Creation. In the Bible, Creation occurs in a linear, historical sequence. It is depicted as the beginning of the history of this world and of man. Creation is presented in a succession of 6 days of 24 hours, it is not timeless and therefore unhistorical. The proof of its historicity in time is that it should be remembered every week through the sabbath which was established in the 7th day of Creation (Gen 2:2-3; Exod 20:8-11). It is also placed in the context of the *toledot* (Gen 2:4) showing by that its historical nature, since *toledot* is the very word for history in the Bible.<sup>95</sup>

No mythological role is ascribed to the sun, the moon and the stars. They are not gods as in other mythologies, but plainly the sun, the moon and the stars as we do see them today in our culture. They are divested of any mythological feature.

The way by which God creates through His word, and the Creation of man in the Bible are also in marked contrast with the mythological accounts. As Gerhard F. Hasel remarked in his comparison between the biblical Creation and the mythical ones:

...Although the biblical writer lived in the ancient world, wrote in a language of the ancient world, and was acquainted with the cosmologies of the ancient world, he did not adopted the context of the surrounding cultures but confronted them polemically with the knowledge of origins gained from divine revelation.<sup>96</sup>

Creation stands in the biblical context as a historical fact, placed at the beginning of the history of this world, it points to the origin and purpose of this world and of man as they were in the beginning. It is the starting point of the history of humanity, and therefore the starting point of any particular history. For only with the beginning in Creation has any posterior particular history any meaning. In fact any history can be history because there was a Creation, without a beginning and without creatures there would be no history. History does not exist in emptiness. To find a "different beginning" for history in the Bible is to disregard what the biblical text clearly states: "In the beginning God created...".

This important role of Creation holds to be true also in its relationship with Redemption. Redemption only has meaning when related to Creation. But it is not because the historical was built upon the mythological, as Schmid proposes, but because Redemption stand in the same historical line that starts in Creation. To this line must be added a third element which is fundamental for the understanding of the relationship between Creation and Redemption: The Fall. Redemption in the Bible, both OT and NT, only has meaning when related to Creation and the Fall of man. To speak of Redemption without relating it to Creation and Fall is render to non-sense the entire theology in the Bible about Redemption. To speak about Creation without relate it to the Fall and to Redemption, is to make a non sense of the present condition of our world and of ourselves, and further to destroy completely the biblical hope for the future.

Since Creation is a historical fact in the Bible, and after the Fall it is deeply related to Redemption, it is not surprising that it can be related to historical redemption, for instance, the Exodus out of the Egypt, or the promises of restoration from Babylon in the Psalms and in Isaiah. The historical context is the "natural" context for both Creation and Redemption in the Bible, and since history is linear any point in the line is related to the other. To look for an independent, unhistorical concept of Creation in the Bible, is looking for a concept that does not exist.

It seems to us that the biblical concept of "linear history"<sup>97</sup> provides the key for the interrelationship between Creation and Redemption. Creation stands in the beginning and at the



end (New Creation) of the line of history, forming the encompassing concept on history. However, we cannot differentiate it from history, as many have done, for, in the Bible, Creation is history. Between these two extreme points stand the points of the Fall and of Redemption (with all its dimension of a conflict between God and the evil, salvation, etc.). All the points in the line of History stand in the same dimension, they are not differentiated from each other as superior or inferior. It is only when Creation-Fall-Redemption-New Creation are hold together and related one to the other that history is history. For only when all the points are hold together in a succession and in relation one to another that a line can be drawn.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Bernhard W. Anderson, "Mythopoeic and Theological Dimensions of Biblical Creation Faith," in B. W. Anderson, ed. *Creation in the Old Testament*, Issues in Religion and Theology, 6 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 4.

<sup>2</sup> See below note 4.

<sup>3</sup> H. Graf Reventlow, *Problems of Old Testament Theology in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 134-154.

<sup>4</sup> G. von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 131-143.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 131.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Deut 26:5ff where the worshipers give thanks for the fruits not by given thanks for what the Creator has provided, but by acknowledge "that he is member of a nation which God brought into the promised land by a historical act, thus making him heir to the blessings of this land." von Rad, "The Theological Problem," 132.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 133.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Isa 40:21ff; 42:5; 43:1; 44:24ff; 45:12ff; 46:3; 54:5.

<sup>11</sup> von Rad, "The Theological Problem," 134-135. von Rad considers that the same happens in the doxologies of the book of Amos where the doctrine of creation has only an ancillary function to redemption.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Isa 42:9; 43:1; 44:24-28; 48:6.

<sup>13</sup> von Rad, "The Theological Problem," 135-136.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 138.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 139.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 139-143.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>19</sup> Gerhard von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," in idem, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 1-78.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 65-66.

<sup>21</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 1:136-153; idem, *Genesis: A Commentary*, rev. ed., Old Testament Library (London: SCM, 1972), 45-67, 73-85.

<sup>22</sup> Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958), III/1, § 41; Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), 136-150; Robert Martin-Achard, "Remarques sur la signification théologique de la création selon l'Ancien Testament," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 52 (1972): 3-11; Jürgen Moltmann, *The Future of Creation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 115-130; Carroll Stuhlmueller, "The Theology of Creation in Second Isaias," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 21 (1959): 429-467; idem, "'First and Last' and 'Yahweh-Creator' in Deutero-Isaiah," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 495-511; Walter Zimmerli, *Old Testament Theology in Outline* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978), 32-43. For a more complete list of theologians who follow von Rad's view cf. Reventlow, 141-146.



<sup>23</sup> Claus Westermann, *Creation* (London: SCM, 1974), 113-123; idem, *Blessing in the Bible and the Life of the Church, Overtures to Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 40-42; idem, *Elements of Old Testament Theology* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 84-117; idem, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), 1-7, 19-47, 64-73, 600-606.

<sup>24</sup> Westermann, *Elements of Old Testament*, 102.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 103.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 103-104.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>29</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 20.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 21-22.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 64-65.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 65-66.

<sup>33</sup> Westermann, *Creation*, 117.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 121-122.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 123. De Vetter, G. Liedke and R. Albertz follow Westermann in his view of the relationship between Creation and Redemption. Cf. Reventlow, 147-149.

<sup>36</sup> Frank Crüsemann, "Die Eigenständigkeit der Urgeschichte," in Jörg Jeremias and Lothar Peritt, eds. *Die Botschaft und die Boten. Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 11-29.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 22-28.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Gösta Lindeskog, "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," in A. Fridrichsen, ed. *The Root of the Vine. Essays in Biblical Theology* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1953), 1-22.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 4,6.

<sup>43</sup> For a more complete discussion cf. Norman C. Habel, "'Yahweh, Maker of Heaven and Earth': A Study in Tradition Criticism," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 321-337.

<sup>44</sup> Lindeskog, 20.

<sup>45</sup> *Ktisiology* is a term which Lindeskog uses in place of *Protology*. For him, the latter is not totally adequate when referring to creation, since creation is not always thought in term of an initial creation of the world — cf. Ibid., 1, n.1. The Greek verb ktizo has the multifold meaning of "to found, to build, to plant, to establish, to produce, to create, to bring into being, to make so and so, to perpetrate."

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 20-21.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 5-8, 21-22.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Reventlow, 149-151.

<sup>51</sup> The article was first published in German as "Schöpfung, Gerechtigkeit und Heil," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973): 1-19. We will be quoting from the English version in H. H. Schmid, "Creation, Righteousness, and Salvation: 'Creation Theology' as the Broad Horizon of Biblical Theology," in B. W. Anderson, ed. *Creation in the Old Testament, Issues in Religion and Theology*, 6 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 102-117.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 111.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 103.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 103-104.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 104-105.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 105.



- <sup>57</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid., 105-106.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid., 106.
- <sup>60</sup> Ibid., 107.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid., 107-108.
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid., 108-109.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid., 110-111.
- <sup>64</sup> Anderson, 8.
- <sup>65</sup> Ibid., 4-5.
- <sup>66</sup> Ibid., 5-6. Cf. Hos 8:14; Isa 43:1a, 15; 44:2a; 45:9-13; 51:9-11.
- <sup>67</sup> Ibid., 7-8.
- <sup>68</sup> Ibid., 9-11.
- <sup>69</sup> Ibid., 10-11.
- <sup>70</sup> Ibid., 12-13.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>72</sup> Ibid., 15.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>74</sup> Ibid., 19.
- <sup>75</sup> Ibid., 19-21.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid., 21.
- <sup>77</sup> Ibid., 14.
- <sup>78</sup> H. H. Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwiste. Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1976).
- <sup>79</sup> Rolf Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, vol. 147 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977).
- <sup>80</sup> Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, Word Biblical Commentary, 1 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), xxviii-xxix. Cf. also the list of scholars provided by him and also by Gerhard F. Hasel, *Biblical Interpretation Today* (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1985), 14-15.
- <sup>81</sup> Gleason L. Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, rev. ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), 109-123.
- <sup>82</sup> Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*, paperback edition (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), 175-200.
- <sup>83</sup> For a more complete discussion on the issue about P cf. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, xxxi-xxxii; and Hasel, *Biblical Interpretation*, 14.
- <sup>84</sup> von Rad, *Genesis*, 119.
- <sup>85</sup> Cf. Bernhard W. Anderson, "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1-11," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 23-39; Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 148-158; idem, "The Coherence of the Flood Narrative," *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 336-348.
- <sup>86</sup> Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, xxxvi. See the discussion on this issue in Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), 69-83; and John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, revised and enlarged ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 8-246.
- <sup>87</sup> Cf. Amihai Mazar, *Archeology of the Land of the Bible, 10,000-586 B.C.E.*, The Anchor Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 328-329.
- <sup>88</sup> Hasel, *Biblical Interpretation*, 42.
- <sup>89</sup> D. A. Knight, *The Tradition of Israel*, 213, quoted in Hasel, *Biblical Interpretation*, 46; see also the discussion in Barton, 30-43.
- <sup>90</sup> As H.-J. Kraus remarked, concerning OT Theology, it should not have its methodological starting point in the traditio-historical method for it seems that OT theology is only theology of the OT when it "accepts the given textual context as contained in the canon as *historical truth* whose final form is in need of explanation and interpretation in a summary presentation" [italics



his]. Cf. H. -J. Kraus, *Die Biblische Theologie*, 364, quoted in Gerhard F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, revised and expanded 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987), 113-114.

<sup>91</sup> Westermann presents a quite detailed treatment on the similarities between the biblical account and its parallels elsewhere. Cf. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 22-47.

<sup>92</sup> Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, xlvi-l; Gerhard F. Hasel, *Understanding the Living Word of God* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1980), 119. Hasel discusses the deep differences of the biblical material in pp. 120-129.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 119-120.

<sup>94</sup> Opposed to pagan mythology. Cf. Hasel, *Understanding*, 125.

<sup>95</sup> Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 55-56. See toledot in Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner et al., eds., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, The New Koehler-Baumgartner in English (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 4: 1699-1700.

<sup>96</sup> Hasel, *Understanding*, 129.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 122; and Siegfried J. Schwantes, *The Biblical Meaning of History* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1970), 38-62.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Bernhard W. "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 23-39.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Mythopoeic and Theological Dimensions of Biblical Creation Faith," in B. W. Anderson, ed. *Creation in the Old Testament*. Issues in Religion and Theology, 6. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 1-24.

Archer, Jr., Gleason L. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Rev. ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. Vol. III/1. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958.

Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Revised and enlarged ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.

Crüsemann, Frank. "Die Eigenständigkeit der Urgeschichte," in Jörg Jeremias and Lothar Perlit, eds. *Die Botschaft und die Boten. Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981, 11-29.

Habel, Norman C. "'Yahweh, Maker of Heaven and Earth': A Study in Tradition Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 321-337.

Hasel, Gerhard F. *Understanding the Living Word of God*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Biblical Interpretation Today*. Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. Revised and expanded 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987.

Jacob, Edmond. *Theology of the Old Testament*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1958.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Religion of Israel: From its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*. Paperback edition. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.



Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner et al., eds. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. The New Koehler-Baumgartner in English, 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000.

Lindeskog, Gösta. "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," in A. Fridrichsen, ed. *The Root of the Vine. Essays in Biblical Theology*. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1953.

Martin-Achard, Robert. "Remarques sur la signification théologique de la création selon l'Ancien Testament." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 52 (1972): 3-11;

Mazar, Amihai. *Archeology of the Land of the Bible, 10,000-586 B.C.E.*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Future of Creation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Rendtorff, Rolf. *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, vol. 147. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.

Reventlow, H. Graf. *Problems of Old Testament Theology in the Twentieth Century*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Schmid, H. H. *Der sogenannte Jahwiste. Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Creation, Righteousness, and Salvation: 'Creation Theology' as the Broad Horizon of Biblical Theology," in B. W. Anderson, ed. *Creation in the Old Testament*. Issues in Religion and Theology, 6. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 102-117.

Schwantes, Siegfried J. *The Biblical Meaning of History*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1970.

Stuhlmüller, Carroll. "The Theology of Creation in Second Isaiah." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 21 (1959): 429-467.

\_\_\_\_\_. "'First and Last' and 'Yahweh-Creator' in Deutero-Isaiah." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 495-511.

von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*. Vol. 1. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Rev. ed. Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1972.

Wenham, Gordon J. "The Coherence of the Flood Narrative." *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 336-348.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.

Westermann, Claus. *Creation*. London: SCM, 1974.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Blessing in the Bible and the Life of the Church*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Elements of Old Testament Theology*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984.



Zimmerli, Walter. *Old Testament Theology in Outline*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978.