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**Abstract**

The paper explores the doxologies in the book of Amos, arguing that they articulate a polemical viewpoint distinct from prevailing biblical and ancient Near Eastern notions about the formation of the sea, mountains, wind, and God’s abode. Central to the comprehension of this cosmogony is the recurring phrase in Amos 5:8d and 6:9c, “(He) who summons the waters of the sea and pours them on the surface of the earth.” While previous scholars have understood this phrase as referring to the primeval Flood, a tsunami event, or Levantine torrential rain, the present paper suggests interpreting it, in line with its context, as a cosmogonic description in which the primordial seawaters were summoned and poured over the dry land. Subsequent actions in the doxologies are interlinked with this portrayal, emphasizing the unified—and polemical—perspective of the doxologies. This new explanation also has ramifications for the dating and composition of the doxologies in the book of Amos.
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In 1875, the esteemed German scholar Bernhard Duhm made a significant observation regarding Amos 4:13; 5:8–9; and 9:5–6.[[1]](#footnote-1) He pointed out that these units deviate from their context in terms of literary, syntactic, and lexical features. At the same time, they share common elements, such as cosmogonic themes and the use of participial phrases concluding with the statement “his name is YHWH.” Because of their hymnic nature, these units have come to be known as “the doxologies of/in Amos.” Over time, scholars have identified editorial intervention within these units, resulting from intentional or accidental scribal modifications. The following presents the doxologies of Amos, excluding such modifications:[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4:13[[3]](#footnote-3) | |
| (He) who forms the mountains and creates the wind, | יוֹצֵר הָרִים וּבֹרֵא רוּחַ |
| And has told man what his wish is,[[4]](#footnote-4) | וּמַגִּיד לְאָדָם מַה שֵּׂחוֹ |
| (Who) makes blackness daybreak,[[5]](#footnote-7) | עֹשֵׂה שַׁחַר עֵיפָה |
| And treads upon the back of earth[[6]](#footnote-8)— | וְדֹרֵךְ עַל בָּמֳתֵי אָרֶץ |
| His name is YHWH, the God of Hosts. | ה' אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ. |
| 5:8 | |
| (He) who makes the Pleiades and Orion,[[7]](#footnote-9) | עֹשֵׂה כִימָה וּכְסִיל |
| And turns deep darkness into morning, | וְהֹפֵךְ לַבֹּקֶר צַלְמָוֶת |
| And darkens day into night, | וְיוֹם לַיְלָה הֶחְשִׁיךְ |
| Who summons the waters of the sea and pours them on the surface of the earth— | הַקּוֹרֵא לְמֵי הַיָּם וַיִּשְׁפְּכֵם עַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ |
| His name is YHWH. | ה' שְׁמוֹ. |
| 9:5–6 | |
| It is my lord, YHWH of Hosts, who touches the earth, and it trembles, and all who dwell on it mourn;[[8]](#footnote-10) | וַאדֹנָי ה' הַצְּבָאוֹת הַנּוֹגֵעַ בָּאָרֶץ וַתָּמוֹג וְאָבְלוּ כָּל יוֹשְׁבֵי בָה |
| Who builds his lofts in heaven, | הַבּוֹנֶה בַשָּׁמַיִם מַעֲלוֹתָו |
| And founds his vault on the earth, | וַאֲגֻדָּתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ יְסָדָהּ |
| Who summons the waters of the sea and pours them on the surface of the earth[[9]](#footnote-13)— | הַקֹּרֵא לְמֵי הַיָּם וַיִּשְׁפְּכֵם עַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ |
| His name is YHWH. | ה' שְׁמוֹ. |

The combination of the roots יצ"ר (“to form,” 4:13), בר"א (“to create,” 4:13), and עשׂ"י (“to make,” 5:8) in these units, as well as בנ"י (“to build,” 9:6) andיס"ד (“to found,” 9:6), indicates that the doxologies of Amos mainly address cosmogony and creation. However, I posit that the key verb for understanding this cosmogony, which challenges other prevailing cosmogonic concepts in ancient Israel and beyond, is a different one altogether: קר"א (“to summon,” 5:8; 9:6). Therefore, I shall begin the following analysis by examining this verb in its current context, before proceeding to additional units that exemplify the polemical approach of the cosmogony embedded in the doxologies.

**1 (He) Who Summons the Waters of the Sea and Pours Them on the Surface of the Earth (5:8d = 9:6c)**

The phrase in Amos 5:8d and 9:6c has been widely interpreted as a description of a catastrophic flood. According to the majority of scholars, the author refers here to either the primeval Flood,[[10]](#footnote-14) or a tsunami event that supposedly occurred in the Mediterranean Sea.[[11]](#footnote-15) It has also been suggested that the text refers to the frequent torrential rains that characterize Levantine winters,[[12]](#footnote-16) or merely warns of a future flood, representing God’s judgment upon Israel’s transgressions.[[13]](#footnote-17) Alternatively, some interpret this phrase in a positive sense: YHWH waters the land with the sea itself, through streams that “run to the sea” (Qoh 1:7), or through the rains that result from the sea.[[14]](#footnote-18)

However, the submersion of the land in seawater is not a scenario that features in biblical doom prophecies. Rather, it is the threat of drying up the sea and sending drought that is frequently presented (e.g., Deut 11:17; Jer 3:3; Isa 50:2; Nah 1:4). Likewise, the water of the sea does not play any role in biblical or Mesopotamian Flood narratives, where the flooding is caused by rain from above and by water that surges from the great deep from below (rather than biblical ים and Akkadian *tiāmtu*).[[15]](#footnote-19) Moreover, irrigating the soil with seawater can hardly be seen as a blessed act, as the seawater contains salt; and it would be misleading to interpret the expression “water of the sea” as a sophisticated reference to other bodies of water such as streams or rain.[[16]](#footnote-20) In fact, the common biblical description of the land being covered by seawater fits into a cosmogonic context.[[17]](#footnote-21) In what follows, some prominent examples are given.

According to the Priestly account in Gen 1:1–2:4a, the creation story begins with a depiction of the whole land being submerged under waters (1:2). On the second day, God commands the waters to gather in a single place (1:9: “Let the water below the firmament be gathered into one area”), resulting in the emergence of dry land (“so that the dry land appears”). God then names the land “earth,” and the gathered waters “seas.” According to the account in Genesis, both the sea and the earth are considered primordial materials, thus exemplifying the perception of *creatio ex materia*. The sea in its current basin is nothing but the primordial waters that covered the land and gathered in one place, while the earth is the land that existed beneath the seawaters beforehand.

In Ps 104, a similar event is described. According to verse 6, before the creation of the inhabited world, the earth was covered by primordial waters, likened to a garment enveloping a person.[[18]](#footnote-22) The abundance of these waters was such that even the mountains were submerged by them (“the waters stood above the mountains”). YHWH then rebukes the waters and thundered at them in the manner of a storm god, causing them to retreat (7: “They fled at your blast, rushed away at the sound of your thunder”). The waters flee to the designated place established by YHWH (8: “They rose mountains, sank valleys, to the place you established for them”), and their boundary is set to prevent the seawater from covering the dry land again (9: “You set a boundary they must not pass so that they never again cover the earth”).

The significant similarities in substance and vocabulary between Gen 1 and Ps 104 (here and in further verses) have led scholars to argue for a relationship of dependency between the two texts.[[19]](#footnote-23) However, since none of them appears to be reliant on the other, they seem to have been independently influenced by a common tradition.[[20]](#footnote-24) Psalm 104 preserves more traces of original theomachy during creation, with its description of the waters’ flight, God’s rebuke, and thunderous actions. Both texts, however, arrive at the same conclusion: when the dry land emerged from the receding waters, the sea basin—where the primordial waters gathered—was simultaneously formed.

Other biblical texts that describe the enclosing of the primordial waters in their new basin during creation indicate that a cosmogony portraying the land submerged by water as the initial state was widespread in ancient Israelite poetry. Noteworthy examples include Pss 89:6–13 and 74:12–17, Job 26:7–13 and 38:8–11, and Jer 5:22.[[21]](#footnote-25) The latter clarifies that the boundary of the sea, its bars and doors, which are mentioned in Ps 104 and Job 38 (among others), are a metaphor for the sand, which separates the seawater in its new, present-day basin, from the inhabited earth.

The widespread adoption of such a creation account in West Asia during the first millennium BCE can be inferred from the Babylonian work Enuma Eliš (which was composed around the 12th–10th centuries BCE). The existence of its multiple manuscripts from the first millennium, as well as the commentaries dedicated to it and the works composed under its influence, reveal the broad distribution of that work.[[22]](#footnote-26) According to Enuma Eliš, Tiamtu (Tiamat), whose name is the Akkadian term for the sea, existed before the gods and the inhabited world were created (I 1–5). After the gods were born, the youngest of them, Marduk, battled against the raging Tiamtu and began creating the world by dividing his defeated enemy into two parts. The upper liquid part he transformed into the blue sky (VI 138–140), while on the lower liquid part, he poured a mountain of dust, causing the water to flow out in the form of the Euphrates and Tigris rivers (V 54–58; cf. VII, 70).

The comparison between the creation account in Enuma Eliš and the biblical cosmogonies reveals distinct variations. Although both view the sea as a primordial substance, the process of land formation differs. In Enuma Eliš, the dry land emerges as Marduk pours soil over the lower part of Tiamtu, the sea, concealing the seawater beneath the earth. The prevailing cosmogony in the Hebrew Bible describes the appearance of the land when the waters recede to their new location, the present-day sea basin. These differing descriptions reflect the contrasting geographical settings of Mesopotamia, characterized by its two rivers, and the coastal Levant, where the tumultuous Mediterranean dominates the visible horizon.[[23]](#footnote-27) Nevertheless, the shared common tradition between the two cannot be denied. [[24]](#footnote-28)

Not surprisingly, not all biblical texts share the prevalent *creatio* *ex materia* narrative. Some present a contrasting cosmogony that excludes the mythical traces of the sea. Pss 95:5 and 146:6, for example, emphasize that God created everything, including the sea. In fact, the Priestly account in Gen 1 also opposes the traditional cosmogony, but in different regards. While it maintains the sequence of events and considers the sea as a precosmogonic material, it specifically eliminates all traces of theomachy, such as the divine rebuke and the fleeing of the waters.[[25]](#footnote-29) The doxologies of Amos challenge the prevalent cosmogony from yet another standpoint.

Like Gen 1 (and other biblical texts), the doxologies of Amos describe the seawater as a primordial material. Unlike Gen 1, however, they present a distinct perspective according to which the primordial waters did not cover the land before creation. Instead, YHWH summoned them to be poured onto the dry land. According to this view, not only the waters are God’s subordinates who obediently fulfilled his command, but God also never engaged in conflict with them, as conveyed in other biblical and Mesopotamian texts. This unique perspective offers a novel understanding of the relationship between YHWH and the primordial waters.

Similarities can nevertheless be observed in the prophecies of Amos and Deutero-Isaiah. In Amos 9:3, YHWH commands the sea serpent, which is considered hostile in other biblical cosmogonies (as the sea itself), to serve him: “And if they conceal themselves from my sight at the bottom of the sea, there I will command the serpent to bite them.” This verse, akin to the doxologies, does not challenge the mythical notion of the sea serpent but views it as an aide of YHWH rather than his rival.[[26]](#footnote-30) The use of the verb קר"א to express the summoning of seawater in the doxologies during creation recurs in Isa 48:13, which depicts the summoning of earth and sky to stand up during creation: “My own hand founded the earth, and my right hand spread out the skies. I summon them (קֹרֵא אֲנִי אֲלֵיהֶם); let them stand up.” As discussed elsewhere, the verbs בר"א, יצ"ר and עשׂ"י, are used exclusively in the cosmogonic contexts of both the doxologies of Amos and Deutero-Isaiah. In light of the above, the verb קר"א should also be included in this list of cosmogonic verbs shared by both texts.

To conclude, the phrase “(He) who summons the waters of the sea and pours them on the surface of the earth” is neither a prophecy of doom nor a blessing. Rather, it reflects a polemical view, according to which the sea was formed when God ordered the seawater to cover the dry land.[[27]](#footnote-31) This approach rejects the old notion of the presence of the sea before creation and its expelling from the land during creation. The following examination aims to demonstrate that that polemical approach is reflected throughout the doxologies of Amos and is not unique to the present phrase.

**2 (He, Who) Treads upon the Back of Earth (4:13d)**

The final phrase of the initial doxology in Amos 4:13, following three cosmogonic expressions, exalts God: “וְדֹרֵךְ עַל בָּמֳתֵי אָרֶץ”. Based on the old translations of the Hebrew Bible, the lexeme במתי in this phrase is commonly interpreted as “heights,” rather than its literal meaning “back,” implying that the poet extols God for treading upon the heights of the earth. However, this interpretation lacks support both etymologically and contextually.[[28]](#footnote-32)

In biblical Hebrew, the phrase דר"ך על במה, literally—treading upon the *back* (of)—commonly signifies the triumph of the victor over his defeated rival. For instance, the victory of the Israelites is vividly expressed in Deut 33 through the imagery of treading upon the backs of their enemies: “Your enemies shall come cringing before you, and you shall tread (תִדְרֹךְ) upon their backs (בָּמוֹתֵימוֹ).” Additional verses referencing this victorious gesture describe it in relation to the enemy’s neck (“Come forward and place your feet on the necks of these kings”; Josh 10:24) or focus on the victor’s feet (“Because of the enemies that encompassed him, until YHWH had placed them under the soles of his feet”; 1 Kgs 5:17). Similar references can be found in ancient Near Eastern literature and iconography, involving both gods and humans. For example, the Egyptian king Sahure of the Fifth Dynasty extols “Thoth and Soped who treading (*ptpt*) upon the Mntw (= the nomad people).”[[29]](#footnote-33) Enuma Eliš also depicts Marduk trampling (*izziz*) on the corpse of Tiamtu (IV 104), and treading (*ikbus*) on her lower parts (IV 129), just before creating the world from her organs.[[30]](#footnote-34)

A striking parallel to the scene in Enuma Eliš can be observed in Job 9:8–9. In this doxological passage, the poet exalts YHWH for treading upon the back of the sea, amidst cosmogonical phrases: “(He) who alone stretches out the heavens and treads upon the back of (the) sea (וְדוֹרֵךְ עַל בָּמֳתֵי יָם); who makes (the) Bear and Orion, Pleiades and the constellation of the South.”[[31]](#footnote-35) The depiction of the submission of Rahab’s aides’ in Job 9:13 reinforces the interpretation of Job 9:8–9 as referring to the victorious gesture of YHWH at the end of his battle against the sea.[[32]](#footnote-36) Another reference appears in Hab 3:15, at the end of a hymn: “You trod on the sea (דָּרַכְתָּ בַיָּם) with your horses, churning the mighty waters.”[[33]](#footnote-37) These citations demonstrate that YHWH’s victorious gesture upon conquering the sea was well-known among Israelite poets.

The close similarity between the doxological phrases in Job 9:8–9 and the doxologies of Amos, both in content and wording, has been widely noted.[[34]](#footnote-38) This is especially evident in the phrases “(He) who makes … Orion and the Pleiades” and “(He) who treads upon the back of…” For convenience, Fig. 1 presents these verses side by side:

Figure 1: Job 9:8–9 and Amos 4:13; 5:8

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Job 9:8–9** | **Amos 4:13 and 5:8**[[35]](#footnote-39) |
| (He) who alone stretches out the heavens,  **and treads upon the back of (the) *sea*.** | (He) who forms the mountains and creates the wind, and has told man what his wish is, (who) makes blackness daybreak,  **and treads upon the back of (the) *earth*.** |
| **(He) who makes (the)** Bear and **Orion, Pleiades,** and the constellation of the South. | **(He) who makes (the) Pleiades and Orion,**  and turns deep darkness into morning and darkens day into night, who summons the waters of the sea and pours them on the surface of the earth. |

Though the occurrences of these two phrases in two different texts may suggest that one depends on the other, it is more plausible that both draw from a shared tradition, and that certain phrases were reworked to align with the poetic style, context, and theological perspectives of the text in which they were inserted.[[36]](#footnote-40)

Nevertheless, due to the close similarity, scholars have tended to amend one of the verses in accordance with its parallel. For example, because Job 9:9 includes the constellation of the Bear (עש) and the constellations of the South (חדרי תמן) alongside Orion (כסיל) and the Pleiades (כימה), some have argued that the Bear (עש) was mistakenly omitted from the stich “who makes Orion and the Pleiades” in Amos 4:13, possibly due to haplography caused by the preceding verb “who makes” (עשה).[[37]](#footnote-41) Alternatively, the hapax term עש may have resulted from the dittography of the verb עשה in Job 9:9. Others maintain that the stich in Amos 4:13, which notably lacks a supplementary stich, originally included the “constellations of the South,” as does Job 9:9.[[38]](#footnote-42) Alternatively, some posit that the absence of a supplementary stich in Amos 4:13 might suggest that the extant stich “who makes the Pleiades and Orion” was added (albeit through metathesis) to Amos 4:13 by a later scribe due to his familiarity with Job 9:8–9.[[39]](#footnote-43)

In contrast to the above conjectures, which are explained by haplography, dittography, metathesis, or other scribal errors, the alteration from “earth” to “sea,” or *vice versa* in the phrase “(He, who) treads upon the back of…” (Job 9:8 / Amos 4:13) cannot be explained in the same way. Rather, it is a significant difference, suggesting intentional modification. In Job 9:8, the phrase refers to a victorious gesture upon conquering the sea, a familiar mythological entity referenced multiple times in the Hebrew Bible and other sources, whereas the phrase in Amos 4:13 lacks such connotations. The earth is rarely depicted as a mythological entity in biblical texts, and it is never portrayed as an adversary of YHWH.[[40]](#footnote-44) Since this difference cannot be explained as a scribal error, and considering the process of demythologization that the biblical texts underwent,[[41]](#footnote-45) it is reasonable to assume that the old cosmogonic tradition about the victorious gesture of power over the sea during creation was integrated in its entirety by Job 9. In contrast, the poet of the doxologies of Amos, who opposed the notion that the primordial seawaters were expelled from the earth by YHWH, altered the term “sea” in favor of “earth.” In this way, neither the primordial sea nor the fighting against it during creation left any echo in this verse.[[42]](#footnote-46)

**3 (He) Who Forms the Mountains and Creates the Wind (4:13a)**

The first cosmogonical phrase in the same doxology in Amos 4:13 praises YHWH who “יוֹצֵר הָרִים וּבֹרֵא רוּחַ.” Following the Septuagint, some commentators have amended the term הרים (“mountains”) in this phrase to רעם (“thunder”) or הדים (“thunderclaps”),[[43]](#footnote-47) since they could not find any connection between “mountains” and “wind,” or any reason to choose the mountains, out of all the forces of nature, as the objects of divine creation. Others, however, have rightly rejected this emendation, for thunder never functions as an object of cosmogony in the Hebrew Bible (it is rather used as a weapon by God who combats the sea before and during creation), nor is it recorded as a peer of the wind in biblical and other West-Semitic poetry.[[44]](#footnote-48) Moreover, contrary to the argument above, the wind and the mountains do share something in common: like the primordial waters, and always in relation to them, they are presented as precosmogonic materials in the biblical texts cited above.[[45]](#footnote-49) According to Ps 104:6, the mountains were covered by primordial waters before YHWH drove them into their new basin. As for the wind, it is portrayed in Gen 1:2 along with all other precosmogonic materials, such as the waters, over which it hovers (מרחפת).[[46]](#footnote-50) The wind is mentioned in Ps 104 as well, but it does not hover over the waters. Instead, it is YHWH who moves (מהלך) over it (v. 3c) and makes (עשה) his messengers from it (v. 4a).[[47]](#footnote-51) Since both Gen 1 and Ps 104 are probably based on a shared tradition,[[48]](#footnote-52) it seems that each of them preserved some original mythical details while reworking others.

Phoenician-oriented sources, like the writings of Philo of Byblos (FGrH 790 F 2 = Eusebius PE 1.9.30–1.10.2; 1.10.7) and those of Damascius, attributed to Mochos and Eufemos (FGrH 784 F 4 = Damascius de Princ. 125 c), indicate that the perception of the wind as a precosmogonic material was widespread in neighboring cultures as well.[[49]](#footnote-53) In these sources, as in Gen 1:2 and Ps 104:3–4, the wind does not represent God’s anger (רוח אפו) or function as his weapon, nor is it breath or spirit; rather, it is a force of nature: the movement of the air, which functions as a primordial material. Together, all these texts thus illuminate a prevailing Levantine concept, only traces of which have been preserved in the extant ancient writings. Accordingly, the wind is never mentioned among the created matter in the Hebrew Bible. The sole exception is the doxologies of Amos. By comparison, the mountains, which are also portrayed as precosmogonic material in Ps 104, are depicted as having been created by YHWH in some other biblical texts (such as Isa 40:12; Ps 65:7; and Prov 8:25).

While one can interpret the polemical description of the creation of the wind in the doxologies, as well as that of the mountains, without necessarily linking it to the innovative description of the formation of the sea basin, a firm connection between them nevertheless appears to exist. For the poet of the doxologies, none of the three—the mountains that according to other sources were hidden under the primordial waters before creation, the wind that hovered above the primordial waters before creation, and the primordial waters themselves that submerged the mountains before creation—existed in these forms before creation. Only during creation did the wind, mountains, and sea come into being. Praising YHWH in the doxologies for creating those forces of nature, which elsewhere are described as precosmogonic materials, can thus point again to the consistent polemical view of the doxologies of Amos.

**4 (He) Who Builds His Chambers in Heaven, and Founds His Vault on the Earth (9:6a–b)**

The discussion so far has highlighted the contrasting cosmogony presented in the doxologies of Amos in comparison to biblical texts like Gen 1; Ps 104; and Job 9, as well as the Babylonian Enuma Eliš and the Phoenician cosmogonies. It is thus intriguing to examine whether there are additional phrases in the doxologies that share similarities with those texts while altering one or more elements to dismiss the notion of the sea as precosmogonic material. Amos 9:6a–b, which describes the construction of YHWH’s abode, aligns with this paradigm.

Psalm 104:3 praises YHWH as covering his lofts (עליותיו), i.e., his upper dwelling, with water (“הַמְקָרֶה בַמַּיִם עֲלִיּוֹתָיו”).[[50]](#footnote-54) In light of Ps 104:13 (“[He] who waters the mountains from his lofts”), these lofts probably refer to primordial upper heavens. This notion corresponds with further biblical and Babylonian cosmogonies that suggest the presence of primordial waters in the upper heavens. Prominent examples are Gen 1:6–7 and Ps 148:4–6 where the “firmament” (רקיע) or the “limit” (חוק) is said to close off the upper primordial waters.[[51]](#footnote-55) Similarly, in Enuma Eliš IV 135–140, a watch (*naṣṣaru*) is assigned to prevent the waters from escaping the heavens, which are the upper part of Tiamtu, the primordial sea.

The phrase occurring in Amos 9:6a (“הַבּוֹנֶה בַשָּׁמַיִם מַעֲלוֹתָו”) bears a striking resemblance to the one in Ps 104, as both describe the building of the upper dwelling of YHWH.[[52]](#footnote-56) The prominent difference between them is that the verse in Psalms includes a reference to water (מים), whereas the doxologies refer to heaven (שמים) instead. Theodore Gaster proposed amending the term “heavens” (שמים) in the doxologies to “waters” (מים),[[53]](#footnote-57) thus expressing a preference for the version in Ps 104 over Amos 6:9. However, the difference between מים and שמים does not seem to be resulted from a scribal error in one of these texts. Rather, considering the polemical approach of the doxologies, it is very plausible that the poet intentionally added the letter ש to the term מים, in order to eliminate the old tradition about the building of the upper seat of YHWH in the primordial waters.[[54]](#footnote-58)

The second part of Amos 9:6 praises YHWH as “וַאֲגֻדָּתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ יְסָדָהּ.” The term אגודה here is commonly understood in biblical dictionaries and commentaries as a vault, which evokes the round shape of the earth,[[55]](#footnote-59) upon which rests the upper seat of God. Since אגודה in this context is a hapax, its usage cannot be directly compared to other biblical occurrences. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Prov 8:27 and Job 26:10 describe the foundation of “a circle” (חוג)—a term that shares a similar meaning to אגודה—within the primordial waters.[[56]](#footnote-60) These texts emphasize again that for the poet of the doxologies there was no primordial water on which to base the world’s vault, but only dry land. Hence, “(He) founds his vault on the earth.”

# **5 Summary and Conclusions**

The present paper suggests that the doxologies of Amos present a cosmogony that disputes the common view reflected in multiple biblical texts, as well as in some extra-biblical sources. In contrast to these cosmogonies, according to the doxologies of Amos, seawaters did not cover the land before creation and then recede into a basin. Instead the waters of the sea were poured upon the dry land during creation (Amos 5:8d; 9:6c; cf. Gen 1:2, 6–10; Ps 104:6–9). Therefore, YHWH did not triumphantly tread upon the back of the sea (Amos 4:13d;cf. Job 9:8–9). Likewise, the mountains did not emerge from the receding primordial waters, nor did the wind hover over them; rather, both were created by God (Amos 4:13a; cf. Gen 1:2; Ps 104:3–4). And YHWH’s dwelling was not built in the primordial upper waters, nor was his vault founded in the lower waters, but rather in the solid heavens and earth (Amos 9:6a–b; cf. Ps 104:3; Prov 8:27; Job 26:10).[[57]](#footnote-61)

Although this polemical view is unique to the doxologies of Amos, it bears significant similarities to the cosmogonic phrases of Deutero-Isaiah. These include the exclusive use of four cosmogonic verbs referring to God the creator: בר"א, יצ"ר, עשׂ"י, and קר"א, alongside the opposition to *creatio ex materia*. Since Deutero-Isaiah is dated to the beginning of the Second Temple period, there is no reason to date the doxologies to an earlier time. The question of their dating also pertains to the composition of the doxologies. Their unified and distinctive viewpoint, as well as their close relation to each other, supports the premise that the doxologies are based on a single source, rather than independent supplementary additions. Yet, the inquiry regarding the integration of those doxologies within the book of Amos deserves a broader study, as it relates to the formation of the book of Amos, a topic that falls outside the scope of the present study.
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