ARCHIVAL UNITY: A NEO-ANALYTIC MODEL OF THE PRIESTLY TEXT

by

TYLER EDWARD KELLEY

(Under the Direction of Baruch Halpern)

ABSTRACT

Many compositional models for the Priestly text of the Pentateuch envision a process of serial revision and editorial supplements to a Priestly *Grundschrift*. Scholars who work within these models—termed Analyst approaches here—separate the Priestly text (P) into a series of compositional strata in an attempt to understand how this document was composed. This dissertation presents a thorough review of these approaches to the Priestly text. Its major proposal is that a different model, termed Neo-analytic, better accounts for both the unity and the diversity of the Priestly text and allows us to understand its composition in a more holistic manner. The Neo-analytic model proposes that the Priestly author drew on a variety of archival texts as the sources of the non-narrative materials embedded into his narrative. This model's approach is grounded in a study of ancient Near Eastern scribal culture, ritual texts, and archival collections. In the course of this work, various chapters review and compare the Analytic and Neo-analytic approaches to major parts of the Priestly text in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. Ultimately, this dissertation concludes that the Neo-analytic framework provides a more robust and historically-grounded model for the composition of the Priestly text.

INDEX WORDS: Priestly text, Priestly author, Scribal culture, Archives, Ritual texts, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Judah, Neo-Assyria, Torah, Pentateuch

ARCHIVAL UNITY: A NEO-ANALYTIC MODEL OF THE PRIESTLY TEXT

by

TYLER EDWARD KELLEY

B.A., The University of Georgia, 2011

M.A., The University of Georgia, 2014

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2023

© 2023

Tyler Edward Kelley

All Rights Reserved

ARCHIVAL UNITY: A NEO-ANALYTIC MODEL OF THE PRIESTLY TEXT

by

TYLER EDWARD KELLEY

Major Professor:	Baruch Halpern
Committee:	Richard Elliott Friedman
	Jared S. Klein
	Jeffrey Stackert

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2023

DEDICATION

Because the world is made from magic and sheep livers, I lovingly dedicate this book to my children, Charlotte Anne Kelley and James Lawrence Kelley. Their humor and graciousness have both kept me grounded and brought me uncountable joy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation could not have been completed without the time, support, infectious passion, and humor of Dr. Baruch Halpern and Dr. Richard Elliott Friedman. Thank you both for your encouragement and your patience, and for your willingness to play with new ideas. Dr. Jeffrey Stackert, who graciously joined my committee, deserves thanks for his insightful comments and for challenging my assumptions in the best spirit of scholarly discourse. Dr. Jared Klein and Dr. Randall Garr both provided valuable feedback at various stages of this process.

Thanks are also owed to my family, especially to my children, Charlotte and James, and to my partner, Amanda Tipton. They have shown incomparable grace in the face of a task that has often demanded attention that I could have otherwise spent on them. I am unspeakably grateful for their encouragement and willingness to listen to me talk about long-dead people. Thank you as well to my parents, Tony and Brenda Kelley, who cheered me on to the very end and who have always been willing to do anything to help my family.

Many others also played a role in this process. Writing a dissertation is a lonely task, and the following people made it more bearable, each in their own way: Dr. Amanda Walls, Dr. Jodie Lyon, Dr. Robert Foster, Dr. Joel Hunt, Dr. Naomi J. Norman, Dr. T. Chase Hagood, and Dr. Megan Patrice Brock. I also owe a debt of gratitude to my dear friends, both in and out of graduate school: Dr. Josh Patterson, Scott Brevard, Jacob Dunn, Sarah Cook, Dr. Zach Eberhart, Sam Perren, and David Price have all made major contributions to my journey through this process. Finally, I want to offer particular thanks to my close friend and writing partner, Dr.

Raleigh Heth. Thank you for continually pushing me to move forward and for our countless conversations about the wonders of the ancient Near East.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

LIST OF FIGURES viii

ABBREVIATIONS x

CHAPTER

1 SKETCHES OF A COMPOSITIONAL APPROACH 1

2 AMONG THE ANALYSTS 39

3 HOLY DISTINCTIONS 99

4 TELLING TIME AT SINAI 185

5 A VIEW FROM THE ARCHIVES 261

6 THE MARCH TO AN ENDING 340

7 A NEW OLD MODEL 463

REFERENCES 470

APPENDICES 518

3.1 519

3.2 522

3.2a 526

3.2b 530

3.3 533

3.4 536

3.5.....540

3.6.....543

5.1.....545

5.2.....546

5.3.....547

5.4.....548

5.5.....549

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 2.1: MT 39:1 and LXX 39:12 & 36:8 85

Figure 3.1: Revised Exod 31:12-17 132

Figure 4.1: Proposed Structure of Numbers 1-10* 200

Figure 4.2: Feldman's Chronology of Numbers 7 201

Figure 4.3: Proposed Chronology of Numbers 7 203

Figure 4.4: Comparison of Num 9:15-16 & Exod 40:34, 38 219

Figure 4.5: Alternative Placements of the Epicycle 1 226

Figure 4.6: Alternative Placements of the Epicycle 2 227

Figure 4.7: Alternative Placements of the Epicycle 3 227

Figure 5.1: SAA XX 37 Comparison 1 302

Figure 5.2: SAA XX 37 Comparison 2 303

Figure 5.3: The 23rd Day 306

Figure 6.1: Num 27:13 & Deut 32:50 438

ABBREVIATIONS

KAI	Donner & Röllig 2002
RIAA	Speleers 1925
RINAP 2	Frame 2021
RINAP 3/1	Grayson & Novotny 2012
RINAP 3/2	Grayson & Novotny 2014
RINAP 4	Leichty 2011
RINAP 5/1	Novotny & Jeffers 2018
RINAP 5/2	Jeffers & Novotny 2023
RINAP 5/3	Novotny, Jeffers, & Frame 2023
RINBE 2	Weiershäuser & Novotny 2020
SAA II	Parpola & Watanabe 1988
SAA III	Livingstone 1989
SAA VII	Fales & Postgate 1992
SAA X	Parpola 1993
SAA XI	Fales & Postgate 1995
SAA XII	Kataja & Whiting 1995
SAA XIII	Cole & Machinist 1998
SAA XX	Parpola 2017
ANEP	Pritchard 1954
CIS	Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum
CAD	Chicago Assyria Dictionary

CHAPTER 1

SKETCHES OF A COMPOSITIONAL APPROACH

An Illusion of Agreement: Compositional Problems in the Priestly Text

Understanding the Priestly text—the largest constituent source of the Pentateuch and the one that provides the structure of Genesis-Numbers—is an important desideratum of biblical scholarship. Since one can not know what a document means until one knows what that document says, investigation into the meaning of the Priestly text requires some level of compositional criticism to determine what is part of that document. From a distance, the consensus of critical scholarship in regards to the Priestly text seems to place any inquiry into its composition on much firmer footing than the quicksand dangers of separating J from E or determining the extent of some of the sources used by the Deuteronomistic Historian. The separation of Priestly from non-Priestly material in the Pentateuch has now been accomplished with such relative ease and widespread agreement that it serves as one of the few issues on which something like a consensus exists in Biblical scholarship.[1] Given such a state of affairs, it may seem that scholars are well positioned to interpret the Priestly text and that such analysis could proceed apace without bothering with the philological tedium of pursuing the unfashionable questions of composition.

[1] Writing nearly a century and a half apart- Kuenen (1886: 65): "…we must recognize the possibility of the later authors who worked over the older material and the editors who combined the independent laws and narratives, having made occasional omissions or modifications; and this will naturally prevent our being able to clear up certain points until later on in our inquiry. The separation of the priestly elements, however, is least encumbered by this difficulty, and we will therefore undertake it first." Kratz (2016: 556f): "…it is possible to agree very quickly on the identification of two literary strata: D (Deuteronomy) and P (the Priestly writing, including H)." The identification of P and non-P material on which this investigation depends is based on Kuenen1886; Wellhausen 1899; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900; Driver 1910; Noth 1981; Friedman 1997, 2003; Propp 1998, 2006; Baden 2009b, 2012.

Nevertheless, there remains a substantial amount of critical disagreement on a number of questions related to the content of the Priestly text. Since the separation of E from P, the relationship between the non-narrative materials and the narrative of P has been an issue,[2] as have arguments over whether all of the legal and ritual material in Leviticus subsumed under the label P comes from the same chronological and ideological horizon.[3] The Priestly material in Numbers, especially its latter half, has long raised questions about growth within the body of material labeled P. Noth's arguments for a Deuteronomistic History distinct from a Tetrateuch destroyed the previous critical consensus that saw in Joshua the final section of the Priestly narrative, leaving the question of P's ending open and unsettled.[4] Offering a resolution to these issues, especially if done within a coherent framework, would provide a more robust foundation for future inquiry into the meaning and purpose of the Priestly text.

This investigation will therefore focus on the larger compositional issues related to the Priestly text before proposing a comprehensive model for identifying what belongs to P and for understanding the production of the Priestly text. Two larger considerations will guide our investigation. First, composition must be understood as a historical as well as literary problem. This does not mean that we must identify from what specific century, reign, or ideological moment a given text of the Torah comes, but rather that we have to recognize that these texts were produced by real people bound by certain scribal and cultural conventions and material

[2] Rendtorff 1993: 76 summarizes a view that goes back to Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen when he states: "But even among those who would not accept Noth's rigid separation of the cultic and legal material from P the majority would see P as a work structured by a narration that begins with creation and leads through to the borders of the promised land. For many of those the relation of the cultic and legal material to the basic narration is a rather difficult problem."

[3] The recent widespread instantiation of this issue in Pentateuchal studies originates in the work of Knohl 1995; Milgrom 1991, 2000, 2001.

[4] Noth 1957: 180-206. Translated in Noth 1987: 107-134. Various suggestions have since been made about where P ends (including Exodus 40; Leviticus 16 or 26; Numbers 10; Deuteronomy 34), and there are still those who continue to see material in Joshua as part of the Priestly narrative (see Boorer 2016: 6-7, nn. 15-16 for a collection of references to these various positions; Nihan 2007: 20-30 for an overview of the debate).

constraints. Any purely literary approach that does not address the historical questions of how the text was operated on by scribes and how its readings were transmitted to reach our received text is inherently lacking. That is to say, it is not enough for compositional models to identify a verse or passage as an addition or expansion, they must also have a theory of *how* (not why) it got there in order to be complete.

Second, our primary means for gaining such a historically informed view of composition lies in the information recovered from cultures neighboring and related to ancient Judah. However, the data of both the Hebrew Bible and the broader ancient Near East, especially Mesopotamia, must be properly sorted before any useful analysis can take place. We must compare like-to-like, and to do this we can not view the corpus of either the Hebrew Bible or Mesopotamian textual production *en masse*. Given that we have close to three millennia of cuneiform material representing a wide variety of genres, any bird's eye view of this material will provide information of only limited use for understanding the scribal culture of Iron Age Judah. Similarly, features relevant for understanding the composition of a prophetic book like Isaiah or a collection of aphorisms like Proverbs, can not be assumed to be relevant for the composition of the Pentateuch. Different kinds of texts were produced and handled differently in the ancient Near East, and we must make sure that our comparanda are in fact comparable.

The Writing on the Scroll: Historical Limits on Compositional Models

We should begin by acknowledging the Priestly text's relationship to the major models for the composition of the Pentateuch.[5] Rendtorff once observed that "P means one of the 'sources' of the Pentateuch according to the Documentary Hypothesis. Just to use that letter

[5] The ideas in the following discussion were sharpened in frequent conversations with Raleigh Heth.

without explication is only possible in that framework, otherwise you will not be understood."[6] He is to a certain extent correct, and this work is situated firmly in the stream of scholarship that views the Documentary Hypothesis (DH) as the best way of explaining the received text of the Torah. This should not be taken to mean that there are not problematic data-points for this model or that all of its assumptions should be accepted unexamined. Nor does this mean that other approaches have nothing to contribute to our understanding of the compositional history of the Pentateuch.[7]

But the oft-wrung death knells of the Documentary Hypothesis are overblown for a simple reason—we have acquired no new data related to the composition of the Pentateuch. Competing models are simply that—they are alternative ways of organizing and interpreting the data set that has always been at hand. Nevertheless, a wealth of secondary data in the form of Mesopotamian, Hittite, and Ugaritic literature has come to light and been easier and easier to access since the days of Wellhausen. This too though has simply limited our options, allowing us to have a more controlled scholarly imagination when it comes to scribal practice. But none of the models for the composition of the Pentateuch has either received unquestionable support or been demolished by this newfound data.[8] Even in the welter of new contextual information gleaned from this ancient Near Eastern material, the DH still meets the criteria of a good

[6] Rendtorff 1993: 78.
[7] Kratz 2016 offers a refreshingly irenic description of the shared assumptions that underlay the schisms of the so-called continental divide in Biblical scholarship. For another approach to the issue, see Schmid 2011.
[8] Despite the attempts to find or refute empirical models (Tigay 1982, 1985; Person & Rezetko 2016; Müller & Pakkala 2017), the Pentateuch, compositionally and generically, remains unparalleled in the ancient Near Eastern and Greek repertoire available to us. Sanders 2014 highlights problems with the empirical models approach, though he pushes some of his conclusions too far. Tatian's Diatessaron, as explored in Moore 1890, still stands as the closest analogy to the composition of the Pentateuch as argued in the Documentary Hypothesis.

hypothesis, "judged to offer the most economical and most plausible account of the largest number of data."[9]

The economy of the Documentary Hypothesis is one of its major strengths.[10] The DH proposes, in its simplest form, a single point of literary production for each of the individual sources and only a few points of redaction necessary to bring the various sources together.[11] This is not to argue that the process by which any of the individual documents came together was simple or that they underwent no revisions.[12] However, any theory that proposes a process of serial revision to a given text ignores the material conditions under which texts were produced in ancient Israel and Judah.[13] Integrating short glosses into a passage, changing the wording of an already existing passage, and inserting large blocks of material would, with few exceptions, have to be done in the context of producing a new copy of a particular text.[14] In a pre-codex era, this was not as simple as replacing a leaf in a quire, itself still a labor-intensive endeavor. Given the

[9] Kloppenborg 2000: 54. His assessment of the nature of compositional hypotheses in relationship to the Synoptic Gospels is easily adaptable for the Documentary Hypothesis: "Hypotheses are *our* intellectual constructs which configure the data in accord with *our* canons of intelligibility and plausibility and in a general framework controlled by what *we* deem to be significant… To admit that the 2DH [Two Document hypothesis] is a hypothesis and qua hypothesis is, on the one hand, unable to render a full and unambiguous account of all Synoptic data and, on the other, that it is not unaffected by the explanatory habits of those who formulated it, is not to encourage the kind of sloppy thinking or worse, intellectual laziness, that casually sweeps aside two centuries of Synoptic criticism with the assertion that 'it is all hypothetical.' *Hypotheses are all that we have and all we will ever have*. " (Emphasis original.) For an intelligent argument in favor of the hypothetical simplicity of a non-documentarian model, see Carr 1996: 290-293. For a brief survey of the data covered by the Documentary Hypothesis, see Friedman 2003:1-31; for more thorough defenses, Friedman 1997; Baden 2012.

[10] Propp 2006: 732 offers this succinct description: "The old JEDP hypothesis can be explained in about twenty minutes and has met with ready assent, since it accounts for dozens of problems immediately apparent to any attentive reader of the Bible." This is not to discount the nature of complexity inherent in any explanatory enterprise, especially a historical one. But what kinds of complexity we introduce into our explanations of our data-set have to be controlled by their own evidentiary basis. For an excellent evaluation of the role of complexity and simplicity in paleographic analysis, see Zuckerman 2003: 94-102, 131-133.

[11] The number of redactions depends on whether one adheres to the classical models, themselves diverse, or to the so-called neo-Documentarian model, as articulated in Baden 2009b, that finds evidence of only a single redaction event.

[12] Even in the simplest formulations of the DH, it is clear, e.g., that E's Covenant Code in Exod 20:18-23:33 contains originally independent legal material, while the author of J incorporated older poetry into his narrative (e.g., Genesis 49; Exodus 15).

[13] See Lemaire 1992 on materials used for writing. For evidence of scribal education in Iron Age Judah derived from epigraphic material, see Rollston 2006; Faignebaum-Golovin, et al. 2016 (cf. Faigenbaum-Golovin, et al. 2020); Schniedewind 2019. See further discussion in Chapter 5.

[14] Van der Toorn 2007: 125-132.

expense, in terms of both time and material, of making a new scroll, it seems preferable when imagining revisions to imagine fewer, more thoroughgoing ones.[15] The more a model relies on a series of small revisions and additions, the less it matches the *realia* of scribal production.

But even if material constraints could be set aside, the process of serial revision supposed by most non-Documentarian models is relatively unattested in the broader ancient Near East. Even in Mesopotamia, where the use of clay tablets meant that writing materials were significantly cheaper and easier to produce than the scrolls and ink used for alphabetic scripts, these types of serial revisions are relatively unknown for literary texts. Our two most widely attested literary works, *Enūma eliš* and *Gilgamesh*, have radically different text histories that both illustrate the point. For *Enūma eliš* we have approximately 181 tablets and tablet pieces, ranging in date from the end of the Middle Assyrian period to the Seleucid era, a period spanning approximately a thousand years.[16] The texts come from a geographic range from Sultantepe to Uruk. Despite this chronological and geographic spread to the manuscripts, *Enūma eliš* is known in only two recensions—the well-attested, standard one and a sparsely attested Assyrian version that replaces Marduk with Anšar/Aššur.[17] Even in Assyria, though, the standard version was regnant. And despite being a work of cultural, political, and religious importance—features that are argued to attract revision in many models of Pentateuchal development—the text of *Enūma eliš* was stable.[18]

---

[15] Such as Cross 1973: 274-289 argues for the Deuteronomistic History. For further articulation of this redaction, see Friedman 1981b.

[16] Lambert 2013: 3-4. For an argument for the Middle Babylonian provenance of the epic, see 439-444.

[17] Lambert 2013: 4-6. The critical apparatus, 45-134, bears out Lambert's description of the text's stability. The so-called Aššur recension is only attested in 3 copies, one each of Tablets I, III, and V. Additionally, a quotation of IV.17 in SAA X 365.o.11-12 replaces the standard version's *bēlum* with Anšar. See Frahm 2010: 8-13 for the political valence of this recension. Lambert 2013: 456-463 persuasively argues against the view that the Fifty Names of Marduk is a later addition to the epic.

[18] Changes and interpretations of the *Enūma eliš* seem to have found their home in commentaries rather than in the text itself. See Livingstone 1986; Lambert 2013: 135-144. The "Marduk Ordeal," as a commentary on the Akitu festival, also functions in some ways to reinterpret the *Enūma eliš* (Frymer-Kensky 1983: 133).

The *Gilgamesh* epic has a much more involved history, with a development process of close to a thousand year, stretching from the presumed Ur III provenance of the several independent Sumerian poems to the standardized Akkadian version that came into vogue sometime between the thirteenth and eleventh centuries.[19] In this time the epic developed from discrete tales into a fully integrated epic in a completely different language. Notably though, once the epic reached its standard form, its text remained fixed for the next one thousand years.[20]

The standard version of *Gilgamesh* was itself a revision of an Old Babylonian form of the epic. Among the changes the standard version made were the addition of a framing prologue and epilogue, the narration of the flood story by Utnapishtum, and Enkidu's report from the dead about the Underworld.[21] Apart from these additions, the standard version extensively rewrites the Old Babylonian epic while keeping its structure intact. The differences between the standard version and its Old Bablyonian forerunners are so extensive that we would never have been able to reconstruct the older version's wording without direct access to its text.[22] Unfortunately, the Middle Babylonian exemplars of Gilgamesh are either translations or too fragmentary to allow us a better view into what kinds of stages intervened between the Old Babylonian and standard version of the epic.[23] However, they suggest that the revision of the wording was a separate

[19] Tigay 1982: 23-38, 130-131; George 1999: 141-208.
[20] Tigay 1982: 130-139. Nevertheless, there may have been some recensional differences between Assyrian and Babylonian editions of the epic. For a discussion and a table of all extant variants in the Standard version's manuscripts, see George 2003: 418-431, who also concludes that the differences are what would be expected due to the length of transmission of the epic and are not the results of real editorial intervention intended to produce a new version.
[21] Tigay 1982: 103-107, 140-160, 214-240. Note that the Flood narrative is adapted directly from the Atraḫasīs epic, but transformed into the first-person speech of Utnapishtim with accompanying expansions and abridgments. This is a close parallel to Deuteronomy 1-11's use of the older material contained in Numbers and Exodus.
[22] Tigay 1982: 55-103. Nevertheless, "despite extensive revision of the wording… enough similarities remain to show that the late version is textually related to the Old Babylonian version" (55). George 2003: 39-47 offers supplementary material that was unavailable to Tigay when he wrote his book, but affirms Tigay 1982's place as "the standard work" on the development of the Gilgamesh epic (39, n. 106).
[23] Tigay 1982: 110-129.

process from the expansions and subtractions that took place.[24] This is of note to compositional models that propose a series of larger and smaller accretions to the Pentateuchal material—the revision of Gilgamesh was not piecemeal, but wholesale and done in such a way as to eliminate or update the older version's wording in many places.[25] Neither the precise wording of the older version nor the presence or absence of particular lines are recoverable from the standard version. Only the addition of larger units such as the flood narrative are visible by recourse to the canons of compositional and form criticism.[26]

A survey of less well attested literary works confirms the general outlines suggested above, though varying states of preservation make conclusions more or less precarious. Despite many fewer extant manuscripts of *Atraḫasīs* than *Gilgamesh*, the outlines appear similar. The most well attested version of *Atraḫasīs* is the Old Babylonian one. Where the manuscripts overlap, they show a remarkably stable text.[27] Unlike *Gilgamesh*, this older version survived in the later period, as attested by several Neo-Assyrian fragments from Nineveh.[28] Alongside this version there also existed an Assyrian recension of the poem, attested in Neo-Assyrian copies that seem to go back to a Middle Assyrian revision of the Old Babylonian version.[29] As with

[24] Tigay 1982: 123-129.
[25] The assimilating tendencies of the standard version are also of note, and will be discussed below.
[26] See the discussion of the relationship between theories of composition and textual evidence in Tigay 1982: 16-22.
[27] Lambert & Millard 1969: 31-34. Note that their description of variation is somewhat misleading as it considers different lineation and column formats to be signs of different recensions. For an analysis of the variation in language between the OB texts, see Tigay 1982: 65-66, 66 n. 25 who identifies only one actual variant—the replacement of the name of the goddess in I.295. See also the observations in Van Koppen 2011: 144 on the homogeneity of the manuscripts.
[28] Lambert & Millard 1969: 34-35. Note that there are some differences between these Neo-Assyrian fragments and the Old Babylonian version, though they consist of the omission or transposition of lines, harmonization, and possibly expansion. It is unclear if these are intentional editorial changes or examples of well-known types of scribal mistakes.
[29] Lambert & Millard 1969: 36-39. This recension in turn abbreviates and expands the Old Babylonian version, so that the Assyrian version covers in approximately 8 lines what the OB covers in about 44 (S iv.29-36 // OB I.372-415), while also harmonizing elements of the several successive plagues that lengthen (or, in Lambert & Millard's words, "pads out") the story. On this phenomenon in later Akkadian versions of old texts, see Cooper 1977 (with strong reservations about his aesthetic judgments) and discussion below.

Gilgamesh, it would have been impossible to restore the Old Babylonian version from this later edition; its changes represent a thorough revision.

Two other sparsely preserved epics, *Anzû* and *Etana*, also confirm the textual stability of standard versions that were produced through extensive revision of older editions. There are thirteen manuscripts of the standard version of *Anzû*,[30] which range in date from the Middle Assyrian period through the Neo-Assyrian and -Babylonian periods.[31] These manuscripts show a remarkably stable text with very few variations and a uniformity of lineation and tablet division that resembles the state of the standard version of *Gilgamesh*.[32] While the Old Babylonian version of *Anzû* is only extant in two fragmentary manuscripts, enough is preserved for us to see that it is both related to the later version and that the later version is a significant revision.[33] As with *Gilgamesh* the standard version contains both deletions from and additions to the OB version.[34] Notably, the standard version of *Anzû* frequently assimilates parallel passages to each other, creating a uniformity not present in the OB version, and frequently expands passages via symmetry and repetition.[35] It would be impossible without manuscript evidence to detect most of the editorial intervention that took place to create the standard version out of the old. Again we see the twin trends of the stability of the standard version of a work alongside its production through thorough revision of an older text.

Although far more fragmentary, the extant remains of *Etana* also show these trends. The standard version is represented by twelve manuscripts with very few overlaps that indicate that

---

[30] Saggs 1986: 3-4, with L and M omitted from the count as not part of the epic, per Vogelzang 1988: 19-23, and excluding N and O, which are copies of the Old Babylonian version. Note also that Saggs' manuscript S is a further fragment of D.
[31] Vogelzang 1988: 8.
[32] Vogelzang 1988: 17-18. For a critical edition of the Standard version that includes the important manuscript containing tablet III from Saggs 1986 (not available to Vogelzang in her edition), see Annus 2001.
[33] Vogelzang 1988: 18-19, 190-201. For a synopsis of the two versions, see Annus 2001: 31-39.
[34] Vogelzang 1988: 193-195.
[35] Vogelzang 1988: 195-196, 200; Cooper 1977: 508-509 (discounting his aesthetic judgments).

the epic existed in more than one layout.[36] Two older editions, a Middle Assyrian and Old Babylonian one, are also extant, but parallel the standard version in only a few places.[37] As with *Anzû*, the most extensive overlapping episode among the various editions shows an increase in narrative symmetry and repetition in the later version.[38] In evaluating the relationship among these editions, Kinnier Wilson noted that the late version represents a thorough revision of the older texts and that "restoration of the one version from the other is neither proposed without risk nor should be accepted without reserve."[39]

Finally, the *Cuthean Legend of Narām-Sîn* provides us with an interesting case of contraction rather than expansion over time. Its Old Babylonian version is extant in only one manuscript apiece for two tablets, leaving us uncertain about the total length of the text.[40] If there were in fact only two tablets to the OB version of the tale, it must have taken up approximately 600 lines.[41] In contrast, the standard version of the *Cuthean Legend* consists of only 180 lines on a single tablet.[42] As with *Gilgamesh*, the standard version displays a stable text,[43] and exhibits, where comparison is possible, the same types of revision of the older version as seen in other texts.[44] Despite its shortness in comparison with the Old Babylonian version, the standard version reads as a complete, coherent narrative. This suggests a different kind of caution about

---

[36] Novotny 2001: xxi-xxv; Kinnier Wilson 1985: 81.
[37] See the score in Novotny 2001: 27-41 for an easy synopsis of places where the standard and earlier editions parallel.
[38] Cooper 1977: 509-510. Whether this represents "a dilution or impoverishment of narration," as Cooper claims, is another question.
[39] 1985: 81. In relation to the even more fragmentarily preserved Adapa story, Milstein 2017: 96 concludes that "[t]he notion, then, that we can disentangle 'original' verses from 'secondary' ones is thus inherently problematic."
[40] Westenholz 1997: 267-279.
[41] Westenholz 1997: 263.
[42] Westenholz 1997: 263, 294-331.
[43] See Score in Westenholz 1997: 332-368, notes on 299. For the influence of the *Cuthean Legend* on Neo-Assyrian inscriptions, see Cogan & Tadmor 1977: 80, n. 26.
[44] Cooper 1977: 510 (again discounting his aesthetic judgments). Note that there is also a Middle Babylonian version, though only one manuscript exists in any extent. While comparison with the OB version is not possible, comparison with the SB version again shows the thorough revision characteristic of new editions (Westenholz 1997: 280-293, with a list of MB/SB parallels on 281).

our ability to reconstruct or detect successive revisions. We have very few cues for detecting abridged or condensed recensions and are even more in the dark when it comes to attempting to reconstruct a prior longer text from a short version. Finally, it should caution us about the frequent recourse in scholarship to the concept that shorter versions are older. This may be true, but it also does not have to be. Each case must be judged on its own merits.

While all of the above texts exhibit thorough revision across epochal boundaries, this should not be taken to mean that serial revision of a text is unknown in the ancient Near East. However, in order to find examples of this practice we must turn away from literary texts to the successive editions of Assyrian royal inscriptions.[45] When we examine the plethora of Assyrian inscriptions that have survived, particularly from the reigns of the Sargonid kings from the late-8th to late-7th centuries, we see clear examples of the kinds of editorial revision posited by many of the non-Documentarian models of the Pentateuch. Episodes are added to the ends of pre-existing texts,[46] accounts are abridged,[47] conflated,[48] or omitted,[49] glosses or summary statements find their way into the text.[50] Unlike the marked differences between recensions of literary texts, there is frequently a large amount of textual stability between older and newer editions of these royal inscriptions due to the much shorter timescale. The circumstances of the production of these inscriptions accounts for the variety of ways that they were edited and repurposed—they were updated to accord with the changing political and historical circumstances and to make

[45] For excellent studies of these trends in Sargonid inscriptions, see, e.g., Cogan 1977, 1980; Cogan & Tadmor 1977, 1981; Gerardi 1987, 1992; Jeffers 2018 (an excellent response to Cogan's views of Aššurbanipal's Prism F); L. Levine 1973, 1981; Tadmor 1958a, 1958b.
[46] See, for instance, the two *līmu* accounts in RINAP 3/1 17 (King Prism) added to an otherwise identical historical account taken from RINAP 3/1 16 (Cylinder D) which itself adds the fifth campaign account to an otherwise identical record of campaigns 1-4 taken from RINAP 3/1 15 (Cylinder C). Examples could be multiplied.
[47] This is sometimes taken as the normal scribal recourse when adding episodes in new editions of royal inscriptions, but see Levine 1981 for critiques.
[48] E.g., in the account of the Lydian affair, see Cogan & Tadmor 1977: 77-78.
[49] See the disappearance of the Qirbit affair from Ashurbanipal's annals beginning with RINAP 5/1 9 (edition F).
[50] E.g., Levine 1973.

known the latest accomplishments of the Assyrian king. In other words, the frequent revision of these texts is related to their function as vehicles of propaganda by reporting on, as it were, current events. When turning to comparisons between these editorial techniques and models for the production of the Pentateuch, we must ask ourselves whether the genre of Torah literature more closely aligns with the treatment of Mesopotamian literary texts or with that of Assyrian royal inscriptions.[51] Given the specific function of Assyrian royal inscriptions and the literary nature of the Pentateuch, we should expect its treatment to more closely match that of other literary works.

Ultimately, the above data weigh against the various kinds of Supplementary and Fragmentary models, positing multiple layers of small-scale changes, which are the DH's most frequent competitors.[52] This type of revision is known from Assyrian royal inscriptions,[53] but literary texts exhibit relatively stable textual traditions. Even if successive revisions did take place in the sources of the Pentateuch, the examples of *Gilgamesh* and the *Cuthean Legend* suggest that we would be ill-equipped to recover older editions from the received text beyond

[51] For an interesting and suggestive look at the way that Assyrian royal inscriptions may have influenced the production of the Priestly text, see Roskop 2012. The better Biblical parallel for Assyrian royal inscriptions is, *mutatis mutandis*, the book of Kings, which Weippert 1972; Halpern 1981; Halpern & Vanderhooft 1991; Halpern & Lemaire 2010 argue underwent successive revision and expansion in the reigns of different kings.

[52] See, for instance, Rendtorff 1977, where his approach on this matter can be attributed to his dismissal (1-28) of Noth's methodologically sound distinction between the oral and literary stages of the various traditions' development. For a thorough critique of Rendtorff's arguments, see Nicholson 1998: 100-131; Baden 2009b: 60-73. Carr 1996: 143-293, particularly 152-176, advocates for a model wherein the pre-Priestly material undergoes several additions that "do not all seem to be written at one time" despite the fact that "they do share some themes and foci" (173). Propp 2006: 724-730 rebuts Carr on these points.

[53] Such processes of serial revision can sometimes be seen in practical literature and reference works (e.g., omen series). But works such as Van der Toorn 2007 (see esp 128-130) that discuss examples from these kinds of practical reference works are drawing data from genres even more distant from the Torah and whose histories of editorial handling are at best suspect for evaluating models of Pentateuchal composition. We should also caution that for some texts in these genres, such generalizations do not hold. While the OB, MB, and SB editions of liver omen compendia show the kinds of revision we have seen in literary texts across epochal boundaries, the extant parts of the Standard Babylonian edition of the series *Barûtu* shows remarkable textual stability (Koch-Westenholz: 2000: 11-27). Manuals related to *āšipūtu* and *asûtu* also underwent a standardization process, on which see the essays collected in Steinert 2018. References to tablets and omens that are *aḫû* ("outside") also indicate an awareness of a distinction between some standard form of a text and other texts related to it (see Geller in Steinert 2018). Nevertheless, some omen series, such as Šumma ālu and Enūma Anu Enlil, do not display the same level of textual stability as others (Freedman 1998 and Rochberg in Steinert 2018, respectively).

tentatively identifying larger blocs of material as additions.[54] Smaller changes and glosses would be, largely, beyond our ken. Furthermore, the Pentateuch itself attests in both D and P to a preference in Judahite scribal culture for rewriting rather than revising older sources.[55] This strategy aligns in some ways with the differences apparent between older and newer recensions of some Mesopotamian literary texts. If revisions produced successive editions, they were likely few in number with changes leveled throughout a given text.

Finally, the very existence of standardized versions of various Mesopotamian literary works is itself a noteworthy piece of evidence.[56] Most of these texts received their fixed form in the late Middle- through early Neo- Assyrian periods—at the other end of the Neo-Assyrian period, various records from Ashurbanipal's library provide further evidence of a concept of a unified, stable text for certain works.[57] These standard versions exhibit largely identical texts between manuscripts, even, in some cases, ones separated by centuries.[58] The writings that make up the Torah come from the latter part of this timespan, and we would not be outside the bounds of the evidence to view textual stability of literary works as part of the scribal culture of this particular period.[59] The D source, admittedly the most self-conscious work in the Torah, directly attests to this attitude in Moses' exhortation to neither add nor subtract words from his speech

[54] Even these are suspect, as Lambert 2013: 456-463's evaluation of the Fifty Names of Marduk section shows.
[55] Baden's 2009b: 197-207 objections to the idea that P knew JE will be addressed later.
[56] Van der Toorn 2007: 217-219 views the emergence of these standardized texts as part of a shift from a predominately oral to a predominately literate mode of understanding tradition, but perhaps we should allow that what triggers the creation of standard versions has nothing to do with the question of orality versus literacy. It is possible that the standard versions emerge from some critical mass of oral exegesis of the older versions, which were nevertheless viewed as primarily literary works in their own right.
[57] Hallo 1962: 21-26. For records from Ashurbanipal's library, see Lambert 1962; Parpola 1983. For a different view of the implications of the catalogues, see Van der Toorn 2007: 42-44.
[58] Van der Toorn 2007: 126 notes that "faithful reproduction of the text as received was the scribal norm." These standard versions even go so far as to preserve apparently corrupt lines faithfully (Lambert 2013: 464).
[59] Other works that posit a far more flexible notion of text in the ancient Near East fail to differentiate trends in different time periods. Instead it is common to collapse the nearly three millennia history of Mesopotamian writing into an undifferentiated mass. This would be like someone attempting to define a single concept of the book by taking the two millennia of our era as a single data sample—the roughly 1500 years before the European invention of the printing press would certainly skew whatever picture one would abstract from the exercise.

(Deut 4:2; 13:1). The contemporaneous existence of standard editions of Mesopotamian literature favors Judahite texts that are comparably stable.

There are further historical factors that weigh against the concept of multiple revisions of these texts. The first is the limited geographic area in which the Pentateuch developed. With the possible exception of the E source,[60] these documents were all produced, and were certainly all copied, in the kingdom of Judah, making a proliferation of local variant texts unlikely. And even when a text is used in a variety of locations, that does not guarantee multiplicity. The standard versions of both *Gilgamesh* and *Enūma eliš* maintained stability across a widespread geographic area. Even a more sparsely attested text, *The Sargon Birth Legend*, extant in only four late exemplars of varying states of incompleteness, shows identity between manuscripts from Nineveh and Dilbat.[61] Similarly, the standard version of the *Cuthean Legend* shows an identical text across eight copies from Nineveh, Sultantepe, and Kish. The more limited geographic distribution of a Judahite text, with its attendant much smaller chance for regional variation, would likely also exhibit textual stability.[62]

The various texts that make up the Pentateuch also developed across a much shorter timeframe than the Mesopotamian literary texts that we have examined. The reference to Kalḫu in the pre-Priestly (J) genealogy in Genesis 10 makes any date earlier than the early ninth century difficult to defend.[63] If J material is understood as the earliest of the Pentateuchal strands and the final redaction took place sometime in the early Persian era, this allows only approximately 400-450 years for development to take place. The accumulation of several, small-scale, successive

[60] Friedman 1997: 70-88. For an earlier articulation, Kuenen 1886: 228-232.
[61] Westenholz 1997: 36-49.
[62] One would have to place a large bulk of the editing of non-Priestly material in the exilic and post-exilic age in order to posit regional variation.
[63] This is not to say that there are not older texts in the Pentateuch—the Song of the Sea and the Blessing of Jacob certainly predate the 9th century. But they are themselves sources used by the authors of the surrounding narratives.

revisions in such a relatively short period of time seems unlikely, especially given the Torah's reporting of ancient history rather than the current events of the Assyrian royal inscriptions. Furthermore, when we do see major recensional changes to texts, it occurs *between* epochs- Old Babylonian editions over-against Neo-Assyrian/Standard Babylonian ones. These recensions occurred precisely because the texts had been around for such a length of time. They required updating both because of their language and because they had likely received elaboration and commentary in the oral tradition that continued to flow alongside the literary traditions of the ancient Near East.[64] In contrast, the few centuries in which the Pentateuch was composed do not seem to require the rewriting and elaboration of pre-Priestly material in that material itself,[65] and there was certainly not enough linguistic distance to necessitate revision.[66] As noted above, the type of development seen between versions in Mesopotamia is instead paralleled by the way that the Priestly and Deuteronomistic texts adapted and rewrote the older, pre-Priestly material. The relatively short time frame in which the Pentateuchal texts were produced again supports the supposition of a stable text.

If the material constraints of production, the attested scribal practices of the ancient Near East, and the limited geographic and temporal range of Torah literature are problematic for models that posit numerous small scale changes, there is a further issue in the mode of transmission they envision. While rarely addressed as such, transmission is a historical issue rather than a literary one and has to be contextualized in the matrix of scribal realia and culture

[64] Van der Toorn 2007: 128-129 also attributes changes to the elaboration of a text in oral tradition, but does so in the context of revised editions of a text rather than a rewritten form. Both phenomena certainly happen, but genre plays a role in which one is selected. Reference texts such as omen literature and exorcism manuals are much more likely to see the kinds of expansion Van der Toorn describes, while literary works such as *Gilgamesh* seem to be subject to wholesale rewriting rather than small changes and expansion. See Niditch 1996 for some suggestive, though problematic (especially in her collapse of poetic and prosaic texts when discussing their relationship to an oral milieu), explorations of the interplay between written and oral literature in ancient Israel.

[65] Though the JE redaction is possibly an example of such a recension.

[66] On the relative linguistic homogeneity of the language of the Pentateuch, see Hendel & Joosten 2018. This should be contrasted with the linguistic updating present in the Chronicler's adaptation of material from Kings.

discussed above.[67] Given that the production of a new copy of a text provides the most likely setting in which scribes would make changes and revisions, there are two possible explanations of how our received text of the Pentateuch could preserve numerous small-scale changes. The first model must presuppose that only one copy of a text existed at any given time so that multiple layers of small-scale changes build up, able to be disseminated and preserved in later copies. The alternative would have to involve numerous editions of individual Pentateuchal texts or fragments, each with different small changes, that would then have had to be collected and redacted into a single text. These models can be evaluated in light of scribal and historical factors and compared with the admittedly limited manuscript and versional evidence we have access to.

The first model's single text approach is problematic in that it assumes for the Pentateuchal text or text fragments an existence that was only archival, with no public use of the text imagined, existing in a single copy in a central place that had complete control over every copy made.[68] Furthermore, the likelihood that only a single copy of these texts existed to be worked on is contraindicated by the mere fact of their survival, in relatively pristine condition, through the Babylonian destruction of 587 up to their inclusion in the Pentateuch. The alternative transmission route of many varied contemporary copies, though somewhat analogous to the proliferation of Assyrian royal inscriptions, is no more convincing. First, the material, generic, temporal, and geographic constraints described above militate against the likelihood of this scenario. We also might expect such a path of transmission to produce several different Pentateuchs, but the versional evidence of the Septuagint, Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Dead

[67] Carr 1996: 203 curiously states that he is going to evaluate which "transmission-historical model" best accounts for the data he presents and then immediately moves back to compositional analysis without ever returning to the question of transmission.

[68] Another problematic assumption embedded in this view, and one that will be discussed in detail below in relation to P, is the idea that these texts were somehow religiously normative and authoritative for the communities that received them. That is to say, the view of many changes to the text(s) suggests that in order for changes to society or religion to be authorized, they must be reflected in the text of the Pentateuch. This is an overly Protestant view of religion and text unsupported by the evidence for textual use and canonicity in the ancient Near East.

Sea Scrolls present us instead with a stable and well-preserved text-tradition. This points to the existence of multiple, relatively identical copies of the text.[69] Documentary Models, with their relatively straightforward views of production, transmission, and redaction remain the most plausible explanations for the Torah as it exists.

The Documentary Hypothesis also has an advantage in its ready-made explanation for the large-scale narrative continuities and cross-references that exist between various portions of the Pentateuch, phenomena that Supplementary and Fragmentary models have a difficult time accounting for. Various, disconnected stories have continuity with one another because they were once part of separate documents that were then intermingled with each other.[70] This point has particular relevance for the Priestly text as the question of whether P was originally a separate document or a redactional layer of older non-priestly material (JE) has been a live argument since its independence was questioned by Cross.[71] This argument has been picked up and expanded by Blum, who, like Cross, sees the Priestly work as a redactional layer intended to produce a new composition (KP) over the foundation of the non-Priestly material, but one that was designed so that parts of it could be read separately as well: "weder 'Quelle' noch 'Redaktion.'"[72] Boorer rightly points out that such a model "seems to complicate the issue unnecessarily" and further observes that Blum's assertion of a P-composition that incorporates

[69] The view that changes continued to be made to the post-compilation Pentateuch is also belied by this relatively stable and well-preserved text-tradition. This stands in contrast to the preservation of divergent editions of books such as Esther, Daniel, and Jeremiah.

[70] This is what Friedman 2003: 13 describes as "narrative flow" and Friedman 1998: 361-378 argues for its importance for evaluating compositional reconstructions in a critique of Van Seters and Blum. This feature of the Documentary Hypothesis is underutilized in defenses of the Hypothesis against other frameworks and models, though it is a major feature of Baden's (2009b, 2012) approach.

[71] 1973: 293-325. Cross was not the first to propose this, but his arguments revived a debate that had not received much attention since Wellhausen. A valuable overview of the history of this discussion can be found in Boorer 2016: 34-47; see also Lohfink 1994: 144, n. 28. Perhaps the most radical rejection of P's independence is found in Rendtorff 1977: 160-2 where he claims that after the beginning of the Moses story "läßt sich diese priesterliche Schicht im Pentateuch nicht mehr erkennen."

[72] Blum 1990: 221-285.

older non-Priestly material has no actual impact on his analysis of P's concerns and theology.[73] Neither Cross's nor Blum's model of P holds up under scrutiny. Given the Priestly text's internal coherence and frequent conflict, in both plot and ideology, with the older material it now sits beside, it seems far more likely that P has its origins as a separate work that was later combined with non-Priestly (JE) material.[74]

For all of these reasons, this work adheres to a classical Documentary Hypothesis framework, one in which the Torah as it stands is the product of a redaction that combined originally separate JE[75] and P documents with each other and with the opening book of the Deuteronomistic History.[76] I am persuaded that it offers the best account of the data in the Pentateuch in a way that is consistent with what we know of ancient Near Eastern scribal culture in the Iron II Age, including its material aspects, and that respects the geographic and temporal limits of the Torah's formation. I do not expect everyone to be similarly persuaded; we are all of us licensed to organize and interpret the data at hand in a way that, to us, most successfully explains the problems of the Torah's composition. Nevertheless, I hope that this work will still contribute to broader discussions on the Priestly text, even for those who understand the

[73] Boorer 2016:42. For further critique of Blum, see Nicholson 1998: 116-131, 202-213.
[74] Lohfink 1994: 146, n. 31 contains a succinct refutation of Cross's position. See also, e.g., Schwartz 1996: 105-109, passim; Friedman 1997: 188-192, 208-211; Gilders 2009. Gertz 2015 refutes Blum's position as it applies to Genesis 1-11, but is wary about drawing conclusions for other parts of the Pentateuch. Schmid 2011: 18-20 notes Blum's position as an outlier in European scholarship, though see Hutzli 2023 for a recent continuation of his conception of P as, at least in parts, a redactional layer.
[75] In line with classical models, I am persuaded by the evidence that this document is itself a redaction of originally separate J and E texts. For further definition of the J/E distinction and a defense of the existence of E, see Baden 2009b. Additionally, the separation of J and E elements after Exodus 3 has been greatly advanced by the work of Friedman 2003 and Propp 1999, 2006. This is not the place for a full discussion of Baden 2009b's contention that there was no JE redaction, but his argument is weakened by the relationship between Deuteronomy 9-10 and Exodus 32-34. If one is unconvinced, as I am, by his analysis of Exodus 32-34, then these sets of chapters provide all of the evidence necessary for a JE redaction that preceded the composition of the Deuteronomistic History. I would like to take this moment to offer many thanks to my colleague Sarah Cook, who has generously shared her insights into Pentateuchal redaction with me.
[76] For discussion on the relationship between older views of the Hexateuch and the post-Noth views of a Tetrateuch and Deuteronomistic History, see Chapter 6.

composition of the Torah differently. It is to the issue of the appropriate methods for analyzing this Priestly document, isolated from the received text of the Pentateuch, that we now turn.

Some Rules of the Game: Principles for Secondary Analysis

Once isolated, the Priestly text still presents a complex façade that has led Biblical scholars on a quest to understand its composition. Over the course of the next five chapters, we will be examining various problems of the Priestly text that have generated this discussion. But there is preliminary work that must be done. If, in general, the large-scale results of the analysis of the Pentateuch seem secure, the question then becomes how best to approach the analysis of the individual documents identified by this analysis.

Reinhard Kratz has argued that the best way to ensure methodological control of the data is to avoid going behind the text to theoretical oral stages and instead investigate these texts at the literary level so that "the same methodological rules can (and should) be used that were applied to the differentiation of the larger literary strata."[77] While I think Kratz is correct that the literary level of examination is our surest guide to the history of these documents, his conclusion that the same methodological rules used to identify the larger strata should be recursively applied is questionable. This is especially true for the Documentary Hypothesis, where such a claim runs the risk of confusing primary and secondary levels of analysis. The primary level of analysis takes account of both continuity and discontinuity in an attempt to reconstruct the underlying documents. That is to say, the identification of the larger strata is not simply a matter of isolating

[77] 2016: 540-543 (quote from 543). We should also keep in mind that none of the texts of the Pentateuch that we have are transcriptions of oral performances, but are rather literary distillations of Israelite and Judahite tradition. Study of these precursor traditions should not be confused with study of the Pentateuch or its composition. This is true even for literature that is much closer in form to an oral production, such as the Homeric epics. For relevant observations on the relationship between studying oral and written forms in Homeric studies, see Goold 1977; West 2003: 11-14; 2011.

characteristics of the different documents and searching for inconsistencies. It is also predicated on connecting the various pericopae that share those characteristics and a unified narrative perspective.[78] Any contribution to the establishment of the documents' identities should be considered part of the primary level of analysis.[79]

Now it is entirely possible that the primary analysis requires more than just a first sorting of the data, and the history of scholarly evaluation of the Pentateuch shows that this was in fact the case. When scholars first attempted to divide Genesis into its putative sources, an image of two sources, J and E (i.e., not-J), emerged. Hupfeld's argument that E/not-J was in fact two different sources, a younger (later, E) and older (later, P) Elohist, was a refinement of this picture, contributing to the primary analysis of the Pentateuch.[80] And while this is an example of Kratz's recursive application of methods, at a certain point we should consider the identity of the larger strata to be established and ready for investigation in themselves. If we continue to recursively apply the primary analytic framework we will not only experience diminishing

[78] Friedman 2003: 10-13; Baden 2012: 16-20. It is for this reason that the individual documents are readable as independent texts.

[79] While this may seem circular (we think there are documentary sources so we reconstruct documentary sources to prove there were documentary sources), it is not. Such reconstructions help make the case for the hypothesis on which they are based because features of the separated texts, such as their narrative continuity, make a powerful argument for their explanatory necessity over against other models. That is to say, the reconstruction of putative documents on the basis of a hypothesis is a key part of testing that hypothesis. For a similar situation in New Testament studies, see Robinson, Hoffman, & Kloppenborg 2000, a reconstruction of Q that did not wait on the field to achieve unanimity over whether such a document existed or was a necessary part of the solution to the Synoptic Problem. This critical edition of a reconstructed source text serves as a valuable methodological exercise and repository of comparative data even if new evidence invalidates the hypothesis on which it is based or the consensus of the field shifts to some other model.

[80] For an invaluable overview of the pre-de Wette state of the field, see Harvey & Halpern 2008. For an overview since de Wette, see Rogerson 1984; Nicholson 1998. Another excellent summary of the early field can be found in Carpenter & Harford Battersby 1900: I.23-48. One wonders if the shift in first sort of the data from a J/not-J model to a P/not-P model, partially a response to the success of Hupfeld's arguments for separating not-J into two sources, is responsible for the uncertainty with which many scholars treat the existence of an E text. A thought experiment: If you made a Venn diagram of not-J and not-P from both of these approaches, you would produce a kind of *vesica piscis* E text. What does it look like and is it any different from the E text identified by, e.g., Wellhausen 1899 or Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900 or Friedman 2003? The advantage of constructing an E text this way is the same as that for Auld 1994's reconstruction of a putative common source for Kings & Chronicles. You produce a text using consistent, non-subjective criteria (primary analysis) and can then evaluate whether the now-hypothesized source actually serves an explanatory purpose (secondary analysis).

returns as the balance of continuities and discontinuities becomes less persuasive;[81] we will also never move on to the valuable insights that a secondary analysis might afford.[82]

This secondary level of analysis, wherein the documents identified by the primary analysis are evaluated, requires different tools and approaches. The methods for identifying glosses, additions, and layers must be adjusted when dealing with a text that may have once existed as a whole. We must be careful to weigh every supposed sign of stratification and addition against competing concerns such as the dynamics of narrative, literary technique, and the use of source material. And we must find tools to evaluate seemingly out of place passages rather than simply identifying them as such while dismissing them from consideration. Rather than leave our understanding of how these various features relate to an analysis of the Priestly text implicit, we will here lay out some of the principles that will undergird our compositional evaluation of P. The general criteria described will then be used and refined in the more detailed secondary analyses undertaken in the following chapters.

Though it might seem like a simple assertion, we should state that, like the older non-Priestly sources, the Priestly text is a narrative.[83] And while genealogies may jostle against a narrative flow that seems to be temporarily lost in a glut of ritual regulation, these other types of material all sit within P's narrative framework and participate in it to a much greater extent than is frequently recognized.[84] Any compositional analysis of P must take account of this narrative

[81] This can be seen in the fact that few models that move beyond the identification of the larger strata have ever managed to generate a consensus.

[82] Note that this is true regardless of the certainty or correctness of the primary analysis. At a certain point a scholar should treat the reconstructed material in itself; this too becomes part of the evaluation of the robustness of their hypothesis at both levels of analysis.

[83] While not a controversial claim, there are still those whose vision is closer to Cross 1973: 301's assertion that "P is not a narrative source."

[84] For this position and its impact on understanding the composition of the Priestly text, see also Ruwe 2003: 57-58; Baden 2009a; Feldman 2020. Such an approach cuts against the grain of such descriptions as Noth 1981: 8, where he argues that "[i]t can hardly be disputed that in its total structure P is a *narrative work*," but goes on to say that the inclusion of unrelated legal material under the siglum P has obscured this feature of the source (emphasis original).

nature. Narratives are predicated on change, with themes and plots emerging at different paces. When we fail to take the narrative of P seriously, we reduce it to a mass of textual data and lose sight of the connection among its various components. An egregious example of this kind of neglect can be seen in the work of King, who argues that the Priestly texts in Genesis are part of a different composition than those in Exodus-Numbers in part because he understands the use of *ʾĕlōhîm* instead of Yhwh in Genesis to represent an unacceptable variation from what he defines as a standard Priestly formula.[85] This ignores the fact that the revelation of the name Yhwh to Moses is part of the plot of the Priestly text.[86] P thus provides us with a narrative explanation for the distribution of the data and no firm basis for a compositional explanation.[87] While this example is an extreme, we will encounter other places in the following chapters where a failure to grapple with the narrative nature of the Priestly text has led to mistaken advocacy for compositional stratification. To avoid this pitfall, this book's analysis of the Priestly text will operate on the following principle: *When there is a narrative explanation in P for the feature under investigation, the weight of other data must be sufficiently robust to prefer a compositional explanation in its place.*

The Priestly text is not just a narrative, but a piece of literature.[88] Frequently derided for its literary value in comparison to the parallel JE text,[89] negligence in studying and

---

This view of the Priestly text, common to major works such as Elliger 1952; McEvenue 1971; Lohfink 1994; Guillaume 2009; and Boorer 2016, will be addressed extensively in the following chapters.

[85] King 2009: 3-27. Note too his strange insistence on 19, n. 50 that any text that has non-narrative material embedded in it, such as Exodus 35-40 or Leviticus 8-9, should not be understood as narrative at all.

[86] Exod 6:2-3. For an excellent discussion of this passage, see Garr 1992.

[87] Compare King's argument with the parallel situation of the distribution of the divine Name in the Torah as a whole. There, we receive competing narrative claims (Gen 4:26; Exod 3:13-15; 6:2-3) none of which can be reconciled with the mass of the data contained in Genesis. In this situation we are pushed to a compositional explanation as it resolves all the tensions in the data. On the contrary, in P there is only one narrative claim for the distribution of the divine Name and once P is separated from non-P/JE there is no tension between the Genesis data and this claim. Even the supposedly problematic Gen 17:1; 21:1b are not really problems—they are given by the narrator and not any of the characters in the story (on this, see Friedman 2003: 56n.).

[88] Pedersén 1985: 20-21; 1998: 2-3 offers a pragmatic sorting of Mesopotamian texts that treats occasional documents produced for a particular purpose as "archival" and texts that participate in the broader stream of

understanding the Priestly author's style has been a serious flaw in biblical scholarship.[90] The work of McEvenue has served as a necessary and appreciated corrective to this trend, and though this author does not find McEvenue's classification of the Priestly text with children's literature to be accurate or enlightening, this in no way diminishes his contribution to understanding the Priestly author's artistry.[91] Chief among McEvenue's points is that repetition serves as "one of his [i.e. the Priestly author's] most characteristic and marked tricks of style."[92] This observation is key, as an unconsidered importation of the criterion of repetition from the primary stage of Pentateuchal analysis combined with the latent lack of sympathy for P as a literary text has led many scholars to consider the Priestly text to be a document that has received frequent elaboration. But, as McEvenue points out, repetitions are an innate part of the Priestly text and supposing layers of glosses or additions in repetitive passages, such as Gen 9:8-17 or 17:9-14, often adds nothing to our understanding of the text.[93]

Additionally, while McEvenue recognizes and explores repetition as a literary feature within the individual passages he chose to deal with, this feature is not restricted to these occurrences. The Priestly author also uses this device between texts, creating parallels and, in structural roles, signaling shifts in his work. A brief example can be found in Gen 13:6, 11b-12 alongside Gen 36:6-8; 37:1 where the situation between Abraham and Lot is repeated with Jacob

---

tradition and exist in multiple copies as "literary." Note that this includes many non-narrative genres, such as lexical lists; likewise, some texts with a literary nature, such as letters, are categorized as archival. However, Pedersén's treatment of the purpose of texts as a basic criterion for identifying them as "literary" has an attractive simplicity to it. It furthermore recognizes that even non-narrative texts are frequently have internal organizations that unfold in a way analogous to—though distinct from—what we would identify as plot in narrative texts.

[89] McEvenue 1971: 1-21 provides a thorough review of the negative evaluations of the Priestly author's literary merits in Biblical scholarship.

[90] McEvenue 1971: 8 notes about this neglect that "Scholars familiar with Homer, or European sagas, were able to read the Yahwist and Elohist without any special preparation. The style of P, which we have seen von Rad call 'esoteric', was studied or analysed only so far as was necessary to separate it out as a source distinct from JE."

[91] McEvenue 1971.

[92] McEvenue 1970: 104. For descriptions of the various types of repetition that the Priestly author uses, including what McEvenue refers to as *palistrophe* (defined on 29, n. 18), see McEvenue 1971, esp 27-32, 79-81.

[93] McEvenue 1971: 72-78, 167-172.

and Esau. These two panels serve a structural function, framing the Priestly story of the competition among Abraham and his family for possession of the land of Canaan and bookending Yhwh's interactions with the patriarchs.[94] Repetition, as an innate feature of the Priestly author's style, should not on its own provoke the question of editorial additions.

Conversely, the Priestly author's use of repetition should not lead us to expect roteness. Nevertheless, variety in formulae is frequently used to posit editorial intervention in P.[95] Currently fashionable in Priestly studies, Knohl's and Milgrom's approach to the distinction between P and H makes rampant use of such variation as a diagnostic criterion for separating out layers in P.[96] Closer examination of P shows that this approach operates with unrealistic expectations, with Blum noting in regard to such use of variation that "the priestly writers, despite their formulaic style, were not robots and they did not work mechanically."[97] McEvenue also documents numerous instances where the Priestly author avoids repeating himself verbatim, but instead uses variation in repetition as a literary technique to convey emphasis and introduce new information.[98]

More to the point, we should not expect perfect regularity of expression or formulae in any literary text.[99] And where perfect regularity is present, the evidence from ancient Near

---

[94] Genesis 13:6, 11b-12 comes just before the first interaction between Yhwh and the patriarchs in Genesis 17, while Genesis 36:6-8; 37:1 come just after the last interaction in Genesis 35:9-15. See the following chapters for elaborations on the role of repetition in, e.g., the Tabernacle instruction-execution panels (Exodus 25-31//35-39, including its miniature in Exod 40:1-15//16-33) and the Toledot lists (Gen 5:32//6:10; 10:22-23, 31//11:10; 11:26//27).

[95] Kuenen 1886: 82, n. 16 is exemplary: "slight changes of expression occur [in comparing Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8] which seem to betray diversity of authorship." See also Noth 1965: 31's claim that "the three subdivisions [of Leviticus 3]…are almost alike, even in wording, and correspond even more closely in the unedited original than in the text before us."

[96] E.g., Knohl 1995: 106-110; Milgrom 1991: 35-42; 2000: 1325-1332. See Chapter 3 for detailed discussion.

[97] Blum 2009: 36.

[98] McEvenue 1971: 28-32, 79-81. See also Driver 1910: 130; Emerton 1988: 385; Hendel 1998: 21-22.

[99] Emerson 1841's contention that "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds" seems appropriate here. I for one would not classify the Priestly author as among the "little statesmen and philosophers and divines."

Eastern literary texts shows that it is more likely to be a feature of later editions of a text.[100] Indeed, we have an example of this enforcement of regularity in later copies of texts for a P portion of Genesis in LXX Gen 1:8's addition of "καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν" to bring the second day into conformity with the rest of the days reported in Genesis 1.[101] Other genres that contain formulaic elements, such as letters, also show variety in their formulae.[102] To take a single example from the vast Neo-Assyrian corpus, of the seven letters of Marduk-šallim-aḫḫe to the king of Assyria with preserved greetings, we find the same basic formula used in all of them.[103] However, discounting orthographic variants (including the use of logograms for Akkadian words or visa-versa), we still find changes to the basic expression including the insertion of an adjective,[104] the deletion of an adverb,[105] the addition of a phrase,[106] and the replacement of one phrase for another.[107] There are likely contextual reasons for some of these variations,[108] but they nicely demonstrate that differences in formulaic language can occur from the hand of a single author and may even be signs of a literary sensibility on the part of the letter

[100] See discussion above, but directly note Cooper 1977; Tigay 1982: 81-2, 100-3; Vogelzang 1988: 190-201.
[101] In support of this position, there are no obvious anableptic triggers in Genesis 1:8 that would suggest an omission in MT. Hendel 1998: 23-24, 120 also understands this as a harmonistic addition in LXX's *Vorlage*. A similar case is seen in LXX Gen 1:20's addition of "καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως" to the fifth day. See Hendel 1998: 81-92 for a full discussion on LXX and Samaritan tendencies towards harmonization and regularity in Genesis 1-11. These trends should not be at all surprising as they align with what we know about scribal practice elsewhere.
[102] Overviews of epistolary features can be found in Pfeiffer 1923 for Assyrian letters; Fitzmeyer 1974 for Aramaic letters; and Pardee 1978 for Hebrew letters.
[103] SAA XIII 9.o.1-14: *a-na* LUGAL *be-lí-ia* ARAD-*ka* PN *ka-ri-ib-ka lu* DI-*mu a-na* LUGAL *be-lí-ia* [List of DNs] *a-na* LUGAL *be-lí-ia a-dan-niš a-dan-niš lík-ru-bu* UD.MEŠ GÍD.DA.MEŠ MU.AN.NA.MEŠ *ṭu-ub* UZU *a-na* LUGAL *be-lí-ia lid-di-nu* ("To the king, my lord. Your servant, PN, the one blessing you. May peace/health be for the king, my lord. May DNs bless the king, my lord, very, very much. May they give to the king, my lord, long days and years of good health.").
[104] *maʾdāti* ("many") to describe "years" in SAA XIII 12.o.10; 13.o.11.
[105] Only one use of *adanniš* ("very") instead of two in SAA XIII 13.o.9.
[106] *ṭūb libbi* ("goodness of heart") before *ṭūb šīri* ("good health") in SAA XIII 12.o.11.
[107] *ṭūb libbi* ("goodness of heart") in place of *ṭūb šīri* ("good health") in SAA XIII 13.o.12; 15.o.12.
[108] For instance, SAA XIII 12 reports the completion of a temple of Mullissu, a subject of more freighted importance than some of his other reports about routine offerings. For an in-depth study of variation in 8th century Assyrian epistolary formulae that touches on the meaning of such differences, see Luukko 2012.

writer.[109] The Lachish letters of Hôšaʿyāhû show a similar variation in their opening formulary.[110] Finally, ritual texts from Neo-Assyrian archives also contain a variety of expression in their descriptions of similar rituals.[111] Variation in expression and even in formulaic language can not provide a sound basis for positing editorial layers, but must be carefully adjudicated and weighed alongside other kinds of evidence.

A last literary technique of the Priestly author that can contribute to the discussion at this point is his frequent use of prolepsis. In particular, the Priestly author is fond of giving proleptic reports of the fulfillment of commands followed by their actual fulfillment in the narrative. This literary technique is visible already in Genesis 1 where the phrase ויהי־כן is deployed between god commanding something to happen and a description of that thing happening.[112] This same proleptic reporting of fulfillment of Yhwh's commands can also be seen in P's plagues narrative at both the small and large scale. In a manner similar to Genesis 1, we find commands given by both Yhwh and Pharaoh reported as fulfilled in summary language (*wyʿśw kn*) with a narrative of their actual fulfillment immediately following.[113] But in P's plagues narrative, the proleptic

[109] Luukko 2019: 239 singles out these variations in the introductory formulae of the priests' letters as evidence of "literary features" in the epistolary corpus.
[110] Compare the openings in KAI 192-197, with commentary in Aḥituv 2008: 58-86.
[111] See, e.g., SAA XX 1, 2, 37 and extensive discussion in Chapter 5.
[112] Gen 1:9 (LXX), 11, 15, 24. One is tempted to adopt the order of phrases in LXX Gen 1:6-7 as well, which places *wyhy kn* in proleptic position instead of as a report of completion as in MT. However, given the harmonistic tendencies of LXX elsewhere in Genesis 1 and the lack of explanation for LXX's reading giving rise to MT's, MT is the better reading (see Hendel 1998: 21). The harmonizing of LXX is also the reason for not including LXX 1:20 on this list, though there is the smallest possibility of anablepsis by homoioarchton given that *wyhy kn* is followed by *wybrʾ*. On the other hand, the expanded phraseology of 1:9 LXX, where the narrator describes the action following *wyhy kn*, is supported by Qumran manuscripts and does not show signs of being a harmonization (Hendel 1998: 25-27). Note as well that this phrase is used as a conclusion to the acts of creation in 1:30 and as the conclusion to the creation of the firmament in MT Gen 1:6-7. This is a further example of the Priestly author's preference for repetition with variation; he is no slave to consistency.
[113] Yhwh's commands: Exod 7:8-10; 8:12-13. Pharaoh's commands: 7:11-12. Note that this phrase is not used exclusively in a proleptic manner. Like *wyhy kn* in Genesis 1, it is deployed in a variety of ways in the plagues narrative and elsewhere. See, for example, Exod 7:20a, 22; 8:3a where it serves in lieu of a narrative report. The plague of boils (9:8-11) lacks it altogether. 8:14 clearly demonstrates that the phrase "and they did so" is not always meant literally as part of the narrative sequence—the *ḥarṭummîm* can not both do the action and not be able to do the action (while one may argue that the phrase "and they did so" is meant to refer to them striking the dirt with their

fulfillment report also operates at the macro-level. Exod 7:6 reports "And Moses and Aaron acted; just as Yhwh commanded them, thus they acted," in reference to the instructions that Yhwh gave them to go before Pharaoh, demand the release of the Israelites, and create the opportunity for Yhwh to perform wonders (Exod 6:29-7:5). P's entire plagues account then serves as a narrative elaboration of this summary statement. This demonstrates that the Priestly author is comfortable using prolepsis both in "short-term" and "long-term" situations.

Effectively, P's proleptic reporting is a specialized deployment of repetition, as the narrator tells us that something has occurred in summary fashion ("and it was so," "and they did so," etc.) before going on to an actual description of what happened. These reports also serve as a breakpoint between two sections (command and execution) that are themselves repetitions, though rarely ever exactly so. The Priestly author uses these proleptic statements as both a literary device and an organizational one. The use of prolepsis, by breaking narrative sequence, allows the Priestly author to step outside the flow of his narrative.[114] He is able to use these narrative breaks in a variety of ways, such as by conveying information about regular occurrences in the story.[115] In its most complex usage, proleptic reporting provides the Priestly author a platform to present an argument for the upcoming narrative to the reader. In these cases, the foregoing "short-term" prolepses create the expectation that execution will always parallel command and prepare the reader to pay closer attention to situations in which the

---

staffs like Moses and Aaron had done, the adverbial "with their secrets" makes this seem unlikely). For other "short-term" prolepses in P using the phrase *wyʿśw kn*, see, e.g., Gen 50:12; Exod 16:17; 40:16; Num 5:4; 20:27; 27:22; 31:31. For a possible example in the epigraphic repertoire, see KAI 194 & commentary in Aḥituv 2008: 69-76.

[114] For examinations of such achronological approaches to narrative in Judahite historiography, see Halpern 1990; 1996: 121-143.

[115] E.g. Exod 16:35*; 34:34-35. Some scholars (e.g., Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: II.106; Driver 1910: 30-31; Propp 1998: 590) attribute the entirety of Exod 16:35 verse to P, while others (e.g., Wellhausen 1899: 78-79; Noth 1962: 137; Friedman 2003: 148) split this verse between the J and P sources in accordance with their presence in the rest of the chapter (for the view that the entire chapter belongs to P and subsequent P-like expansions, see Kuenen 1886: 70, 331-332).

execution of commands is a more complicated affair.[116] Given the Priestly author's use of prolepsis, we should be cautious in seeing the hand of an editor in chronological disjunctions or in summary statements followed by more extensive reporting of action. The widespread attestation of all of these literary techniques in the Priestly text leads us to a second principle for the compositional analysis of P: *The presence of known literary techniques of the Priestly author (especially repetition, variation in repetition, and prolepsis) can not be used as the basis for identifying editorial additions to the Priestly text.*

In addition to being a narrative, literary composition, there is every indication that the Priestly author incorporated pre-existing sources into his work. Texts similar to much of the non-narrative material contained in the Priestly text, such as the various manuals and legal treatises in Leviticus, are attested across the ancient Near East, including Greece.[117] Additionally, collections of ritual texts from the ancient Near East attest not only to a diversity of materials available, but also to the existence of multiple texts dealing with the same ritual or practice. Collections of texts from Hattuša/Boğazköy,[118] Emar,[119] Ugarit,[120] and Assyria[121] all contain multiple copies of the same or similar rituals, frequently with variants among them.

The same archives also contain multiple kinds of texts dealing with the same ritual. The Hittite KI.LAM ritual included detailed descriptions in two series, as well as an outline of the whole ritual and texts containing a list of rations needed for the ritual.[122] The *zukru* festival

---

[116] Chapters 2 and 4 will argue that this is an important function of the proleptic material in Exodus 40.
[117] See texts in Zimmern 1901; Thureau-Dangin 1921; Sokolowski 1955; 1962; 1969; Fleming 1992; 2000; Wiseman & Black 1996; Roth 1997; Pardee 2000; 2002; Miller 2004; 2013; Lupu 2009; Feder 2011; Parpola 2017. A one volume collection of Hittite ritual texts, similar to Pardee's for Ugarit, is a serious need for future comparative research on ritual as both act and literature. Pedersén 1998 contains a survey of various Mesopotamian archives.
[118] Singer 1983: 33-52; Miller 2004. KUB 32.133 contains an explicit acknowledgment by Muršili II of variation in ritual texts and a concern that the properly approved version is followed (translation in Feder 2011: 233).
[119] Fleming 2000: 48-192.
[120] Pardee 2002: 26-33, 40-53, 56-65.
[121] SAA XX.1-6, 9-10, 30-31, 38-48.
[122] Singer 1983: 40-51.

celebrated at Emar existed in both annual and seventh-year versions.[123] God-lists from Ugarit are implicated in the structure of prescriptive sacrificial texts.[124] Assyrian *tākultu* manuals from the reigns of Sennacherib, Ashurnanipal, and Aššur-etel-ilāni vary in their contents.[125] Manuals for the *kalû* directing them what to chant during rituals were kept separately from the instructions for how to perform those rituals;[126] a similar division is seen in texts of the *maqlû* ritual.[127] Notably, these collections frequently contain texts originating from diverse time periods, such as Neo-Hittite copies of Middle Hittite instructions for priests[128] or Middle Assyrian rituals in Neo-Assyrian archives.[129]

The priests of Judah would be an anomaly in their world if they did not have their own collections of instructional, cathartic, calendric, legal, regulatory, and taxonomic texts. There is thus no need to suppose that the Priestly text's non-narrative sections are fresh compositions.[130] Furthermore, the disarray of information in the various manuals and legal texts of Leviticus attest to the diversity of sources from which they were drawn.[131] Technical terms are used before they are defined,[132] similar information occurs in multiple places,[133] and specifications are given at a

[123] Fleming 2000: 11.
[124] Pardee 2002: 11-14, 44-45.
[125] SAA XX.38, 40, 42.
[126] SAA XX.1-3, 12.
[127] Abusch 2015.
[128] E.g., Miller 2013: 244-265.
[129] Parpola 2017: LXXXII-LXXXIII. See discussion of possible Neo-Assyrian adaptations of Middle Assyrian ritual texts in van Driel 1969: 52-60.
[130] See Chapter 5 for an extensive discussion of this issue.
[131] This disarray is tolerable to the audience because the Priestly text is largely describing what is normative practice and accepted behavior; the audience is not being given novel information. Books come from religions and not religions from books.
[132] E.g. תמים as a necessary quality of sacrificial animals is used in Lev 1:3, 10; 3:1, 6; 4:3, 23; 5:15, 18, 25 but isn't defined until Lev 22:17-25. Both טמא and טהור of persons and animals are used in Lev 5:2-3; 7:19-21 before being defined in Leviticus 11-15. נדה regulations are referenced in Lev 12:2, 5 before being given in Lev 15:19-24.
[133] E.g., the extensive parallels between Leviticus 18 and 20 or the שלמים offering being dealt with in Lev 3:1-17; 7:11-21; 19:5-8; 22:21, 29-30.

remove from the generalities they govern.[134] The supposition that the Priestly author used diverse sources for the non-narrative sections of P resolves these difficulties and aligns with the variegated nature of ritual collections known from elsewhere in the ancient Near East.[135]

It is also consonant with what we know about the use of sources in ancient Near Eastern literary texts. To return to our two premier examples of ancient Near Eastern literature, both *Gilgamesh* and *Enūma eliš* contain elements drawn from other sources that create tension with other parts of their narratives. In the standard version of *Gilgamesh*, the flood narrative in tablet XI has been taken over from *Atraḫasīs*, having been converted from a third person narrative to a first person recounting.[136] However, in *Gilgamesh* the name of the flood hero is Utnapishtum rather than Atraḫasīs, and the editor who chose to include this portion of the older flood story changes it in almost every instance.[137] However, there are two places where the name Atraḫasīs is used, causing tension with the context.[138] Additionally, a list of gods that begins the flood narrative in *Gilgamesh* reflects the concerns and story of *Atraḫasīs* in a way that is not consonant with the version given in *Gilgamesh*.[139] They have been included because the author of the standard version of *Gilgamesh* has faithfully copied them from his source. Even in a purely

---

[134] Lev 22:1-16 deals with the behavior of priests in relationship to their sacrificial dues which were defined in Leviticus 6-7.

[135] For further discussion of this issue, see Chapter 5. Douglas 1993, 1999 argues that the repetitive nature of Leviticus is part of an intentional literary artifice to achieve a "ring composition" structure (see chart on Douglas 1993: 11). Her suggestion is not incompatible, in terms of arrangement of the sources at the macro-level, with the model offered here, though I am not wholly convinced by her arguments and worry that her arrangement too much severs Leviticus from its clear connections with the Priestly material in both Exodus and Numbers.

[136] The author of the Mosaic review that opens Deuteronomy undertook a similar task in converting third person material from Exodus and Numbers into a first person perspective.

[137] See Tigay 1982: 229-230 for how Utnapishtum was derived from the earlier Sumerian flood hero's name, Ziusudra.

[138] *Gilgamesh* XI.49, 197. There are three manuscripts of this line and all attest the presence of Atraḫasīs over Utnapishtim here (information derived from Andrew George's scores of Gilgamesh, accessible at https://www.soas.ac.uk/gilgamesh/standard/). Tigay 1983: 217, n. 11 (correct his citation of XI.187 to XI.197 throughout the book) asks whether this "mistake" could be intentional. Given the care with which literature was produced and copied in the ancient Near East, it almost certainly is. See Stackert 2023b: 347-349 for the argument that these are mistakes caused by scribal fatigue.

[139] Tigay 1983: 216.

narrative text like *Gilgamesh*, the use of sources did not compel the author to fully homogenize his materials.

An example closer to the Priestly text is the incorporation of the non-narrative "Fifty Names of Marduk" into the climax of the *Enūma eliš*.[140] Here too, the author adapted his source material, such as by rearranging the order of groups of names and using the personal name Tiamat in place of the common noun *tâmtu* found in parallel god-lists.[141] Nevertheless, there are places where the manner of creation described in the exposition of Marduk's names is in conflict with the story given in the body of the epic.[142] The author also neglects opportunities to bring the explanation of certain names into line with important themes of the epic.[143] Again we see that the incorporation of source material into a narrative did not require that all contradictions and tensions be erased.[144]

While noting that texts like Leviticus 1-7 likely reflect pre-existing compositions is not a new observation,[145] it is one that has had only minimal impact on research into the composition of the Priestly text. This is unfortunate, as maintaining a distinction between an author and the sources an author used is essential to fruitful analysis, both compositional and literary.[146] The use of sources means that the traditional method of dealing with the Priestly corpus—parsing the

---

[140] See Lambert 2013: 147-168 for an extensive study of the parallels to this material outside of the *Enūma eliš*. Lambert 2013: 456-463 contains a persuasive argument for viewing this section as an integral part of the epic; see also Seri 2006. This is not the only kind of material incorporated into *Enūma eliš*; astronomical material is also used (Landsberger and Kinnier Wilson 1961: 172; Lambert 2013: 454-455).
[141] Seri 2006: 509-511, 514.
[142] Lambert 2013: 461.
[143] Lambert 2013:456 notes that the name Lugalšuanna (VII.101-102) is not given the meaning "King of Babylon" despite the clear exaltation of Babylon by Marduk in V.119-130.
[144] This is attested in the Biblical corpus as well, such as the incorporation of the Elijah cycle—whatever its ultimate origin—into the Deuteronomistic History. On the one hand, Elijah's construction of an altar on Mt. Carmel is neither erased nor condemned by the centralization-focused historian; on the other hand, not a single speech condemning the golden calves is put in the prophet's mouth.
[145] See, e.g., Kuenen 1865: 35; 1886: 81-87; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: 141-157; Noth 1965: 10-15; Levine 1965; Fohrer 1968: 144-145; Cross 1973: 293-325 (though Friedman 1981: 77-81 argues that the Toledot and Way-station sources were integrated at a stage after the initial composition of P—see Chapter 5 excursus for discussion).
[146] Friedman 2004: 9-10.

various non-narrative passages that deal with similar subjects for nuanced differences in meaning and identifying successive editorial layers in the documents[147]—is not necessarily informative about compositional strata in the Priestly text itself. What we may be identifying is rather the history of the individual underlying sources or the editorial methods by which the Priestly author incorporated these sources into his text. Differences between various non-narrative sections and the disarray of information noted above may be due to the use of diverse sources that the author felt no need to harmonize.[148] We must be careful, when speaking about this material, to maintain the distinction between passages that belong to the Priestly text from those that are by the Priestly author; the first assertion may be true for many more passages than the second one. Most especially, we should be wary of drawing conclusions about the Priestly author's typical wording and phraseology from non-narrative sections. The likely use of sources by the Priestly author for non-narrative material leads us to a third principle for our secondary analysis: *Tensions and repetitions between non-narrative (ritual, legal, calendrical, etc.) blocks of material are preferably explained by the diverse array of sources that the Priestly author had available to draw on and are not sufficient grounds for positing stratification in the Priestly text itself. Only when these materials conflict with the Priestly narrative, either in content or placement, should we suggest a compositional explanation.*

Finally, we must outline a strategy for how to deal with large sections of material that appear, for various reasons, as out of place or as additions to the Priestly text. We noted above, in our discussion of the editorial histories of ancient Near Eastern texts, that identifying large

[147] E.g., The separation of H and P pursued by Knohl 1995; Milgrom 1991, 2000, 2001 rests on the assumption that the texts of Leviticus represent not just the general views but the wording and minute arrangements of the people responsible for their inclusion in the Pentateuchal narrative.

[148] See also Emerton 1988: 385, "If P thus used sources, we should not be surprised to find some diversity…" For other cases where Biblical editors felt no need to harmonize, see, for instance, the weaving together of the disparate materials in 1 Samuel 8-2 Samuel 1, the disconnect between the Deuteronomistic Historian's commitment to centralization with his inclusion of the multi-altar endorsing Elijah and Elisha cycles, or the work on the Pentateuchal documents done by final R.

blocks of material as editorial insertions was one of the more secure critical tools at our disposal. However, this picture must be complicated in order to be accurate. When we do identify blocks of material, such as the flood story in *Gilgamesh* or the Fifty Names of Marduk in *Enūma eliš*, as additions, we are not necessarily correct in saying that they are additions to our text. It appears that a literary version of *Enūma eliš* without the Fifty Names of Marduk never existed; it is deeply implicated in the structure and function of the epic as we have it.[149] When scholars identified this material as an editorial insertion, what they really identified was the fact that this material was not written by the author, but drawn from a pre-existing source. The editorial insertion was thus one performed by the author of the epic himself. Nevertheless, it is possible, if not likely, that the story of the struggle between Marduk and Tiamat, of which the *Enūma eliš* is a literary instantiation, existed without a detailed explication of Marduk's names. This is also the case with the flood narrative in *Gilgamesh*. While it is true that the Gilgamesh story and even a literary version of that story existed without the flood narrative, the standard version text of *Gilgamesh* never existed without this material. We have identified an editorial insertion of material taken over from another text—but again, this was the work of the author and not a later editor.[150]

This is relevant to our above discussion of the Priestly author's use of source material. If the Priestly author is using source material and we can identify it as such, we must be careful to distinguish between material that has been inserted by the Priestly author into his own text and material that is the work of a later editor. This is not an easy thing to do, but it is necessary to

[149] Seri 2006.

[150] The case of Tablet XII of *Gilgamesh* is more difficult to sort out. Again, we have material that is taken over from a different source, this time still extant (albeit in a different language), but that has not been integrated into the epic. We are uncertain at what stage between the Old Babylonian and Standard Version of *Gilgamesh* this material was incorporated (Tigay 1983: 103, 105-107; George 2003: 47-54). Nevertheless, it was viewed as a part of the epic and the only two copies of Tablet XI that have their catch-lines extant indicate the epic's continuation in XII.

make the attempt. Too often in scholarship on the Priestly text, material is identified as an addition and then simply dismissed from consideration.[151] Too often such a procedure does no more than highlight the ways in which we do not understand the text before us. When we suggest that something is an addition we must be careful to ask why it has been placed where it is. It is only when we can answer that question that we can determine whether the logic used for its placement was consonant with other practices of the Priestly author or whether they are perhaps the result of a later editor inserting a body of material into an already existing Priestly text. Our fourth and final principle is: *When a block of material has been identified as ill-placed or misplaced within the Priestly text, we must identify why it has been so placed in order to determine whether the logic at work is similar to or different from that seen elsewhere in the Priestly text. Only when the logic differs from other examples can we prefer the attribution of the material to an editor rather than the Priestly author.*[152]

Fields of Play: Areas of Compositional Contention

These principles constitute the tools we will use to evaluate the major areas of debate over the compositional profile of the Priestly text. Broadly speaking, there have been three trends that have driven discussion around the compositional history of P. The first of these belongs to the recalibration of the critical inquiry into the Pentateuch that took place under the influence of Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Graf.[153] They argued that the core of the Priestly text is a purely narrative document into which legislative and ritual elements have been inserted at later time

[151] E.g. Wellhausen's argument for why the incense altar's placement in Exodus 30 rather than with the rest of the interior Tabernacle furnishings in Exodus 25 means it must be a later addition to the Priestly text: "[The author of Exodus 25] couldn't have forgotten it—and no other possibilities remain, all further explanations are in vain." [German: "Vergessen kann er ihn nicht haben—so bleibt keine weitere Möglichkeit, alle sonstigen Erklärungen sind vergeblich"] (1899: 137).
[152] These four principles are collected and summarized at the end of this chapter for ease of reference.
[153] Kuenen 1886; Wellhausen 1899.

periods in successive rounds of addition and expansion.[154] The second is the more recent proposal by Knohl and Milgrom, building on older observations, to see in the Priestly text two major layers attributable to different ideological and chronological horizons, one associated with more traditional views of the Priestly text and the other deriving from the "Holiness Code" of Leviticus 17-26.[155] Finally, Noth's arguments for a Deuteronomistic History stretching from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings shifted the field away from a Hexateuchal approach to understanding the composition of JE/non-P and P.[156] The resulting "Tetrateuchal" approach to the Priestly text has led to a variety of proposals on where to place the end of the Priestly text and has had a major impact on how its purpose and focus is understood.[157] As these arguments have been a major force in the history of scholarship on the Priestly text, they will be used to structure our discussion of the composition of P. What follows is a brief summary of the major issues dealt with in the following chapters.[158]

In Chapter 2, we will engage with the origin of the stratification of P into an "original" Priestly narrative with later additions. This will involve a thorough analysis of both literary and textual aspects of the Tabernacle material in Exodus and the sacrificial and purity collections in the first part of Leviticus. We will argue that the basis of Kuenen and Wellhausen's proposed stratification of the Priestly text, the placement of the incense altar in Exodus 30, is insufficient grounds for the far-reaching conclusions they drew from it. Furthermore, their other arguments for the stratification of P fall short of the methodological principles proposed above. The phenomena they appeal to are amenable to other, more satisfactory explanations.

---

[154] For full discussion, see chapter 2. The influence of this view can be seen in its adoption in Elliger 1952; McEvenue 1971; Noth 1981; Lohfink 1994; Nihan 2007; Guillaume 2009; and Boorer 2016.
[155] Knohl 1995; Milgrom 1991, 2000, 2001. For full discussion, see chapter 3.
[156] Noth 1957. The groundwork for these views was laid in Noth 1938.
[157] See Nihan 2007: 20-31 for an overview of the debate. For full discussion, see chapter 5.
[158] The relevant scholarly histories and supporting arguments will be left for the individual chapters.

Chapter 3 addresses Knohl and Milgrom's model of a Holiness redactional layer in the Priestly text. Despite the fact that Knohl and Milgrom have built their entire program on an older scholarly proposal for the distinctiveness of the Holiness Code from the rest of the Priestly text, neither one evaluates the arguments that were made to support this proposal. This chapter therefore reviews the original arguments for why the Holiness Code should be viewed as a separate body of literature. Again, the methodological principles outlined above expose the weakness of these arguments and we will suggest that there is no compelling reason to view the Holiness Code as a distinct corpus within the Priestly text, much less for taking it as the basis for an entire layer or edition in the rest of P. Nevertheless, we will briefly review the evidence Knohl and Milgrom use in identifying a distinctive layer within P. Here too we will find that their method and approach rests on questionable methodology.

In Chapter 4 we will return to the issue of the stratification of the Sinai material in P. This chapter focuses on Numbers 1-10, as scholars have identified much of this material as secondary due to the chronological difficulties these chapters present. An exploration of the complex chronology of the Sinai episode in P will allow us to better understand the relationship between Numbers 1-10 and the material that precedes it. Ultimately, we conclude that the model derived from our analytical principles allows us to account for the difficult features of this text and has more explanatory force than those marshalled in favor of viewing this material as reflective of a process of additions to the Priestly text.

Chapter 5 represents a break in our compositional inquiry to address the Neo-analytic compositional model developed in our survey of the Sinai episode, synthesizing the results obtained in previous chapters. In this chapter, we will examine the evidence for writing related to rituals and temples, analyze the Priestly text in terms of scribal culture, and examine the remains

of a Neo-Assyrian ritual archive. The results obtained from these various studies will show the evidentiary basis and strength of our proposed compositional model.

In Chapter 6, we will turn to Noth's argument that the existence of the Deuteronomistic History undermines the previous scholarly consensus that the sources of the Torah were Hexateuchal in scope. As part of this foray, we will evaluate Noth's arguments for the secondary nature of much of the Priestly material in Numbers 11-36* in light of his particular notion that the Priestly text was uninterested in the promise of the land. By undertaking a narrative analysis of the Priestly text in Genesis-Numbers, we will demonstrate that the promise of Canaan is a central component of P's narrative and that such a criterion can not be used to identify material as expansions. Furthermore, we will argue that P likely included an account of the entry and settlement in the land. The rest of this chapter is a tentative analysis of the post-Sinai material in Numbers and of the arguments surrounding Priestly-like material in Joshua. Our results suggest that much of the material in Numbers 11-36* are integral to the Priestly narrative and that we have more options than usually supposed for understanding Joshua's relationship to the Priestly text.

The text arrived at through this analysis can then serve as the basis for future inquiry into the work of the Priestly author. In our final chapter, we will briefly discuss the ways in which this model requires us to re-conceptualize what the Priestly text is and what it was trying to accomplish. Importantly, this model allows us to address a different set of questions to the Priestly text. Rather than asking whether non-narrative material is part of P or whether it provides a systematic and consistent exposition of sacrificial ritual, we should instead be asking where this material came from, why the author chose to incorporate it, and how he adapted the material to fit into the narrative context that he was working within. We hope that such questions

will further our understanding of the Priestly text and its place in the Judahite intellectual tradition.

CHAPTER 2

AMONG THE ANALYSTS

Roots, not Branches

In her recent full-scale analysis of the theology of the Priestly text, Boorer begins her inquiry into defining P by observing that "Almost all who adhere to P as a separate document identify a basic coherent Priestly narrative, a Priestly *Grundschrift* (Pg), which is distinguished from later P-like material that supplemented Pg…"[1] In a similar vein, Noth is comfortable spending only a single paragraph defending his assertion that the Priestly narrative must be distinguished from "those legal parts which are loosely connected with the Sinai situation only by introductory formulas."[2] Elliger too, in a landmark study on the purpose of P, declared that "Opinions also do not differ on the fact that the Priestly-text represents a complex quantity, insofar as a *Grundschrift* (P^g) has been expanded by elements from different hands (P^s)."[3]

The situation is, of course, not nearly as settled or unanimous as the above quotations suggest. Setting aside the plethora of possibilities on offer for defining the specific limits of an

---

[1] 2016: 5. See next paragraph for the ways in which this distorts the actual *status quaestionis*.

[2] Noth 1981: 8. He is so persuaded by this division that he questions the appropriateness of the designation *Priesterschrift* for the work (240). Noth, despite his brilliance, should always be held in suspicion as a compositional critic. One need only note his (in)famous and sweeping declaration that "*in a case of doubt one is to decide for J rather than E*" (1981: 27, emphasis original) as a principle for dividing the non-Priestly material in the Pentateuch. This declaration both did away with what had been the common (and more honest) practice up to that point of labeling non-Priestly texts after Exodus 3 with the siglum JE and falsely made the E-material appear more fragmentary (and the J-text more expansive) than the scholarship of Friedman 2003; Propp 1999; 2006; Baden 2009b has demonstrated it likely is.

[3] 1952: 121, "Auch darüber gehen die Meinungen nicht auseinander, daß die Priesterschrift literarisch eine komplexe Größe darstellt, insofern eine Grundschrift P^g durch Zutaten verschiedener Hände P^s erweitert worden ist." All translations are the authors own unless otherwise noted. The identification of the Priestly source given by Elliger in this piece served as the basis for several succeeding studies, including McEvenue 1971; Lohfink 1994 (and so Guillaume 2009, by proxy); and Boorer 2016. For an evaluation of the place this position has had in the history of scholarship since Noth and Elliger, see Nihan 2007: 11-13.

exclusively narrative Priestly text (P^g), Guillaume has observed that there is a more basic bifurcation in approaches to P: a group of scholars that treats the mass of Priestly literature (with the exception of the Holiness Code) as a whole and the tradition, outlined above, that distinguishes a Priestly narrative text (P^g) from an array of supplements (P^s).[4] We may, borrowing convenient language from the history of Homeric scholarship, label these positions as Unitarian and Analyst, respectively.[5] While the proponents of these two approaches almost always acknowledge the other, there has been very little serious engagement from one side with the other.[6] Among the major representatives of the Unitarian view of P, Kaufmann dismissed detailed analysis beyond the basic identification of the sources proposed by Wellhausen by stating that it "rarely leaves the realm of speculation."[7] Haran acknowledges that the Priestly text

[4] Guillaume 2009: 6-7. For a similar observation, see Jenson 1992: 21-26; Rendtorff 1993. Guillaume incorrectly attributes the P^g & P^s (Analyst) approach to Noth and Elliger, but the forthcoming discussion will show that it emerged directly from the analysis of P given by Kuenen and Wellhausen. Guillaume instead identifies (again incorrectly) the work of Kuenen and Wellhausen as the source of what he calls the "Kaufmann school's" undifferentiated (Unitarian) approach to P. His view of these matters is likely due to Kuenen and Wellhausen's criticism of Graf's later recanted argument that the Priestly narrative and Priestly legal material must be two separate strata and dated to different eras (Kuenen 1886: xix-xxiv; Wellhausen 1885: 10-11). Nevertheless, as we will discuss below, both scholars effectively recapitulated this approach in their own analysis of the Priestly text. The impression that Wellhausen conceived of the Priestly text as a largely undifferentiated mass is also reinforced by his restricting himself to the siglum P in his discussion of the history of Israelite religion in the *Prolegomena* (Wellhausen 1885: 7-8 and n.3); however, his literary analysis in the *Composition* eventuates in a variegated Priestly text of many layers (Wellhausen 1899: 134-186). The attribution of an undifferentiated view of P to a "school" founded by Kaufmann, while understandable in terms of this view's association with arguments for a pre-exilic date for P (Lohfink 1994: 148-149, n. 33), is also inaccurate. The impulse to recognize the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26) as the only stratum within P is seen already in Driver 1910: 37-38, 42-62, 126-159 who relegates to small notes the question of whether Exodus 30-31, 35-40 are supplements and completely ignores the views of Kuenen and Wellhausen on the secondary nature of large sections of the material in Leviticus 1-16; Numbers 1-10; 15-20; 26-36. On Driver's reception of German critical scholarship, see Cheyne 1893: 248-292; Rogerson 1984: 273-285.

[5] See Goold 1977: 1-9; West 2011 for brief, accessible descriptions of the place of these two movements in Homeric scholarship.

[6] Rendtorff 1993 explicitly challenges Milgrom to address the relationship of his model to the P^g/P^s approach.

[7] Kaufmann 1972: 156. Kaufmann supports this position by arguing that the scholars who engaged in these kinds of atomistic analyses did so on the unproved assumption that "ancient Hebrew writers ordered their writings in a logical manner, did not include explanatory comments and repetitions, etc." and that "the degree of compositeness alleged by extreme text-criticism gives cause to doubt that even the keenest critic could successfully unravel so intricate a skein." He further justifies his lack of engagement with these models by arguing that this type of detailed analysis has no bearing on the history of Israelite religion with which he is concerned. A similar approach is seen in Wellhausen 1885's analysis of Israelite religion, where Wellhausen collapsed his otherwise detailed analysis of the Priestly material into a single siglum P and lumped together J and E as representing a single moment in the development of Israelite religious thought and practice.

as we have it is "far from being committed to writing at a single stroke" and yet includes almost all of the material that is typically identified as supplemental to P in his analysis and further remarks on P's "considerable uniformity, its solid structure, and its well defined scope."[8] Crüsemann rejected the basic bifurcation between law and narrative that arose in the Analyst school without addressing the arguments that led to it.[9] Propp acknowledges the existence of more detailed analyses of P while maintaining his skepticism of their results.[10]

On the other hand, the scholars who work within the Analyst framework, while offering refinements on the basic schema, have not frequently revisited the arguments that led to this type of analysis in the first place.[11] Rather than dealing with the outgrowth, we must return to the contributions at the root of this approach to the analysis of the Priestly material in order to properly evaluate it.[12] The emergence of the analysis of the Priestly text that saw it as multi-layered happened alongside a larger revolution in the criticism of the Pentateuch. When de Wette eliminated the rear-guard of Mosaic authorship with his 1805 dissertation demonstrating that Deuteronomy was not only non-Mosaic but the latest of the works in the Pentateuch, this left scholarship of the Pentateuch with three major bodies of literature to deal with: Deuteronomy, a narrative text akin to our modern J, and what was commonly referred to as the *Grundschrift* (a combination of what later scholarship would label P and E).[13] While there were a variety of

[8] Haran 1978: 11, 147. Haran 1978: 146-148 also argues for a relatively small window from which almost all of the material traditionally labeled as Priestly comes.
[9] Crüsemann 1996: 280-282.
[10] Propp 2006: 730-732.
[11] Though Nihan 2007 seems more richly aware of the problematic nature of this history of scholarship than many others who have engaged in this framework and arrives at some different conclusions, especially in regards to Exodus 35-40 and Leviticus 1-7, 11-15, for which, see the discussions below. Schwartz 2009: 3 observed that "the idea that the laws and the narrative [of P] must somehow be literarily distinct seems to be extremely difficult to relinquish."
[12] The following summary draws on Wellhausen 1885: 1-13; Kuenen 1886: xi-xl; De Vries 1963; Rogerson 1984: 28-103, 257-272; Harvey and Halpern 2008: 47-73. See also Nihan 2007:1-4, 11-17.
[13] The identification of E with P is easy to understand given the early approach, identified with Astruc in the 18th century, that used the variation between the name Yhwh and the word *ʾĕlōhîm* as the basis for untangling sources. It should also be remembered that this documentary analysis was originally applied only to Genesis and the first few

explanations for how these works arose, the majority of scholars agreed on the relative age of these groups and the successive nature of their compilation: the *Grundschrift* was the first comprehensive account of Israel's origins, the J material was produced and interpolated into the *Grundschrift* at a later date, and Deuteronomy was the latest addition, its editor producing a final redaction of the Pentateuch and Joshua.[14]

This consensus was disrupted by Hupfeld's 1853 *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung* in which he identified in the *Grundschrift* both an older Elohist (what we now call P) and a younger Elohist (E). He further argued that these texts, alongside J and Deuteronomy, were originally independent documents that were later combined to produce the Pentateuch. Unfortunately his work was not acknowledged by Graf, who continued to work with the three-fold paradigm (PE, J, D) in his 1866 *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*.[15] Graf, having confirmed de Wette's dismissal of Chronicles as a historically unreliable source for the monarchic period, argued that the laws of the *Grundschrift* must be later than those of Deuteronomy.[16] Because he was unwilling to give up the received scholarly opinion about the antiquity of the *Grundschrift* narrative,[17] Graf severed the legal and ritual material from the narrative, arguing that the material in Exodus 25-31; 35-40, all of Leviticus, and the majority of Numbers were post-exilic additions to a work that consisted of the

---

chapters of Exodus and was meant as a defense of Mosaic authorship, explaining how Moses could have written about events to which he himself was not a witness. For the text of de Wette's dissertation, see Harvey and Halpern 2008.

[14] Ewald 1869: 61-132 provides a relatively succinct overview from an *Ergänzungshypothese* point of view that saw the J material in several layers, all of which were produced as supplements to the *Grundschrift* (which Ewald referred to as 'The Great Book of Origins').

[15] Actually published, according to Kuenen 1886: xix, in 1865.

[16] He was anticipated in this by the works of George and Vatke.

[17] In a letter to Kuenen (reproduced in Kuenen 1886: xxiii-xxiv), Graf wrote that "La priorité de l'Élohiste [=P+E] sur le Jéhoviste a été jusqu'à present tellement hors de doute ou plutôt admise comme une sorte d'axiome…" In his statement outlining his later rejection of the earliness of the Priestly narrative, he similarly wrote that "Was der Anerkennung dass die 'Grundschrift' den jüngsten Bestandtheil des Pentateuchs bildet, im Wege steht, ist nur—die Gewöhnung" (Graf 1869: 468).

Grundschrift narrative supplementarily expanded by J material and Deuteronomy in the pre-exilic era.[18]

Graf's work, then, represents the earliest occurrence of an effort to stratify the Priestly material in a way that is similar to the analyses given by those who adhere to a P^g/P^s framework.[19] It is important to note that Graf's view did not arise out of literary analysis of the material at hand, but was rather arrived at from purely external considerations. Graf was persuaded that the non-narrative material was late and was similarly persuaded that the narrative was early.[20] This is the sum total of his justification for sundering one from the other. After receiving criticism from Riehm, Nöldeke, Kuenen, and others, he would later come to accept Hupfeld's analysis and recant his separation of the non-narrative and narrative elements of the Priestly material.[21]

---

[18] Interestingly, since Hupfeld only extended his analysis to the narrative material in Genesis and Exodus, his identification of the "older Elohist" conceptually prefigures Graf's approach.

[19] It should be noted though that Kuenen 1865: 34-37, 155-156 (the first edition of his *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*) suggests that the non-narrative Priestly material is the end-result of a long process of compilation. He offers no involved analysis of which parts he views as earlier or later and maintains that "these laws [Exodus 25-31; 35-40; Leviticus 1-17; Numbers 1-10, *inter alia*] have the closest mutual connection, and refer continually to each other, so that there is no doubt that they do indeed belong together" (34).

[20] I have here used the neutral description "non-narrative" in preference to the habit of these 19th century scholars to contrast narrative with "law." While certain non-narrative portions of the Priestly text are legal (e.g. Leviticus 25 or Num 35:9-34), there are also large portions that are not "legal" or "law," such as the sacrificial manuals in Leviticus 1-5 or the purity manuals in Leviticus 11-15. Similarly, these scholars frequently label Exodus 35-40, a narrative, as a "legal" text. This problematic mislabeling leads to problematic compositional analyses, discussed below. Note that these texts are non-narrative only in the sense of their internal content—they are, nevertheless, integrated into the narrative of the Priestly text through their adaptation as speeches. See Chapter 3 and Chapter 5 for full discussion.

[21] Graf 1869. While they all argued for the unity of the Priestly material (still frequently called the *Grundschrift*), Nöldeke and Riehm both continued to support de Wette's position on the lateness of Deuteronomy when compared with the ritual and legal material in P. Note as well that Riehm's and Nöldeke's distinction between the date of P's composition and the date of its influence anticipated the position of Haran 1981. Kuenen, meanwhile, combined Graf's observations on the priority of the legal material in Deuteronomy with (among other things) the argument of Kosters' 1868 dissertation which asserted that Deuteronomy shows no knowledge of the Priestly narrative, arriving at what is frequently and misleadingly called the Graf or Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. In reality, it was Kuenen who should be recognized for this field-defining innovation. For Kuenen's humility in the face of the lack of credit he received for his contributions, see de Vries 1963: 55-56. Note as well that Graf's change in position did not always ripple outwards: Colenso 1879 maintained Graf's original separation of the narrative and non-narrative elements, as well as their dating as the oldest and youngest section of the Pentateuch respectively. Finally, we should observe the irony of Noth 1966: 8, 13's inversion of the Grafian separation, whereby the non-narrative material is considered pre-exilic and the narrative exilic or later (and their combination not effected til still later).

For Kuenen, Graf's error in separating the narrative and non-narrative elements was the "Achilles-heel of his whole hypothesis."[22] Like Graf, Kuenen's stance was first and foremost a historical one: he argued that the resemblance between the narrative and non-narrative sections of the Priestly material were such that "they cannot possibly be severed by a period of three or four centuries."[23] Superficially, Kuenen's argument for the unity of the narrative and non-narrative material also encompassed literary observations, for he noted in an earlier work "the agreement in language and ideas, which we observe between these laws and those narratives of Genesis, which have been assigned to [P]."[24] Nevertheless, when Kuenen engaged in more detailed analysis of the Priestly material, he arrived at a stance that makes a mockery out of any supposed unity between narrative and non-narrative sections and lauded the contributions of Julius Popper for their "shock to the very generally accepted belief in the unity of the *Grundschrift*."[25] In other words, Kuenen's argument for keeping the law and narrative together was not a stance regarding compositional analysis, but one about the historical era to which the material should be, as a whole, attributed. When Kuenen did turn to compositional analysis, he found three general strata of the Priestly material: P^1 (Leviticus 17-26), P^2 (the narrative Priestly

[22] Kuenen 1886: xxii.
[23] Kuenen 1886: xxii. These is some irony in Kuenen's criticism here as he himself articulated a view that can only be described as proto-Grafian in Kuenen 1865: 34-37, 155-156 (the first edition of his *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*), where he argues that the antiquity of the Priestly narrative (what he calls here "Book of Origins, after Ewald) must be separated by some time from several elements of the legal material. This was, however, due to his still adhering to the notion that Hupfeld's Older Elohist (our P) was the oldest component of the Pentateuch, committed to writing in the Solomonic period, combined with his recognition that the ritual and legal material did not all match that historical horizon.
[24] Kuenen 1865: 34.
[25] Kuenen 1886: xviii in reference to Popper 1862. Popper's views, as enshrined in Kuenen and Wellhausen, will be discussed in detail below (Graf 1866: 86f, n. also took notice of Popper's work). As early as 1865: 155, n. 104, Kuenen was looking for a literary insight to enable the unraveling of the various non-narrative portions of the Priestly material. However, his impulse towards this unraveling in his earlier work was due to his belief that the Priestly material, as a whole, originated in the Solomonic period, combined with his recognition that some of the laws and rituals in the Priestly material did not suit this early date. It is striking that as he came to view the Priestly material at large to be from a much later time period that he did not return to a *compositional* view of the basic unity of the material.

material, with some "legislation"), and P^3 (supplementary material compiled at various times and added to P^2).[26]

In a similar vein, Wellhausen also recapitulates Graf's distinction between narrative and non-narrative in his compositional analysis of the Priestly material. For Wellhausen, the original Priestly text was a primarily narrative work to which he assigned the siglum Q "as an abbreviation for the 'Four covenant book' (quatuor)."[27] To this original work were added several kinds of expansions, primarily ritual and legal, producing the "Priestercodex."[28] At the heart of both Kuenen's and Wellhausen's analyses is the relegation of Exodus 30-31; 35-40; Leviticus 1-7; 11-15 to secondary status,[29] and this forms the basis for all subsequent Analyst approaches.[30] The arguments Wellhausen and Kuenen offered for this view have never been improved upon, and they have rarely been revisited by either proponents or opponents of this approach. For this reason, our evaluation of the entirety of the P^g/P^s approach to the Priestly text will take the form of an extensive engagement with their analysis of this material, taking note of later developments only where they have contributed to the discussion (rather than simply assuming a common

[26] Kuenen 1886: 63-64, 87-88. Kuenen mentions a siglum P^4 but nothing is ever assigned to it in his book; he simply means to indicate that there are several successive rounds of addition to P beyond the basic work P^2 (1886: 313).
[27] Wellhausen 1899: 1 ["als Abkürzung für Vierbundesbuch (quatuor)."]. Kuenen 1886: 64-65 criticizes Wellhausen's choice of this title as part of his own adoption of the now field-standard P. It should be noted that, among the sigla traditionally used for identifying strata of the Pentateuch (JEPD), P is the least neutral of them. Both J and E are labelled after their habits of identifying the divinity in the pre-Mosaic period while D comes directly from the name of the book where that material is found. Only the Priestly text received a label that in some way defines the type of content one finds there. This has had the unfortunate side-effect of, rightly or wrongly, predetermining scholars' views of this material's origin and concerns. This label also does not hold a neutral place in Kuenen's and Wellhausen's arguments about the date of this material. In both their work, the priestly is contrasted with the "prophetic" viewpoint of other sources and is axiomatically later than other sources precisely because of its priestly nature. This idea permeates Wellhausen 1885 (and here he is really recapitulating contemporary Protestant views that saw the Catholic Church as a priestly and hierarchical corruption of an originally more Protestant-like Christianity). Kuenen 1882: 195 explicitly states, "All agree in acknowledging their *priestly* character…Does not this in itself afford a first proof of the later origin of those narratives? Does not the prime of prophecy precede, *omnium consensu*, that of the priestly tendency among the Israelites?" (emphasis original).
[28] Wellhausen 1899: 134-135.
[29] Wellhausen 1899: 149 summarizes his discussion thus: "Also Exod. 25-Lev. 16 ist zwar alles Priestercodex, aber nicht alles Q."
[30] Though note that the siglum P^g for P-*Grundschrift* returns to a nomenclature that Kuenen and Wellhausen strove to get away from and returns to the roots of this separation as proposed by Graf.

acceptance of Wellhausen's and Kuenen's results). After this, we will subject the approach of the Unitarian school to a similar evaluation.

Narrative Interrupted: Leviticus 1-7, 11-15

As outlined above, the final outcome of the Analyst approach is a separation between an originally narrative Priestly document (Pg) and a series of largely non-narrative supplements (Ps) added to this original document. While the material in Genesis and the first half of Exodus largely conformed to expectations, the Tabernacle material in the back half of Exodus and the ritual manuals of Leviticus provoked scholars to identify interruptions, reduce repetition, and search for a systematic unity that could be attributed to the author of the Priestly text.[31] The presuppositions underlying this endeavor are, however, problematic, even when one takes only the Priestly text in Genesis 1-Exodus 15 as the basis for making such evaluations. The Priestly text in Genesis, while certainly narrative, also betrays an interest in the integration of non-narrative material, such as the expansive genealogies of Genesis 5, 10, and 36.[32] Prescriptions, such as the command to circumcize in Genesis 17 or the Passover instructions in Exodus 12*, are also present.[33] Repetition, as argued in the previous chapter, is a favorite literary device of the Priestly author used throughout P and so should not necessitate a compositional explanation.

The Analysts' program as set out by Wellhausen and Keunen nevertheless saw insurmountable problems with attributing all of the Priestly material in Exodus 25-Levicitus 16 to the same document that they had traced through Genesis and Exodus 1-24. Wellhausen

[31] See, e.g., Wellhausen 1899: 135's general observation about the Priestly material stretching from Exodus 25 to the end of Numbers that "…the substantial similarity does not indicate systematic unity" ["Aber die materielle Gleichartigkeit bedeutet nicht systematische Einheit."]. This desire for systematic unity among the non-narrative material depends on expectations about what the Priestly author intended to accomplish by their inclusion and on assumptions about the well-ordered nature of ritual and religious practice. We will address these issues below.
[32] For discussion of the place of the *tôlədōt* in the Priestly text, see Chapter 5 excursus.
[33] Though Analysists frequently deny Exod 12:14-20, 43-50 to Pg (e.g., Kuenen 1886: 70-71, 304; but contrast with Wellhausen 1889: 72-73), the remainder still contains ritual instructions.

describes the problem by stating that "the Priestly-book in its current form and magnitude does not exhibit the well-planned structure and rigid construction by which Q distinguishes itself."[34] He begins his assessment of this material by claiming that Leviticus 1-7 constitutes an interruption in the narrative of P.[35]

While this view has received almost unanimous acceptance among later adherents of the Analyst model, Nihan's work on the composition of Leviticus offers a reassessment of this stance. Nihan's inquiry into the Priestly text is characterized throughout by a greater engagement with the narrative nature of that document as a guide to understanding what is and is not an organic part of that document, and this led him to argue that Leviticus 1-3 must belong to it. Nihan notes that the inauguration of the sacrificial cult is implicated in P's narrative as early as the Flood story and its failure to conclude, contrary to traditional expectations (Gen 8:21; *Gilgamesh* XI.162), with a sacrifice offered to Yhwh.[36] According to Nihan, this undermined expectation leads the reader to await the fulfillment of this sacrificial obligation, something that does not occur until Leviticus 1-9. He further notes that Leviticus' opening statement that "Yhwh spoke to him from the Tent of Meeting" (1:1) is the logical continuation of the setting up of the Tabernacle in Exodus 40, and especially its statement that "Moses was not able to enter into the Tent of Meeting" (40:35).[37]

---

[34] Wellhausen 1899: 135 ["Der Priestercodex in seiner gegenwärtigen Form und Grösse weist nicht dies planvolle Gliederung und strenge Construktion auf, wodurch sich Q auszeichnet…"].

[35] Wellhausen 1899: 135. See also, Kuenen 1886: 81. The long-term reception of this argument can be gauged by Noth 1965: 12-14, 18; Lohfink 1994: 145, n. 29; Boorer 2016: 67-69. The view that Leviticus 1-7 is in some way secondary has had such a large impact that Milgrom 1991:61-63 appears to both accept and reject it, acknowledging that "Lev 1-7 is an insertion, but one that makes sense" (61) and claiming that additions to these chapters represent "supplements to the basic P stratum" (62). He never really resolves this tension in his views, carrying it over into his analysis of Leviticus 11-15 as well, for which see n. 69 below.

[36] Nihan 2007: 56-57, 231-233. See also, Gilders 2009.

[37] Nihan 2007: 56-57. See also Kuenen 1886: 84, n. 18; Nihan 2007: 53 for a refutation of Wellhausen 1889: 136-137's view that Lev 1:1 must be later than Lev 7:38. Nihan 2007: 150-159 further supports his argument for the integrity of Leviticus 1-3 with P through an extensive analysis of the parallels between the ritual procedure of Leviticus 1-3 and their implementation in Leviticus 8-9, from which he concludes that Leviticus 8-9 must be dependent on Leviticus 1-3. His reasoning in this case, however, is flawed. He assumes that the author of Leviticus

Wellhausen, however, did not observe these narrative connections and instead focused on the way that Leviticus 1-7 supposedly breaks the intended connection between Exodus 40 and Leviticus 8.[38] In particular, he notes that "This separation of these two related parts in [their] implementation does not correspond to their factual and temporal connection in the instructions."[39] While it is true that the sequence of Exodus 40:2-15 might lead one to expect the installation of the priesthood to follow immediately on the heels of the erection of the Tabernacle, Leviticus 1-7 are nevertheless difficult to construe as an interruption. As noted by Kuenen, "it is not surprising that these regulations should precede the first ritual performance in the tabernacle,"[40] and Wellhausen himself explained their placement in the same terms, even conceding that this explanation was obvious.[41]

8-9 must have had a written text in front of him in order to appropriately describe a ritual; this assumes, improbably, that the Priestly text is not based on lived religion. Presumably, any priest would have been able to accurately describe a ritual in which they had taken part numerous times in their life, without needing a written summary of that ritual to do so. This represents an, unfortunately common, importation of a Protestant-like view of Biblical texts into his analysis of the Priestly text. His argument essentially assumes that a written document was a *sine qua non* for justifying religious behavior. It should be remembered, however, that in the ancient Near East, books come from religions and not religions from books.

[38] This is likely because Wellhausen subsumed the Priestly material from Exodus 25-Leviticus 9 under the rubric of "Stiftshüttengesetzgebung" (1899: 137) and included all of his analysis of the Priestly material between Exodus 25 and Numbers 10 in a section on the "Gesetzeskörper" (1899: 134-135) of the Pentateuch rather than including any of it in his exploration of the "Erzählung" (1899: 61-134, where on p. 81 he refers to Exodus 25-31; 35-40; Leviticus 1-27; and Num 1:1-10:28 as "gesetzliche Stoffe"). Leaving aside the problematic labeling of all of this material, including ritual instructions, as "law," Wellhausen's view of this material as essentially non-narrative seems to have obstructed his ability to look at them from a narrative perspective, even when these passage are explicitly narrative (e.g., Exodus 35-40; Leviticus 8-10). More curiously, while relegating the material in the latter half of Exodus, all of Leviticus, and the beginning of Numbers to a discussion of "law," Wellhausen shows himself quite adept at separating the non-narrative and narrative material in Numbers 11-36 as he traces the plot of Q in these chapters. For other critiques of the way that the narrative nature of Leviticus is frequently ignored, see Ruwe 2003.

[39] Wellhausen 1899: 135, "Diese Trennung der zwei zusammengehörigen Teile in der Ausführung entspricht nicht ihrer sachlichen und zeitlichen Verbindung in dem Befehl…".

[40] Kuenen 1886: 81.

[41] Wellhausen 1889: 135, "Die Veranlassung, weshalb Lev. 1-7 hier eingedrungen ist, ist leicht zu finden. Da Lev. 8 die ersten Opfer dargebracht wurden, so schienen die allgemeinen Opferregeln vorher ihren Ort zu haben." The well-placed nature of Leviticus 1-7 continues to be a constant of the Analyst tradition, see, e.g., Noth 1965: 14, "for accommodating the wide collection of sacrificial instructions (chs. 1-7) a suitable place suggested itself immediately before the narrative of the first great sacrifices…" See discussion below on the breakdown between this observation and the generally accepted notion that Leviticus 1-7 do not represent fresh compositions but traditional material (Noth 1965: 15). In his critical review of such positions, Nihan 2007: 157-159 also notes that "from the perspective of the overall structure of Ex 25-Lev 9 in P, the present position of Lev 1-7 is quite careful" (158), but for him this is an argument for some part of these chapters being an original part of P.

Leviticus 1-7 further verify the correctness of these observations, as they explicitly connect themselves with the narrative moment of the Tabernacle's initial set-up and the anointing of the priesthood. We have already discussed Nihan's observation that Lev 1:1's statement about Yhwh speaking to Moses from inside the Tent of Meeting conforms to the statement in Exod 40:35 that Moses was not able to enter.[42] But these chapters also explicitly state that their regulations were given "on the day he [Moses] offered them [Aaron and his sons] to act as priest to Yhwh…on the day he anointed them from the children of Israel" (7:35-36). The framing of Leviticus 1-7 further situates them "on the day he [Moses] commanded the children of Israel to offer their offerings to Yhwh in the wilderness of Sinai" (7:38), indicating a connection with either Lev 9:1-5 or Num 7:1-11 (or both). In either case, both of those events take place during the initial period of the sanctification of the Tabernacle and the priesthood and so are consonant with the order of events as described in Exodus 40. Rather than an interruption, Leviticus 1-7 are thoroughly implicated in their chronological setting.[43]

Furthermore, by placing the speeches of Leviticus 1-7 between Exodus 40 and Leviticus 8-9, the Priestly author may have intended to convey that they occurred simultaneously with the events of Leviticus 8 (and Numbers 7).[44] In the narrative imagination, Leviticus 1-7 constitute not an interruption but one of a series of events all happening on the day that Moses set up the

[42] Nihan 2007: 88-95 notes that Moses' ability to enter the Tabernacle in Lev 9:23 represents the resolution of this plot-point (he identifies Lev 8:10b-11 as an insertion, in part by their conflict with this narrative movement, though this is not a necessary conclusion). The contrast between *bʾhl mwʿd* in Num 1:1 and *mʾhl mwʿd* in Lev 1:1 also supports this conclusion. Feldman 2018: 97-98 offers a different proposal based on similarities between Lev 1:1 and Exod 24:16-18a. See also the comment in Num 7:89, which describes the procedure for Yhwh speaking to Moses after the dedication of the Tabernacle and priesthood as taking place within the Tabernacle.

[43] Noth 1981: 8 n. also acknowledges this connection, though he still maintains that these chapters are a later addition to P.

[44] Feldman 2018: 57-87. For further discussion of the complex chronology of the Sinai episode in P, see Chapter 4. Note also the perceptive observations of Propp 2006: 691-694 on the implications of what he calls "anachronisms" in P, especially in the Sinai narrative.

Tabernacle.[45] Such a reading also takes seriously their description as speeches—as such, the content of Leviticus 1-7 need not take up more than an hour of the imagined time.

Exod 40:1-15 is, then, best understood as an argument—in the poetic sense of the term—providing the reader with a general synopsis of the action that follows in the narrative. This argument, in fact, helps ease the transition into Leviticus 1-7 by providing the reader with a narrative framework and encouraging them not to lose track of the general narrative arc as they peruse the ensuing ritual manuals. The Priestly author uses this technique elsewhere in his narrative, most clearly in Exod 7:1-5. Here too we find a speech of Yhwh describing, in general terms, all of the events of the Priestly narrative in Exodus 7-14*. Just as in Exod 40:16, a general fulfillment statement follows this speech, assuring the reader that "Moses and Aaron did; according to what Yhwh commanded them, thus they did" (Exod 7:6). In both cases, this proleptic fulfillment statement is followed by an actual narrative that details the actions.[46] More to the point, Exod 7:1-5 no more leads the reader to expect an interlude of ritual instruction (Exod 12:1-20) prior to the Exodus than Exod 40:1-15 does prior to the anointing of the Tabernacle and priests.[47]

Finally, the Priestly author, after providing a general argument in Exod 40:1-15, seems to prepare the reader for chronological displacement in the ensuing description of Exod 40:17-33. He accomplishes this by presenting actions and asides that are clearly not meant to be read sequentially. This is first seen in the statements that Moses arrayed bread on the table, lit the menorah, and burned incense on the golden altar (40:23, 25, 27)—they at least raise suspicion as

[45] Feldman 2018: 61-63.
[46] Note as well that the description of the Tabernacle's setup in Exod 40:17-33 provides far more details about several steps in the process than the speech in 40:1-15 gives.
[47] To be sure there is a difference in quantity between the two examples, but not in kind. Propp 2006: 671 also comes to the conclusion that "the reference to the priests' ordination in 40:12-15 must be *prospective*" (emphasis original).

it is difficult to believe that each of these actions was done before the entire structure was set up.[48] However, the clearest of these is the statement that Moses offered a burnt-offering and grain-offering on the bronze altar (Exod 40:29) before he set up the basin (Exod 40:30), used for washing part of the *ʿōlāh* (Lev 1:9), and before he had erected the courtyard barriers (Exod 40:33).[49] The extended aside on the use of the basin (Exod 40:31-32) further encourages the impression that the narrative sequence has been somewhat disrupted.[50] This mode of presentation thus already breaks the expectation that the sequence given in Exod 40:1-15 is going to be strictly followed—the connection is severed before Leviticus 1 even begins.

None of the arguments presented above is necessarily decisive on its own, though they do increase the weight of probability in favor of understanding Leviticus 1-7 as an integral part of P's narrative. It is perhaps telling that Kuenen did not offer a narrative argument for why Leviticus 1-7 should be viewed as an addition to P and observed that their integration into the text occurred "without any considerable disturbance of the unity of P" and noted "the evident care with which they [= these chapters and P's narrative] were brought into agreement and connection with each other."[51] Absent other arguments, the decision to attribute this unity to the Priestly author or to a later editor will depend on how one views the purpose and character of the text. However, given the apparent unity between Leviticus 1-7 and the narrative, concerns, and

[48] It may also be objected that these actions should all be under the purview of the priests, which is a position that Moses does not hold in P.

[49] For an alternative explanation of this aside, see Feldman 2018: 41-45. Note, however, her willingness to otherwise accept "forward-looking and/or iterative description in the midst of other sequential and singular instructions" (2018: 47-48).

[50] Exod 40:36-38, whose originality is disputed by many, furthers the impression of chronological displacement by providing information that will not be relevant until the Israelites prepare to leave Sinai (Num 9:15-10:28). In this way, all of Exodus 40 serves as a strange hybrid of argument and narrative; Childs 1974a: 637, observes that "the writer disregards the strictly chronological sequence for the sake of his narrative conclusion." See Chapter 4 for further discussion.

[51] Kuenen 1886: 81. For the other arguments that Kuenen made for the secondary nature of Leviticus 1-7, see below. See the conclusion of this chapter for the role these observations can play in a different model of P's composition.

language of P, the burden of proof rests on those who wish to identify these chapters as secondary intrusions.

For Wellhausen, further proof of the intrusiveness of these chapters was found in what he perceived as their redundancy and tension with other parts of the Priestly text. He first objected to the perceived redundancy between Leviticus 1-7 and Exodus 29//Leviticus 8; 9, noting that those chapters "contain in historical form a counterpart to Lev. 1-7 that is only not quite so complete."[52] However, Wellhausen's desire for narrative and textual economy is not a criterion derived from either the Priestly text or ancient scribal practice; it is simply his preference. As Kuenen points out, this objection is questionable when compared to the rest of the Priestly author's work, where we find "a writer by no means distinguished for conciseness."[53] Furthermore, Leviticus 1-7 provide a large amount of information about different cases that Exodus 29//Leviticus 8 do not (and could not) cover. Finally, as Kuenen again observes, we should be suspicious of the idea that describing the ritual for the heightened occasion of the installation of the priests would obviate the need for a description of regular practice.[54] Wellhausen's objections to the presence of Leviticus 1-7 in the original Priestly text on the basis of redundancy fails to convince.

But Wellhausen and Kuenen also noted disagreement between Exodus 29//Leviticus 8; 9 and Leviticus 1-7 in regards to the procedure for the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* ("sin-offering" or "purification-offering").[55] The *ḥaṭṭāʾt* takes two different forms in Leviticus 4—one for the high priest and the community in which the priests bring the blood from the offering into the shrine and then burn

[52] Wellhausen 1899: 135-136, "…in historischer Form gehalten ist Exod 29. Lev. 8-10 ein Pendant zu Lev. 1-7, das nur nicht ganz so vollständig ist."
[53] Kuenen 1886: 84. For repetition as a literary technique of the Priestly author, see Chapter 1.
[54] Kuenen 1886: 84.
[55] Wellhausen 1899: 136-137; Kuenen 1886: 83-84. Kuenen offered the conclusion that "the single discrepancy which Wellhausen notices [between Exodus 29//Leviticus 8 and Leviticus 1-7] proves more than the many repetitions…" (84). For the rendering "purification-offering," see Milgrom 1991: 253-292.

all the remnants outside the camp after offering the fat on the altar (Lev 4:2-21; 6:23), and one for the tribal leader (*nāśîʾ*) and individual in which the priests smear the blood from the offering on the bronze altar in the courtyard and then eat the remains after offering the fat on the altar (Lev 4:22-35; 6:18-22). However, Exodus 29//Leviticus 8 in describing the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* performed during the inauguration of the priesthood, states that Moses smeared the blood from the offering on the bronze altar, burned the fat on the altar, and then burned the remains outside the camp (Exod 29:10-14//Lev 8:14-17; Aaron does likewise in 9:8-11, 15).[56] For Wellhausen this constituted an "undeniable and unresolvable difference," and Kuenen concluded from this discrepancy that "had this precept [Leviticus 4] been incorporated by the author of *Ex.* xxix…he would not have departed from it in *v.* 10-14."[57]

Both Kuenen and Wellhausen analyze these differences in evolutionary terms, identifying the procedure described in Leviticus 4 as not only irreconcilable with that of Exodus 29//Leviticus 8; 9, but also as a later development of the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* ritual.[58] There is, however, a more satisfying explanation available for these differences. Kuenen and Wellhausen both observe that the inauguration of the priesthood represents a special, solemn occasion, yet neither of them considers the possibility that the uniqueness of this event might involve a different *ḥaṭṭāʾt* procedure than that described in Leviticus 4. Furthermore, that chapter already bears witness to the fact that a single type of ritual can have different procedures depending on the situation that necessitates it. If there is a different *ḥaṭṭāʾt* procedure for the tribal leader and

[56] Wellhausen 1899: 136 also observes that Lev 9:3, 15 describe a goat as the offering of the people rather than the bull required by Lev 4:13-21.
[57] Wellhausen 1899: 136, "Also eine unleugbare und unauflösbare Differenz." Kuenen 1886: 83-84.
[58] Kuenen 1886: 84; Wellhausen 1899: 136. Nihan 2007: 160-161 gently pushes back on this position and offers a possible narrative reason for the difference in procedure—neither Moses nor Aaron are able to enter the Tabernacle to follow the "proper" *ḥaṭṭāʾt* instructions until after the rituals of Leviticus 8-9 have been completed (Exod 40:35; Lev 9:22-24). He nevertheless views Leviticus 4 as a later addition to the Priestly text on other grounds (Nihan 2007: 161-198). His narrative proposal is compatible with the one offered here. Feldman 2018: 97-98 suggests that Moses is able to enter the Tabernacle beginning in Lev 1:1, which she takes to be an invitation similar to the one in Exod 24:16-18a.

individual versus the high priest and community as a whole, then there is no serious barrier to having yet another procedure for the induction of a high priest and inauguration of an altar.[59] This is consonant with the ritual variety known elsewhere in the ancient Near East—the *nāṭu* rituals of the Assyrian royal court covered several different procedures,[60] the Neo-Assyrian *tākultu* manuals show significant variation,[61] and the *zukru* festival at Emar was celebrated in both annual and seventh-year forms.[62]

Finally, we must also keep in mind that Leviticus 9 is a narrative rather than a prescriptive text. Leviticus 8-9 take place at a particular moment in the Priestly narrative—one that falls between the Tabernacle's inaccessibility (Exod 40:35) and its accessibility (Lev 9:23).[63] The priests' inability to enter the Tent of Meeting until their consecration is complete means that it would not have been possible to carry out the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* as described in Leviticus 4.[64] Additionally, Leviticus 9 acknowledges the difference in ritual procedure. Throughout Leviticus 8-9, the author notes that actions are performed "according to what Yhwh commanded Moses."[65] Moses also urges Aaron to act in accordance with Yhwh's commands and informs the Israelites that he is acting likewise.[66] When the priests' *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and *ʿōlāh* are offered in Leviticus 8 and 9, the text notes these as actions done as Yhwh had commanded, apparently referencing the

---

[59] Milgrom 1991: 635-640 offers a mediating position; he views the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* ritual described in Exodus 29//Leviticus; 9 as older than the one described in Leviticus 4 and also argues that it was allowed to stand because the ritual is unique to the ordination of Aaron and his sons. I am less certain that this is intended to be a historically resurrected form of the ritual deployed to describe a unique event. Rather, the installation of priests was a regular occurrence (as suggested by Exod 29:29-30) and the occasions for consecrating an altar were far more widespread in Judah than the Deuteronomistic History would suggest. Given that we have very distinct situations in which the different ritual procedures are deployed, there is no need to invoke a diachronic explanation. For a related argument that sees P as a kind of "constitution" for the High Places, see Kaufmann 1972: 180-184.

[60] SAA XX 19, 24-26, 32.

[61] SAA XX 38, 40, 42. See Frankena 1954; van Driel 1969: 60-69; Pongratz-Leisten 2017: xxxvi-xlvii. See Chapter 5 for further discussion.

[62] Fleming 2000: 48-113.

[63] Nihan 2007: 90-91, 127-128; Feldman 2017: 16-19.

[64] Feldman 2017: 16-19, 27-30, 34.

[65] Lev 8:9, 13, 17, 21, 29, 36; 9:10, 21.

[66] Lev 8:5, 31, 34-35; 9:6, 7. These opening statements of Moses (8:5; 9:6) should be added to Knohl 1995:148's list of exceptions to Kaufmann 1972: 303-304's contention that the ritual of P is practiced in silence.

instructions in Exod 29:10-18.[67] But when it comes time for Aaron to offer the first sacrifices of the community in Lev 9:15-16, the notation changes. Here, we are told that the *ʿōlāh* was done "according to custom" (*kmšpṭ*), while the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* was done "like the first (one)" (*krʾšwn*). This seems to explicitly acknowledge that while the *ʿōlāh* has followed the procedure given in Leviticus 1-7, the people's *ḥaṭṭāʾt* has deviated to align itself with the instructions of Exodus 29.[68] That the concluding remark on the *šəlāmîm* reverts back to the standard "according to what he commanded Moses" (9:21) confirms the pattern—this type of sacrifice was not part of the inauguration of the priests and so only one set of instructions exists for this offering. The people's *šəlāmîm* is the first such ever offered. The differences between the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* of the inauguration of the cult and the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* as normally practiced are therefore not relevant to the question of whether Leviticus 1-7 is an original part of the Priestly text.[69]

The evaluation of whether Leviticus 11-15 is also a later insertion into an original Priestly text proceeds along similar lines of argument to those used for Leviticus 1-7. Both Wellhausen and Kuenen argued that these chapters broke the narrative connection between the death of Nadab and Abihu and the notice in Lev 16:1 that Yhwh gave the instructions for the Atonement ritual after this event.[70] As with Leviticus 1-7, both nevertheless admit that these chapters are

---

[67] See Nihan 2007: 124-147 for a refutation of the Analyst school's attempt to identify unresolvable differences between Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8.

[68] The "first (one)" mentioned here could either be the one done by Aaron earlier on the same day (9:8-11) or the very first *ḥaṭṭāʾt* offered (8:14-17).

[69] See further discussion in Chapter 5 on the difference between general ritual instructions and their execution when embedded within other ritual complexes. This kind of confusion of categories when evaluating reports of rituals can also be seen in Nihan 2007: 222-231, drawing on Rendtorff 1967 and B. Levine 1974. Here, Nihan concludes from the presentation of the *šəlāmîm* in Joshua–Kings that it "takes place almost exclusively in the context of celebrations of national dimension" (223) and so P has innovated by making it "no longer an offering made in the context of the royal cult in exceptional circumstances" (227). This completely ignores the genre of Joshua–Kings as national history. The very fact that all the *šəlāmîm* reported happen, as he says, "in exceptional circumstances," is not evidence for the exceptional nature of the offering—it is simply confirmation of the fact that a text such as Kings is concerned with royal/political history and does not have to report ordinary occurrences and circumstances since those are part of the cultural background that the text shares with its audience.

[70] Kuenen 1886: 82, 86; Wellhausen 1899: 148. Unlike, Kuenen, Wellhausen was uncertain about whether Leviticus 11-15 should be considered an addition to the original P, "Doch entscheide ich nicht…" (148). Among the weaker

comfortably fitted into the Priestly text.[71] Here too we can observe that, narratively speaking, the speeches of Leviticus 11-15 take up relatively little of the imagined time following the events of Leviticus 10. As importantly, Leviticus 16 serves as a climax to Leviticus 11-15, providing a grand atonement ritual that caps off the recitation of routine uncleanness and its remedies.[72] Finally, the very fact that Leviticus 16 opens by reminding the reader of the narrative context is indicative of a return to the story after a pause.[73]

The relationship among these chapters has the appearance of an intentional literary plan rather than a happy accident of later expansion. This perception is supported by Yhwh's address to Aaron following the death of his sons, describing the duty of the priests as "to divide between the holy and profane, and between the unclean and the pure" (Lev 10:10).[74] However, while scholars frequently acknowledge the connection between this statement and the content of Leviticus 11-15, these verses are just as frequently identified as a later addition to the Priestly

---

arguments that Wellhausen offers, and a testament to the way that his own religious views influenced his literary criticism, is his commentary on the opening formula used in Leviticus 11-15 wherein Yhwh addresses both Moses and Aaron (11:1; 13:1; 14:33; 15:1). For Wellhausen, "the issuing of the word of god to two people at the same time is, in any case, the less original one and a psychologically inexplicable idea" ("das Ergehn der Rede Gottes an zwei Personen zugleich ist jedenfalls das minder ursprüngliche und eine psychologisch unerklärbare Vorstellung") (148). If, as seems apparent throughout the Priestly text, Yhwh is speaking out loud, addressing more than one person poses no difficulties.

Milgrom 1991: 1011, 1061 also adduces this narrative argument to identify Leviticus 11-15 as an insertion. As with his curiously dual view of Leviticus 1-7, Milgrom 1991:61-63, 616, 691-696, 886-887, 1011, 1061 reflects both the opinion that Leviticus 11-15 are insertions and that the bulk of the material in these chapters should be attributed to "P_1" (which he defines as "the basic Priestly text").

[71] Kuenen 1886: 82, "They [Leviticus 11-15] are not essential in the position they now occupy, but are very appropriately inserted there." Wellhausen 1899: 148, "Even the content of chapters 11-15 admittedly fit quite well in the place where they are, after the establishment of the sanctuary and the beginning of service there and before the order about the general atonement for all pollutions and offenses." ("Inhaltlich passen freilich auch Kap. 11—15 so ziemlich an die Stelle, wo sie stehn, nach der Einrichtung des Heiligtums und der Eröffnung des Dienstes daran, vor der Anordnung über die Generalsühne für alle Befleckungen und Verstösse.").

[72] See also Nihan 2007: 95-99 on the unity of Leviticus 11-16. For the role of Leviticus 16 as a hinge, see Blum 1990: 318 and discussion in Chapter 3.

[73] As also observed by Blum 1990: 318, n. 119.

[74] The relationship between this statement and the following chapters goes back to Ibn Ezra, who says about the phrase "על כן נכתבה אחרי זאת הפרשה פרשת זאת החיה, ואחרי כן טומאת היולדת וצרעת אדם ובין הטמא ובין הטהור ובגד ובית ובעל קרי וזב ונדה". On the implications of this statement for the scholarly construct of the Holiness Code, see Chapter 3.

text.[75] This is usually done not on the basis of the verses themselves, but on the assertion that Lev 10:8-11 depend on Lev 10:6-7 which both Kuenen and Wellhausen identified as secondary.[76] However, accepting such a view of the development of the text, whereby editors incorporate a handful of sentences followed by another handful from yet another editor, all identifiable by the keen eye of the critic, violates the view of textual production argued for in Chapter 1.

But even if we grant the Analyst arguments for the secondary nature of 10:6-7,[77] they make no actual arguments for associating 10:8-11 with these verses or for identifying them as secondary in and of themselves. In terms of content, Lev 10:8-11 belong to the context of Leviticus 10, regardless of the status of 10:6-7. The failure to distinguish between what was and

---

[75] E.g., Noth 1981: 9, n. 11; Milgrom 1991: 616.

[76] Kuenen 1886: 85, "the general precept in *Lev.* x. 8–10 is tacked on to this insertion [i.e., Lev 10:6-7]." Wellhausen 1899: 147 refers to Lev 10:8-11 as "ein Nachtrag zum Nachtrag" and points out Yhwh's address to Aaron alone as an anomaly ("bisher unerhörten Einleitung"). This strikes me as a narrative rather than a compositional issue; Aaron has just been installed as priest, successfully invoking the *kābôd* of Yhwh to appear to the community (Lev 9:4, 6, 23-24) and so it is unremarkable that the commission of priestly duties would be directed to him in particular at this moment. The rare deployment of Aaron as sole audience to Yhwh (also in Num 18:1, 8, 20) can not be determined to be from a later hand if there are narrative reasons for Yhwh to address him related to both the occasion and the content of the speeches (see Chapter 1; on Numbers 18, see Chapter 6).

Nihan 2007: 148-150, 576-602 distinguishes himself from the mainstream of the Analyst school by arguing that the entirety of Leviticus 10 is basically coherent and the composition of a single author. He couples this, however, with the argument that Leviticus 10 must be among the latest additions to the Priestly text. He supports this by claiming that this text's mention of Mishael, Elzaphan, and Uzziel is dependent on the genealogy of Exod 6:14-27, which he understands as either a late addition to P or, more likely, a part of the Pentateuchal redaction. He notes especially that the genealogy only deals with members of the family that are relevant in the upcoming narrative (Phinehas, Korah, Elzaphan, and Mishael). However, Nihan does not address the contrary possible case—it is just as easy to imagine the compiler of the genealogy, if it is in fact a late addition, constructing the text by gathering together all of the important figures of the Levite clan mentioned in the Priestly narrative. The argument is simply too tenuous to justify the conclusions Nihan draws from it.

[77] Kuenen 1886: 75-76, 85; Wellhausen 1899: 139-141, 147. They argue that Lev 10:6-7 contradict the chronological sequence described in Lev 8:33-9:1 and that their conception of all priests as being anointed is in tension with the earliest practice recoverable from the Priestly text. The first argument is easily disposed of. It is based on a misunderstanding of Moses' statement to Aaron and his sons that "the oil of the anointing of Yhwh is upon you" (Lev 10:7). Kuenen and Wellhausen understood this to mean that the seven-day process of installing the priests, ended in 9:1, was still in process and so contradicted the chronology of Leviticus 8-9. However, as Milgrom 1991: 610-611 notes, the phrase is more likely an indicator of status—Aaron and his sons have been anointed to the priesthood and are serving actively in that capacity. For similar usage, see Lev 20:10-15, where the mourning prohibitions justified by the phrase "because the crown of the oil of the anointing of his god is upon him" (20:12) are certainly meant to apply throughout the duration of the high priest's service and not just during his inauguration. Their second argument, based on their understanding of the historical development of the anointing of priests, will be addressed in our discussion of Exodus 30, below.

was not a proper offering lies at the heart of Nadab and Abihu's otherwise enigmatic crime—after the refrain-like repetition of "just as Yhwh commanded" in Leviticus 8-9,[78] the statement that Nadab and Abihu made an offering "which Yhwh did not command them" (10:1) shocks the reader, and both authorized and unauthorized acts end with fire from Yhwh (Lev 9:24; 10:2), to vastly different effect.[79] That such a violation following immediately on the heels of the installation of the priesthood would provide an occasion for the Priestly author to have Yhwh warn Aaron and inform him of the responsibilities of the priesthood makes good narrative sense. Furthermore, their function as an argument for the rest of the book of Leviticus is parallel to what we have already seen in divine speeches in Exod 7:1-5 and Exod 40:1-15. The use of particular divine speeches as signposts to the following content appears to be a structural strategy of the Priestly author.

Finally, when Kuenen does briefly address the connection between Leviticus 11-15 and 10:8-11, he closes the circuit on his argument—having determined that Leviticus 11-15 are secondary as an interruption between Leviticus 10 and 16 since nothing "suggests that such a mass of other laws has preceded [Leviticus 16],"[80] 10:8-11 must also be secondary because they are "intended as a further preparation for the laws on uncleanness."[81] However, if 10:8-11 prepare for the content of Leviticus 11-15, as Kuenen concedes, then, as noted above, there is no reason to view those chapters as an interruption. As with the case of Leviticus 1-7, the Analysts' narrative arguments for viewing Leviticus 11-15 as an interruption fail to convince.

[78] Lev 8:5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 29, 31, 34-35, 36; 9:6, 7, 10, 21.
[79] Nihan 2007: 92. This connection has been noted before, to the point that some Rabbinic commentators suggested that the consumption of the first offerings and the deaths of Nadab and Abihu took place at the same time; see Milgrom 1991: 599 for refutation.
[80] Kuenen 1886: 86.
[81] Kuenen 1886: 85. Milgrom 1991: 616 uses similar reasoning.

But Kuenen has one more objection to regarding Leviticus 11-15 as an original part of P, one that has nothing to do with its position in the Priestly narrative. For him, the deciding factor is that these chapters depend on Leviticus 1-7, pointing particularly to the presence of the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and the *āšām* in the purity manuals.[82] Kuenen and Wellhausen's certainty about the lateness of Leviticus 1-7, to the point where they would use reliance on it as a compositional criterion for identifying later strata in the Priestly text did not derive entirely from narrative considerations or procedural differences in the *ḥaṭṭāʾt*. Rather, the presence of the incense altar in Leviticus 4 is what made them certain that they were dealing with definitively later material.[83] To understand why, we must leave Leviticus behind and turn our attention to the Tabernacle material in Exodus 25-31, 35-40.

Scents and Sensibility: Exodus 30-31

After the crescendo of Exod 29:43-46, in which Yhwh declares the Tabernacle as the place of his relationship and dwelling with Israel, the Analyst model views the material that makes up the remainder of the Tabernacle instructions (Exodus 30-31) as a series of secondary expansions to an original core of Exodus 25-29.[84] This relegation of Exodus 30-31 to secondary status forms the core justification of the Analyst program.[85] If one accepts the variety of

[82] Kuenen 1886: 86, "in *Lev.* xi.-xv. The sacrificial precepts of *Lev.* i.-vii. are presupposed (e.g. in xii. 6-8; xiv. 12, etc.)." For Kuenen the two passages cited bring to mind Leviticus 5, irrevocably linked to Leviticus 4 in his mind.
[83] Nihan 2007: 150-198, 237-268 again breaks with the traditional Analyst position by arguing that the issue of the incense altar does not implicate all of Leviticus 1-7. For him, Leviticus 4-7 are the only passages that should be identified as secondary on this basis. While his position on Leviticus 4-5 makes sense if we grant his uncharacteristically uncritical acceptance of the traditional Analyst view of the lateness of the incense altar, Nihan surprises by not offering a more atomizing analysis, in line with his impulses elsewhere, to recover an "original" version of Leviticus 6-7.
[84] After Wellhausen and Kuenen, it became common to also reject the unity of Exodus 25-29. See Nihan 2007: 34-58 for a review and refutation of these proposals, which are founded in the Analyst program's inherent tendency towards atomization.
[85] One may review the arguments on the secondary nature of Exodus 30-31 in Noth 1962: 234-241, 274-275 and Nihan 2007: 31-33 to see that no significant changes or improvements have been made over Wellhausen's and

arguments for the secondary nature of Exodus 30-31, then the bulk of Exodus 35-40, which integrates the material of 30-31 into its narrative of the Tabernacle construction, must also be secondary. If Exodus 35-40 is secondary, then Leviticus 8 is suspect due to its similarity as an extended narrative recounting of Exodus 29. Leviticus 1-7, which acknowledge the existence of the incense altar, also become suspicious. Leviticus 11-15, with their knowledge of the *āšām* and *ḥaṭṭāʾt* from Leviticus 4-5, must then be secondary as well.[86] Elements in Leviticus 10 that seem to comment on tensions between Leviticus 1-7 and 9 or that forecast the existence of 11-15 must be even later.[87] If, however, the secondary nature of Exodus 30-31 is not secure, then one must consider much of the Analyst model—which rests, in part, on the secondary nature of these texts—to be questionable.

While Wellhausen and Kuenen treated each piece of Exodus 30-31 separately, many of their arguments rely on their placement after Exodus 29; they are "prejudiced by their surroundings."[88] Viewing these passages as secondary because of their placement relies on the questionable assumption that we correctly understand both the organizational impulses of the Priestly author and the manner in which Exodus 25-31 was compiled—i.e., it assumes that Exodus 25-31 represents a fresh composition by the author of P. As such, we will deal with these arguments when we turn to a broader evaluation of the Analyst framework below. With two

---

Kuenen's presentation. Boorer 2016: 59 goes so far as to state that "It is generally agreed that Exod 30-31 is secondary material and not part of Pg."

[86] Note however that this last assertion relies on the problematic but common assumption that a written script for a type of sacrifice must exist in P in order for texts to make reference to that type of sacrifice (see, e.g., Nihan 2007: 150-159). This ignores the fact that the Priestly text describes lived religious acts. Even if Leviticus 1-7 were definitively proved as secondary, this has no real bearing on whether mentions of these sacrifices elsewhere are also secondary.

[87] On the relationship between Leviticus 10 and other texts, see Milgrom 1991: 618-627, 635-640. Other implications than those briefly mentioned here were also derived from the rejection of Exodus 30-31, some of which are discussed in the examination below of Wellhausen's theory of the development of the anointing ritual.

[88] Wellhausen 1899: 141, "wird durch ihre Umgebung präjudicirt," specifically in reference to 30:17-21; 34-38; see his similar comments on 31:12-17. See also Kuenen 1886: 75-76. Evidence for the continuing influence of this view can be seen in Nihan 2007: 33's summary of scholarly arguments for the secondary nature of Exodus 30-31: "For the present discussion, it is enough to observe that if the incense altar is a late addition, all of ch. 30-31 should be viewed as secondary."

exceptions—the arguments concerning the anointing of priests and concerning the incense altar—their other objections to these passages are notably minor.[89]

We will focus our attention, then, on the two of their objections that constitute a sustained argument for this far-reaching stratification of the Priestly text.[90] The first of these is Wellhausen's and Kuenen's argument that the Priestly text contains evidence of two different stages of development related to the anointing of priests at their installation—an earlier stage in

[89] Seriatim, always with an eye to their assumption that a post-Exodus 29 placement already implies secondary status: Kuenen 1886: 75; Wellhausen 1899: 139 dismiss the poll-tax (Exod 30:11-16) because it assumes the existence of a command to take a census. For both of them, this shows dependence on Numbers 1 (which both attributed to P, Wellhausen 1899: 176, cf. Kuenen 1886: 92, 94, in part, but Wellhausen would not concede that an author could make reference to material he had not yet written, showing his implicit belief in the linear composition of P and its status as the original work of an author not drawing on sources). However, their objection ignores the fact that the Priestly narrative has already referred to the Israelites' organization into musters, which serves as the basis for census taking (Num 1:2-3; 2 Sam 24:9), both in Egypt and at the moment of the Exodus (Exod 7:4; 12:17, 41). The Priestly writer's image of the Israelites' organization thus assumes some kind of census-taking for maintenance. This is one of the rare cases where the Priestly writer assumes a cultural institution rather than accounts for it; the divergence in this approach between his assumption of a muster-/census-based organization with his desire to explain the fiscal policy that accompanied it deserves further exploration.

Kuenen 1886: 75; Wellhausen 1899: 141 argue that the laver (Exod 30:17-21) would have been placed earlier if the author had intended to mention it originally. This assumes a greater knowledge of the organizational structure of Exodus 29-31 than we have a right to. Wellhausen further asserts that the Priestly author originally omitted the laver since it was "kein heiliges," but this ignores the manufacture of the bases, pegs, and various other items that the Priestly author includes but never labels as "holy."

Kuenen 1886: 76; Wellhausen 1899: 141 excise the instructions for compounding incense (Exod 30:34-38) because of their association with the oil recipe (discussed below) and because Exod 30:36 seems to assume the existence of the incense altar, which they have likewise dismissed as secondary. Neither argument is compelling, and even if one agrees with their position on the incense altar, nothing in Exod 30:36 requires its presence, which is just as easily imagined as being undertaken with a censer (*maḥtāh*), as observed by Noth 1962: 239. Wellhausen's and Kuenen's argument is over-applied, really being an observation about 30:36 and not the whole passage. For the misconception of the history of incense usage that is endemic in Wellhausen's and his inheritors' work, see the following discussion on the incense altar.

Kuenen 1886: 76; Wellhausen 1899: 141 dismiss the commission of Bezalel and Oholiab (Exod 31:1-11) because it is replete with material from Exodus 30. The cascading implications of the dismissal of the incense altar will be discussed below.

Finally, Kuenen 1886: 76; Wellhausen 1899: 141 argue that the Sabbath command must be a later addition because, for Wellhausen, "die Sprache zwar von Q abhängt, aber nicht völlig damit übereinstimmt." However, none of the examples he gives are convincing, and all have parallels with P elsewhere (Driver 1910: 38 suggests connections with the Holiness Code, for which see next chapter). For Kuenen, the passage represents a "subsequent reflection…with a subsidiary legal intention." He offers support for this by noting that the intention for the Sabbath to override the work of Tabernacle construction is broadcast explicitly in Exod 35:1-3, which he views as another later addition to P, along with the rest of 35-40, on the basis of data related to the incense altar.

[90] Finn 1915: 470-475 already identified the issues of anointing and the incense altar as the main force of the Analytic argument concerning Exodus 30-31. Finn's article was dismissed for its anti-Septuagint bias in Wevers 1992: 118-119, but Wevers ignores the fact that Finn makes his bias apparent in a way that allows one to separate it easily from the rest of his arguments; furthermore, Finn's arguments about the material in Exodus extend beyond the relationship between MT and LXX.

which only the high priest was anointed and a later one in which all the priests receive anointment.[91] On this basis, they identified any passages that spoke of the anointing of Aaron's sons as a later interpolation (Exod 28:41; 30:22-33;[92] 40:13-15; Lev 7:36; 10:6-7; Num 3:3). Their argument relies on Exodus 29, which they contend, reading 29:7//Lev 8:12, only envisions the anointing of Aaron. They further support this contention by noting that the high priest is also referred to as "the anointed priest" (Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 6:15; cf. Num 35:25), a distinction they contend would be meaningless if all priests were anointed.

This entire scheme is based on a misreading of the material in Exodus 29. While Kuenen and Wellhausen are correct that Exod 29:7//Lev 8:12 only mention the anointing of Aaron, they ignore Exod 29:21//Lev 8:30, which has Aaron's sons receiving anointing alongside Aaron, albeit by aspersion rather than affusion. The divergence they detect is not, then, a development of the ritual over time, but the use of two different types of anointing: only the high priest is anointed by affusion, but all priests are anointed by aspersion at their installation.[93] This view nicely makes sense out of the description of the high priest in Lev 21:10, which specifies that the high priest is the one who has oil poured "on his head" (*ʿl-rʾšw*). It also explains the presence of *nezer* in the description of the high priest in 21:12 (*ky nzr šmn mšḥt ʾlhyw ʿlyw*) versus its absence in the description of all the priests in Lev 10:7 (*ky-šmn mšḥt yhwh ʿlykm*).[94] As Finn

[91] Kuenen 1886: 75-76; Wellhausen 1899: 139-141. For an inversion of this sequence, see B. Levine 1965: 312. The long-term reception of this argument can be gauged by Noth 1962: 230; 1965: 86; B. Levine 1993: 155; Nihan 2007: 128-130; Boorer 2016: 350, n. 398.

[92] One should perhaps note that although Wellhausen and Kuenen use this argument to relegate the whole anointing oil pericope to secondary status, it really amounts to, at most, a dismissal of Exod 30:30. Their other reason for dismissing this material, the mention of the incense altar in 30:27, will be addressed below.

[93] Rooke 2000: 20; Propp 2006: 456-457 reach a similar conclusion in their examination of these passages.

[94] Milgrom 2000: 1818 also recognizes this as the difference between the descriptions in Lev 10:7 and Lev 21:12, though he insists, nonsensically in my opinion, that the relationship between the two verses is also diachronically diagnostic.

observed, the distinctive form of anointing he receives sufficiently accounts for "the High Priest being styled 'the anointed priest' *par excellence*."[95]

Further undermining their assertion that calling the high priest "the anointed priest" would not be distinctive if all priests were anointed, several of the passages that Kuenen and Wellhausen identify, correctly, as describing only the high priest as anointed combine this notion with the distinctive clothing that the high priest wears (Exod 29:5-7, 29-30; Lev 8:7-10; 16:32; 21:10). This makes clear that it was not just anointing that set apart the high priest from his subordinates; the distinctive clothing of his office was also an important indicator of his status.[96] That these distinctions could nevertheless be collapsed in general descriptions is proved by Exod 28:41—identified by Kuenen and Wellhausen as one of the later passages that has all of the priests receiving anointment—which no more implies that all priests receive the same kind of anointing than it does that they all wear the same type of clothing.

There is, finally, the issue of how and why an editor would have allowed these two different rituals to both stand if he was correcting the Priestly text to acknowledge the identical anointing of all priests. Finn's description of the problem, in which he correctly recognizes that the editor required for their model must be considered deeply incompetent, is worth quoting in full:

> …on the later addition theory, we should be required to believe in an interpolator who has been careful to include the sons in Exod. xxviii 41, but failed to mention them in xxix 8 ten verses later; and in the same way has included them in Lev. vii 35, 36, and left viii 13 (fifteen verses further on) without them. He has also inserted precise directions in

[95] Finn 1915: 471. For further exploration of the way that biblical scholars have misunderstood the history and purpose of anointing, see Fleming 1998, who powerfully refutes the notion that anointing priests represents a late, post-exilic arrogation of a royal prerogative to the priesthood.

[96] Note as well that Num 20:23-29 focuses on the transfer of the sacred garments to indicate the passing of the high priesthood from Aaron to Eleazar.

> Exod. xxx 30, xl 15, and allusions in Lev. x 7, Num. iii 3, but left the mentions of 'the anointed priest' untouched. He must have been very careless.

This is not a minor point that can be waved away. As we discussed in Chapter 1, compositional models must also be historical models that can account for not just what editors did to a text, but also how and why. As Finn's description makes clear, the editor imagined by Kuenen and Wellhausen is inherently improbable. On the other hand, the supposition that these texts are in agreement and that all priests can be spoken of as anointed even though only the high priest undergoes anointing by affusion not only accounts for the data at hand—it also allows us to explain other texts, such as the difference, discussed above, between the descriptions in Lev 21:12 and 10:7. The Analyst argument for editorial layers in the Priestly text on the basis of a change in the anointing ritual for priests fails to be persuasive.

The second argument that Kuenen and Wellhausen advance is that the incense altar is a clear, later addition to the Tabernacle material—any passage that refers to it either explicitly or implicitly (i.e. by referring to the altar in the courtyard as "the bronze altar" or "the altar of burnt offering") must also be considered a later addition.[97] They build their argument from the fact that the incense altar material in Exod 30:1-10 not only comes after Exodus 29, but that there is absolutely no mention of this altar with the rest of the inner furnishing of the Tabernacle described in Exodus 25 and Exod 26:34-36. They contend that Ezekiel shows no knowledge of the incense altar (Ezek 41:21-22) and Wellhausen argues that its only mentions in Kings come from corrupt passages (1 Kgs 6:20, 22; 7:48), confirming that the incense altar was not an original part of the Israelite cult. They draw further support for this point by noting that several texts refer to the altar in the Tabernacle courtyard as "the altar," as though there was no other,

[97] Kuenen 1886: 74-75; Wellhausen 1899: 137-139. The long-term reception of this argument can be gauged by Noth 1962: 234-235; Heger 1997: 1-3, 97-99; Nihan 2007: 31-33, 161-164; Boorer 2016: 59, n. 292.

and by cataloging occasions in the Priestly text where the incense altar is either omitted where we might expect it or where censers are used to burn incense instead. Finally, Wellhausen invokes the absence of the incense altar from parts of the Septuagint of Exodus 35-40 to prove that its inclusion in the Priestly text must be a later phenomenon.

While this appears to be an imposing edifice of converging evidence, closer examination of these data exposes the fact that they constitute less a compelling argument than a collection of ephemera that have been selectively construed to support the Analytic view of the incense altar. Though both Wellhausen and Kuenen herald the absence of the incense altar from Exodus 25 as sufficient proof of its secondary nature, Haran observed that "the contention that the passage in question (Exod 30:1-10) is not in its proper place, while of course correct in itself, is extremely weak as a starting point for a literary analysis."[98] We can begin our own examination by dismissing from consideration at least one possible explanation for the absence of the incense altar from Exodus 25—Wellhausen's idea that the author of Exodus 25 "did not know [the incense altar]" and that "all further explanations are in vain."[99] Archaeologically recovered incense altars from the Iron II period in Judah, Israel, Philistia, and Moab, some of which are horned like the one described in Exod 30:1-10, decisively rule against this position.[100] If the

[98] Haran 1978: 228-229. For further discussion of the arrangement of materials in P, see below and Chapters 3 and 4.
[99] Wellhausen 1899: 137, "Der Grund, warum der Verfasser von Kap. 25ss. an der Stelle, wo er die innere Einrichtung der Hütte, bestehend in Lade und Kapporth, Tisch und Leuchter, beschreibt, den goldenen Räucheraltar nich mit aufführt, ist der, dass er von letzterem nichts Weiss. Vergessen kann er ihn nicht haben—so bleibt keine weitere Möglichkeit, alle sonstigen Erklärungen sind vergeblich." Compare to his statement about the absence of the bronze laver from Exodus 25-29: "Das eherne Becken ist zwar auf keine Weise so zu beurteilen wie der goldene Altar, es hat notwindigerweise existirt und muss auch dem Verfasser von Exod. 25ss. bekannt gewesen sein" (141).
[100] Haran 1978: 235-238; Nielsen 1986: 38-51; Gitin 1989, 1992; Dion and Daviau 2000; Bean, et al. 2018. Wellhausen's further contention that any form of incense offering was a late addition to the Judahite cult, with Jeremiah's work in the 6th century marking the earliest reference to frankincense (Wellhausen 1885: 64-65), has also been undermined by archaeological evidence, which shows that Judah participated in the South Arabian incense trade at least by the 8th century and perhaps as early as the 9th; see Singer-Avitz 1999. His argument that prior to the exilic period the verb קטר never referred to the burning of incense has been undermined by the 8th century Moabite incense altar, which is labelled *mqṭr* (Dion and Daviau 2000: 5-6). Finally, Arie, Rosen, and Namdar 2020's chemical analysis of the incense residue on the 8th century Arad altars has confirmed that frankincense was burned on the larger altar. Unfortunately, work that follows Wellhausen's stance on both the incense altar and incense, such

incense altar is in fact not an original part of the Tabernacle instructions, then the author of this material must have intentionally omitted it.[101]

This position, however, depends on our certainty that the incense altar should be treated with the rest of the sancta that belong inside the Tabernacle. Though Kuenen emphatically states that "the passages does not stand where the author of *Ex.* xxv.-xxix. must have placed it [i.e., in Exodus 25],"[102] this stance is based on nothing more than his own expectations. While this is a seemingly subjective issue with very few objective criteria we can bring to bear on the question,[103] there is at least one piece of evidence that suggests that these assumptions have misunderstood the relationship between the incense altar and the rest of the Tabernacle furnishings.

When we turn to the Samaritan Pentateuch, we find the passage describing the incense altar displaced from Exod 30:1-10 to between Exod 26:35 and 26:36.[104] Nihan asserts that this provides confirmation of the contention that the incense altar is in the wrong place,[105] and it is certainly true that the editors of SamP must have felt the same tension about the passage that we do. Just as noteworthy, however, is that when they decided to relocate the incense altar

---

as Heger 1997 and Nihan 2007, almost completely neglect archaeological data. This is especially egregious in Nihan 2007: 220-222, who freely cites Persian-era cuboid altars as evidence that incense use was a post-exilic phenomenon in Judah while not mentioning a single one of the Iron II altars that have been recovered—despite the fact that he includes Nielsen 1986 in his bibliography. A notable exception to this trend is Noth 1962: 234-235, see next note.

[101] This is the position of Noth 1962: 234-235, whose acknowledgement of archaeologically recovered incense altars led him to conclude that Pg's omission of the incense altar from Exodus 25 must be intentional. Kuenen 1886: 75 foreshadows this position, as Kuenen did not engage with Wellhausen's historical speculations about incense in Judah.

[102] Kuenen 1886: 75.

[103] Meyers 1996 explores some of the possible reasons for Exod 30:1-10's displacement, noting in particular the complexity and boundary-crossing nature of some of the rites of the incense altar (e.g., blood being brought from outside into the sanctuary as part of some of the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* rituals) as the reason for its displacement to Exodus 30. Haran 1978: 205-227 argues for the inherent unity of all of the rites that take place within the Tabernacle, including the ones involving the incense altar, as evidence that it must be an organic part of the Priestly text.

[104] This is also the case with 4QpaleoExod^{m}, which is a witness to a proto-Samaritan text, see Sanderson 1988; Propp 2006: 334.

[105] Nihan 2007: 32. While SamP sheds light on the perception of the incense altar passage in the Second Temple period, it has no bearing on whether the passage is original, since it agrees with MT regarding the incense altar in every other detail (i.e. there are no "minuses" involving the incense altar in SamP).

instructions, they still did not place them in Exodus 25 with the instructions for the ark, table, and lampstand.[106] This suggests that a reason, possibly unrecoverable, existed for not placing the instructions for the incense altar with the instructions for the rest of the inner sancta.

Indeed, contrary to Wellhausen's and Kuenen's analysis, the placement of the incense altar may in fact indicate its originality. Finn questions whether a late editor eager to add the incense altar to the already existing Tabernacle material would not have placed them exactly where Wellhausen and Kuenen expect them to appear.[107] An additional factor to consider is that, unlike the other supposed additions in 30:11-31:17, the incense altar appears as part of the initial divine speech to Moses. That is, all of Exod 25:1-30:10—including the incense altar—is presented in the narrative as a single divine speech.[108] Any substantiation of Wellhausen and Kuenen's theory would have to explain why an editor would mark off some of his additions as separate divine speeches and not others.[109] These reasons are sufficient to bring into question whether the incense altar's absence from Exodus 25 is enough to warrant viewing the passage as a late addition and lend support to Propp's suggestion that "the Priestly Writer had a reason for proceeding as he did [in arranging the material in Exodus 25-31], which it is our job to discover."[110] We can suspend judgment until we have evaluated the other arguments for viewing it as secondary.

Both Kuenen and Wellhausen argue that Ezekiel's visionary temple supports their position, claiming that Ezekiel did not distinguish between the table and incense altar (Ezek

---

[106] The decision to place the incense altar instructions just prior to the instructions for the screen for the Tabernacle entrance may have been influenced by Exod 35:15-16.
[107] 1915: 474-475.
[108] Compare to the rest of the Tabernacle instructions, which are broken up into six, shorter speeches: 30:11-16, 17-21, 22-33, 34-38; 31:1-11, 12-17. (Note that 30:22-38 could be one speech, as the verb *ʾmr* rather than *dbr* might indicate a return to the main discourse if 30:31-33 is viewed as an aside.)
[109] For a suggestion about what the divine speeches may be demarcating in Exodus and Leviticus, see discussion at the end of this chapter and in chapter 3.
[110] 2006: 716-717.

41:21-22).[111] For Wellhausen, this is evidence that the existence of an incense altar distinct from the table for the *pānîm* bread is a late phenomenon and that the editor who added the incense altar to Exodus 25-29 was adjusting the text to a reality that knew them as separate furnishings.[112] For both of them, Ezekiel's temple vision provides proof that it was not necessary to include an incense altar as part of a sanctuary's furnishings. There are, however, numerous problems with their reading of Ezekiel. First, while the table in Ezekiel is called an altar (or the altar is called a table), we can not accept Wellhausen's statement that "table is its name, altar its function."[113] This is because the table is constructed of bare wood and so, as Milgrom observes, "would go up in flames during its first day of service."[114] Whatever this object is meant to be, it clearly can not be considered a functional altar.[115]

More problematically, Wellhausen and Kuenen have extracted a passage to support their view without considering how it is contextualized within Ezekiel's broader vision. While it is true that Ezekiel does not include an incense altar within his temple, he also does not include a lampstand or even the ark.[116] Ezekiel's vision is a vision and does not need to correspond to the reality of either the Temple in Jerusalem or to the Priestly description of the Tabernacle.[117] Kuenen's position that Ezekiel's vision is evidence that it is possible to imagine a sanctuary without an incense altar remains viable, but given its relationship to other notable absences in Ezekiel it is questionable whether it should be used to understand the Priestly text. The absence

[111] Kuenen 1886: 75; Wellhausen 1899: 137-138.
[112] Wellhausen 1885: 66-67.
[113] Wellhausen 1899: 138, "Tisch ist der Name, Altar der Zweck." Kuenen 1886: 75 similarly states "…Ezekiel, likewise, left his proposed temple without any altar of incense distinct from the table of shew-bread, inasmuch as he identified the two."
[114] Milgrom and Block 2012: 96.
[115] On the ambiguity of this object, see Nielsen 1986: 104; Milgrom and Block 2012: 95. Haran 1978: 288 maintains that it is an altar, but this seems unlikely given Milgrom's observation.
[116] Note as well that the priests' service within the temple building has been reduced to only serving at the table (Ezek 44:16).
[117] Milgom and Block 2012: 174-177, 262 provides an analysis of the possible theological underpinnings of Ezekiel's largely empty temple.

of the incense altar from Ezekiel's visionary temple seems no more relevant to the compositional history of the Priestly text than the absence of the ark or menorah.

Wellhausen compounds his error, using his belief that the incense altar and table for *pānîm* bread were identical in the pre-exilic period to dismiss references to the incense altar in 1 Kgs 6:20-22; 7:48. According to Wellhausen, the golden altar described in 1 Kgs 6:20-22 is really the combined altar-table and that 1 Kgs 7:48 originally only mentioned the golden altar. A later editor, influenced by the layout of the Second Temple and the Priestly text, then added a reference to the table to this verse. [118] The fact that Wellhausen has incorrectly understood Ezekiel notwithstanding, the complete lack of any variants for 1 Kgs 7:48 undermines Wellhausen's claim. Moreover, his assertion that the "concluding summary mentions one piece of furniture more…than the preceding detailed description" as a reason to doubt the originality of the table's mention is contraindicated by the fact that not just the table, but numerous items in 1 Kgs 7:48-50 are not mentioned in the account of the manufacturing that precedes it.

Finally, if a later editor interfered with the account in 1 Kings 6-7 to bring it more in line with the Priestly text or later tradition, then Wellhausen must explain why he added the table in 1 Kings 7 and not also in the description of 1 Kings 6. Wellhausen's editor is again inconsistent, incompetent, and difficult to justify in a historically contextualized way. We must, then, acknowledge that the description of the Temple in 1 Kings knows of an incense altar and does not conflate it with the table for the *pānîm* bread.[119] Wellhausen's entire contention that the incense altar as a separate temple appurtenance is a late feature of Judahite religion is not supported by a single piece of evidence he adduces in its favor, has been archaeologically

[118] Wellhausen 1885: 67.
[119] See Nielsen 1986: 104-106 for further examination of the weakness of the hypothesis that the table and incense altar were originally identical.

falsified, and can not be used to justify identifying Exod 30:1-10 as an addition to the Priestly text.

Wellhausen and Kuenen find further support for the notion that the incense altar is secondary by noting that when the bronze altar is first introduced it is called, simply, "the altar" (Exod 27:1) as though it were the only altar.[120] This phenomenon also occurs in Leviticus 16, which calls the bronze altar "the altar" (Lev 16:12, 18, 20, 33).[121] From this, Wellhausen draws the conclusion that any place that refers to the bronze altar as the altar of burnt-offering (*mizbaḥ ʿōlāh*) or that further defines that altar (e.g., by locating it in the courtyard of the Tabernacle) must be from the later layer of P that knew of both the incense and bronze altars.[122] However, several pieces of data militate against understanding the description "the altar" as indicating that it was the only altar that existed. There is first the fact that the definite article in Hebrew does not have a perfect overlap with our concept of definiteness;[123] the fact that Exod 27:1 refers to the bronze altar as "the altar" does not have to carry the implication of uniqueness.[124] Indeed, Num 4:13 calls the bronze altar "the altar" despite the fact that the incense altar is mentioned just two verses before (Num 4:11). Additionally, as Finn notes, the centrality of the bronze altar to public

[120] Kuenen 1886: 75; Wellhausen 1899: 138-139; Noth 1962: 215. Undercutting the notion of the bronze altar as singular is likely the motivation behind the variant in both LXX and SamP that deletes the definite article in Exod 27:1, with the added motivation in SamP that 27:1 comes after the incense altar passage that was relocated to 26:36. See Propp 2006: 334-335.

[121] Some have attempted to understand at least some of the references to an altar in Leviticus 16 as the incense altar in accordance with the instruction given in Exod 30:10, but, as Milgrom 1991: 1025, 1036 observes, the far more natural reading is to take all occurrences as referencing the bronze altar.

[122] Kuenen 1886: 75 also suggests that the phrase "bronze altar" may likewise indicate the existence of another altar (the "gold altar") and mentions 1 Kgs 8:64; 2 Kgs 16:14, 15; Ezek 9:2 as passages that may confirm the existence of those two altars in the Jerusalem Temple (though this does not alter Kuenen's stance on the secondary nature of the incense altar in P). However, describing something by the material it is made of does not have to be intended to distinguish it from the same item of a different material. If, however, one does wish to understand the label this way, then only 1 Kgs 8:64 can be taken into evidence as a distinction between the bronze altar and a gold altar, since in both 2 Kings 16 and Ezekiel 9 the distinction may be between the bronze altar and the large altar constructed by Ahaz.

[123] Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 235-249; Joüon and Muraoka 1996: 505-513 for discussion and examples.

[124] Finn 1915: 474 humorously observes that "the use of the term 'the altar,' therefore, no more implies that 'there was no other' than the mention of 'the chair' at a public meeting implies the absence of all other chairs."

rituals—especially when contrasted with the mostly hidden functioning of the incense altar—provides sufficient reason for referring to it as "the altar" in contexts where it would not be confused with the incense altar.[125]

More importantly, the context of the bronze altar instructions (Exod 27:1-8) provides a motivation for the presence of the definite article at its introduction. While scholars frequently read the instructions in Exodus 25-31 as primarily non-narrative texts that imply a purely verbal communication concerning the Tabernacle from Yhwh to Moses, the Priestly text makes it clear that there is also a visual component to Moses' experience on Mt. Sinai. In Exod 25:9 Yhwh tells Moses that he must make the Tabernacle and its implements "according to everything which I am showing you." The verbal description is thus only one component of the Tabernacle revelation—Moses seems to be taken on a tour through the Tabernacle as it is being described.[126] The instructions for the bronze altar come just after the instructions for setting up the interior of the Tabernacle (26:30-37), culminating in the manufacture of the screen doorway for the Tabernacle. If we imagine this visually as well as textually, Yhwh then turns Moses to the courtyard and the definite article here functions deictically, pointing out "this altar." The end of the instructions confirms the visual element of this particular section, as Moses is told to make the bronze altar "just as he [Yhwh] showed you on the mountain" (Exod 27:8).[127] Without a prior commitment to the lateness of the incense altar, nothing requires understanding the few places that describe the bronze altar as "the altar" as implying its uniqueness.

---

[125] 1915: 474.

[126] See also 25:40; 26:30; 27:8. This may be the implication behind the statement in Exod 24:16 that the *kābôd* of Yhwh "tented" (*škn*) on Mt. Sinai, i.e., it set up the divine counterpart to the earthly Tabernacle. The temple vision of Ezekiel may indicate that if this is not correct, then it is an interpretation that goes back at least to the 6th century. See also, the vision in Gudea A.

[127] On other possible renderings of *her'āh*, see Propp 2006: 424.

Wellhausen further contends that the incense altar is absent in places where we might expect it to occur in P and that frequently censers are used for carrying out incense-related rituals.[128] The first of his examples is the absence of the incense altar from the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* ritual performed in Leviticus 8-9, as opposed to how they are described in Leviticus 4. We have already examined this problem in detail above and it need not detain us again here. His second example is the atonement ritual of Leviticus 16, which mentions only one altar—the bronze altar in the courtyard—and does not contain a parallel to the instruction of Exod 30:10 requiring the once-a-year atonement of the incense altar.[129] There is no question that Wellhausen is absolutely correct about this observation. The question is whether this is sufficient grounds on which to dismiss every other passage that concerns the incense altar as a secondary addition to the Priestly text as a whole. The lack of other strong arguments in favor of the Analyst position on the incense altar should lead us to ask whether this datum is amenable to a non-stratigraphic explanation. We will return to this question at the end of this chapter to propose just such an explanation, one grounded in the principles of secondary analysis outlined in chapter one.

As for the use of censers for incense rituals (Lev 10:1; 16:12-13; Num 16:4-7, 16-18, 35; 17:1-5, 11-13), this has no bearing on whether the incense altar is a secondary addition to P. Wellhausen's insistence on this is based on his argument that incense altars were unknown in the pre-exilic period, so that the use of censers was indicative of an evolutionary stage prior to their introduction. As discussed above, this is not a tenable position. Without this evolutionary scheme, there is no reason to perceive the use of censers and the incense altar as mutually exclusive aspects of the Judahite cult. With the exception of the Day of Atonement ritual, the other passages noted by Wellhausen take place outside of the Tabernacle and so could not

[128] Wellhausen 1899: 138.
[129] Kuenen 1886: 75 also makes note of this.

involve the incense altar.[130] When it comes to the use of a censer for the Day of Atonement ritual within the Tabernacle, it is important to remember that the purpose of the incense for this ritual was that it created a screening cloud between the priest and the presence of Yhwh when the priest passed the *pārōket* and entered into the Holy of Holies (Lev 16:13). This requires that the cloud of incense move with the priest, something the incense altar could not accomplish.

In the Priestly text, the function of the incense altar seems restricted to its part in the *tāmîd* ritual, like the lighting of the menorah (Exod 30:7-8; cf. Lev 24:1-4), and its role in some versions of the *ḥaṭṭāʾt*. That it does not occur with more frequency in the Priestly text should not occasion surprise—as part of the ritual that took place inside of the Tabernacle it had very little impact on the public-facing cult that provides the majority of the Priestly text's subject matter. The other inner sancta of the Tabernacle, the menorah and the table, are hardly mentioned with more frequency.[131] As with the other objections we have examined so far, neither the use of censers nor the incense altar's absence from certain passages can justify its excision from the Priestly text.

Wellhausen reserves what he calls "the most remarkable" piece of evidence in favor of viewing the incense altar as secondary for the end of his discussion: that the Septuagint has no equivalent to the account of the manufacture of the incense altar in MT Exod 37:25-28.[132] As with the argument about the missing incense altar in Ezekiel, this is a factually correct statement, but one that has to be contextualized within all the features of the Septuagint version of Exodus

---

[130] Haran 1978: 231-245 argue that there is also a difference between the incense used on the golden altar and that used in censers, but Nielsen 1986: 69-70 calls his argument into question.

[131] Not counting lists, the incense altar occurs in 6 passages (30:1-10; 37:25-28; 40:5, 26-27; Lev 4:7, 18; Num 4:11); the table in 6 (25:23-30; 37:10-16; 40:4a, 22-23; Lev 24:5-9; Num 4:7-8); the menorah in 8 (25:31-40; 27:20-21; 37:17-24; 40:4b, 24-25; Lev 24:1-4; Num 4:9-10; 8:1-4).

[132] Wellhausen 1899: 139, "Und höchst bemerkenswert ist es, dass in der Sept. Die Stelle Exod. 37, 25-29 [*sic*] fehlt, der Räucheraltar also zwar wol befohlem, aber nicht ausgeführt wird." Wellhausen is incorrect to include MT 37:29 here, which has an equivalent in LXX 38:25. Neither Kuenen nor Noth invoke the Septuagint in their discussion of the secondary nature of the incense altar, though Nihan 2007: 31-33 does. The classical trio of Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen received many of their ideas about the relationship of LXX Exodus 35-40 to MT from Popper 1862.

before we can properly evaluate its relevance.[133] When we examine the data from the Septuagint, it becomes immediately apparent that Wellhausen only presents, at best, a partial view of the evidence. Whether one is dealing with LXX Exodus 35-40 or the entirety of the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch, one can not describe the incense altar as missing. Of the 12 references to the incense altar in MT, spread across 3 books, LXX only certainly omits 2 and possibly omits 1 other—and all these omissions occur in just 5 chapters of one book.[134]

Even if we count the one ambiguous case as a certain omission, this still leaves 9 references identical between LXX and MT. Furthermore, 2 of the mentions of the incense altar that are certainly identical between LXX and MT are in the same set of chapters (Exodus 35-40) where the omissions are otherwise clustered. The LXX, then, can not in any way be used as evidence for the absence of the incense altar and the inconsistency of its presence in LXX 35-40 suggests either an inner-Greek textual issue or a facet of the translator's approach (or both).[135] For instance, in the place where we might expect the construction of the incense altar to be recorded in the Septuagint (LXX Exodus 38), there are 9 verses in a row that begin with οὗτος (LXX Exod 38:18-26), 8 of which begin with οὗτος ἐποίησεν (LXX Exod 38:19-26). It is difficult to imagine a riper environment for parablepsis due to homoioarchton.[136] In fact, the

[133] The role that the Septuagint plays in the larger Analyst argument for identifying Exodus 35-40 in their entirety as a later addition will be dealt with below.

[134] MT refers to the incense altar in Exod 30:1-10, 27; 31:8; 35:15; 37:25-28; 39:38; 40:5, 26; Lev 4:7, 18; Num 3:31; 4:11. LXX certainly omits MT 35:15; 37:25-28. The altar mentioned in LXX 39:15 is ambiguous and may be taken as the equivalent of either MT 39:38 (the incense altar) or MT 39:39 (the bronze altar). However, the context of the verse in LXX weighs heavily in favor of understanding the incense altar to be in view here, as it comes between the ark (LXX 39:14) and the menorah (LXX 39:16)—the bronze altar does not have a place with the inner sancta and the order "ark, bronze altar, menorah, table" is nowhere attested in either MT or LXX (though see LXX 31: 7-8 which has the order "ark, altars [plural!], table, lampstand"). See also Gooding 1959: 66-69, who further suggests that the list in Exodus 35 has become distorted in transmission in the Greek, including where the incense altar should be.

[135] For other suggestions, see Finn 1915: 475-476; Gooding 1959: 66-69, Wevers 1992: 126-146 Along with Wevers 1992: 119's praise of Gooding, I would like to offer my own—Gooding's book takes a complex problem and presents it concisely and in a nuanced manner that rarely oversteps the evidence at hand. The larger issues of the relationship of LXX 35-40 to MT will be addressed in the next section.

[136] There are, in fact, numerous issues with this passage, see Gooding 1959: 40-59; Wevers 1992: 133-138.

Hexapla indicates that Origen had access to at least one Greek manuscript that contained an account of the incense altar that began οὗτος ἐποίησε τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν.[137]

Wellhausen's choice to highlight the absence of the incense altar from LXX Exodus 35-40 also disregards the fact that LXX Exodus 35-40 omits other items as well, and not just material from the supposed additions in Exodus 30-31. The manufacture of the goat-hair curtains, the *qərāšîm*, and the bars that join them (Exod 36:14-34) are all missing in the Septuagint, and yet this has not led to a widespread questioning of the originality of these items in the Priestly text.[138] More interestingly, the Septuagint not only omits the manufacture of the *qərāšîm*-frames; it never mentions them at all in these chapters.[139] That is, the omission of the *qərāšîm* is total, whereas the omission of the incense altar is only partial. One has trouble justifying a hermeneutic whereby the data related to the incense altar is indicative of the compositional history of P while the data on the *qərāšîm* is not.[140] We will reserve further discussion of the relationship of LXX and MT Exodus 35-40 for the next section, but given that there are many reasons for thinking that LXX is based on a text not substantially different from

[137] Gooding 1959: 113, who also notes that Origen's asterisk occurs after this phrase, marking the rest of the verse and the ones that follow (ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων – χρυσίῳ) as restored by him (likely from the θ tradition), in accordance with how he has marked LXX 38:1=MT 37:1 to indicate Septuagint abbreviations vis-a-vis MT. Though this entry is recorded in Field 1875: 154, Wevers 1992:9-12 does not include this in his list of Origenic readings to Exodus 35-40 nor does he discuss it elsewhere. He appears to have accepted without comment the conclusions of Fraenkel 1990: 172-174 (see Wevers 1992: 9, n.). However, Fraenkel's argument about Origen's Exod 37:25 entry, for which he concludes that "οὗτος – χρουσοῦν ist nicht asterisiert, obwohl auch dieser Passus Zusatz ist," relies on the nature of the material that actually is asterisked in the Hexapla, as it duplicates, in part, the Hexapla's θ-rendition of the asterisked material for MT Exod 38:1b-2. However, none of this material is part of the LXX tradition, as the Hexaplar markings correctly note (and can, therefore, be explained by inner-Hexaplaric confusion, as Fraenkel admits). Fraenkel attributes peculiarities in Origen's Exod 37:25, such as the use of οὗτος for וְ and the rendering of מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת by τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν, to an imitation of the procedure followed in LXX Exod 38:22 (= MT 38:1). He does not reckon with the possibility that the same translator would likely have rendered MT Exod 37:25 and 38:1 with the same methods. Until Fraenkel's arguments have been fully re-evaluated, Gooding's argument that Origen's reading may preserve an otherwise lost verse from the original LXX remains a viable one.

[138] Gooding 1959: 72-75.

[139] Gooding 1959: 41-42, 74-75.

[140] Gooding 1959: 70f, observes that "Any absence of the gate-screen, laver and goats'-hair curtains is therefore most easily accounted for as the result of abbreviation on the part of the original translator, made worse, maybe, by subsequent accident in the transmission. To attempt to account for the presence or absence of these three things alone in chs. xxxvii, xxxviii, and xl on the theory of earlier and later Hebrew recensions involves so many contradictions as to reduce the theory to absurdity."

MT.[141] If this is the case, then we must side with Haran's statement that "the LXX version of the sections dealing with the tabernacle…has hardly anything to do with the literary question of Pentateuchal sources."[142]

The above contextualization of the missing passage concerning the incense altar in the Septuagint makes clear that Wellhausen has once again adduced a piece of data and construed it in favor of his position rather than evaluating it as evidence. When this datum is weighed rather than merely observed, it does not support the idea that the missing passage describing the manufacture of the incense altar is indicative of the incense altar's late addition to the Priestly text. Additionally, the transmission model that Wellhausen's reconstruction demands is almost unimaginable—this process would have to produce a Hebrew text of Exodus that a) included the supposedly late additions of 30-31, but b) still reflected in 35-40 a stage of the text from before the addition of 30-31, except that it c) also records the manufacture of the incense, oil, and laver (LXX 38:25-26) and knows the commission of Bezalel and Oholiab (LXX 35:30-34) so that it knows details from the supposedly later additions in MT 30:17-31:11, which includes three passages (30:27, 36; 31:8) that, according to Wellhausen, presuppose the existence of the incense altar and so are evidence for the lateness of this material, and d) in at least 2, and possibly 3, instances (LXX 39:15?; 40:5, 26) nevertheless contains the very incense altar that the text is taken as a witness for omitting. It is almost impossible to propose a plausible historical scenario that would produce a manuscript that vacillates so wildly between preserving earlier and later forms of the text, and only in five of its chapters. The Septuagint evidence that Wellhausen

[141] Gooding 1959: 29-98; Wevers 1992: 117-146. Cook 1996 demonstrated that reordering texts in translation is a technique known from other parts of the Septuagint. Wade 2003: 14-55 demonstrates that LXX also shows sensitivity to interpretive issues that gave rise to SamP, though after an exhaustive examination of the data (pp. 149-232) she remains agnostic about whether the *Vorlage* for LXX Exodus 35-40 differs from MT or not.
[142] 1978: 229, n. 28.

invokes is surely indicative of something, but it is highly doubtful whether it supports the claim that the incense altar is a late addition to the Priestly text.

We can return, then, to the question of whether the arguments put forward by Kuenen and Wellhausen are enough to support the contention that the incense altar is not an original part of the Priestly text. Wellhausen's case in particular seems exceptionally weak, as many of his arguments are either archaeologically disproven, based on poorly contextualized readings of texts, require improbable scenarios of transmission, or are susceptible to other, more plausible explanations than the one he offers. Kuenen's stance was more reserved, as he largely focused on the placement of the incense altar instructions and recognized that other arguments, such as whether Solomon's Temple had an incense altar, were immaterial to the question of whether the Priestly text included this item.

Importantly though, the placement of the incense altar and the few other supporting arguments that remain viable are deeply ambiguous data on which to base the consignment of such a large number of texts to secondary status. Any defense of the Analyst model's continued use of the incense altar as a criterion for identifying layers in the Priestly text must contend with this ambiguity and make an argument for why this is a superior way to construe the information. Until that case is made, we should acknowledge that the evidentiary basis for the contrary position, in which the incense altar is considered an original element of the Priestly text, is just as sound and provides an equally productive model on which to operate. Such a model would have an even more secure basis if we examine and find wanting the further arguments that the Analyst school has leveled against the originality of the narrative equivalents of the Tabernacle instructions, Exodus 35-40 and Leviticus 8—material which first entered Wellhausen and

Kuenen's suspicions on the basis of their relationship to the material in Exodus 30-31, including the incense altar.

Redundant Repetition: Exodus 35-40, Leviticus 8

Exodus 35-40 and Leviticus 8 make an easy target for critical models that are predisposed to stratification. These somewhat repetitive texts provide a narrative of the performance of the divine commands contained in Exodus 25-31. As such, they can be eliminated from the Priestly text with almost no loss of content. What is at stake, then, in the question of whether these chapters constitute an original part of P, is not whether the Priestly text recounted these topics, such as in the question of whether Exodus 30-31 or Leviticus 1-7 or 11-15 are secondary. What we are instead inquiring about is the shape of the Priestly text. This is an important question—its answer shapes our own models about how the Priestly author worked and what kind of text he intended to produce.

We can dispense with non-objections first—Kuenen's stance that only a later author would have had the idea "to give such a diffuse account of how Moses executed the commands of [Yhwh], immediately after the commands themselves."[143] This is not an observation based in the text, and other texts demonstrate that repetition is a common feature of ancient Near Eastern literature.[144] Even more importantly, there are numerous parallels in Mesopotamian literature to this type of repetition in building accounts in particular.[145] Finally, Noth—himself positioned firmly in the Analyst tradition—nevertheless dismisses the repetitious nature of Exodus 35-40 as

[143] Kuenen 1886: 78. Note that this contradicts Kuenen 1886: 84's observation that the Priestly author was "by no means distinguished for conciseness."
[144] Propp 2006: 710-720.As an example, see the repetition of the description of Tiamat's horde from Ee I. 129-162 in II.15-48 then again in III.19-52. In fact, tablet III of *Enūma eliš*, consisting of 138 lines, has only 40 lines of new text—everything else in the tablet is repeated from elsewhere in the epic.
[145] Hurowitz 1985; 1992.

a sign of its secondary nature, observing that "in view of the character of P as it can be observed elsewhere, such a long repetition in his work might be deemed quite possible."[146]

There are essentially two other arguments for the lateness of Exodus 35-40. The first is that it integrates the supposedly late material in Exodus 30-31 into its account.[147] The second is that the divergence between the LXX and MT in Exodus 35-40 suggest that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX is radically different from MT, indicating the lateness of adding a detailed compliance report to the end of Exodus.[148] Leviticus 8 is dismissed as secondary because it diverges in part from the instructions of Exodus 29, including the integration of supposedly late material from Exodus 40, and so should be attributed to a different author.[149] All of these positions assume that our current, detailed texts have replaced much simpler statements similar to the frequent Priestly notes that Moses acted just as Yhwh instructed him.

We will begin with a brief analysis of the arguments related to Leviticus 8. Seeming differences between Leviticus 8 and Exodus 29 compelled Wellhausen and Kuenen to relegate Leviticus 8 to a later stage of the Priestly text.[150] However, when these differences are examined in detail, they appear to be irrelevant or easily explained.[151] Among the major differences that

---

[146] Noth 1962: 274-275.

[147] Kuenen 1886: 72-73, 78; Wellhausen 1899: 141-142, 144-145. The long-term reception of this argument can be gauged by Noth 1962: 274-275; Boorer 2016: 65-67. Nihan 2007: 57-58 takes a different approach, arguing that some form of detailed compliance report likely existed in Pg, but one devoid of the elements derived from Exodus 30-31. His view is made deeply unlikely by the evidence from the LXX which, though it might have excluded the incense altar from Exod 30:1-10, nevertheless included every other piece of Exodus 30-31.

[148] Kuenen 1886: 79-80; Wellhausen 1899: 146-147.

[149] Kuenen 1886: 73, 82-83; Wellhausen 1899: 142-144. The long-term reception of this argument can be gauged by Noth 1965: 68-69; Milgrom 1991: 545-549; Feder 2011: 43-53; Boorer 2016: 67.Nihan 2007: 53, 111-112, 124-147 again distinguishes himself from the mainstream of the Analyst school by rejecting the secondary status of Leviticus 8.

[150] Kuenen 1886: 82-83's analysis of Leviticus 8's relationship to Exodus 29 seems particularly unfair, since he identifies both "slight changes of expression" and the text's appearance as "slavishly reproduced" as evidence that the two chapters are by different authors. Kuenen, in the same breath, thus argues that minute differences and exact identity are both to be taken as signs of different authors. One is left to wonder how to identify the work of a single author with this approach.

[151] Nihan 2007: 124-147. Nihan, however, problematically makes recourse to ascribing several of the divergences to interpolations. See following discussion.

remain is the different order in which the *millu'îm* rite is carried out—in Exodus 29 Moses is instructed to sprinkle the blood of the sacrifice on the priests before burning the portions of the offering, while in Leviticus 8 Moses delays the blood sprinkling to the end of the ritual (Exod 29:19-26; Lev 8:22-30).[152] Feldman has demonstrated that this change is due to the different genres of Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8, with Leviticus 8's narrative nature accounting for the change in practice.[153]

The other major difference between Leviticus 8 and Exodus 29 lie in the fact that Leviticus 8 integrates the ritual for consecrating the Tabernacle as described in Exodus 40 (Lev 8:10-11; Exod 40:9-11). Since Leviticus 8 is a narrative of the particular moment in the Priestly narrative at which both the Tabernacle and the priesthood are being consecrated, there is no *a priori* reason to identify this as a problematic difference.[154] We are confronted again with the cascading results of dismissing the incense altar, which leads to the relegation of Exodus 40 to secondary status, which causes scholars to identify these verses in Leviticus 8 as interpolations. Whether one accepts this argument depends on whether one views Exodus 35-40 as a later addition to P. The related argument that Leviticus 8 as a fulfillment narrative is more likely to be an addition to the Priestly text due to its similarity to Exodus 35-40 also stands or falls on how

[152] Nihan 2007: 128-130's analysis of this difference is problematic. He first cites SamP to Exodus 29, which matches the order in Leviticus 8. MT is preferable here though both because it is *lectio difficilior* and because SamP has a well-known bias towards harmonization. The evidence he cites from LXX Exodus 29, which places 29:20b after 29:21 is not an indicator that the blood sprinkling is a late element, but only that LXX felt tension in the relation of blood disposal to the burning of the fat (Propp 2006: 352). MT, however, seems more sensible in this case. Nihan's conclusion that both Exod 29:21& Lev 8:30 are later additions does not address why, if this was the case, they were added in incompatible ways. He also objects to the passage because the rite itself is unparalleled in the Bible—this is, however, not a real objection, as the ritual for installing a priest does not have to be similar to other rituals. Finally, his invocation of the 18th century Samsuilina B inscription that recounts the building of Sippar's wall and the restoration of the Ebabbar temple as an example of "ancient parallels preserved lead us to expect some degree of conformity" (128, n. 95) does not support his point—for an edition, see RIMe 4 3.7.3 (pp. 374-378); Milgrom 1991: 549-553 provides Sollberger's translation with analysis. A quick look at the panels of the Samsuiluna B inscription shows quite a range of variation and difference between command and action, including the attribution of the command to different gods in the fulfillment section and the inclusion of an extra action not commanded.

[153] 2018: 101-104. See also Fleming 1998: 411-412.

[154] Fleming 1998: 411-412; Feldman 2018: 87-114.

one understands those chapters' relationship to the rest of P. We will turn now to addressing the Analyst case for the secondary nature of Exodus 35-40.

The beginning of the argument against Exodus 35-40 resides in the presence of material from Exodus 30-31 in these chapters. As the previous section demonstrated, the Analyst arguments for the lateness of Exodus 30-31 are weak at best—the position that these chapters are late must be considered a supposition rather than a claim founded on evidence. Therefore, the mere presence of material from Exodus 30-31 in Exodus 35-40 is not sufficient to justify their relegation to secondary status. However, interesting and forceful points lie behind the Analyst observation about the way that Exodus 35-40 integrates the supposedly late materials from the Tabernacle instructions.

Analysts have observed that the elements of Exodus 30 have been placed in their logical relationship with the other Tabernacle material, so that the incense altar's manufacture occurs alongside the other inner sancta (Exod 37:25-28), the production of the oil and incense occur just after (37:29), and the manufacture of the laver follows the bronze altar and precedes the construction of the courtyard (38:8). The material from Exodus 25-28 also appears in a different configuration, with the creation of the Tabernacle proper now preceding the manufacture of its furnishings (36:8-38). Analysts have reasonably asked whether it is sensible to attribute such different treatments of the same topics and materials to a single author. The fact that occasional changes of language are visible between the two sections—such as the description of the curtains' join changing from אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ (Exod 26:3, 5, 17) to אַחַת אֶל־אַחַת (36:10, 13)—strengthens the case for thinking that different hands are at work. Any model that contends that Exodus 35-40 are an original part of the Priestly text must address these issues directly. We will return to this issue at the end of this chapter.

The case of the LXX of Exodus 35-40, its relationship to the MT, and what bearing this has on the possible lateness of these chapters is a complicated problem that is not amenable to a brief presentation.[155] There is no substitute for a detailed, side-by-side study of the Hebrew and Greek texts, accompanied by the articles and monographs that have been written on this subject.[156] Briefly sketched, the problem is this: when compared to MT (and SamP), LXX Exodus 35-40 is radically shorter, differently arranged, and there are indicators that a different translator was responsible for it than the one who produced LXX Exodus 1-34.[157] This intersects the problem of whether Exodus 35-40 are an original part of the Priestly text in two ways. The first is the question of whether LXX is a translation of MT that has been radically edited and rearranged or whether there is a different Hebrew *Vorlage* underlying LXX. If the latter is the case, it strengthens the argument that Exodus 35-40 is a late addition to MT or at least was in flux at a very late date. This could suggest that it was not an original part of P (or the Torah in general). The second intersection lies in the question of whether, if a different translator produced LXX Exodus 35-40, this is an indicator that Exodus 35-40 were not part of the *Vorlage* of the translator responsible for LXX Exodus 1-34.

The differences between LXX and MT Exodus 35-40 are stark. Minuses in LXX include the majority of the descriptive elements during the manufacture of most of the sancta,[158] the majority of the manufacture of the Tabernacle proper,[159] and a host of other small minuses. At the same time, the text is differently organized, so that the creation of the priestly vestments, which occurs last in MT (Exod 39:1-31) is instead first in LXX (36:8-38), while the manufacture

[155] Propp 2006: 631-637 understandably sidesteps the issue, referring to it as a "quagmire."
[156] Chief among them Finn 1915; Gooding 1959; Nelson 1986; Aejmelaeus 1992; Wevers 1992; Wade 2003. Wade 2003: 4-9 provides a concise review of these and other works.
[157] Propp 2006: 632-636 provides a convenient chart detailing the differences in order, though it contains some errors and one could quibble on how he has divided up the topics.
[158] LXX 38:1-27 covers the same material as MT 37:1-38:8 (37 verses).
[159] MT 36:8-38 is represented by LXX 37:1-6. See Wevers 1992: 129-130.

of the plaza occurs just after the creation of the Tabernacle curtains (LXX 37:7-18) instead of after the courtyard sancta as in MT (38:9-20). Despite these differences, the text of the Septuagint contains several elements that suggest that it is nevertheless based on a text similar to MT. We can see the first of these in the manufacturing of the priestly vestments. Although they are located in different places in the two texts, both MT and LXX follow the same order for the production of the individual pieces of the garments—an order that is not found in Exodus 28's instructions in either MT or LXX.[160] Again, despite being located in different places, both MT and LXX place a list of those responsible for the Tabernacle work (Ithamar, Bezalel, and Oholiab) just after the creation of the Tabernacle plaza (MT 38:21-23 = LXX 37:19-21). In order to argue that MT and LXX Exodus 35-40 have no relationship with each other, we would need to suppose that two independent authors came to the exact same decisions about how to reorder the manufacture of the priestly garments and that both reached the same (arbitrary?) decision that a list of those in charge of the project belonged after the account of the Tabernacle plaza's construction. This would require a very high level of coincidence.

Further signs that MT and LXX share a substantially similar *Vorlage* comes from the larger agreements between the two. For Exod 35:1-36:8a, MT and LXX are substantially identical, with the exception of the list of items to be manufactured in Exod 35:11-19.[161] Similarly, Exodus 40 in both MT and LXX show the same two-panel structure of divine command followed immediately by a narrative of its fulfillment. Although LXX Exodus 40 is a shorter text, its minuses against MT Exodus 40 do not inspire confidence that LXX is a superior text. Gooding's summary of the matter is worth quoting in full:

---

[160] In both MT and LXX Exodus 28, the instructions are given in the following order: *ʾpd* (6-14), *ḥšn* (15-30), *mʿyl* (31-35), *ṣyṣ* (36-38), *ktnt* and *mṣnpt* and *ʾbnṭ* (39), *mknsym* (42-43). In both MT 39:1-31 and LXX 36:8-38 the order is *ʾpd*, *ḥšn*, *mʿyl*, *ktnt*, *mṣnpt*, *mknsym*, *ʾbnṭ*, *ṣyṣ*. Both MT and LXX place the *ktnt* after the *mʿyl*, the *mknsym* after the *mṣnpt*, and move the *ṣyṣ* to the end of the manufacturing account.

[161] On which, see Gooding 1959: 65-66, 68.

> The notion that a coherent, sensible and consistently detailed account can only be the result of many attempts and many recensions is grotesque. When archaeologists find shattered fragments of pottery which on being pieced together form two-thirds of a symmetrical vase, they suppose that the vase was originally complete and restore the lost third accordingly. So with the Hebrew and Greek of Exod. xl. The Hebrew is a perfectly symmetrical composition; the Greek reproduces that symmetry in part, but with evident gaps. And even these gaps can be largely filled with pieces from ch. xxxviii (Gk.) which have no known Hebrew authority for standing in their present context. Obviously the Hebrew account is the original; the Greek is a broken and dislocated copy.[162]

We can add to these two observations that, when one removes LXX Exodus 38, LXX Exod 37:7-21, 39:1-9 constitute a quite close translation of MT 38:9-31. That is, the placement of LXX Exodus 38 interrupts what is in MT a single passage.[163] More importantly, the LXX's splitting of these passages removes MT 38:21-23 (= LXX 37:19-27) from its proper place as the heading of the list contained in MT 38:24-31 (= LXX 39:1-9).[164] LXX, then, agrees with MT in roughly 3 of MT's chapters (Exod 35:1-36:8a; 38:9-31; 40). Where they differ in these chapters, MT seems to contain the superior text. If both LXX and MT are supposed to represent two different attempts to "fill-out" an originally shorter ending to Exodus, this is difficult to support when the majority

---

[162] 1959: 58, n. See also Wevers 1992: 142 who, while otherwise disposed to assume that LXX Exodus is a sensible text, notes that "In summary, it can be said that [Greek] Exod abbreviates considerably and it is not always clear why he does so…Since [Greek] Exod abbreviates as a matter of course, it says nothing about the longer text of 𝔐. Where the two differ, [Greek] Exod does not usually seem to be an improvement, and there is no good reason to suggest a different Hebrew text underlying the text of [Greek] Exod in general."

[163] Gooding 1959: 78-85.

[164] See Gooding 1959: 82-85 for a criticism of Popper's argument that LXX has the original placement of the statement concerning Ithamar, Bezalel, and Oholiab . To the arguments that Gooding brings forward, one should add that Popper's contention that LXX correctly renders *pəqûdîm* by σύνταξις because of its connection to the term's use in Numbers 3-4 is undermined by the fact that those chapters, when referring to "duties/arrangements" (σύνταξις), use the feminine singular פְּקֻדָּה, not the masculine plural (e.g., Num 4:16).

of LXX mirrors MT.[165] The idea that MT represents an expansion of an older Hebrew *Vorlage* underlying LXX is equally difficult to support, as LXX is frequently explainable from MT, but it is difficult to derive MT from LXX. One must also consider that, as discussed above, all of the supposed late elements of Exodus 30-31 that triggered the hunt for an earlier *Vorlage* are represented in LXX.

Additionally, there are other signs that LXX has been produced by dislocating elements of MT and not that MT represents an expansion or redaction of a *Vorlage* similar to LXX. An immediately noticeable example follows the accounting of metals used in manufacturing various Tabernacle implements (MT 38:24-31 = LXX 39:1-9). Here the Septuagint still retains half of the first verse of the manufacturing of the priestly garments (LXX 39:12) despite the fact that this only follows in MT—LXX has relocated this material to Exod 36:8-38. More compelling, is that LXX 36:8b, the opening of the priestly vestments section, contains the other half of MT 39:1, so that by combining LXX 39:12 and 36:8b, one can obtain a translation of almost the entirety of MT 39:1.[166]

MT 39:1	LXX
וּמִן־הַתְּכֵלֶת וְהָאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי עָשׂוּ בִּגְדֵי־שְׂרָד לְשָׁרֵת בַּקֹּדֶשׁ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֶת־בִּגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לְאַהֲרֹן כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃	39:12 καὶ τὴν καταλειφθεῖσαν ὑάκινθον καὶ πορφύραν καὶ τὸ κόκκινον ἐποίησαν στολὰς λειτουργικὰς Ααρων ὥστε λειτουργεῖν ἐν αὐταῖς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ. 36:8[167] Καὶ ἐποίησεν πᾶς σοφὸς ἐν τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις τὰς στολὰς τῶν ἁγίων, αἵ εἰσιν Ααρων τῷ ἱερεῖ, καθὰ συνέταξεν κύριος τῷ Μωυσῇ.

Figure 2.1: MT 39:1 and LXX 39:12 & 36:8

[165] Propp 2006: 368-369 also notes that it seems linguistically unlikely for the material in Exodus 35-40 to be this late.
[166] Gooding 1959: 85-89. See also Finn 1915: 467.
[167] Note that the LXX 36:8a corresponds precisely to MT 36:8a.

Most importantly, in MT this verse is a sensible part of the account of the manufacturing of the priestly vestments, while its remnant in LXX 39:12 is a free-floating sentence with almost no connection to the context.[168] One can see another, smaller example in the LXX plus attached to the manufacture of the laver, describing its purpose (LXX Exod 38:27). This verse's mention of Moses indicates that it is the equivalent of MT 40:31-32 (cf. 30:17-21).[169] LXX does not contain this verse (nor any mention of the laver) in its version of Exodus 40, but the MT's placement again makes more sense than LXX's.[170]

The features discussed above are joined by more subtle examples of this nature.[171] When taken as a whole, they suggest that LXX's translation is based on a *Vorlage* similar to MT, but one that has been rearranged by either the translator or a later editor.[172] While this is not a certainty, defending the stance that LXX is based on a different *Vorlage* must involve accounting for the similarities as well as the well-known differences between MT and LXX. It seems more likely at this point in our inquiry that LXX is based on a text similar enough to MT that it can not be taken as evidence that Exodus 35-40 are a late addition to the book of Exodus or, therefore, the Priestly text.

One issue with the Septuagint of Exodus 35-40 remains for discussion. This is the question of whether these chapters share a translator with the rest of the book. If a different

---

[168] Though see Wevers 1992: 140-141 for an attempt to understand how it functions within LXX in reference to itself. Gooding 1959: 88-89 shows how it has been interpreted in LXX while also retaining the original sense of its meaning in MT.

[169] Finn 1915: 461; Gooding 1959: 57-58.

[170] Gooding 1959: 58-59 and see discussion of LXX Exodus 40 above.

[171] See Finn 1915: 464-470; Gooding 1959: 78-98. Wade 2003: 149-226 presents the raw data of differences in meaning between MT, SamP, and LXX, along with commentary reviewing the major approaches that have been taken to explaining them. Wevers 1992: 119 states that his primary concern is not the relation of LXX to MT, but rather "Does [Greek] Exod make sense, not Does [Greek] Exod accurately equal the Hebrew," though he does offer some thoughts on the matter (see next note).

[172] Finn 1915; Gooding 1959; Wevers 1992: 144-145. Wade 2003: 227-245 remains agnostic about the *Vorlage* of LXX, arguing that one's view of whether MT and LXX share a common *Vorlage* ultimately depends on how one understands the constraints and freedoms on translation in the ancient world. She does, however, argue that the data suggests that if LXX represents a re-arrangement of MT, then the translator and reorganizer should be considered one and the same (226).

translator was responsible for producing the last five chapters of Exodus, one way of accounting for this situation is to suppose that the translator of Exodus 1-34 did not translate these last chapters because they did not exist in his *Vorlage*.[173] The second translator would then be responsible for supplementing the original Greek version of Exodus in order to bring it in line with later Hebrew texts that contained the detailed fulfillment narrative.

Opinions about how to explain the differences between LXX 35-40 and LXX 25-31 range widely—a single translator produced all of LXX Exodus,[174] or a single translator produced all of LXX Exodus and a later editor interfered with 35-40,[175] or a different translator was responsible for LXX Exodus 35-40.[176] Different scholars will be differently convinced by the evidence, but for the sake of argument we can assume that there were two different translators. We must now address whether the best way to explain this is by assuming that the original translator's *Vorlage* ended without an equivalent of Exodus 35-40.

Among the suggestions that Propp offers are the possibilities that the original translator either tired of his work or died.[177] There are numerous places where LXX Exodus 35-40 seems to be dependent on the Greek translation of Exodus 25-31 to guide its understanding of its Hebrew *Vorlage*.[178] While only speculative, one could easily imagine a situation in which a student finishes his teacher's work, using it to guide his own translation.

A different kind of answer can be gained from looking at other translations in the Septuagint. The book of Jeremiah provides an interesting case study that parallels Exodus in many ways. Most scholars accept that the Hebrew *Vorlage* that underlies LXX Jeremiah

[173] Kuenen 1886: 79-80; Wellhausen 1899: 146-147.
[174] Finn 1915: 449-457.
[175] Gooding 1959.
[176] Wevers 1992: 145-146; Wade 2003: 236-240.
[177] Propp 2006: 636.
[178] Wevers 1992: 127-144.

represents a shorter, earlier edition of the book and the discovery of 4QJer^{b,d} have confirmed, at the least, that a different edition of that book circulated in Hebrew.[179] Unrelated to this issue, LXX Jeremiah contains numerous indications that chapters 29-52 are either from a different translator than 1-28 or represent a revision of the original translation.[180] However, while this has sometimes been taken to support the notion that the prophecies of Jeremiah circulated as two separate collections at some point, no one has ever attempted to argue from this data that the material in Jeremiah 29-52 simply didn't exist when the original translation was made. For those who support Tov's theory of LXX Jeremiah 29-52 representing a revision of the original translation, there has not been an attempt to argue that this revision must have been done to a text that did not contain Jeremiah 1-28. In other words, we know of mixed texts from other parts of the Septuagint that have not required the supposition of shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* to explain. None of this is decisive, and we may accept that, if Exodus 35-40 do indeed come from a different translator, this may indicate that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Exodus 1-34's translator was shorter than MT. But, we may note in closing that Qumran has yielded no copies of Exodus lacking this material (where it was extant).

Barring the unlikely recovery of another old copy of Exodus or, even unlikelier, a separate P document intact, we are unable to make a firm evaluation of which hypothesis is correct—whether P originally included Exodus 35-40 or whether the material in those chapters is a later elaboration on an earlier, succinct "and they did so." In weighing these alternate hypotheses though, there are some items that we can put in the balance. First, given that repetition, parallelism, and proleptic fulfilment followed by described execution are everywhere

[179] Tov 1999: 315-317, 363-384.
[180] Thackeray 1903 was the first to argue that there were two different translators in Jeremiah. Tov 1976 re-evaluated Thackeray's arguments and suggested that the features were better accounted for by understanding 29-52 to represent a revision. Pietersma 2010 offers some critique of Tov's argument, tentatively suggesting a return to the two-translator hypothesis.

endemic to P, there is nothing peculiar about this passage that compels us to excise it. Notably, the two panels of Exodus 40—one containing divine instruction, the other Mosaic execution—mirror the larger structure of Exodus 25-31//35-39, suggesting that this is an intentional feature of P's structure. Inversely, one would have to explain, if we do excise this passage, why a later editor would have felt compelled to replace a simple, succinct statement of Mosaic compliance, also a normal feature of P, with this detailed, repetitive narrative.

Second, if the *Vorlage* of the original translator of Exodus truly ended at chapter 34 and 35-40 represent a later elaboration, we would expect to see some linguistic indicators of this lateness.[181] Hebrew texts from the Persian and Hellenistic eras, such as Chronicles, Daniel, and Song of Songs, betray their lateness in the very language that they use.[182] While one could protest that the theoretical supplementor who wrote Exodus 35-40 merely copied material from Exodus 25-31 into a narrative format and so was able to muffle his own linguistic usage, this is not born out by the evidence. Exodus 35-40 does, in fact, feature a slightly different linguistic register than 25-31, but still does not contain the same type of Late Biblical Hebrew found in Chronicles.[183] And, despite the fact that the author of Chronicles copied from the pre-exilic books of Samuel and Kings, his own linguistic register is still perfectly visible.[184] We should be skeptical that a text late enough to be absent when the Septuagint was produced would show absolutely no signs that it comes from the Hellenistic period.

Finally, if we are correct that the similarities and divergences of LXX from MT are best explained by LXX representing a Hebrew *Vorlage* substantially similar to MT, though abbreviated and rearranged, this removes a substantial amount of the evidence of these chapters'

[181] Propp 2006: 368-369.
[182] Polzin 1976: 1-84; Joosten 2005; Polak 2006; Hendel and Joosten 2018: 85-97, 124-125.
[183] Polzin 1976: 101-112. See also, Hendel and Joosten 2018: 128-130.
[184] Hendel and Joosten 2018: 85-97, 124-125.

development over time. Absent such evidence, attributing these chapters to a secondary layer of P becomes a far more arbitrary decision. And if Exodus 35-40 are an original part of the Priestly text, then we must also grant the same status to Leviticus 8. Any model of the Priestly text's composition must then take these passages into account and explain their presence and form. We will now turn to an evaluation of the Unitarian model to see whether it provides such an explanation.

Conclusions: Against the Unitarians, or A Neo-analyst Position

The exhaustive (or exhausting) survey and critique of the Analyst approach to the Priestly material in Exodus 25-Leviticus 16 presented above might lead us to be more sympathetic to a Unitarian approach to the material. At every turn, the Analyst arguments for stratifying the Priestly text were shown to be either untenable or amenable to other, more preferable explanations. If the grounds for stratifying the Priestly text are weak and based more on supposition than evidence, this should lead us to consider a model in which all of this material is part of a single work.

Nevertheless, difficult problems attend our reading of the Priestly text if we assume that all of it to comes from a single horizon and author, especially if we treat the Priestly text as a fresh composition. The apparent differences in ordering between the material in Exodus 25-31 and 35-39 are accompanied by notable differences in language used to describe the construction of the Tabernacle implements. The instructions for the purgation of the incense altar in Exod 30:10 has no parallel in the instructions for the yearly purgation in Leviticus 16. There are repetitions and overlaps between information given in various places. And yet, there is a noticeable trend among many scholars who reject the Analyst model to speak of P as a unity,

with the exception of the Holiness Code in Leviticus 17-26.[185] This Unitarian model, while not falling prey to the problematic arguments of the Analysts, nevertheless fails to provide a robust way of dealing with these discrepancies.[186] Recourse is usually made to describing a series of discrete supplemental additions to the original P—an editorial model which our study of text production in chapter 1 shows to be historically unlikely.[187]

This situation is unsatisfactory and leaves us searching for another avenue of explanation that accounts for all of our textual data and accords with the compositional realities of the ancient Near East. The basis for such an approach has already been suggested numerous times, but has never yet been used in a robust way to explain the compositional features and form of the Priestly text. This is the observation, already common in the 19th century, that the non-narrative materials in the Priestly text do not represent fresh compositions, but are adapted from already existing sources.[188] If we take seriously the nature of P as a tradent who used source material, contextualizing it within his narrative, we can begin to explain both the unity and diversity of the

[185] Driver 1910: 42-59, 126-159; Kaufmann 1972: 156, 166-172; Haran 1978; Friedman 2003 (though see p. 218 n.); Propp 2006; Baden 2012: 169-177, 299, n. 25. In a similar vein, Milgrom 1991; 2000; Knohl 1995 speak of the Priestly author as though he was the composer of the very words in sections like Leviticus 1-7, 11-16. Their entire hypothesis, addressed in the next chapter, is based on this assumption. Propp 2006: 365-366 refers to Exodus 25-31, 35-40 as "the parade example of the Priestly source" and, like Milgrom's use of Leviticus, widely draws on the language of 25-31 to delimit language that is representative of P (this is usefully compared to the approach of Driver 1910: 129-135). For a functionally Unitarian account that includes H in its purview, see Crüsemann 1996: 277-327.

[186] Rendtorff 1993: 76 observes, "But even among those who would not accept Noth's rigid separation of the cultic and legal material from P the majority would see P as a work structured by a narration that begins with creation and leads through to the borders of the promised land. For many of those the relation of the cultic and legal material to the basic narration is a rather difficult problem."

[187] See Haran 1978: 146-147 for a Unitarian account that nevertheless envisions growth and addition.

[188] Kuenen 1865: 35; 1886: 81-87, 272-273; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: 141-157; Driver 1910: 129-135; Noth 1965: 10-15; Fohrer 1968: 144-145; Cross 1973: 321-322; Freedman 1997: 110; Friedman 1997: 214-215; Van der Toorn 2007: 122-123; Baden 2009a: 14-18. Among the few examples of scholars both arguing this position and allowing it to influence their compositional and exegetical approach to P are B. Levine 1965, 1993, 2000; Watts 2003. Nihan 2007 occasionally invokes this idea, particularly in his discussion of Leviticus 1-3 (pp. 198-231) and 11-15 (pp. 270-339). But he has not integrated the concept of P regularly using sources into his compositional analysis and did not extend the idea into his survey of Exodus. Other scholars have recognized the source material behind the non-narrative material in Leviticus and Exodus (see Watts 2003: 81-86 for summary), but this has not impacted their view of its relationship to the Priestly text, as they subscribed to the Analyst view that these materials constituted secondary additions to Pg. For a discussion of adaptation of sources in P, see Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Priestly text. We may term such a model, borrowing again from Homeric studies, a Neo-analyst approach.

The Neo-analyst approach arose in Homeric scholarship as a response to the excesses of the Analyst movement, taking note of the weakness of many of their arguments and observing that a Unitarian framework provided a better explanatory vehicle for the Homeric epics as a whole. Nevertheless, the methods and observations of the Analysts were integrated into this approach in a new way, allowing for the identification of motifs and scenes from earlier poems without denying that Homer (as shorthand for the poet/s of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) was responsible for the way in which they were combined and contextualized.[189] West referred to this model as "a kind of analysis for unitarians."[190]

As a first pass, we might define the contours of this model for the Priestly text in the following way. The book of Leviticus should serve as the basis for understanding how the Priestly author integrated pre-existing sources into his work. As observed in chapter 1, the non-narrative materials contained in this book are paralleled by similar texts from throughout the ancient Near East and Greece. The disarray of the information in Leviticus further suggests that the Priestly author was drawing from a variety of sources which he had more interest in including wholesale than in harmonizing with one another.[191] Finally, the structural nature of

[189] This brief description has been drawn from Goold 1977; West 2003, 2011. I have neglected here the role of the Oralist school in this development, as this approach has never played a substantial role in Biblical scholarship on the Priestly text (though see Polak 2017 who suggests that many linguistic features of the Priestly text favor an oral milieu of composition). Nevertheless, the criticisms of an Oralist approach found in the works cited here might be appropriately applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to certain approaches to the JE (non-Priestly) material in the Pentateuch.
[190] West 2003: 4.
[191] See discussion in chapter 1. For the implications of this choice to present source material rather than synthesize and harmonize, see Chapter 5. Goold 1977: 4-5 provides a similar justification for the Neo-analyst approach to Homer: "It is a natural fallacy, but a fallacy nevertheless, to regard all logical inconsistencies in the Homeric poems as marks of inferior artistry or, if not that, marks betraying the conflicting intentions of different composers… The very nature of Homeric composition involves these structural difficulties: nothing is in fact so Homeric as the contradictions, interpolations, and accretions assumed without a thought as un-Homeric. Evidently they were inseparably bound up with the circumstances of composition. These structural difficulties must not—the usual mistake of the unitarian—be underestimated or argued as not existing: they are there all right… We, who study

Leviticus suggests that the best way to find the limits of these sources is to pay attention to the distribution of divine speeches—while the other large Pentateuchal legal collections, the Covenant Code (Exodus 21-23) and Deuteronomic Code (Deuteronomy 12-26), are presented as a single continuous piece of speech, Leviticus contains a series of thirty-five discrete divine speeches of varied instructional genre.[192] The Priestly author likely adapted each of these speeches from separate pre-existing documents.[193] We will reserve an examination of how he adapted these sources for later chapters, but even this broad outline can illuminate some of the issues we have explored above.[194]

When we turn this lens on the Priestly material in the book of Exodus the following suggestions present themselves to us. The Tabernacle material in Exodus 25-31 are contained in a series of six divine speeches containing non-narrative material—we should understand each of these to be drawn from a separate source text.[195] This resolves several difficulties with the

---

them, must see them in proper perspective." Compare to the statements of Haran 1978: 228-229; Propp 2006: 692 regarding the Priestly text.

[192] Speeches start in Lev 1:1; 4:1; 5:14; 5:20; 6:1; 6:12; 6:17; 7:22; 7:28; 10:8; 11:1; 12:1; 13:1; 14:1; 14:33; 15:1; 16:1; 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1; 21:16; 22:1; 22:17; 22:26; 23:1; 23:9; 23:23; 23:26; 23:33; 24:1; 24:13; 25:1; 27:1. Note that there are also other organizing rubrics used subsidiary to these speeches, such as "this is [the torah of] X" (most prominently: 6:2, 7, 13, 17; 7:1, 11, 37). See Warning 1999 for an examination of the structural importance of divine speeches for Leviticus.

[193] Note as well that the Covenant Code, also a non-narrative text couched as divine speech in the midst of the Sinai narrative, is frequently identified as a source text incorporated into E. See Watts 2003; 2011 for a different approach to the speeches in Leviticus. However, this scholar finds the idea that the Priestly text (or any text) is attempting to persuade its readers to engage in a particular type of ritual practice highly unlikely. Ritual practice is part of a culture's normative behavioral complex. Such behaviors are instilled in children through largely non-verbal communication, rather than being presented to adults in the form of a written text.

[194] See chapter 5 for a more detailed examination of the way that the Priestly author adapted material in Leviticus 1-7, 11-16. In this work we will restrict this approach to a compositional model. However, such an approach also has exegetical implications for understanding the work of the Priestly author.

[195] 25:1-30:10 (tabernacle proper); 30:11-16 (poll-tax), 17-21 (laver), 22-33 (anointing oil), 34-38 (incense); 31:12-17 (Sabbath). (Note that 30:22-38 could be one speech, as the verb *ʾmr* rather than *dbr* might indicate a return to the main discourse if 30:31-33 is viewed as an aside.) The speech in 31:1-11, the commission of Bezalel and Oholiab, appears to be narrative. Cross 1973: 321-322; Baden 2009a: 16-17 briefly suggest that these chapters are a source, but do not address what this might mean for how we understand P's composition. Propp 2006: 366-369, 724 acknowledges the possibility of sources used by P in Exodus, but states "As for the Tabernacle pericope, it is hard to imagine a context for it other than that which it now occupies." Propp also does not invoke any source explanations when offering commentary and analysis on the relationship between 25-31 and 35-40. For a recent suggestion of an Akkadian parallel to the Tabernacle materials, see Donnelly-Lewis 2022. See further discussion of Iron Age writing media in Chapter 5.

material at hand. It immediately accounts for the "miscellaneous" character of Exodus 30-31. As observed for Leviticus, the Priestly author had no interest in harmonizing or synthesizing his sources, preferring to include them serially. This explains why the bronze laver does not appear in the command for the Tabernacle's courtyard—it was not part of that document. The choice to place the poll-tax instruction between the incense altar at the end of the first speech and the bronze laver instruction may have been controlled by the general preference in Exodus 25-28 to present items in descending grades of gold, silver, and bronze.[196] We are still left wondering about the placement of the incense altar, but we should presume that both it and its placement are original features of the source text the Priestly author was using.[197] The inclusion of recipes for both the anointing oil and incense rectify the lack of instructions to manufacture them despite their use in the source document in Exodus 25:1-30:10.[198]

This further explains the noted differences between Exodus 25-31 and 35-40.[199] The Priestly author received and utilized a series of sources that did not always correspond with his own reconstruction of how they were related. Exodus 35-40's narrative allows the Priestly author to comment on the source materials he used in Exodus 25-31. The manufacture of the laver,

---

[196] Finn 1915: 472 already suggested this as the reason for the organization, though he attributed all of the material directly to the Priestly author. See Haran 1978: 158-165 on material gradation in the Tabernacle account. If this is the correct explanation, it shows that the Priestly author was sensitive to the nuances of the source material he was using.

[197] Among the possible reasons for this placement, one could observe that 30:1-10's focus on both *tāmîd* and *kipper* mirror the same concerns for the bronze altar as expressed in 29:36-42. The two altar services thus frame the heightened declaration of Yhwh's presence in the Tabernacle. Furthermore, the incense altar following this declaration may have been felt appropriate given the connection between incense and Yhwh's presence (e.g., Exod 30:36; Lev 16:2, 12-13; see Nihan 2007: 101-102). See also the suggestion in Finn 1915: 473. We should also note that the Akkadian text called the "Exorcist's Manual" (see Geller 2018 for edition) displays a structure in which an introductory list of corpora is followed by a colophon-like text attributing the recension of these collections to a particular scribe and their content to the god Ea (KAR 44.27-28). These statements are then followed by a list of "advanced" corpora. This continuation of a text after its seeming natural endpoint parallels the position of Exod 30:1-10 after the climactic discourse of 29:43-46.

[198] For a collection of Middle Assyrian "perfume" recipes, see Ebeling 1950. For a Neo-Assyrian example, Postgate 1973 (*GPA*): text 215.

[199] Some of these examples have been selected to answer the objections of Popper as described in Wellhausen 1899: 144-147.

anointing oil, and incense are all integrated into the rest of the material from Exodus 25:1-30:10. The incense altar has been moved to where the Priestly author, like modern scholars, felt it was most appropriate—alongside the rest of the interior furnishings of the Tabernacle. The manufacturing of pegs and ropes, missing in the instructions, are added as a practical matter by the Priestly author (Exod 35:18). He provides an explanation for how the gold was woven into the ephod (Exod 39:3) missing from the instructions for manufacturing (28:6), while his description of the high priest's diadem combines its two designations in his source material (39:30; cf. 28:36; 29:6). In the account book (Exod 38:21-31), he has synthesized the demand for a donation (Exod 25:1-7) and a poll-tax (30:11-16), explaining where each source of material was used. He has also updated the language used for certain descriptions, such as the frequently noted change from אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ (Exod 26:3, 5, 17) to אַחַת אֶל־אַחַת (36:10, 13).[200]

We could multiply particular examples of this model's explanatory value.[201] But, in addition to these individual cases, it also answers larger, structural observations about the material. If Exodus 25-31 are not a fresh composition, this explains why they are not organized the way we might wish them to be. This also explains the different organization of the same material in Exodus 35-40. It also provides us with a rationale as to why the Priestly author chooses to relate the detailed execution of Yhwh's plans in 35-40. Though this is a common

[200] See Propp 2006: 328. This may confirm Wellhausen 1899: 145-146's perception that this language is later—the question is still, how much later. His invocation of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which levels this change throughout Exodus 25-31, to confirm the lateness of this language is incorrect though, as SamP has a well-known tendency to harmonize across parallel passages.

[201] For instance, Baden 2009a: 17 observes that the Sabbath command in Exodus 31 has no inherent connection to the Tabernacle legislation. Despite the fact that he has just invoked the idea of P using sources to explain part of its form, Baden nevertheless suggests that the Sabbath command be viewed as secondary. If it is, however, from a source document, there is no need to suppose such a supplement. The Priestly Writer has brought them into relation with each other, and what is more, he has narratively interpreted that relationship in Exodus 35. Why the Priestly author wanted to attribute the Sabbath command to Yhwh's discussion with Moses on Mt. Sinai instead of waiting for its occurrence in later divine speeches (e.g. Lev 19:3; 23:3) is what we must discover. Moreover, the presence of the Sabbath in relation to the Tabernacle material well-aligns with the frequent observations of scholars that the Tabernacle material, in general, echoes the Priestly creation account—see, e.g., Stackert 2023. For further discussion of the Sabbath passage, see Chapter 3.

feature of certain ancient Near Eastern building accounts, it also allowed him a chance to offer commentary on the sources he had pulled together and identified as coming from Yhwh's interaction with Moses on Mt. Sinai.

The Neo-analyst approach also accounts for the tensions observed between material in Exodus and Leviticus. The inauguration of the priesthood in Leviticus 8, as noted above, combines elements from both Exodus 29 and 40. Again, we see that the Priestly author has used his narrative fulfillment of divine instructions to offer commentary. The material in Exodus 29 details the installation of a group of priests, but it does not offer instructions for the inauguration of a new sanctuary. Presumably, the installation of new priests was a more frequent occasion, and a ritual text describing this process understandably existed and had been incorporated into the source underlying Exodus 25:1-30:10. But the Priestly author needed to depict the installation of a high priest simultaneous with the consecration of a new sanctuary. Leviticus 8 thus accurately reflects the narrative of the Priestly text—it was not his intent to just describe the installation of a high priest as described in Exodus 29, but to describe how such a thing occurs at the consecration of a new sanctuary.[202]

Finally, we may address the absence of any purgation of the incense altar in the day of purgation ritual in Leviticus 16.[203] This lack of reflex from Exod 30:10 strengthened the Analyst case that the incense altar was a late addition to the Priestly text. Nevertheless, Analysts had a difficult time explaining why, if the incense altar was a late addition to the Priestly text, the person who added it did not ensure that Leviticus 16 also accurately reflected his addition. The

[202] Fleming 1998: 411-412; Feldman 2018: 87-114. Note that Exod 29:36-37 does imply that the ritual for installing priests is already combined with a ritual for the consecration of an altar. The Priestly author's broadening of this ritual to the consecration of an entire sanctuary in Exodus 40; Leviticus 8 again represents his commentary on his sources. See also, Chapter 5 for an Assyrian example of the integration of a standard liturgy into a larger ritual complex and the changes it occassions.

[203] On this issue, see also the discussion in Chapter 5.

Neo-analyst model resolves these difficulties. Leviticus 16, as a non-narrative text couched in divine speech, was likely also a source document used by the Priestly author in constructing his account. In fact, several scholars have observed that Leviticus 16 contains signs of a distinctive use of terms that differs from other parts of the Priestly text, possibly reflecting an older provenance.[204] The Priestly author, as seems to have been his common practice, did not harmonize this text with the source he used in Exod 25:1-30:10. What he did do, however, was allow earlier parts of his account to condition how his readers understood texts that come later. As Finn observed, the statement in Lev 16:16-17 that Aaron makes expiation/atonement (*kpr* D) inside the Tent of Meeting may include carrying out the instructions in Exod 30:10.[205] I think that Finn is incorrect in how he understands the meaning of Leviticus 16, but that he has successfully reconstructed the logic of the Priestly author. Without needing to add anything to either source, the Priestly author allows the fact that these two texts have been embedded in his narrative in a particular sequence to condition the reader to understand the ambiguity of Lev 16:16-17 in light of what they have already read in Exod 30:10.[206]

When Jenson reaches the end of his evaluation of compositional models of the Priestly text, he observes that "much of the challenge and difficulty of the Priestly material is how so many disparate concepts and institutions can be held together as a more or less coherent whole."[207] The Neo-analyst approach outlined here enables us to do exactly this. It explains both the consistent structure of the Priestly text and the tensions and lack of harmonization apparent in the non-narrative material. It also allows us to situate the composition of the Priestly text within

[204] Noth 1965: 117; Milgrom 1991: 36, 1063. See also Nihan 2007: 340-362. In particular, the mention of *ʿzʿzʾl* and the use of the term *qdš* for the innermost sanctum have drawn scholars' attention.
[205] 1915: 473.
[206] For other examples of this kind of sequential conditioning in P and how it influenced his method for adapting source materials, see Chapters 3 and 4.
[207] 1992: 26.

what we know about text production in the ancient Near East. It respects both the unity and complexity of the Priestly author's work. In other words, this model answers the major challenges leveled by the Analyst approach and unaccounted for by the Unitarian one.

This model has further implications for how we analyze the Priestly text, and we will address these in later chapters. Before we move on to this though, we will turn to the corpus of texts in Leviticus 17-26. These chapters, the Holiness Code, provide a point of widespread agreement between both Analyst and Unitarian models—both accept that it represents a corpus distinct from the rest of P. The Holiness Code, then, provides an ideal testing ground for whether the Neo-analyst approach sufficiently accounts for data beyond Exodus 25-Leviticus 16.

CHAPTER 3

HOLY DISTINCTIONS

A *Doloneia* for the Priests?

The Neo-analytic model described at the end of the previous chapter is, clearly, a blunt instrument. It requires sharpening and refinement, including a detailed examination of what types of editing we might expect from the Priestly author as he integrated these sources into his narrative. But before turning to such an examination, we should see whether, even as a blunt instrument, such a model can illuminate other problems in the Priestly text that scholars have traditionally attributed to editorial intervention of one kind or another.

The material in Leviticus 17-26 provides just such a valuable testing ground. Analysts and Unitarians alike have identified these chapters, the so-called Holiness Code (H), as a special problem within the Priestly text.[1] While scholars have long accepted the separate nature of Leviticus 17-26 within the Priestly text, the works of Knohl and Milgrom have stimulated a broader engagement with these chapters and their relationship with the rest of the Priestly text over the last thirty years.[2] The traditional Analyst and Unitarian approach to these chapters saw

[1] The term "Holiness Code" ("Heiligkeitsgesetz") for these chapters comes from Klostermann 1877, though Graf 1866: 75-83 was the first to point out their peculiarities. Kuenen 1886: 88; Wellhausen 1899: 149 provide brief recapitulations of scholarship up to their own day. Sun 1990: 1-43; Ruwe 1999: 5-35; Nihan 2007: 4-11; Tucker 2016: 11-35; Feldman 2018: 283-289 summarize the history of research since Wellhausen. Driver 1910: 47-59, demonstrates the early reception of this idea in the English-speaking world alongside its rejection of other Analyst tendencies (a position forecast in Colenso 1871)—Carpenter and Harford-Battersby 1900: I.143 also single out the value of Driver's exposition of H. Schwartz 2009; Baden 2009a provide recent examples of the Unitarian trend of rejecting stratification of P while embracing the P/H distinction. Kratz 2016: 557 lists the idea that "The Holiness Code (H) is not an original element in P and presupposes both D and P" as one of the consensus conclusions of Pentateuchal analysis.

[2] See, e.g., the collections Schechtman and Baden 2009; Gane and Taggar-Cohen 2015.

them as a pre-existing collection which the Priestly author heavily edited when he incorporated it into his text.[3] The Knohl-Milgrom model reversed the chronological relationship of the two, positing that the Holiness Code constitutes a later supplement to the Priestly text and that evidence of editing from those who inserted it is present throughout P.[4] Nevertheless, despite the widespread acceptance of the notion that the Holiness Code is a distinctive corpus, others have argued that such an approach misreads the evidence.[5]

These objections notwithstanding, the notion that Leviticus 17-26 are distinctive enough to identify them as a separate corpus retains such a strong hold on analyses of the Priestly text that it is worth revisiting the primary evidence that scholars have adduced to support this view. This is especially important since the works of Milgrom and Knohl, which have driven discussion on this issue in recent decades, offer no such reevaluation.[6] While Milgrom and Knohl's reversal of the traditional chronology of P and H proposes a different relationship between the two corpora, their work nevertheless maintains the traditional identification of Leviticus 17-26 as the major supplementary addition that represents the distinctive views of H. The broader identification of a strata of H-related material added to the Priestly text—pursued by both themselves and others working within their model—depends, first and foremost, on the features of the traditional Holiness Code. It is from this body of material that scholars derive the criteria by which they identify theoretical additions to P. For these reasons, we will focus our

[3] Kuenen 1886: 87-91, 302-306; Wellhausen 1899: 149-172; Driver 1910: 47-59; Noth 1965: 14, 127-128; B. Levine 2003. Note that there is disagreement over whether P originally included this older law code or if it was absorbed into an already existing Priestly narrative text.

[4] Knohl 1995; Milgrom 1991, 2000, 2001, 2003. This position was already adumbrated in Elliger 1966; Cholewiński 1976.

[5] Wagner 1974; Blum 1990: 319-322; idem 2009; Albertz 1994: 2.629, n. 100; Crüsemann 1996: 277-280; Ruwe 1999; 2003.

[6] Although Milgrom 1991: 13 states that "Knohl has demonstrated masterfully that on the basis of style, idiom, and ideology, H can be separated from P…" no such demonstration actually exists in Knohl 1995. Instead, Knohl 1995 simply begins by accepting the premise that H and P are separate and proceeds accordingly. This leads to many problematic arguments in Knohl's work, discussed below. Propp 2006: 731's conclusion can stand in as shorthand—Knohl's argument is frequently circular, "presupposing what is argued and arguing what is presupposed."

attention on arguments related to Leviticus 17-26's distinctiveness in what follows. If we can demonstrate that these texts are largely aligned with other parts of the Priestly text, then this severely weakens their use as a standard by which other supplements to P can be identified.

The bibliography on the Holiness Code and its relationship to the Priestly text is incredibly large. In the course of our discussion here, we will again follow the principle of addressing roots rather than branches. In other words, we will focus the majority of our attention on the scholarship that has made positive arguments for the existence of a distinctive Holiness Code—whether earlier or later—rather than scholarship that takes this model as its starting point and works within it. In surveying the former literature, we can group the major arguments for the distinctiveness of the Holiness Code into the following categories: distinctive terminology and linguistic usage, first person address from the deity, extensive use of motivational and paraenetic clauses, a special relationship with the book of Ezekiel, an ideology or theology that conflicts with P—to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the model—and a structural similarity to other Biblical law codes.[7] We will evaluate these arguments first on their own merits before turning to the Neo-analytic model for how it might illuminate these issues differently.

If God Could Talk: Arguments from Language and Diction

The first set of arguments that we will evaluate all revolve around the language and diction of the divine speeches in Leviticus 17-26. Scholars frequently maintain that these chapters contain a distinctive set of vocabulary that distinguishes them from the rest of the

[7] These categories are drawn from the arguments in Kuenen 1886: 87-91, 272-287; Wellhausen 1885: 376-384; idem 1899: 149-172; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby 1900: 143-152; Driver 1910: 47-59; Pfeiffer 1941: 239-250; Eissfeldt 1965: 233-239; Noth 1965: 127-128; Milgrom 1991: 13-28, 35-42; idem 2000: 1319-1367; Knohl 1995: 1-58; Rofé 1999: 80-83; Schwartz 1999: 11-37; Nihan 2007: 545-562; Baden 2009a.

Priestly text.[8] While lists of such expressions can be useful for seeing patterns of distribution, the mere existence of distinctive vocabulary in an arbitrarily delineated set of chapters can not, on its own, be taken to indicate that those chapters are a distinctive body. If one took any set of chapters of equal size from the Priestly text, one could find just as many distinctive turns of expression.

This is especially true when the selection consists, as the Holiness Code does, of primarily non-narrative material. Vocabulary that is distinctive to a topic does not need to appear evenly distributed throughout the entirety of a text. We do not expect the architectural terms of the Tabernacle chapters or the anatomical terms of the Sacrificial Code to be present in an even distribution across the Priestly text. In other words, genre and topic are determinative of word choice. We must evaluate any distinctive words or phrases in Leviticus 17-26 against their context before we can arrive at a conclusion about what the distribution signifies.[9] Only having done so can we determine whether a contextual or a compositional model better accounts for these distributions.

This order of operations is especially important when addressing Knohl and Milgrom's newer model, which sees the Holiness Code as an addition to an already-existing Priestly text. In this model, the presence of distinctive terms associated with Leviticus 17-26 outside of that corpus have been used as evidence for a strata of revisions associated with this addition.[10] This is an unfalsifiable position. When one identifies a term as being distinctive to H, one can not then reattribute its occurrences in the rest of the Priestly text as proof of its distinctiveness. Such a

[8] See Appendix 3.1 to this chapter for a list.
[9] See also the plea in Blum 2009: 36, "for an approach that takes into account the respective context of any phrase (in terms of genre and semantics) and which does not rely on a few pieces of evidence… the priestly writers, despite their formulaic style, were not robots and they did not work mechanically."
[10] See Stackert 2011: 12, who recognizes the tenuousness of such arguments and relegates these terminological co-occurrences to "a secondary, evidentiary position." Contrast, e.g., Knohl 1995: 100 on the appearance of *šəʾēr* in Num 27:11.

procedure is only persuasive when the distinctiveness of Leviticus 17-26 has been secured on other grounds. We must, then, hold open two possible explanations for when such theoretically distinctive terms occur in the midst of Priestly, rather than Holiness, material. Either these are evidence that H has edited P or they are evidence that the deployment of terms is contextual rather than compositional. Only when we have finished our review of arguments for the distinctiveness of the Holiness Code against the Priestly text can we truly test these conflicting hypotheses. In what follows, we will focus on the context in which terms occur and return to alternative hypotheses later in this discussion.

Our first example is the distribution of the term *šəʾēr* in the sense of "close relative" (#10).[11] This term occurs in the following places: Lev 18:6, 12, 13, 17; 20:19; 21:2; 25:49; Num 27:11. If one simply glances at the listing, it appears that this is, in fact, a distinctive word of Leviticus 17-26. But close analysis does not bear this out. When we examine the context in which the word occurs, it is unsurprising to find that it is deployed in passages that have bearing on family relations. Leviticus 18 and 20 use it in their list of prohibited sexual relationships, Leviticus 21 in reference to which family members a priest may defile himself for at their death, and Leviticus 25 to describe who may redeem an Israelite from debt slavery. We should not expect to find this word used outside of contexts that deal with family relations. A survey of the Priestly text up to Leviticus 17 does not reveal any contexts in which such a term would seem relevant.

The use of *šəʾēr* in Num 27:11, outside of the Holiness Code—in relation to the order of family members who can inherit a sonless man's property—confirms that this is an accurate expectation. The distribution of *šəʾēr* is not, then, a distinctive of Leviticus 17-26, it is a distinctive of discussions of family relations. This is further confirmed by its distribution within

[11] Numbers marked # in parentheses indicate the position of a term in the list in Appendix 3.1 to this chapter.

Leviticus 17-26—even here, it is not evenly distributed, but only occurs in relationship to certain topics. That it does not occur elsewhere suggests that a contextual explanation is as effective as a compositional explanation for explaining this distribution. It need not have any bearing on the question of the relationship between Leviticus 17-26 and the rest of the Priestly text.

The distribution of *ʿāmît* (Lev 5:21; 18:20; 19:11, 15, 17; 24:19; 25:14, 15, 17) indicates a similar pattern (#12). Here we have a term for "community" or "kin group" and should not expect to find it outside of relevant contexts. Its occurrence in Lev 5:21 shows both that it is not unique to Leviticus 17-26 and supports the contextual explanation. This sole occurrence outside of the Holiness Code focuses on the types of *ʾāšām* violation that occur interpersonally. The types of wrongdoing described in this passage (Lev 5:21-22) are, in fact, similar to the ones described in Lev 19:11. If this suggests that these two passages are from the same compositional horizon, it is not clear in what direction this evidence cuts—that Leviticus 19 reflects the same view as Leviticus 5 or visa-versa. Just as likely is that the similarity of context has conditioned the deployment of this term. Importantly, we have no contrasting passage in Leviticus 1-7 to compare this usage to—we have no sign that an alternative formulation was available to whoever composed these texts.

Importantly, we can understand the distribution of *ʿāmît* as highlighting the fact that Leviticus 17-26 contain several discussions on community relations. Since such issues occur infrequently elsewhere in P, we should not expect to see the term used throughout the Priestly corpus. The concentration of a particular topic in Leviticus 17-26 also should not surprise us—the rest of Leviticus is similarly segmented, with sacrificial instructions largely contained in Leviticus 1-7 and purity issues dealt with in Leviticus 11-15. Again, we find that a contextual

explanation is available and that the occurrences of this term need not have any bearing on whether or not Leviticus 17-26 is a distinctive corpus within the Priestly text.

We find similar contextual motivation for the distribution of *zimmāh*, used in Leviticus 17-26 as a description of willful wrongdoing related to sexual transgressions (#11). Its presence in Lev 18:17; 19:29; 20:14 in discussions of sexual impropriety then comes as no surprise. Notably, this term does not appear in every discussion of such cases—Lev 21:7, 9, (15?) describe situations in which we might expect the same term to occur. That it does not occur in these places suggests that this distribution again indicates contextually determined usage that may be irrelevant to compositional issues. Its limited use even in Leviticus 17-26 shows that it is not a sign that these chapters somehow form a group separate from the rest of the Priestly text and its terminological habits.

The occurrences of *šabbātôn* also show the contextual appropriateness of its use (#15). While the majority of this term's appearances are in the Holiness Code (Lev 23:3, 24, 32, 39; 25:4, 5), it also occurs in every other Sabbath passage in the Priestly text other than the description of Yhwh's rest at the end of the creation account (Exod 16:23; 31:15; 35:2).[12] It additionally appears in the Day of Atonement ritual, indicating the seriousness of the work prohibition associated with that celebration (Lev 16:31). The widespread distribution of this term, appearing in almost every major discussion of the Sabbath, argues against taking it as a distinctive element of Leviticus 17-26. It is, rather, a distinctive element of the Priestly text's descriptions of the Sabbath.

[12] Some controversy exists over these passages and their relationship with P, though usually based on the assumption that Leviticus 17-26 are a distinct body of literature. See Knohl 1995: 15-16; Olyan 2005; Stackert 2011.

On the other hand, the use of the plural of Sabbath has a somewhat more limited distribution (#14).[13] It occurs 6 times in Leviticus 17-26 and only once outside of them (Exod 31:13). However, this distribution is also contextually determined, as Blum observes that "the plural of *šabbāt* is firmly restricted either to the case of counting seven *šabbātôt* or to general admonitions."[14] One possible explanation, then, for the absence of this phrase from other Sabbath passages in P is due to its lack of relevance to those passages. In support of this explanation, we should note that it is difficult to attach ideological weight to the use of a plural versus singular of a term shared by both P and H corpora. Nevertheless, the distribution of this term can not be definitively attributed to context—its ultimate weight must be determined in conversation with the other arguments for and against the existence of a Holiness Code.

The pair *huqqôt* and *mišpāṭîm* provide another case of contextualized usage (#8).[15] We mentioned in chapter 2 the habit of 19th century scholars to speak of all non-narrative passages, especially in the Priestly text, as being "law."[16] Such an approach, though, dismisses the fact that the text itself identifies different types of material by different labels. Leviticus 6-7, 11-15 identify their contents as *tôrāh*. The terms *ḥqh* and *mšpṭ* appear in different contexts not only in Leviticus 17-26, but also in Exodus.[17] It should furthermore be noted that these terms do not occur in Leviticus 21-22, which return to issues related to sacrifice as in Leviticus 1-7. The uneven distribution of these terms is not a sign of compositional strata, but is rather indicative of

[13] The use of "my Sabbaths" will be discussed below with other aspects of the 1st person address by Yhwh.
[14] Blum 2009: 36.
[15] The first person pronominal suffix that accompanies them will be discussed below, as well as the role that the terms as a pair play in the paraenetic speech of Leviticus 17-26.
[16] E.g., Wellhausen 1899: 81, 134-135. Even the instructions for the Tabernacle are called "Stiftshüttengesetzgebung" (p. 137).
[17] While a thorough study of these legal terms and what they indicate is beyond the scope of this analysis, we can note some trends. The term *ḥqh* is used to describe regulations related to festivals (Exod 12:14, 17, 43; Lev 16:29, 31, 34), a use that continues in the Holiness Code (Lev 23:14, 21, 31, 41). It also covers various other issues (Exod 27:21//Lev 24:3; Lev 3:17; 17:7; 20:8, etc.). On the other hand, *mšpṭ* seems related to customs or regular practices (Lev 5:10; 9:16; Lev 18:4, 5, 26; 20:22; cf. Exod 26:30) and is also related to what should happen in courts (Lev 19:15, 35).

the fact that different genres are deployed in different parts of Leviticus—a point driven home by the closing of the book which states that it contains "the statutes (*ḥuqqîm*) and customs (*mišpāṭîm*) and instructions (*tôrōt*)," accurately describing the genre labels used for different parts of the book (26:46).[18] We should furthermore note that the segmentation by genre is not a special feature of Leviticus 17-26, but appears as part of the structural strategy used throughout this section of the Priestly text. The grouping of subjects by topic occurs as well in Leviticus 1-7 and 11-15. Again we see that the occurrence of these terms is not necessarily indicative of the special language of a separate corpus—a contextual evaluation suggests that these are, rather, indicative of the genre of texts that these chapters contain.

Other terms that occur on these lists suffer from a limited distribution within Leviticus 17-26, undercutting their force as an argument for the uniqueness of the Holiness Code. For instance, the phrase "his/their blood will be on him/them" occurs exclusively in Leviticus 20 (#19). This may indicate something about Leviticus 20, but is irrelevant to the larger question of whether we should identify Leviticus 17-26 as separate from the rest of the Priestly text. The phrase *leḥem ʾĕlōhim* is, similarly, confined to Leviticus 21-22 and is paralleled by similar language in Lev 3:11, 16 (#20).[19] Its association with discussions of sacrifice is unsurprising,

[18] On the anomalous use of *ḥq* where *ḥqh* is expected, see also Lev 10:11.

[19] Milgrom 1991: 58-61; Milgrom 2000: 1804's claim that the difference in language between the two is somehow indicative of a more anthropomorphic view of Yhwh in H is undercut by a broader reading of the Priestly text. The creation of human beings in the "image of god" in Gen 1:26-27—reconfirmed in Gen 5:1 and used to justify god's ban on murder in Gen 9:6—demonstrate that P's view of Yhwh is not non-anthropomorphic. Additionally, one would be hard pressed to argue that the phrase describing *šəlāmîm* offerings as "food, offerings for Yhwh" (*lḥm ʾš lyhwh*) in Lev 3:11 or describing sacrifices as "soothing scents" (*ryḥ nyḥḥ*) throughout P are somehow less anthropomorphic than describing them as "food of god." Milgrom's suggestion that language like "soothing scent" is nothing more than a "linguistic fossil" (1991: 59, 213) is special pleading that fails to convince. Milgrom's argument is further undercut in that he attributes to H any passage in P that might be taken as anthropomorphizing (e.g., Lev 15:31), assuming his own conclusion in his argument. Finally, his statement that "There can be no doubt that the Priestly legists have succeeded in eliminating even the slightest suspicion that the purpose of the Tabernacle is…'the care and feeding of Israel's God'" (1991: 59) is difficult to sustain—the entire ritual suite seems to revolve around this idea, as does the declaration from Yhwh that the purpose of the Tabernacle is so that he might live with Israel (Exod 29:43-46).

while its distribution again suggests that it has no weight in determining whether Leviticus 17-26 as a group are distinct from the rest of P.

The use of the term *ʾĕlîlîm* in Lev 19:4 and 26:1 also shows a limited distribution (#17), likely contextually determined rather than indicative of a special idiolect for the Holiness Code. More widely used, the distribution of the phrase *wəyārēʾtā mēʾĕlōhêkā* is nevertheless restricted to Leviticus 19 and 25 (#18), again nullifying its probative value for determining whether the Holiness Code is distinct from P.[20] The case of the expression *nśʾ ḥṭʾ* is slightly more involved (#21). In comparison to other entries, this expression appears in a broader array of chapters (Leviticus 19, 20, 22, 24) and only in two chapters outside of the Holiness Code (Numbers 9, 18).[21] Nevertheless, we are again dealing with a contextual issue. While scholars (rightly) treat this phrase alongside *nśʾ ʿwn* when determining the meaning of *nśʾ* in these phrases, the distribution of the different direct objects suggests a difference in meaning.[22] We should only expect the object to be *ḥṭʾ* in places where the discussion is centered on crimes that can be

[20] This phrase is not well understood. Given its connection to property laws and respect for kinsman, as well as its use of the singular in contexts that are otherwise plural addresses, we may tentatively suggest a rendering of "and you will each revere your ancestral-spirits" (cf. 1 Sam 28:13; Isa 8:19).

[21] Note that the use in Lev 19:17 differs from its uses elsewhere, as there it appears to be transitive "to bear against him [i.e., someone else] sin" as opposed to reflexive "to bear [oneself] sin." The case in 22:9 is marginal, as it may also be transitive, but the direct object is either the sanctuary or the sancta (it shouldn't be *mšmrt*, as the verse might lead one to suspect, because of the gender disagreement).

[22] Milgrom 1991: 295-297; Schwartz 1995; Milgrom 2000: 1488-1490; Wells 2012. The major difference between Milgrom's and Schwartz's approach to these expressions is how they understand the meaning of *nśʾ*—Schwartz claims that it means "to forgive" and Milgrom argues that it means "to suffer punishment." Milgrom's argument is the more persuasive one and accords better with similar phrases found in Akkadian. Wells 2012 argues that this clause is intended to signal additional liability, not otherwise specified, for the guilty party/ies. Stackert 2016: 220-221 connects this expression with a Late Babylonian clause (*ḫīṭu ša šarri zabālu*/*šadādu*) that occurs in some of the Āl-Yaḫūdu documents as a piece of evidence suggesting connections between H and the Babylonian exile. However, similar phrases also occur in the Laws of Hammurabi (e.g., vi.5, viii.24, *aran dīnim šuāti ittanašši* [*našû* Gtn]), the Middle Assyrian Laws (e.g., A.iv.55, *ḫubullē arna u ḫīṭa ša mutiša tanašši*), and the Middle Assyrian Palace Decrees (e.g., 55, *ḫīṭa inašši*). MAL also contains the inversion of the formula, *ḫīṭu laššu* "there is no penalty" (e.g., A.ii.24). All of this suggests that these phrases are part of the general tradition of legal formulation in the ancient Near East and we should be wary of suggesting any particular point of Mesopotamian-Judean contact in order to explain their occurrence in the Priestly text.

categorized as such.[23] Tellingly, its occurrence in relation to the eating of sacred offering in Leviticus 22 is paralleled when that topic returns in Num 18:31-32.[24] As we noted above, the concentration of a discussion topic in a group of chapters need not indicate a distinctive status for Leviticus 17-26, but may rather reflect the organizational structure of the entire book.

The phrase *nśʾ ʿwn* has a different problem that undermines its value in this discussion (#22). Rather than being restricted to Leviticus 17-26, the phrase is commonly used throughout non-narrative materials in the Priestly text, and there is nothing that indicates that it has any special value in the Holiness Code. A similar situation obtains with regard to the distributive phrase *ʾîš ʾîš* (#9).[25] Here, however, the phrase is used not only in non-narrative material, but

[23] On the different categories of wrong-doing in P, see Milgrom 1991: 24-26, 228-231, 1034, 1043-1044. Among desiderata in studies of the Priestly text is a reevaluation of Milgrom's arguments for the meaning of technical terms and a related broad study that analyzes the deployment of wrong-doing categories (*pšʿ*, *ḥtʾ*, *ʿwn*, etc.) and legal categories (*mšpṭ*, *ḥqt*, *twrh*, etc.) in P. Wells 2012 treats the *ʿwn* and *ḥṭʾ* cases together. While there are places where they seem to be used synonymously (Lev 20:19-20; Num 18:22-23) these cases don't quite present parallel uses of the two phrases. In Lev 20:19, we find *nśʾ ʿwn* as the indicator of punishment for the man who has sex with his consanguineous maternal or paternal aunt, while in Lev 20:20 *nśʾ ḥṭʾ* occurs as the indicator of punishment for the man who has sex with affinal aunt (i.e., his uncle's wife). However, we should note that the second case has another consequence attached to it—childlessness (*ʿărîrîm*). This suggests that the cases presented in Lev 20:19 and 20:20, although seemingly parallel, are viewed distinctively. The second case in which the *ʿwn* and *ḥṭʾ* clauses appear to be synonymous involves violations related to the Tabernacle (Num 18:22-23). However, in each case the violation is different—one involves non-Levites approaching the Tabernacle and the other involves violations Levites might commit in the course of their work within the Tabernacle. Again, the situations are distinct enough to suggest that these clauses are not precise equivalents. Marginal cases such as these illustrate the need for a more thorough study of technical terms for both instructional genres and wrongdoing within the Priestly text.

[24] Knohl 1995: 21-23 (and n. 36) takes this as an indication that these Numbers passages are all H, but he assumes his conclusion in order to do so—"PT uses נשא עון only…while HS has both נשא עון and נשא חטא." Knohl's book is filled with circular argument of this kind (see also the critique in Blum 2009). Absent other compelling evidence for seeing Numbers 18 as an addition to the Priestly text—on which see the argument in Chapter 6 for its deep integration in the Priestly narrative—such circular terminological arguments carry little to no weight as unfalsifiable assertions. Baden 2009a: 19-23; 2013b: 362 n.36 makes a narrative case against Numbers 18, arguing that the Priestly author thought that all giving of instructions took place at Mt. Sinai. His argument is undercut by two issues—he does not offer a thorough consideration of the narrative place of the post-Sinai non-narrative materials (for which see extensive discussion in Chapter 6) and he does not consider the fact that Yhwh's dwelling in a mobile Tabernacle that travels with the Israelites and has already served as the site of revelation (Lev 1:1) makes post-Sinai instruction-giving inherently plausible within the Priestly author's narrative world. Stackert 2007: 191-198 bases his attribution of Numbers 18 to H rather than P on the idea that H has a distinctive definition of holiness with which Numbers 18 agrees; see discussion below on this issue.

[25] See also Milgrom 2000: 1453's skepticism that this should be viewed as an H distinctive. Knohl 1995: 87 attempts to argue that P only uses *ʾîš ʾîš* in purity laws and not sacrificial ones, but this is expecting a formulary strictness and consistency that we simply do not find in any corpus of similar size and content (see chapter 1). It also assumes that we completely understand the contextual pressures and denotations of different formulae, which is not

even in a narrative section of the Priestly text (Exod 36:4). In the same vein, Knohl has attempted to argue that the phrase *ḥuqqat ʿôlām lədōrōtām/-êkem* is a distinctive of H (#16).[26] The distribution of the phrase, which occurs 6 times in Leviticus 17-26 and 9 times elsewhere in P, suggests that it is a commonly used expression throughout the Priestly corpus.[27] In contrast to the other expressions we have examined, the above expressions do not require a contextual argument to explain their concentration in Leviticus 17-26—while contextually deployed, they are not in any way special to the Holiness Code. These phrases, then, gives no support to the hypothesis that the language used in Leviticus 17-26 is distinctive enough to identify it as a separate corpus within the Priestly text.

This brings us to the use of the verb *ḥll* (D) "to profane" usually accompanied by the objects *šēm*, *qōdeš*, or *miqdāš* (#13a,b,c). This term occurs 15 times in the Holiness Code and only twice outside of it (Exod 31:13; Num 18:32). Given its association with violations related to eating sacrifices (e.g., Lev 19:8; 21:6; 22:9, 15), respect for the Tabernacle (Lev 21:12, 23), and oath-breaking (Lev 18:21; 19:12; 20:3),[28] we could easily imagine contexts in which it could have been used outside of Leviticus 17-26, such as in the *tôrōt* of Leviticus 6-7, the closing of Leviticus 15, or the discussion of violations requiring an *ʾāšām* in Leviticus 5. Milgrom has gone so far as to argue that this distribution suggests that *ḥillēl šēm* in Leviticus 17-26 is functionally equivalent to *māʿal maʿal* in Leviticus 5.[29] While this may be evidence of a different hand at

---

the case. Finally, Knohl's conclusion can only stand if we first assume that Leviticus 17-26 are different from P rather than representative of different genres within P.

[26] Knohl 1995: 46-55. Knohl's argument is based on several undefended assumptions (such as that a relationship with Ezekiel is indicative of H and not P) and also on badly reasoned criteria (such as the occurrence of this expression appearing at the end of a passage, which is the only logical place for such an expression to occur). We will address Knohl's assumptions about what is distinctive about H throughout the discussion in this chapter.

[27] Milgrom 1991: 16-17 also expresses skepticism of this part of Knohl's argument.

[28] On the relationship between oaths and *mlk*-sacrifices, see Zeph 1:5 and Dewrell 2019.

[29] Milgrom 1991:36; 2000: 1326. For Milgrom's other claims about *ḥll* and *mʿl* in H and P, see discussion below.

work in the two passages, Blum has cast doubt on the equivalence, pointing out the weakness of claiming that *māʿal maʿal* is indicative of P's style on the basis of only two verses.[30]

This phrase, then, constitutes the strongest case in favor of the argument that Leviticus 17-26 uses distinctive language. However, since it is isolated in this regard, it is not sufficient to support the weight of identifying an entire group of chapters as different from the rest of the Priestly text. Furthermore, it suffers from the same problem as other entries in that its distribution is limited, in this case to Leviticus 18-22. One would have to prove some necessary connection between 18-22 and 23-26 in order to argue that this expression marks the entire set of chapters as distinctive.[31] Additionally, given the contextual use of the other terms we have examined, we might assume that closer investigation will reveal that this expression is also determined by what topic is under discussion—an assumption lent some credence by this phrase's deployment in Num 18:31-32 as part of a discussion on consuming offerings.

The analysis offered above confirms what we suggested at the outset—any set of arbitrarily marked off chapters will yield some examples of unique or individual language.[32] However, the usage of particular terms or phrases is easily explained in most cases by genre and context. Further confirming this point, none of the entries on this list is leveled throughout the Holiness Code, but each one is confined to limited, appropriate contexts. When appropriate contexts appeared elsewhere in P for these terms, they were deployed appropriately. Neither individually nor as a group do these terms suggest that the Holiness Code is distinctive enough from the rest of the Priestly text to justify identifying it as a special body of literature. This does not definitively foreclose the possibility that these terms and expressions might play a supporting

[30] Blum 2009: 35.
[31] See below for further discussion on ways that Leviticus 18-22 are treated distinctively within 17-26.
[32] The rest of the entries on the list in Appendix 3.1 (#1-8) are not specific vocabulary items, but are instead related to H's supposed preference for 1st person address by the deity and parentic speech. As such we will address them with their related subjects below.

role in describing the Holiness Code after its distinctiveness is established on other grounds. However, they can only play a subordinate role in this regard. If we find the other arguments for the distinctiveness of Leviticus 17-26 to be similarly weak, then we should prefer the contextual explanations offered here for their distribution over an explanation that favors compositional stratification to explain their presence.

We should also address a further word of caution to these types of lists and their comparative value. When Driver made his initial list of distinctive P expressions, he explicitly restricted himself to expressions that occur in either the narrative alone or in both narrative and non-narrative sections.[33] His motivation for doing this was his observation that "the habits of thought and expression, which the author had contracted through his practical acquaintance with the law, were carried by him into his treatment of purely historical subjects."[34] The compositional understanding that underlies this observation is consonant with the Neo-analytic model proposed in the previous chapter—it assumes that the non-narrative portions of the Priestly text already existed and were known by the Priestly author.

So far, well and good. However, when it comes to an evaluation of Leviticus 17-26, one is forced, by necessity, to deal almost exclusively with non-narrative material. Outside of the speech introductions of Yhwh addressing Moses and the exhortative frames found in some of the speeches, the only extended narrative in these chapters is in Lev 24:10-23.[35] This means that the lists that are drawn up to compare the language of Leviticus 17-26 to the language of P are comparing apples and oranges, non-narrative texts with narrative texts. Such a procedure is methodologically poor and is bound to produce results in which the two bodies show different characteristics. On the other hand, if we accept the Neo-analytic model of composition—which

[33] Driver 1910: 130-135.
[34] Driver 1910: 130.
[35] There are also narrative reports of Moses conveying information to the Israelites in Lev 21:24; 23:44.

simply takes Driver's own view of this material into more thorough account—then the non-narrative material throughout the Priestly text should be recognized as pre-existing. This means that inconsistency of language and expression between various chapters is not a problem requiring explanation, but a feature arising from the way that the Priestly author compiled his work.[36]

Milgrom's claim that terms used in Leviticus 17-26 "lose their precision" when compared to their counterparts in Leviticus 1-16 is based on sounder methodological footing than Driver's comparative lists.[37] His argument, though, rests on the assumption that the way that terms are used in the sacrificial manuals of Leviticus 1-7 or the purity manuals of Leviticus 11-15 are standard usage instead of technical usage. When we take context into account, there is no objection to a vocabulary item being used in a technical way in technical settings and then being used in more generalized ways in non-technical settings. For instance, when Milgrom argues that "in P, *ṭāhôr*…denotes 'ritually pure,' that is, the purity one achieves through ablutions and sacrifices" and cites Leviticus 11-15 to support this claim,[38] he is ignoring the fact that these chapters are technical manuals about that specific type of purity and purification. This is no obstacle to the term being used in a different way in other contexts.[39]

---

[36] See further the discussion in Chapters 1 and 5 on the compositional implications of using sources.
[37] Milgrom 1991: 35-38; 2000: 1327-1328.
[38] Milgrom 1991: 37.
[39] His claim about the use of *ṭāmēʾ* is similarly hobbled by his lack of sensitivity to context. As another example, Milgrom 2000: 1328 claims that P uses *niddāh* "as a technical term for menstrual discharge," citing Leviticus 12 and 15 for support and arguing that "In H and derivative literature…it becomes a metaphor for impurity." This pretends that both uses can not have existed side by side and that P was only capable of using the term technically—though Ezekiel was certainly capable of using both types of reference (7:19-20; 18:6). His conclusion from the difference in usage between Leviticus 1-16 and 17-26, that "Indeed, P would have found H not only inaccurate but misleading [in regard to its vocabulary]! If P had incorporated H it would have insisted on thoroughly overhauling it so that it would be consistent with P's vocabulary" (1991: 38) ignores that the Priestly author would not have had a problem (as most native speakers do not) distinguishing technical uses in technical contexts from other, more general uses. From a Neo-analytic perspective, all of these uses belong to P in the sense that they all come from the sources with which he was familiar and from which he constructed his narrative.

Similarly, when Milgrom states that "In P, *maʿal* is limited exclusively to the sacrilege of sanctums," what he really means is that Leviticus 5 uses the term this way.[40] These two uses can not define the entire scope of P's vocabulary; nor can one then use this limited sample to arbitrarily identify any other usage as non-P.[41] Such a method starts with the assumption that the Priestly text can only use terms in a single way and then proceeds accordingly, rather than starting by asking the question of how the Priestly text deploys a term and seeking to understand its contextual nuances.[42] To work in any other way is to assume that Leviticus 17-26 is especially distinct and different from the rest of Leviticus—observations based on such an approach can never constitute arguments for such a distinction. As a writer working in his native language, we should grant the Priestly author the same freedom to deploy the resources of that language in all the ways necessary to communicate what he was attempting to communicate.[43]

At the end of our evaluation of the putative terminological distinctiveness of H against P, we should return briefly to our discussion from the beginning. As we noted at the beginning, the Knohl/Milgrom model presents a special problem when it comes to this topic. While scholars have long noted the distinctiveness of the language in Leviticus 17-26, Knohl and Milgrom used this distinctiveness as a means by which they identified H material in the midst of the Priestly text. Such a procedure is, however, inherently circular—if we argue that a given usage is shared by P and H only to be told that any usage that occurs in Leviticus 17-26 must be H everywhere it

---

[40] Milgrom 2000: 1327.
[41] See also Blum 2009: 35.
[42] Most of Milgrom's work on this subject assumes such an artificially restricted use of vocabulary in Priestly texts.
[43] See, in a related vein, Stackert 2011: 12-13, n. 43's objection to Milgrom 2000: 1344's attempt to reattribute Gen 2:2-3 to H (Here, he is simply carrying Knohl 1995: 15-16's logic to its ultimate conclusion). Among the evidence Milgrom adduces for his position is the use of קדש D, about which Milgrom asserts, "this root is totally absent in P." Stackert offers an excellent rejoinder on this issue, noting "My assumption is that the authors of each of the Torah sources were entirely fluent in… biblical Hebrew and could draw from and employ the full Hebrew lexicon… The claim that only H can use the D stem of קד״ש is unsustainable because both P and H not only knew this root but were fully capable of creating a denominative verb from the noun קדש."

occurs, we are left with no arguments to make. What we have done above, however, is offer an alternative accounting of the data. In our accounting, context and genre explain the distribution of terms. There is, then, no need to posit compositional strata to explain the fact that H and P share language. Instead, our reading of the data acknowledges that P and H share language and take this as indicating a shared compositional horizon—that is, there is no H, only P. What we have at hand, then, are two competing models for the explanation of the same data. Which one is more persuasive will depend on how these models relate to other arguments for the distinctiveness of P and H.

The problems discussed above also mean that we are on firmer ground in many ways as we evaluate the remaining features of divine speech that scholars describe as indicative of Leviticus 17-26's special status (#1-8). These phrases relate to the argument that Leviticus 17-26 contain a distinctive form of divine speech in which the deity addresses Israel in the first person and uses paraenetic or exhortative speech to frame commands. They are, for the most part, levelled throughout Leviticus 17-26 instead of being restricted to certain parts of the corpus. They are also more amenable to comparison with the rest of the Priestly text as these are, largely, narrative features related to these texts' setting as a revelation to Moses at Sinai rather than aspects of the non-narrative material contained in the Holiness Code.

We will begin with the notion that first-person address by Yhwh to a second-person Israelite community is a special feature of the Holiness Code.[44] While some have argued that Leviticus can be handled as a self-contained literary unit even within the Priestly text,[45] we can only truly evaluate this claim by an examination of the entirety of the Priestly text, taking note of how Yhwh refers to himself in each divine speech. To ease our examination, we will break this

[44] Kuenen 1886: 89; Driver 1910: 49 n. §; Knohl 1995: 1-2, n. 3, 15, 17-18, 17, n. 24, 107-8, 169-172; Milgrom 2000: 1332.
[45] E.g., Smith 1996; Auld 2003; Nihan 2007: 69-76.

down into two separate phenomena: the use of first person speech by Yhwh—including 1st person verbs with the deity as the subject and the use of the first person pronominal suffix indicating Yhwh's ownership—and the use of the phrase "I am Yhwh" (*ʾny yhwh*) either alone or with various complements.

A survey of the divine speeches in Genesis and Exodus shows that Yhwh speaks almost exclusively in the 1st person.[46] Across 50 speeches, consisting of 369 verses, Yhwh uses 1st person verbs 102 times and the 1st personal pronominal suffix 67 times. Across the same range of speeches, he refers to himself in the 3rd person only 37 times. This preference for 1st person speech is not concentrated, but scattered across the divine speeches in Genesis and Exodus, from creation to the instructions to erect the Tabernacle.

However, the use of the 3rd person in these divine speeches is not equally distributed and invites closer inspection.[47] The only such use in the twenty-five divine speeches in Genesis is in 9:16, when Yhwh says about the rainbow that "I will see it in order to remember the eternal covenant between *ʾĕlōhîm* and every living *nepeš*."[48] In the seventeen pre-Sinaitic divine speeches in Exodus, Yhwh refers to himself in the 3rd person four times in just three speeches (12:11, 14, 48; 16:23). In all of these cases, Yhwh is describing his relationship to a festival or holy day: "*psḥ lyhwh*" (12:11, 48); "*ḥg lyhwh*" (12:14); "*šbtwn šbt-qdš lyhwh*" (16:23).

[46] See Appendix 3.2 for a full table of the data presented in this discussion.
[47] See Appendices 3.2 and 3.2a for a table of the data presented in this discussion.
[48] For other examples of switches between first and third person reference in the same sentence, see also Exod 29:42; 31:(3?), 17; Lev 23:2; Num 18:6, 26. It is also possible that Gen 9:16 may not in fact be an instance of Yhwh referring to himself in the third person—other gods may be in view, as in Gen 1:26-27 and Exod 7:1; 12:12. The monotheism of the Priestly author is more often assumed than defended (usually on the basis of assumptions about the date of the text—see, e.g., Schmid 2011b), and these verses may suggest that his theology is more in line with an archetheism that views a single high god as supreme over a host of lesser divinities (see also Gen 3:22; 11:7; Exod 15:11; Deut 32:8-9; 1 Kgs 22: 13-23; Psalm 29; 82; Job 1-2). See Kaufmann 1972: 7-121; Halpern 1987; M. Smith 2001: 41-53; Machinist 2011. For how texts like these may be witnesses to an underlying system, see Friedman 2017: 168-188.

During the Sinai theophany (Exodus 25-31), Yhwh's use of the 3rd person to refer to himself intensifies—it occurs thirty-one times and in five of the seven speeches.[49] This is a radical concentration, representing 84% of the third person references in Genesis and Exodus. We should also observe, circumspectly for now, that this concentration occurs precisely where the first large block of non-narrative material is located in the Priestly text. This concentration also aligns with the pre-Sinaitic 3rd person references in Exodus, 75% of which occur in the non-narrative Passover instructions in Exodus 12*.[50]

When we turn to the way that these 3rd person references function in the Tabernacle instructions, we can discern a few trends. The first is the frequent use of the phrase *lpny yhwh* when describing the performance of various kinds of rituals, such as lighting the Menorah, sacrificing animals, burning incense, or wearing various parts of the high priest's garments.[51] The other common use that appears is the phrase *lyhwh*. Typically, it describes Yhwh's relationship to various offerings (e.g., אִשֶּׁה לי),[52] but it is also used to indicate his ownership of the incense altar (30:10) and his relationship to the Sabbath (31:15). Finally, Yhwh uses his own name in a genitive construct with *trwmh* twice (30:30:14, 15) and three times speaks of himself as the 3rd person subject of a verb (31:17). Contextually, Yhwh's use of third person to refer to himself correlates most extensively with descriptions of sacrifices and offerings.[53]

---

[49] I have chosen to exclude from this discussion Exod 31:3, as the *rûaḥ ʾĕlōhîm* seems more likely to be "a divine spirit" than "spirit of god [i.e. Yhwh]" (Propp 2006: 487-488).

[50] There is some debate in scholarship over whether Exod 12:1-13 is intended to be a prescription for how future Passovers are carried out, or whether it is a descriptive account of the first Passover as it took place in Egypt. In either case, it is non-narrative in its presentation. For the idea that this is a command, see, Kaufmann 1972: 179. For the idea of it being a descriptive part of P's narrative, see Friedman 1981a: 95-96. For an analysis of whether sacrifice is involved in this passage, see Gilders 2009: 60-62; Rhyder 2019: 246-248. Propp 2006: 427-428 perceptively notes that by placing these instructions into the narrative here, the Priestly author "makes each subsequent celebration not just a historical commemoration but an actual reenactment."

[51] Exod 27:21; 28:12, 29, 30 (2x), 35, 38; 29:11, 23, 24, 25, 26, 42; 30:8, 16.

[52] Exod 29:18 (2x), 25, 28, 41; 30:12, 13, 20, 37.

[53] Exod 29:11, 18 (2x), 23, 24, 25 (2x), 26, 28, 41, 42; 30:8, 20.

Nevertheless, despite this concentration of 3rd person references in Yhwh's speeches in Exodus 25-31, there are still 42 uses of the 1st person, constituting 58% of all references in these chapters. The above overview suggests that first-person address from Yhwh is not an anomaly in the Priestly text. It also tells us that we should expect the use of 3rd person references to cluster when we are dealing with non-narrative materials. With these patterns in mind, we can examine Leviticus to see whether the Holiness Code deviates in a way that suggests we are dealing with a different corpus.

Leviticus 17-26 contains 17 divine speeches consisting of 316 verses. In these speeches, Yhwh speaks in the 1st person 160 times and the 3rd person 76 times (68% and 32% respectively). Two features are worth observing here. First, the overwhelming use of 1st person is entirely in accord with how Yhwh speaks in Genesis and Exodus.[54] Second, the use of 3rd person matches the patterns we have already seen in Exodus 25-31. This form of reference both clusters in non-narrative sections and is associated with particular contexts.

Yhwh, for instance, has the habit of referring to himself in the 3rd person when referring to sacrifices and offerings.[55] This feature is captured in microcosm in Leviticus 17, where all of the 3rd person references cluster in the discussion of sacrifice in 17:1-9 while not a single one appears in the rest of the chapter's discussion of blood consumption. The pattern, however, continues throughout 17-26, with over half of the 3rd person uses occurring in such contexts.[56] Chapters in which sacrifice plays a minor or no role (18, 20, 24, 25, 26) have relatively few 3rd person references.

---

[54] Setting aside Genesis, as it contains mostly narrative speech, there are 25 divine speeches in Exodus, with 93 1st person references (73%) and 35 3rd person references (27%). Reducing it to just Exodus 25-31 (7 speeches), which is almost entirely non-narrative speech, still yields 42 1st person references (58%) and 31 3rd person reference (42%).

[55] Appendix 3.2a, entries 1-5.

[56] Lev 17:4, 5 (x2), 6, 9; 19:5, 8, 21, 22, 24; 21:6 (x2), 8, 17, 21 (x2), 22; 22:3, 15, 18, 21, 22 (x2), 24 25, 27, 29; 23:8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 (x2), 20 (x2), 25, 27, 36 (x2), 37, 38; 24:7, 9. This accounts for 47 of the 76 occurrences (62%) of 3rd person speech in Leviticus 17-26. See Exod 29:11, 18 (x2), 23, 24, 25 (x2), 26, 41, 42; 30:20. This same pattern is also found in Leviticus 1-16 and Numbers.

Many of the remaining 3rd person references conform to the other uses of the 3rd person in Exodus. Rituals are performed *lpny yhwh*.[57] The 3rd person is used to refer to Yhwh's ownership of various sancta.[58] He refers to his relationship with the Sabbath and various festivals in the 3rd person.[59] Yhwh also once uses a 3rd person verb to describe his own actions.[60] We also see new uses of the 3rd person to refer to the priests' relationship with Yhwh and to refer to desecration of Yhwh's Name.[61]

If the general distribution of 1st person to 3rd person speech is equivalent to the pattern seen in the Priestly text in Genesis and Exodus, and the uses of the 3rd person intermingled into these 1st person speeches is also the same, we must finally ask whether the uses of the 1st person are in some way different in Leviticus 17-26 than in the chapters leading up to them. In the case of 1st person verbs, we can single out a few cases in Leviticus 17-26 where unique language is found. The common punishment phrase "that life will be cut off (*krt* N) from its people" and its variants is found expressed in the 1st person as "I will cut off (*krt* C) that one from the midst of its people" (Lev 17:10; 20:3, 5, 6).[62] While this is certainly anomalous, it is also not distributed throughout Leviticus 17-26 and is, in fact, against the standard usage of that phrase as it occurs

[57] Lev 23:28, 40; 24:3, 4, 6, 8. See Exod 27:21; 30:8.
[58] Lev 17:4, 6; 21:12. See Exod 30:10.
[59] Lev 23:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 34, 38, 39, 41; 25:2, 4. See Exod 12:11, 14, 48; 16:23; 31:15.
[60] Lev 17:2. This may be him telling Moses what to say in his speech, but, if so, it is incongruous with the 1st person verbs later in the speech. See also Num 19:2.
[61] Priests' relationship to Yhwh: Lev 21:6, 7, 12. Desecration of Yhwh's Name: Lev 18:21; 19:12; 21:6; 24:15, 16. Note that 18:21 is also a sacrificial context (and see Dewrell 2019 on the relationship between *mlk* sacrifices and oath taking). It is unclear if 24:15 should be understood as a reference to Yhwh or if it should be read in contrast with Yhwh in the following verse; see Milgrom 2001: 2115-2116. Related to this issue is the concentrated use in Leviticus 17-26 of אֱלֹהִים as the 3rd person reference (Lev 18:21; 19:12; 21:6 (3x), 7, 8, 12 (2x), 17, 21, 22; 22:25; 23:14; 24:15 & Lev 19:14, 32; 25:17, 36, 43). Its clustering in the priests' manual in Leviticus 21 is especially noteworthy and deserves further study; for one suggestion, see Milgrom 2000: 1803-1804.
[62] #5 in Appendix 3.1. See Schwartz 1991: 40 for a contextual analysis of the first-person *krt* clause in Lev 17:10.

in those chapters.[63] While this formulation certainly should receive closer examination, its distribution can not support the identification of Leviticus 17-26 as a separate corpus.

The other interesting use of a 1st person verb is in the phrase "I will give (*ntn*)/set (*śym*) my face against X" (17:10; 20:3, 5, 6; 26:17).[64] This is, in fact, unique phrasing, but it again only occurs in limited distribution. Even more tellingly, in all but one of its occurrences it appears correlated with the 1st person version of the *krt*-phrase. These data indicate that these phrases should receive close attention for what they may tell us about the composition of the chapters they appear in, but their limited deployment does not mark the Holiness Code as a distinctive corpus within the Priestly text.

This brings us to the use of the first person pronominal suffix.[65] In broad outlines, the use of the 1st person pronominal suffix conforms to the patterns also seen in the divine speeches of Genesis and Exodus. This does not mean that there are not a few unique uses, such as Yhwh speaking of "my *nepeš*" (Lev 26:11, 30), but such occasional uses are also seen in other parts of the corpus, such as "my *kābôd*" (Exod 29:43) or "my ears" (Num 14:28). The majority of the uses unique to Leviticus 17-26 occur in only one or two speeches, again providing a weak basis for positing the distinctiveness of these chapters as a group.

Two uses of the 1st person suffix do, however, merit further consideration. The first is in the phrase "my sanctuary/ies" (Lev 19:30; 20:3; 21:23; 26:2). This is a phrase limited to Leviticus 17-26 and appearing in sufficient distribution to support the possibility that these chapters are somehow distinct from the rest of P. The statement from Yhwh in Exod 25:8 mitigates the impact of this phrase somewhat though, as he tells Moses that the Israelites "will

---

[63] Lev 17:4, 9, 14; 18:29; 19:8; 20:17, 18; 22:3; 23:29. Uses outside of Leviticus 17-26: Gen 17:14; Exod 12:15, 19; 30:33, 38; 31:14; Lev 7:20, 21, 25, 27; Num 4:18; 9:13; 15:30, 31; 19:13, 20. Lev 23:30 constitutes another anomalous version of this phrase, using the 1st person *ʾbd* (C) instead of *krt*.
[64] #4 in Appendix 3.1.
[65] See Appendix 3.2b for a table of the data presented in this discussion.

make for me a sanctuary" (*wəʿāśû lî miqdāš*).[66] At the narrative level, this makes it at least possible that Yhwh would refer to the Tabernacle as "my sanctuary" at some point in the Priestly text.[67] The roughly synonymous phrase "my Tabernacle" appears both in and outside of the Holiness Code, further undermining the evidentiary value of this usage (Lev 15:31; 26:11).

The other use of the 1st person suffix that appears distinctive in Leviticus 17-26 is its use with terms for different legal genres—חֻקֹּתַי, מִשְׁפָּטַי, מִצְוֹתַי, and מִשְׁמַרְתִּי. With one exception (Num 15:40), these all occur in the Holiness Code and their usage is widespread throughout these chapters (Leviticus 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26).[68] Above, we argued that we could explain the occurrence of these terms in Leviticus 17-26 as related to the genre of the material contained in those chapters, as distinct from the *tôrōt* of Leviticus 6-7, 11-15. However, this does not explain why these terms are used with the 1st person pronominal suffix and why we do not see an equivalent תּוֹרֹתַי used anywhere in P. We should note, though, that this use of the 1st person suffix occurs almost exclusively in the frameworks of these chapters and constitutes part of the paraenetic or exhortative language that many argue is characteristic of the Holiness Code against the rest of the Priestly text. Whether the bare fact of a single anomalous use of the 1st person suffix in Leviticus 17-26 is sufficient to conclude that these chapters must be a separate corpus from the rest of P must await further evaluation so that we can put this datum into conversation

[66] Knohl 1995: 63 claims that "the use of the word מקדש as a synonym for the parallel word משכן is never found in PT [= P]" and so attributes Exod 25:1-9 to H instead of P. However Knohl must assume his conclusion to make this argument (a fallacy found throughout his book). The statement in Exod 25:8 introduces the instructions for constructing the Tabernacle and so provides sufficient evidence that P can, in fact, use these words as synonyms. We have shown above that his further argument for why this must be H instead of P, namely that Yhwh speaks in the 1st person, is not founded on the actual data of the Priestly text. Finally, Lev 12:4's use of *mqdš* suggests that the Priestly material is, in fact, comfortable with using this a synonym with *mškn* in at least some contexts (see Chapter 5 for further discussion).

[67] This also undermines Knohl's contention that the Priestly text could never imagine Yhwh as the personal owner of sancta.

[68] See Appendix 3.2b, #6a-6d for a full list of occurrences.

with alternative narrative and generic explanations. We will, then, reserve further exploration of these terms for our discussion of the paraenetic language of Leviticus 17-26.

The above survey has shown that the use of the 1st person in Leviticus 17-26 is in no way anomalous, but continues the patterns of usage seen in the divine speeches of Genesis and Exodus. We should, then, briefly inquire into why this feature persists as a distinctive in treatments of the Holiness Code.[69] The concentrated nature of divine speech in this section may be one culprit. All of the divine speeches of P in Exodus add up to approximately 307 verses, while Leviticus 17-26 contains 312 verses of divine speech on its own. This disproportionate amount of speech skews one's impressions when reading instead of tracking of broader trends.

A second issue is the relative weight of Leviticus 26, which scholars have, on other grounds, considered an essential part of the Holiness Code.[70] This chapter alone contains 77 of the 160 uses (48%) of the 1st person in Leviticus 17-26. This concentration is easily explained by the genre of the chapter, which does not contain the ritual, instructional, or legal material found in other parts of Leviticus. Instead, we might expect this list of promises and threats to use a different form of address because of its distinctive genre. If we remove Leviticus 26 from consideration, the rest of the material in 17-25 appears even closer to the patterns we see

[69] Milgrom 1991: 17, "There can be no doubt that Knohl is correct in contrasting the impersonal, indirect address of God in P with the first-person address in H." Despite this, he concludes that "…that P is theologically incapable of having the deity address Moses in the first person must be questioned… Perhaps, then, P is not averse to having the deity speak in the first person…" This caution does not stop him from using this feature to identify H passages elsewhere, such as: "As correctly noted by Knohl, a basic characteristic of H's style is that YHWH speaks in the first person to second-person Israel" (2000: 1326). Milgrom also uses this criterion as part of an argument attributing Lev 17 to H: "There is overwhelming evidence for placing [Lev] 17 at the head of H. Its distinctive style (YHWH addressing Israel in the first person)…" (2000: 1332). See, however, the skepticism expressed by Nihan 2007: 34, n. 72, though Nihan elsewhere cites Knohl's work approvingly (2007: 261, 282-283, 298-299). Knohl himself derives the 1st person as distinctive from Cholewiński 1976. Even Feldman 2018, who otherwise disagrees with Knohl's analysis, states that "A large portion of the priestly narrative is direct speech from Yahweh to Moses, in which Yahweh necessarily refers to himself. Most of Yahweh's self-references are in the third person, though occasionally he uses first person" (2018: 199). Quantitatively, however, Yhwh refers to himself in the 1st person 415 times and in the 3rd person 246 times in all of the divine speeches in the Priestly text—the inverse of what Feldman suggests.

[70] On the structural argument for the Holiness Code, based on the perception of Leviticus 26 as a blessing/curse list, see discussion below.

elsewhere for divine speech with non-narrative content in the rest of P.[71] Including the language of Leviticus 26 alongside the language of the rest of these chapters again skews one's perception of the relative use of the 1st person in Leviticus 17-26.

Finally, most analyses of 1st person divine speech in Leviticus 17-26 are impacted by what is used for comparison. The question of whether 1st person divine speech is distinctive within the Priestly text is a question best addressed by a global view of P. However, most approaches to this question instead compare Leviticus 17-26 solely to Leviticus 1-7, 11-16.[72] This may reflect an attempt to compare like-to-like,[73] but it does not take account of the difference in genre between these corpora. Leviticus 6-7 and 11-15 explicitly define themselves as *tôrōt* (Lev 6:2, 7, 18; 7:1, 7, 11; 11:46; 12:7; 13:59; 14:2, 32, 54, 57; 15:32), whereas nothing in Leviticus 17-26 is described this way. The different language used in these various corpora may reflect a generic differences rather than a difference in authorial outlook.

When we turn to Leviticus 1-7, 11-16 against the global background of P, we in fact find an inversion of the usual observation. Rather than the Holiness Code showing an increased concentration of 1st person divine speech against the rest of the Priestly text, we instead find that Leviticus 1-16 represent a radical decrease in the amount of 1st person divine speech when compared to the rest of P. Leviticus 1-7 contains 9 divine speeches across 159 verses in which Yhwh uses the 1st person only 4 times (6:10; 7:34) and refers to himself in the 3rd person 72 times.[74] Leviticus 11-16 contains 7 divine speeches across 232 verses in which Yhwh uses the 1st

[71] Lev 17-25 (**17** speeches of **270** verses with **158** references to Yhwh; **289** total verses in unit**)—**1st verb (**41**), 1st suffix (**42**), 3rd verb (**0**), 3rd reference (**75**).
[72] Milgrom 1991; 2000; Knohl 1995: 46 defines "the central corpus" of P as Exodus 25-30, Leviticus 1-16, but Knohl also reattributes several major sections in 25-30 to H rather than P.
[73] E.g., Knohl 1995: 59 constrains himself to comparing "texts dealing with belief and the cult."
[74] See Appendix 3.2 and 3.2a for the tables of data on which this discussion is based.

person only 6 times (11:44, 45; 14:34; 15:31 16:2) and refers to himself in the 3rd person 21 times. This is the corpus that demands explanation for its divine speech, not Leviticus 17-26.

Our analysis above, however, already suggests the answer to the curious state of divine speech in the first part of Leviticus. Sacrifice constitutes the primary subject matter of Leviticus 1-7, and the extensive use of 3rd person reference in those chapters aligns with what we have seen elsewhere in Leviticus and in Exodus. That is to say, it is not that Leviticus 1-7 happen to be about sacrifice and also happen to have Yhwh refer to himself in the 3rd person frequently—these are not coincidental features. They are, rather, correlative ones. Whether in Leviticus 17-26 or Exodus 25-31, this type of 3rd person reference predominates when sacrifice is the subject. In contrast, 1st person reference in sacrificial contexts is incredibly rare (Lev 6:10; 22:2; Num 18:8-9).[75] Leviticus 1-7 simply adheres to this pattern, but the subject matter is more concentrated here than in those other groups of chapters.

When we turn to Leviticus 11-16, we see the same pattern play out. This is especially clear when comparing the diagnostic manual for skin disease in Leviticus 13 with its related purification manual in Leviticus 14. Leviticus 13 contains not a single use of the 3rd person in its divine speech, while Leviticus 14 contains 9 uses in its first speech, dealing with the purification of humans (Lev 14:11, 12, 16, 18, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31). We find none, however, in its second speech, which details the purification of buildings and does not require sacrifice. The pattern holds for the rest of these chapters as well. The concentration of 3rd person self-reference in Leviticus 1-16 is explicable by its content.

However, the relative absence of the 1st person in these speeches still demands an explanation. For the moment, we will only make a general observation. The majority of these 1st

[75] There is no 1st person equivalent לִי or לְפָנַי to the standard sacrificial לִי׳ or לִפְנֵי י׳ (Compare Appendices 3.2a and 3.2b). Exod 25:30 (cf. Lev 24:6-9) comes closest.

person passages occur at the end of the speech with which they are associated (Lev 6:10; 7:34; 11:44-45; 15:31), which is in line with the clustering of 1st person language at the beginnings and ends of speeches in Leviticus 17-26.[76] The 1st person statement that opens the speech at Lev 14:34 is mirrored by other similar passages (Lev 18:3; 20:22; 23:1; 25:2). In other words, the types of usage of the 1st person in Leviticus 1-16 are consonant with its uses elsewhere—only the density is different. Until we understand the generic and contextual issues that may trigger these uses, we can not use a difference in density to identify this material as foreign to the rest of P. We will touch on this issue again in our discussion of paraenetic language in Leviticus 17-26. But, before we move on to that topic, we must deal with one final aspect of the argument about the use of the 1st person in Leviticus 17-26—the use of the phrase אני י׳.[77]

The distribution of the phrase "I am Yhwh" with its various complements presents a different pattern than the other uses of the 1st person in Leviticus 17-26. This phrase occurs 50 times in Leviticus 17-26 and only 24 times in the rest of the Priestly text.[78] It also occurs in every chapter of the Holiness Code except Leviticus 17. It is thus both concentrated within and widely distributed throughout these chapters in such a way that might suggest that they constitute a distinctive corpus.[79] As we have repeatedly done above, we must evaluate the possibility raised by quantitative data against the contextual usage of this phrase, testing for qualitative differences between its use in Leviticus 17-26 and the rest of the Priestly text.

[76] 18:1-5, 24-30; 19:2, 37; 20:1-8, 22-26; 22:2, 31-33; 23:2-3; 25:2, 55-26:2.
[77] #1-3 in Appendix 3.1.
[78] See Appendix 3.3 for a full list of occurrences.
[79] Knohl 1995 problematically makes widespread use of this phrase for attributing passages to H rather than P. E.g., 1995: 15 ("…a verse that is shown to be of HS origins by the closing words אני ה׳ מקדשכם"), 16 ("…concludes with אני ה׳, the distinguishing concluding formula of HS"), 17 n. 24, 52, passim. As often, he assumes that because something appears in H, it must always be H wherever it appears.

When we survey the use of אני יי in the Priestly text in Genesis and Exodus, we find its first three appearances occurring at pivotal moments in P's narrative (Gen 17:1; 35:11; Exod 6:2).[80] The use of this phrase in such heightened moments—the covenant of circumcision with Abraham, the blessing of Jacob and his renaming as Israel, and the revelation of the divine personal name to Moses—suggests that it marks an important motif for the Priestly author. This importance is highlighted by Yhwh's explicitly recalling his revelation to the patriarchs when he first speaks to Moses (Exod 6:2-3).[81] Yhwh then tells Moses to proclaim this statement to the Israelites as his first act as Yhwh's mouthpiece, using the declaration as a prelude to the announcement of the imminent exodus (Exod 6:6). These occurrences make it clear that this phrase constitutes an important part of the narrative movement from the patriarchal to the Mosaic period in the Priestly text.

In the Exodus account, the Priestly author continues to use this phrase, frequently embedded in Yhwh's declaration that "you/they will know that I am Yhwh" (Exod 6:7; 7:5; 14:4, 18; 16:12). The phrase serves a narrative purpose in this capacity as well, expressing Yhwh's revelation of his might to the Israelites and Egyptians alike, which culminates in his judgment on the Egyptian gods and his deliverance of the Israelites (Exod 12:12; 14:4, 17-18). This motif is brought to its conclusion at the construction of the Tabernacle, in which Yhwh declares for the final time that the Israelites "will know that I am their god who brought them from the land of Egypt in order to dwell in their midst. I am Yhwh, their god" (Exod 29:46). With the descent of the *kābôd* into the Tabernacle (Exod 40:34) and its appearance to the Israelites at the inaugural

[80] For a full discussion of this phrase's relationship to the Abrahamic promises and the Priestly narrative, see Chapter 6.

[81] For an excellent analysis of the grammar of this passage, see Garr 1992. Note as well that Jacob retells the story of El Shadday's appearance to Joseph in Gen 48:3-4.

service (Lev 9:4, 23-24), the Israelites know their god. Making good narrative sense, we do not see this particular use of the phrase after this point.

What emerges in the Tabernacle instructions is a new theme associated with a new complement to the phrase. This theme is introduced alongside the command in Exod 31:13, when Yhwh says that the Sabbath will serve as a sign between himself and the Israelites for their future generations "to know that I am Yhwh, the one sanctifying you (*qdš* D)." This statement combines the final appearance of the "knowing" theme in Exodus with the first appearance of this new claim that Yhwh is the sanctifier of Israel.[82]

Yhwh's claim to this role in the context of the Sabbath command echoes his earlier sanctification of the seventh day in Gen 2:3. This passage also serves as the crescendo of the Tabernacle instructions, which contain the first uses of the verb *qdš* since the creation account. Yhwh has spoken already of his role in sanctifying the Tabernacle and the priesthood as part of his intention to meet with (*yʿd* N *lə*) the Israelites (Exod 29:43-44).[83] That these instructions would come to a close with the sanctification of the Israelites so that they would be equally prepared for this meeting makes for a coherent narrative (cf. Exod 19:9-11, 14, 21-23). Moreover, this parallelism is matched by other parallels that scholars have long noted between the Tabernacle and creation narratives in P.[84] The deployment of the phrase "I am Yhwh" in a fashion that combines the preceding motif of "knowing Yhwh" with a new concept of Yhwh sanctifying Israel, which itself participates in the Tabernacle instruction's connection to the creation account, demonstrates the way that this phrase is enmeshed within the larger plot of the Priestly narrative.

---

[82] See discussion below on this passage's putative relationship with H.
[83] The statement that the Tabernacle will be sanctified by Yhwh's *kābôd* finds fulfillment in Exod 40:34-35.
[84] See Stackert 2023 for a review of prior scholars' views on what this relationship means and for a new analysis of this relationship. See also Hundley 2011 for a thorough study of the Tabernacle service that accords with Stackert's argument for the difficulty with which Yhwh maintains his presence on earth.

The next occurrence of this phrase—the last before Leviticus 17-26—also participates in this theme of Yhwh's relationship with Israel and holiness. This statement comes at the close of the pure and unclean animal list in Leviticus 11, and implores the Israelites to be holy just as Yhwh is holy, stating that he is the one who "brought you up from the land of Egypt to become god for you" (Lev 11:44-45). This reprises a theme from the patriarchal promises of Genesis, where Yhwh states that he will be a god to the Israelites and they will be his people (Gen 17:7). This promise is repeated in the first message Yhwh commissions Moses to give (Exod 6:7) and is integrated into the declaration of the Tabernacle's purpose (Exod 29:45).[85] These verses, like the ones in Exodus 31, seem to participate in and further the Priestly narrative of Yhwh's relationship with Israel.[86]

Despite the strong connections between these statements and the larger plot of the Priestly text, several scholars have argued that the latter two occurrences (Exod 31:13; Lev 11:44-45) are interpolations into the Priestly text that belong to H rather than P.[87] All of the arguments in favor of these positions require one to have already accepted the premise that Leviticus 17-26 are so distinct from the rest of the Priestly text that we must explain any similarity to these chapters as the product of imitation or redaction. The traditional model that held that P used a collection H in its compilation either noted these as imitations of the older H or argued that these were fragments from H used by P.[88] The Knohl/Milgrom model that views H as a later supplement to P instead uses passages like these to prove that H edited P instead of the

[85] For further discussion of the role of this promise in the Priestly narrative, see Chapter 6.
[86] Against the conclusions in Feldman 2018: 177-180. See also the following discussion.
[87] See Knohl 1995: 15-16; Olyan 2005; Stackert 2011 on Exod 31:12-17; see also Propp 2006: 367's note that the phrase *šmr…lʿśwt* is more characteristic of Deuteronomy than P, though *šmr* and *ʿśh* are used in parallel in Leviticus 17-26. On Lev 11:44-45, see Kuenen 1886: 278 (who argues that Lev 11: 1-23, 41-47 originally followed 20:25); Driver 1910: 58-59; Noth 1965: 96; Milgrom 1991: 63, 683-688, 694-696; Knohl 1995: 69; Nihan 2007: 298-299.
[88] See n. 3 above.

other way around.[89] What neither approach offers is an argument for why these "H phrases" can not have also been used by P.

As we noted above in reference to the terminological arguments, the position that sees any similarity to Leviticus 17-26 as automatically indicative of the presence of a distinctive worldview must always assume its conclusion. One can not argue against it—not because it is a strong argument, but because it is not an argument. When any sign that P and H agree is automatically reattributed to H, there is no counterargument available. What we are left with, again, are two competing explanations for the presence of H-like passages in the Priestly text. We can either attribute these to a compositional model that sees the supplementation of the Priestly text by a later editor or we can attribute these to a single compositional horizon in which the Priestly author developed his ideas in accordance with the unfolding of the plot of his narrative and in accordance with his arrangement of the non-narrative material embedded in that narrative. We have offered the plot-based analysis above and scholars will have to determine whether they find it more or less useful than the redaction model as an explanatory mechanism for the data at hand.

In favor of our analysis here we can also offer further arguments concerning both Exod 31:12-17 and Lev 11:44-45. In the case of Exod 31:12-17, both Olyan and Stackert have offered far more nuanced approaches to these verses than that offered by Knohl.[90] In contrast to Knohl's wholesale attribution of this speech to H, Olyan and Stackert instead argue that this text is a

[89] See n. 87 above.

[90] Knohl 1995: 15-16 argues that Exod 31:12-17 should be attributed to H based on the occurrence of the phrase אני יי מקדשכם. However, nowhere does he argue that this phrase/idea is so unique that it must be attributed to H and can not be used by P as well (another example in which Knohl appears to assume his conclusion in order to prove his conclusion). Knohl also notes the similarity between this passage and Lev 23:3, but nowhere addresses why we should be surprised that Sabbath passages describe the Sabbath in similar ways.

composite text made up of both H and P material.[91] Nevertheless, as Stackert himself argues, Olyan's approach to the text is ultimately unsatisfactory in its dependence on "style" as a criterion.[92]

Stackert's own proposal offers guidelines for a better compositional approach. He first suggests that we should always begin with an assumption of unity and that recourse to stratification can only be licensed when we can not read a passage coherently.[93] He furthermore argues that stylistic evidence and terminological evidence should always play a "secondary, corroborative evidentiary position."[94] This methodology ensures that any recourse to stratification is motivated by the text itself, rather than bringing the assumption of stratification into the text from the outset. Such a careful approach aligns well with our own principles of secondary analysis, ensuring that the narrative of the Priestly text maintains a central role in our analysis.

When Stackert turns to the Tabernacle Sabbath speech (Exod 31:12-17), he identifies a lone point of disunity in the fact that Exod 31:13 makes reference to "my Sabbaths" and 31:14 to "the Sabbath." According to Stackert, these references "presume prior knowledge of the Sabbath and thereby short-circuit P's claim of Israelite ignorance of the Sabbath."[95] There are two issues with his identification of disunity in this speech. In the first case, we should note that his argument that the Israelites are ignorant of the Sabbath in the Priestly text prior to this speech is dependent on Baden's idiosyncratic argument that the Priestly manna narrative in Exodus 16*

[91] Olyan 2005 attributes Exod 31:16-17 to P and 31:12-15 to H. Stackert 2011 identifies Exod 31:12-13a, 15*-17 as P and 31:13b-14, 15* as H. See Figure 3.1.
[92] Stackert 2011: 9, 12; cf. Olyan 2005: 203-205.
[93] Stackert 2011: 12.
[94] 2011: 12.
[95] Stackert 2011: 16. Stackert follows this identification of disunity with the more typical stylistic and terminological analyses, though he also acknowledges that certain issues, such as the shift in grammatical person, are not universally probative for identifying compositeness.

has been moved by the Redactor from a theoretically original post-Sinai position.[96] For those who reject Baden's proposal, the Sabbath has already been introduced in the manna story and so there is no tension at all in Yhwh's reference to it as "my Sabbaths" and "the Sabbath."[97]

However, even granting Baden's relocation of the Priestly manna story, there is no reason to take the references to the Sabbath in Exod 31:13-14 as presuming prior knowledge. Such a reading is contraindicated by other introductions of new topics with the phrase "my X" in the Priestly text. For example, the first mention of a covenant in P occurs in Yhwh's speech to Noah when he states that "I will establish my covenant with you" (Gen 6:18). Neither the narrator nor Yhwh have spoken of this covenant before. This same introduction occurs when the covenant of circumcision is introduced to Abraham, who Yhwh likewise tells "I will establish my covenant between me and you" (Gen 17:7). This is the first time that Yhwh even speaks to Abraham, yet his ignorance of Yhwh's covenant does not prevent the Priestly author from having Yhwh refer to it in these terms. There is, then, no reason for us to assume that the Priestly author could not have Yhwh also introduce the Sabbath, at its first occurrence, as "my Sabbaths" as in Exod 31:13.[98] The use of such a definite, possessive phrase does not indicate prior knowledge on the part of the audience in the narrative.

There is an additional problem with Stackert's proposal that the H supplementer has added Exod 31:13b-14 to a pre-existing Priestly text concerning the Sabbath. If we grant the argument that the expression "my Sabbaths" indicates the prior knowledge of the Israelites and that this contradicts the Priestly narrative's presentation in which the Israelites have never heard

[96] Stackert 2011: 14 n. 49; Baden 2010.
[97] See discussion of this proposal in Chapter 6. In brief, Baden's proposal creates as many problems as it solves in terms of the Priestly narrative, dismisses the Priestly author's use of achronological and proleptic narrative throughout P, and requires us to imagine an unparalleled operation by the Redactor.
[98] For further discussion on whether there is an ideological/theological difference in how P and H view the Sabbath, see discussion below.

of the Sabbath prior to this speech—both contraindicated by the Priestly text itself—then we must characterize the H supplementer as a poor reader of P. To avoid contradicting the Priestly text's narrative, on Stackert's reading, all the H supplementer would have had to do is place his addition subsequent to rather than prior to P's own introduction of the Sabbath in Exod 31:12-13a, 15-16 (see Figure 3.1).

31:12	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר׃
31:13a	וְאַתָּה דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר
31:15[99]	שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים֙ יֵעָשֶׂה מְלָאכָ֔ה וּבַיּ֥וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֖י שַׁבַּ֣ת [**שַׁבָּתוֹן קֹדֶשׁ**] לַיהוָ֑ה כָּל־הָעֹשֶׂ֤ה מְלָאכָה֙ בְּי֣וֹם הַשַּׁבָּ֔ת [**מוֹת**] יוּמָֽת׃
31:16	וְשָׁמְר֥וּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּ֑ת לַעֲשׂ֤וֹת אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת֙ לְדֹרֹתָ֔ם בְּרִ֥ית עוֹלָֽם׃
31:13b	אַךְ֙ אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתַ֣י תִּשְׁמֹ֔רוּ כִּ֣י אֹ֔ות הִ֥וא בֵּינִ֖י וּבֵינֵיכֶ֑ם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶ֔ם לָדַ֣עַת כִּ֔י אֲנִ֖י יְהוָ֥ה מְקַדִּשְׁכֶֽם׃
31:14	וּשְׁמַרְתֶּ֥ם אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּ֖ת כִּ֣י קֹ֑דֶשׁ הִ֚וא לָכֶ֔ם מְחַלְלֶ֖יהָ מֹ֣ות יוּמָ֑ת כִּ֣י כָל־הָעֹשֶׂ֤ה בָהּ֙ מְלָאכָ֔ה וְנִכְרְתָ֥ה הַנֶּ֖פֶשׁ הַהִ֥וא מִקֶּ֖רֶב עַמֶּֽיהָ׃
31:17[100]	בֵּינִ֣י וּבֵין֮ בְּנֵי֒ יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ אֹ֣ות הִ֔וא לְעֹלָ֑ם כִּי־שֵׁ֨שֶׁת יָמִ֜ים עָשָׂ֣ה יְהוָ֗ה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַ֛יִם וְאֶת־הָאָ֖רֶץ וּבַיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֔י שָׁבַ֖ת וַיִּנָּפַֽשׁ׃

Figure 3.1: Revised Exod 31:12-17 (H passages in bold)

Stackert does not offer an explanation for why an H reviser of P would have acted in what he argues is a clear contradiction to P's narrative, especially when there were other options available. This is especially difficult to understand since the H editor does not have an alternative

[99] The items in bold and brackets in Exod 31:15 are also attributed by Stackert 2011: 17-19 to the H supplementer of P. Stackert's identification of this material as a supplement—the words *šabbatôn qōdeš* and *môt*—are based solely on the terminological and stylistic criteria that Stackert himself states should only be invoked secondarily. There is nothing in Exod 31:15 itself to suggest that these items are out of place nor is there any problem reading the verse coherently. Stackert bolsters his claim here by comparing Exod 31:15 to 35:2, arguing that the variations in formulation between the two verses constitute further evidence of the supplementation of Exod 31:15. This, however, assumes a level of formulaic consistency that the Priestly author simply does not display (see discussions in Chapters 1 and 5). Even more confounding, Stackert explicitly describes the H additions in both Exod 31:15 and 35:2 as "inconsistent interjection" while expecting the P text to be "consistent and coherent" (2011: 18-19). Stackert does not explain why P must be consistent and coherent but the H redactor is allowed to be inconsistent. Finally, Stackert's analysis of these passages fails to take into account their distinctive narrative features, such as the different speakers (Yhwh versus Moses) and audiences (Moses versus the Israelites) of each. On Stackert's own method, then, there is no reason to suppose H interference in either Exod 31:15 or 35:2.

[100] Stackert 2011: 17 n. 58 argues that *wayyinnāpēš* is a redactional addition. The arguments in Stackert 2011: 16-17 attribute Exod 31:17 to P rather than H. However, the source assignment given on 2011: 19-20 mistakenly (?) attributes 31:17 (minus *wynpš*) to H.

narrative of Yhwh's revelation of the Sabbath, as he is only supplementing the Priestly narrative. We must conclude that the H editor either misunderstood P or was too careless to make sure that his intervention was consonant with the text he was revising. Neither is a particularly satisfactory hypothesis. Given these problems with supposing an H supplementer and absent the disunity that Stackert poses as the prerequisite for positing stratification, we are left to conclude that this passage should be regarded as a unity—one which, as Stackert himself argues, is connected to the larger Priestly narrative.[101]

When we turn to Yhwh's self-declaration and command for the Israelites to be holy that closes the list of clean and impure animals (Lev 11:44-45), we again encounter the contention that this passage originates from the H redactor's supplementation of a part of the Priestly text.[102] Milgrom goes so far as to claim that the idea that the Israelites should be holy "is assiduously avoided—and, by implication, denied—by P."[103] However, there is a compelling reason to understand the call to holiness as a native element of the dietary laws in Leviticus 11. When we compare this chapter to the other dietary laws in the Bible, we find that both of them associate foodways with holiness. Exod 22:30 states, "You will be men of holiness to me and you will not eat flesh, carrion in the field; to the dog you will throw it." This is the only occurrence of the root *qdš* in the Covenant Code. Similarly, Deut 14:21 closes its own list of dietary restrictions by stating "you will not eat any corpse…because you are a holy people to Yhwh your god." It is unclear why the Priestly author, and the Priestly author alone, could not speak of holiness in association with dietary laws.[104] In light of the comparative data from other codes, we should

[101] Stackert 2011: 13-16.
[102] See n. 87 above.
[103] 1991: 686-687. He only arrives at this conclusion because he has reattributed all mentions of the sanctification of the Israelites to H on the assumption that only H is interested in this type of holiness. The circularity of the argument is apparent (any references to the holiness of the Israelites must be H, therefore there is no reference to the holiness of the Israelites in P). See also Knohl 1995: 180-186 for similar conclusions.
[104] See also Lev 20:25-26 which also associates dietary restrictions with holiness.

allow the Priestly author to have likewise seen a connection between the holiness of Israel and their dietary taboos. In the case of both Exod 31:12-17 and Lev 11:44-45, then, we have both narrative and non-narrative reasons to be skeptical of the reattribution of their divine self-declarations to an H supplementor.

When we turn to the divine self-declarations in Leviticus 17-26, we find continuity rather than disruption. Leviticus 19 opens with the statement that "you will be holy because I, Yhwh your god, am holy," echoing language we have already seen in Leviticus 11.[105] These chapters further develop the narrative associated with the sanctification of Israel by repeated use of the phrase "I am Yhwh, the one sanctifying you/him/them."[106] In other words, Leviticus 17-26 do not introduce a new theme of holiness into the אני י expression, but contribute further definition to a theme already nascent in earlier parts of the Priestly text (Exod 31:12-17; Lev 11:44-45). Tellingly, the sanctification of the Israelites registers not just in divine speech, but in the Priestly narrative, with Korah using this in his claim against Mosaic and Aaronid authority (Num 16:3).[107] This narrative presupposes the sanctification of the Israelites that Exod 31:12-17, Lev 11:44-45, and Leviticus 17-26 all attribute to Yhwh's instructions given at Sinai.

Furthermore, the development of this theme has been forecast by the Priestly writer in his description of the role of the priests in Lev 10:10, "to distinguish between the holy and the profane, and between the unclean and the pure." Having first dealt with the pure and unclean (Leviticus 11-15), the subject turns to the holy and profane (Leviticus 18-22).[108] As we discussed in chapter 2, Lev 10:10 and the arrangement of the following material show every sign of being

[105] See also Lev 20:26; 21:8.
[106] Lev 20:8; 21:8, 23; 22:9, 16, 32-33.
[107] See further discussion in Chapter 6.
[108] The issue of holiness does not extend throughout the Holiness Code, despite its name, but is a particular feature of Leviticus 18-22. See the discussion on the formal/structural argument and the integrity of the Holiness Code below.

an intentional compositional device, an argument, in the poetic sense, from the Priestly author describing what comes next in his text.[109] Leviticus 16 even functions perfectly as a hinge between these two panels, embracing atonement for both the purity issues of 11-15 (16:11-20) and from the sins and misdeeds that will be described in 18-22 (16:21-24).[110] Leviticus 17-26 and their use of the "I am Yhwh" phrase appear well integrated into the Priestly narrative in this regard. In other words, the development of this theme pervades the Priestly Sinai narrative, continuous over supposed H and non-H contexts, unfolding in accordance with the progress of the Priestly author's narrative arrangement of his non-narrative materials. While the Knohl-Milgrom model would explain this continuity via the redaction of P by H, it is unclear why this is a necessary or preferable hypothesis to explain the features we have explored here.

In addition to this narrative function, the phrase אני יי is also deployed rhetorically. In the Priestly material in Genesis and Exodus, it opens speeches (Gen 17:1; Exod 6:2; cf. Gen 35:10-12), expresses emphasis (Exod 12:12; 29:46b), and marks the end of a speech (Exod 6:8). When we turn to Leviticus 17-26, we immediately see the continuing rhetorical use of this phrase. Just as in the Priestly text leading up to the Holiness Code, this phrase opens a speech (Lev 18:2), emphasizes points (e.g., 18:5; 19:18; 21:12), and closes speeches (18:30; 22:16, 33b; 23:22, 43; 24:22; 26:45). Except for opening a speech, these uses are denser in Leviticus 17-26, but, as we observed above, this is easily explained by the greater density of divine speeches in these chapters than in other parts of the Priestly text. Otherwise, these rhetorical uses align with what we find in the rest of the Priestly text.

---

[109] Sun 1990: 491-493; Smith 1996: 24; Ruwe 1999: 49-52; Nihan 2007: 93-94. See also Wagner 1974: 309-314, who understands the same theme to pervade 11-22 as a group. Further discussion below.

[110] Blum 1990: 318; Crüsemann 1996: 278-279. See Feldman 2018: 221-295 for an extensive and compelling argument that Leviticus 17 shows no signs of being part of the Holiness Code and that it should instead be understood in connection to Leviticus 16. See also discussion below.

We do, however, also find new uses of the expression "I am Yhwh" in Leviticus 17-26. One of them is its use to punctuate individual commands. This occurs in Leviticus 19, where the phrase appears 16 times (32% of all occurrences in Leviticus 17-26), of which 14 are used as a kind of refrain.[111] This is not a defining feature of all of Leviticus 17-26, though, but a characteristic of Leviticus 19 alone. Its presence in this chapter is likely contextual, conditioned by the sheer variety of types of instructions that this divine speech contains.[112]

Finally, we see frequent use of this phrase in an explanatory fashion—the audience is told to do certain things "because I am Yhwh" or "because I, Yhwh…"[113] Sometimes, this simply repeats information we have from elsewhere, such as when Yhwh states that he is the one who sanctifies priests (Lev 21:8, 15, 23; cf. Exod 29:44) or that he is holy, so Israel should be too (Lev 19:2; 20:26; cf. Lev 11:44-45). The broader use of this phrase seems to be exhortative, providing motivation for the various audiences, priest and lay alike, to keep the commands that Yhwh has given.[114] As such, this is a feature of the paraenetic tone of Leviticus 17-26 and we will address it when we come, shortly, to this issue.

We have again found that a supposed distinctive feature of Leviticus 17-26 is, in fact, shared with the Priestly text. The difference appears largely quantitative, due to the concentration of divine speech in these chapters, rather than qualitative. Where differences arise in how the phrase is used, they can be explained by the context in which they occur. Most importantly, the

---

[111] Lev 19:3, 4, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36. A similar use possibly appears in Lev 22: 3, 8, 9. Schwartz 1999: 275 also recognizes the nature of this statement as a refrain in Leviticus 19, arguing that it transforms this chapter into a kind of litany in which the divine self-declaration is the central focus.

[112] Schwartz 1999: 272-273 suggests that its use in this chapter rhetorically strengthens the impact of the associated commands, but cautions that each deployment of this phrase must be weighed in association with its full context. Milgrom 2000: 1517-1518, 1611-1612 argues that, at least sometimes, *ʾny yhwh* should be understood as an equivalent to the statement *nəʾum yhwh* found in the prophets and that it serves to remind the audience of the ultimate source of these laws. His further claim that this reminder is necessary because the laws in Leviticus 19 "are unenforceable in human courts" (1612) pushes too far—issues such as theft (19:11), miscarriage of justice (19:15), prostitution of a daughter (19:18), consulting mediums (19:31), using inaccurate measures (19:35-36), and others could be adjudicated in court settings.

[113] Lev 19:2; 20:26; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:16; 24:22; 25:17; 26:1, 44.

[114] For further discussion of the idea of Israel as Yhwh's people in P, see Chapter 6.

phrase "I am Yhwh" forms an important part of the Priestly text's narrative. We have also found that the phrase's use in Leviticus 17-26 develops themes that already occur in the Priestly text in Exod 31:13 and Lev 11:44-45. One could, in fact, argue that this statement is narratively empty of content without Yhwh's promise to be god to the Israelites as described in the Priestly text (Gen 17:7; Exod 6:7; 29:45).

This is consonant with the use of the phrase in the Priestly text in Genesis and Exodus, where it serves as a vehicle signifying important narrative motifs, the revelation of Yhwh to the patriarchs and Moses as well as the Egyptians and Israelites coming to know him. The knowing motif transitions into the sanctification motif (Exod 31:13), then finds its elaboration in Leviticus 17-26. This suggests that these chapters are deeply contextualized into the Priestly text, and their integration is signaled by Lev 10:10's laying out of the structure of the rest of Leviticus.[115]

As a final observation about the phrase אני יי, we again find that, as with the other 1st person expressions, Leviticus 1-16 are more conspicuous by the relative absence of this expression than Leviticus 17-26 are by its relative presence. However, we can again look to the sacrificial genre of Leviticus 1-7 for the answer. Even Leviticus 19, which is otherwise replete with this expression, does not use it with either of the sacrificial commands that occur within it (Lev 19:5-8, 20-22). The speech concerning animals unfit for sacrifice also does not use this phrase (22:17-25). The regulations concerning the menorah and the *pānîm* bread similarly lack the expression (24:1-9). These data indicate that there are particular settings in which the divine self-declaration would not be at home, namely ritual contexts. Notably, the absence of this phrase in such contexts is consistent both within and outside of the so-called Holiness Code.

[115] For further exploration of this phrase's relationship with themes in the Priestly text, see Joosten 1996: 93-107.

The purity content of Leviticus 11-15 may have similar generic constraints. While food laws could be associated with holiness and so deploy this phrase (Lev 11:44-45; 20:25-26; 22:8), other purity topics may not have been as amenable. This is sensible if the phrase is meant to be exhortative, as most other forms of impurity are involuntarily contracted. The distribution of the statement "I am Yhwh" in Leviticus 22:1-8 may provide some insight into this issue. The general statement that priests should not eat while impure—a voluntary choice—is qualified by this phrase (Lev 22:3), as is the impurity contracted through food consumption (22:8). However, the intervening material, which describes the contraction of impurity and how to handle it does not use this expression (22:4-7). Further assessment of the validity of this observation, must wait for our larger survey of the paraenetic tone of Leviticus 17-26.

The above review of the phrase **אני ה׳** weighs heavily against attempts to identify this phrase as characteristic of a theoretical Holiness Code, and we certainly should not accept Knohl's contention that this is a Holiness addition to P in almost every case that it occurs, including in the revelation to Moses in Exod 6:2-8.[116] This forces him to the nonsensical conclusion that the Priestly author has Yhwh speak in distinctly different ways in the Patriarchal and Mosaic periods, moving from a personal to an impersonal mode of communication with humans.[117] Such a position is unsupported by the data and robs the Priestly text of narrative development by having the change to Yhwh simply happen without announcement.[118] This violates our principle of secondary analysis, described in Chapter 1, that narrative explanations for a feature under investigation can only be overturned by sufficiently robust data supporting a

[116] Knohl 1995: 17 n. 23, 61-63.
[117] Knohl 1995: 107, 124-128, 168-175. See Nihan 2007: 34, n. 72 for further critique.
[118] Knohl 1995: 124-125 acknowledges the change from *ʾĕlōhîm* to *ʾēl šaddāy* to *yhwh* in the Priestly text, but there is no narrative element to this, as in his reconstruction the Name simply begins to be used in the Priestly text in Exod 6:13 (which, according to 1995: 61, n. 4, originally followed Exod 2:23-25 and preceded 7:8-13. Exod 6:2-8 and 7:1-6 are attributed to H). This position was carried to its natural conclusion in King 2009.

compositional explanation. Knohl does not offer such support, and we have not found any in our investigation here.[119]

Yet, even if we lay aside Knohl's extreme position, attempts to attribute the narrative consistency and regular deployment of the divine self-declaration to the Knohl-Milgrom model's view of an H re-edition of P do not have much to recommend them. We are again confronted with two competing ways of organizing our data. The Knohl-Milgrom model would see this phrase as indicative of a distinctive perspective that is not native to the Priestly text. However, in order to maintain this stance, they must reattribute some number of these phrases that occur in non-H contexts to an H editor. This is, as we have repeatedly stated, an inherently circular position. It is unclear why we should view H as so distinctive as to require the reattribution of statements in P contexts to an editor in this model. On the other hand, our own proposal takes a global view of P that does not presuppose the distinctiveness of Leviticus 17-26. From this perspective, we have seen the narrative integration of the divine self-declarations of the Holiness Code into the larger Priestly text. Additionally, we have seen that the theoretical distinctive uses of this phrase in Leviticus 17-26 are either not distinctive or contextually determined and limited in distribution. Such consistency and coherence is most easily attributable to a single compositional horizon.[120] Absent further evidence for the distinctiveness of Leviticus 17-26, nothing in our analysis requires the presupposition of an editorial layer to explain the distribution and uses of the phrase אני יי throughout the Priestly text including the putative Holiness Code.

The final argument that a distinctive mode of divine speech is present in Leviticus 17-26 relates not to countable items, such as vocabulary or 1st person expressions, but to a more general

[119] Crüsemann 1996: 281 offers this about such positions: "The question of the inner unity of the text should be of equal importance to that of potential stratification. Careless preference for literary-critical operations over structural analysis and exegesis of content is methodological stupidity."
[120] Stackert 2011: 12.

style of speaking.[121] The various sections that make up Leviticus 17-26 abound with explanatory and motivational asides, a characteristic that P lacks according to some.[122] As we have done above, we will evaluate this claim against a global view of the Priestly text.

In Genesis, the first two prohibitions that Yhwh gives are the ban on eating blood and on murder (Gen 9:4-6).[123] The ban on murder is accompanied first of all by an exhortative statement—that Yhwh (in the 1st person) will seek requital for the murder from the hand of the one spilling blood, whether human or animal (Gen 9:5). This is followed by an explanation for why murder is forbidden and must be requited, "because in the image of god he made humans" (Gen 9:6). The entire passage appears similar to what we find in Leviticus 17-26—a command, explanatory statement, and promise of punishment.[124]

The covenant of circumcision with Abraham also contains elements similar to what we see in Leviticus 17-26. The speech begins with Yhwh commanding Abraham "to walk about before me and be whole (*tāmîm*)" (Gen 17:1), which formally—though not semantically—parallels the command to the Israelites to "be holy" (Lev 19:2). After describing the promises of the covenant and how to keep it (Gen 17:4-14), Yhwh states that any transgressor will be punished because "he broke my covenant" (17:14). The use of the 1st person suffix on "my covenant" in an exhortative statement mirrors the use of "my statutes and my judgments" seen in

[121] Though see #2, 6-8 for some countable samples of this kind of discourse.
[122] E.g., Driver 1910: 48: "…the prominence given to particular principles and motives: the parenetic framework with which the laws have, in certain cases, been provided is also contrary to P.'s usual style." See also Knohl 1995: 106; Milgrom 2000: 1371-1375; Baden 2009a and entries in n. 7 above. For a more general overview of how this paraenetic style functions within Leviticus 17-26, see Joosten 1996: 194-196.
[123] Yhwh does not provide an explanation for the ban on blood consumption, but Lev 17:12 may make direct reference to this command (for a similar understanding of this verse and its use of the suffix conjugation *ʾāmartî*, see Feldman 2018: 278-279).
[124] Compare Gen 9:4-6 to Lev 17:10-12.

Leviticus 17-26.[125] Again we find similarities between the presentation of Yhwh's commands in P and what we see in the Holiness Code.

The long speech in Exodus 25:1-30:10 also contains an explanatory aside, as Yhwh triumphantly explains the purpose of the Tabernacle (Exod 29:42-46). He tells the Israelites that he brought them out of Egypt "in order for me to dwell (*škn*) in their midst" (29:46). While these types of explanation are rare in the body of Leviticus 11-15, this collection closes with a broad explanation for why the purity regulations as a whole should be kept (Lev 15:31). As we discussed above, Leviticus 11 also closes with a paraenetic statement that echoes similar sayings in Leviticus 17-26. In Numbers, the command to set up cities of refuge is accompanied by an exhortation to keep the land free from blood pollution (Num 35:33-34). As we have found before, the feature that sets Leviticus 17-26 apart is not, then, the presence of an element not found in P, but the concentration of a particular mode of expression.

As Erhard Blum has observed, this distribution is easily explained by the context in which paraenesis occurs—it is only necessary to use this kind of explanatory and exhortative language in cases where there is a possibility of intentional violation.[126] This aligns with our analysis of the use of the expression אני יי above. One can choose to murder or not, one can choose to circumcise or not, one can choose to eat unclean animals or not. And, while one can not help but contract many forms of impurity as described in Leviticus 12-15, one can make a choice about whether to undertake the proper purification techniques or whether to enter the sacred precinct while impure—precisely what the warning in Lev 15:31 concerns.[127] The

[125] #8 in Appendix 3.1.
[126] Blum 1990: 318-322; 2009: 38-39.
[127] Milgrom 1976; 1991: 254-258, 316-317, 945-947. For this author, Gane 2005; idem 2008's critiques of Milgrom's approach are persuasive and there is no reason to think that purification offerings were intended solely for the benefit of the sanctuary rather than the person. Lev 12:4 further shows that entry into the sanctuary during a period of *ṭāmēʾ* was perceived as something to be avoided. Comparative evidence from the Greek world (Lupu

increase in paraenesis in Leviticus 17-26 is again a function of context and the type of commands dealt with in those chapters.[128]

This analysis is confirmed by the fact that the paraenetic tone is not used throughout these chapters.[129] When the subject shifts away from the general Israelite population to regulations for the priests, sacrifice, festivals, and Tabernacle ritual (Lev 21:1-24:9), we no longer find the same level of exhortation. These chapters have no speeches similar to the ones that open Leviticus 18 or close Leviticus 20 (18:1-1-5; 20:22-26). The inconsistent use of this type of language in Leviticus 17-26 suggests that Blum is correct to seek a contextual explanation for its distribution.

This explanation is also preferable to that offered by Baden, who correctly sees the use of paraenesis as a narrative issue, but argues that "[a] historical claim of the original priestly stratum is that the laws are presented as addressed to the generation of the wilderness alone, without reference to the future generations of Israelites."[130] His analysis is, however, undercut by the frequent use in P of commands being "for your/their generations."[131] This stance also ignores the fact that P does, in fact, situate certain laws in the future—when it must. We see this in the case of the house that has *ṣāraʿat*, which is situated "when you come to the land of Canaan" (Lev

---

2009: 14-16) also confirms that one purpose of cathartic codes is to prevent impure persons from entering into the sanctuary. Note as well that Milgrom (1991: 316-317) wrongly concludes that the Priestly text displays two different stages of belief in regard to how to deal with an individual who has become *ṭāmēʾ* due to his misreading of Num 5:1-4 as a binding instruction rather than as a part of the Sinai narrative with no normative implications (see Chapter 4 for full discussion).

[128] Crüsemann 1996: 279.

[129] Blum 1990: 319-322.

[130] Baden 2009a: 24.

[131] Gen 17:7, 9, 12; Exod 12:14, 17, 42; 16:32, 33; 27:21; 29:42; 30:8, 10, 21, 31; 31:13, 16; 40:15; Lev 3:17; 7:36; 10:9; Num 9:10; 10:8; 35:29. His analysis is marred by other misstatements about the content of P, such as "the promised land is hardly ever mentioned" (2009a: 24). This is contraindicated by such important passages as Gen 17:7-8; 35:12; Exod 6:4-8—Baden's stance on the land in P is inherited from Noth 1957 which will be discussed in depth in Chapter 6. His further statement that "the location of the cult is not addressed" in P (2009a: 24) ignores the historical narrative element of P, in which the Tabernacle is emphasized over and over again as the location of the cult—moreover, this is not a distinguishing feature of P from H, as H also does not mention the performance of ritual in any other location.

14:34). If there is an increase in this type of forward-looking address in Leviticus 17-26 this is not because it has a different orientation than the rest of P. It is, again, due to the types of laws contained in those chapters. In the Priestly narrative, there is no need to postpone the practice of ritual and purity practices until entrance to the land since the Tabernacle already exists in the present of the story (contrast with Deut 12:8-11). Blum's explanation for this feature is superior in every way.

In our survey of the arguments about the distinctiveness of the divine speech in Leviticus 17-26, we have found over and over again that these chapters appear to be well in line with trends and uses seen throughout the Priestly text. The use of unique vocabulary is contextual, related to the topics under discussion. The use of 1st person speech from Yhwh is the same as that seen throughout the Priestly text outside of sacrificial contexts. The phrase "I am Yhwh" is used in important narrative and rhetorical ways in the Priestly text and these uses are continued in the Holiness Code. The paraenetic tone of these chapters occurs elsewhere in P and their concentration here is explained, again, by the contexts in which it appears. We have also seen that what appears to be distinctive about Leviticus 17-26 only appears so when placed in contrast with Leviticus 1-16—due, again, to contextual environments. When Leviticus 17-26 is instead put into conversation with the larger Priestly text, its seemingly distinctive language appears consonant with the practices of the Priestly author elsewhere.

Ultimately, the issue of the language of Leviticus 17-26 is simply not probative for determining whether this is a distinctive corpus. As we have observed several times, the Knohl-Milgrom model of H as a reviser of the Priestly text attributes this consistency to the H author editing the received text of P. In terms of language, there is no way for this argument to be anything but circular—it takes as its starting point the idea that Leviticus 17-26 is, in fact,

distinctive. Throughout this section, we have offered an alternative model, one that sees the continuity as the result of the Priestly author's attention to his narrative and to the context in which particular types of language occur. In particular, this model allows the Priestly author to develop themes and ideas at appropriate points in his narrative, rather than requiring that all possible ideas be present at all times. Both models account for the data. The question we must now address is whether it is necessary to posit an editorial layer to account for this continuity. Since the perception that the Holiness Code as distinct from the Priestly text can not, then, be sustained from the features of its divine discourse, we must turn now to other arguments for its distinctiveness.

A Forest Without Trees: Other Arguments for H

We must now evaluate the other arguments that scholars have brought forth to support the view that the Holiness Code is a separate, distinct corpus within the Priestly text. These other argument take a larger view of the issue, looking to the relationship between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code, ideological or theological differences between Leviticus 17-26 and the rest of the Priestly text, and the structural parallels between these chapters and other law codes in the Hebrew Bible.

Scholars have long recognized a connection between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code,[132] with some early scholars going so far as to propose that Ezekiel was, in fact, its author.[133] Most used this as a lever for dating the material in these chapters, with some leaving the question open of whether Ezekiel also demonstrated knowledge of other parts of the Priestly text. Knohl,

[132] Kuenen 1886: 276, 284-287; Paton 1896; Wellhausen 1899: 168-172; Driver 1910: 145-149. For a recent thorough study, see Lyons 2009. See also Kohn 2002: 6-29 for an overview of how scholars have handled the relationship between Ezekiel and material in the Torah.
[133] See, e.g., Graf 1866: 81-83. This view was rejected already in Kuenen 1886: 276.

however, took this observation of a relationship between the two works and raised it to a compositional criterion, using similarity to Ezekiel as the basis for attributing diverse passages in P to H.[134] On the basis of Knohl's own model, this approach is deeply problematic. He argues that the Priestly Text is earlier than the "Holiness School" which thoroughly revised the underlying Priestly Text in the process of adding Leviticus 17-26 to it—in other words, Knohl's model does not know a Holiness Code that is separate from the Priestly text.[135] Knohl never addresses how, under his own model, he can tell the difference between Ezekiel echoing H-revised passages of P and unrevised passages of P (of which he argues there are many).[136]

Furthermore, studies by Propp and Kohn have shown that close attention to Ezekiel shows evidence that the prophet was acquainted with material beyond the bounds of Leviticus 17-26.[137] This undermines Knohl's and other scholars' assertion about a special relationship between Ezekiel and Leviticus 17-26. Kohn explicitly addresses Knohl's use of Ezekiel for compositional analysis, concluding: "Ezekiel's linguistic correspondence to PT [=P] is as pervasive as its correspondence to HS[=H], if not more… If we can indeed subdivide P into two separate entities, Ezekiel utilizes both without particular differentiation."[138]

But even setting aside Knohl's particular use of Ezekiel, there is room for criticism of older scholarship's use of Ezekiel's relationship with Leviticus 17-26 as confirmation for the

---

[134] Knohl 1995: 46-47, "Regarding the appearance of the phrase [חקת עולם לדרתיכם] in the central PT corpus, the following indicators are relevant:… Whether the passage displays other clear linguistic similarities to the Holiness Code (or to Ezekiel, which is linguistically very close to the Holiness Code)… The presence of several of the following indicators will be sufficient for us to label one of these passages a product of HS:…Terms or phrases characteristic of the Holiness Code or of the book of Ezekiel."
[135] 1995: 6-7, 59-106, 111-123; a lá Elliger 1966.
[136] 1995: 104-106.
[137] Propp 1996: 471-474; Kohn 2002: 30-85. Kohn's conclusions were presaged by Kaufmann 1972: 433's observation that "the contacts with the Priestly Code [in Ezekiel]—the whole of it, not merely the Holiness Code, which alone is allowed by critical dogma—are numerous and pervasive." Propp's work is particularly interesting, as he argues for Ezekiel's knowledge of the narrative of the Priestly text, undermining a key tenet of the Graf-Wellhausen-Kuenen redating of the Priestly text to the post-exilic period.
[138] Kohn 2002: 85.

view that this was a distinctive corpus. This lies in the simple fact that Ezekiel's preference for quoting or echoing particular sections of a work has no bearing on the existence of other sections—the prophet (or compiler of his book) could have simply liked that material more or found it more resonant with the themes of his own message. Moreover, this seems confirmed by the fact that Ezekiel does not mirror the Holiness Code in its entirety, but shows a distinct preference for Leviticus 26's language.[139] Even granting a special relationship between Ezekiel and Leviticus 17-26, then, proves nothing about the rest of Leviticus or the Priestly text.

When we turn to attempts to identify ideological or theological disjunctions between the Holiness Code and the rest of the Priestly text we must tread with caution. As we pointed out in Chapter 1, one must know what a work says before one can know what it means—an author can choose to introduce new ideas at different points in accordance with the narrative he is presenting. To take an extreme example, one could argue that the Israelites' wandering in the wilderness until the death of the exodus generation literally contradicts Yhwh's statement in Exod 6:8 that he would "bring you to the land which I raised my hand to give to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and I will give it to you as an inheritance." But this is not a compositional lever, not a reason to declare the wilderness wandering a late addition to the Priestly text. This is, instead, part of the normal functioning of narratives. Narratives are dynamic and we understand that Yhwh's decision to make the Israelites wander is directly responsive to the new events that occur in Numbers 13-14. This decision need not be broadcast earlier in order to constitute part of the Priestly text's narrative.

To take a different example, closer to our issue because of the involvement of non-narrative texts, one would not argue that the Tabernacle materials that fill Exodus 25-31, 35-40

[139] Lyons 2009: 162-165 provides a listing of the passages that are paralleled between Ezekiel and Leviticus 17-26. Of the 148 parallels he lists, 91 of them (61%) are with Leviticus 26.

are alien to the Priestly text's worldview just because the Tabernacle had not been mentioned previously. An important confirmation of its belonging is that once one arrives at the Tabernacle material, certain elements of the Priestly narrative up to that point—such as the lack of sacrifice—become meaningful.[140] To move even closer to our problem, we found in Chapter 2 that narrative reasoning motivated the placement of the non-narrative material in Leviticus 1-7 and 11-15. Those materials, introducing many new concepts, make narrative sense in relationship to the Tabernacle material and the installation of the priesthood.

So, when we come to Leviticus 17-26, we can not identify new ideas introduced by them as foreign to P's worldview simply because they are new. We must instead evaluate their integrity with P both ideologically and narratively. To proceed otherwise would produce only self-confirming results.[141] And we should always hold in mind that, when we do this, we are engaged in the methodologically problematic—even if sometimes unavoidable—venture of evaluating the meaning and intent of a work at the same time as we are determining its content. These really belong to two different stages of inquiry, and the content determination should necessarily precede the ideological one. We can not know what a text means until we know what a text says.

Similarly, we can dismiss artificially imposed evolutionary schemes out of hand. Wellhausen's argument that Leviticus 23's fusion of agriculturally-dependent and calendrically-determined festivals indicates a revision by P of an older H only makes sense within his model's supposition that such calendar fixing is part of a pattern of later priestly impositions that

[140] Gilders 2009.

[141] And, as Nihan 2007: 34 n. 72 observes about Knohl's approach, sometimes produces nonsensical conclusions: "One can see here the general difficulty raised by the radical opposition construed by Knohl between the theologies of P and H when he assumes, for instance, that the motif of [Yhwh] residing in Israel's midst should stem from the HS *because* it is a central motif in Lev 17-26 and in other H passages. What was the purpose of the sanctuary in P, if not that the deity resides among the community?"

subverted an original, more spontaneous religious impulse.[142] Such a position has been irrefutably exploded by the recovery of ritual texts and calendars from Ugarit, Emar, and Mesopotamia—fixed festivals have always formed part of the religious life of the ancient Near East. This is not to say that Leviticus 23 has no editorial layers,[143] but is to say that we can not accept that editing as evidence of two different religious approaches indicating a distinct ideology for H against P.

In other words, we are on safe ground for positing a distinctive H ideology only if we are able to find an explicit contradiction of something found in P. In what follows, we will not address every contrast between P and H posited by scholars. Instead, we will focus on the ones to which the most ideological weight is usually attached. The issues of centralization, profane slaughter, holiness, the role of the laity, and the view of the Sabbath are important topics on which scholars frequently stake the identity and identification of the Holiness Code. While other disagreements between P and H might be identified, it is not clear that any would carry the ideological weight sufficient to maintain the view of a Holiness perspective distinct from P's.

Among the most commonly asserted ideological differences is the issue of centralization of worship and the related subject of profane slaughter. Wellhausen argued that "[centralization] is still a demand [in H], not a presupposition [as in P]."[144] Wellhausen's perception of P's presupposition is based on his understanding of the Tabernacle material in P and the repeated

[142] Wellhausen 1885: 99-112. Knohl 1995: 40-45 reverses the equation, so that P is older but still fixed and H is younger but still more focused on agricultural cycles and "popular" practices.
[143] See Milgrom 2001: 1947-2056 for one such reconstruction.
[144] Wellhausen 1885: 377. See also 1885: 34-38, 49-51; 1899: 150-151. Knohl 1995: 112-113 agrees in principle, though the features that led Wellhausen to view P as presupposing centralization are taken by Knohl as ignoring the subject. Nevertheless they agree that what distinguishes H from P is the explicit demand for centralization in Leviticus 17.

reference to it in Leviticus 1-7. For Wellhausen, this indicated that the Priestly author was simply unable to imagine an Israelite community that had any other than the one sanctuary.[145]

While this sounds reasonable on the surface, this is not the only way one can read the relationship between Leviticus 17 and the rest of the Priestly text. If Leviticus 17 demands centralization, itself a controversial proposition,[146] then it may serve as the explicit demand of the Priestly text that Wellhausen sought. Furthermore, Wellhausen and his follows have neglected the fact that the assumption of a state of affairs as normative can itself serve as a powerful polemic. Rhyder has, in fact, recently argued for the weakness of the traditional focus on what P doesn't say rather than on what it does. She demonstrates that the Priestly text conveys the concept of centralization through several features of its presentation of the Israelite community, including the existence of a single, central sanctuary, directives towards the whole community for service at that sanctuary, and the installation of a single priesthood.[147]

Additionally, the placement of Leviticus 17 as a centralization law (or ban on profane slaughter) makes narrative sense. At this point in the Priestly narrative, the Israelite cult has only been operative since Leviticus 9; Leviticus 16 reminds us that we are still narratively just past that moment. Leviticus 17's statement that Israelites should bring all domesticates as offerings to the Tent of Meeting comes, sensibly, after a retinue of instructions designed to make sure that the

---

[145] 1885: 34-37.

[146] Kaufmann 1972: 180-184; Milgrom 2000: 1503-1514. For an analysis of the relative strengths of Wellhausen's and Kaufmann's reading of centralization in P, see Brichto 1976: 36-50. For a recent review of scholarship on centralization in Leviticus 17, see Rhyder 2019: 90-111. All arguments about the relationship between the Priestly text (including Leviticus 17) and centralization assume these texts are programmatic and neglect, to a certain extent, the narrative setting. In interpreting P, scholars frequently forget that Deuteronomy 12's demand for centralization exists as part of a narrative text that recognizes multiple, legitimate sacred precincts until the construction of Solomon's Temple (1 Kgs 3:2). We should assume that the Priestly author was aware of the history/tradition of post-conquest Israel's existence in the land and may have understood his own account in relationship to this history, just as the Deuteronomist did. This issue has a bearing on the extent to which we understand the Priestly author to be motivated by antiquarian concerns.

[147] Rhyder 2019: 112-189. References to the Tent of Meeting have an interesting distribution in Leviticus 1-3 that may have further bearing on this issue by intentionally aligning the instructions for the *šəlāmîm* offering with the command in Lev 17:1-7. See full discussion of the adaptations in this material in Chapter 5.

Israelites do not bring impurity into the Tabernacle's sacred precinct (Lev 15:31). The Priestly text has not ignored this issue; it has simply placed an explicit accounting of it at an appropriate place in the narrative arrangement of non-narrative materials. Nevertheless, the repeated emphasis on the Tent of Meeting in the instructions of Leviticus 1-7 have prepared the reader for this explicit statement. There does not, then, seem to be any contradiction in the centralization motifs in the Priestly text and Leviticus 17.[148]

More recent scholarship has cast the tension between the Priestly text and Leviticus 17 in slightly different terms. Rather than a disagreement about centralization, these scholars have come to see the texts as having different approaches to the issue of profane slaughter—Leviticus 17 forbids it while the Priestly text allows it.[149] This approach requires the reattribution of Lev 3:17 and 7:22-27—passages that claim all fat and blood for Yhwh and ban their consumption—to H. The arguments for these reattributions and deletions are less than compelling.

The first argument that Knohl and Milgrom leverage for identifying Lev 3:17 as an addition is the presence of the phrase *kl-ḥlb* in Lev 3:16. This phrase, they claim, must be an addition because it does not conform to the "stylistic convention" seen in the rest of the *šəlāmîm* instructions and so suggests an attempt to connect the original ending of this passage to the addition in 3:17.[150] However, as Schwartz observes, "[t]he willful mutilation of the concluding formula in the original verse would be most unexpected" and is not reflective of any other

[148] See also, Rhyder 2019: 238-249. Rhyder emphasizes here the strong continuity between P and H (see, especially, 2019: 244)—while maintaining a slight disjunction between the two strata on the issue of "local butchery." She herself identifies this as a "subtle critique" and one wonders if she would have arrived at this position without presupposing a separation between Leviticus 17 and the rest of P. Note especially that her comparative texts from P all come from before the construction of the Tabernacle. See discussion below for the narrative location of Leviticus 17.

[149] Milgrom 1991: 28-29, 214-216, 426-429; idem 2000: 1353, 1452-1463, 1503-1514; Knohl 1995: 49-51; Nihan 2007: 402-430. The suggestion of such an approach is also nascent in Wellhausen 1899: 151. Brichto 1976 presents a minority position in that he argues that P and H simply support two different types of sacrificial procedure and that neither license profane slaughter.

[150] Milgrom 1991: 214, 216; Knohl 1995: 49. Knohl further cites Noth 1965: 32's undefended assertion that "The word *kol-ḥēleb*, 'all the fat', has crept in by mistake from v. 17 after v. 16."

passages that Knohl and Milgrom identify as H additions to P.[151] Additionally, Lev 3:16, while admittedly different from the endings of the other sub-sections of Leviticus 3 (3:5, 12), may be this way precisely because it is part of the final statement. That is, it does not just conclude the instructions for a goat *šəlāmîm*, but concludes the entirety of the *šəlāmîm* instructions and even closes the first divine speech of Leviticus. We should not be surprised if stylistic variation is deployed in such a context and that variation is used to drive home a new point to the audience.

Regardless of how one accounts for *kl-ḥlb* in Lev 3:16, the issue is ambiguous enough that it should have no bearing on the evaluation of 3:17. The identification of this verse as an addition is old, with scholars pointing in particular to its shift in address from 3rd person singular to 2nd person plural.[152] We should first of all note that Leviticus 1-3, presented as a single divine speech, alternates between 3rd and 2nd person address elsewhere. The *minḥāh* instructions in particular change from a 3rd person description in 2:1-3 to 2nd person address in 2:4-16.[153] Curiously, there is also a shift from 2nd singular to plural that occurs at the point in which the instructions step back to describe a more general principle of offering any *minḥāh*—they can not

[151] Schwartz 1996b: 31-32. Schwartz suggests a possible "vertical dittography" to explain the presence of this phrase, preferring to view it as an unintentional corruption of the passage with no redactional or ideological significance. Another possibility is that, rather than *kl ḥlb* being an addition, there could be a missing *lyhwh* between *nyḥḥ* and *kl* (though there are no obvious anableptic triggers). This is supported by SamP and LXX (κάρπωμα, ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ. πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τῷ κυρίῳ), though it may be harmonizing on the basis of the same discomfort that drove other scholars to identify *kl hlb* as intrusive. Knohl 1995: 49 n. 7 invokes SamP and LXX as evidence for his own supposition that *kl ḥlb* is an addition because it "indicates the unevenness of the Masoretic Text." However, a testimony of unevenness is just as likely, if not more likely, to indicate textual corruption as an editorial addition. Knohl simply waves this possibility away by saying "there seems to be a greater likelihood of deliberate editorial addition, intended to link v. 17 to the main body of the pericope," but since most scholars' explanations of corruption here involve dittography from 3:17, it is difficult to see how Knohl has arrived at his conclusion. Nihan 2007: 199 n. 382 also offers an evaluation that leans towards this phrase being an original part of the verse.

[152] Baentsch 1903: 320 points to this feature (as well as parallelism with 7:22-27 and 17:10-12, on which, see below), concluding tentatively that "probably the author of the addition is a redactor" ["Wahrscheinl. ist d. v. redact. Zusatz."]. Noth 1965: 32 just states that the verse is a secondary addition without justification. We already addressed above the weaknesses in Knohl's attempt to see the phrase חקת עולם לדרתיכם as a sign of the presence of an H redactor and will not do so again here.

[153] For the various ways that this has been accounted for, see Nihan 2007: 206-215, who ultimately concludes that these shifts are likely an original feature of this chapter. We should also note that the use of *taqrîb* initially parses ambiguously since the ruling subject of the passage is the feminine *nepeš* (2:1). See further discussion in Chapter 5.

be burned if made with any leavening agent or honey and they must be salted (Lev 2:11-13).[154] After this, the address returns to 2nd person singular.

This shift into 2nd person plural at the moment of a general principle is exactly what we see in Lev 3:17. This verse reserves the fat and blood of all *šəlāmîm* for Yhwh. It applies regardless of which animal is sacrificed for the *šəlāmîm* and so its statement as a general principle after all the cases have been described is logical. This change in persons alone can not be used to attribute this passage to H. Additionally, these occasional instances of direct address to the audience are consonant with the narrative frame, which presents this speech as Yhwh telling Moses how to address the Israelites.[155] While the address may disagree with the style of the descriptions of the offerings themselves, it does not disagree with the narrative presentation. There is, then, no reason to eliminate this verse from P or reattribute it to H on this basis.

Furthermore, as Schwartz has pointed out, the *šəlāmîm* offering is the only context in which the offerer comes into contact with sacrificial portions. This contact between a lay person and sanctified meat provides a sensible context for informing the audience of the limits of what they can consume.[156] Contextually and narratively, this verse does not provide a reason for positing that it is an addition.

When we turn to Lev 7:22-27, we again find a long tradition of viewing this passage as secondary, both because it interrupts seemingly related passages in 7:1-21, 28-34 and because of

---

[154] Nihan 2007: 212-213 also sees this shift in perspective as emphatic and related to the content of these verses, though he uses the same shift in persons in 3:17 to strike that verse from P. See Milgrom 1991: 188-192 for further commentary.

[155] Milgrom 1991: 216 notes as well the *inclusio* formed with Lev 1:2 which also uses the 2nd plural. For him, because he has attributed 3:17 to H, this is evidence that H has redacted the entire speech in Leviticus 1-3. The flimsiness of this method of attribution, and its preference for stratification, is apparent. Such parallelistic features are just as easily taken in the other direction, as indicating that 3:17 is an integral part of Leviticus 1-3, with no secondary redaction required.

[156] Schwartz 1996b: 28. See also Milgrom 1991: 215 who observes that these verses must refer to the blood and fat of sacrificial animals, and not animals in general.

a shift to 2nd person plural address.[157] While it is true that 7:1-21 and 7:28-34 both relate to the *šəlāmîm* offering, it is not evident that they were originally connected, as their topics differ—7:1-21 is about the offerer's portion of the sacrifice while 7:28-34 is about the priest's portion. 7:29 also begins the speech by describing the general topic, suggesting that it could have existed independently of the instructions in 7:1-21.[158] Lev 7:22-27, which provide further instructions forbidding the consumption of certain portions of domesticate carrion and non-sacrificial animals is, then, just as related to the subject as the other sections are.[159] Nevertheless, we might suspect this passage of being intrusive. The question is whether the Priestly author is responsible for the passage—i.e., did he add this to inherited material[160]—or if this is a secondary addition to the Priestly text. Contextually, though, Lev 7:22-27 is sensibly placed.

The 2nd person address is also contextually appropriate. The beginning of the new speech (7:22-23a), addresses the Israelites instead of the hitherto addressed priests (6:2, 18), and this accords with the instructions Yhwh communicates here. 7:22-27 cover issues that do not take place in the sacred precinct, but which Israelites would encounter in the course of regular events. There is, then, no priest present to instruct the Israelite on proper procedure in these

[157] Baentsch 1903: 340-341; Driver 1910: 44; Noth 1965: 64; Milgrom 1991: 426-427; Knohl 1995: 49 n. 8; Nihan 2007: 260-261.

[158] Milgrom 1991: 429 maintains that this recapitulation was added after the original connection was interrupted between 7:21 and 7:29b. However, it is not at all apparent that anything in 7:29b-30 make for a sensible continuation of 7:21. Furthermore, the phrase "his hands will bring" (7:30) is not present anywhere in the speech contained in 6:19-7:21—its distinctiveness may indicate that the material in 7:28-34 comes from a different source than the rest of the *tôrōt* in Leviticus 6-7. In other words, 7:22-27 is not an interruption, but one of two additional teachings related to the *šəlāmîm*.

[159] Schwartz 1996b: 28-30 persuasively argues against the tradition that sees this passage as implicitly licensing the consumption of non-sacrificed (or "profanely slaughtered") domesticates by pointing out that the total context acknowledges only two ways in which Israelites might come in contact with their meat—either by sacrifice (7:11-21) or as carrion (7:22-25). He concludes from this explicit mention that "Carrion is permissible *because it has not been slaughtered*; if it had been slaughtered it would be subject to all the laws of sacrificial flesh" (1996b: 29, emphasis original).

[160] The argument for Leviticus 6-7 being based on pre-existing material does not require the full acceptance of a Neo-analytic framework. The Punic Marseilles Tariff (KAI 69) already testifies to this genre existing in display form in temples; for connections to Leviticus 6-7 see Baker 1987 and Chapter 5.

circumstances, and so Moses is told to communicate to them that fat and blood are forbidden in all contexts.[161] The 2nd person address is, then, no reason to identify this as an addition.

Nevertheless, all of the features we've explored here are just as easily attributed to a later editor as to the original Priestly author. Both, presumably, would have had an interest in making the text work and be sensible. However, since the perception that these features are disjunctive usually motivates the identification of this passage as secondary, we are licensed to accept them as original absent compelling evidence to the contrary.[162] Knohl attempts to provide such evidence, arguing that the regulations in Lev 7:22-27 are H rather than P because "the opinion that all profane slaughter is prohibited is expressed in only one place—Leviticus 17, the first chapter of the Holiness Code."[163] This, clearly, assumes his own conclusion. If 7:22-27 are part of P then his statement is simply not true; to argue that they aren't part of P on the basis of his pre-determined conclusion is, to say the least, unsound.[164]

---

[161] Milgrom 1991: 429 objects to this reading, arguing that 7:16-21, which cover eating *piggûl* or consuming *šəlāmîm* while impure, are practically addressed to the laity even though the text addresses them to the priests. He is correct, but the text clearly imagines a scenario in which the priest has the opportunity to inform the laity of these possible violations while they are making their offering. No such opportunity for instruction arises in the scenarios imagined by 7:22-27 (discovery of carrion and hunting).

A similar logic may possibly be behind Lev 7:28-34's address to the general community instead of to the priests. One should note that while the priest sprinkles the blood, it is the offerer who butchers the *šəlāmîm* and presents the appropriate portions (Lev 3:3-5, 9-10, 14-15—see Milgrom 1991: 205). If we understand this in relationship to Leviticus 17—whether that is because Leviticus 17 is an original, integral part of P or because both this passage and Leviticus 17 were added by the same editor—then this makes perfect sense. Lev 17:3 allows for the slaughter of domesticates outside of the camp, while 17:4 requires that an offering be brought to the Tent of Meeting (see Milgrom 2000: 1454 for excellent counterarguments to this reading—which is also possibly contraindicated by Lev 3:2, 8, 13; 7:33). Lev 7:28-34 seems to cover this exact scenario—the offerer, regardless of where he slaughters the *šəlāmîm*, is responsible for ensuring that the fat, portions, and the appropriate prebends for the priest are brought to the sacred precinct.

[162] Stackert 2011: 12.

[163] Knohl 1995: 50. He also bases the secondary nature of 7:22-27 on their agreement with 3:17 which he identified as secondary. See above arguments against this position.

[164] Knohl 1995: 50-51 also attempts to argue that H is simply "adding to the margins of older Priestly scrolls." However, Lev 7:22-27 is not on the margin of anything—it is positioned, logically, in the middle of the *šʾlāmîm* regulations. Knohl's statement here is based on Haran 1983, but Knohl never defends his adoption of Haran's model nor offers any evaluation of how we can find the "margins" of the original scrolls that P was divided into. Further, Knohl seems to have misunderstood Haran's model, referring to "the command scrolls of PT" (1995: 6 n. 22). Haran, however, does not view P as divided into a myriad of small scrolls devoted to individual topics, but simply recognizes that a literary work of this size could not have been contained on a single scroll (and applies the same

On the issue of profane slaughter, then, it appears that there is no tension between P and H in Leviticus. Leviticus 17 does not introduce a new command against profane slaughter and P does not tolerate or ignore profane slaughter (Lev 3:17; 7:22-27). Instead, these passages mutually reinforce each other, providing multiple kinds of explication of the same topic. That this is the case can be seen by the fact that Milgrom and Knohl must attribute 3:17 and 7:22-27 to H in order to maintain that P and H disagree on profane slaughter.[165] However, this parallelism between multiple passages is just as easily taken as a sign of a single author with a consistent message as it is as a sign of stratification—if Leviticus 17 is part of P, then Lev 3:17 and 7:22-26, of course, agree with it.

We have, in our previous section on the language of Leviticus 17-26, pointed towards the inherently circular reasoning by which the Knohl-Milgrom models renders any shared language between P and H as a sign of H's editorial work in P contexts. In the discussion on profane slaughter we find a similar form of *ex hypothesi* argument in Milgrom's objection to the idea that both H and P agree on this subject. Milgrom asks, "If, however, it is assumed, as it is by most scholars…that P (not just H) totally banned nonsacrificial slaughter after the construction of the Tabernacle, what is H stating that is new?"[166] In other words, Milgrom does not conclude that Leviticus 17 belongs to a distinctive corpus because it disagrees with P. Instead, he concludes that Leviticus 17 disagrees with P because he starts with the assumption that it belongs to a distinctive corpus. Milgrom does not consider the possibility that H and P agree on this subject nor what that might indicate about the necessity of positing a separate H and P.

---

model to J and E). Haran's proposal is no different from what we see in Mesopotamian literary works that exist across multiple tablets.

[165] Schwarts 1996b: 30-32 argues that even if one accepts the argument that these passages are secondary additions to P, there is nevertheless extensive evidence that P does not license or imagine non-sacrificial slaughter.

[166] Milgrom 2000: 1455.

Importantly, the stance on profane slaughter contained in Leviticus 17 connects to other parts of the Priestly narrative. When we expand our scope beyond Leviticus, we find the idea that all animals must be brought as offerings is consonant with Priestly texts in Genesis as well. Ruwe noted that Lev 17:3-4 in particular demonstrate sympathy with the Priestly text's conception of the progress of humanity's relationship with animals.[167] The Priestly text presents the original state of all creatures as vegetarian (Gen 1:29-30), which Ruwe perceptively notes indicates a theoretical absence of violence between humans and animals. The postdiluvian allowance of animal slaughter is precisely an allowance and is accompanied by the universal demand that no one eat blood (Gen 9:1-6).[168]

As Schwartz has observed, the instructions given in Leviticus 17 both participate in this system and innovate upon it.[169] However, this innovation is not unmotivated, but responsive to a new situation that has arisen in the Priestly narrative. As we pointed out above, the chronological note that opens the atonement ritual (Lev 16:1) places Leviticus 17 close in time to the completed sanctification and first public use of the Tabernacle and its altar (Leviticus 8-9). The issue of blood disposal, first addressed in Gen 9:5-6, is resumed in Leviticus 17 under these new circumstances.[170] Just as the flood and its aftermath affected all of creation and produced a situation to which Yhwh responded by changing his determination of the human-animal relationship, so the construction of the Tabernacle and its altar affects the Israelites and produces a situation to which Yhwh responds by changing the Israel-animal relationship. Moreover, we should note that the importance of the altar and its role in a new relationship between Yhwh and Israel was already forecast by the Priestly author in the Tabernacle instructions (Exod 29:36-46).

---

[167] Ruwe 1999: 141-144. See also Blum 1990: 323-325; Crüsemann1996: 291-294.
[168] Milgrom 1991: 704-706.
[169] Schwartz 1991: 60.
[170] See Schwartz 1991 for an excellent analysis of Leviticus 17, demonstrating the centrality of blood disposal to its various instructions.

In this passage, Yhwh singles out the altar alongside the priests and the Tabernacle itself as part of the network of sanctified objects that fulfill his intention to meet with and dwell in the midst of Israel (Exod 29:43-46).

Because of the new availability of the Tabernacle altar, the original prohibition on blood consumption is modified for the Israelites. Yhwh now reveals that the blood of domesticates is henceforth to be reserved for the Tabernacle altar (17:10-12).[171] When Lev 17:4 states that whoever does not bring a slaughtered animal as an offering is guilty of murder, we find an echo of the language used to forbid both humans and animals from murdering a human (Gen 9:5-6).[172] Through the sacrificial system, Yhwh has moved Israel closer to his original conception of human-animal relations,[173] holding Israelites responsible for the (non-sacrificial) murder of sacrificeable animals in the same way that he says he will hold animals responsible for the murder of humans. And even when humans must kill animals through sacrifice, the blood is used to atone for the animal's death (17:11).[174] As Ruwe concludes, "The genuinely priestly (or Priestly text-related) intention of 17:3f. is therefore clear."[175]

One other part of the narrative trappings of the opening command in Leviticus 17 (Lev 17:1-7) accord with this progressive unfolding of foodways in the Priestly narrative. While Milgrom and Nihan have argued that the description of the Israelites offering sacrifices *ʿal pənê haśśādeh* (Lev 17:5) represents an anachronism—discarding the fiction of the wilderness setting for the settled life of Canaan—this is not the only reading of this phrase.[176] Rhyder has rejected

[171] Lev 17:12 even explicitly refers to this earlier command. For a similar understanding of this verse and the suffix conjugation *ʾāmartî*, see Feldman 2018: 278-279.
[172] Ruwe 1999: 143-144.
[173] Milgrom 1991: 704-713 comes to a similar conclusion. Curiously, in this review, Milgrom mixes what he identifies as P and H texts and treats them as a single system—an implicit acknowledgment that there is less tension between the two corpora than he asserts elsewhere.
[174] Milgrom 1991: 707-708; 2000: 1472-1479.
[175] Ruwe 1999: 144, "Die genuine priester(schrift)liche Intention von 17,3f ist damit deutlich."
[176] Milgrom 2000: 1459-1460; Nihan 2007: 206 n. 58.

this reading, offering a thorough and persuasive argument that the term שדה accords just as well with the wilderness setting as a settled one.[177] In the course of her argument she notes that the opening command of Leviticus 17 creates a spatial opposition between the open field and the Tabernacle, specifically its altar.

This idea that the Israelites have been sacrificing "on the face of the field" up until the construction and sanctification of the Tabernacle altar is consonant with the patriarchal narrative in the Priestly text. One of the distinctive features of the Priestly account of the patriarchal period is that there is not a single note about any of the patriarchs building an altar. People nevertheless ate animals prior to the construction of the Tabernacle, avoiding only the blood (Gen 9:4). Lev 17:5's statement is a description of what this behavior looked like. In this way, it is reminiscent of the account of the Israelites' slaughter of animals after the battle of Michmash (1 Sam 14:32-35). Here the people are described as slaughtering their animals "on the earth" (*ʾarṣāh*) and eating "on the blood" (1 Sam 14:32).[178] Saul remedies this situation by means of a large stone, which the narrator connects to the beginning of Saul's career as an altar builder (1 Sam 14:33, 35). Here we have the same constellation of images as we find in Leviticus 17—the people slaughter on the earth, blood is a central concern, and the remedy is an altar. Because the Priestly author does not narrate the construction of altars prior to the Tabernacle's altar, the people must be understood as slaughtering "on the face of the field" up to this point, equivalent to 1 Samuel's "on the earth." In this way, then, the image of the people's behavior in Lev 17:5 matches the Priestly narrative's contention that altars were not built prior to the Mosaic era.

---

[177] Rhyder 2019: 205-208. Rhyder's further argument (2019: 208-214) regarding the meaning of the *śəʿîrîm* in Lev 17:7 constitutes major progress towards solving this interpretive crux and is preferable in every way to the attempt to read this term as indicating a type of demon.

[178] McCarter 1980: 249 argues that the people's sin in this instance is the consumption of blood. However, given the connections to the ideas of Leviticus 17 discussed here, the other option may be that the people did not atone for the slaughter of the animals at an altar. This is not to argue that 1 Samuel is acquainted with either Leviticus 17 or P, but we should be hesitant to posit that the Priestly text's ideas are all innovative and unreflective of earlier ideas.

In our above discussion, we have failed to find a distinctive ideology in Leviticus 17 that disagrees with the Priestly text. Instead, we have seen that they agree on the issue of centralization and profane slaughter. Additionally, the instructions of Leviticus 17 are related to earlier instructions given in the Priestly text. Finally, the placement of these instructions in Leviticus 17 is responsive to the new situation of the Tabernacle altar's construction and sanctification, events that occur in the Priestly narrative. In other words, there is not just an absence of disunity in the relationship between Leviticus 17 and the Priestly text, there are positive signs of continuity between the commands in Leviticus 17 and the course of the broader Priestly narrative. The Knohl-Milgrom model could, again, explain this continuity as the result of H's supplementation of P, but we are, again, left with little motivation to posit a separate strata in order to explain this unity.

Another distinctive idea that scholars attribute to H against P is the one after which this stretch of texts is labeled: the concept of holiness. Especially common among proponents of the Knohl-Milgrom hypothesis of a later H, the argument is that holiness, though a concern within the P corpus as a whole, takes on a distinctive character in Leviticus 17-26.[179] So, while Milgrom grants that "the theme of the entire book of Leviticus is holiness," he argues that "H's main distinction from P is that P restricts holiness to sanctified persons (priests) and places (sanctuaries), whereas H extends holiness in both its aspects to persons, the entire people of Israel, and to places, the entire promised (YHWH's) land."[180]

---

[179] Knohl 1995: 180-186; Schwartz 1999: 25; Milgrom 2000: 1397-1400, 1711-1726. Kugler 1997: 3-27, argues for a differing view of holiness in Leviticus 1-16 and 17-26. However, his study is undermined by treating Leviticus in isolation rather than surveying the entire Priestly text, a lack of nuance in the assignment of genre to P's material, and, most importantly, by accepting Milgrom and Knohl's assignment of certain portions of Leviticus 1-16 to H (9 n. 16, 17 n. 34) despite his (correct) insistence that the proper methodological approach is one that "from the outset does not assume the existence of P or H" (8). For other criticisms of Kugler 1997, see Milgrom 2000: 1712-1714.

[180] Milgrom 2000: 1397. See also Knohl 1995: 180, "in PT holiness is concentrated in ritual and applies primarily to the cultic enclosure…. HS expands the realm of holiness… Holiness thus includes all areas of life and applies to the entire community of Israel and the land they inhabit."

We will begin by making clear that H nowhere says that the land is holy (*qdš*)—Milgrom is making a surmise on the basis of the fact that the Holiness Code states that the land belongs to Yhwh (Lev 25:23) and that it can be rendered unclean (Lev 18:24-30). It is unclear if this should indicate that H considers the land holy, and we should be hesitant to label it such absent an explicit statement in the text.[181] However, if we briefly grant that Milgrom is correct, then we should also observe that P says the Israelites belong to Yhwh (Exod 6:7; 7:4; 12:41) and that they can be rendered impure (Leviticus 11-15). This undermines Milgrom's assertion, as these features—the same features that Milgrom states make the land holy in Leviticus 17-26—indicate that P views the Israelites (and not just priests and the sanctuary) as holy.

We are likely on more secure footing, however, if we acknowledge that neither Leviticus 17-26 nor the Priestly text view the land as holy—they are in agreement on this subject.[182] However, this also means that our argument that P views the Israelites as holy by the same criteria must be left to the side. And, unlike with the land, there is no denying that Leviticus 17-26 view the Israelites, as a group, as holy or capable of holiness. The question is whether Milgrom and Knohl are correct when they assert that the rest of the Priestly text does not share this view.

There is, though, explicit evidence that they are incorrect. We have already discussed the place of Exod 31:13 and Lev 11:44-45 in the Priestly text, arguing that both are original parts of P and that there is no compelling reason to identify strata in the contexts of these passages. Both of these passages express the sanctification or holiness of the Israelites—Lev 11:44-45 in terms almost identical to what is found in Leviticus 17-26 (19:2; 20:26). This should be the end of the argument—Milgrom and Knohl are incorrect because the Priestly text, in these places, explicitly

[181] See Kaufmann 1972: 129-130; Joosten 1996: 169-192; Milgrom 2000: 1399; Milgrom 2001: 2184-2187.
[182] Num 35:34 suggests that the special qualities of the land and its need for purity derive from the fact that Yhwh "tabernacles" in it amongst the Israelites.

speaks about the holiness of the Israelites. We have already noted that this conclusion is only avoidable by recourse to circular arguments—the Priestly text never mentions the holiness of the Israelites because every mention of this by P is actually an H supplement.

As we have pointed out above, the only argument we can mount against such circular reasoning is to present an alternative case. In addition to the explicit statements of the Israelites' holiness outside of Leviticus 17-26, we should note that the concentration on that subject within the chapters of the so-called Holiness Code is explicable on narrative grounds. We have already explored the nature of the charge to the priests in Lev 10:10 as an argument for the following sections of P.[183] Included in this charge is the command that priests should distinguish between the holy and profane and teach the Israelites—this suggests that Leviticus 17-26 contain the relevant instructions for how to achieve that. If the Priestly author has not dwelt on this topic earlier, it is because that did not accord with how he chose to organize the topics and issues in his narrative. Throughout Leviticus, the Priestly author displays the habit of grouping together non-narrative texts by topic and introducing those topics in an order that participates in the larger narrative. Instructions for sacrifice are given once the Tabernacle is erected but before the priests are installed.[184] Instructions for purity are given once the priests are active as a way of ensuring that the Israelites do not bring impurity into contact with the sacred precinct now that it is ready for use.[185] Once the security of the sacred precinct from contamination is secured, the next logical subject is the more morally and ethically focused issues of behavior outside of the sacred precinct that guide the Israelites to comport themselves appropriately in relation to their god's expectations.[186]

---

[183] See Chapter 2.
[184] See chapter 2.
[185] See chapter 2 and discussion above on Leviticus 11.
[186] Wagner 1974: 308-314; Blum 1990: 318-325; Crüsemann 1996: 278-279; Ruwe 1999: 49-52.

Such a narrative unfolding of the topic of Israel's holiness also accords with other narrative movements we see in regard to this topic. At the end of creation, the seventh day is sanctified (Gen 2:3), and throughout the first part of the Priestly text only times are associated with holiness (Exod 12:16; 16:23). The Priestly author does not introduce the concept of sanctified space until the Tabernacle instructions in Exodus 25-31, beginning with the *pārōket*, which functions to distinguish between "the holy" and the "most holy" (27:33). If we used Milgrom and Knohl's logic on this unfolding, we would have to relegate these Tabernacle instructions to a different author or strata, since the Priestly text up to this point has not demonstrated that it considers spaces to be holy.

But this does violence to the narrative nature of the text, which introduces topics and issues at appropriate moments in the story. The labeling of the Israelites as holy in Leviticus 17-26 is easily understood as part of this larger narrative movement by which the Priestly author extends the possibility of holiness first to times, then to spaces, then finally to people. We can again detect no contradiction or tension between Leviticus 17-26 and the rest of the Priestly text and instead find a sympathy of ideas and a narrative integrity between these materials. The topic of holiness, then, is no reason to identify these chapters as different from the rest of P.

Yet another issue that some critics argue distinguishes H from P is the relationship of the laity to the cult. Milgrom and Knohl argue that H has a more egalitarian thrust that does not privilege priests in the same way that P does, but instead invests the lay person with responsibility for the sanctuary and oversight of the priests.[187] The integration of the laity in the cult is, however, a recurrent theme of the Priestly text. In addition to the texts we discussed above that indicate that P thought of the people as holy, we should also observe that P views the

[187] Knohl 1995: 152-157, 192-196; Milgrom 2000: 1352, 1451, 1832-1834.

construction of the Tabernacle as a joint effort of the entire community, who both donate gifts and provide labor for its construction (Exod 25:2-7; 35:4-29; 36:2-4, 8; 39:32-41).

The address of the sacrificial instructions in Leviticus 1-5 to the "children of Israel" (Lev 1:2; 4:2) is also a telling sign that the involvement of the laity in the cult was of paramount importance to P. Lev 7:28-34 charges the lay people with ensuring that priests receive their appropriate portions from *šəlāmîm* sacrifices. The revelation of Yhwh's *kābôd* at the inauguration of the Tabernacle explicitly embraces the entire Israelite community (Lev 9:23-24). Most importantly, Yhwh conditions his appearance on the offerings that the people bring (Lev 9:3-4, 6). That is to say, the priests' presence and offerings are not sufficient to invoke the *kābôd*'s appearance—the people's participation is a requirement. Furthermore, there is nothing in the Holiness Code that suggests an intensification of this theme. The disclosure of the regulations for the eligibility of priests to the entire community is simply a continuation of this idea (Lev 21:24). There is, again, nothing about Leviticus 17-26 that contradicts the Priestly text leading up to it.

Yet another suggested point of contention lies in the view of the Sabbath in H. Stackert has recently argued that the Holiness Code contains a view of the Sabbath that distinguishes it from the Priestly text's view.[188] However, a large portion of his argument relies on his stratification of Exod 31:12-17, which we have already shown to be untenable on the basis of the very criterion that he argues is necessary to posit stratification.[189] We can, then, dispense at the outset with his contention that P views the Sabbath as a sign for Yhwh, while H views it as a sign for Israel.[190] Both of these ideas are contained in Exodus 31 and both originate from a single layer. What is more, it is unclear why these should be taken as evidence for differing views—

[188] Stackert 2016b.
[189] See discussion above.
[190] Stackert 2016b: 85-95, 98-100.

these are complementary rather than mutually exclusive ideas. Furthermore, since his proposal acknowledges that the underlying view of the Sabbath in Leviticus 25 is directly aligned with the view expressed in Exod 31:13b-14, a segment of the Priestly text, we again encounter alignment rather than disagreement between P and H.

Finally, we should acknowledge that it is difficult to compare the Priestly view of the Sabbath with that expressed in the Holiness Code. Leviticus 25 is the only place where the details of the land Sabbath are provided—we can not compare these details with any other part of either the Priestly text or the Holiness Code. Therefore, when Stackert's conceives of the weekly Sabbath in P as a reminder to the deity to bless the land, while arguing that the yearly land Sabbath in H involves Yhwh's blessing of the land in order to enable the practice, we can simply grant his observation.[191] However, this is not a difference between P and H. It is a difference between the function of the daily and yearly Sabbaths. The comparison is not like-to-like, but apples-to-oranges. At the outset of his article, Stackert states that "H's continuity with P far outweighs its divergences from it."[192] It is our contention that this is not only true, but true to the extent that there is no need to distinguish P from H.

Stackert attempts to control for this divergence in subjects by appealing to the Priestly manna story in Exodus 16.[193] Here, he correctly rejects others' attempts to identify an H stratum on the basis of stylistic and terminological features. Nevertheless, Stackert identifies Exod 16:22-25 as containing an H stratum—though he never provides a more specific identification of what this stratum consists of—that reorients the Priestly manna story towards H's view of the Sabbath. There are, however, numerous difficulties with Stackert's assessment of this story. Stackert's assertion that the sixth-day abundance of manna indicates the timing of the blessing in

[191] 2016b: 95-98, 101-102.
[192] 2016b: 81.
[193] Stackert 2016b: 102-104.

accordance with H rather than P's view of the Sabbath has three major difficulties.[194] The first is that, despite his labeling of this as a blessing, neither Leviticus 25 nor Exodus 16 ever use this term. The second problem is that it is unclear what P's manna story would have looked like—Stackert provides no indication—without a similar arrangement of sufficient manna for the seventh day. Finally, Stackert overlooks the fact that there simply is no abundance of manna on the sixth day. The text indicates that there was more than enough manna on each day—there is no other way to understand the command to only collect what you need and the fact that certain members of the *ʿēdāh* collected more than they strictly needed (Exod 16:15b-18). The narrative further relates that when more than was needed was collected and saved, the manna rotted (16:20, 21a-22). This indicates that whatever miracle occurs in relation to the Sabbath is not a miracle of sixth-day abundance—it is the fact that on the seventh day, the manna does not rot as it would on any other day (16:22-24).

None of this requires us to see any disagreement between Exodus 16, Leviticus 25, and Exod 31:12-17. If there are nuances of emphasis in each of these texts, they are just as easily attributable to the complexity of the Sabbath idea held by the Priestly author as they are attributable to two distinctive views of the Sabbath that we are forced to attribute to two different authors/editors. That this is the case is indicated by even Stackert's view of the final text—his H text only gently realigns P, allowing both ideas to stand side by side. The question we must ask is why H could have and allow both ideas to exist, but the Priestly author could not. Without a much firmer basis of evidence, which we lack, for viewing Leviticus 17-26 as distinctive, the Sabbath differentiation that Stackert identifies simply is too subtle to require us to posit two authors.

[194] Stackert 2016b: 103-104.

Attempts to identify Leviticus 17-26 as a distinctive corpus on the basis of ideology are, ultimately, not persuasive. In every instance addressed here we have seen that Leviticus 17-26 is instead integrated into the Priestly text's broader ideas and narrative and that these chapters make sense when contextualized within P.[195] This state of affairs is acknowledged and affirmed by Schwartz, who nevertheless maintains that the Holiness Code is distinct from P and that these continuities are the result of the fact that H is a later supplement to the original Priestly text.[196] However, if the terminology of H is not distinct, and the use of language in H is not distinct, and the ideas of H are not distinct, and H exists in narrative continuity with the rest of the Priestly text, then it does not appear that we have license to suggest stratification as the explanation for this state of affairs. Positing a Holiness supplement is not a necessary hypothesis to explain the state of the Priestly text.

This brings us, finally, to the original insight that motivated the identification of a "Holiness Code" within the Priestly text—the argument that Leviticus 17-26's structure is indicative of an originally separate, distinctive corpus. This argument from structure is elegant in its simplicity.[197] The claim begins by arguing that Leviticus 26 should be understood as a list of blessings and curses and is therefore the end of a (law) code of some kind. Other law codes in the Hebrew Bible (Exodus 20:22-23:33; Deuteronomy 12-26, 28) begin with a law regarding altars or the place of sacrifice and so we should seek a similar law that precedes Leviticus 26. Leviticus 17, as a law requiring that all offerings be brought to the Tent of Meeting fits this description. Therefore Leviticus 17-26 resemble other law codes in the Hebrew Bible which are generally accepted as pre-existing corpora and this is evidence that these chapters were also an originally

[195] Crüsemann 1996: 278 states his stance on the issue thus, "This complex is no foreign body in the context. All of the important features of the sections have parallels in other priestly material, and there are no real contradictions."
[196] Schwartz 1999: 24-29.
[197] Kuenen 1886: 87-91; Wellhausen 1899: 149-152; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby 1900: 1.143; Driver 1910: 48; Eissfeldt 1965: 233-234; Noth 1965: 127-128; Cholewiński 1976.

separate corpus. Crüsemann refers to these structural observations as "the strongest argument for viewing the Holiness Code as having been an independent law book at one time."[198]

Despite the elegance and seeming strength of this argument, it too abounds in weaknesses.[199] The features scholars describe as shared by these three law codes disintegrate into difficult to compare distinctives upon closer examination. The first is the idea that law codes, as separate pieces of literature, end with blessings and curses. This observation is supported by numerous treaties from the Iron Age II, which frequently end with a series of curses.[200] However, this is not actually a feature shared by all three biblical law codes. While the Deuteronomic Code (DC) certainly ends with such a list (Deuteronomy 28) and Leviticus 26 appears generically similar—though it would perhaps be better described as a list of promises and threats since the terms *brk* and *ʾrr*/*qll* do not occur here—we can only nominally compare the Covenant Code (CC) to these lists.

Rather than a list of blessings and curses, CC instead ends with a warning against disobedience (Exod 23:20-24), a brief recitation of blessings (Exod 23:25-26), and a promise that Yhwh will aid in the expulsion of the Canaanites (Exod 23:27-33). Importantly, two of these features—the warning against disobedience and the promise of Yhwh's aid—are thoroughly contextualized into the narrative moment of the Sinai event. Rather than being a general warning against disobedience, Exodus 23 warns against disobeying the *malʾāk* that will guide the Israelites to the promised land. And rather than being a general statement of Yhwh's aid against enemies, Exodus 23 envisions his aid in the specific context of the upcoming conquest. That is to say, these features of the closing section of CC are not comparable to the grand, paraenetic

[198] Crüsemann 1996: 277.
[199] See also, Schwartz 1999: 17-24.
[200] See the various treaties in SAA II and also KAI 222 (Sefire treaty, contemporary with SAA 2.2). See also, from an earlier period, the "epilogue" to the Code of Hammurabi. The parallels to ancient Near Eastern treaties is part of the habit of imagining the relationship between Yhwh and Israel in treaty terms (*bərît*, *ʿēdût*).

exhortations that close the series of divine speeches in Leviticus 17-26 and the two Mosaic speeches in Deuteronomy 1-28. Those blessings and curses are just as much aimed at the audience contemporary to the respective texts as they are contextualized in the narrative. CC's closing, in contrast, seems almost entirely a function of the narrative—the only exception to this is the command to not worship other gods or to act like the Canaanites (Exod 23:24, 32).

We should also note that there are no curses in CC's closing section. While the content of both Deuteronomy 28 and Leviticus 26 overwhelmingly consist of threats (Lev 26:14-39; Deut 28:15-68), the warning in Exodus 23 lacks any associated punishment for violators, no curses to be feared by those who transgress. The blessing is the one thing that CC shares with DC and Leviticus 26, with all three law codes centering their blessings around prosperity in the land (Exod 23:25-26; Lev 26:3-13; Deut 28:1-14).[201] Nevertheless, we must acknowledge that the idea that originally independent codes end with blessings and curses is not borne out by an examination of these texts—DC certainly has one and Leviticus 26 is similar to it in content, but CC is so different that we can not speak of a shared trope of pre-existing law codes.

When we examine the notion that law codes begin with laws related to the place of sacrifice, we find a similar disjunction among the three theoretical exemplars. While DC begins with a law regarding centralization (Deut 12:5-28), it is difficult to account for CC in similar terms.[202] The precise beginning of CC is sometimes disputed, but if Exod 21:1 is not taken as its opening, then the beginning of the divine speech in 20:22 serves this purpose.[203] This means that

[201] Note that Leviticus 26 is closer to CC than DC here—both lead into the blessing with interdictions on worship (Exod 23:24; Lev 26:1-2). DC instead associates this motif with the centralization law that opens the code (Deut 12:1-4).
[202] Eissfeldt 1965: 234 argues that CC (his B) begins with a law concerning centralization in that it rejects the notion. This is not a particularly persuasive reading—CC does not require centralization, but this is not the same as saying that it opposes it.
[203] See Propp 2006: 147, 295, 304-305 for discussion. Eissfeldt 1965: 212-213, 234 views CC (his B) as beginning at Exod 20:22, but still argues that the law in Leviticus 17 is a parallel characteristic.

the Covenant Code begins with a prohibition on icons (Exod 20:23).[204] Even if we grant that CC opens with a law concerning place of worship (Exod 20:24-26), it is apparent that CC and DC contain very different kinds of laws that can only be loosely categorized together as "laws concerning places of worship." CC is concerned with the construction and use of altars, how they are to be made and how not to defile them when they are built. DC is concerned with centralization: not how you build and use an altar, but *which* altar one should use.

The difference between these two laws matters for the sake of comparison with the Priestly text and determining the beginnings of the code concluded by Leviticus 26. If we take the CC model, where construction of an altar signals the beginning of such codes, then there is no reason why we could not find such a parallel in Exodus 25-31.[205] If, however, we take DC as a model, then Leviticus 17 serves tolerably well.[206] The vagueness of the formal criterion suggests that it is not a reliable guide for determining the extent or pre-existence of legal corpora in the Hebrew Bible.

Wellhausen, in fact, recognized that Exodus 25-31 served as the beginning of P's code.[207] From this he deduced that Leviticus 17 must be a duplicate, since it serves the same formal purpose, stating that "its position is otherwise incomprehensible."[208] As we have shown above, however, the placement of Leviticus 17 as a requirement to bring all slaughtered animals to the Tabernacle as offerings makes excellent narrative sense—it follows the discussions of purity that affect whether an Israelite is able to come to the sacred precinct at all. The hypothesis

[204] Whether this is intended to prohibit iconic representations of YHWH alone or of other gods is unclear.
[205] Noth 1965: 127 bats away this possibility by stating, "We can suppose it to begin with ch. 17, primarily for the simple reason that we can see elsewhere no other longer collection to which ch. 17 and the following chapters could once have belonged…" Again, one can see the circular reasoning that is frequently invoked in defenses of the Holiness Code.
[206] See Cholewiński 1976 for extensive comparative analysis of the two laws. Feldman 2018: 290-293 addresses weaknesses in this comparison, arguing that these laws serve very different functions.
[207] Wellhausen 1899: 150.
[208] Wellhausen 1899: 150, "Sonst wäre die Stellung ebenso unverständlich..."

that Leviticus 17 serves as an opening to a distinctive law code that runs through Leviticus 26 is also undermined by the simple fact that, absent 1st person address, not a single one of the characteristics that scholars have identified as marking the special character of Leviticus 17-26 actually appear in Leviticus 17.[209]

Moreover, the colophon in Lev 26:46 explicitly includes at least the material in Leviticus 11-15 in its purview by mentioning *tôrōt*—a term never found in Leviticus 17-26.[210] The announcement in Lev 10:10 that priests will "distinguish between the holy and the profane and between the unclean and the pure" also indicates, as we have argued above, the integration of Leviticus 17-26 into the larger structure of Leviticus 11-26. Finally, Lev 26:46's anomalous use of *ḥuqqîm* (where we would expect *ḥuqqōt*) echoes the same anomalous use in Lev 10:11—the only two such uses in the Priestly text—further supporting the idea that Leviticus 17-26 are inseparable from 11-16.[211]

Even if one views the colophon as an addition to an originally separate code and the commission of the priests as a later addition, they show that the formal criterion of "codes must begin with regulations on a place of worship" was weak enough for an editor to offer a different scope for the regulations that Leviticus 26 concludes. This suggests, again, that our understanding of what constitutes a necessary structure for an ancient Judahite law book is

---

[209] Milgrom 2000: 1332; Feldman 2018: 221-295. See Rhyder 2019: 25-27 for a brief review of the early argument over whether Leviticus 17 belonged with H.

[210] Graf 1886: 85; Wagner 1974: 313 go even further, arguing that this closing actually comprehends all of the non-narrative Priestly material from Exodus 25-Leviticus 26.

[211] Milgrom 1991: 618-619 for the distinction—the feminine is used throughout P to indicate a "statute" or "law" and the masculine for a "due." Milgrom 1991: 37; 2000: 1327 argues that this is an example of H's blurring of P's technical vocabulary. This is, as he acknowledges, not quite true since "H" maintains this distinction in every other context except Lev 26:46 and Lev 10:11 (which he identifies as H). The fact that this "incorrect" use occurs at the bookends of Leviticus 11-25 suggests that this was a conscious, structural choice. We should also note that while P typically does not use *ḥōq* in the singular to indicate a law (though see Exod 30:21, which Milgrom 1991: 619 corrects on the basis of SamP) the plural *ḥuqqîm* is only used in these two contexts, further indicating an intentional choice. That *ḥuqqîm* would be understood as indicating legal content (and not simply the plural of "dues") is indicated by its use as a legal category throughout Deuteronomy (e.g., 12:1; 26:16). Finally, we should note that this anomalous use occurs outside of non-narrative contexts, signaling to the reader that non-technical uses of vocabulary can be expected.

insufficient to support the weight of the Holiness Code hypothesis. We have also seen that bringing DC and CC into conversation with Leviticus does not necessarily clarify the extent of the material that Leviticus 26 concludes in the way that scholars have claimed. Structural and textual indicators point just as easily to either Exodus 25-31 or Leviticus 10/11 as they do to Leviticus 17.

Additionally, while scholars typically use the beginning and end of these codes in their argument about the separate nature of Leviticus 17-26, we should also examine their internal characteristics. Bookends are not sufficient formal criteria on which to base an established structure; one would expect other shared characteristics as well. However, here we find a striking difference between CC and DC on the one hand and Leviticus 17-26 on the other. Both CC and DC present themselves as a single continuous speech with no interruptions. Leviticus 17-26, in contrast, contains numerous speech introductions that indicate the beginning of separate units and even includes three narrative interludes (Lev 21:24; 23:44; 24:10-23).[212]

This subdivision into individual speeches sets these chapters apart from both CC and DC. This suggests that the structure of those codes can not be used to support the notion that Leviticus 17-26 was originally a separate law code. Importantly, the arrangement of discrete speeches dealing with individual topics interspersed with narrative interludes is characteristic of the form of the Priestly text all of Leviticus, not just the Holiness Code. This stands as a strong weight in favor of viewing the Priestly tradent as the one responsible for organizing this material. This notion is further supported by several studies which have concluded that the content and

[212] Speeches begin in Lev 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1, 16; 22:1, 17, 26; 23:1, 9, 23, 26, 33; 24:1, 13; 25:1. Many scholars view the narrative in Leviticus 24, or at least 24:10-14, 23, as a Priestly insertion into the original H talion law, see, e.g., Kuenen 1886: 278; Paton 1897: 53-57; Driver 1910: 56. Knohl 1995: 119-121 and Milgrom 2001: 2101-2106, who view H as later than P, hold that this section is original to the Holiness Code. See Chavel 2014: 23-92 for an analysis of the *talion* narrative and an argument for its responsiveness to the context in Leviticus 18-22. Even if one regards the narrative section of Leviticus 24 as a later addition (a difficult to defend position, though Noth 1965: 179 argues that this is a legal and not a narrative text), the point about H consisting of discrete divine speeches still stands.

themes of Leviticus 17-26 can only be understood in relationship to the rest of the divine speeches in Leviticus, which themselves flow from the Priestly narrative's setting at the end of Exodus.[213] If there are formal similarities between Leviticus 17-26 and the other biblical law codes—though our above analysis makes such an assertion tenuous—this may be an intentionally artificial construction, perhaps meant to parallel the form of a "law book."

We have, then, arrived at the end of the arguments for the distinctiveness of Leviticus 17-26 from the rest of the Priestly text. As with arguments from the divine speeches, none of the other arguments brought forth to defend this notion held up under close examination. We found the relationship with Ezekiel to be wrongly limited to these chapters and amenable to other explanations. We demonstrated that the supposed disagreements between H and P on certain matters were non-existent. And our discussion above proved that the idea that the structure of Leviticus 17-26 was evidence of its original independence rested on weak reasoning and overgeneralized comparisons. Over and over again we have seen that Leviticus 17-26, rather than being distinct from the Priestly text, participates in its narrative and structure in a way that suggests it is a native presence. For those who work in the Knohl-Milgrom model, that sees H as a later addition to P, the burden of proof has shifted so that they must explain why stratification is necessary to explain the shape of the Priestly text and why it is preferable to the narrative readings and contextual analyses offered here.

Weighing Alternatives: A Neo-analytic Perspective on the Holiness Code

In the preceding in-depth examination of arguments for the distinctive nature of the Holiness Code, we have treated two different conceptions of the relationship between Leviticus

[213] Wagner 1974; Blum 1990: 318-322; Ruwe 1999, 2003. See also Feldman 2018: 223-283 for extensive arguments for why Leviticus 17 in particular must be contextualized with Leviticus 1-16 and other parts of the Priestly text. Milgrom 2000: 1332 shows awareness of this issue and attempts to account for it.

17-26 and the Priestly text as a single argument. The first is the traditional model that saw in Leviticus 17-26 an older legal code that was incorporated into the Priestly text, either by a later editor or by the Priestly author. The second is the model associated with Elliger, Cholewiński, Knohl, and Milgrom that understands parts of Leviticus 17-26 as a later supplement to the Priestly text.

Despite the different historical orientation of these two approaches, they are at heart based on the same perception—that Leviticus 17-26 contain features that distinguish this corpus from the rest of the Priestly text. This unquestioned assumption of distinction led Elliger, Milgrom, and Knohl to their reversal of the traditional model. They, quite rightly, saw the weaknesses in the old model's approach—in particular, the idea that you can arrive at the original form of the Holiness Code by stripping away the distinctively Priestly elements from Leviticus 17-26.[214] The work that proceeded on these lines was always controversial, and rarely produced anything that was sensible as a legal collection.[215]

Further strengthening their sense that Leviticus 17-26 did not represent an older law code that was incorporated into P was the fact that these chapters appear dependent on material in the Priestly text in order to fully understand them—both narratively and through cross-references to material contained in the earlier part of Leviticus.[216] Milgrom and Knohl pushed this reversal even further, noting that there were a number of passages throughout the Priestly text that showed agreement with the tone and material of Leviticus 17-26.[217] They understood this as more evidence that a later redactor had added these passages to the Priestly text (e.g., Exod

[214] Elliger 1966: 14-20; Knohl 1995: 111-123; Milgrom 2000: 1349-1352.
[215] Nihan 2007: 395-401. For a classic example of this approach, see Paton 1897, 1898, 1899.
[216] See discussion above.
[217] Milgrom 1991: 13-21; 2000: 1333-1344; Knohl 1995: 8-110.

31:12-17; Lev 3:17; 7:22-27; 11:44-45), editing that text throughout in order to support this supplementation and bring P into line with the ideas of the Holiness Code.

This entire reading of the data is based on a massive, unexamined presupposition—that the majority of Leviticus 17-26 contains a large amount of distinctive material that clearly does not belong to the original Priestly text. Milgrom and Knohl nowhere question this baseline assumption, simply accepting the classic position on these chapters without examining the arguments for them. This assumption affects even the starting position that Knohl takes for determining how to distinguish P and H. He begins by analyzing the differences between Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28-29, but he nowhere argues for why we should understand Leviticus 23 as distinctively different from the rest of the Priestly text.[218] His position is even more problematic given the nature of Numbers 28-29, which many scholars have identified as among the latest portions of the Pentateuch and only Priestly by topic rather than by incorporation into the Priestly narrative.[219]

Knohl additionally uses characteristics of H described by previous scholars as proof of its independence as though they are definitive indicators of the presence of H wherever they may occur. This means that Knohl identifies 1st person address, use of the phrase *ʾănî Yhwh*, relationship with Ezekiel, and sympathy with ideas expressed in Leviticus 17-26 as the levers by which he can identify H additions to the Priestly text.[220] We have demonstrated above that these features are present throughout the Priestly text and that the ideas of Leviticus 17-26 are deeply integrated into P as well. The attribution of these features as identifiable marks of H depends on

[218] Knohl 1995: 8-14.
[219] Kuenen 1886: 63-65, 87; Gray 1903: 402-403; Eissfeldt 1965: 204-205; Noth 1968: 219-220; idem 1981: 9; Friedman 1981a: 115; idem 2003: 296 n.; Wagenaar 2005: 146-155. We will discuss Numbers 28-29 further in Chapter 6.
[220] See, e.g., Knohl 1995: 1 n. 3, 15, 17 n. 24, 46-47, passim.

the *a priori* assumption that H is distinctive. The weakness at the heart of Knohl's and Milgrom's program is that they never stopped to question this assumption.

Schwartz's study on the Holiness Code represents a definite improvement over the Knohl and Milgrom approach. In his work, Schwartz acknowledges and emphasizes the continuities between the Priestly text and the Holiness Code.[221] Nevertheless, despite this different orientation towards this material, the criteria he provides for identifying H as distinctive do not substantially differ from those used by Milgrom and Knohl in their own work.[222] One wonders if Schwartz would not have identified all of this material as P had he not been introduced to the idea that Leviticus 17-26 contained distinctive material. On Schwartz's own accounting, it is difficult to understand why stratification is necessary to explain the state of affairs he describes.

When the starting point of the inquiry is the idea that Leviticus 17-26 contains a distinctive body of literature, then there are only two options available to explain its inclusion in the Priestly text—it is either an earlier corpus that was incorporated in P (the classical view) or it is a later corpus of literature composed as a supplement to P (the Elliger-Knohl-Milgrom view). There is, however, a third option. Given our detailed examination above, we have found that Leviticus 17-26 does not, in fact, distinguish itself from the rest of the Priestly text. It is, instead, a well-integrated part of the Priestly narrative, and there do not appear to be any major disagreements between the two.[223]

Taking the totality of the data as examined above and setting aside preconceived notions about the compositional history of P, the natural conclusion one arrives at is that Leviticus 17-26, like Leviticus 1-7 and 11-16, have always been a part of the Priestly text.[224] The features that

[221] Schwartz 1999: 24-25.
[222] Schwartz 1999: 25-29.
[223] On minor disagreements, see below.
[224] See also the works cited in note 5 above.

Milgrom, Knohl, and others have identified as evidence of H editing P are instead evidence of a consistent viewpoint levelled throughout the Priestly text. When material related to the Holiness Code is being identified in Priestly material in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, then we must wonder why we need redaction to explain this state of affairs.[225] In our own view, these works have not uncovered an H editor supplementing the Priestly text, but the Priestly author in his role as editor of non-narrative materials. To put the problem in a different light and view it in the abstract: if a scholar was presented with evidence that a particular piece of literature displays a consistent thematic and narrative structure throughout its text, with certain ideas appearing at every major moment of the story, that scholar would not assume that this unity was created from the redaction of a base text by an editor who disagreed with major ideas of that base text. The evidence should instead lead us to understand that text as a unified, coherent whole.

One of the strongest evidences in favor of this proposition is a perusal of the Priestly text that Knohl proposes.[226] What is left of P once Knohl has removed all of the passages that he attributes to H is simply nonsense—a random assemblage of dead-end, unconnected narratives and a series of ritual instructions. We have already discussed the way that the reattribution of the revelation of the name Yhwh to Moses damages the narrative of the Priestly text. But Knohl's P also jumps from the plague of boils (Exod 9:8-12) to the receiving of the Tabernacle instructions (Exodus 25-30) and contains no account of its construction. Knohl's P narratively ends with the

[225] See, e.g., Arnold 2014, 2017; Brett 2014; Carr 2020 who extend the identification of H additions into the Priestly material in Genesis. Knohl 1995: 60-101; Milgrom 2000:1334-1344; King 2009: 125-151; Baden 2013b; Nihan 2013; Awabdy 2019 deal with Exodus and Numbers (though Nihan questions the validity of identifying H-sympathetic passages as constituting a separable H layer in the Pentateuch). At a certain point one must wonder whether scholars working within the Knohl-Milgrom paradigm will eventually reattribute all of P to H, effectively agreeing with the view that the entire text is a conceptual unity.

[226] Knohl 1995: 104-106 contains a chart summarizing his identification of the Priestly text. Milgrom is more circumspect and expresses skepticism about the possibility of identifying narrative passages as H (see, e.g., Milgrom 2000: 1334). Nevertheless his list of passages he marks as H (2000: 1343-1344) includes the revelation of the Name to Moses, which robs the Priestly text of one of its most important motifs. Milgrom 2000: 1344 also attributes the Sabbath passage in Gen 2:2-3 to H, for a critique of which see Stackert 2011. One must question the circularity by which one says that the Sabbath is an exclusively H motif and therefore every occurrence of it in P must be H instead.

deaths of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10:1-5), which is followed by the purity manuals (Leviticus 11-16), the *śōṭāh*, nazirite, and red heifer instructions (Num 5:11-31; 6:1-21; 19:1-22), and a festival calendar (Numbers 28-29). That, for Knohl, is the end of the Priestly text. This reconstruction has nothing to recommend it over the proposal offered here.

This conclusion should hold regardless of what model one uses to explain the composition of the Priestly text. However, it also happens to accord well with the Neo-analytic model proposed at the end of Chapter 2. That is, we should understand all of the non-narrative material in Leviticus, including 17-25, as source material that was used by the Priestly author. His work was not the composition of these materials, but their selection, arrangement, and adaptation to his narrative. This allows us to leverage the insight of older scholarship that the materials in Leviticus 17-26 are not the work of the Priestly author and to better integrate it into our understanding of the composition of the Priestly text. Once we postulate that the Priestly author is using older materials in the Holiness Code just as he does elsewhere, then we can see a common method at work throughout the segment of Priestly narrative contained in the book of Leviticus—the Priestly author collected existing non-narrative materials, then brought them together into thematic groups and placed them into a narrative progression embedded in his Sinai narrative.[227] The Priestly author prepares his audience for this eruption of non-narrative materials by being explicit about the upcoming topics (Lev 10:10-11), and reminding the audience of the narrative setting of these speeches (Lev 16:1; 25:1).[228] While we will reserve a full exploration of this model until we have completed our analysis of the Priestly Sinai account, in what follows we will provide an initial assessment of some of the ways that it helps us understand the Priestly material in Leviticus.

[227] This method is, in fact, consistent across the entirety of the Priestly text. See Chapters 2, 4, 5, and 6.
[228] For further examination of the structure of Leviticus when viewed without a hard dividing line between Leviticus 16 and 17, see Wagner 1974; Ruwe 2003.

The Neo-analytic model first allows us to explain otherwise unusual features of Leviticus 17-26. Blum has already noted that the duplication of material between Leviticus 18 and 20 is a sign that these chapters were drawn from sources.[229] This is an important indicator of the Priestly author's method for working with sources, as he neither chose a single text nor attempted to synthesize the two different presentations into a single speech. This suggests that the preservation of the selected non-narrative material was more important to the Priestly author than offering a unified, systematic exposition of the Sinai revelation.[230]

The same instinct to preserve multiple presentations of similar material may also account for the occasional duplication of topics between Leviticus 1-16 and 17-26. One frequently noted example is the giving of the *šəlāmîm* regulations in 7:15-16, paralleled by regulations in 19:5-8; 22:29-30.[231] On our hypothesis, each of these was set within a different, already existing document. Here we see the Priestly author at work, as he chose to deploy all of them, differentiating between what audience each was given to—the regulations in 7:15-16 are directed to the priests (6:18), while the ones in 19:5-8; 22:29-30 are directed to the community at large (19:2; 22:18). Because these instructions deal with the consumption of the *šəlāmîm*, they are relevant to both groups.

The preservation of originally distinct sources also accounts for the structure of Leviticus 23. This chapter is a single calendar, but the information it contains is distributed across five different speeches (23:1, 9, 23, 26, 33). In fact, each of these speeches may represent either a different source text or an excerpt from a different source text. It is difficult to explain away

---

[229] Blum 1990: 321, n. 130. Other, smaller overlaps also occur, such as Lev 19:9-10 || 23:22.
[230] VanDriel 1969: 69 offers a similar observation about Mesopotamian ritual texts: "We can say in any case that except for KAR 214 [SAA XX 42] and VAT 8005 [SAA XX 37] the texts of this group seem to derive from several different sources; what was taken from elsewhere was not made into a really well-composed new text...The lack of unity in the composition shown by several of the texts mentioned and by several of those that are still to come is not a speciality of the Neo-Assyrian rituals. An Old Babylonian text of the same type was published by van Dijk…"
[231] Nihan 2007: 468-469.

these speech introductions as indicating some kind of essential organization of these festivals. The choice to combine Sabbath and Passover in one speech (Lev 23:1-8) but separate them from the *ʿōmer* and Shavuot (23:9-22), while also placing *tərûʿāh* and *kippurîm* in separate speeches (23:23-25, 26-32) is instead better explained by the same mechanism one uses to explain the separation into speeches of the sacrificial instructions in Leviticus 1-5 or of the *tôrôt* in Leviticus 6-7. In the case of the Neo-analytic framework, a single explanation exists—the supposition that the speech introductions mark documentary sources.

Parallel ancient Near Eastern texts offer further support for this suggestion. Complete cultic calendars from the ancient Near East are non-existent, and usually festival texts deal with only one or a handful of months.[232] The Priestly author likely had access to similar, smaller texts about various holidays and has constructed a complete calendar from them. He nevertheless maintained the originally separate nature of these source materials by embedding them each in their own speech. This approach provides insight into the Priestly text's format throughout Leviticus, which presents Yhwh's revelation to Moses as a series of speeches instead of a single, unified speech as in the Deuteronomic (Deuteronomy 1-26) and Covenant Codes (Exod 20:22-24:33). The Priestly author seems committed to preserving the original separation of the diverse materials he has drawn on.

The Neo-analytic model also accounts for minor disagreements between parts of Leviticus. Scholars most frequently point to the fact that Lev 15:24 and 20:18 contain different

[232] At Emar texts range from covering a single month (Emar 452 & 463), to three (Emar 373), while Emar 446 covers six months (See Fleming 2000 for editions and commentary). Fleming 2000: 143 identifies this long-form calendar as "unique in cuneiform literature." See further discussion in Fleming 2000: 141-195. At Ugarit, the maximum time-frame in a single text is 2 months, see texts 6-18 in Pardee 2002. Likewise SAA 20.12 covers 3 (possibly 4) months and 20.9 covers 2. The others only cover a month or a series of days. SAA 20.52-53 contain sections that list the days during the course of an entire year during which particular rituals should take place, but these texts' genre and form is distinct from the calendrical texts. See Cohen 1993 for further review of ancient Near Eastern calendars. The only texts we have that deal with the full cycle of the year are the hemerologies, which are functionally different and deal with personal rather than public religious observance; see Livingstone 2013 for texts and commentary.

outcomes for the man who has sex with a menstruating woman—Leviticus 15 states that it makes the man *ṭāmēʾ* for seven days, while Leviticus 20 prescribes the *krt*-penalty for both parties.[233] Disagreements on such a subject may be attributed to the use of disparate sources instead of to editorial layers.[234] Similarly, even if Milgrom is correct that technical terms are used in a different way in different chapters of Leviticus, this can also be attributed to different sources that the Priestly author felt no need to harmonize.[235]

Additionally, this model allows us a different vantage point on the arrangement of material in Leviticus. The placement of Leviticus 11 provides an admirable example. The hortatory close to this chapter shows that the behaviors it describes fall under the category of "holiness" (Lev 11:44-45), and the closing speech of Leviticus 20—alongside the non-Priestly parallels in Exod 22:30 and Deut 14:21—confirms this perspective. The Priestly tradent had to decide whether to file Leviticus 11 under the category of its outcome—holiness—or under the category of its content—purity. The closing speech in Lev 20:22-26 allowed him to have it both ways,[236] but it is a reasonable and understandable choice for the chapter's content to determine its broader place in the Priestly author's schema of divine speeches.

However, gains have not only been made at the macro level. Our examination of the arguments for the Holiness Code has provided additional data with which we can sharpen our

---

[233] Olyan 1994; Milgrom 2000: 1353, 1754-1756. Nihan 2007: 452, raises the possibility that the use of מקור דם in 20:18 is an intentional callback to Leviticus 12 and is meant to include not just sex with a menstruating woman, but also with a woman who has just given birth.

[234] Alternatively, it is possible that there is no conflict between the two statements—note that Lev 20:18 is centered on *ʾiššāh dāwāh* and not *niddāh*. This could indicate that it is not concerned with sex with a menstruating woman, but one who is bleeding beyond or outside of her menstrual cycle. Lev 15:25-27, which deals with this issue, does not contain a statement about a man who sleeps with a woman in this state, despite other parallels between it and the menstruation rules (15:20-23 || 15:26-27). Further confirmation for this view may be found in Lev 12:2 which compares a woman's postpartum status to the days of her *niddat dəwōt* (though this may be contraindicated by 12:5). Lev 18:19, which forbids sex with a menstruating woman, is not in conflict with either passage since it does not describe an outcome for violators.

[235] See, e.g., Milgrom 2000: 1327-1330, rejected by Blum 2009: 35. See also the discussion above. George 2013:85 provides evidence for a similar process of non-harmonizing collection from diverse sources in an Old Babylonian diagnostic text.

[236] This speech may be the work of the Priestly author. See discussion below.

image of how the Priestly tradent worked on these sources at the small scale. From a Neo-analytic perspective, the use of 3rd person self-reference in sacrificial contexts explored above provides confirmation for the suspicion that these speeches were drawn from pre-existing sources. If their primary context was not embedded into divine speech, then the use of 3rd person to refer to Yhwh is reasonable and expected. Additionally, this conforms to how ritual texts from the ancient Near East are usually presented—we almost never see them attributed to divine revelation and so they speak of the gods in the 3rd person.[237]

The Priestly tradent adapted similar source materials into his narrative without changing this feature, allowing the prefaced statements that Moses is to repeat these words to the Israelites to alleviate some of the tension between each speech's framing and content.[238] This supposition appears at least as valid as assuming that an author went out of his way to frequently have Yhwh speak about himself in the 3rd person and offers an explanation grounded in how the text was constructed rather than in a theological predisposition.[239] This also indicates that the Priestly

[237] The few ritual texts that I am aware of that present themselves as divine revelations are KTU 1.100; 1.107; 1.114; 1.124 (see Pardee 2002: 167-191 for editions), all of which are apotropaic or medicinal; the Erra epic's use as an amulet (see Cagni 1970 for edition, with additional fragments in Lambert 1980; Saggs 1986: 29; Al-Rawi and Black 1989) which is also apotropaic (see Reiner 1960); and the Cyrene Cathartic Law which claims to be the revelation of Apollo (see Sokolowski 1962, #115 for edition; Burkert 1992: 68-73 on connections to the Near East; Parker 1996: 332-351 for translation and commentary). There are also the interesting late Old Babylonian tablets from Tigunānu, which attribute certain omens to Adad/Hadad, "bēl Ḫalab" (George 2013: 109). Additionally, the Ashurbanipal library catalogues sometimes attribute divine authorship to ritual and instructional genres, such as attributing the *āšipu*-corpus, *kalû*-corpus, and *Enūma Anu Enlil* (among others) to Ea (Lambert 1962; Van der Toorn 2007: 31-45). These attributions in the catalogues, however, are not reflected in the form in which the texts present themselves. See Steinert 2018 for several insightful essays on the relationship between texts and catalogues. A similar phenomenon can be seen in the Enmeduranki legend (Lambert 1967; 1998; see also, Jiménez 2014: 104-108), which attributes the eponymous king's knowledge of various divinatory arts to direct revelation from Šamaš and Adad. Despite this framing, the text does not present its various instructions concerning diviners as divine speech from the mouth of those gods, whom the text consistently references in the third person.

[238] The narrative image that logically follows then is not one in which Yhwh refers to himself in the third person, but one in which Moses refers to Yhwh in the third person when he repeats the speeches verbatim. Nevertheless, what is reported to us is not this logical narrative outcome, but the speeches from Yhwh to Moses. That this was also not the consistent narrative logic is demonstrated by the numerous speeches that mix 1st and 3rd person reference. See Chapter 5 for further discussion of the Priestly author's use of underlying sources.

[239] See, for instance, Knohl 1995: 169-171's explanation that the Priestly author viewed Yhwh as impersonal and that a later H author/editor unconsciously imported this language into his own sacrificial passages despite not sharing this view.

author's intervention into these source texts was likely minimal—sufficient to adapt them to the narrative context or make a point.[240]

Other data also supports this supposition. In Leviticus 1-7 the only uses of the 1st person by Yhwh come in 6:10 and 7:34—both are at the end of a divine speech. We should also look to the beginning of speeches, where the Priestly author has added statements indicating the audience of each speech (e.g., Lev 1:2; 4:2; 6:2). This suggests that the Priestly author added statements to his source materials, but he did so at their edges.[241] The same pattern holds in Leviticus 11-16, where all uses of the 1st person occur at the beginning or end of divine speeches (Lev 11:44-45; 14:34; 15:31; 16:2). Within the speeches though, Yhwh is strictly referred to in the 3rd person,[242] again suggesting the Priestly author's minimal intervention in his source material.[243] The Neo-analytic framework can, uniquely, account for this vacillation between the 1st and the 3rd person in a way that is contextualized in the composition of the Priestly text.

When we turn to Leviticus 17-26, we must take into account the different genre of some of these materials—we are no longer dealing with instructional manuals as in the first part of Leviticus, but with a much more varied body of source materials. Nevertheless, these trends seem to hold. The divine speech in Leviticus 18 reserves its exhortative elements for the beginning and end of the speech (18:1-5, 24-30). In between these poles, the non-narrative material is presented without further elaboration, with the exception of two uses of the emphatic *ʾny yhwh* (18:6, 21).[244] Leviticus 22:17-25, which is concerned entirely with acceptable and

[240] We will examine this in more detail in Chapter 5.
[241] Milgrom 1991: 216 approaches this observation when he connects the material in 3:17 to that in 1:2. Because of his presupposition that P is the author of the non-narrative material of Leviticus 1-3 and his assumption that profane slaughter is permitted in P, he argues that this is evidence that H has edited the entire section. Instead, we claim that he has identified the Priestly author at work, as the editor of the non-narrative source material.
[242] See Appendix 3.2.
[243] See Chapter 5 for further examination of how the Priestly author worked on these materials.
[244] 18:6 can be accounted for by noting that this verse serves as a topic statement for the rest of the chapter, with 18:7-18 (20?) serving as an elaboration on this statement. 18:21's expression may have been triggered by the phrase

unacceptable sacrifices, does not use 1st person at all. Most other speeches also reserve 1st person elements for the beginning or end of the speech.[245]

Other cases are more complex.[246] Leviticus 20 also ends with a long, exhortative speech (20:22-26) in which 1st person speech with 2nd person address is used in a way that is disjunctive with the preceding material (20:9-21). However, this speech also opens with two laws that are couched entirely in 1st person, exhortative speech (20:1-8). This fits the pattern of 1st person material existing at the open and close of speeches, but is surprising in the way that the opening speech gives specific law instead of general exhortation.[247]

Leviticus 19 is also a special problem, with its repeated use of the emphatic *ʾny yhwh* throughout the chapter. Leviticus 17 and 25 also intersperse 1st person speech throughout their non-narrative material. We may content ourselves for now with Blum's observation that paraenesis is a byproduct of genre—the Priestly author may have been more willing to intervene in these materials as he was incorporating them because of their legal/ethical rather than instructional nature in order to emphasize their message.[248] A more detailed examination may reveal other reasons for these deviations, and we will return to this issue in Chapter 5.

Whether one accepts the Neo-analytic model or not, the view that Leviticus 17-26 should be treated as a distinctive body of literature must be either rejected or defended with new arguments. The Unitarian and Analyst agreement on this issue is an agreement on an error and their models should be adjusted accordingly. From a Neo-analytic view, the rejection of the Holiness Code's distinctiveness allows us to integrate these chapters into our framework in a

---

šēm ʾĕlōhêkā, which is also accompanied by this expression in 19:12. The frequent generic use of *ʾĕlōhîm* in Leviticus 18-22 may have conditioned the Priestly author to add statements specifying Yhwh as the divinity in question.

[245] See Appendix 5.4-5 for the distribution of 1st person by speech.

[246] The observations in Nihan 2007: 399-401 cover some of these problems from a different perspective.

[247] See further discussion in Chapter 5.

[248] Blum 1990: 318-322; 2009: 38-39.

way that shows the Priestly author working consistently across the divine speeches that follow the construction of the Tabernacle. What the Priestly author accomplished was not a harmonizing synthesis, but a collection that respected the diverse origins of the traditional material at his disposal. Rather than making sure that these texts all worked as a system, he ensured that they were embedded in his story of the Israelite past in a way that made narrative sense and participated in the progression of events.

This examination into Leviticus 17-26 has clarified some aspects of the Neo-analytic framework offered in general terms at the end of chapter 2. We have further seen that this model offers a robust explanatory framework for accounting for both the unity and diversity of material in Leviticus and in the Priestly text at large. This model has also provided better insight into the Priestly author's work as a collector and arranger, which may in turn help illuminate the overall purpose the Priestly author envisioned for his work. We will continue to sharpen this framework in further discussion, but for this to be fruitful we should have a firm grasp on the full range of the Priestly text's use of non-narrative materials in the Sinai account. Our next task, then, is to grapple with the Priestly text in Numbers 1-10*.

CHAPTER 4

TELLING TIME AT SINAI

Responsible Uses of Disorder

The end of the Sinai segment of the Priestly text (Numbers 1-10*) presents the reader with both a variety of materials and an array of problems. Nevertheless, as the concluding part of the Sinai pericope in the Priestly text, these chapters require our attention if we are to offer a global model of P's composition.[1] Furthermore, our exploration of Numbers 1-10* will serve as a landmark: this last foray into the Sinai narrative of the Priestly text will also represent our last engagement with the Analytic program as defined by the works of Wellhausen and Kuenen. When we turn to the Priestly text beyond these chapters we will find that Noth's arguments about the ending of P have thoroughly changed and reoriented the terms of engagement. Caught between these post-Noth debates about the Priestly text's ending and the recent fascination with the Holiness Code, scholars have largely allowed a benign neglect to settle over the question of Numbers 1-10*'s place in P.[2]

In broad strokes, the Analyst school relegates the bulk of the Priestly material in the opening chapters of Numbers to secondary strata.[3] While scholars disagree about the extent of

[1] In numerical perspective, the entire Sinai pericope is covered in approximately 1,734 verses in the Priestly text (Exodus 19-Numbers 10*). There are 412 verses in the Priestly account of the final part of the Sinai narrative contained in Numbers 1-10, constituting ~24% of the Priestly Sinai account. To put this in another perspective, the Priestly text in Numbers 1-10 is nearly half the size of the entire book of Leviticus (859 verses).

[2] See, e.g., the relatively small amount of attention paid to Numbers 1-10* in Frevel 2013's framing of the *status quaestionis* for debates on Numbers and Römer 2008's focus on only the "legal" texts in Numbers 1-10* when exploring the increasing focus on Numbers in contemporary Pentateuchal scholarship.

[3] The following discussion draws on Kuenen 1886: 91-95; Wellhausen 1899: 172-179; Carpenter & Hardford-Battersby 1900: I.152-155, II.183-201; Gray 1903: xxxiii-xxxix, 1-92; Noth 1968: 6, 13-77; Kellermann 1970;

the secondary material, most identify all of the so-called "legal material" in Num 5:1-6:26; 8:1-4; 9:1-14 as additions to the original Priestly narrative by arguing that they are all supplemental and have little to no connection to their context. Of the remaining material in these opening chapters, there is broad agreement that Numbers 7 and 8:5-26 are also not original elements of the Priestly text due to their chronological dislocation and the presence of certain contradictions and repetitions.[4] Finally, Numbers 1-4 and 9:15-10:28 have generated a range of opinions among Analysts on the question of how much to accept as originating with the Priestly *Grundschrift*, though all identify at least some of that material as belonging to later strata. The far end of this spectrum includes scholars who argue that none of Numbers 1-10* belongs to P^{g}.[5]

Even a cursory glance at the Analyst approach to the Priestly text in Numbers 1-10* reveals the use of the same compositional criteria used in the earlier books of the Torah. Having found several Priestly compositional strata in Exodus and Leviticus, the Analysts were comfortable identifying further parts of these layers in Numbers as well. While sensible given the success they felt their approach had achieved, we have demonstrated that the arguments offered to support the Analyst model for the stratification of Exodus and Leviticus are severely lacking. In a similar vein, our refutation of the idea that the Holiness Code constitutes a unique layer within P undermines attempts to attribute parts of Numbers 1-10* to a layer related to H.[6]

Knierim & Coats 2005: 33; Seebass 2009: 100-101, 108; 2012: 4*-7*, 25*-27*, 31*-35*. Levine 1993: 104, 106-107, 200 endorses the idea that P consists of layers and that the Priestly material in Numbers is later than the Priestly material in Exodus and Leviticus, but he does not offer a detailed reconstruction of these layers.

[4] See discussion below.

[5] Elliger 1952: 122 & n. 4, 127; Nihan 2007: 30, 73; Boorer 2016: 70-71. Frevel 2013: 18's review of the *status quaestionis* for Numbers asserts that scholarly consensus only agrees on Priestly narrative material existing in Numbers 10* from these opening chapters (though his own view, as expressed in Frevel 2000: 46-47, 112 n. 130, is sympathetic to a greater amount of material from these chapters being attributed to the *Grundschrift* of P).

[6] Gray 1903: xxxviii, 3; Knohl 1995: 52-54, 56-57, 71-73, 83-90, 105; Milgrom 2000: 1334-1335, 1337-1338, 1340-1341, 1343-1344; Frevel 2013: 15-17. See also, Stackert 2011: 194 for the view that "In P there are no Levites…H takes a mediating stance [between D & P], incorporating the Levites into the cult but only in an inferior role."

In our own inquiry, then, we bring to Numbers a strong presumption of the unity of the Priestly text up to this point.

This does not mean that we can not encounter new, compelling reasons for stratifying the Priestly text here. It does mean, though, that we have earned the right to be skeptical of stratification founded on reference to the Analyst model for Exodus and Leviticus. For example, Kuenen's argument that the genealogy of Aaron presented in Num 3:1-4 must belong to a later layer of the Priestly text because it refers to Aaron's sons as "anointed priests" need not detain us—we have already addressed the fallacious logic behind separating strata on the basis of whether only Aaron is anointed or whether his sons are also anointed.[7] Similarly, we need no longer deal with arguments for the secondary nature of a passage based on the presence of the incense altar.[8]

In a different vein, Wellhausen's argument that Num 1:17-47 must be a later addition because it duplicates material found in Numbers 2—which he considered more original—also does not require specific refutation.[9] Kuenen already rejected Wellhausen's reasoning here,[10] and we may join him even more firmly as we have repeatedly seen that the Priestly author does not shy away from repetition.[11] While we might seek a reason for such repetition, its mere existence is no obstacle to accepting a passage as part of P. Likewise, we have shown that the variation in

[7] Kuenen 1886: 94. See also, Gray 1903: xxxv. See Chapter 2 for discussion.
[8] E.g., Kuenen 1886: 94; Wellhausen 1899: 178 n.; Gray 1903: xxxiv-xxxv; Kellermann 1970: 55. Noth 1968: 39 strikes a more cautious note, wanting to mark the plural מזבחות in 3:31 as a secondary development rather than striking the entire passage on this basis; nevertheless he joins the others in viewing all of Num 4:1-33 as secondary in part because of the occurrence of the incense altar and other material from Exodus 35-40. See Chapter 2 for full discussion of the incense altar in P.
[9] Wellhausen 1899: 176.
[10] Kuenen 1886: 94; see also, Noth 1968: 17; Kellermann 1970: 7-17, 147-148, 154.
[11] See also, Driver 1910: 61, who offers this statement on Numbers 1-2 without ever mentioning the Analyst position on strata in Numbers 1-10: "The systematic development of a subject, capable in itself of being stated more simply and succinctly, is characteristic of the narrative-sections of P."

formulae such as Kellermann uses in his detailed Analyst treatment of these chapters to identify strata are amenable to other, better explanations.[12]

More compelling are the arguments based on the dislocation of units. While we have previously argued against the Analyst impulse to see other series of chapters as later additions (e.g., Exodus 35-40; Leviticus 1-7; 11-15), the scholarly impulse to see layers in Numbers 1-10* is perhaps more justified than the same predilection in Exodus and Leviticus—no one can escape the fact that the narrative in Numbers 1-10* is non-chronological. Numbers begins in the second month of the second year after the Exodus (Num 1:1), jumps back to the erection of the Tabernacle in the first month (Num 7:1, 10), reverts to the celebration of Passover in the first month (Num 9:1), then again reverses to the day of the Tabernacle's erection (Num 9:15) before finally narrating the Israelites' departure from Mt. Sinai in the second month (Num 10:11). Compounding the more obvious issue of this non-chronological presentation is that certain elements of Numbers 7 appear to rely on the information given in Numbers 1-4, despite the explicit placement of Numbers 7 as chronologically prior.

Analyst evaluations treat this chronological disarrangement as self-evident proof that later editors have expanded an original core of Priestly texts in these chapters.[13] Their confidence in this solution was backstopped by their supposition of layers in Exodus and Leviticus, to which they could attribute other supplements to the original Priestly text. The model we have pursued

---

[12] See, e.g., Kellermann 1970: 35-36, where he concludes that the lack of the term שמות after במספר in Num 3:15, 22, 28, 34 means that "therefore, although this author [of Numbers 3] is dependent on chapter 1, he is not, however, identical with any of the authors identified in chapter 1." ["Demnach ist dieser Verfasser zwar abhängig von Kap. 1, er ist aber nicht identisch mit einem der in Kap. 1 festgestellten Autoren."]

[13] Kuenen 1886: 94; Wellhausen 1899: 179; Gray 1903: xxxv, 74; Noth 1968: 63-64; Blum 1990: 301 n. 54; Nihan 2007: 73; Seebass 2009: 101-102. These authors also support the chronological observation by noting connections between Num 7:1 and material in Exodus they view as secondary. For these sections, see Chapter 2. For complaints about the monotony of Numbers 7 that have been elevated, with no evidentiary foundation, to the level of a compositional criterion, see the collection of quotes in Kellermann 1970: 98, n. 40. For early circumspection about how to explain this achronological arrangement, see Driver 1910: 61.

here has left us without these layers and so we must approach the issue of how to explain the disarray of Numbers 1-10* more circumspectly.

From this point of view, simply observing the achronological sequence and attributing it to an editor does not resolve the problem but merely restates it in different terms. It is insufficient to identify something as a supplement simply because we do not understand how it fits—such an identification is as much a commentary on our own idea of how texts should function as it is a comment on the text itself.[14] That is to say, identifying something as an addition should not and does not rescue the scholar from having to explain its placement in the text. This does not mean that those pieces that various scholars have identified as supplements are not, in fact, additions. It simply means that they have not completed the task of evaluating the status of these elements. The question we must seek to answer, in accordance with the principles of secondary analysis set out in chapter 1, is why the text is disordered. Our inquiry requires an understanding of why Numbers 1-10* are arranged the way that they are, not just a recognition that their organization does not meet our own criteria for how we would arrange and present a narrative. Only when we understand the text can we adjudicate between attributing the disorder to an author or an editor.

However, when turning to scholarly commentaries, one is confronted with a curious situation in which individual units of Numbers 1-10* receive thorough commentary and evaluation in terms of their meaning, history, place in the compositional history of the Priestly text, and contribution to or disagreement with Priestly ideas from elsewhere in the Torah. What is missing from these commentaries, however, is an attempt to make sense of these units in terms of a narrative throughline or in terms of how each unit relates to the units that precede and follow

[14] See, e.g., the similar statements, separated by a century in Gray 1903: xxxv, "The retrospective dates in 7^{1} $9^{1.\ 5.\ 15}$ are most satisfactorily explained by attributing the sections thus introduced to P^{S}" and Knierim & Coats 2005: 33, "The best explanation for the diverse aspects and the uncoordinated relationships of the units in 5:1-10:10 is that this part in its present structure reflects to a large extent the history of the growth of the text in successive accretions."

it.[15] As Olson observes, "These supplements [in Numbers] are often seen as largely arbitrary or haphazard interpolations. The only motive involved is a later editor's desire to include favorite traditions somewhere before the end of the Pentateuch."[16]

This approach is in part due to the Analytic consensus related to these chapters that we outlined above. Further compounding this issue is the fact that, as he did with Exodus 35-40, Wellhausen included Numbers 1-10* in his discussion of the legal (*Gesetzgebung*) rather than the narrative (*Erzählung*) material of the Pentateuch.[17] When combined with the view that these chapters consist of a very small core of original Priestly material with a healthy dose of later supplements added for various purpose, such an approach obscures the true nature of the material in these chapters and prevents scholars from engaging with them on their own terms. Because this critical consensus undergirds most scholarly approaches to Numbers 1-10*, the field itself provides no impetus towards understanding these chapters holistically.[18]

This situation can not be allowed to stand. Regardless of whether one attributes the received form of Numbers 1-10* to an editor or an author, these chapters explicitly present themselves in narrative terms and a narrative text demands a narrative analysis. While readers can easily lose sight of the narrative nature of these chapters due to the inclusion of large lists, the way that this material is presented offers constant reminders that the reader is, in fact, approaching a story. This can be seen most clearly by comparing the divine speeches in Numbers

---

[15] Noth 1968: 44-45 marks this view as programmatic for his own commentary. Levine 1993 is a particularly interesting example of this phenomena, since we might have expected his suspension of the question of particular layers in this material to have motivated him to identify some kind of relationship between the different units in Numbers 1-10*. Milgrom 1990: xiv offers a brief attempt at identifying the "thematic and verbal links that bind the material together," but provides no detailed analysis of how the units function in relation to one another beyond a few acknowledgements of the problem (1990: 34, 43, 51, 53, 60, 67 constitute exceptions).

[16] Olson 1985: 29.

[17] Wellhausen 1899: 81-82, 172-180. See Milgrom 1990: xv; Nihan 2013: 109 for more recent examples of this overgeneralization applied to Numbers 1-10*. See chapter 2 for discussion of this issue.

[18] Even Condren 2013, a self-conscious attempt to eschew Analyst approaches and to engage in a synchronic reading of Numbers 1-10, ultimately reverts to a thematic rather than a narrative structuring of these chapters. Milgrom 1990: xiv indicates the same approach. See further discussion below.

1-10* with the divine speeches in Leviticus. In Leviticus, almost every divine speech begins with an imperative verb of speaking, instructing Moses to convey the informational content of the divine speech to a specified audience.[19] While these speeches are part of a narrative, the content of these speeches is intended, within the narrative, to be informative. The speeches, then, are not meant to spur action in the narrative, but to dictate a standard of behavior.

When we turn to Numbers, we find instead that the divine speeches begin with imperative and jussive verbs demanding action: counting, taking, offering, assigning, making. This form of action-demanding divine speech patterns with the narrative moments in Leviticus—the installation of the priests (Lev 8:1-2) and the execution of the blasphemer (Lev 24:13-14)[20]—further confirming the narrative aspect of these chapters. The presence of fulfillment clauses in these Leviticus passages and in Numbers 1-10*—statements that Moses or the Israelites have complied with Yhwh's commands—also signal the direct impact these speeches have on the action within the narrative.[21]

These features serve to remind us that the long lists involved in Numbers 1-10* are frequently part of the narrative being told.[22] The census in Numbers 1 is the report of the Israelites' fulfillment of Yhwh's command.[23] The exhaustive description of the *nəśîʾîm*'s offering in Numbers 7 is a day-by-day narrative of their bringing gifts to the Tabernacle. Even when the listing takes place in divine speech, such as in Numbers 2 and 4, the content of that speech is meant to shape our image of the narrative situation that will prevail for the rest of the

[19] The verb is almost always *dbr* D impv., but *ʾmr* can be found in Lev 20:2; 21:1.
[20] One is tempted to also include the demand for offerings for the *mənôrāh* and *pānîm*-bread (24:1-2), which begins with *ṣwh* (D) imperative followed by *lqḥ* in a pattern similar to Num 5:1. This is sensible because the demand for oil and grain here is not just setting a future standard of behavior but can also be read as an action demanding immediate response in the narrative moment of the text.
[21] Lev 8:4, 36; 16:34b; 24:23; Num 1:17-19, 54; 2:34; 3:16, 42, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 5:4; 8:3, 20, 22; 9:5. Such statements are not otherwise found in Leviticus 1-7, 11-27.
[22] For a somewhat similar approach to this material, see Douglas 1993b: 102-103.
[23] Note as well that the fulfillment clause in Num 1:17-19 precedes its elaboration in the actual census, a common pattern in the Priestly text that we discussed in chapters 1 and 2.

book of Numbers—the arrangement of the Israelite camps around the Tabernacle as they travel and the constant disassembling and reassembling of the Tent of Meeting that their travels require.

Numbers 1-10*, then, demand a narrative analysis that offers an account of how their various units articulate with one another. Only when we have such an account in hand can we offer a judgment on what parts of Numbers 1-10* may be additions to the Priestly text. Though we do not intend to offer an exhaustive commentary on Numbers 1-10*, our attempt to create such an account will necessitate that we take a granular approach to the various units found in these chapters.[24] In doing so, we hope to alleviate the situation that Knierim and Coats observed when they stated that "All attempts at discerning an organizing principle [in Numbers 5-10] have been either tentative or insufficiently substantiated."[25]

The Motion of the Planets: Structure in Num 1:1-10:28

To make sense of the narrative of the Priestly material in Numbers 1-10, we must also understand the structure of this material. To this end, some of the passages that have most provoked scholarly consternation serve as a useful starting place. While we are reserving judgment on whether these passages are indicative of a history of editorial supplementation, such seams provide useful handholds for attempting to understand how best to approach the organization of the material in these chapters.

The most noticeable of these seams is the anachronistic presentation of events. Num 1:1 places the following action on the first day of the second month of the second year, precisely one

[24] See Condren 2013: 424-428 for a recent, brief overview of proposals on the organization of these chapters. Olson 1985: 31-37 has a review of proposals up to his day.
[25] Knierim & Coats 2005: 32. See below for a discussion of the analysis of Numbers 1-10 they offer (Knierim & Coats 2005: 27-34).

month after the erection of the Tabernacle (Exod 40:2, 17). This, on its own, presents no difficulties. However, Num 7:1, 10, 84 place the beginning of the presentation of offerings by the *nəśîʾîm* as synchronic with the erection of the Tabernacle, placing its events a full month prior to the date in Num 1:1.[26] While suspending our judgment about the purpose and origin of this anachronism, we can mark the importance of the return of absolute dating in Num 1:1 for the first time since the erection of the Tabernacle in Exodus 40, the same event to which Num 7:1 synchronizes itself.[27] Such chronological indicators are not leveled equally throughout the Priestly text and their presence here suggests that chronology provided at least one part of the organizational structure of Numbers 1-10, with Num 1:1's date indicating a disjunction from the preceding material in Leviticus.[28] From this perspective, Num 7:1's retrograde motion provides a clear, high-level dividing point in these opening chapters.[29] A first sorting of these chapters presents us, then, with two sections which we can neutrally identify as the Deferent (Numbers 1-6) and the Epicycle (Num 7:1-10:28), borrowing terms for describing retrograde motion from Ptolemaic astronomy.[30]

The additional explicit statement of absolute date in Num 10:11 (20th day of the second month of the second year) helps us further define the relationship between these two sections. At first glance, this verse seems to mark the return of the Epicycle to the path of the Deferent. However, when viewed in the larger context of the Priestly text, the relative date in Num 9:15 and the parallelism between Num 9:15-23 and Exod 40:34-38 perhaps better represents the

[26] Feldman 2018: 370-371 correctly refutes Milgrom 1990: xii, 362-364's denial of the anachronism here. For further discussion of the various proposals for understanding the relative date in Num 7:1, see below.
[27] Leviticus contains only relative dates in Lev 9:1; 16:1, though 9:1 is close enough to calculable that an absolute date is easily ascertained from it.
[28] For other indications of a disjunction between Leviticus and Numbers, see below.
[29] Condren 2013: 427-431 comes to a similar conclusion while offering arguments against the alternative organizational schema proposed in Knierim & Coats 2005: 27-34.
[30] The deferent describes the ideal circuit that a planet should follow, but whose course is deferred (hence the name) when the planet instead moves backwards in an epicycle before continuing forward again along the ideal path.

return of the Epicycle to the main course of the narrative. As we argued in chapter 2, Exod 40:17-38 itself represents a suspension of strictly chronological narration. The partial resumption and elaboration of this material in Num 9:15-23 would then make a fitting indicator that the narrative is returning to an ordered presentation. Such an analysis is further strengthened by the fact that the departure notice in Num 10:11-12 not only serves to mark time in Numbers 1-10, but also definitively marks the end of the entire Sinai episode and parallels the statement of the Israelite arrival at Mount Sinai in Exod 19:1-2.[31] We can, then, characterize Num 9:15-10:10 as a long passage that marks the merger between the Epicycle proper (Num 7:1-9:14) and the Deferent (Numbers 1-6), with 10:11-28 marking the return to chronological narration, coinciding with the end of the Sinai episode.[32]

In addition to absolute dates, indicators of geographic setting also appear to play a role in marking structural divisions within these chapters. The statement in Num 1:1 that Yhwh spoke to Moses "in the wilderness of Sinai" is—like the return of absolute dating—a clear contrast with Leviticus, which presents itself as Yhwh's communications to Moses "on Mt. Sinai" (Lev 7:38; 25:1; 26:46; 27:34).[33] Yet despite a consistent geographic setting for Numbers 1-10, the text reports twice more, in Num 3:14 and 9:1, that Yhwh spoke to Moses "in the wilderness of Sinai."[34] We can understand these reminders as setting off further divisions in the text that are,

---

[31] Ruwe 2003: 59.

[32] On the functions of 9:15-23 and 10:1-10, see further discussion below.

[33] Olson 1985: 48 also views this shift in geographic indicator as demarcating the line between Leviticus and Numbers, though he elevates this to an argument about the book of Numbers constituting an independent literary unit. Note that Lev 7:38 also indicates that this material was given "on Mt. Sinai" at the time when Yhwh "commanded the children of Israel to offer offerings in the wilderness of Sinai." In this way, Lev 7:38 itself captures the distinction between the instructional association of "Mt. Sinai" material and the narrative association of the "wilderness of Sinai" material. For further comment on the nature of the closing statement in Leviticus 26, see Chapter 3. For an evaluation of Leviticus 27's relationship to P, see excursus in Chapter 5.

[34] Kellerman 1970: 32 notes the similarity between Num 1:1; 3:14; 9:1 but dismisses it because the occurrence of the locative is "by no means unique" ["keineswegs einzigartig"] since it also appears in 1:19; 3:4; 9:5. However, Kellermann's concern in evaluating these statements was not with the structure of Numbers 1-10, but with identifying compositional layers. For Kellermann's purposes, these locatives are not unique enough to identify with a specific layer of P. Nevertheless, their structural purpose seems secure as described above, especially when we

due to their essentially conjunctive nature, presumably at a lower level than the major chronological disjunction of Num 7:1. These markers would then split the Deferent and the Epicycle into two parts each: Num 1:1-3:13 and 3:14-6:27 in the Deferent; 7:1-8:26 and 9:1-14 in the Epicycle.

Finally, we should take notice of a less explicitly demarcated set of texts within these chapters. Num 5:5-6:27 presents us with four consecutive speeches that return to the style of discourse that predominated in Leviticus—speeches that open with the imperative *dabbēr* and whose primary purpose is to convey information about standards of practice that have no immediate impact on the narrative moment in the text. While Num 9:9-14 possibly presents us with another example of this type of speech in Numbers 1-10, Num 5:5-6:27 is the only concentration of such speeches.[35] The distinctive nature of this material is also marked by the complete lack of the fulfillment clauses that regularly punctuate the rest of the material in the Deferent.[36] As these speeches occur at the boundary between the Deferent and the Epicycle, we will provisionally designate the material in Num 5:5-6:27 as the Interlude. This title is both neutral and serves to indicate the provisional nature of setting these texts off by recourse to such a different criterion from our other demarcations.

With the exception of the Interlude, the divisions outlined above are based on the explicit chronological statements and geographic reminders of Numbers 1-10 and so should remain

---

differentiate between the contexts in which the locative phrase is employed. We should note that the locale notices in Num 1:19 and 9:5 are contained in fulfillment clauses that correspond to the same locative marker in speech introductions in 1:1 and 9:1 respectively—their presence is explicable by this fact. The mention of the wilderness of Sinai in 3:4 ensures that the reader does not confuse the scene of Nadab and Abihu's death with the setting of the genealogy in 3:1, contrary to Milgrom 1990: 14's claim that "[3:]1-13 take place at Mt. Sinai…and [3:]14-51 take place in the wilderness of Sinai." See further discussion of this unit below.

[35] While the speech in 8:1-2 opens the same way, the fulfillment clause in 8:3 indicates that this speech has both an immediate and an abiding impact on the world of the narrative. See further discussion below.

[36] Num 1:17-19, 54; 2:34; 3:16, 42, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 5:4.

secure regardless of how one analyzes the content of these chapters.[37] This structural analysis also has the added advantage of accounting for the repeated mention of dates and location in these chapters. This proposal should be compared with previous analyses, which have only intermittently noted these verses as structural indicators and have focused on thematic- and content-based criteria to analyze the structure of these chapters.

Two prominent recent examples of these organizational schemas are found in the works of Knierim and Coats and of Condren. Knierim and Coats' analysis takes the organization of the camp to be the subject of the entirety of Numbers 1-10.[38] They therefore divide the chapters into two parts, which they label as "the organization of the sanctuary camp" in Numbers 1-4 and the "expansion of the organization report" in Numbers 5-10. Each of these units is then subdivided into two subunits related to the organization of the "outer camp"—by which they mean the non-Levite groups—and the "inner camp." They thus arrive at a four part division with units in Numbers 1-2 ("outer camp"), 3-4 ("inner camp"), 5-6 ("outer camp"), and 7-10 ("inner camp").

The major issue with this division is that these broad classifications do not accurately represent the material contained in these chapters. Numbers 1-2 detail the camping location and responsibilities of the Levites (Num 1:50-53; 2:17), not just the non-Levite tribes of the "outer camp."[39] While Numbers 3 speaks of the Levites in relation to Israelite firstborn, it can't be ignored that this entails a separate census of the firstborn of the so-called "outer camp" (3:40-43). These chapters do not so neatly separate as Knierim and Coats would like them to, and their imposition of this framework ignores other indicators of structure as discussed above.

---

[37] See, e.g., Lee 2008 for criticism of other attempts to use Num 7:1 as a major division on the basis of the thematic justifications that supported that division.

[38] Knierim & Coats 2005: 27-28.

[39] Knierim & Coats 2005: 32 attempt to discount Num 1:48-54 from affecting their division, stating that "its appearance in the text is premature."

Knierim and Coats' failure to accurately describe the divisions of Numbers 1-4 means that their imposition of the same framework on 5-10 is also suspect. And, indeed, Knierim and Coats themselves recognize this, admitting that "the structural problem [of understanding Numbers 5-10] is further complicated by the fact that seven out of the twelve units are not related at all to Numbers 1-4."[40] They nevertheless attempt to classify the material in Numbers 5-10 along the same lines they used for Numbers 1-4. This material is, however, even less amenable to such a division.[41] The matter is most strained in relation to the regulation for the second Passover (Num 9:1-14), which Knierim and Coats file under regulations pertaining to the "inner camp" despite the fact that it contains speeches explicitly addressed to and incumbent on the whole community.[42] Even the decision to describe the donations of the *nəśîʾîm* in Numbers 7 as related to the "inner camp" relies on thinking the emphasis is primarily on the sacred use of the donations rather than on the fact of the donation itself. This may be correct, but the chapter is at least ambiguous on this—we should question whether asking if the chapter pertains more to the "inner" or "outer" camp is even relevant to the chapter's purpose. Here too, Knierim and Coats' analysis fails to persuade because of its focus on arbitrarily imposed thematic categories.[43]

---

[40] Knierim & Coats 2005: 33.

[41] See also, Lee 2008: 488-489 for a similar critique. Lee 2008's own imposition of the thematic category of "the rights and responsibilities of the Aaronide priests" on Numbers 5-10* is, however, no more satisfactory.

[42] Knierim & Coats 2005: 33 address this, stating that "…7:1-10:10 focus on the inner realm, including…possibly also the instruction concerning the Passover in 9:1-14 because of its specifically cultic nature although this unit deals with the purity of the outer realm." The limitation of anything cultic to the "inner realm" even when it is related to a general observance of a nationwide feast seems unnecessary.

[43] To be fair to Knierim & Coats, this type of approach goes back to Wellhausen 1899: 172-179, who announces the "main interest" ["Hauptinteresse"] of this material in his opening paragraph, and then devotes the next three pages to a discussion of the numerous materials "that have nothing or only a little to do with" ["die nichts oder nur wenig damit zu tun haben"] this so-called "main interest" despite being "interspersed" ["hineingestreut"] with it. A proper methodological orientation should require us to define the "main interest" of a body of material on the basis of its total content, rather than by isolating a single element and then either subtracting or artificially redefining all material that does not agree with that element.

Condren's proposal for the structure of Numbers 1-10 begins by noting the weakness in Knierim and Coats' primary division of the text into two parts consisting of Numbers 1-4 and 5-10. He argues instead for a primary division at Num 7:1.[44] This is in line with our own analysis of these chapters and he likewise bases this division on the disjunctive nature of the chronological marker that heads Numbers 7.[45] However, after he arrives at this high-level division on the basis of textual indicators, he too reverts to a thematic-dependent organization of the type that Knierim and Coats advanced. In Condren's outline, each of the two major sections are organized into three panels that consist of material pertaining to the lay tribes (Numbers 1-2; 7), material pertaining to the Levites (Numbers 3-4; 8), and material consisting of community legislation (Numbers 5-6; 9:1-10:10).[46]

The same weaknesses that attended Knierim and Coats' analysis also attend Condren's. This is particularly the case in his "community legislation" category which is forced to include a narrative with no explicit normative function (Num 5:1-4), an explanation from the narrator that is never communicated to the community (Num 9:15-23), and the priestly blessing (Num 6:22-27). He also carries this thematic approach to an extreme when he reduces the chronological disjunction in Num 7:1 to nothing more than a marker between the two thematic panels, without real narrative impact.[47] Nevertheless, Condren's analysis still identifies several interesting parallels among the various units in these chapters.

What his proposal lacks, however, is any explanatory power. It offers no theory as to why the Priestly author arranged an essentially narrative section in accordance with thematic concerns

[44] Condren 2013: 427-431.
[45] Condren 2013: 430.
[46] Condren 2013: 431-452.
[47] Condren 2013: 433. In making the argument that Numbers 7 picks up directly from Numbers 2 "literarily," he relegates the issue to a footnote that acknowledges that his reading runs counter to the chronological framework. He offers no further justification for this stance. This is all the more striking given Condren's explicit invocation of a synchronic approach to these chapters.

to the point that he disarticulated the chronology of his material. Condren instead provides a justification for the layout in terms of a thematic message that is meant to be gleaned by the reader, wherein the text's movement from lay to priestly to community is meant to mimic the layout of the camp as presented in Numbers 2—a central priesthood surrounded by the non-Levite tribes.[48] While this may justify such an arrangement within a particular panel, he offers no reason for why these materials had to be arranged into two separate panels presented out of chronological order. The fact that the order of elements would have remained just as Condren describes it even if the Priestly author had arranged the material in Numbers 1-10 into a straightforwardly chronological narrative further weakens the force of his explanation. Condren's focus on thematic rather than narrative concerns, like Knierim and Coats', leaves us without a satisfactory account of the structure of Numbers 1-10.

Our own structural proposal highlights two issues that require investigation if we are to make headway in understanding this material. First we must address the question of why there is a chronological epicycle initiated in Numbers 7. Then we must understand the relation of the Interlude material to the surrounding narrative passages in both the Deferent and the Epicycle. Both of these subjects arise naturally from the structural indicators we examined above—the Epicycle is only remarkable due to the foregoing, clearly marked Deferent, while the Interlude's non-narrative nature stands out in the midst of a return to the main narrative thread of the Priestly text. In order to avoid the pitfalls that have beset past attempts to understand this material, our analysis will place emphasis on both the narrative nature of Num 1:1-10:28 and the fact that they are part of and participate in the larger Priestly text.

[48] Condren 2013: 450-452

Proposed Structure of Numbers 1-10*	
I.	Deferent (Num 1:1-5:4)
	a. Deferent, part 1 (Num 1:1-3:13)
	b. Deferent, part 2 (Num 3:14-5:4)
II.	Interlude (Num 5:5-6:27)
III.	Epicycle (Num 7:1-9:14)
	a. Epicycle, part 1 (Num 7:1-8:26)
	b. Epicycle, part 2 (Num 9:1-14)
IV.	Convergence (Num 9:15-10:10)
	a. Closing Sinai (Num 9:15-23)
	b. Wilderness Argument (Num 10:1-10)
V.	Departure from Sinai (Num 10:11-28)

Figure 4.1: Proposed Structure of Numbers 1-10*

Sinai in Retrograde: The Coherence of the Epicycle in Num 7:1-9:14

Our inquiry into the Epicycle's purpose will begin with a review of its contents and their internal cohesion. As we noted above, the Epicycle opens with an explicit reference to an earlier point in the Priestly narrative, informing the audience that what follows occurred *bywm klwt mšh lhqym ʾt-hmškn* (Num 7:1). The most natural way to understand this reference is as a return to the first day of the first month of the second year after the Exodus (Exod 40:17).[49] In this reading, Num 7:1 has brought the narrative back to the moment on which the book of Exodus closes.

Recently, however, Feldman has argued that this notice instead synchronizes with the last day of the altar's dedication (Lev 8:31-36; cf. Exod 29:37) and the events of Leviticus 9 (i.e., the eighth day of the first month).[50] Feldman arrives at this understanding by applying the verb *klh* in Num 7:1 to not only the immediately following infinitive (*lhqym*) but also to the succeeding preterite/*wə-yaqtul* verbs in the verse, thus including not only the initial erection of the Tabernacle, but also Moses' anointing and sanctification of the altar under the rubric of "when he

[49] Gray 1903: 74-75. Levine 1993: 247 is agnostic about the chronological place of this chapter, while also asserting that it "carries forward the chronology of Exodus 40 and Numbers 1."
[50] Feldman 2018: 364-376. See also, Milgrom 1990: 368; Propp 2006: 693, Chart 1.

finished."[51] She then points to the presence of the tribal leaders and absence of Aaron from the narrative to further bolster her conclusion, asserting that this is the equal but inverse of the situation presented in Leviticus 9.[52] In that chapter, the elders of the people are present but have no active role (9:1, 5) as the text shifts to focus on Aaron's activities within the Tabernacle's precincts (9:7-21). In Feldman's reading, Numbers 7 presents us with the related activity of the elders—Aaron's absence from this narrative is explained by his occupation with the tasks described in Leviticus 9.

Feldman's Model	First month of second year of the exodus	
Altar Consecration (Leviticus 8)	Day 1 ➔ Day 7	
First Public Offerings (Leviticus 9)		Day 8
Leader's Offerings (Numbers 7)		Day 8 ➔ Day 19

Figure 4.2: Feldman's Chronology of Numbers 7

Yet the grammar of Num 7:1 presents a major obstacle to accepting Feldman's proposal. When we survey the other instances of the verb *klh* plus infinitive in the Biblical corpus, we find that its governance extends only to this immediately following infinitive. In every case, the preterite/*wə-yaqtul* form(s) that follow the infinitive clearly constitute a resumption of sequential narration.[53] There is not a single instance where a *wə-yaqtul*/preterite verb is subsumed under the rubric of *klh*.

In Num 7:1, then, the temporal reference is connected solely to the day on which Moses finished assembling the Tabernacle: the first day of the first month. The rest of the verse's

[51] See the translation of Num 7:1 offered on Feldman 2018: 365: "…the day Moses finished setting up the tabernacle…once he had finished anointing and sanctifying it." See also Feldman 2018: 45-47 on the Tabernacle's construction and consecration being separate events.
[52] Feldman 2018: 366-367.
[53] Gen 17:22 (P); 24:19; 49:33 (P); Exod 34:33 (P); Deut 31:24-25; 32:45-46; Josh 8:24; 19:49; Judg 3:18; 15:17; 1 Sam 10:13; 13:10; 2 Sam 6:18//1 Chron 16:2; 1 Kgs 8:54 (reading *wyqm* with LXX); 2 Kgs 10:25. All of these uses share the same subject across verbs. Instances where the subject changes between *klh* and the *wə-yaqtul* form follow the same pattern.

statements about Moses' anointing and sanctifying the Tabernacle and the altar are part of the narrative of what happened after he finished completing that process.[54] In other words, what is in view here is not the final anointing of the altar, as Feldman would have it, but its initial anointing on the first day of the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Exod 40:9-11; Lev 8:10-11). The strong echo of Lev 8:10-11 in Num 7:1 further supports this conclusion.[55] Providing this narrative sequence enables the reader to place the tribal leaders' offering of oxen and carts not only on the appropriate date, but also at the appropriate moment on the event-filled first day.

Nevertheless, the remainder of Numbers 7 centers the timing of the *nəśîʾîm*'s offerings for the dedication of the altar exclusively around the altar's anointing (Num 7:10, 84, 88). While Feldman's suggestion for the date reference of Num 7:1 is not viable, we should inquire whether her view applies to the longer narrative sequence that takes place *bywm hmšḥ ʾtw* (7:10-88). Here, however, two elements militate against accepting this statement as referring to the final day of the altar's anointment. First, the lack of the verb *klh*, used in the otherwise similar statement in 7:1, suggests that this event does not take place after the completion of the altar's sanctification process. If the Priestly author intended to convey this, there is no reason for him to have omitted the verb *klh* from this statement.

Second, the summary of the dedicatory gifts of the tribal leaders in 7:84-88 presents us with a contrast between its opening and closing statements indicating that the twelve-day period during which the tribal leaders' brought their offerings spanned the period before and after the completion of the altar's seven-day sanctification process. In Num 7:84, at the head of the summary, we find a repetition of the phrase from Num 7:10 stating that the *nəśîʾîm* brought their

[54] See also, Knierim & Coats 2005: 98.
[55] It is also telling that Lev 8:15 says "and he [Moses] sanctified it [the altar]" despite the fact that this was the first day of a seven day process (Exod 29:36-37). There is, then, no contradiction between Num 7:1's statement that Moses sanctified the altar and our locating this event on the first day of the first month.

dedicatory offerings *bywm hmšḥ ʾtw* (= *mzbḥ*). The closing statement of the summary instead describes the dedicatory offerings as coming *ʾḥry hmšḥ ʾtw* (= *mzbḥ*). The presence of *ʾḥry* in this final statement informs us that we should be wary of reading this sense into 7:10, 88—as with the absence of *klh*, if the Priestly author had intended us to frame the events this way, he had the language available to him to express it clearly. On the other hand, we can sensibly explain the contrasting statements that open and close the summary by reference to the twelve day period during which the leaders brought their dedicatory offerings. While the bringing of these gifts began on one of the seven days on which the altar was anointed, the last of these gifts would have, of necessity, been presented after that process was completed. The temporal statements that open and close the list of totals take account of both of these facts.

Proposed Model	First month of second year of the exodus	
Altar Consecration (Leviticus 8)	Day 1 ➔ Day 7	
First Public Offerings (Leviticus 9)		Day 8
Leader's Offerings (Numbers 7)	Day 1 ➔	Day 12

Figure 4.3: Proposed Chronology of Numbers 7

Despite the shortcomings of her argument for setting Numbers 7 after the seven-day sanctification of the altar, Feldman's insistence that we must pay attention to the narrative aspects of this chapter is well founded. Feldman's argument rightly focuses on the characters who are present in this chapter, noting that while both Moses and the *nəśîʾîm* are present, Aaron and his sons are anomalously absent.[56] For Feldman, this closely resembles the narrative situation of Leviticus 9, where the elders and Aaron are both summoned by Moses (Lev 9:1). In Feldman's reading of events, Moses then sets Aaron and his sons to the task of preparing the

[56] Feldman 2018: 366-367.

initial offerings of their priesthood (9:7-21) while "there is no clear role for the elders."[57] Feldman contends that Numbers 7 provides us with the activities that these elders were engaged in while Aaron and his sons were busy carrying out the rest of Moses' instructions as detailed in Leviticus 9.

We have already observed that the language of Numbers 7 does not allow us to construe its events as taking place entirely after the ordination of the priesthood and sanctification of the altar. But the presence of the tribal leaders paired with the absence of Aaron and his sons is amenable to other situations than the one presented in Leviticus 9. Prior to this moment in the narrative, Aaron and his sons are occupied with the ritual of ordination for seven days (Exod 29:35; Lev 8:33-9:1), providing another window in which events might take place that don't involve the priests. And, while neither the elders nor the leaders are specifically mentioned, Lev 8:1-4 envisions the entire *ʿēdāh* present for this ceremony from the first day. Numbers 7 then provides the details of what the leaders of the community were doing during this ordination period.

That the chronology of the entire Epicycle depends on the temporal references in Numbers 7 compels us to ascertain, if possible, precisely when during this seven-day ceremony the tribal leaders began presenting their offerings. While we have established that Num 7:1 refers to the first day of the first month, the language of Num 7:10, 84 is more ambiguous. The basic choice that confronts us is whether to understand 7:10, 84 as referring to the same day as 7:1 or not. Scholars have typically seen these statements as synchronous, though more often by

[57] Feldman 2018: 367. In MT this is certainly true, though LXX and SamP read *zqny* for *bny* as the audience of Aaron's address in 9:3. It is difficult to select between these readings, as the LXX and SamP may be correcting towards 9:1 based on the same lack of purpose for the elders that Feldman senses. However, it is also easy to imagine an MT scribe accidentally transcribing the far more common phrase *bny yśrʾl* out of habit. Feldman offers no comment on this variant. Even if we accept MT's reading, though, it is not clear that the elders have no role—while we may assume that Moses' directive that Aaron address "the children of Israel" envisions direct communication with the entire community, it is also possible that communication through the intermediary of the elders is in view.

assertion than argument.[58] Nevertheless, the decision to deploy a *bywm* statement in 7:10 in such close proximity to the one that heads the chapter invites at least some scrutiny.

The best argument in favor of the perceived identity of the temporal markers in Num 7:1 and 7:10 is the disparate grammatical formations in which the *bywm* statements of each verse are embedded. In 7:1 the chronological statement directly accompanies the verb *hyh* as its main argument—a common formation that sets the general timeframe for succeeding events.[59] In 7:10, we instead find the temporal statement used as an adverbial modifier to a transitive verb. Its presence here indicates to the reader that there has been no passage of time between the offering by the tribal leaders in 7:2-3 and their offering in 7:10, despite the different functions they serve and the digression on the disbursement to the Levites in 7:4-9. Secondarily, the restatement of the timeframe reinforces the portrayal of the *nəśîʾîm* as responsive to the needs of the newly-erected Tabernacle.

Placing the twelve-day sequence of Numbers 7 in its appropriate place—starting on the first day of the first month of the second year after the exodus—clarifies the chronological movement in the remainder of the Epicycle. The events of Num 7:89-8:26, lacking their own explicit chronological indicator, must sequentially take place on either the twelfth or thirteenth day of the month.[60] The celebration of the Passover and the accompanying controversy in Num 9:3-8 then, sensibly, take place on the fourteenth day of that month. Finally, Yhwh's provision of a second Passover (9:9-14) prepares the way for the convergence of the Epicycle with the

[58] Gray 1903: 76; Levine 1993: 255; Knierim & Coats 2005: 98-99.
[59] In the Torah: Gen 26:32; 34:25; 40:20; Exod 6:28 (P); Exod 16:22 (P), 27; 19:16; Lev 9:1 (P).
[60] Alternatively, we may understand 7:89-8:4 as coordinated with Lev 9:23, and so taking place on the 8th day of the tribal leaders' offerings (see discussion below). The dedication of the Levites must take place at least after the 8th day of the first month, since Aaron acts as a priest during the ritual (8:11-12, 21). If this occurs on the 9th day of the month, then the following command being related to Passover aligns well with Exod 12:3's instruction to secure a lamb on the 10th day. Feldman 2018: 376 also understands 8:5-26 to follow chronologically, but arrives at a different conclusion about when this is due to her identification of Num 7:1 with the eighth day of the first month (on which, see discussion above).

Deferent (9:15-10:10) by forecasting events in the second month. While not probative, we suggest that the neat chronological sequence yielded by connecting Num 7:1, 10 to the first day of the first month is another argument in favor of this reading.

In addition to this chronological coherence, we can also observe a narrative and thematic coherence to the materials in the Epicycle. As we argued above, the repetition of the geographical setting in Num 9:1 subdivides the Epicycle. The first section details the final work done for the Tabernacle. The unit opens with the donation of ox-carts which Yhwh instructs Moses to disburse to the Levites for transporting the Tent of Meeting (7:2-9) and closes with the dedication of the Levites to their work and their arrival at the Tabernacle (8:20-22). We move from the offerings of the *nəśîʾîm* for the Tabernacle's altar (7:10-88) to the offering of the community at large, who are tasked with dedicating the Levites to their work at the Tent of Meeting (8:6, 11, 16-18, 20). In between these passages we find the description of two hitherto unaddressed statements from the Tabernacle instructions: the ark as source of divine speech (Num 7:89; cf. Exod 25:22) and the final orientation of the menorah's lamps (Num 8:1-4; cf. Exod 25:37).[61] All the major constituents of the Israelite camp are represented in this unit—Moses, Aaron, the *nəśîʾîm*, the *ʿēdāh*, and the Levites all participate in some aspect of finalizing the Tabernacle's preparation for use.

Sensibly, the subdivision at Num 9:1 signals a shift in subject from the Tabernacle-centric narrative of the first part of the Epicycle. Even across this border, though, we find a consistency of thought. The first panel of the Epicycle ends with the Israelites' dedication of the Levites to service at the Tabernacle—an exchange that is explicitly connected with the Passover

[61] The seeming isolation of Num 7:89 from its context on either side has provoked frequent comment. See, e.g., Gray 1903: 77; Noth 1968: 65; Kellermann 1970: 107-109; Levine 1993: 258-259; Knierim & Coats 2005: 101-102; Feldman 2018: 368, n. 18, 369. To these observations, we can add that the abrupt conclusion of the verse, which leaves the reader expecting speech, finds its closest echo in Exod 19:25. See further discussion below.

event (8:16-18). This is the only mention of the death of the firstborn in the Epicycle and comes just before it shifts its subject from the Tabernacle to the celebration of the first Passover after the exodus (9:1-5). Additionally, the completion of the Tabernacle's preparation just prior presents the reader with an image of a fully functional community and cult participating in the Passover celebration at Sinai.

When we isolate the Epicycle from the rest of the material in Numbers 1-10* and correctly identify the timeframe to which its opening returns us in Num 7:1, we find a chronologically and thematically coherent narrative unit.[62] This coherence confirms our earlier proposition that the Epicycle is structurally marked as a distinct unit within the Priestly text in Numbers 1-10 and contradicts the general reputation this material has acquired for disorganization.[63] However, it also throws the achronological presentation of events in Numbers 1-10* into starker relief. Rather than challenging our demonstration of coherence, we should take the explicitly marked chronological displacement of the Epicycle material as an invitation to explore its relationship with the rest of the Sinai episode in the Priestly text. We will start by examining the relationship between the Epicycle and the proximal material in Numbers 1-4.

Post hoc ergo propter hoc: Anachronism vs. Achronological Presentation

The order in which we read materials often shapes our understanding of them. Despite the explicit chronological marking in Numbers 1-10* indicating that we should understand Num 7:1-9:14 as the background to Numbers 1-4, scholars have often claimed that the material in the Epicycle is instead dependent on and develops the narrative and factual information given in the

[62] Contra Seebass 2012: 178, who asserts that Numbers 7-10 "do not form a unit" ["die Kapitel 7,1-10,10 keine Einheit bilden"].
[63] See Condren 2013: 424 for representative quotes.

opening chapters of Numbers.[64] The underlying claim is that the order of the presentation of events is correct in terms of the development of their content and that the chronological markers are incorrect. For the Analysts, this disjunction between chronology and content strengthens their view that the achronological presentation is indicative of editorial supplementation. What these scholars leave unexplained is why a later editor would provide an explicit chronological indicator for his supplementary material and then contradict that dating in the very material he was adding.[65] The internal chronological coherence of the Epicycle—with its movement from the day of the Tabernacle's construction to the day of the Passover—arouses skepticism about such presumed carelessness. An analysis contrary to this scholarly tradition, one that takes the chronological indicators seriously, deserves consideration.

In theory, the dependencies that previous scholars have identified present an obstacle to such a reconsideration. However, the Analyst approach to the elements in Num 7:1-9:14 that presuppose Numbers 1-4 weakens the evidentiary value they might otherwise hold. As we have already discussed, the Analysts viewed the out-of-sequence dates in Num 7:1; 9:1, 15 as self-evident signs of editorial intervention in Numbers 1-10. This view restricted their inquiry into the material, limiting it to the question of determining which set of materials in Numbers 1-10 was original to P^g and which was supplementary. In other words, their investigation sought for signs of literary dependence in order to identify what was supplementary to an older text—the possibility of narrative coherence is never entertained. Any sign that material in Numbers 7-10 was aware of the material in Numbers 1-4 indicated its relative lateness from the Analyst perspective.

---

[64] See, e.g., Wellhausen 1899: 173, 179, "Chapter 7 is intimately connected with chapters 1-4 and factually depends on them…" ["Kap. 7 hängt sachlich eng mit Kap. 1-4 zusammen und davon ab... "]; Gray 1903: 74; Noth 1968: 63; Kellermann 1970: 98-102; Levine 1993: 247.

[65] See the conclusion of this chapter for further discussion of this issue.

The undefended assumption at the root of the Analyst inquiry is the idea that a single author would never choose to present events out of chronological order—the circumference of their question determines the bounds of their answer. But the counterfactual is available to us, and the principles of secondary analysis compel us to recognize that any author is free to structure their work as they see fit and to make internal reference to their own work wherever that is necessary.[66] In other words, when we examine the relationship between the Epicycle and the Deferent, we do not need to be alert to achronological presentation—the text already makes explicit that state of affairs. Instead we should be questioning whether the material is anachronistic, whether there are, in fact, any conflicts in the facts and narratives between the disparate time frames set out in the two bodies of material. The absence of such conflicts would diminish the strength of the case for seeing strata in Numbers 1-10*.

We can, for instance, readily grant that the statement in Num 7:2, describing the *nəśîʾîm* who bring offerings as "those standing over the appointments (*pəqudîm*)," shows awareness of Numbers 1.[67] This does not, however, require us to grant that this indicates the lateness of Numbers 7 relative to Numbers 1. This phrase's construction with a personal pronoun and participle—rather than a relative pronoun and *qatala*-perfect—indicates a lack of absolute temporal reference. The text is not informing us that these were the ones who, previously in the narrative, served in this capacity, but simply informing us that they are the same as those we have already read about—even though the event in Numbers 7 took place earlier than the one in Numbers 1. There is no anachronism here, only another achronological element.

More interesting is the order of the tribes in Numbers 7, which matches the order of the tribal encampments described in Numbers 2. These are the only places in the Hebrew Bible in

[66] On primary vs. secondary analysis, see chapter 1.
[67] Levine 1993: 254 reviews the connections. See also, Exod 30:11-16.

which this particular ordering occurs, and we can again acknowledge that this unique listing indicates some kind of relationship between the two chapters. However, this does not require us to view Numbers 7 as dependent on Numbers 2 and, therefore, later.[68] Nor does the order in Numbers 7 necessarily indicate an anachronistic deployment of the order in Numbers 2, as though the author or editor imagined the tribes already in their ordered encampments at a time chronologically prior to their assignment to these locations. We instead have the option to interpret these events in the order in which the chronological markers tell us they occurred, rather than the order in which they are narrated. From this perspective, we might come to the conclusion that the order of the tribes in Numbers 2—which is dictated by Yhwh to Moses and Aaron—constitutes the divine response to the order in which they presented their gifts for the Tabernacle—which was done on a voluntary basis. If Numbers 7 was located prior to Numbers 1-2 in the Torah, one can't help but suspect that scholars would treat such an exegetical conclusion as self-evident.

A stronger case for true anachronism comes from the distribution of ox-carts to the Levite clans "each according to the measure of its service" in Num 7:3-9. Moses' distribution of these carts shows awareness of Yhwh's assignment of tasks to the Levites in Numbers 3-4, a chronologically later event.[69] However, the restatement of the date of the *nəśîʾîm*'s offerings in 7:10 suggests a return from a digression and closer examination of the syntax of 7:3-9 supports this understanding. In these verses, the only actions that sit within the *wə-yaqtul* verbal sequence are the bringing of the carts to the Tabernacle (7:3), the speech by Yhwh to Moses commanding that he give the carts to the Levites (7:4), and Moses' fulfillment of that command by giving the carts to the Levites as a single group (7:6). When we come to the actual distribution of the carts

[68] Noth 1968: 63; Kellermann 1970: 102; Seebass 2012: 192.
[69] Wellhausen 1899: 179; Gray 1903: 74-75; Noth 1968: 64; Kellermann 1970: 100-102; Levine 1993: 247; Knierim & Coats 2005: 99; Seebass 2012: 190.

among the individual Levite groups, these actions are syntactically subordinated by the use of an inverted object-verb word order with *qatala* verbal forms throughout (7:7-9).

This syntactic subordination could either indicate that these verses provide supplementary information to the main statement in 7:6 on which they depend or that the further distribution of the carts to the individual tribes is temporally distinct from the main sequence. One ambiguous factor in weighing these alternatives is the statement that the distribution of the carts was accomplished through the agency of Ithamar (7:8), who was in charge of the Tabernacle-related labor of the Gershonites and Merarites (Num 4:28, 33).[70] If the syntax of the distribution in Num 7:7-9 indicates a subordinate supplementation of Moses' bestowing the carts on the Levites, then the presence of Ithamar here aligns with the Analyst view of Numbers 7 as an anachronistic addition to Numbers 1-10. If, however, we grant that the chronology is not incorrectly marked and that the syntax of the distribution indicates a digression, the presence of Ithamar here aligns the distribution of the carts with the later chronological frame of Numbers 3-4. The repetition of the initial chronological indicator in 7:10, mentioned above, lends weight to the latter reading. That the text provides a reminder of when the leaders made their offerings suggests that 7:7-9 represents a step away from the main chronological sequence—the presence of Ithamar in his role as overseer of the Gershonites and Merarites then helps us understand the timeframe in which to locate this digression.

Those who view the distribution of the carts to the Levites as anachronistic rather than achronological also tend to view this passage as representing a modification of the instructions given in Numbers 4, further cementing their identification of Numbers 7 as part of a later

[70] The placement of the phrase *byd ʾytmr* suggests its connection with both the Gershonites and Merarites, as distinct from his non-involvement with the Qohathites; contra Kellermann 1970: 101, who sees the placement of this phrase as indicating a special status for the Merarites in Numbers 7.

stratum.[71] They argue that the gifting of the ox-carts directly contradicts the command that the Gershonites and Merarites "lift/carry" (*nśʾ*) their respective parts of the Tabernacle (Num 4:25-26, 31-33). The ox-carts, on this reading, represent a later attempt to describe how the Tabernacle was transported in the wilderness.

This approach to the relationship between Numbers 4 and Numbers 7 is overly literal in its understanding of the meaning of Numbers 4—scholars who believed that the chronological epicycle in Num 7:1 already indicated an addition were alert to any way in which they could exploit these texts for contradictions to determine the relative dating of the bodies of material. But there is no real tension between the description of the Levites' tasks in Numbers 4 and the use of ox-carts to accomplish these tasks. In fact, the verb *nśʾ* is used to describe the transport of the Ark of the Covenant on an ox-cart at the close of the Ark narrative in 2 Sam 6:3-4, demonstrating that the descriptions in Numbers 4 and 7 are well within the bounds of normal Hebrew usage.[72]

Numbers 7, then, has provided us with no strong evidence of anachronism or tension with the rest of Numbers 1-10—only the achronological features that the marked chronological presentation already leads us to expect. When we turn to Numbers 8, however, we encounter a clear contradiction between the Epicycle and the Deferent in regard to the age at which the Levites begin their service at the Tent of Meeting. Num 8:23-26 states that the Levites should begin their service at twenty-five, while the Deferent repeatedly states that all the Levites coming

[71] See note 64 above for references. Seebass 2012: 190, though, acknowledges that there is no necessary contradiction since Numbers 4 does not provide precise details for how the Levites' work should be done ["ohne die dabei anfallende Arbeit zu verzeichnen."].

[72] Gray 1903: 75 offers the further comment that Numbers 4 does not envision the kind of distinction between the work of the Qohathites and the rest of the Levites as indicated in Num 7:7-9, but this ignores the detailed instructions for their conveyance of the sancta in Num 4:4-16, the special aside about the precariousness of the Qohathites in 4:17-20, and the inherent portability of the sancta as described in Exodus 25-27, 30, 37-38.

to work at the Tent of Meeting are at least thirty (4:3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47).[73] The Analyst tradition sees the work of a later hand in the difference.[74] This may be correct, but, if so, it indicts only 8:23-26 and has no implications for the rest of the material in the Epicycle.[75] We should note too that this contradiction is one of fact, not of chronology—the disagreement between the Epicycle and the Deferent on this point does not involve any anachronism.[76]

The account of the Israelites' dedication of the Levites in Num 8:5-26 has drawn opprobrium from the pens of the Analysts, but it too is chronologically coherent with the rest of Numbers 1-10.[77] Its placement in the Epicycle sensibly marks the event as occurring prior to Moses summoning the Levites to work at the Tabernacle, despite Analyst objections that ignore the marked chronology and take the narrated order as reflecting the sequence of events.[78] More importantly, material in Numbers 1-4 appears dependent on the chronologically prior material narrated in Num 8:5-26. For instance, the exclusion of the Levites from the initial census mentioned in 1:47 and justified in 1:48-49 has troubled some scholars as being wrongly positioned in relationship to the actual census.[79] Despite the perceived tension, the text does, in

---

[73] Post-exilic literature provides another variant on this issue, stating that twenty years marks the beginning of Levite service (Ezra 3:8; 1 Chron 23:24, 27; 2 Chron 31:17).

[74] Kuenen 1886: 93; Wellhausen 1899: 178n.; Gray 1903: 32-33, 81-82; Noth 1968: 69-70; Kellermann 1970: 120-122; Knierim & Coats 2005: 115-116; Seebass 2012: 220. Levine 1993: 134 suggests that the five-year discrepancy could be explained by supposing a period between when Levites begin training for their service and when they are eligible to fully engage in that service. While an interesting proposal, nothing in the text supports this reading. The typical explanation offered for this change is that it was intended to compensate for the small number of Levites available for service in the post-exilic period. This explanation, however, rests on the undefended assumption that either the Torah or P was directly consulted for such practical applications and that behavior had to be directly licensed by the text. Such a Protestant use of the Bible in the early post-exilic period strains credulity. One is further required to assume that this late editor was comfortable with adding to and blatantly contradicting an already existing text but would not countenance simply changing the text of Numbers 4 to read "twenty-five" instead of "thirty." For further discussion of the issue of editorial inconsistency demanded by Analyst models, see below.

[75] Seebass 2012: 208.

[76] The Neo-analytic model may offer a different view of this issue as well, for which, see further discussion below.

[77] Kuenen 1886: 93 describes it as "an insipid repetition" (quoted approvingly in Gray 1903: 78). Wellhausen 1899: 178, calls it an "unimaginative fantasy" ["ideenlosen Phantasterei"]. With less dismissiveness, see also Noth 1968: 67-69; Kellermann 1970: 122-123; Seebass 2012: 208-215.

[78] Kuenen 1886: 93.

[79] Wellhausen 1899: 176; Gray 1903: 15; Noth 1968: 17; Kellermann 1970: 13-14, 17, 25-26, 32; Milgrom 1990: 9; Knierim & Coats 2005: 52; Seebass 2012: 21-22.

fact, prepare the reader for the exclusion of Levi from the census by its list of *nəśîʾîm* (1:4-16).[80] Just as importantly, the chronological priority of the Levites' dedication in Num 8:5-22 means that Moses has already been informed that the Levites are not counted as part of the rest of the Israelite community (8:6, 14)—the statement in Num 1:49 simply affirms this fact, as signaled by the clause-initial *ʾak*.

Additionally, the text constructs a narrative of the transfer of the Levites—from the Israelites to Yhwh to Aaron and his sons—that is only apparent when the events are read in chronological order. In Num 3:9, Yhwh tells Moses to give the Levites to Aaron, stating that they are "dedicates, dedicates to him (*ntwnm ntwnm hmh lw*) from the children of Israel." This same language occurs in 8:16, with a crucial difference. There, the Levites are described by Yhwh as "dedicates, dedicates to me (*ntwnm ntwnm hmh ly*) from the midst of the children of Israel." Then, in 8:19, Yhwh announces his intention to give the Levites to Aaron and his sons as "dedicates" (*nətûnim*). The ritual described in Num 8:5-22 forms the background to the command in 3:9. The dedication ceremony transfers the Levites from the Israelites to Yhwh who intends to then convey them to the priests. In Numbers 3, this transfer from Yhwh to Aaron is accomplished through the mediation of Moses. Again we find that the Epicycle is achronological without being anachronistic.

The remaining segments of the Epicycle further confirm this assessment. The Passover celebration and the law concerning the second Passover in 9:1-14 do not in any way conflict with the chronology of Numbers 1-4. The final arrangement of the menorah in 8:1-4 also does not. The short unit on Moses' communication with Yhwh inside the Tabernacle in 7:89 not only does not contain any anachronism, but again provides background to the already narrated but chronological posterior material in Num 1:1. This heading to the book of Numbers tells us that

[80] Lev 25:33-34 also prepares the reader for the distinctive nature of the Levites.

Yhwh spoke to Moses "in (*b*) the Tent of Meeting" in contrast with the introduction to Leviticus which has Yhwh speaking "from (*mn*) the Tent of Meeting" (Lev 1:1; cf. Exod 40:35). While the description of how Yhwh communicates to Moses in Num 7:89 is narratively delayed, its placement within the Epicycle marks it as occurring chronologically prior to the general announcement of Moses' and Yhwh's dialogues within the Tabernacle that opens the book.

Our survey of the relationship between the Epicycle and the Deferent has demonstrated that there are no anachronistic elements within the Epicycle. To the contrary, material in the Epicycle frequently forms the background for understanding the material in the Deferent. This relationship becomes apparent when the chronological marking of the Epicycle is taken seriously and the events are placed in their proper chronological position relative to the events of the Deferent. When placed alongside the internal chronological and thematic coherence of the Epicycle, this lack of anachronism further weakens the Analyst case for the stratification of this material.

Context and Convergence: The Articulation of the Epicycle in the Sinai Episode

The absence of anachronism at the small scale of Numbers 1-10* invites us to broaden the scope of our inquiry. The material in Num 7:89-8:4 explicitly refers to material first presented in Exodus 25-31, while the Epicycle's opening invokes the erection of the Tabernacle in Exodus 40 as its reference point. The material that closes the Epicycle in Num 9:15-23 also returns us to this moment. In other words, the Epicycle's content and chronological markedness implicate it in the larger Sinai moment in the Priestly narrative. Any explanation for the presence of the Epicycle must also necessarily account for its relationship to the larger sweep of Priestly material in Exodus and Leviticus.

As argued above, one of the major focuses of the Epicycle is the finalization of the Tabernacle. In this way, the material in Numbers 7-8 furthers the narrative commentary on the Tabernacle instructions seen in Exodus 35-40 and Leviticus 8-9.[81] This is most directly apparent in Num 7:89 and 8:1-4. Num 7:89 provides a narrative description of Yhwh's promised form of communication with Moses found in Exod 25:22. However, the emphasis in Num 7:89 is not on the fact of Yhwh's speaking with Moses or even on Yhwh's speaking from the *kappōret* on the Ark—Yhwh's speaking to Moses has already been a commonplace throughout the book of Leviticus. Rather, this passage emphasizes the fact that this was how Yhwh communicated with Moses when he entered the Tabernacle.

The issue of Moses' access to the Tabernacle interior is introduced at its construction (Exod 40:35) and Num 7:89 provides the final word on this subject. With the installation of the priesthood, Moses is able to enter the Tabernacle (Lev 9:23),[82] but the delay of this description until the Epicycle creates a secondary connection between the *nəśîʾîm*'s dedicatory gifts and Moses' regular audiences within the Tent of Meeting.[83] Furthermore, the chronology of Exodus and Leviticus is not damaged by this new connection. Moses' entry into the Tabernacle for the first time takes place on the eighth day of the first month (Lev 9:1, 23), overlapping with the bringing of the dedicatory gifts by the *nəśîʾîm*.[84] Num 7:89 does not begin with a sequential *wə-yaqtul*/preterite verb, but with an infinitive construct expressing non-specific temporality: "on the occasion when Moses entered the Tent of Meeting," i.e. the eighth day as explicated in Leviticus 9.

---

[81] See Chapters 2 and 5 for fuller discussion of the relationship between the narrative and instructional portions of the Tabernacle material.
[82] See Chapter 2 for full discussion of Moses' inability to enter the Tabernacle as a part of the Priestly text's narrative.
[83] This notice may also draw an implicit contrast with Aaron's presence in the Tabernacle, which is mandatorily accompanied by bells intended to save his life (Exod 28:33-35). Where Moses enters to converse with Yhwh, Aaron's entry is intended to cover over the sound of possible conversation.
[84] See discussion above on the chronology of Numbers 7.

This reading may explain the oft-noted abruptness of the verse's conclusion, which ends with *wydbr ʾlyw* with no following content. Placed within the Epicycle, Num 7:89 retroactively reframes the setting of the divine speeches beginning with Leviticus 11, so that the reader now imagines them taking place within the Tabernacle. The final clause of this verse may in fact be an elliptical reference to those speeches which, through its abruptness, is intended to encourage the reader's reimagining. While frequently regarded as an isolated statement,[85] Num 7:89 participates in the larger Sinai narrative of the Priestly text and especially so when understood within the first-month bubble created by the Epicycle's chronology.

The final disposition of the menorah's lamps described in Num 8:1-4 has similar connections to the larger Sinai narrative in P. This passage also offers a narrative commentary on the last remaining piece of the Tabernacle instructions, this time related to the direction in which the lamps of the menorah should shine (Exod 25:37).[86] When Moses initially sets up the Tabernacle, he does not arrange the lamps in the way prescribed in Exodus 25, instead making them shine *lpny yhwh* (Exod 40:24-25). Num 8:1-4 reserves the proper arrangement of the lamps for Aaron,[87] describing their direction by exchanging the *hapax* phrase *ʿal-ʿeber pāneyhā* with the more common *ʾel-mûl pənê* X in a way similar to the type of explanatory commentary we identified in the main body of narrative fulfillment material in Exodus 35-40; Leviticus 8-9.[88]

Num 8:1-4's status as the final statement on the menorah as well as the final statement on the Tabernacle's construction and setup also explains other oddities about the passage. The

---

[85] See note 61 above for references.

[86] Gray 1903: 77-78; Noth 1968: 65-66; Knierim & Coats 2005: 106-107.

[87] If MT Exod 25:37 is accepted as *lectio difficilior* with ועשית…והעלה instead of the Versions' + SamP's ועשית…והעלית, then the shift from 2nd person address to Moses to the anonymous 3rd person for the instruction involving the lights' directionality may have motivated the assignment of this task's first instantiation to Aaron. Conversely, the MT form may be explained by harmonization with Num 8:1-4 and the consistent use of 2nd person from the other traditions preferred.

[88] Gray 1903: 78 already notes that these two phrases should likely be understood as equivalent. For a fuller discussion of the narrative as commentary on the instructional material, see Chapter Two.

seemingly redundant description of the menorah's body reminds the reader that the body of the lampstand is of a single piece—and, by implication, that the lamps themselves are not of a piece with the body and are, therefore, adjustable in the way just described. Fittingly, this restatement of the menorah's construction is connected to the final reminder that Yhwh not only gave verbal instructions to Moses, but also showed him a vision of the heavenly Tabernacle. As the final narrative fulfillment of the instructions given in Exodus 25-31 brings the Tabernacle's installation to a close, the text reminds us one last time of the origin of the Mosaic Tent of Meeting in a vision from Yhwh as it asks the audience to contemplate the direction of the light shining from the sacred lampstand. This reminder signals that the Tabernacle has reached completion in Aaron's final adjustment of the lamps.

Both of these passages demonstrate that the Epicycle participates in the broader Sinai narrative. They also provide further confirmation that Num 7:1 provides the chronological framework for the following chapters and that the Epicycle is in fact epicyclic—it is not coincidence that both Num 7:89 and 8:1-4 narrate actions connected to other events in the first month of the second year after the exodus and provoke explicit connections to the setup of the Tabernacle. We find this same type of connection at the distal end of the Epicycle where Num 9:15-23, describing the cloud over the Tabernacle and how it guided the travel and encampment of the Israelites, echoes earlier material from Exod 40:34-38. We argued above that this passage, alongside Num 10:1-10, constitutes the convergence of the Epicycle back into the path of the Deferent. As our final task in analyzing Numbers 7-10*, we will examine the role this convergence plays in the Epicycle and its broader connection to the Sinai narrative.

Scholars have long noted the connection between Num 9:15-23 and Exod 40:34-38 and have frequently approached their similarity as a question of the literary relationship between

them, attempting to determine which passage is primary and which a secondary elaboration.[89] Continuing to leave such questions aside, we should note that each text is carefully crafted for its context. Exod 40:34-38 narrates the circumstances that immediately attended the erection of the Tabernacle and that set the stage for the book of Leviticus—chief among these is the entry of the *kābôd* into the Tabernacle and Moses' consequent inability to enter it (Exod 40:34-35).[90] Unsurprisingly, Num 9:15-23 does not mention Moses' inability to enter the Tabernacle as that has already been resolved in the narrative prior to this moment (Lev 9:23; Num 1:1; 7:89).

However, Numbers 9 also does not repeat the statements about the *kābôd*'s filling of the Tabernacle despite Exod 40:34 linking this to the phenomenon of the cloud's covering. This makes clear that the emphasis in Num 9:15-23 is not on the internal events of the Tabernacle with which Exod 40:34-38 is, in part, concerned. Rather, its emphasis is on the external feature of the cloud's presence and what it signals for the Israelites. This focus is further conveyed by the way that Numbers 9 opens its account of the cloud's function by combining elements that bracket the account in Exodus 40 (see synopsis below).

Num 9:15	וּבְיוֹם הָקִים אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן כִּסָּה הֶעָנָן אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן לְאֹהֶל הָעֵדֻת וּבָעֶרֶב יִהְיֶה עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן כְּמַרְאֵה־אֵשׁ עַד־בֹּקֶר׃	וַיְכַס הֶעָנָן אֶת־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וּכְבוֹד יְהוָה מָלֵא אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן׃	Exod 40:34
Num 9:16	כֵּן יִהְיֶה תָּמִיד הֶעָנָן יְכַסֶּנּוּ וּמַרְאֵה־אֵשׁ לָיְלָה׃	כִּי עֲנַן יְהוָה עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן יוֹמָם וְאֵשׁ תִּהְיֶה לַיְלָה בּוֹ לְעֵינֵי כָל־בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכָל־מַסְעֵיהֶם׃	Exod 40:38

Figure 4.4: Comparison of Num 9:15-16 & Exod 40:34, 38

In Exod 40:34-38, the relationship between cloud, *kābôd*, and Tabernacle drives the narrative of the passage, while the description of the cloud's appearance during the day and night provides

[89] Gray 1903: 85; Noth 1962: 83; 1968: 75; Kellermann 1970: 134-140; Friedman 2003: 256n; Knierim & Coats 2005: 128; Seebass 2012: 234-236.
[90] See discussion above and in Chapter 2.

the image and setting for future events. Num 9:15-16, on the other hand, fronts the description of the cloud's appearance and connects it directly with its covering of the Tabernacle. In the passage that follows, its appearance and visibility to the Israelites is a key part of its function.

Conversely, elements in Numbers 9 that form a core part of its content are absent from Exodus 40. Num 9:15-23 emphasizes the guidance function of the cloud by repeatedly connecting the Israelites' travelling and camping to the phrases *ʿl-py yhwh* (Num 9:18, 20, 23) and *šmr mšmrt yhwh* (9:19, 23). Despite Exod 40:36-37 describing the role the cloud would play in the future travels of the Israelites, neither of these phrases is present. The description in Exodus 40 of this aspect of the cloud is brief and schematic—it is precisely the type of proleptic description that we see elsewhere in the Priestly text,[91] and Num 9:15-23 returns to and fills out this information at the appropriate point in the narrative, just before the departure from Sinai.

Additionally, we should note that both Num 9:15-23 and Exod 40:34-38 function in different ways in relation to their context. The introduction of the cloud in Exod 40:34-35 is a narrative passage that directly participates in the sequence of events in Exodus 40, with the proleptic description of the cloud's function and appearance logically extending from this. Num 9:15-23, on the other hand, does not have a sequential-chronological relationship with its setting. The transition between the dispensation for a second-month Passover (Num 9:6-14) and the description of the cloud (9:15-23) is jarringly abrupt, lacking even a standard fulfillment clause to signal the end of the Passover speech.[92] At the other side of this transition, the opening phrase

[91] See Chapters 1 & 2 for discussion of prolepsis in P.

[92] It is also possible that there is no fulfillment clause here because the act of holding a second-month Passover could not have taken place immediately within the narrative—fulfillment clauses tend to indicate immediate execution within the narrative. Nevertheless, one could imagine a deployment of *ʾny yhwh ʾlhykm* to signal the close of the speech. Chavel 2014: 98-115 argues that the law in 9:11-14 was an originally separate text to which someone has prefixed the narrative in 9:1-10 and inserted it into the Priestly text. While Chavel acknowledges that this author felt the need to provide a narrative introduction to this law but did not finish this narrative (109), he does not offer an explanation for why an author/editor would operate in this way. His initial argument—that the law pre-exists its narrative framing—is perfectly in line with our Neo-analytic framework. However, that this must have been done by

in Num 9:15 signals a shift away from the narrative sequence the Epicycle has followed up to this point.

Num 9:15, like Num 7:1, refers back to the erection of the Tabernacle. However, the formulation of this reference and the use of durative and future-oriented verbal forms throughout indicate that the narrator is stepping away from chronological-sequential narrative in order to give more general information. Unlike the other date markers in the Epicycle, which both begin with a *wə-yaqtul*/preterite verb prior to giving the chronological reference (Num 7:1; 9:1), this passage opens with the date rendered by *bywm* + infinitive construct + *qatala*/perfect verb. Rather than moving the narrative back to this moment of time, this formulation functions to remind the reader of previously given information. The passage proceeds to a series of *yaqtulu*/imperfect and *wə-qatala*/imperfect verbs describing the relationship between the cloud's and the Israelite camps' movements. These verbal forms express what will habitually happen in the future as the Israelites traveled in the wilderness.[93] The entirety of Num 9:15-23 operates outside of the chronological-sequential frame of the narrative up to this point.

As pointed out above, this long digression comes on the heels of Yhwh's announcement of a second-month Passover for those who were unable to participate during the normal Passover festival. The unanchored chronology of the description in Num 9:15-23 following this proleptic mention of the second month makes the return to the second-month setting of the Deferent in Num 10:11 much less abrupt. That Numbers 9's description of the cloud is intended, in part, to ease this transition is further indicated by the notice that "the cloud was lifted from upon the

---

someone other than the Priestly author does not accord with the narrative position of this text within the Priestly narrative, on which see further below.

[93] This analysis echoes, with more detail, Gray 1903: 85-86. See also, Kellermann 1970: 135-136, for consideration and dismissal of alternative understandings of the verb forms.

Tabernacle of the Testimony"—a direct reference to Num 9:15-23—accompanying the absolute date in the second month given in Num 10:11 for the Israelites' departure from Sinai.

Between the description of the cloud and the departure of the Israelites in the second month, Num 10:1-10 contains Yhwh's instructions for the manufacture and use of two silver trumpets. One could easily object that this obscures the transition from the Epicycle to the Deferent to which Num 9:15-23 so readily lends itself. However, the commands for the trumpets also participate in this transition. Like the description of the cloud, Num 10:1-10 focuses, in part, on the impending departure from Sinai and the mechanics of the march. Num 10:2 identifies signaling the Israelite camps to travel as one of the two primary uses of the trumpets.[94] The precise way that these trumpets are used to signal the Israelites is then taken up in 10:5-6.[95] Importantly, this description of the trumpets' role in the Israelites' travel directly connects with the administrative groupings of the tribes described in Numbers 2. This connection relies on events in the second month and thus also eases the reader back into the chronological frame of the Deferent. This reminder of the administrative grouping of the camps also points forward to the description of the departure in 10:11-28, which also uses the groupings from Numbers 2 as a framework. The instructions for the trumpets, like the description of the cloud, aid in the transition from the Epicycle back to the second-month setting of the Deferent and prepare the reader for the departure from Sinai.

---

[94] The combination of divine and human signal for the march of the Israelites in Num 9:15-10:10 recalls the dual-causation explanations present in Judahite historiographic texts (e.g., 1 Kings 11-12, where the division of the kingdom is attributed to both a divine punishment for Solomon's "idolatry" and to a political consequence of a taxation dispute).

[95] A case can be made for reading LXX over MT in these verses. MT contains instructions for the movement of only the first two groups of camps. LXX contains the expected instructions for all four. While Wevers 1998: 148 identifies this expanded text as "the creation of Num [= the LXX translation of Numbers]," he provides no defense of his reasoning. The text is formulaic enough that it is easy to retroject LXX into Hebrew—once done, the opportunities for anablepsis in this passage are immediately apparent. Admittedly, the fact that the other Versions and SamP agree with MT militates against accepting LXX here.

The use of these two passages as a convergence accomplishes more than a return to the chronological sequence interrupted by Num 7:1. Each also contributes a structural element to the larger Priestly text. If, as we argued in Chapter 2, Exodus 40 functions as something of an argument for the following parts of the Priestly text, then the description of the cloud in Num 9:15-23 signals the end of the Sinai moment in P by addressing the last of the elements introduced in Exodus 40. Num 10:1-10, on the other hand, also functions as an argument, in its own way, for what follows in the Priestly text.

The trumpets serve two primary purposes: assembling the Israelites and signaling the marches of the camps (10:2-8). The events that happen in the rest of the book of Numbers cluster around these two activities. The travel of the Israelites is a key part of the rest of the book as they make their way from Sinai to Canaan.[96] Similarly, the actions that take place in P after this point frequently revolve around meetings between Moses and the *ʿēdāh* or particular groups who come before the *ʿēdāh* and the *nəśîʾîm*.[97]

The text also describes other uses for the trumpets connected with their status as a *ḥuqqat ʿôlām*, that is, having relevance outside of the world of the narrative (10:8-10).[98] Nevertheless, the uses of the trumpets for war and for sacrifices are also programmatic for the Priestly text. The notice about the trumpets' role in sacrifices and festivals reminds the reader, just prior to departure, that the Israelites will adhere to the ordinances given in Exod 29:38-42 and Leviticus 1-7; 23 throughout their march. The trumpets' association with warfare looks forward to the entry into the land (cf. *ṣrr* in Num 33:55),[99] but the one warfare narrative in the Priestly text in Numbers also uses the key term *ṣrr* from this passage and then explicitly mentions the trumpets

[96] Num 10:11-28; 20:1a, 22; 21:4a, 10, 11; 22:1.
[97] Num 13:26; 14:2-3, 5-10, 16:19; 17:6-8, 21, 24; 20:10; 26:3; 27:2, 22; 31:13; 32:2, 28; 36:1, 5.
[98] Ashley 1993:188-189.
[99] See Chapter 6 for thorough discussion of the entry into the land in P.

(25:16-18; 31:6). Notably, these passages comprise all the uses of the root *ṣrr* in P. Num 10:1-10 anticipates the major forms of action in the remainder of P and reminds the reader that a variety of other activities will take place that the narrative will not explicitly mention. It calls to mind major elements of the Sinai material while also pointing forward to what will happen after the Israelites depart.

The descriptions of the cloud and the trumpets in Num 9:15-10:10, then, are well-suited to their role as the transition from Epicycle to Deferent. Both look forward while recalling key information from earlier in the narrative. Both play a structural role in the broader Priestly narrative—the cloud by closing the Sinai argument and the trumpets by offering a schematic view of what is to come. The narrative's return to the second month and the description of the departure from Sinai in 10:11-28 sensibly follows these two descriptions. Importantly, the function of these passages is only clearly visible when they are viewed as part of the larger Priestly narrative, rather than as editorial fragments haphazardly strung onto a pre-existing work.[100]

Under Ptolemaic Skies: The Epicyclical Arrangement of Exodus 40-Numbers 10*

The above analysis has demonstrated that the Epicycle in Numbers 7-10* is internally coherent, chronologically consistent with Numbers 1-4, thoroughly connected to the larger Sinai episode, and implicated in the structure of the Priestly text. None of this, however, addresses the question of why the material is arranged epicyclically. It does, though, suggest a productive way forward in our investigation—given its participation in the broader Priestly text, we must attempt

[100] This is not to suggest that an editor is not responsible for these passages, only that such an editor did not operate haphazardly or at random, as analyses of Numbers 1-10* frequently claim. For further discussion of this issue, see below.

to understand why there is an epicycle in Exodus 40-Numbers 10*, not in Numbers 1-10* alone.[101]

In this inquiry, we will take the internal thematic and chronological coherence of the Epicycle material in Num 7:1-9:14 as justification for treating them as a unit. Rather than asking why each individual part of the Epicycle was not placed earlier, we will ask after the Epicycle as a whole. In terms of possible alternative placements, Num 7:1's connection with the erection of the Tabernacle indicate that this material could have been placed at any point after Exodus 40. Realistically, these other possible positions could have been prior to Leviticus 1, prior to Leviticus 8-9, after Leviticus 10, or prior to Numbers 1.

Of these possible alternatives, the easiest to eliminate are the ones in Leviticus. If the Epicycle preceded Leviticus 1, the *nəśîʾîm* would have been bringing animals for sacrifices that had not yet been defined. Placing the Epicycle material prior to Leviticus 1 or Leviticus 8 would also have delayed the fulfillment of the instructions given in Exodus 29 for the installation of the priesthood as a key part of the Tabernacle's function.[102] This would have necessitated making Leviticus 8-9 function as an epicycle, returning back to the first day of the month after the Epicycle material moved us to at least the fourteenth.[103] The Priestly text instead allows the Tabernacle instructions in Exodus 25-31 to define the primary thread of the narrative in the first part of Leviticus. Given the prominence of the Tabernacle instructions in P, we should not be surprised to find the Priestly author prioritizing that material's association between the Tabernacle's construction and the installation of the priesthood.

[101] As Feldman 2018: 373-375 does, using a different approach than the one here.
[102] See Chapter 2 for arguments on why Leviticus 1-7 does not constitute a *narrative* interruption.
[103] This would hold true even if only Numbers 7 were positioned prior to Leviticus 1 or 8—it still pushes the date forward to the twelfth of the first month.

Alternative 1:	Exodus 40	Num 7:1-9:14	Leviticus 1-9
Alternative 2:	Exodus 40-Leviticus 7	Num 7:1-9:14	Leviticus 8-9
Analysis Summary:	Both arrangements sever the connection between the Tabernacle's construction and the installation of the priesthood (Exodus 25-31). They also shift the inauguration of the priesthood into the status of epicycle.		

Figure 4.5: Alternative Placements of the Epicycle 1

We should also note that if Num 7:1-9:14 were placed somewhere after Leviticus 8-9, they would still constitute an epicycle, returning back to the first day of the month after the narrative had moved forward to the eighth day (Lev 9:1). Regardless of how the narrative is laid out, the multi-day sequences that constitute both Leviticus 8-9 and Numbers 7 require some form of epicyclical arrangement to co-exist. Once the Priestly author (or a later editor) had made the choice to privilege the installation of the priesthood but still include the gifts of the *nəśîʾîm*, the question becomes not whether there should be an epicycle, but where it should be placed and how it should be integrated into the larger narrative.[104] The only way out of this conundrum would be to date the events of Numbers 7 differently, to identify them with the period following Leviticus 8-9.[105] We should assume that the tradition and reality of sacred-precinct dedication foreclosed this possibility.[106]

Keeping in mind the inevitable epicyclical arrangement, the other possible setting for the Epicycle material in Leviticus, after Leviticus 10, also appears unsuitable for this material. As we discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the statement defining priestly responsibilities in Lev 10:10-11 sets the stage for the collection of instructions in Leviticus 11-26. Placing Num 7:1-9:14 after Leviticus 10 would have disrupted the connection between Yhwh's definition of priestly

[104] This would not be the only instance of a Biblical author using epicyclical narrative to express complex, synchronic events. Halpern 1996: 134-137 has argued that the deployment of the death of Joshua (Josh 24:29; Judg 1:1; 3:6-10) also serves as an epicycle marker uniting several strands of narrative and argument in this part of the Deuteronomistic History. For a different example of the sophisticated ways that Judahite historiographers were capable of deploying chronology, see Halpern 1990.

[105] As Feldman 2018: 364-376 does, though see discussion above.

[106] This holds true even more so if we ascribe this material to an editor, who would have immediately recognized this strategy as a means of erasing the chronological tension that Numbers 7 otherwise introduces.

duties—to distinguish between *ṭmʾ* and *ṭhwr* and between *qdš* and *ḥl* and to teach the Israelites to do the same—and the content necessary to carry out those duties. The well-planned structure of Leviticus 8-26 precluded the interposition of this body of material. What is more, placing the Epicycle in this location would have also severed the inauguration of the Levites (Num 8:5-22) from their own assignment to duties (Numbers 3-4) by allowing the instructions of Leviticus 11-26 to intervene.

Alternative 3:	Exodus 40-Leviticus 10	Num 7:1-9:14	Leviticus 11-26
Analysis Summary:	This arrangement severs the connection between the teaching-assignment of the priests (Lev 10:10-11) and the content of that assignment (Leviticus 11-26), while also severing the inauguration of the Levites (Num 8:5-22) from their own assignment (Numbers 3-4).		

Figure 4.6: Alternative Placements of the Epicycle 2

We come, then, back to the question of why the Epicycle does not open the book of Numbers better equipped to answer this question, knowing that the choice is not between a chronological and unchronological presentation of events. We have already laid aside the possibility of a non-epicyclical arrangement, and can instead seek to understand what is accomplished by continuing to delay the Epicycle material. There are two aspects to this issue to examine—what is gained by opening the post-Leviticus narrative with Numbers 1-6 and what is gained by ending the Sinai moment with the Epicycle.

Alternative 4:	Exodus 40-Leviticus 26	Num 7:1-9:14	Num 1:1-5:4
Analysis Summary:	This arrangement obscures the ways in which Num 1:1-5:4 are related to important thematic and narrative movements in Leviticus 8-26. Furthermore, such an arrangement misses the opportunity to have the Passover serve as the climax of the Sinai narrative.		

Figure 4.7: Alternative Placements of the Epicycle 3

One possible motivation for continuing to delay the Epicycle is the connection between the material that closes Leviticus and the material in the Deferent in Num 1:1-5:4. The last substantial body of law in Leviticus 25 deals with the ownership of land and its inalienable

connection with the Israelite families to which it will be distributed.[107] This subject is intimately tied up with both the role of the *nəśîʾîm* and the size of the individual tribes, as made explicit later in the book of Numbers (26:52-56; 34:16-20). The appointment of the *nəśîʾîm* and the census in Numbers 1 thus show a thematic connection to the land regulations that end Leviticus. These regulations also contain the first hint of the Levites' special status in connection with the land, a status that their exclusion from the first census also emphasizes (Lev 25:32-34; Num 1:47-53). When considering the importance of these connections, we should keep in mind that within the world of the narrative there is no expectation of a forty-year wandering at this point—the expected next stop after Sinai is Canaan.[108] The subject matter of Numbers 1-4 following so closely on Leviticus 25 creates dramatic tension by anticipating an upcoming allotment of land.

The material in Numbers 1-4 also resonates with the promises of Yhwh that close the book of Leviticus. At the climax of the blessings in Leviticus 26, Yhwh tells the Israelites that he will put his Tabernacle in their midst and walk-about (*hlk* tD) among them (Lev 26:11-12). This promise itself echoes Yhwh's declaration that his Tabernacle's presence in the midst of Israel was a key purpose of the exodus and an indicator that he was Israel's god (Exod 29:42-46). Numbers 1-4 concretizes these promises by creating an image of the Israelite camps with Yhwh's *miškān* at their center, all prepared for movement.[109] By placing this material immediately after the close of Leviticus, the Priestly author is able to express Yhwh's immediate fidelity to his stated intent to live among the Israelites—it is not just that Yhwh is present in the Tabernacle, but that the Tabernacle is present at the center of the Israelites and will travel among them. While this arrangement will become a source of narrative tension (Num 17:27-28),

[107] On the regulations in Leviticus 27, see excursus in Chapter 5.
[108] And indeed, the next narrative in P after the departure from Sinai is the dispatch of the spies in preparation for the entry into the land (on which see Chapter 6).
[109] Num 1:51; 2:17, 34; 4:5, 15, 25, 31, 47, 49.

Numbers 1-4's description of the camps following so closely on Yhwh's promise makes it part of the triumphant establishment of Yhwh's relationship with Israel.[110] Notably, none of the material in the Epicycle expresses this aspect of the Tabernacle's role.

In addition to these connections with Leviticus 25-26, the census in Numbers 1-3 also provides an explicit narrative account of an event that has already happened once before. The Tabernacle instructions in Exodus include provisions for a poll-tax during a census (Exod 30:11-16), and the construction account of the Tabernacle includes a report on the outcome of this census and the use to which the silver gained from it was put (Exod 38:25-28).[111] The focus on the Tabernacle construction precluded the Priestly author from including more than the total from this first-year census in Exodus 35-40. In its own way, then, the census as a fully narrated event has also been delayed from its expected position. This narrative delay, combined with the Priestly author's clear interest in genealogical matters and the implications they have for land policy, may have provided further inducement to prioritize this narrative account of a census over the Epicycle's material.

One other connection between the material in the Deferent and the content of Leviticus may also have contributed to the decision to continue to the events at the beginning of the second month before reverting to the Epicycle. Num 5:1-4, coming as the final part of the camp's setup,

---

[110] See Chapter 6 for further analysis of this motif in the Priestly text.

[111] Propp 2006: 536-537 comes to the conclusion that the two censuses are actually identical—that the count and silver were done prior to the completion of the Tabernacle, but the actual population count not announced until Numbers 1-4. This seems to require ignoring what the text explicitly states was the activity in the 2nd month of the 2nd year in Num 1:1, 18. Furthermore, Propp's attempt to correlate Numbers 1-2 and the total in Exod 38:25-28 requires him to ignore that the silver isn't just collected in the first month of the 2nd year—it has already been collected, processed, and recast for use in the construction of the Tabernacle by the first day of the first month of the 2nd year. It seems more likely that the census whose results are recorded in Exodus 38 took place sometime in the first year, rather than the second. This may possibly have taken place during the events recounted in Exod 35:1-36:7 (Propp 2006: 536). Note that the identical census totals in Exod 38:26 and Num 1:46 may imply a Priestly view that no Israelites died naturally at Sinai or that the rate of people reaching 20 years of age and the death rate were identical (in Propp 2006: 537's droll expression "a miraculous violation of actuarial probability"). The omission of the Levites from this first census may perhaps be signaled by the fact that the distinctive status of the Levites is alluded to in the heading of the "account book" in which the census information is embedded (Exod 38:21).

envisions the application of the *tôrōt* given in Leviticus 11-15.[112] This brief narrative presumes a background in which the priests have fulfilled their obligation to communicate these *tôrōt* to the Israelites who then abide by them (Lev 10:10-11).[113] Yhwh's justification for the dismissal of unclean persons from the camp even invokes his encampment (*škn*) among the Israelites (Num 5:3) in an echo of the rationale that concludes the purity manuals (Lev 15:31). By implying the execution of the priests' teaching commission, Num 5:1-4 provides a fulfillment account that brings the instructions of Leviticus directly into the world of the narrative.

In many ways, then, the material in the Deferent in Num 1:1-5:4 directly advances and continues the plot of the Priestly text from Exodus and Leviticus in a way that the material in the Epicycle in Num 7:1-9:14 simply does not. The arrangement of the camps, the appointment of leaders, the instructions for the disassembly and movement of the Tabernacle all directly contribute to the Priestly narrative, concretizing themes from Leviticus and creating the image that the reader is meant to hold in their mind for the remainder of the Priestly text. The material in the first part of the Epicycle (Num 7:1-8:26) instead provides an account of finishing touches, minor matters that cohere together nicely in their focus on the finalization of the Tabernacle's preparation as a sacred precinct. However, outside of the dedication of the Levites, these same materials do not further the Priestly text's main narrative thread in any significant way.

---

[112] The issue of corpse contamination is not addressed in those chapters, but the narrative in Lev 10:1-7 and the instructions in Lev 21:1-4 make clear that the concept of impurity contracted by corpse-contact is part of the cultural lexicon (Feldman 2018: 302-311). What is lacking in Leviticus is not the concept of corpse contamination, but a remedy for it. The Priestly text will not provide this until Numbers 19, on which see Chapter 6.

[113] Knierim & Coats 2005: 72. Much has been made by scholars who view this passage as irreconcilable with Leviticus 11-15 because it is more stringent by requiring that all persons with impurity be expelled from the camp (e.g., Wellhausen 1899: 173-174; Gray 1903: 40; Noth 1968: 45-46; Milgrom 1990: 33; 1991: 262; Levine 1993: 184-186). However, as Knierim & Coats correctly note, this is not a law or a perpetually binding requirement, but an event within the narrative to which no normative value is attached. This distinction has been one of the many casualties of the artificial sorting of P into the *Gesetzgebung* and *Erzählung* categories. As a possible rationale for the Priestly author having Yhwh require the dismissal of unclean persons from the camp in this situation, we should acknowledge that we do not know how the image of the Israelites living in a series of nomadic camps may have affected the Priestly author's understanding of the transmission of impurity—it is possible that this situation was imagined to have a differential effect on this issue when compared to the more permanent dwellings in houses located in a city.

Continuing to delay the Epicycle allows the continuity between P material in Exodus-Leviticus and the Deferent to appear in an undiluted form, rhetorically and narratively emphasizing the land-owning implications of the census, the fulfillment of Yhwh's promises to Israel, and the priests' execution of his instructions.

On the other side of the balance, the delay of the Epicycle to its current position accomplishes its own rhetorical ends. In the first case, this arrangement places the dedication of the Levites narratively closer to the departure from Sinai. This passage emphasizes the subordination of the Levites to the Aaronide priesthood (Num 8:13-19, 22) and the public nature of their installation in this position (Num 8:9-10, 20). By embedding the dedication ceremony for the Levites in the Epicycle and delaying this material until after the Deferent, the text places the public ritual that signaled the position of the Levites narratively closer to the Qorah rebellion and its aftermath (Numbers 16-17) than it would be otherwise. This ensures that the reader's last extended encounter with the Levites is in the context of the ritual in Numbers 8, making them deeply aware of the precariousness of Qorah's claims against Moses and Aaron. Moses even directly recalls the dedication of the Levites during the Qorah narrative (16:8-10), and the appearance of both Qorah's group and Aaron before Yhwh at the Tent of Meeting provides a mirror image of the dedicatory ritual in Numbers 8. While the Deferent mentions the subordination of the Levites (Num 3:5-10), this is incidental to the main focus of these passages on the Levites' role in Israelite taxation (3:11-51) and their responsibility for transporting the Tabernacle (1:48-53; 4:1-33). The delay of the Epicycle to the close of the Sinai narrative enables a clearer narrative connection between the subordination accomplished in the dedication of the Levites and the baselessness of the Qorah rebellion.[114]

[114] The public's involvement in this ceremony also emphasizes the baselessness of Qorah's complaints and the fact that the other Israelites should have been wary of his claims. The connection of the larger *ʿēdāh* to the Levites

The delay of the Epicycle also allows the departure from Sinai to symbolically mirror the exodus from Egypt. In both accounts, the celebration of Passover serves as the climax before a mass movement of the Israelites to the next phase of their existence.[115] Deferring the Epicycle to the end of the Sinai account makes the Passover function narratively as the last event before the departure, even though this is not chronologically accurate. Without this chronological displacement, the parallel with the exodus event would be non-existent. While it is unlikely that this parallelism was sufficient to motivate the deferment of the Epicycle, the appeal of such a structure likely added to the other benefits of this arrangement as discussed above.[116] Furthermore, if the Epicycle had preceded the Deferent then the celebration of the first post-exodus Passover would have taken its place as one event among many, lost between the detailed accounts of the *nəśîʾîm*'s offering and the census of the Israelites. The chronological displacement instead privileges the celebration of the Passover by separating it out from the mass of events in the wilderness of Sinai and giving it pride of place at the climax of the Epicycle.

While all of the arguments above should not be given equal weight, it is clear that the arrangement of the material in Numbers 1-10* is far from being the insensible, disorganized mess that scholars often describe it as. The material in the Epicycle is internally coherent, both chronologically and thematically. The marked achronological presentation is consistent with the proximal material in Numbers 1-4 without any anachronism. The Epicycle further participates in the broader Sinai narrative, connecting with material in both Exodus and Leviticus. Treating

---

expressed in Num 8:5-22 also clarifies the response of the community to the death of Qorah's group in the sequel in Num 17:6. See Chapter 6 for further discussion.

[115] Note as well the narratively unnecessary addition of a geographic setting to the speech opening in both Exod 12:1 and Num 9:1. Chavel 2014: 116-117 also proposes that the celebration of the Passover at the end of the bringing of gifts and dedication of the Levites mimics the progress of a temple dedication eventuating in a public feast. Despite this thoroughly sensible narrative coherence, Chavel 2014: 98-115 also argues that the Passover story is a later addition to the Priestly text.

[116] For another example of this kind of narrative parallelism (though without chronological displacement), see the discussion of Gen 13:6, 11b-12 and 36:6-8; 37:1 in Chapter 1.

these texts as the narrative that they are, rather than solely attempting to find some central subject, has proven to be a fruitful approach.[117]

Most importantly, we have found that the epicyclical arrangement is not an aberration in the text, but a requirement of it. The narration of a complex, synchronized set of events taking place around the erection of the Tabernacle required the imposition of some kind of epicycle at some point in the text. The genius of the current order of these chapters is that they take this chronological disruption and use it in order to emphasize certain narrative and structural features of the material. The convergence of the Epicycle back into the path of the Deferent is used both to close the narrative argument introduced in Exodus 40 and to introduce an argument for the wilderness journey. The delay of the Epicycle until after Num 1:1-5:4 provides a continuity of context and immediacy of fulfillment to the material in Leviticus 25-26. The current position of the Epicycle narratively connects with the rebellion of Qorah and allows the Passover to serve as the climax to the Sinai sojourn. The chronological displacement of the material in Numbers 1-10*, rather than the result of editorial inattention, appears well-planned and rhetorically effective.[118] It is achronological and motivated, not anachronistic and haphazard. This appearance of intentionality further undermines the case for editorial strata in the Priestly material in Num 7:1-10:10, though we will continue to reserve judgement about whether to attribute the unit as a whole to the Priestly author or to a later expansion of the Priestly text.

[117] See above for discussion of thematic approaches.

[118] We should note too that there are signs of ambivalence in the arrangement, as though the choice to place Num 7:1-9:14 after Num 1:1-5:4 was not entirely a foregone conclusion in the compilation of the material. Both the Epicycle and the Deferent focus on the role of the *nəśîʾîm* and the status of the Levites. In both sets of texts, the names of every *nāśîʾ* is repeated twice (and then a fifth time in Num 10:11-28). In both sets of texts, the connection between the Levites and the Exodus is mentioned, as well as their status in relation to the priests. Regardless of whether Numbers began with Numbers 1 or Numbers 7, it would have begun with a text that spoke of the *nəśîʾîm*, rehearsed the tribal groups of Israel, and indicated the distinctiveness of the Levites.

Torah in the Camp: The Articulation of the Interlude in Num 5:5-6:27

The above discussion has demonstrated the sensibility of the epicyclical arrangement of Numbers 1-10*, one of the two major problems we identified as arising from our structural analysis of these chapters. The other major problem arises from the presence of Leviticus-like material in Num 5:5-6:27. This series of four divine speeches provide instructions that reach outside of the world of the narrative and constitute an interlude in the otherwise narrative-focused Priestly material of Numbers 1-10*. Additionally, all of these speeches are related to material in Leviticus—the *ʾāšām*-offering regulation (Num 5:5-10) expands on the earlier instructions related to this offering (Lev 5:14-26; 7:1-7), the ritual for the suspected adulteress (Num 5:11-31) and the rules for the Nazirite (6:1-21) see the return of the *tôrāh* genre that constituted the subject of Leviticus 6-7; 11-15,[119] and the priestly blessing (6:22-27) recalls the narrative of the first public offering at the Tabernacle (Lev 9:22).

The placement of these speeches has long baffled scholars, who have seen in their anomalous appearance evidence of the editorial history in the opening chapters of Numbers.[120] In addition to the problem of their setting in Numbers, there is also the apparent fact that "[Num 5:5-6:21] have hardly any connections among themselves."[121] As with our discussion of the Epicycle and Deferent, we will hold at bay the question of whether to attribute these materials to a process of editorial expansion at this point in our inquiry. Instead, we will continue with the

[119] The genre marker recurs in Numbers 15 and 19, for which see Chapter 6.
[120] Kuenen 1886: 93; Wellhausen 1899: 173; Gray 1903: xxxvi, 39; Noth 1968: 44-45; Levine 1993: 200; Knierim & Coats 2005: 32-34; Seebass 2012: 4*-5*, 108.
[121] Seebass 2012: 108, ["...daß die drei mittleren Stücke 5,5-10.11-31 und 6,1-21 kaum Verbindungen untereinander…haben."]. Milgrom 1990: 34 recognizes both problems and offers an attempted explanation that requires viewing 5:1-4 as a law rather than a narrative and the whole set of Numbers 5-6 as a pre-existing scroll covering impurity miscellanea (which strikes this author as nothing more than a restatement of the problem on other terms). Milgrom 1990: xiv further asserts that these texts are united by their focus on "the prevention and elimination of defilement in Israel's camp" and the prominence of the priest's role in these texts. Neither of these contentions is very persuasive and the former requires a skewed reading of the content of these chapters. Lee 2008 also argues for the presence/role of the priest as the unifying theme for Numbers 5:1-10:10, but this is no more persuasive than other attempts to explain these chapters on thematic rather than narrative terms.

supposition—in line with our principles of secondary analysis—that these texts make sense in their context, regardless of whether their placement is the work of an author or an editor.[122]

We will begin with a negative observation about the *tôrōt* contained in Num 5:11-6:21. While these texts share an internally-marked genre with the material in Leviticus 6-7 and 11-15, their content is not in any way related to either of those collections. The collection in Leviticus 6-7 details the distribution of sacrificial remnants, while Leviticus 11-15 is a collection of manuals dealing with purification from uncleanness. The texts in Num 5:11-6:21 clearly do not belong with the collection in Leviticus 6-7, but they would also sit uncomfortably in the collection in Leviticus 11-15. While both the *śōṭāh* and *nāzîr* instructions touch on subjects relevant to Leviticus 11-15, neither of them are directly implicated in the issues central to those chapters—neither text is centrally concerned with purification nor do they help with the distinction between the unclean and pure (Lev 10:10).[123] Despite a shared focus on *tôrāh*, Num 5:11-6:21 do not belong to either collection of such materials in Leviticus 1-15.

This leaves the possibility of a place for these instructions in the collection in Leviticus 17-26. Here too we can see that these texts would not be at home. Their genre, primarily oriented towards instructions for ritual or ritualized behavior, estranges them just as much from the material in Leviticus 17-26, much of which is internally subsumed under the genre of *ḥuqqāh* and *mišpāṭ*.[124] Nevertheless, we could imagine the *śōṭāh* ritual's connection with sexual behavior finding a place in proximity to Leviticus 18-20 and the *nāzîr* instructions' emulation of priestly behavior existing close to Leviticus 21-22.[125] But this arrangement would have changed the nature of the collection in these chapters, diluting its focus on behavioral and ethical instructions

[122] See Chapter 1 for full discussion of primary vs. secondary analysis.
[123] See Chapter 2 for discussion of the relationship between Lev 10:10 and Leviticus 11-15.
[124] See discussion of the distribution of genres in Leviticus in Chapter 3.
[125] On the relationship between the *nāzîr* and the high priest, see Milgrom 1990: 44; Levine 1993: 221.

and the distinction between the holy and profane (Lev 10:10).[126] It is not at all clear that placing these texts in Leviticus 17-26 was a viable option.

From this perspective, we can see that, by their nature, Num 5:11-6:21 do not belong in any of the collections in Leviticus. Whether the Priestly author or a later editor is responsible for their inclusion, the decision to locate them in the book of Numbers does not appear unmotivated. In other words, the choice regarding their inclusion in the Priestly text is not a decision between whether they belong to Leviticus or Numbers, it is whether they belong at Sinai or later. The Priestly text includes numerous non-narrative materials in the post-Sinai section, including materials labeled *tôrāh* (Num 19:2, 14; 31:21).[127] The majority of these non-narrative texts cluster in P's account of the Israelites' stay in the plains of Moab prior to their entry into Canaan (Numbers 22-36*). These texts, like those in Leviticus, are labeled as a discrete group of Mosaic instructions within the Priestly text (Num 36:13; cf. Lev 7:37-38; 26:46) and largely concern issues related to the acquisition, distribution, and inheritance of land.[128] Neither the *śōṭāh* nor the *nāzîr* address these subjects and would be out of place among these materials.

The last alternative location for these texts is somewhere between Sinai and Moab. The non-narrative materials that find their home in this part of the Priestly text do not share a common theme—like the collections in Leviticus or at the end of Numbers—but instead share a common strategy of deployment. All of these instructions and commands are closely associated

[126] See Chapter 3 for discussion on the relationship between Lev 10:10 and Leviticus 17-26.
[127] Num 15:16, 29 also label their related texts as *tôrāh*. However, it is not clear whether Num 15:1-31 are part of the Priestly text (Noth 1968: 114; Friedman 2003: 266n). See further discussion in Chapter 6.
[128] Gray 1903: 449. These texts consist of a second census and appointment of *nəśîʾîm* for land distribution (Num 26:1-65; 34:16-29); a survey of inheritable land (34:1-15); inheritance of land by daughters (27:1-11; 36:1-12); distribution of cities and property to Levites (35:1-8); assignment of cities of refuge (35:9-34); instructions for warfare and distribution of plunder (31:19-30; 33:50-56). For a full discussion of these texts and their place in the Priestly text, see Chapter 6. If they are part of P (on which, see Chapter 6), Numbers 28-29 provide a full sacrificial calendar for the celebration of festivals in the land, while Numbers 30's focus on women's vows possibly relates to their ability to inherit property.

with the accompanying narrative, including the *tôrāh* in Numbers 19.[129] While we should not dismiss the possibility that the Priestly author or an editor could have attached the *śōṭāh* or *nāzîr* instructions to some narrative, the narratives that exist in this section of the Priestly text provide no clear context into which these could have been embedded. The only remaining suitable location for these instructions is in the post-Leviticus Sinai section of P—they belong most naturally to Numbers 1-10*.

If the *tôrōt* in Num 5:11-6:21 have no other home than in Numbers 1-10*, we can not say the same for the texts that bookend them—we can easily imagine other suitable contexts for both Num 5:5-10 and 6:22-27. The *ʾāšām* regulation in Num 5:5-10 stipulates that in the event that no next-of-kin can be located to whom reparations can be made, the monetary restitution and its twenty-percent surcharge reverts to the officiating priest.[130] On the surface, there is no apparent reason why this could not have been included alongside the other relevant speeches in Lev 5:14-26. The *ʾāšām* regulations in Leviticus, unlike those for the *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, already consist of multiple speeches (Lev 5:14, 20), so the addition of one more speech to this subject would not have been disruptive.

Alternatively, the subject matter of Num 5:5-10 also aligns well with the statements about priestly dues related to the *ʾāšām* and other sacrifices in Lev 7:1-10. After Num 5:5-10 directs all *ʾāšām* payments to the priest when no *gōʾēl* is available, it goes on to specify that any offering

[129] The story of the Sabbath-breaker motivates both instructions from Yhwh for his execution and the command for Israelites to wear fringes (*ṣîṣit*) on their garments (Num 15:32-41). The modification to the priestly perquisites and the addition of the Levite tithe (Numbers 18) are a direct response to the plague that occurred in the aftermath of the Qorah rebellion (Num 17:27-28; 18:5). The *tôrāh* on purification from corpse contamination (Numbers 19) occurs just after the first mass deaths in the camp (16:35; 17:14). See Chapter 6 for a full discussion of the relationship between these texts and their narrative setting.

[130] Milgrom 1991: 368; Milgrom 2000: 1336-1337 further argues that this text also introduces the requirement of confession to the *ʾāšām* regulations. This seems mistaken to me, however. Although the term confession is never used in Lev 5:20-26, the return of previously missing goods along with a twenty-percent surcharge themselves indicate the admittance of wrongdoing. Num 5:7 may have made this explicit, but it seems to be part of what Milgrom 2000: 1336 recognizes as the abbreviated nature of this text, standing in for the full list of return scenarios in Lev 5:23.

(*tərûmāh*, *qōdeš*) belongs to the priest to whom it is given (Num 5:9-10).[131] Similar statements occur in the collection labeled *tôrat hāʾāšām* (Lev 7:1), which covers not only the reparation-offering, but also the distribution of remnants from the *ʿōlāh* and *minḥāh* (Lev 7:8-10). This too would have provided an ideal location for the statements contained in Num 5:5-10, and the addition of a supplemental speech to a *tôrāh* in these chapters would not be anomalous.[132]

The priestly blessing in Num 6:22-27 also seems removed from its most natural context. Aaron blesses the people at the inaugural public sacrifices at the Tabernacle (Lev 9:22), prior to his first entry into the Tabernacle. He then blesses the people alongside Moses when he exits the Tabernacle (Lev 9:23).[133] We can easily imagine a Priestly text wherein Num 6:22-27 comes prior to these events.[134] In fact, this short divine speech—telling Moses to instruct the priests in how to bless the Israelites—would sit comfortably between the end of the inauguration of the priesthood in Leviticus 8 and Moses' preparations for the first public sacrifices at the beginning of Leviticus 9.

In other words, the texts in Num 5:5-6:27 do not all show the same relationship to the larger Priestly narrative—the two large *tôrōt* texts have no other apparent place in the Priestly text and the smaller texts on either side of them could easily belong elsewhere. Furthermore, these two smaller texts are distinct in their possible alternative locations. Num 5:5-10's *ʾāšām* regulation has two possible homes within the collection of non-narrative sacrificial instructions in Leviticus 1-7. The priestly blessing, on the other hand, relates directly to the narrative content of Leviticus 8-9.

---

[131] The formulation in Num 5:10 is somewhat ambiguous, but see Gray 1903: 43; Levine 1993: 191; Seebass 2012: 115, 119.

[132] Such as in the way that Lev 7:22-27 supplements 7:11-21—see Chapter 3 for further discussion.

[133] These blessings should be read in conversation with Moses blessing the Israelites as a whole on their completion of the Tabernacle's construction (Exod 39:43).

[134] Gray 1903: 71; Milgrom 1990: 51; Levine 1993: 216.

Despite these differences in their possible distributions, their actual location narratively unites them in their relationship to the Deferent in Numbers 1-6. These four speeches all take place in the Priestly narrative at some point between the first and twentieth day of the second month, between the final arrangement of the camp and the departure from Sinai. With the possible exception of the instructions for the silver trumpets—whose precise chronological relationship to both the Epicycle and the Deferent is ambiguous—these speeches are, chronologically, the final words from Yhwh at Sinai. Our interpretation of these materials should take account of this narrative setting and the structural implications of concentrating these texts in this location.

From this perspective, these speeches participate in some of the central ideas of the preceding narrative in Num 1:1-5:4. We have already discussed the way in which the dismissal of unclean persons from the camp in Num 5:1-4 implies the transmission of instruction from the priests to the broader Israelite community as commanded in Lev 10:10. But the arrangement of the Israelite camps also makes the intermediating role of the priests explicit through location—the Israelites are separated from the Tabernacle by a cordon of Levites, with the priesthood situated at the east between the Israelites and the entrance of the Tent of Meeting (Num 1:52-53; 3:38). The interface between the priesthood and the rest of the community continues throughout these Interlude speeches,[135] culminating in Yhwh providing the blessing for the priests to use in their interactions with the Israelites.

Between the dismissal of the unclean from the camps and the priestly blessing, the three speeches in Num 5:5-6:21 specifically involve the priesthood's interaction with familial matters. The first of these, the *ʾāšām* regulation (Num 5:5-10), is most directly connected to the census material that opens the book of Numbers. At the heart of this regulation is the case of the

[135] See also, with a different emphasis, Lee 2008: 483-484.

Israelite who lacks a *gōʾēl*. The role of the *gōʾēl*-redeemer is most ideally taken by an immediate family member, but a more distant relative is also acceptable (Lev 25:48-49; cf. Num 27:9-11). The existence of a *gōʾēl* is primarily a matter of local knowledge, but one that becomes part of the public record through a census. The instruction to count the Israelites "by their clans, by their father's houses, according to the names of every male by headcount" (Num 1:2) and the description of that process as being an "enrollment" (*yld* tD, Num 1:18) indicate that the census was not simply intended to acquire a total number of Israelites, but also created a record that organized the enumerated Israelites within a genealogical framework.[136] The involvement of Aaron in this census (Num 1:3, 17, 44) indicates that the priesthood likely had access to such records and could verify the existence or non-existence of a *gōʾēl*.[137] The *ʾāšām* regulation thus involves the priest in the adjudication of an interfamilial issue—the identification of a *gōʾēl* and its placement after the census of Numbers 1 implies an administrative background for the execution of this regulation.

The *śōṭāh* and *nāzîr* instructions also involve the priesthood in family issues, but they are intrafamilial in these cases. The *ṣōṭāh* clearly involves the relationship between a husband and wife, as mediated by the priest through the described ritual—the entire *tôrāh* on this subject is implicated in family life. This ritual is even more deeply implicated in familial matters if Friedman's analysis of this passage proves correct. Friedman has argued that the condition brought about by the woman's consumption of the "bitter cursing waters" is pregnancy and that the husband's jealousy is incited by the possibility of his wife having conceived during a period

[136] For a comparandum, see the collection of documents conventionally referred to as the "Harran Census" in SAA XI.201-219, which list male relatives by household. For commentary on these texts, see Johns 1901; Fales 1973.
[137] This is perhaps an overly generous reading, as the law may have functioned as something more akin to a "public notice" requirement—that is, this clause may have taken effect not when no *gōʾēl* existed, but when one could not be located.

in which they did not have intercourse.[138] If this is correct, then the *śōṭāh* ritual is not only about the relationship between husband and wife, but also about progeny and, by extension, inheritance.

In a different way, the instructions for the *nāzîr* also involve the priest in family matters. By taking his or her vow, the *nāzîr* removes themselves from participating in any funerary rites for their close relatives (Num 6:6-7). However, the first part of the *tôrāh* for the *nāzîr* recognizes that it is not always possible for a person to avoid the sudden death of another and provides instructions for how to handle this situation (Num 6:9-12). Because of the *nāzîr*'s status, the priest becomes involved in what would otherwise be a private, family affair related to the death of a close relative by having to provide expiation for the *nāzîr*'s inadvertent defacement of his or her vow. The text is not explicit about this being a family death, and the procedure certainly would apply to any accidental encounter with death. However, the fact that the instructions for dealing with accidental death come just after the stipulation forbidding the *nāzîr* from participating in familial funerary arrangements suggests a strong connection between the two. Additionally, we expect the home to be the location where sudden death is most commonly encountered, and therefore the *nāzîr* is most likely to unexpectedly encounter the death of their own relatives. The *nāzîr* instructions, like the *ʾāšām* and *śōṭāh*, involve priestly intervention into otherwise family-centered dynamics.

The census-taking measures of Numbers 1 centers the family structure of the Israelites and Numbers 2-3 contextualize this family structure in relation to the priesthood and Tabernacle. The three speeches in Num 5:5-6:21 continue to explicate this interface between priest and family. But we can also see another reason why these speeches have been collected in this particular place, at the finalization of the camp arrangement and just prior to departure—each of

[138] Friedman 2012.

these speeches deals with extraordinary cases. The *ʾāšām* regulation details a case in which a person has no available next-of-kin, surely an actuarial unlikelihood. The *śōṭāh*, regardless of how one interprets the triggering situation, can not have been a commonly carried out procedure and its unique features among rituals in the Hebrew Bible further highlight its unusual nature. Finally, the *nāzîr*, which requires a person to temporarily take on restrictions similar to those imposed on the high priest, likely represents an uncommon phenomenon.[139] Even if there were a high occurrence of individuals taking this vow, the onerous restrictions would have definitively marked the period of this vow as a significant one in their lives.

This does not exhaust the unusual features of these texts. At this point in the Priestly narrative, the *nāzîr* instructions are the only case where purification from encounter with the dead is required and provided for, regardless of whether that death involves a family member. In other words, this case extraordinarily involves interaction with the priesthood that is not otherwise necessary. Furthermore, both *tôrōt* in Num 5:11-6:21 involve a special relationship between the central parties and the Tabernacle sancta. In the *śōṭāh* ritual, the woman must drink water that is mixed with dirt from the tabernacle floor. While other rituals involve moving materials from outside of the Tabernacle to the inside—such as the blood of certain *ḥaṭṭāʾt* (Lev 4:5-7, 16-18)—this is the only case in ritual where material is brought from inside the Tabernacle to the outside. In a different way, the completion of the Nazirite vow involves the *nāzîr* shaving his or her own head and then placing the shorn hair into the fire on the altar (Num 6:18).[140] This is the closest that a non-priest ever approaches to the altar in any of the rituals described in the Priestly text; in all other cases, it is the priest who places materials on the altar and manipulates

[139] See Gray 1903: 57-61; Levine 1993: 229-235 for further comment on the Nazirite vow in the Hebrew Bible and elsewhere.
[140] Levine 1993: 226, *pace* Milgrom 1990: 49.

their presence there.[141] Through a vow that mimics the prohibitions on officiating priests, the *nāzîr* is uniquely able to imitate the priests' relationship with the altar in this single act. As regulations covering unusual and extraordinary circumstances, these speeches constitute sensible content for Yhwh's last words to the Israelites at Sinai.

Our discussion so far has neglected the priestly blessing (Num 6:22-27), but it too contributes to the theme of the priestly interface with the Israelites by prescribing the manner in which priests should offer blessings to the community. As importantly, this text's particular location connects it to both the Deferent and Epicycle in a way that reinforces and participates in the narrative logic of Numbers 1-10*'s arrangement. As we observed above, all of the speeches in Num 5:5-6:27 are set in the chronological horizon of the Deferent and take place after the organization of the camp in the second month of the second year, prior to the departure from Sinai. The priestly blessing comes at the end of this series of speeches—it is, therefore, the end of the Deferent, constituting the climax of the Israelite stay at Sinai in chronological terms. We encounter here another advantage of the achronological presentation of events, which essentially allows Numbers 1-10* to have two climaxes—the narrative climax of the Passover, as discussed above, and the chronological climax of the priestly blessing. The position of this blessing just before the epicyclical rewinding of time emphasizes this speech, making Yhwh's statement that he will bless the Israelites echo into the coming wilderness march.[142]

In addition to serving as the climax to the Deferent, the priestly blessing also functions to prepare the reader for the Epicycle. As we observed above, when reading the Priestly text as a whole, the blessing in Num 6:22-27 calls to mind the inauguration of the priesthood and the first

[141] Lev 1:5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17; 2:2, 8-9, 16; 3:2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16; 4:10, 18, 25-26, 30-31, 34-35; 5:9, 12; 7:5; 14:20; 17:6. Note as well that Levites are explicitly forbidden from approaching the altar in Num 18:3.

[142] See Knierim & Coats 2005: 96, who attribute this function to the *Sitz im Leiben* of this blessing at "the conclusion and culmination of communal worship…before the worshiping pilgrims were sent on their way home," but only tentatively suggest that this may have some connection with its current placement in the Priestly text.

public sacrifices at the tabernacle (Leviticus 8-9). This association evokes prior events and so prepares the reader to accept the immediately following dislocation in time, moving back to the day of the erection of the Tabernacle (Num 7:1).[143]

As a point of fact, however, there is nothing in either Lev 9:22-23 or Num 6:22-27 that requires us to think that the priestly blessing in Numbers 6 is identical to the words that Aaron (and Moses) spoke in Leviticus 9. This is merely inference and it may be nothing more than testimony to how rhetorically effective it was for the Priestly author or a later editor to position this text in its current location. Just as Moses spontaneously blesses the people when they bring him the completed Tabernacle components (Exod 39:43), Aaron (and then Aaron and Moses) may have extemporaneously blessed the people at the first public offerings. Within the world of the Priestly text, there is no narrative reason why Yhwh's instructions for future blessings can not occupy a special position as the final command given at Sinai, separate from the blessing Aaron offered in Leviticus 9.

The role that the priestly blessing plays in preparing the reader for the Epicycle by invoking an earlier moment in the narrative illuminates another feature of the collection of speeches in the Interlude in Num 5:5-6:27. As we discussed in our structural analysis of Numbers 1-10*, these speeches all cluster together right at the boundary line between the Deferent and the Epicycle. While they definitively participate in the chronological horizon and narrative sequence of the Deferent, these speeches also disrupt the otherwise consistent emphasis on narrative events in Num 1:1-5:4. As we observed with the step away from sequential narration in the convergence of chronological horizons in Num 9:15-10:10, such disruption is an effective way of preparing readers for chronological shifts. The fact that this series of speeches culminates

[143] Smoak 2015: 111-132 also suggests that its placement reflects blessing genre's association with votive offerings, lending it connection to both the offerings of the *nəśîʾîm* in Numbers 7 and the vow of the *nāzîr* in Num 6:1-21.

in the priestly blessing, which appears to intentionally evoke a previous point in the narrative, further confirms that one function of placing these speeches together at a single point in Numbers 1-10* is to ease the transition from the Deferent to the Epicycle.

As we found with the Epicycle and Deferent, the collection of speeches in the Interlude appear far more purposeful than critical scholarship has traditionally allowed. These speeches further emphasize Num 1:1-5:4's focus on the organization of the Israelites around the Tabernacle with the priesthood serving as intermediaries between the Israelite clans and Yhwh's presence in the Tent of Meeting. Similarly, the first three speeches all explore the interactions between the priesthood and the family unit in extraordinary circumstances—the lack of a *gōʾēl*, the jealousy of a husband, the sudden death in proximity to a *nāzîr*. These extraordinary circumstances unite these speeches in their role as the final body of instructions from Yhwh prior to the Israelite departure from Sinai. When viewed in chronological relationship to both Deferent and Epicycle, the priestly blessing's position at the end of the Interlude allows it to serve as one of two climaxes to the Sinai event. Finally, as a group, these speeches serve to transition the reader from the Deferent to the Epicycle by first implying a removal from sequential narrative and then by recalling an earlier moment in the larger Priestly text.

Rather than being an assemblage of random materials that have been awkwardly placed in their context, these speeches play a sensible and functional role in the arrangement of Numbers 1-10*. Again, this functional role does not automatically serve as evidence against a later editor being responsible for the placement of these texts. However, it further suggests that we can not attribute these speeches to a process of random or haphazard compilation at work in this section of the Priestly text. Any model that accounts for the structure of these chapters will

require a judicious weighing between the alternatives of an authorial and editorial origin of the materials in the Interlude.

Confirmations & Biases: A Neo-analytic Approach to Authors and Editors

Our analysis of Numbers 1-10* has demonstrated that the supposed disarray of these chapters gives way to structured sensibility when their narrative nature and connection with the larger Priestly text are kept in view. Nevertheless, as already noted, we should assume that editors were as concerned with the coherence of the text they were working on as the original author would have been. While our analysis has severely weakened the Analytic view that Numbers 1-10* largely consists of a series of supplementary editorial strata, the fact that the text is far more cogent than the Analyst view allows does not eliminate the possibility that some of the materials in these chapters are in fact later editorial additions to the original Priestly text. A conclusion can be correct even if it has been insufficiently justified in the past.

Here we encounter a problem that the editorial history of Mesopotamian literary texts tells us is difficult to surmount—the problem of distinguishing between the work of composition and later editorial intervention in a text. As we observed, the most secure conclusions on this front involve the identification of larger bodies of material as additions to a text. Here too, though, caution is warranted. The flood story in SB Gilgamesh XI is taken from another source and is an addition to the Gilgamesh tradition, but it is also an original and integrated part of the Standard Babylonian Gilgamesh epic.[144] Much of the material that scholars have identified as being additional strata to the Priestly text in Numbers 1-10* arguably meet the criterion of being larger pieces and many likely derive from outside sources. Nevertheless, the question of whether this is sufficient to identify them as bodies foreign to the original P still stands.

[144] See Chapter 1 for full discussion.

However, our analysis of the coherence of Numbers 1-10* does appear to foreclose one editorial approach to these chapters. The Analytic habit of seeing the majority of the materials in Numbers 1-10* as the result of a series of unclearly-motivated, discrete additions offers no explanatory vehicle for their relatively well-formed structure. Rather than paying dividends by enabling the Analyst school to see Numbers 1-10* more clearly, the atomizing approach to Exodus and Leviticus instead created confusion. Kuenen's caution that "we must bear in mind that we no longer hold the thread of P^2 [= P^G] in hand" is emblematic of the difficulties the Analyst approach to the Priestly text faces when it reaches the book of Numbers.[145]

This approach also requires the Analysts to imagine a series of editors who made incomprehensible decisions. They require editors who are willing to intervene in the received text of either P or the Torah (which one does not matter for the sake of this discussion), but who are not willing to intervene in the text to smooth out the difficulties that they themselves introduce. We must imagine an editor who felt compelled to add the brief note on the *ʾāšām* in Num 5:5-10 but who would not contemplate adding it at its most sensible location with the other instructions in Leviticus 1-6. The installation of the Levites, which the Analysts imagine as chronologically following the census in Numbers 3-4, also must have been added by an editor who needed the Levites to undergo a ritual dedication but who did not dare put this in its narratively appropriate place. Then we must imagine another, different editor who felt compelled to add the long donation list in Numbers 7, but one who dated his addition in such a way, according to the Analysts, so as to conflict with the chronology of the text which he was supplementing. The introduction of the Levite age requirement in Num 8:23-26 runs into similar problems. Here we have an editor who felt the need to change the age at which Levites entered their service, but who respected the received text too much to simply change the number thirty to

[145] Kuenen 1886: 95.

twenty-five throughout Numbers 4. Instead, out of respect, he made an addition that created a self-contradictory text.[146]

The Analysts have no answer for why an editor would date material in such a conflicting way or why he did not simply add materials in a different location or just change the received text on a minor point. The only possible answer is unsatisfactory and mechanical—the editor did not dare intervene with the received text, except by adding to its end in a way that conflicted with the received text that he supposedly held too sacred to tamper with. Without an explanation for why these texts were added in these locations in such a disjointed way, the traditional Analyst ascription of these chapters to a build-up of editorial layers is not viable, especially when we combine its lack of explanatory power with the ahistorical scribal and transmission models required by supposing serial editions.[147]

The well-motivated and coherent nature of the material in Numbers 1-10* is nonetheless still amenable to an editorial explanation, just not one that requires a series of small additions. Given the internal chronological coherence of the Epicycle and the Deferent, we could suppose that one or the other body of material is, as a unit, an editorial expansion to an originally shorter text. If this is the case, then the editor has taken care to make certain that his achronological presentation did not involve anachronism or chronological contradiction. Furthermore, the present arrangement of these chapters participates meaningfully in the larger the Priestly text, continuing certain elements from the end of Leviticus and creating a parallel with the exodus by having the Passover serve as narrative climax. This careful integration of material is in line with

[146] Underlying all of these discussions is an unexamined presupposition that either the Priestly text or the Torah functioned as the arbiter of normative behavior in the time period in which these editorial decisions were made. It is not at all clear that this was the case, nor is it clear that the Priestly text ever superseded the Jerusalem temple's (either first or second) own archives of instructional texts or its autonomy to determine its own best practices.
[147] See Chapter 1 for full discussion of the scribal and historical problems with supposing such serial editions.

what we might expect from a methodical editor who was mindful of the text with which he was working.

Yet nothing compels us to attribute either body of material to an editor rather than to the original Priestly author other than the achronological presentation. However, as we have already noted, even this is not probative—just because a narrative could be arranged differently doesn't mean that an author is obligated to arrange it differently. Furthermore, the marked chronology in these chapters participates in the chronology of the larger Sinai episode in the Priestly text, which provides more dates for events than any narrative sequence since the Flood. Because the marked chronology aids the chronological coherence across the material in Exodus 40-Numbers 10* (or, really, Exodus 19-Numbers 10*), we would have to suppose that the editor who inserted the Epicycle or the Deferent either knowingly participated in this chronological scheme or introduced it himself.[148] In the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, we should prefer the non-editorial explanation.

The material in the Interlude, loosely connected as it is to its narrative context, could also constitute an addition to Numbers 1-10*. Yet, here too, we have found connections to both the Deferent and Epicycle and a function for the non-narrative nature of these materials between these two different chronological horizons. There is also an intentionality to the placement of the priestly blessing as the chronological climax of the Sinai event. Furthermore, an alternative placement for at least the two *tôrōt* in these chapters was simply not available. We could attribute these details to a sensible editor, but again there is nothing that compels us to assign these texts to such an editor rather than to the Priestly author.

So while an alternative editorial model that posits large-scale additions and a careful integration of materials exists, it is not clear why we should prefer this to attributing these

[148] On the implications for P of the chronographic indicators in the Sinai episode, see also Ruwe 2003:59-67.

materials to the original form of the Priestly text. The only materials that truly challenge this assumption are two small passages: the *ʾāšām* regulation (Num 5:5-10) and the adjustment to the Levite work age (Num 8:23-26). In the first case, while we can see the connection this case may have to its context in Numbers, it still appears to fit more comfortably with the other regulations in Leviticus 6-7. In the second case, we encounter the only material contradiction in fact between the Deferent and the Epicycle. In both of these cases, we might suppose editorial intervention; however, the same difficulties that attend the original Analyst model also attend this supposition.

Even should we accept the supplementary nature of these two texts, we have convincingly demonstrated that the majority of Numbers 1-10* functions as a well-motivated and coherent part of the Priestly text. We have not lost the thread of P, but carried it forward from Exodus and Leviticus into the opening chapters of Numbers. Just as we did not find a convincing case for stratifying the Priestly material in the preceding books, there does not appear to be a compelling case for the stratification of Numbers 1-10* either. Instead, by viewing all of these texts with reference to the narrative nature of the Priestly text, we have demonstrated that Numbers 1-10* relates in meaningful ways to the Priestly narrative that we have traced from Exodus 25 to the end of Leviticus. These chapters, just like the Tabernacle instructions and their execution, the sacrificial manuals, the purification manuals, and the so-called holiness code, are original parts of the Priestly text.

Beyond rejecting editorial models and attributing the bulk of the material in Numbers 1-10* to the original Priestly text, we can turn to the Neo-analytic model for which we have advocated in previous chapters to provide a fruitful approach for evaluating the materials in the opening chapters of Numbers. This Neo-analytic model of the Priestly text has enabled us to account for the diverse yet unified features of P in Exodus and Leviticus by understanding the

work of the Priestly author as consisting of arrangement and compilation as much as composition. The results obtained in those chapters suggest that one of the foundational methods of the Priestly author was the incorporation and adaptation of pre-existing materials. In other words, the Priestly author functions as both author of his narrative and as editor of the non-narrative materials he is adopting and adapting. Approaching the materials in Numbers 1-10* from this perspective illuminates the relationship of these chapters to the Priestly text and clarifies the complexity of their arrangement.

Several of the non-narrative texts in Numbers 1-10* represent genres that we have already discussed in previous chapters as reflecting the larger corpus of ritual texts that would have constituted part of a Judahite temple or priestly archive. The ritual instructions of the *śōṭāh* and *nāzîr* (Num 5:11-6:21) share a genre with the texts that appear in Leviticus 11-15, while the instructions for a second Passover (Num 9:9-14) resemble the festival instructions in Exodus 12* and Leviticus 23. The dedication of the Levites (Num 8:5-19) bears a generic resemblance to the instructions for installing the priests in Exodus 29. The short text on the *ʾāšām* in Num 5:5-10 resembles the instructions for offering distributions in Leviticus 6-7. These materials in Numbers, like their counterparts in Exodus and Leviticus, likely reflect pre-existing texts. Notably, a separate speech rubric with a defined audience introduces each of these non-narrative texts, indicating the same method of marking individual sources that we hypothesized for the speeches in Leviticus.

We also find the same pattern of adaptation and non-adaptation in these texts as we saw previously. For example, Yhwh refers to himself in the third person within these speeches in the context of the offerings and vows of the Israelites.[149] This third person reference to Yhwh is most sensible when supposing these instructions originally existed separately from the narratives into

[149] Num 5:8, 16, 18, 25, 30; 6:2, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21; 8:9, 10, 11, 12, 13; 9:10, 13, 14.

which they are now embedded.[150] As we saw in Leviticus, deviations from this practice happen at the margins of speeches—in the speech describing the Levite dedication ritual, Yhwh speaks of himself in the third person until he begins to offer commentary on the ritual. In this last part of the speech (Num 8:14-19), Yhwh exclusively speaks in the first person. This leads us to suspect that the ritual is drawn from a pre-existing document, while the commentary, which embeds the ritual within the narrative of the Priestly text, is from the hand of the Priestly author.

When we turn to the priestly blessing (Num 6:22-27), we no longer have to hypothesize the existence of source material. The amulets found at Ketef Hinnom confirm that this blessing was part of the repertoire of liturgical sayings in late Iron Age Judah.[151] Interestingly, each amulet opens with a different description of Yhwh's character with the blessing coming at the end of each amulet's text. This use as a benediction mirrors its function as the end of the Interlude and as the chronological climax found in the Deferent in Numbers 1-6.

The other non-narrative texts that make up Numbers 1-10* are also amenable to the Neo-analytic view, as many of them reflect known genres of archival material. The list of donations that makes up the bulk of Numbers 7 is a prime example. Levine has argued that its format reflects a prosaic rendering of an original tabular record such as those known from Mesopotamian temples.[152] The census counts in Numbers 1-4 also reflect administrative genres implicated in both taxation and conscription.[153] These functions are, in fact, explicitly present in

[150] See Chapter 3 for further discussion.
[151] See Barkay, et al. 2004 for an edition that provides high-resolution photographs of the amulets. Smoak 2015: 12-42 provides further commentary on these texts. For recent arguments about the dating of the amulets, see Na'aman 2011; Aḥituv 2012.
[152] Levine 1965: 314-318; 1993: 247-248, 259-266. For Neo-Assyrian records related to donations to temples, including texts that tag the donor or the day of the offerings, see the texts in SAA VII.158-219. For detailed commentary on many of these texts, see van Driel 1969.
[153] Postgate 1974 provides an excellent examination of the relationship between censuses, taxation, and conscription in an Assyrian context. See also Milgrom 1990: 336-339; Propp 2006: 534-538. For a possible census document from 8th/7th century Judah, see Beit-Arieh 1983, though a different view of the text, proposed by Garfinkel 1987, should probably be accepted (but not his argument that *pqd* and *šmr* are interchangeable equivalents). Demsky

the texts as they appear in Numbers. The census of the Israelites (Numbers 1) is directly related to their performance of either military or corvée service (*kol-yōṣēʾ ṣābāʾ* Num 1:3, *passim*). The first census of the Levites (Num 3:14-39) is connected to tax payments owed by Israelites for their firstborn (Num 3:40-51). The second census of the Levites (Num 4:34-49) is related to their performance of work in the sacred precinct, another area in which we would expect administrative record keeping.

We should contend with the possibility that the Priestly author did not just mimic administrative text genres in these chapters, but embedded already existing administrative records or administrative-like documents into his narrative, with more or less adaptation to their new context. This is not to suggest that the Priestly author had access to actual records from the Mosaic period—nor do we even need to suppose that the names and numbers in these administrative-like lists are part of the original documents that the Priestly author has copied. The question of where particular elements come from is a vexed one, and we will provide several alternative interpretations for these texts in the following discussion. We should note at the outset that many of these suggestions are tentative. One strong possibility is that these texts served as part of the priestly scribal curriculum, combining the format of administrative texts with pseudo-information related to Israelite antiquity.[154]

2007's argument that the third line should be read as a second *mpqd* (adopted by Aḥituv 2008: 179-180 without comment) should not be accepted. While he convincingly calls into question the reading of *mwqr* for this line based on the form of the *waw*s in the ligatures on the first and last line of the ostracon, his suggestion that the previously-read *waw* is instead a *peh* is not persuasive—note especially how different the stances of the secure *peh* of line 1 and the supposed *peh* of line 3 are, the different angle between the head and tail, the fact that the head overreaches the tail in line 3 but not line 1, and the different lengths of the heads (this last is especially probative given how much space was available on line three for this word). Additionally, Demsky's reading requires him to discount the line above the head of his supposed *peh*, which he attributes to a "false start" to writing the letter below the ceiling line of the neighboring *mem*. See also, the military list (Aḥiqam Ostracon) from Ḥorvat ʿUzza in Aḥituv 2008: 166-173 and commentary in Mendel 2011.

[154] See Chapter 5 for further discussion.

We can most easily make the case for an adapted record for the list of donations in Num 7:12-88. Levine has noted that the format of this text, with quantities following the listed commodities is a format known mostly from administrative records.[155] Its use in this text suggests that this is not a fresh composition, but a copy of an actual record. The integration of a pre-existing administrative record would also account for the unusual length and repetitiveness of the list in Numbers 7, which is exhaustive even given the penchant for repetition on display in the Priestly text. The uniformity of the donations offered by each individual is also not an obstacle to this interpretation, as such relative uniformity is known from other temple donation records.[156]

Levine has also noted this list's minimal degree of adaptation to the Priestly narrative—its administrative background is not in the least disguised.[157] The text clearly separates the donations most deeply implicated in the narrative setting—the ox-carts for the Levites' transportation of the Tabernacle—from the donation list. The fact that the ox-carts are not integrated into the donation list suggests that the Priestly author was motivated to preserve an already existing text in as close to its original form as possible, consonant with what we have seen elsewhere in P. Even the mention of the dedication of the altar in this list (Num 7:84, 88) is likely original, as it is only the contextualization within the Priestly text and the note that heads Numbers 7 that programs us to understand "the altar" as the altar in the Tabernacle courtyard. Deuteronomistic quibbles aside, the dedication of altars presumably took place with some regularity in Judah and Israel, and this text may originate from one such ceremony. On the whole, it appears that Numbers 7 faithfully replicates an actual record of donations.

---

[155] Levine 1993: 258, 261-263.
[156] Levine 1965: 317.
[157] Levine 1965: 317; 1993: 261.

This leaves the names of the *nəśîʾîm*, which may or may not be original to this list. It is difficult to decide between these two options, though the fact that the name of the relevant *nāśîʾ* occurs twice in each entry of this list may barely weigh in favor of their originality. Otherwise, we would have to suppose a greater degree of tampering in this text than we see in other cases in the Priestly text. Scholars have long supposed that these names represent a genuinely old tradition, and their preservation in the underlying dedication list may be their source.[158] Unless we think that the Priestly author was the first Judahite intellectual to engage in speculation about the nature of the Mosaic Tabernacle, it is not outside the bounds of possibility that such a dedication list was mocked up at some point, including the names, and then copied as genuine by later scribes. On the other hand, the occurrence of these names in no fewer than five different locations in Numbers 1-10* suggests that they were important enough to the Priestly author that he may have felt compelled to add them, twice, to the original donation list from which he drew the bulk of Numbers 7. In this case, possible origins for these names include both broader tradition and inscribed votive objects (or records thereof) stored in the Jerusalem temple.[159] None of these objects would have to be genuine antiques to be perceived as such by later observers. We must leave these options open to future investigations into the onomastic sources and traditions available to the Priestly author.

[158] See Noth 1968: 18-19 for the suggestion that these names are an old list connected to his concept of a pre-monarchic amphictyony, though the idea that they represent a genuine selection from the early onomasticon goes back to Gray 1896: 191-211; 1903: 6-7. Cross 1973: 321 also suggests that these names stem from an old documentary source of some kind. The preservation of these names within the context of a dedication list would eliminate the sensible objection of Kellermann 1970: 155-159, who argues that the preservation of such a list devoid of all other context would be unlikely. Even if these names were not originally attached to Numbers 7, they still were likely drawn from authentic genealogical tradition. Another possibility is that these names were drawn from old, highly regarded votive offerings kept in the Jerusalem temple—2 Kgs 18:4 suggests that the Jerusalem temple contained artifacts that were perceived as Mosaic down to the late-eighth century.

[159] See further discussion in Chapter 5.

The census report in Num 1:20-43 also has the appearance of an administrative record.[160] Here too, we find little adaptation to the narrative setting of this text within the actual census account. All of the narrative contextualization takes place in the introduction to the census (Num 1:1-19) and in its subscript (1:44-47). The relationship between Numbers 1 and Numbers 2 further reinforces the possibility that the census report is a previously existing administrative record. Numbers 2 duplicates the data from the census report, but contextualizes this information within the world of the narrative by assigning the tribal groups to camping positions around the Tabernacle. Numbers 2 also combines the data from the census report with the name of the respective *nāśîʾ* for each tribe. The fact that this narrative contextualization was kept separate from the initial census report in Num 1:20-43 again suggests that the Priestly author was motivated to integrate a previously existing text with minimal interference in its original form. Finally, we can contrast the lack of adaptation within the census report in Numbers 1 with the frequent occurrence of such narrative adaptation within both Levite censuses (Num 3:14-39; 4:34-48). Numbers 3 directly integrate the Tabernacle assignments and camping positions of the Levites into their population tally, while Numbers 4 makes repeated reference to the count being carried out by Moses and Aaron (Num 4:37, 41, 45, 46). The combined weight of the above evidence strengthens the case for viewing Num 1:20-43 as an originally independent census record.

If this is correct, then the appearance of the word *ṣābāʾ* in the census report in Num 1:20-43 and in the surrounding texts provides an admirable example of the Priestly author's method of narrative contextualization with minimal adaptation. While the term *ṣābāʾ* has largely military connotations in the Hebrew Bible, we should note that its Akkadian cognate refers as often to

[160] For a different view of how the census in Numbers 1-2 are interrelated and adapted from a previously existing document, see Kislev 2016: 191-197, 199. For Kislev, Numbers 2 is the primary document on which Numbers 1 is based.

laborers as to soldiers.[161] This word likely also had a similar range of meanings in administrative Hebrew in the Iron Age, as appears to be the case in its usage in other texts in Numbers 1-10* (Num 4:3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43; 8:24, 25). The census report in Numbers 1 is likely, in origin, a record related to corvée labor—however, the ambiguity of the word *ṣābāʾ* combined with the setting at Sinai and the camp around the Tabernacle leads the reader to naturally understand the census as related to conscription into military service.[162] As we've seen in other case, the Priestly author allows the narrative setting of his work to program the reader's understanding of the materials he has integrated while making minimal changes to those materials. Here too, we should also allow for the possibility that the Priestly author is not the first to engage in genealogical and numerological speculation about Israelite antiquity—a census list may have emerged out of this type of speculation on comments in the exodus story (Exod 12:37) and been preserved and transmitted as a "model text" for scribal practice.[163]

As observed above, the Levite censuses in Numbers 3 and 4 show far more integration into their narrative context than is the case with the census in Numbers 1. The first census (Num 3:14-39) is a conceptual mirror of Numbers 2, providing information about camp location, *nāśîʾ*, and labor assignment alongside the population count for each Levite clan. The second census (Num 4:34-48) appears to more closely resemble the census report in Numbers 1, and here we find the Levite census totals reported without reference to the specific labor duties or camp positions. Nevertheless, a note accompanies the total for each clan, stating that the count is derived from the census carried out by Moses and Aaron. We might suppose that the count for

[161] CAD Ṣ, s.v. *ṣābu*.
[162] See Halpern 2001: 68-69 on the distinction between the professional/standing army and the tribal musters. Note that the same distinction may be encoded in Sennacherib's report of his siege of Jerusalem, where he notes the presence of both ^{LÚ}urbū, "auxiliary troops?" and ^{LÚ}ṣābū damqūti, "good/elite soldiers" (RINAP 3/1 4.55, 15.iv.1', 16.iv.24, 22.iii.39, 23.iii.34; 3/2 46.31, 140.r.14).
[163] See Chapter 5 for further discussion.

each Levite clan came from a different record and that the note at the end of each count was a way of signaling a shift from record to record—the Priestly author may have adopted this strategy because these counts were presented in narrative and so could not be separated out by his usual recourse to different speech rubrics. Nevertheless, the possibility that this second Levite census reflects a series of originally independent records is much less strong than is the case for the Numbers 1 census.[164] This suggests that either there are not originally independent records underlying these census texts or that the Priestly author felt far more freedom to interfere in their original form than he did in the cases of Numbers 1 and Numbers 7.

The Neo-analytic model also provides an explanation for the relationship between these non-narrative materials and the accompanying narrative. As we saw with Exodus 35-40 and Leviticus 8-9, the Priestly author continues to use narrative texts to provide commentary on the sources he is incorporating. We have already discussed the way that the description of Yhwh's speaking with Moses (Num 7:89) and the final arrangement of the menorah's lamps (8:1-4) provide commentary on the Tabernacle instructions in Exodus 25-31. This same approach is also apparent in Numbers 2's relationship with other materials in Numbers 1-10*. This chapter draws on the order of the tribes' donations in Numbers 7, the list of *nəśîʾîm* (whatever its origins), and the census counts from Numbers 1 in order to create an image of the organization of the Israelite camp. Finally, Numbers 1 and Numbers 7 both serve as examples of the Priestly author's ability to use non-narrative materials to drive forward the narrative of his text, as we saw with the

[164] We can possibly explain the contradiction in the age of service for Levites by analogy with this process. If we are correct that the Levite census in Num 4:34-48 was based on a series of originally discrete Levite counts, then the age of service was already received from these pre-existing sources. The Priestly author may have kept this age, even integrating it into Yhwh's speech describing the Levites' tasks (Num 4:1-33). However nowhere in Numbers 4 is this age ever described with normative language—it is a fact of the narrative rather than a command from Yhwh. The adjustment in age, motivated for whatever reason, is instead given as divine command and so is binding. Its placement in the Epicycle distances it from the text that it contradicts and makes it the last comment the reader encounters on this subject, cementing its place as the binding practice. This is even more speculative than the rest of our attempts to understand P, however, and we should likely accept the supplementary nature of Num 8:23-26.

speeches in Exodus 25-31, the placement of the speeches in Leviticus 1-7, and the progression of speeches by topic in Leviticus 11-26.

The implication of a Neo-analytic model for Numbers 1-10* extends beyond identifying source texts that may underlie the Priestly text in these chapters. The intent to integrate these source texts into the Sinai narrative helps explain the complex presentation of the materials, since the impulses and needs of an arranger of received materials is different from that of a person simply composing a narrative. As we observed above, the achronological narrative of Numbers 1-10* was inescapable once the Priestly author decided to include the twelve days of donations to the altar. However, the twelve days' time this event requires was likely already a feature of the underlying source text. The Priestly author's decision to reproduce originally independent documents with minimal modification created the necessity for an epicycle in the narrative presentation. In a different vein, the oft-noted repetition between Numbers 1 and Numbers 2 also finds its origins in the desire to reproduce a source text while also integrating its information into the narrative—again, akin to the relationship between Exodus 25-31 and Exodus 35-40; Leviticus 8-9. Finally, the originally separate existence of the ritual texts allowed the Priestly author the flexibility to place them at sensible points within his narrative and to exclude texts such as the *śōṭāh* and *nāzîr* from the collections that he had organized within Leviticus.

The Neo-analytic model thus enables us to see a consistency of method across the Priestly text in Exodus 25-Numbers 10*. Repeatedly, we have been able to explain the nature of the Priestly text by supposing the integration of pre-existing, non-narrative, archival documents into P. Repeatedly, we have seen these non-narrative documents arranged within and incorporated into the narrative of the Priestly text in sensible ways that shape the reader's

understanding of the Israelite past. Repeatedly, we have encountered the use of narrative to comment on these non-narrative materials. This consistency of method across the entire Sinai narrative is perhaps the most powerful argument we have for attributing the entirety of these materials to the Priestly author, including Numbers 1-10*.[165]

As importantly, we have shown that the Analyst approach to Numbers 1-10* offers as little explanatory power as its approach to Exodus 25-31, 35-40 and Leviticus 1-16. The assertion that these texts are disorganized and chronologically incoherent falls to the wayside as heavily as the case for the distinctiveness of the Holiness Code. The Analyst case for the deeply stratified nature of the Priestly text in the Sinai account ignores indications of coherence, consistency, and intentionality. Regardless of whether one accepts the Neo-analytic model offered in these chapters, we have hopefully demonstrated that any attempt to understand the Priestly text as consisting of a series of editorial expansions and supplements grafted onto an originally narrative text requires new and more robust argumentation in order to be sustainable. When we move beyond the Sinai narrative of P, we will leave behind our extensive engagement with the Analysts and turn to the discussion over where to locate the ending of the Priestly text. However, before we turn to this analysis, we will take this opportunity at the end of the Priestly Sinai narrative to set our proposed Neo-analytic approach on a firm evidentiary basis.

[165] See further discussion in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

A VIEW FROM THE ARCHIVES

Looking Backwards

In the previous chapters, we have offered a first approach to a Neo-analytic understanding of the Priestly text. The advantages of this approach is that it allows us to preserve the Unitarian perception of an underlying cohesion to the Priestly text while acknowledging the Analysts' identification of several tensions in the material identified as belonging to P. In applying this framework to the Priestly text, we have found that it provides several advantages over previous attempts to understand the Priestly text's Sinai pericope (Exodus 19-Numbers 10*) by attributing various prominent features of P—the segmentation of content into separate divine speeches, the distribution of similar topics in different speeches, the narrativization of particular divine commands (often mischaracterized as "repetitions"), and the occurrence of civic-administrative-type texts—to the use of pre-existing documents.

When we turn our attention to the post-Sinai Priestly text in Numbers, we will find evidence that the Priestly author's use of pre-existing, non-narrative materials continues. The post-Sinai Numbers material includes both divine speeches of a type similar to what we have already seen in Leviticus as well as the recurrence of civic-administrative texts, such as census lists and boundary descriptions.[1] As importantly, when we evaluate the Priestly text prior to the Sinai narrative on which we have focused our attention up to this point, we find a similar use of

[1] See extensive discussion of the status of these materials in relation to the Priestly text in Chapter 6.

non-narrative texts—in this case, genealogies—as an important part of the Priestly author's approach to both constructing and structuring his narrative.[2] In other words, the Neo-analytic framework enables us to recognize the use of non-narrative sources as an essential part of the Priestly author's method.

Given the possible importance of this insight, we will pause our analysis of the Priestly text in order to examine the foundations of the Neo-analytic framework in more detail. We have suggested that the Priestly author had at his disposal a number of pre-existing texts, which he selected, arranged, and adapted into the various divine speeches that constitute the bulk of the material in Exodus 25-Numbers 10*. Up to this point, however, this model has served as nothing more than a suggestion, though one that has shown itself productive insofar as it has enabled us to explain certain elements of the Priestly text by reference to the process of composition rather than with reference to layers of ideological perspectives for which we have little outside control. To elevate this model above the status of mere suggestion requires us to address two major issues—the possible sources that may have been at the Priestly author's disposal and the method by which he adapted them for use in the Priestly narrative. It is to these issues that we turn now.

Looking Outwards: Iron Age Archives and Other Sources

The question of what written sources would have been available to the Priestly author is related to the question of when the Priestly text was written. Despite the relative consensus surrounding the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis that the Priestly text is the latest of the Pentateuchal sources, we should nevertheless look to the Iron II Judean state and Jerusalem temple as the most likely originator of the texts available to the Priestly author.[3] A cultic and

[2] See excursus at end of chapter.
[3] As, e.g., Noth 1965: 14-15 suggests.

ritual archive requires some kind of context in which to develop, and this is the most reasonable one into which to place the documents that may have been at the Priestly author's disposal. This holds true regardless of whether the Priestly text was composed during the period of the monarchy or during the exilic or early post-exilic period.

Alternative hypotheses—either that any underlying ritual and cultic texts were not composed until after the fall of Jerusalem or that they reflect the praxis and archive of the Persian-era temple—fail to successfully grapple with both historical and linguistic factors. The notion that there was no written tradition of rituals in pre-exilic Judah has been a common assertion from biblical scholars since the days of Wellhausen.[4] The widespread existence of written ritual texts across the ancient Near East—including Hittite, Ugaritic, and Neo-Assyrian ritual archives—would on its own suggest that Judah had a similar collection of texts.[5] The fact that both Ugarit and Emar produced ritual texts reflecting native, West Semitic practices within a very short time span at the end of the Late Bronze Age strengthens the idea that the Iron Age II Jerusalem temple would have produced similar texts at some point during its existence.[6] Furthermore, the production of such native ritual texts aligns with the self-conscious development of national scripts that occurred among the Levantine polities of during the Iron II

[4] See, e.g., Wellhausen 1885: 59-60; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: I.137-157; Elliger 1966: 32; Knierim 1992: 104-105; Nihan 2007: 160-198, 215-229, 329-335. See also the related view that attributes the origins of the non-narrative materials in Leviticus to oral teaching in Rendtorff 1954; Koch 1959. This latter view has received substantial criticism, for which see Knierim 1992: 101-103; Watts 2003: 81-82.

[5] See Chapter 1 for discussion.

[6] For the relationship between the Syrian Emar archive and its mixed Hittite and Mesopotamian matrix, see Fleming 1992: 273-289. For a description of the "diviner's archive" from Emar, see Fleming 2000: 13-47; Rutz 2013. On the down-dating of the Ugaritic script to the thirteenth century, significantly shortening the amount of time in which Ugaritic archives developed, see Bordreuil & Pardee 2009: 19-20. See Pardee 2000 for extensive commentary on the background of the Ugaritic ritual texts. For the various archival contexts of the Ugaritic ritual texts, cross reference Pardee 2000 with del Olmo Lette 2018—a large number of texts were found in either the Great Priest's House, the Temple of Dagan, or in the south acropolis sites "House of ʾAgptr" and "House of the Priest-magician." On the intellectual (rather than genetic) connection between the Ugaritic experiment in a vernacular script and the later Iron Age polities, see Hawley, Pardee, & Roche-Hawley 2015: 231's observation that "the move away from the (technically more complicated) logo-syllabic systems toward alphabetic ones [at Ugarit] proved to be definitive in the region, and the move away from an 'international' intellectual culture toward a multitude of 'national' ones anticipated the developments better attested in the Iron Age."

period.[7] To posit that there was no written tradition of rituals and cultic praxis from the Iron Age Judean state and Jerusalem temple would be to suggest that Judah constituted a sociological anomaly among the writing cultures of the ancient Near East.

Two other factors elevate the possibility that a written ritual and cultic tradition existed in pre-exilic Judah into a probability. First is the fact that the book of Ezekiel contains ritual instructions and related cultic regulations (e.g., Ezek 43:18-27; 44:15-31; 45:18-46:15).[8] It is *a priori* unlikely that Ezekiel has innovated the writing down of these types of materials—rather, we should assume that Ezekiel's work reflects aspects of his education and training.[9] That education and training likely included exposure to and the copying of the types of cultic and ritual regulations that both Ezekiel and the Priestly text contain.[10] The fact that Ezekiel shares the Priestly text's habit of referring to Yhwh in the third person as the receiver of sacrifices even when those commands are embedded in direct speech from Yhwh (e.g., Ezek 43:24; 46:4, 12, 13, 14) further strengthens the idea that they are both drawing on pre-existing texts whose generic conventions do not include the presentation of their contents as divine speech. The alternative is that both Ezekiel and the Priestly author were taught that third person references were the preferred way of writing about sacrifices for Yhwh. In either case, a tradition of writing about cultic and ritual instructions is necessary to account for the convention.

---

[7] Sanders 2009: 103-155; Rollston 2010: 19-46.

[8] On the general consensus that Ezekiel 40-48, in some form, belongs to the original form of the book, see Levenson 1976: 7-11; Greenberg 1983: 3-17; 1997: 396; Sweeney 2015; Cook 2018: 10-12. Attempts to read the vision in Ezekiel 40-48 as separate from the rest of the book tend to rest on the ungrounded assumption (based in Protestantism's view of itself and with no support from attested ancient Near Eastern cultures) that there is inherent tension between priestly and prophetic forms of religious thought (and that "priestly" and "prophetic" are viable categories within which to place ancient Israelite and Judean thought); see, e.g., Eichrodt 1970. Even for those who reject the connection between Ezekiel 40-48 and the rest of the book, a date in the 6th century is usually maintained for this material.

[9] On scribal education's role in explaining Ezekiel's text, see Greenberg 1997: 395-396; Haran 2008. See also the programmatic comment in Schniedewind 2019: 139 – "It is better not to envision 'schools'—wisdom or otherwise. Rather, there was curriculum and scribal exercises. Scribes copied, memorized, and recited individual sayings as part of learning to read and write."

[10] On the nature of scribal education and its relationship to the Priestly text, see further discussion below.

Second, despite the fact that we have not recovered any ritual or cultic texts from Iron Age II Judah, our current epigraphic corpus suggests that writing played a role in Iron II temple administration and in ritual activities.[11] This corpus contains a large number of administrative texts (mostly ostraca) which—though their precise sociological context and administrative purpose is frequently opaque—make clear that record keeping and disbursement tracking were among the major uses of writing in Iron Age Judah.[12] Recent archaeological studies of Jerusalem's hinterland have illustrated the provisioning relationship that existed between that city and the surrounding countryside.[13] The Jerusalem temple—with its daily and holiday-related schedules of offerings consisting of both livestock and agricultural products—was certainly one of the beneficiaries of this provisioning relationship. The disbursement of livestock, wine, oil, and cereals from the Jerusalem hinterland to the Jerusalem temple would have entailed the kind of administrative record keeping that our epigraphic corpus suggests was common in Iron II Judah. While the royal bureaucracy likely played a role in this administrative work, it is extremely improbable that the priests of the Jerusalem temple wholly absented themselves from the administrative duties associated with their work in the temple. In short, we would expect there to be a system of written record keeping related to temple income and disbursements.[14]

---

[11] For a convenient collection of the Iron Age corpus, see Aḥituv 2008:17-248. For a comprehensive collection, see Renz & Röllig 2016. See also, Dever 2017: 491-496 for a broad analysis of archaeologically recovered writing from Iron II Israel and Judah.

[12] In addition to the texts classified as "*Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungsurkunden*" by Renz & Röllig 2016: II/1.17-22, note that a number of the Arad letters in the ʾElyāšib dossier also contain principally administrative content. The various jar handle markings (Renz & Röllig 2016: II/1.4-8), both the well-known *lmlk* and others (e.g., the collection from Gibeon), also indicate the role that writing played in administrative bureaucracy.

[13] Greenberg & Cinamon 2013; Gadot 2015; Sapir-Hen, Gadot, & Finkelstein 2016.

[14] Middle- and Neo-Assyrian archives show just such a system of record keeping in place in relationship to the temples of the Assyrian capitals. See Ismail & Postgate 2008; Postgate 2010; Gaspa 2011 for Middle-Assyrian materials. See SAA VII 158-219 for Neo-Assyrian materials and van Driel 1969 for analysis (see also, SAA XIII 18-23 for a series of letters concerning problems with deliveries of livestock to the Aššur temple). For disbursements from a temple, see Kozuh 2010 on Neo-Babylonian economic records from the Eanna in Uruk. Additionally, we should also acknowledge that ritual calendars likely originate in an administrative context—they allow the planning and provisioning for large-scale state celebrations.

The epigraphic evidence allows us to push this basic observation a bit further by examining two other kinds of archaeologically recovered writing that are directly related to cultic practice and ritual. One is the recovery of vessels—mostly bowls, one krater, and one jar—incised with the word *qdš* from Arad, Beer-Sheba, Beth-Shemesh, and Jerusalem.[15] The choice to incise rather than write the label on these vessels suggests a permanent indication of their function. While the majority of these vessels come from contexts that are not clearly associated with the cult, the two bowls from Arad were found directly next to the large burnt-offering altar in use during the ninth/eighth-century Stratum X.[16] The other kind of writing associated with ritual was also recovered from Arad. This is a series of small, complete ostraca found in Stratum VIII near the former location of the temple structure, each of which has a single name written on it.[17] While the interpretation of these ostraca remains uncertain, the suggestion that they represent lots for the distribution of priestly duties at the Arad temple has found some measure of acceptance. Both types of epigraphic finds provide evidence that writing played a role in how Iron Age Judahite priests carried out their duties.[18]

---

[15] See Manor 2016 for an overview of all *qdš* vessels and further references. A *qdš*-incised bowl was also recovered at Hazor, but we are restricting our discussion here to Judean sites. The *qdš* bowl from Tel Miqne/Ekron is also not relevant to our discussion—it is a century later than the others, from a Philistine context, and has the word written in ink rather than incised into the bowl.

[16] Although the precise interpretation of the Arad bowl inscriptions is debated (a clear qoph followed by either a symbol or an anomalously rendered letter; see Aharoni 1981: 115-117 for images; Renz & Röllig 2016: I.72-74 for assessment of the options and bibliography), their find context at the steps/bench of the large altar of Arad X (see Herzog, et al. 1984: 11-12 for the definitive evidence of association and Herzog 2002: 11-14, 26-33, 49-58, 69-72 for the dating and description of Arad X) is sufficient to group them with the other vessels under discussion here.

[17] See Aharoni 1981: 85-87 for images and initial description; Renz & Röllig 2016: 160-165 for recent discussion and bibliography. Note that Herzog 2002: 35-40 presents evidence that the Arad temple was already decommissioned in Strata VIII, which could complicate the interpretation of these inscriptions. However, Herzog's reinterpretation of the Arad strata makes it possible that Aharoni's association of these ostraca with Arad VIII is mistaken and that they instead belong to Arad IX—or, alternatively, that they were found in Arad VIII contexts but represent debris from the decommissioning of the Arad IX temple in Stratum VIII. The paleographic analysis of these texts suggests they originate from the late-eighth century, making either stratum a possible candidate.

[18] To these direct evidences, we may also add the indirect witness of the Ketef Hinnom inscriptions, which we might construe as suggesting that priests were involved in the production of amulets. See further discussion in Chapter 4 and below.

When we set these data—the likelihood of priestly administration, the use of writing to designate sancta, and the use of writing for sortition—alongside the presence of Judean Iron Age seals belonging to cultic functionaries, an image emerges that is great than the sum of these parts.[19] Priests would have been among the elite of Judean society, as attested by both biblical texts and by the archaeologically verified existence of state-sponsored temples at Arad and Moza, presumably staffed by state-sponsored priests.[20] Elite priests who used writing as part of their temple-related duties would have been participants in a scribal culture—which is to say, an intellectual culture. This intellectual culture was robust and multifaceted, producing a variety of literature, including collections of aphorisms (e.g., some layer of Proverbs), legal texts (e.g., the Covenant Code and Deuteronomic Code), historiographic-chronographic works (e.g., the Deuteronomistic History), prophetic literature (e.g., Amos, 1st Isaiah), and stories about Israel's national origins (e.g., JE/non-Priestly Torah material). To these literary genres preserved in the Hebrew Bible, we can add the epigraphic genres of administrative and epistolary texts.

That priests who participated in this scribal-intellectual culture would not have also produced texts related to their own practices is possible, but seems improbable. Whether we approach this question from the perspective of what parallel writing cultures produced or from the perspective of the attested writing culture of Iron Age Judah, we arrive at the same conclusion. Priests likely produced texts related to their various areas of expertise and such texts likely existed in an archival context(s) in Iron Age Jerusalem.

For those who reject the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen consensus on the exilic or post-exilic date of the Priestly text, these ritual-cultic archives and their institutional context provide the intuitive setting within which the Priestly author would have worked. However, for those who

[19] For seal images and description, see Avigad & Sass 1997: 59 (seals 27-28); for recent comments and bibliography, see Renz & Röllig 2016: II/2.219 (seal 8.41), 293 (seal 13.77).
[20] For Arad, Herzog 2002: 27-35, 49-72. For Moza, Greenhut & de Groot 2009: 217-227; Kisilevitz 2015.

accept the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen consensus, a post-monarchic dating for P presents relatively few obstacles to the pre-587 archives serving as the ultimate source of the documents that the Priestly author drew from when compiling and composing P. That some part of these archives would have survived the Babylonian destruction of 587 seems certain. The 597 deportations that took place prior to the ultimate destruction of Jerusalem involved the removal of a subset of the elite of Judah (2 Kgs 24:8-16), at least some of whom may have arranged for the transportation of their own personal collections of text.[21] Such personal collections would have derived from scribal exercises undertaken as part of their training for work in the temple—the density of elites in Jerusalem and the concentration of priests there would have provided an ample base for the reproduction of the kinds of short texts that we have proposed as underlying the non-narrative material in P.[22] The immediate aftermath of the 587 conquest of Jerusalem likely also allowed for some individuals to preserve texts that were important to them. Whether we imagine the Priestly author writing in exile or shortly after the return, these pre-587 collections would have been available—either as continued personal collections or as part of the reformulated archives of the Jerusalem temple after its refounding.

Linguistic evidence also supports the contention that these texts would have originated in a pre-exilic matrix. Most importantly, there is no evidence for either Aramaic or Akkadian influence on the non-narrative materials in the Priestly text. This is striking when we set this datum against the book of Ezekiel, whose language is replete with Aramaic and Akkadian features that align with the known commingling of those languages in the Babylonian context

[21] We have only vague knowledge about the mechanics and practical implementation of deportations by both the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian empires. For recent studies on this issue, see the essays collected in Koch 2022. See also, Tanret 2011: 280-282 for archaeological evidence of a family attempting to save their personal archives during a fire. We should also not discount the possibility that the Babylonian expropriation of goods from the Temple in Jerusalem (2 Kgs 24:13) involved the removal of texts.

[22] For the reproduction of texts as part of advanced, specialized training in the Mesopotamian tradition, the relationship between state and temple archives, the personal collections of texts held by individuals, and scribal culture's impact on the Priestly author, see discussion below.

that produced Ezekiel.[23] Given the speed with which Aramaic-Akkadian contact affected Ezekiel's linguistic register, the linguistic features of the non-narrative materials in the Priestly text suggest that these texts originate prior to extensive contact with Akkadian and, especially, Aramaic that occurred during the exilic and post-exilic periods.[24] This is not to say that the precise copies that the Priestly author used in this scenario would have been from monarchic Judah. Such texts could have continued to be copied within a scribal-institutional framework that emphasized the preservation of their linguistic features, such as the one we must presume to explain the preservation of Iron Age linguistic features in the majority of the biblical corpus.[25] However, we should understand the texts themselves as originating in the pre-exilic period regardless of either the date of their copies or of their incorporation into the Priestly text.

Given the preponderance of evidence that supports the period of the Judahite monarchy as the origin of the texts the Priestly author made use of, we should describe and define a sort of maximal textual basis that could have been available in this time period. We will do this by describing the different categories of writing that likely existed, drawing on epigraphic evidence from the Northwest Semitic corpus to bolster our inferences. In the course of this description, we will evaluate the likelihood of each category of text surviving the conquest of Jerusalem to be

---

[23] Boyd 2021: 229-303.

[24] See Hurvitz 1982; 1983; 1988; 2000 (responding to Blenkinsopp 1996) on the comparative lack of LBH features in the Priestly text when compared with Ezekiel and Petersson 2019 for a preliminary analysis of the syntax of the Priestly narrative demonstrating its alignment with Standard/Classical Biblical Hebrew. Polzin 1976; Joosten 2005 are basic studies contrasting the features of Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew. Polak 2006 offers a sociolinguistic analysis that places the majority of the Priestly text in the period of the late Judahite monarchy. Polak 2017 further refines this analysis and offers a suggestive argument for viewing many of the non-narrative texts in P as being closely allied with an earlier, originally oral milieu whose conventions have been partially preserved in their conversion to text. For further bibliography on the linguistic analysis of P, see Hendel & Joosten 2018: 128-129. For evidence of early-exilic Judean involvement in Akkadian bureaucratic culture in Babylonia, though controversial due to their unprovenanced nature, see the Āl-Yaḫūdu texts and analysis in Pearce & Wunsch 2014 (see also, Boyd 2021: 299-300). For critical evaluation of the archival reconstruction offered in Pearce & Wunsch 2014, as well as a contextualization of the importance of the Āl-Yaḫūdu texts alongside other Babylonian archives with connections to Judean exiles, see Waerzeggars 2015.

[25] Note, on this subject, the ability of Assyrian scribes to work in both Assyrian and Standard Babylonian dialects of Akkadian using both Assyrian and Babylonian cuneiform scripts as well as the preservation of Old Babylonian texts in later copies.

available in the exilic and post-exilic periods. This approach will allow us to present data useable by scholars on either side of the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen divide and will enable individual scholars to narrow down and eliminate certain categories of text according to their own stance on the date of the Priestly text and their understanding of scribal preservation and transmission.

Zhakevich's recent study on scribal technology in ancient Israel and Judah conveniently collects the archaeological evidence and comparative data for different writing media and their terminological reflexes.[26] Among this mass of available media, we can, somewhat arbitrarily, divide them into portable and non-portable forms of writing. Portable forms of writing would include papyrus, vellum, ostraca, writing boards, small stone tablets, and metal sheets (i.e., amulets). Of these, we have the most direct evidence of writing associated with cult practice for metal sheets and small stone tablets. We have already discussed the Ketef Hinnom amulets in relationship to the Priestly blessing (Num 6:22-27).[27] While the connection may be indirect, these texts at least suggest that priests may have been involved in the production of amulets. That the Priestly author drew on a well-known poem whose written form was associated with cultic practice seems a clear validation of the Neo-analytic approach in this one instance. That such personal amulets would have survived both the 597 deportations from and the 587 conquest of Jerusalem is a reasonable surmise given their size and use as personal accoutrements.

Stone tablets may also have been used as a medium for writing—either inked or incised—related to cult and ritual. While not from Iron Age Judah or Israel, the Kition Tariff from Cyprus is an example of temple-related writing on stone. This small (6"x4") limestone

[26] Zhakevich 2020.
[27] See Chapter 4.

tablet, likely from the 6th century BCE, has two lists of ritual dues inked onto it, one per side.[28] Limestone as a writing medium is also attested for ancient Israel by the Gezer calendar, whose text is incised.[29] Given the wide availability of limestone in Israel and Judah, its use as a portable writing surface in the form of tablets seems reasonable.[30] In the context of the 597 and 587 deportations and conquest, we might reasonably be skeptical that such tablets would have been taken unless they were of special value. If the same text were available in a lighter, more easily stored medium, such as papyrus, that would almost certainly have been selected over a stone tablet.

In terms of the Neo-analytic framework, we should note the relative shortness of texts written in the stone tablet format. On the Kition Tariff, side A contains approximately 105 words written in portrait orientation and side B contains approximately 65 words written landscape orientation.[31] These counts are in line with one of the shorter "tariff" speeches in the Priestly text, concerning the offering of Aaron (Lev 6:12-16), which contains 68 words. The combined count of both sides of the Kition tablet would be approximately 170 words, though we could also estimate 210 words if both sides were written in the same orientation. These numbers align with the longer "tariff" speeches in P, such as the *ʿōlāh* and *minḥāh* speech (Lev 6:1-11), which contains 220 words. In other words, such stone tablets might make a plausible source document for some of the speeches in Leviticus, their shortness being no obstacle to the idea that they represent once self-contained, independent material.

---

[28] For transcription, commentary, and photographs, see Peckham 1968. For a comparison of the Kition Tariff's script with other Phoenician cursives and an argument for its placement in the 6th rather than 5th century, see Healey 1974.

[29] Aḥituv 2008: 252-257 for text, commentary, and bibliography.

[30] On limestone's availability and properties, see Zachevich 2020: 47-48. On biblical references to stone tablets as a writing surface, Zachevich 2020: 102-106.

[31] These numbers were arrived at by counting each tally group as one word, assuming that 1 word was lost at the end of any lacunose line, and assuming 5 words were lost on the last line of each side.

Due to their durable nature and the cheapness of their manufacture, ostraca represent our largest category of Iron II epigraphs from Judah. Ostraca likely served one of three purposes in relationship to cultic practice.[32] In the first case, we have already discussed the apparent use of small ostraca for sortition at Arad. Ostraca may also have been used to draft texts or keep records prior to the text's transfer to a more official medium such as papyrus. The record-keeping aspect is apparent in the Samaria ostraca, while Yadin has forcefully argued that the Lachish letters represent drafts of correspondence that was ultimately sent from that city.[33] Finally, ostraca almost certainly served as one of the basic media of scribal training associated with the priesthood. The use of ostraca in this fashion is well attested by both the extant abcedaries and the hieratic chart and practice ostraca from Kadesh Barnea.[34] While these uses are all disposable—in the sense that these texts were not created for long-term preservation—it is possible that ostraca were also used for archival purposes, as seems to be the case for the Arad letters. It is unlikely that ostraca would have been saved and transported during the 597 or 587 events, given that they seem to be largely used as a temporary text receptacle. Any cultic or ritual text written on ostraca likely also existed in a different, more easily transported media, such as papyrus or vellum. Any larger records which may once have been based on ostraca —such as the census texts underlying Numbers 1-4—almost certainly existed solely in papyrus or vellum form by the time of the exile.

Our last categories of portable media are also our least well attested in the archaeological record due to the perishable nature of the materials involved. Nevertheless, they likely

[32] For an overview of the use of ostraca as a writing medium, see Rollston 2010: 66-74; Zachevich 2020: 110-114.
[33] For an overview discussion of the Samaria Ostraca, see Shea 1977; Aharoni 1979: 356-368. See further, Chapter 6. For Lachish letters as drafts, Yadin 1985. For other perspectives on the Lachish letters, see bibliography at Aḥituv 2008: 88.
[34] For abcedaries on ostraca, see Renz & Röllig 2016: II/1.22-23. For the hieratic chart, see Aḥituv 2008: 207-213; Renz & Röllig 2016: I.339-343 with bibliographies.

represented the largest group of writing materials during the Iron II period. The use of papyrus for writing has been securely established by both numerous bullae with papyrus imprints and by a single surviving papyrus palimpsest from Iron II Judah.[35] The Wadi Murabbaʿat palimpsest originally contained a letter before it was repurposed for an administrative record of names and obligations (either owed or paid), demonstrating the versatile uses to which papyrus was put in Iron II Judah. Papyrus was produced in long rolls, but individual sheets could be cut from these rolls to produce a sheet of the needed size for particular uses.[36] Given the large caches of bullae recovered from late-monarchic Judah, we would expect that a large amount of papyrus was in use in the city, including by priests and as part of the Jerusalem temple's archives. Papyri would have been easily transportable during the 597 deportations and some may have been saved prior to the 587 conquest as well.

Tanned animal skins (vellum) likely also constituted a major writing medium, although this use is not archaeologically attested in Israel and Judah prior to the Qumran scrolls.[37] In this regard, we should note that, according to P, priests received animal skins as part of their sacrificial dues from the *ʿōlāh* offering (Lev 7:8). This would provide priests with a ready-made source of the raw material for producing vellum, among other leather products—whether they manufactured it themselves or, more likely, provided the raw material to a tanner. Like papyrus, vellum scrolls can be cut into sheets for multiple uses. As with papyrus, we would expect some subset of this material to have been removed from Jerusalem in 597 and 587.

[35] For bullae, see Shoham 2000; Brandl 2000; Reich, Shukron, & Lernau 2007. For the Wadi Murabbaʿat Papyrus, see Aḥituv 2008: 213-215; Renz & Röllig 2016: I.283-287 and bibliographies there. On the role of papyrus and bullae in Judahite scribal practice, see Rollston 2010: 74-78.
[36] Zhakevich 2020: 8-13, 143-145. See also, Porten 1981: 41-42's physical observations on the Adon/Saqqarah papyrus.
[37] Zhakevich 2020: 85-89, 93-94. See also, Haran 1982; 1983; Lemaire 1992.

Finally, writing boards were also likely in use in Iron II Judah, largely as a drafting and temporary record-keeping tool.[38] We have not recovered any of these from ancient Judah, but the term *dlt* in Lachish 4 may refer to such a tool.[39] The technology was definitively available in the environment of Iron II Judah, as attested by contemporary Neo-Assyrian remains and a Zincirli relief of Bar-rakib with his writing-board-equipped scribe.[40] Given the fragility of the materials involved—wood and wax—it is not surprising that none of these have survived. Beyond their use as drafting tools, writing boards could also sometimes be produced as prestige objects, such as the writing-board copy of *Enūma Anu Enlil* made for Sargon II.[41] If they existed in Iron II Judah, these types of prestigious writing boards may have been transported out of Jerusalem by the 597 deportees or 587 refugees. Any material on temporary writing boards would have been transferred to papyrus or vellum scrolls, which may also have been saved from Jerusalem.

Our second category of writing available in Iron II Judah is the non-portable forms of writing. These took one of three forms: monumental inscriptions carved into stone, inscriptions inked onto plastered stone, and votive inscriptions on dedicated objects. Although Rendsburg has argued that there was no tradition of monumental inscriptions in Israel and Judah, his assertion does not stand up to scrutiny.[42] Stela fragments have been recovered from both Jerusalem and Samaria, indicating some tradition of monumental inscriptions.[43] Rendsburg's argument that these texts are too fragmentary to draw conclusions from is only true in the most general way—we do not know the full text of these inscriptions. Nevertheless, the fact that they come from

[38] Lemaire 1992: 1005; Zhakevich 2020: 96-97, 106-109. See also, SAA X 101.o.7-10; RINAP 5/2 161.iv.2' for Neo-Assyrian attestations of writing boards as drafts.
[39] Hicks 1983: 51-57.
[40] On Neo-Assyrian writing boards, see Mallowan 1954: 98-107; Howard 1955; Wiseman 1955; Taylor 2011: 23-25. For the Zincirli relief, see ANEP 460.
[41] Mallowan 1954: 98-99 (and Plates XXII-XXIII).
[42] Rendsburg 2007: 95-99.
[43] Aḥituv 2008: 25-26, 30-32, 257.

stone stelae in the respective capitals of Judah and Israel is undeniable.[44] Rendsburg's argument about the virtue of humility impacting the use of public inscriptions may have some bearing on why monumental writing seems to have had a limited distribution in ancient Israel and Judah, but it can not surmount the plain fact of monumental writing in Iron II Jerusalem and Samaria.[45]

The stelae fragments from Iron II Jerusalem, one from the City of David and one from the Ophel, are too fragmentary to make any surmise about their content. However, we do have evidence of monumental inscriptions containing ritual and cultic texts from neighboring and related cultures. The most famous of these is the Marseilles Tariff (KAI 69) and the related but distinct Carthage Tariffs (KAI 74-75), whose content has evoked comparison with the divine speeches in Leviticus 1-7.[46] The Festival Stele, also from Carthage, is the remains of a large, two-column inscription that contains instructions for offerings related to a particular celebration.[47] Although these texts date from the fourth to third century BCE, they indicate that monumental inscriptions may serve as a medium for ritual or cultic writing.[48]

While we have no Iron II examples as clearly relevant to priestly activities as the Carthaginian inscriptions, there are nevertheless a handful of Iron II monumental inscriptions that incorporate cultic or ritual instructions into them. Found in the renewed excavations at Zincirli (ancient Samʾal), the Kuttamuwa stele, an eighth-century funerary monument, contains instructions for carrying out yearly sacrifices and offerings at the location of the stele.[49] The

---

[44] Rollston 2010: 47-55. See also Halpern 2001: 107-226 for a reading of 2 Samuel 8's conquest list as a form of display inscription that may have once been an actual monumental inscription.
[45] See also, Zhakevich 2020: 49-56 for a collection of biblical reference to writing on stone.
[46] Dussaud 1914; van den Branden 1965; Baker 1987. Fantar 2001: 61-62 offers comments on how the Marseilles Tariff relates to other evidence of Carthaginian religious practice. See Lupu 2009: 391-396 for commentary on the Marseilles Tariff's relationship to Greek "sacred law" inscriptions.
[47] See Moriggi 2011: 86-89 for the history of this inscription, new photographs, and commentary.
[48] See also, van den Branden 1965's argument that the Marseilles Tariff preserves rites that go back to the Iron II period.
[49] Pardee 2009 is the *editio princeps*. For the archaeological context and other analyses of the stele, see Schloen & Fink 2009; Struble & Herrmann 2009; Sanders 2013; Herrmann 2014a; 2014b.

ninth-century Hadad statue of Panamuwa I (KAI 214), another monumental funerary inscription from Zincirli, similarly contains instructions for holding a feast and sacrifices at the location of the statue (ll. 15-19).[50] Finally, the eighth-century Karatepe inscription of Azatiwada (KAI 26) contains an enactment of several yearly sacrifices (ll. II.18-III.2).[51] These monumental inscriptions confirm that cultic-ritual content had a home in this medium.

Due to the nature of the material, we have very few preserved ink-on-plaster inscriptions from the Iron II period.[52] Nevertheless, the two groups of such inscriptions that we do have—one from Deir ʿAlla and one from Kuntillet ʿAjrud—both have bearing on the use of ritual-related writing in this medium. The Aramaic Deir ʿAlla inscriptions contain an account of Balaam's communication with the gods.[53] The room containing these inscriptions has evoked numerous interpretations, the most prominent of which are its cultic use (possibly for dream incubation) and an educational use.[54] The lack of other items found in the room with the plaster inscriptions despite the sudden destruction of the site, makes it difficult to weigh between these interpretations. However, Wearne's argument for the room's function as a space for dream incubation—connecting the unusual western orientation of the room, the presence of benches, and the Balaam narrative's nocturnal vision—merits consideration.[55] If this interpretation is correct, then the Deir ʿAlla texts, while not of a ritual or cultic nature themselves, nevertheless function in a ritual or cultic context. This suggests that ink-on-plaster writing had a home in these settings.

---

[50] Tropper 1993: 54-97 for description, bibliography, and commentary.
[51] See Dupont-Sommer 1948; Younger 1998 for description, analysis, and further bibliography.
[52] See Zhakevich 2020: 57-84 for the evidence for ink-on-plaster writing in the ancient Near East and a collection of biblical references to the practice.
[53] Hoftijzer and van der Kooij 1976 is the *editio princeps*. Convenient edition with commentary and bibliography in Aḥituv 2008: 433-465. See Wearne 2015: 253-393 for text, analysis, and further bibliography.
[54] See Wearne 2015: 421-451 for a thorough review of the archaeological context of these inscriptions and the suggestions for the bench-room's original function. Schniedewind 2019: 147-151 most recently defended the idea that the space was a school house of some kind.
[55] Wearne 2015: 449-451, 459-460.

The ink-on-plaster inscriptions from Kuntillet ʿAjrud may offer further confirmation of this view.[56] While the original publication of the Kuntillet ʿAjrud findings argued for a cultic function of the entire site, this claim has not withstood closer scrutiny.[57] Nevertheless, that Kuntillet ʿAjrud contained some kind of cultic space seems at least possible, and Ornan has identified the so-called bench room in the gate complex of Building A as the most likely candidate based on a study of the distribution of iconography at the site.[58] This bench room was also the location of the first group of plaster inscriptions (Kajr 4.1-3)—one was likely on the wall in the room, and the other two were associated with the doorway leading from the courtyard into the bench room.[59] Because the interpretation of the entire site, the individual components (such as the bench room), and the texts is far from settled, we can only offer a provisional reading of the evidence in relationship to the question of cult-related writing. However, if the identification of the bench room as a cult or ritual space holds up under further scrutiny and analysis, then the Kuntillet ʿAjrud plasters associated with this room—like the Deir ʿAlla plasters—are further evidence of an association between ink-on-plaster writing and cultic or ritual activities. While neither of our extant ink-on-plaster texts have explicitly cultic or ritual content, we should not rule out the possibility that this medium was used for just such purposes.

This brings us to our final form of non-portable writing: votive inscriptions. One of the functions of a temple, as part of its service to the gods and community, was the storage and

[56] Official publication, Aḥituv, Eshel, & Meshel 2012; Aḥituv & Eshel 2015. Convenient edition with commentary and bibliography in Aḥituv 2008: 313, 322-329. See Wearne 2015: 79-157 for text, commentary, epigraphic analysis, and further bibliography.
[57] Ornan 2016; Smoak & Schniedewind 2019. For a review of the discussion, see Wearne 2015: 185-214. Wearne ultimately sides with the interpretation of the site as the home of a group of prophets.
[58] Ornan 2016; see also, Mandell 2021. Schniedewind 2019: 158-164, following Lemaire 1981: 25-30, most recently defended the idea that the bench room was a space for scribal education, analogous with his interpretation of the bench room with plaster texts at Deir ʿAlla. See Wearne 2015: 171-175 for a judicious review of the various suggestions for the function of the bench room and 2015: 223-242 for analysis of the relationship between the plaster texts and the bench room.
[59] See Wearne 2015: 215-249 for a study of the archaeological context of the Kuntillet ʿAjrud plasters.

safekeeping of items dedicated by worshipers. While these types of items are frequently, though not always, small and are, therefore, theoretically portable, the sacredness of the objects would have restricted their movements to display and storage areas of a given temple complex. Several examples of such inscribed objects have been found from the Late Bronze and Iron Age Levant, including Ugaritic, Aramaic, and Phoenician examples.[60] The texts found at Kuntillet ʿAjrud include inscriptions on three small stone bowls (KAjr 1.1, 3, 4) that some have interpreted as votive objects.[61] Large objects also frequently served as a medium for votive inscriptions, such as the Moabite incense altar from Khirbet el-Mudeiyineh and numerous Phoenician and Punic statues, stelae, and other objects (including KAI 66, on a bronze altar).[62] Again, Kuntillet ʿAjrud has produced an analogous type of text on a large stone basin (KAjr 1.2).[63] In other words, inscriptions on votive objects are a well-known phenomenon throughout the Levantine world.[64]

In light of the epigraphic record, we have no reason to suppose that some such objects were not also kept in the Jerusalem temple. The Hebrew Bible, in fact, attests to the practice of keeping votive objects in both the Jerusalem temple and other sacred spaces (1 Sam 21:10; 2 Sam 8:7, 10-11; 1 Kgs 7:51; 15:15; 2 Kgs 12:19; 14:14; 23:4, 11-12).[65] And while the Hebrew Bible never mentions whether these objects were inscribed, the fact that 2 Kgs 12:19 refers to items sanctified by individual kings (Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, and Ahaziah) suggests that such

[60] For the sole extant Ugaritic example (KTU 6.62), see Pardee 2000: 813-815. Hazael's so-called booty inscriptions (KAI 232, 311), for which see Eph'al & Naveh 1989, likely also served as Aramaic votives despite their anomalous wording. For a Phoenician example, see Steele 2013: 231-234 on the bronze bowl fragments from Kition (KAI 31).
[61] Naveh 1979: 28. See also, Wearne 2015: 39.
[62] See Dion and Daviau 2000 for the Moabite altar. The Phoenician and Punic bibliography is too large to offer a survey here, but see CIS I and KAI for collections.
[63] Wearne 2015: 33-38.
[64] See also, Rollston 2010: 62-65.
[65] See also, 2 Kgs 12:14 which, by its negation of this activity, suggests that the normal use of silver and gold brought to the temple was for the production of various sacred objects. The use of the term *qōdeš* to describe votive objects in some of these passages should perhaps recondition us to understand the prohibition in Lev 22:2—"and they [= the priests] will keep separate from the *qŏdāšîm* of the children of Israel and they will not desecrate (*ḥll* D) the name of my holiness which they are sanctifying to me"—as a literal warning against attempting to remove the divine name from votive offerings in an attempt to pass them off as personal property (cf., e.g., SAA XIII 128, 134, 138; SAA X 107).

objects carried, at a minimum, the name of the person who dedicated them. While these inscriptions may not have had any actual ritual or cultic content such as that contained in Leviticus, they would nevertheless have served as a rich onomastic source that contributed to the Priestly author's understanding of ancient Israelite naming conventions.[66]

The question of whether any of these non-portable sources of writing could have survived the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem may appear simple at first glance. This simplicity is, however, deceptive. While the monumental inscriptions, ink-on-plaster, and votive items themselves all may have been destroyed—or taken as plunder—this does not mean that the texts on them were also destroyed. Copies of these texts may have been kept on more portable writing media, likely papyrus. This type of practice is well attested in contemporary Neo-Assyrian scribal culture, which produced copies (and/or drafts) of monumental inscriptions and dedicatory/votive inscriptions on smaller clay tablets.[67] This practice was sometimes carried out even when it meant divorcing texts from important context, such as the tablets containing epigraphic text whose original purpose was to label and describe wall reliefs.[68]

The majority of the monumental and votive copies probably served an archival purpose, as suggested by the number of Ashurbanipal tablets found at Nineveh/Kuyunjik that contain votive inscriptions from objects dedicated in other cities. Beyond this likely archival function, one set of tablets (K 8664 & K 2411) testifies to another purpose of making such copies.[69] In

---

[66] See, however, RINAP 5/3 Aei 2 for a votive text that contains cultic instructions. See Chapter 4 for the suggestion that the names of the *nəśîʾîm* and spies may derive from some form of votive/dedicatory inscription.
[67] Grayson & Novotny 2014: 5-8; Jeffers & Novotny 2023: 4-9. For copies of monumental inscriptions, see RINAP 3/2 163; RINAP 4 48, 99, 100, 101; RINAP 5/2 113, 161-184 (epigraphs), 187, 213, 220. For copies of votive inscriptions, see RINAP 2 89, 90; RINAP 3/2 159, 161, 162; RINAP 4 43, 44, 45; RINAP 5/2 154, 156, 159, 160, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 216, 223, 224, 225, 226; RINAP 5/3 255, 264, Aei 2, Aei 3, Ssi 15, Ssi 16, Ssi 17, Ssi 18. While well-attested in the Neo-Assyrian period, this practice was common throughout Mesopotamian history and continued down to the end of the Neo-Babylonian empire (see RINBE 2 Nab 5).
[68] Gerardi 1988: 18-21.
[69] K 8664 = RINAP 3/2 161 and K 2411 = RINAP 3/2 162 & RINAP 5/2 223.

689, the failure of Sennacherib's Babylonian policy culminated in the Assyrian conquest and destruction of that city.[70] In the course of this conquest, several items were taken from Marduk's temple, the Esagila, back to Assyria.[71] Sennacherib then had these items refurbished and dedicated to the god Aššur. Sennacherib's son Esarhaddon moved towards a more conciliatory stance regarding Babylon, sponsoring numerous rebuilding and refurbishment projects, some of which were completed under his son Ashurbanipal.[72] This included the return of plundered items to the Esagila temple in Babylon. These tablets are byproducts of that return policy.

The first tablet (K 8664/RINAP 3/2 161) is the Ashurbanipal chancery's record of the inscription Sennacherib commissioned on a ritual bed and throne, originally belonging to Marduk but which Sennacherib had rededicated to the god Aššur. Ashurbanipal had these inscriptions recorded so as to preserve them prior to their erasure and replacement with a new inscription, commissioned by Ashurbanipal, rededicating these items to Marduk, their original owner. The second tablet (K 2411) represents a second stage in this process, recording both Sennacherib's now-removed inscription and Ashurbanipal's newly-written one.[73] The tablet further indicates both the original and new location of these sancta and the date of their movement from Aššur to Babylon (RINAP 5/2 223.iii.36'-40'). These tablets indicate that transfers of sancta and cultic reorganization provide a motive for recording dedicatory and votive inscriptions in a portable medium.

When we turn to the mentions of votives in the book of Kings, we frequently find them mentioned in just such contexts of transfer and reform (1 Kgs 7:51; 15:15; 2 Kgs 12:19; 14:14; 23:4, 11-12). In addition to this, Kings also mentions several occasions of repair and reform to

[70] Frame 1992: 52-63. For Sennacherib's own account, see RINAP 3/2 223.
[71] For a brief history and further bibliography on the Esagila, see George 1993: 139-140.
[72] Frame 1992: 64-105.
[73] The Sennacherib portion of K 2411 is edited as RINAP 3/2 162, while the Ashurbanipal portion is RINAP 5/2 223.

the cultic practice and sancta associated with the Jerusalem temple (1 Kgs 15:11-15; 2 Kgs 12:5-17; 16:10-18; 18:1-4; 21:3-7; 23:4-14).[74] Any of these occasions would have presented an opportunity for scribes working in the Jerusalem temple to catalogue and record inscriptions kept on the grounds, monumental and votive alike. Such copies would almost certainly have been committed to papyrus and available for easy transport in either 597 or 587. In short, despite their theoretical non-portability, monumental and votive or dedicatory inscriptions likely existed in a format that allowed the texts to survive separate from the objects on which they were originally inscribed.

One final feature of the Neo-Assyrian dedicatory-inscription copies deserves attention in relation to the Neo-analytic framework. These texts also contain descriptions of the objects upon which the inscriptions were written, in some cases even providing the measurements of the associated cultic paraphernalia (e.g., RINAP 3/2 162.iii.17'-35'). Such descriptions evoke the Tabernacle material in Exodus 25-30—parts of that complex may originate in textual descriptions of sancta kept in the Jerusalem temple. If the tradition of Solomon's importation of the ark of the covenant along with its associated sancta into the Jerusalem temple (1 Kgs 8:4-6) is in any way accurate, over time scribes would have generated archival descriptions of these items.[75] The book of Kings attests to the fact that there were objects in Iron Age Judah to which some attributed a Mosaic origin (2 Kgs 18:4), and it is possible that scribes and priests likewise

[74] The historicity of several of these events has been questioned by many scholars. Regardless, it is unlikely that all (or even most) of these are made up from whole cloth. For this author, the better path to understanding these texts is to question the theological interpretation provided by the Deuteronomistic Historian rather than questioning the historicity of the events themselves. For a recent attempt to disentangle the Deuteronomistic viewpoint from the presentation of cultic reform during the reign of Ahaz, see Heth 2022.

[75] See Friedman 1981a: 44-61 for the proposal that the Tabernacle may have been kept in the Jerusalem temple. The details of the setup of the Tabernacle proposed by Friedman are irrelevant to this point, a position also taken by Homan 2002: 173-177, who advocates for its storage rather than its setup within the temple. For a critique of Friedman's proposed reconstruction, see Hurowitz 1995; Propp 2006: 503-507, 707-709; for a defense of Friedman vis-à-vis Hurowitz, see Homan 2002: 167-173. For the extra-biblical evidence of tents and tent-shrines in the ancient Near East, see Cross 1947; 1981; Homan 2002. For the suggestion that the tent and sancta imported by Solomon were in fact the Davidic tent shrine for the ark (2 Sam 6:17), see Cross 1947.

viewed antique sancta or records of sancta as originating from the pre-monarchic era regardless of their true origin.[76]

Our brief review of available sources of writing related to cult, ritual, onomastics, and sancta descriptions suggests a vibrant culture of writing existed in late-monarchic Judah.[77] If the Priestly text originates in the pre-exilic period, then these texts would have been readily available for the Priestly author to draw on in the composition of his work. What is more, for those who adhere to an exilic or post-exilic date for the composition of the Priestly text, a representative portion of these written sources is likely to have been available in some form after the destruction of Jerusalem. Regardless of where one stands in relation to the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis, the Priestly author would have had access to a wealth of late-monarchic Judean texts.

Looking Up: Ritual Texts and Scribal Culture

If the Priestly author—whether in late-monarchic Jerusalem, exilic Babylonia, or post-exilic Yehud—lived in a world full of textual sources from which he could construct his work, this is not the end of our inquiry into his use of such documents. We still need to understand his relationship to these texts. The relationship between texts and writers (not just authors) is part of what we signal when we speak of scribal culture and scribal education in the ancient world. The very existence of the Priestly text—a complex, written work of multiple genres—implicates its author(s) in scribal culture and attests to the high level of scribal education that the Priestly

[76] See Donnelly-Lewis 2022 for another proposed parallel to the Tabernacle material in Akkadian literature.
[77] Note that a culture of writing does not imply widespread literacy. The issues we are dealing with in this chapter are related to elite, literate culture and have little to no bearing on the question of whether a culture of reading existed among members of non-elite sectors of society. However, even if we arbitrarily posit a low literacy rate—say 5%—it is notable that this would still yield a group of some 1,000 literate individuals in seventh-century Jerusalem (taking a middle view of approximately 20,000 inhabitants; see, Faust 2005: 108-112; Faust 2008: 177-178, 187 on the variables and perils involved in ancient population estimates).

author must have had. Understanding what this education entailed will sharpen our ability to identify and understand certain decisions the Priestly author made when incorporating pre-existing texts into his work.

Due to the nature of the media used, we do not have an abundance of Hebrew educational material from the Iron Age Levant.[78] Nevertheless, scholars have used the epigraphic record to great effect in uncovering some aspects of the educational curriculum in Israel and Judah during the first half of the first millennium.[79] Importantly, a number of these reconstructed practices match what we know about scribal education from Mesopotamia—practicing letter forms and the alphabet, copying word lists and numbers, copying model texts from major scribal genres such as letters, and, possibly, the use of literary texts as part of the curriculum. For this reason, we will turn to the Mesopotamian analogue to fill in the gaps in our knowledge.

The abundance of cuneiform material recovered from Mesopotamia has allowed us to reconstruct the fine details of elementary scribal education and have a clear but general picture of intermediate and advanced education.[80] The most central element of scribal education at all stages is the performance of copying: beginning students copied out lists of signs and words; intermediate students practiced their skills by copying literary works and model contracts and letters;[81] advanced students made copies of the major texts of their chosen specialization.[82] The central role of copying in scribal training did more than serve as an education tool—it also aided

[78] See Renz & Röllig 2016: II/1.22-25 for a list of educational texts.
[79] Rollston 2006; 2010; Byrne 2007; Sanders 2009; Faigenbaum-Golovin, et al. 2016; 2020; 2021; Schniedewind 2019. See also, Zhakevich 2020. See also, van der Toorn 2007 for a study of cuneiform scribal practices placed into conversation with the composition of biblical texts.
[80] Succinct overviews with further bibliography are available in Veldhuis 2011; Gadotti & Kleinerman 2021: 19-35, 56-57.
[81] On the use of literary texts and letters in the context of scribal education, see Vanstiphout 1979; Tinney 1999; Huber Vulliet 2011.
[82] Löhnert 2011: 407-409; Robson 2011; Schwemer 2011: 421-423; Tinney 2011: 584-591.

in what Veldhuis refers to as "the creation of a scribal identity."[83] Scribal education was not only learning to read and write—it was intended to shape a person's thoughts and views of the world.

This copying, along with its attendant identity-formation and professionalization aspects, likely provided the first context within which the Priestly author encountered many of the non-narrative texts embedded in the Sinai pericope. This type of education has ramifications for how texts are perceived. The teaching scribes would have presented texts to their students and evaluated their work on the basis of a number of factors, including fidelity to the exemplars set before them. This type of education inculcates in its students a standard of fidelity in copying and a respect for the wording of the texts copied.[84] We have already observed that the Priestly author's major interventions in his source texts occurs mostly at the margins of those documents—such an approach may be an unconscious reflex of the copying that comprised a major part of his early education.

Leviticus 11 may provide evidence of what some of that early education looked like. Though this chapter is almost certainly not a scribal school text, it contains certain features associated with scribal education. In its opening section on clean and unclean quadrupeds, this speech identifies three animals who are *ṭāmēʾ* due to a lack of hooves: the camel, the badger, and the hare (Lev 11:4-6). In each of these cases, a different verbal form is used to express this lack of hooves—for the camel, a participial expression negated by *ʾyn* (11:4); for the badger, an imperfect/yaqtulu verb form negated by *lʾ* (11:5); and for the hare, a perfect/qatala verb form negated by *lʾ* (11:6). The meaning of the phrases is identical in all of these cases. This kind of intentional variation in verbal forms is reminiscent of the use of verbal forms in Sumerian poems

[83] Veldhuis 2011: 85. See also the comments on the non-practical nature of scribal education in Gadotti & Kleinerman 2021: 21-22, and Schniedewind 2019: 139-140 for the Israelite/Judahite context.
[84] Van der Toorn 2007: 126 notes that "faithful reproduction of the text as received was the scribal norm."

that constituted part of early scribal education.[85] By giving beginners an excerpt—a common practice in early scribal education—containing Lev 11:2b-8, the scribal teachers could have exposed them to a written, formalized version of a generally observed Israelite habit along with practice in recognizing and deploying a variety of expressions for stating similar kinds of information.[86] This pairing reinforces both group identity and scribal habits.

Another feature of Leviticus 11 that may also be intended for use, through excerpts, in cementing certain scribal habits is the occurrence of word pairs that reinforce orthographic practices. One prominent examples of this is the use of the phrase *haššereṣ haššōrēṣ* (11:29, 41, 42, 43). Despite two different pronunciations these words are written identically as *hšrṣ*. For learners of a writing system, this orthographic reflex is not a natural but learned pattern. The repetition of such a phrase formalizes this orthographic standard in the mind of the learner. In at least one other instance, we see the deployment of a minimal pair of words that also reinforces orthographic habits. The pleonastic phrase *bammayim bayyammîm* (11:9) would have been written as *bmym bymm* in Iron Age orthography, highlighting the necessity of careful attention to consonant sequence when copying texts.

Leviticus 11 also testifies to the existence of one of the core features of elementary scribal education—lists. This text contains three different lists of animals—birds (11:13-19), insects (11:22), and small animals (11:29-30)—and a list of objects made from different materials (11:32-33). These types of thematic word lists constitute a well-known part of scribal

[85] Vantisphount 1979: 121-122; Tinney 1999: 164.

[86] Hebrew speakers would, naturally, be familiar with a wide range of expressions in their own language. However, the standards of written communication frequently do not render the language exactly as spoken. Instead, the scribal standards train students in the use of particular phrases and expressions for use in appropriate contexts (e.g., epistolary expressions). Practice in a variety of verbal expressions such as that in Lev 11:4-6 may be intended to help students recognize and use expressions outside of the habits of their own idiolects and prepare them for engagement with a wide variety of texts.

training.[87] While such lists likely also existed outside of Leviticus 11, assigning excerpts from this particular text would once again have allowed for a standard scribal exercise to be accompanied by a context that emphasizes certain cultural practices.

Leviticus 11 is not the only text embedded in P that contains indicators of a relationship to elementary educational exercises. The administrative-like documents embedded in Numbers 1-10*, particularly the donation list (Num 7:12-88) and census list (Num 1:20-46), bring to mind the model contracts that formed part of the end stage of elementary education in the Old Babylonian curriculum.[88] These model contracts provided practice for students working in a form that would occupy a large portion of their scribal career if they chose to take their training no further. In a similar way, for a scribe being trained in the Jerusalem temple, the recording of donations would have occupied a portion of their scribal career. A text like that underlying the donation list in Numbers 7 would provide practice with the format of such records, as well as the mathematical calculations needed to check their accuracy. All of this is presented in a simplified and schematic form well suited for early practice with this genre.

This proposal may also provide some insight into question of the originality of the names of the *nəśîʾîm* to this text. In keeping with the identity-formation aspects of scribal education, the names may have always been a part of this text, a means of connecting scribal students to traditions about Israelite antiquity. The use of unusual names in such a context is also reminiscent of practices seen in elementary scribal education, where lists of names were frequently copied.[89] The copying of such names provides both practice with orthographic standards for non-lexical items and an opportunity for teachers to explain the meanings of

[87] See OB Ura 2-4; Standard Ura 10, 13, 14, 18.
[88] See Spada 2014; 2018; George & Spada 2019: 73-145 for description of these texts' place in the curriculum, editions of model contracts, and further bibliography.
[89] See texts in Gadotti & Kleinerman 2021: 74-128 for both Sumerian and Akkadian name lists used as elementary exercises.

names, a practice that doubtless preceded the establishment of scribal education but that just as certainly flourished within it as well.

The census list that underlays Numbers 1 may also originate in as a model text for copying. While it is uncertain whether or not priests participated in such administrative ventures as a census, the census list provides practice with rendering large numbers and checking their accuracy through addition. Again, the connection to Israelite antiquity would serve an identity-forming purpose.

Given the scope and ambition of the Priestly text, it is self-evident that the Priestly author's education took him beyond this basic level of scribal education. Again drawing on the Mesopotamian model—where scribal education served as the first step of a long process of professionalization in a number of disciplines—the choice of advancement would have involved some form of specialization.[90] This training would have involved oral instruction, practice in the discipline, and the copying of texts relevant to the chosen specialty. In Mesopotamia, the list of texts a student was expected to be familiar with is quite large for any particular discipline.[91] To this stage of education we might suggest that texts such as those in Leviticus 1-5, 11-15 belong. These texts cover practical aspects of sacrifice and the evaluation and handling of purity issues, but from a general perspective—one could not actually carry out an *ʿōlāh*-sacrifice on the basis

[90] The Mesopotamian evidence has provided us with at least five major areas of scribal/scholarly knowledge within which one could specialize (Parpola 1993: xiii-xiv): *barûtu* (divinatory knowledge), *āšipūtu* ("exorcistic" knowledge), *asûtu* (medical knowledge), *ṭupšarrūtu* (astronomical knowledge), and *kalûtu* (lamentation/divine placation knowledge). While the current state of our evidence does not allow us to know what types of specialization were available in late-monarchic Judah, a comparison of non-overlapping domains of knowledge—defined as broad areas in which a person has received some form of education or training—in Ezekiel and the Priestly text suggest that different forms of specialization were available. That is, while both corpora display overlaps in several *types* of knowledge (e.g., chronographic structure, architectural description, cosmology, cosmography/geography), there are also cases where one corpus or the other shows an acquaintance with a type of knowledge that the other doesn't display (e.g., Ezekiel's use of poetry). A study on this issue is in preparation by the author.

[91] For the so-called "Exorcist's Manual," a list of corpora the *āšipu* was expected to master, see Geller 2018 for edition and commentary; Frahm 2018 for analysis. See also, SAA X 160, 171, 182 for Neo-Assyrian scholars speaking about theirs and others' expertise.

of Leviticus 1 alone.[92] This is where both practice and oral instruction would fill in the specifics.[93] The Priestly author's decision to narrativize certain instructions—usually with noticeable differences between the narrative and non-narrative versions—may echo the complementary role that oral instruction and practice played alongside textual copying and memorization.

An additional set of texts that may belong to this stage of education is the regulations directed at priests in Leviticus 21. The *barû* was expected to master a similar set of teachings dealing with the necessary wholeness of body for approaching the divinatory task.[94] The instructions and warnings regarding how to handle offerings given in Leviticus 22 likely also belong to this stage of education. All of these texts contribute to the development of both a specific set of practices and a professional orientation towards those practices. The underlying texts in each of these cases likely served as part of the corpus that a priest in training was expected to copy and memorize.[95] Again, fidelity to the text in both copying and memorization would have been paramount—even where the practice changed, the memorization of the practical texts remained a necessary component of professionalization.[96]

---

[92] Rainey 1970: 486-487's suggestion that Leviticus 1-5 is didactic in the sense that it provides complete instructions for carrying out offerings must be rejected.

[93] Contra Knierim 1992: 102,who too strongly divides the "writing priests" from the "sacrificing priests." The Mesopotamian parallels suggest that writing played an important part in professionalization, especially in elite culture, where the priests of the Jerusalem temple were no doubt situated. Knierim 1992: 103-106 in some ways approaches the view here, except that his emphasis on the "systematization" of the sacrificial system in Leviticus 1-5 is misplaced if taken too abstractly or theologically. If there is a systematization here, then it is almost certainly the type of organization imposed by making such texts part of a curriculum. See Gabbay 2016: 13-83 on the role of oral instruction in the Akkadian commentary tradition and the educational setting implied by the terminology associated with commentaries.

[94] See Lambert 1998 for edition, with new fragments and partial edition in Jiménez 2014: 104-108. Lambert 1998: 147-148 was the first to see the connection between this text and Leviticus 21.

[95] SAA XX 37 may provide an Assyrian parallel to these types of general-level texts—it is a liturgical "manual" that is incomplete without further knowledge of the *tākultu* ritual to which it belongs (Frankena 1954; van Driel 1969: 60-69).

[96] Robson 2011: 558 also notes that "in the Neo-Assyrian court, *āšipu*s never seem to have cited the diagnostic omen series *Sakikkû* or to have written commentaries on it, although many manuscripts of this work were kept in the royal library there," indicating the continued copying of a text as part of a profession even when actual praxis may have changed.

Finally, even when a priest reached the end of his scribal/professional training and was employed in a position of authority, the copying of texts continued. From the Neo-Assyrian court, we have numerous reports of scribal professionals collecting and copying tablets for use in various ritual settings.[97] Numerous Neo-Assyrian ritual tablets also contain the note that they were copied and checked against originals, indicating not only that copying continued, but also that a scribe sustained an attitude of respectful copying even once formal education had been completed.[98] The Priestly text contains a few passages whose underlying text may represent a similar practice of producing ritual texts for particular occasions. These include the yearly *kippurîm* ritual in Leviticus 16, the *śōṭāh* ritual in Numbers 5, and possibly the Passover ritual in Exodus 12. In all of these cases, the Priestly text provides instructions for complex rituals involving multiple stages and unusual circumstances. A professional may have produced new copies of these texts when the occasion arose that demanded their execution. That even yearly rituals could see such copying is borne out by the multiple copies of the Shebaṭ-Adar complex from the Neo-Assyrian ritual archives, including the notation that a particular tablet was "written according to an older copy and checked."[99]

This brief survey of scribal culture highlights major features of the relationship between texts and writers.[100] At every stage of scribal education, students were expected to copy texts.

---

[97] SAA X 194, 201, 240, 245, 255, 263, 289.

[98] SAA XX 1.r.26; 17.r.14; 18.r.6; 24.r.45'; 25.r.48'; 26.r.43'; 27.r.41'; 32.r.23; 37.r.24; 49.199; 50.r.ii.7'; 51.r.ii.15'. Note that a set of these texts, SAA XX 24-27, are Neo-Assyrian copies of texts that identify themselves as Middle-Assyrian rituals originating in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (r. 1243-1207), testifying to the longevity of texts (if not copies) within ritual archives.

[99] SAA XX 1.r.26. See SAA XX 1-6, 9-11 for overlapping texts related to the Shebaṭ-Adar complex. For further examination of the texts related to this ritual complex, see discussion below.

[100] In the preceding we have intentionally been noncommittal towards a chronological setting for this scribal education. This follows from a comparison between the Priestly text and Ezekiel, which suggests a continuity in scribal culture, regardless of the relative order of these texts. A comparison of overlapping domains of knowledge in Ezekiel and the Priestly text—defined as broad areas in which a person has received some form of education or training—suggests that the broad outlines of the scribal curriculum remained the same. This is most strongly indicated by the fact that both corpora display overlaps in several *types* of knowledge (e.g., chronographic structure, architectural description, cosmology, cosmography/geography, cultic/ritual texts with preservation of disjunctive

These copies were evaluated by their teachers, encouraging a bias towards the preservation of traditional texts through the evaluation of their performance on these tasks. The copying and memorization of texts continued, even when they were supplemented and completed through practice and oral instruction. The texts chosen as part of a scribal education also emphasized a process of identity formation. This identity formation took place at both the general level of cultivating a scribal attitude and a familiarity with cultural—in our case, Israelite/Judahite—traditions and at the more specific level of professionalization within a specialty. Understanding the production of texts in the ancient Near East requires us to understand scribal culture and what role these features played in the composition process.

The Neo-analytic approach to the Priestly text allows us to contextualize that work within this scribal culture and the attitudes it inculcates. The respect for already-existing texts explains the Priestly author's preservation of disjunctive forms, such as the third-person references to Yhwh, and the non-harmonization of texts concerned with the same topic. It also explains the fact that the material that most directly contextualizes and comments on these non-narrative texts occurs at the beginning and ending of the divine speeches through which the Priestly author has narrativized their content. The use of narrative renderings of non-narrative instructions (e.g., Leviticus 8; cf. Exodus 29) to offer further interpretation both shows this bias towards preservation and possibly reflects the practice and oral instruction that would accompany the copying and memorization of certain texts. Scribal education's emphasis on the creation of an identity and the reinforcement of that identity through connections to Israelite antiquity virtually describes the scope and content of the Priestly text. The professionalization aspects of the advanced scribal curriculum are echoed by the content and emphases within the Priestly text that

---

features). Due to the fact that Ezekiel's training would have taken place prior to 597, this similarity again highlights the Iron Age/late-monarchic roots of the Priestly text regardless of whether one accepts or rejects the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis. A study on this issue is in preparation by the author.

led scholars to give it this title in the first place. Finally, the fact that several texts embedded within P can plausibly be identified with different stages of the scribal curriculum provide us with a setting within which to understand the Priestly author's primary contact with and continued access to this variety of material.

In other words, the Neo-analytic framework provides a cultural and institutional matrix—grounded in the actual practices of ancient Near Eastern scribal education and text production—within which to construe the composition of the Priestly text. To better flesh out the implications of this image for the shape and form of the Priestly text, we turn now to ritual archives and texts from Sargonid-era Aššur, home of the main temple of the national god of Assyria.

Looking East: Neo-Assyrian Archives and Ritual Texts

Just as data from Mesopotamia help us fill in the gaps in our knowledge of scribal education, so too does it provide us with actual archives (or libraries) of ritual and cultic texts.[101] We can examine these archaeologically-recovered collections of texts to test the Neo-analytic supposition that the Priestly text owes its shape and form to the Priestly author's drawing on a similar collection for the non-narrative materials embedded in the Priestly narrative. We will train our attention primarily on the family library of Kiṣir-Aššur, the *āšipu*/*mašmassu* of the Ešarra, the temple of the god Aššur.[102] In line with our contention that we should compare like to like, this allows us to look at an archive that is roughly contemporaneous with the late-monarchic

[101] Pedersén 1998: 3 distinguishes between libraries ("…a collection of texts normally with multiple copies for use in different places at different times, and includes, e.g., literary, historical, religious, and scientific texts.") and archives ("…a collection of texts, each text documenting a message or statement, for example, letters, legal, economic, and administrative documents."). His distinction, necessary for his own discussion and description, is not relevant to our own discussion here—we will use the terms archive and library interchangeably in what follows. The continued use of the term archive allows us to emphasize the longevity and institutional orientation of these collections of texts.

[102] On the various names for this temple and its parts, see van Driel 1969: 34-37. For a general orientation towards the *āšipu*, see Schwemer 2011. The essays in Steinert 2018 provide an approach to this professional class through the disciplinary catalogues, including discussions of the relationship between *āšipūtu* and *asûtu*.

Judean setting that we have argued is the most likely source of the non-narrative materials in P. It will also enable us to see what the collection of a leading cultic functionary of the temple of a national god looked like. We can treat the collection of texts belonging to such a figure as analogous to the range of texts that may have been collected by a major functionary of the Jerusalem temple, also the temple of a national god.

The library archive belonging to Kiṣir-Aššur and his family was recovered from a private house in the city Aššur, presumably belonging to this family.[103] The house was located in the central temple area of the city, about 300 meters south of the Ešarra.[104] The colophons from texts in this library make it clear that it was compiled over at least three generations—the focal point appears to be Kiṣir-Aššur, with the library also containing texts attributed to his father Nabû-bēssunu and his nephew Kiṣir-Nabû. All three of these men were trained in *āšipūtu* ("exorcism") with the latter two attaining the title of *āšipu* of the Aššur Temple. In the case of Kiṣir-Aššur, the colopha attest to his journey through the scribal curriculum, starting as a *šamallû ṣeḫru* ("junior student") and then passing through four intermediate stages before attaining to his ultimate title as *āšipu* of the Aššur Temple.

The archive itself is supremely impressive, containing some 630 tablets.[105] The majority of these tablets, approximately 470, were found together in a single room dubbed the "Library Room." As implied by their sheer number, these tablets contain a wide variety of texts spanning many genres. The library includes a number of texts related to the discipline of *āšipūtu*, as one might expect. This includes two copies of the so-called Exorcist's Manual, a list of the corpora

[103] For a family tree and discussion of Kiṣir-Aššur's family, as reconstructed from colopha on tablets in this collection, see Hunger 1968: 19-20 and Pedersén 1986: 44-47, from which the following descriptions are drawn.
[104] See Fig. 24 in SAA XX for map of this area, marking both the "Enlil/Aššur Tempel" (Ešarra) and the "Haus des Beschwörungs-priesters," the location of this archive.
[105] See Pedersén 1986: 41-76 for a description of the archaeological context, a thematic overview of the contents of the archive, and a full catalogue of tablets.

an *āšipu* was expected to master.[106] We also find portions of every major incantation series (e.g., *Utukkū Lemnūtu*, *bīt mēseri*, the Lamaštu series, *maqlû*, *šurpu*, and several namburbi rituals including one for cult offenses) as well as several other incantation series.[107] In addition to the incantation series themselves, the library also contains commentaries on several of the major series. There are also a large number of related healing texts, cataloguing medicinal plants and stones and describing their preparation as treatments and amulets. Many of these texts can be correlated, by either title or content, with the list of *āšipūtu*-lore contained in the Exorcist's Manual.[108]

Outside of these disciplinary-specific texts, the Kiṣir-Aššur library also contains the remnants of the earliest stages of scribal education—a sign list, a syllable alphabet, lexical lists, god lists, synonym lists, and a metrological text. The presence of such texts in this library is an indicator that early scribal education likely took place within the family. However, the retention of particular texts on school (i.e., practice) tablets suggests that such items were at least sometimes kept by students.

The above texts are all related in one way or another to the education and professionalization of an aspiring *āšipu*. Beyond these texts, this library also demonstrates the way that this family's work with the Ešarra influenced their text production and storage habits. Due to the work that Kiṣir-Aššur and his father did at the Aššur Temple, their library contains a number of overlapping ritual texts describing the state rituals undertaken by the Assyrian king in the Ešarra as part of the Šebaṭ-Adar ritual complex.[109] Some of these texts are phrased as instructions (SAA XX 1, 3), while others are phrased as though they are reports of past

[106] See n. 89 above.
[107] For the namburbi rituals from this archive related to cultic offenses, see Caplice 1970: 124-132.
[108] See the fuller description in Pedersén 1986: 48-56 for a true appreciation of the scope of the disciplinary texts in this library.
[109] On the festivals in this month, see van Driel 1969: 140-145; Pongratz-Leisten 2017: xlvii-lvi.

performances (SAA XX 10, 11).[110] There are also texts describing rituals in the temple of Assyrian Ištar (SAA XX 17, 21) and a liturgical manual connected to the *tākultu*-ritual (SAA XX 37).[111] Finally, six different copies of a text known as the "Cultic Topography of Aššur" (or the "Addressbook of the Gods"), a list of temples, rooms, gods, and gates of the city Aššur (SAA XX 49) were also found in this library. This text likely had both a practical and educational purpose, encouraging the memorization of key information necessary for the care-taking and daily service of the Aššur Temple. All of these texts find practical expression in a handful of offering lists that reflect the administrative aspect of temple service.[112]

The library also contains new copies of antique royal decrees from the time of Tukulti-Ninurta I (r. 1243-1207) and Shalmaneser (III? r. 858-824) related to the prebendary distribution and personnel of the Ešarra (SAA XII 68; XX 51).[113] This interest in older texts extends to ritual texts as well, as evidenced by the presence of a Middle Assyrian tablet in this library (SAA XX 29). If this text was of more than simply antiquarian interest, then it is also evidence that the priests of this household engaged in rituals outside of the royal realm, directed instead at the initiation of others into Ištar's mysteries (SAA XX 29).[114]

---

[110] SAA XX 9 also likely belongs to this library (designated N4 by Pedersén 1986). XX 9 is a join of Istanbul texts A125+A181, neither of which have preserved excavation numbers as far as this author could locate. However, a look at the surrounding Istanbul Museum numbers is at least suggestive. The texts on either side of A125 are A122-124 (fragments of Gilgamesh VI), from the N3 archive in Aššur, and A126 (SAA XX 3), from our N4 archive. The texts on either side of A181 are A180 (a list of amulet stones), from N4, and A183 (a namburbi ritual) from N4 (note that A182 does not have a locatable recorded excavation number). The fact that three of the four texts on either side of A125+A181 are from the N4 archive suggests that these fragments are from there as well. Given the lack of similar ritual texts in the N3 archive, which belonged to a *kalû* (Pedersén 1986: 34-41), it is likely that SAA XX 9 (A125+A181) belongs with its parallels (SAA XX 10, 11) as part of the N4 library of Kiṣir-Aššur's family.

[111] On this liturgical manual, see Frankena 1954; van Driel 1969: 60-69.

[112] See Pedersén 1986: 58 for the N4 catalogue numbers. The majority of these have not been edited, save N4.316 in Menzel 1981: II.T17-T18 (text 15) and N4.461 in Menzel 1981: II.T22 (text 20). For similar records to these fragments, see SAA VII 158-219.

[113] SAA XX 51 may also mention Sennacherib (r.i.1' reads ^{m}30 before it breaks off). If this is the case, then this multi-column text, now only a fragment, may have been a compilation of ordinances from several different kings—see SAA XII 77 for an example of such a text from a different archive. In terms of content, it may also reflect assignments of responsibility similar to SAA XX 50.

[114] See Oppenheim 1966 for analysis of this ritual.

Other texts appear to reflect an engagement with ritual responsibilities that move beyond a mere commitment to their performance. Kiṣir-Aššur personally copied a tablet containing a compilation of mystical and esoteric lore that includes the mythological interpretation of particular rituals, particularly the state rituals so central to the Ešarra's cult (SAA III 39).[115] This library also contains a copy of the Neo-Assyrian "Assur Version" of the Marduk Ordeal (SAA III 34). This text represents an Assyrian mythological reinterpretation of the Babylonian *akītu*-festival, likely formulated as part of Sennacherib's religious response to his destruction of Babylon and seizure of items from the Esagila.[116] The presence of such texts indicates an interest in not just carrying our rituals, but in understanding their theological content and meaning.

However, this archive does not stop at these professional limits. In addition to texts related to beginning education, the discipline of the *āšipu*, and texts related to their work in the Ešarra, this archive also contains a number of literary texts. This includes fragments of three of the five tablets of the *Erra* epic, one being an amulet-shaped copy of tablet V.[117] Also present was a fragment of tablet II of the *Lugal-e* epic. Both of these texts have a possible relationship with the *āšipūtu* corpus—*Erra*'s use as a protective amulet and the judgement of the stones in *Lugal-e* are not unrelated to the apotropaic function of a part of this discipline's practice.[118] Nevertheless, these texts do not exhaust the literary corpus of this archive and so we should not rush to attribute their presence solely to disciplinary concerns.

The other major literary pieces contained in this archive include two of the so-called "fictional Akkadian autobiographies" or "prophecies"—those of Šulgi and Marduk.[119] There is

[115] On the various sections of this text, see Livingstone 1986: 82-91, 94-111, 124-125, 131, 134-136, 145-148, 153-170, 233-235. Horowitz 2011: 3-19 offers detailed commentary on SAA III 39.o.30-38.
[116] Freymer-Kensky 1983; Livingstone 1986: 205-253; Barcina 2017.
[117] Pedersén 1986: 56. See Reiner 1960 for a study of the Erra epic amulets.
[118] See also, Lambert 1962: 64-65 for a catalogue text that attributes both the *āšipūtu* corpus and *Lugal-e* to the god Ea.
[119] Grayson & Lambert 1964; Longman 1991.

also a copy of the so-called Weidner Chronicle, detailing the calamities suffered by ancient kings who neglected or changed the service and offerings for the Esagila temple.[120] Related to these texts, which focus on Babylonian antiquity, is the Sargon Geography, a speculative literary text that attempts to map the peoples and lands of the world by reference to an imagined empire of Sargon of Akkade reconstructed from the various legends that had grown around that figure.[121] Finally, the most impressive literary text in this collection is Sargon II's Letter to Aššur, concerning that king's 8th campaign, launched against Urartu.[122] This text is one of the most compelling pieces of Neo-Assyrian literature, a campaign report formatted as though it were a letter addressed to Aššur himself. While it shares many features with other types of Assyrian Royal Inscriptions—including lists of cities and depictions of battle—this text is marked by elevated, epical language, ethnographic curiosity, and vivid descriptions of an Urartian royal city. Moreover, the tablet itself was carefully and lovingly produced, with clear handwriting and ten-marks in the margin—it almost certainly served as a display object in the Ešarra before finding its way into this collection. This is a unique text and its place in the Kiṣir-Aššur archive crowns the breadth and complexity of the collection held by this high-ranking cultic functionary.

Iron Age II Judah was not Neo-Assyria. Nevertheless, this does not require us to limit the possible cultural riches of Judah, but only the scale. The archival library of a priest of the Jerusalem temple almost certainly contained fewer texts than the Kiṣir-Aššur archive, but it likely held the same variety of texts. In fact, the Priestly text itself seems to reflect this diversity. The ritual texts of the Kiṣir-Aššur archive contain instructions for rituals similar to, *mutatis*

[120] See Glassner 2004: 263-269 (text 38) for recent edition; Grayson 1975: 43-45, 145-151 (text 19) for an older edition with commentary.
[121] Grayson 1974/77; Horowitz 2011: 67-95 for editions and commentary. See Westenholz 1997 for a collection of other Sargon material, some of which likely served as the basis for the speculation of the Sargon Geography.
[122] RINAP 2 65 for edition; Oppenheim 1960 for the setting for such texts. For other examples of the genre, see RINAP 4 33 (Esarhaddon); RINAP 5/2 194-195 (Ashurbanipal).

mutandis, the instructions of Exodus 29 and Leviticus 16.[123] That these ritual texts deal in annual rituals and correspond to particular days suggests the source material for a digest such as Leviticus 23's calendar. The texts devoted to specific parts of disciplinary practice reflect the texts in Leviticus 1-5; 11-15. The copies of decrees dictating the distribution of sacrificial perquisites mirror the tariffs in Leviticus 6-7. The namburbi for absolution from violations of ritual and cultic responsibility suggests an underlying tradition such as that found in Leviticus 21-22. While not a perfect parallel, the Exorcist's Manual's attempt to arrange all the components of *āšipūtu* into a single list for a student to master echoes the compendious nature of Leviticus 19.[124] The presence of administrative documents related to the Ešarra suggest the type of administrative training implied by Numbers 1 and 7. The Marduk Prophecy, a first-person speech from a god claiming authority over both calamity and abundance in response to obedience and disobedience—in terms both cultic and moral—brings Leviticus 26 to mind. Even where we find a lack of parallels—such as in the case of the type of legal texts underlying Leviticus 20 and 25—this is simply a byproduct of our choice to examine the Kiṣir-Aššur library in particular. The archive of the Aššur temple itself, where Kiṣir-Aššur family's served, includes both ritual components and legal texts.[125]

Yet the above parallels in practical material do not exhaust the ways in which the Priestly text appears to reflect the intellectual range of the Kiṣir-Aššur archive. Texts like SAA III 39 offer speculative comments on the nature and structure of the cosmos (o.30-r.3), echoing the cosmological speculation of Genesis 1. The Sargon Geography attempts to map the world through a list of peoples and lands, not unlike the "Table of Nations" in Genesis 10*. The

[123] See Lambert 1993 for a study of the nature of Mesopotamian offerings and how they differ from the Levantine tradition. Gaspa 2012 specifically studies the role of meat offerings in the Neo-Assyrian state cult.
[124] It is perhaps worth considering whether some of the shorter statements in Leviticus 19 may be incipits pointing to other texts now lost to us, though this likely pushes the analogy too far.
[125] Pedersén 1986: 12-28.

existence of cultic commentaries in this archive suggests a curiosity towards the received tradition that finds its parallel throughout the Priestly text, in its attempts to embed that tradition into a narrative of national origins. Finally, the presence of literary texts, almost all of which deal with the deep past, reflects the choice of the Priestly author to make his own attempt to craft a narrative of his culture's antiquity.[126]

The content of the Priestly text is remarkably similar to the contents of the Kiṣir-Aššur family archive—too similar to dismiss the resemblance as mere coincidence. Instead, we should acknowledge that the Priestly text offers us a glimpse into the contents of the archives kept by a highly-ranked priest of the Jerusalem temple.

If the contents of such an archive offers a parallel to the variety of texts contained in P, this is not the limit of what they can tell us about the Priestly text's composition. An examination of the ritual texts in this archive demonstrate that a number of the features of the Priestly text that scholars attribute to editorial layers or supplementation—usually explained by way of an ideological motivation—are, in fact, simply what practical texts from an archive look like. In what follows, we will examine the texts concerning the state rituals for the Šebaṭ-Adar festival complex.

---

[126] This same impulse may also be reflected in the Priestly text's relationship to the prior JE text, see Mowinckel 1964b: 26-43; McEvenue 1971; Friedman 1981a: 46-47, 76-77. For a recent rejection of this idea, see Baden 2009b: 197-207. Baden's argument, however, relies on far too narrow and literal a concept of dependence. In particular, his claim that we should expect direct verbal correspondence in order to establish dependency is misguided (see, e.g., the continued fruitful arguments over the relationship between John and the Synoptics). Moreover, he is simply wrong when he claims that we have no such examples within the Priestly text—Gen 48:7 (P) quotes Gen 35:16-20 (E), taking an almost verbatim statement and modifying it with his own characteristic language and narrative viewpoint. Exod 7:1 (P) quotes Exod 4:16 (E), again with modifications towards the Priestly perspective. Num 14:28 (P) quotes Num 14:21 (J), both being the only use of the phrase *ḥy ʾny* in the entire Pentateuch, both occurring in the same narrative situation in the two different sources. In a more tenuous, but interesting, case, both Num 16:3 (P) and 16:13 (JE) use hithpael verbal forms (*nśʾ* tD and *śrr* tD, respectively) as the core of the accusation against Moses from the Levites and Reubenites, respectively (see Chapter 6). Finally, Baden's attempt to dismiss the similarity scholars have seen between J and P both beginning with creation by asking how else they could have started is falsified by the complete lack of any other narratives from the ancient Near East that open with creation as the introduction to a narrative of national origins. Only the J (and, by extension, JE) and P texts do this. While this is not necessarily evidence of dependence, it certainly deserves deeper consideration than the rhetorical brush off Baden provides.

The Kiṣir-Aššur archive contains six texts concerning the celebration of the Šebaṭ-Adar festival.[127] Two of these texts are instructions for carrying out the appropriate rituals in the Aššur temple (SAA XX 1, 3), three of them are narrations or reports of these rituals' execution (SAA XX 9, 10, 11), and one is a broader liturgical manual, copied by Kiṣir-Aššur, whose material is relevant for part of the Šebaṭ-Adar celebration (SAA XX 37). In addition to these texts, we will also examine two texts from Nineveh, both dealing with the same ritual complex and connected with their execution in the Ešarra.[128] One of these is another tablet containing instructions for these rituals (SAA XX 2); the other is a "manual" containing the appropriate incantation-songs the *kalû* was supposed to perform in the Aššur temple during the Šebaṭ-Adar cycle (SAA XX 12).[129] The majority of these texts are not whole, but represent fragments from originally larger tablets.

These tablets come in a variety of formats—some are large, multicolumn tablets (SAA XX 2, 9), others are single column tablets. Single-column tablets, both large and small, are known in both portrait and landscape (*uʾiltu*) orientation (SAA XX 3). Some have catch lines suggesting that they belong to a series (SAA XX 1, 2, 3). Three texts have colophons—two stating that they were copied from originals (or "older texts") and checked (SAA XX 1.r.26; 37.r.24-25) and one stating that it was copied (or extracted) for someone else to check (SAA XX 9.r.iv.23'). Additionally, these ritual texts have three different primary forms of verbal expression. In some instruction texts (SAA XX 1, 2, 3), the verbs are in the third-person durative. In others (SAA XX 12, 37), the instructions are phrased in the second-person

[127] This count includes SAA XX 9, whose association with this archive is only a matter of guesswork. See n. 109 for justification.
[128] Due to the nature of the Kuyunjik excavations, it is frequently difficult to assign texts from Nineveh to a more specific setting. See Pedersén 1998: 158-165.
[129] For a general orientation to the *kalû*, see Löhnert 2011. For a study of the *kalû*-priest during the Neo-Assyrian period, see Gabbay 2014.

durative.[130] Finally, ritual reports (SAA XX 9, 10, 11) are expressed primarily in the third-person perfect.[131]

Even this general overview demonstrates that ritual texts had no single form of expression.[132] They were copied multiple times and could be arranged and conveyed in many different ways. To this, we should add that our texts, despite their fragmentary state of preservation, nevertheless frequently overlap each other. Both SAA XX 9 and 10, from the same archive, describe ritual events that took place on the 17th-21st of Šebaṭ. SAA XX 1 and 2, from different archives, cover the rituals for the 18th-22nd of Šebaṭ. The catch line of SAA XX 1 describes the major ritual of the 23rd of Šebaṭ, enabling us to compare it to SAA XX 3's instructions—rendered in a completely different format—for that day. The variety of formats and the duplication among these tablets suggest that these texts served a practical purpose, whether that was for education, reference, or, though unlikely, as a kind of script.

We will begin our examination with SAA XX 37, a liturgical manual that is both related to the *tākultu* texts (SAA XX 38-48) and contains instructions that are broadly applicable to provisioning ceremonies.[133] The obverse of the tablet is divided into two parts, one describing a liturgy for the Aššur temple in Aššur (o.1-8)—relevant to the Šebaṭ-Adar complex—and one describing a liturgy for the Ištar temple in Nineveh (o.9-.31). On the reverse, the instructions can be divided into roughly three parts—the first dealing with the prayer that accompanies the presentation of wine and beer (r.1-6), the second dealing with the prayer that accompanies salt offerings to the major god of various temples (r.7-17), and the third containing the prayers for

[130] Note that all of the verbs in SAA XX 12 are logographic, making it difficult to determine their precise valence, though they are likely intended to be read as second-person durative, cf. XX 13.o.2; r.6'.
[131] See discussion below for more details.
[132] See SAA XX for more details.
[133] van Driel 1969: 60-69.

what appears to be a miscellanea of ritual acts (r.18-23). Throughout the text, instructions are rendered in the second-person durative.

SAA XX 37 provides an interesting case study in the type of variability that can occur in a single ritual text. The first section on the obverse (o.1-8) is largely paralleled by the opening part of the second section (o.9-16), with the differences between the two largely occurring as a result of their association with different temples. Nevertheless, we should note that these are clearly two versions of the same rituals with an identical liturgy—their slight variations should caution us against assuming that every description of a ritual must needs be identical. Nor should we ignore the possibility that the Jerusalem temple may have had ritual texts, with slightly different procedures, that originated from other sacred precincts in the Judah.

Beyond these variations in the ritual itself, we also find variations in their written expression. Either Kiṣir-Aššur or the exemplar from which he copied chose to render a particular ritual act ([*ša–tēlissi*] *šētequ*) by a ditto sign (KI.MIN) in the first section (SAAA XX 37.o.6), while describing the corresponding action in an unnecessarily full form—reintroducing the *ša–tēlissi* object—in the second section (o.14).[134]

[134] Note that the use of the ditto sign would have been unavailable in section 2 due to the fact that the swinging of the purification device in o.14 follows a different act, "not drawing near" (*lā qarābi*) in o.13. Nevertheless, this did not make it necessary to reintroduce the "purification device."

37.o.5-7	…*tal-˹lak˺ ina kaq-qar še-ḫa-ti tu-še-taq* [MURUB$_4$ É *ṣa-bit ta-qab-bi t*]*u-ta-ra ina* UGU *še-ḫa-a-ti* KI.MIN[135] [^{d}GIŠ.BAR *li-lil ta-qab-bi*]…
37.o.13-14	…*ta-lak ˹ina˺ kaq-qar še-ḫa-ti la qa-ra-bi* MURUB$_4$ É *ṣa-bit ta-qab-bi* *tu-˹ta˺-ra ina* UGU *še-eḫ-ti šá–te-li-si tu-še-taq* ^{d}GIŠ.BAR *li-l*[*il ta-qab-bi*]

Figure 5.1: SAA XX 37 Comparison 1

Variations in the written expression of the ritual are also apparent in the sections on the reverse of the tablet. The first section (SAA XX 37.r.1-6) opens by stating the prayer spoken to Aššur and his consort when presenting wine and beer to them: "Aššur, bless Mullissu! Mullissu, may Aššur bless you!" (r.2: ^{d}*Aššur Mullissu kurub* ^{d}*Mullissu Aššur likrubki*).[136] After a ruling on the tablet, the instructions—minus the mention of wine and beer—repeat for the god Sîn, with his name and the name of his consort, Nikkal, in the otherwise identical prayer (r.3-4). After another ruling, the text abbreviates further, stating "Before Šamaš, like this (*kī annim-ma*)" (r.5). This abbreviation has dispensed with the items being offered, the verb of offering, the content of the prayer, and a verb of speaking related to the prayer. What follows is an even further abbreviation: "Before Adad, ditto. Before Bēl, ditto. Before Nabû, ditto" (r.5-6).[137] The summary statement at the instruction's end mediates among the abbreviations: "Before all the gods, you will speak like this (*kī annim-ma taqabbi*)" (r.6).[138] Again, we see that the same ritual activities can be described in various ways. As importantly, we can see that such ritual instructions rely on the reader or user to have a thorough acquaintance with the cultural background—the names of

[135] This is what SAA XX 37.o.6 reads, based on Parpola's collation, and also what Ebeling 1952: 130 restores on this line. However, Müller's handcopy of VAT 8005 (included in SAA XX, p. 234f.) reads the last two signs of this line as *šú-nu* (presumably to be read in continuity with the preceding word, yielding *še-ḫa-a-ti-šú-nu*). The latter reading is sensible in and of itself, but then renders this a verbless instruction. Based on the parallel with 37.o.14 and in the absence of an available photograph for further collation, the KI.MIN reading of Parpola and Ebeling seems preferable. The choice to ditto the ritual action here is interesting, as the expected *tu-še-taq* (cf. XX 1.o.14-17) would hardly take up more space than KI.MIN does and, as the writing of line 7 shows, Kiṣir-Aššur was willing to wrap a line onto the edge of the tablet where that was necessary (likely to make sure the lineation of his new tablet matched the exemplar).

[136] Note the scribe's omission of the DINGIR determinative before the name Aššur in the second part of the prayer.

[137] Note that the ditto sign here is MIN rather than KI.MIN as in section 1 on the obverse.

[138] Compare with SAA XX 15.r.i.19'-r.ii.11 for a slightly different pattern of abbreviations in the same instructions.

the consorts of Šamaš, Adad, Bēl, and Nabû are omitted on the understanding that the offerer will still know what to say. This is an excellent illustration of the fact that ritual instructions are not intended to be a full explanation of a system, but instead rely on the assumed cultural knowledge of their audience.

We find a different pattern of abbreviation in the second section of the reverse (SAA XX 37.r.7-17). This section provides the prayers to be spoken when scattering salt before the main god of temples in various cities, with each instruction being separated by a ruling. The first set of instructions offers the model from which the others are abbreviated (r.7-8). After this, the instructions are abbreviated in a variety of ways. In the two that immediately follow, the verbal phrase indicating the ritual act is abbreviated by ditto mark (MIN) for the next two instructions (r.9-10). The next two instructions are given in full just like the first one (r. 11-14).[139] After this, the scribe uses two ditto marks in each of the next three instructions, one to replace the entire ritual act—divine names, salt, and verb—and the other to replace everything from the prayer except the divine names (r.15-17). Across eight sets of instructions, there are three different forms of expression. Again, we see that there is no fixed way of describing ritual activities.[140]

37.r.7-8, 11-14	*kī ina* GN *ṭābta ina pān* DN *ana karārikāni* DN *balāṭu taqabbi*
37.r.9-10	*kī ina* GN *ina pān* DN *ṭābta* MIN DN *balāṭu taqabbi*
37.r.15-17	*kī ina* GN MIN DN MIN

Figure 5.2: SAA XX 37 Comparison 2

[139] There is one small difference among the instructions that are given in full—the placement of the MUN logogram, which occurs immediately following the god's name in r.11 and r.14 rather than immediately following the geographic name as in r.7.

[140] Compare with SAA XX 15.r.ii.12-34, which shows a different pattern of abbreviation for the same set of instructions.

All of the above should lead us to be skeptical of expectations of consistency, such as Noth's insistence that the different sections of Leviticus 3, which are similar but distinct, "correspond even more closely in the unedited original than in the text before us."[141]

From the same archive, the instructions on SAA XX 1 begin on the 18th day of Šebaṭ, whose ritual partially parallels the one described in SAA XX 37.o.1-8.[142] Here, however, the instructions are phrased in the third-person durative (rather than the second person), with the king as the express subject. Furthermore, the ritual activities from SAA XX 37 are now embedded within a larger ritual complex, which engenders changes in how they are carried out. In particular, the ritual surrounding the first prayer is different (SAA XX 1.o.11-13 // 37.o.1-2), involving the offering of "hand-water" (*mê qāti*) and the strewing of salt both before and after the prayer to the gods. Such changes call to mind the differences scholars have noted between Exodus 29's and Leviticus 4's *ḥaṭṭāʾt* procedures. In Chapter 2, we argued that such differences are unlikely to be due to editorial layers or an evolutionary development of the ritual, but are instead a byproduct of Exodus 29 embedding the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* ritual within the ritual for inaugurating a priest. Here we have a precise parallel. SAA XX 37.o.1-8 preserves the general instructions for a particular provisioning ritual in the Aššur temple, while SAA XX 1 contains instructions for how that provisioning ritual is executed when embedded in the Šebaṭ-Adar complex.

---

[141] 1965: 31.

[142] That this tablet begins on the 18th may indicate that it is the second in a series, the first of which would have described the activities on the 16th-17th days (cf. XX 9.o.i.5). While this is possible, SAA XX 9 and 10 suggest that the rituals performed on these first two days were not nearly as expansive—see the relative amount of time spent on Shebat 16-17 versus Shebat 18 in XX 9 and Shebat 17 versus Shebat 18 in XX 10. Note the catch line at the end that indicates the continuation of the series on at least one more tablet (possibly a text like SAA XX 6). A comparison with SAA XX 2 presents an interesting picture. SAA XX 1 is 38+26 lines long, while SAA XX 2, which presumably originally began with the Shebat 16-17 is missing only about 32 lines + 2 partially preserved lines before its extant portion begins with the Shebat 18 ritual. Based on SAA XX 2, it does not appear that there would have been enough text to fill a tablet of the same size as SAA XX 1 if it we were to imagine it as the second in a sequence. These considerations suggest the following, given the colophon's claim of being a copy, that SAA XX 1 represents a sequence as small as 2 tablets that were excerpted from a tablet similar to SAA XX 2 and intended to cover only a particular part of the Shebat-Adar sequence. This suggests that excerpts from the larger ritual complex could easily be made for particular reasons, about which we may speculate—perhaps days 18-22 and 23+ were particularly complicated or perhaps they involved a different set of actors than days 16-17.

Further investigation of SAA XX 1 reveals other interesting facets of how different kinds of information are integrated into ritual instructions. As the text comes to a close with its instructions for Šebaṭ 22nd, we are informed that "the governor supplies (food) for the *quršu*-offering of Mullissu" (XX 1.r.18).[143] Here we have instructions about provisioning—an activity that is not a direct part of the performance of the ritual—integrated into the instructions. What is more, after this brief note, the text then lists which gods are supposed to go with Aššur to the Dagan Temple. This procession to the Dagan Temple in Aššur is a key part of the celebration of the 22nd day, so that this list of gods comes after the conclusion of the ritual activities for which they are necessary.[144] Here we have a set of ritual instructions that includes instructions not directly relevant to their performance and that presents information in a disordered fashion. This should lead us to be suspicious of arguments that disorder and the presence of heterogeneous information are a clear indicator of editorial supplementation. This is simply not how actual ritual texts work—a single document can contain a variety of information.

This archive also reveals the sometimes major discrepancies that can occur between two sets of instructions for the same ritual. A catch line at the end of SAA XX 1 informs us that the king would perform the *mīs pê* ritual on the 23rd day. However, when we turn to SAA XX 3, a tablet regarding this day from the same archive, we find no mention of the *mīs pê* ritual. Instead, we are told that the king "makes the face [of Aššur] shine" (*zīmu ušanmar*), a phrase that recurs for the ritual on the 24th (3.o.1, 11). This may be related to the function of this tablet, whose closing line describes it as a list of the *dariu* ("regular offerings") to be performed on the 23rd-25th. In other words, the *mīs pê* ritual may be outside of its purview. However, this text provides instructions for several other ritual acts that don't involve the regular offerings, so this

[143] See SAA VII 209 for an administrative record reflecting a governor's offerings to the Aššur temple on Šebaṭ 22.
[144] The description of Aššur's procession to the Dagan temple is, unfortunately, lost in a lacuna on this and every tablet that deals with this ritual complex. However, that this occurred on the 22nd is secured by SAA III 40.o.8

explanation appears weak. Furthermore, given its use as an identified of this day in SAA XX 1, one would expect the *mīs pê* to occur as at least a chronological marker somewhere in XX 3's description of the 23rd day.

Two other data points have a bearing on this issue. The first is a ritual instruction tablet of uncertain origin (SAA XX 6).[145] This text possibly opens with a description of the 23rd day, immediately stating that the king performs the *mīs pê* ritual in agreement with XX 1's catch line.[146] This confirms that SAA XX 1 is neither idiosyncratic nor a mistake. The second is a report of the rituals performed during the Šebaṭ-Adar festival (SAA XX 9), likely from the same archive as SAA XX 1 and 3.[147] While the text is slightly damaged in its description of Šebaṭ 23, it appears to also omit the *mīs pê* ritual. What is more interesting is that it also does not reflect the instructions given in SAA XX 3.o.1. Instead, this tablet states that the king's first action on this day was that he "brought forth a censer and a torch" (XX 9.o.iii.15-16). This is either a third possible ritual act performed at the opening of Šebaṭ 23 or this statement is a prosaic version of XX 3's instructions to "illuminate the face" of the god. If the latter is the case, then we have another example of the variability available for describing ritual acts.

SAA XX 1.r.25 (Kiṣir-Aššur archive)	*ūm* 23 *šarru ina bēt danni mīs pê eppaš*
SAA XX 3.o.1 (Kiṣir-Aššur archive)	*ūm* 23 *šarru ina bēt ili urrad zīmu ušanmar*
SAA XX 9.o.15-16 (Kiṣir-Aššur archive?)	*ūm* 23 *šarru ana bēt ili ittarda* *nidnakku gizillû uqṭarrib*
SAA XX 6.o.1 (uncertain origin)	[*ūm* 23] *šarru ina bēt danni mīs pê eppaš*

Figure 5.3: The 23rd Day

However one explains SAA XX 9, we can not deny that SAA XX 3 and 9 either give different ritual instructions for the same day of the festival as SAA XX 1 or XX 3 and 9 omit a major ritual act despite containing otherwise detailed information. When we attempt to understand the

[145] SAAo marks this tablet as a Kuyunjik text, but the hand-copy in RIAA (text 315) labels it as coming from Šerqat (Aššur).
[146] Unfortunately this text is in very poor condition and the date has to be restored from SAA XX 1.
[147] For the argument that this text likely originates in the Kiṣir-Aššur archive, see n.107 above.

Priestly text, we must keep such variability in ritual texts in mind—especially since the Kiṣir-Aššur collection demonstrates that such variability can occur among document kept in a single archive.

The above case brings to mind the supposed disconnect between the instruction for the incense altar's atonement during the yearly *kippurîm* ritual (Exod 30:10) and its absence from the Day of Atonement ritual instructions in Leviticus 16. Scholars are accustomed to thinking of Leviticus as a comprehensive repository of ritual instructions laid out in a systematic manner.[148] However, once we view these ritual instructions as originating within a living cultic practice that produced and re-produced texts for various purposes, we immediately find better explanations for the supposed inconsistencies of the Biblical text. The Neo-Assyrian ritual archives demonstrate that no single ritual text needs to be complete in and of itself—both oral teaching and practical instruction, not to mention the living, sustained praxis, obviate this need. As importantly, different texts concerning the same ritual do not need to agree with each other in every single detail. van Driel has observed that texts describing yearly rituals are particularly susceptible to such variation, as what occurs in any particular year need not be what occurs every year.[149] Such disagreements do not indicate editorial layering in response to changing ideologies. They simply reflect the natural diversity of archival texts produced as part of a living praxis.

In a related vein, no particular text needs to be a comprehensive description of every part of a ritual activity. While our texts that contain instructions or descriptions for the performance of the Shebat-Adar rituals (SAA XX 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11) mention the raising and seating of chanter-priests (*kalû*), their role in the ceremony is not otherwise specified. Instead, a separate

[148] This is a byproduct of the Protestant influence on early critical biblical scholarship—the tendency is to assume that ancient Judahites used and viewed the Hebrew Bible in the same way that modern Protestants use and view the Bible.
[149] 1969: 121.

text, SAA XX 12, contains a list of the particular "lamentations" (*eršemmu*) that should accompany these rituals. This text not only has the names of the "lamentations" to be chanted on each day, but also what particular ritual actions are associated with each "lamentation." Without this text, we would not have clear insight into the role of the *kalû*-priests during the Shebat-Adar ritual complex.

This fact again provides insight into the structure of the Priestly text's arrangement of non-narrative texts. For example, the multiple speeches that contain instructions on the *šəlāmîm*-sacrifice (Lev 3:1-17; 7:11-21, 22-27, 28-34; 19:5-8; 22:21-25, 26-30) or the separation of the *kippurîm* ritual for the incense altar (Exod 30:10) from the rest of the *kippurîm* ritual (Leviticus 16) may be further examples of this kind of lack of ritual comprehensiveness. Without parallel evidence, it may have once been an acceptable expectation that any given description of ritual in the Bible should be a complete description of that ritual—comparison to actual ritual archives, however, demonstrates that this is an unproductive expectation that should be laid aside. Furthermore, the disarticulation of a particular ritual across several texts in the Neo-Assyrian ritual archive can not be attributed to any theological or ideological perspective. It is instead a purely practical feature related to the complexity of ritual events. When we turn to the ritual complexes described in the Priestly text, then, we should be wary of attributing any of these ritual dislocations to an ideological agenda rather than to the inherent nature of professional, ritual archives.

Yet another feature of these ritual texts that provides insight into the Priestly text is the occurrence of unexplained ritual actions. In the Šebaṭ-Adar ritual context, the king is instructed to perform funerary-offerings (*kispu ikassap* SAA XX 1.o.20, r.11; 2.ii.24'). The ritual for our funerary offerings are nowhere described in the Kiṣir-Aššur archive or commented upon further

in the Šebaṭ-Adar instructions. This is—like the knowledge of the gods' spouses in XX 37—part of the cultural background and related training of the ritual actors.

This brings to mind the various speeches in the Hebrew Bible that compare two rituals to each other or instruct an officiant to carry out a ritual in the same manner as a different one.[150] In the past these have been viewed as something like cross-references, especially since the comparisons tend to be to rituals previously described, such as when the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* procedures describe the manipulation of the corpse as happening "like what is removed from the ox of the *zebaḥ šəlāmîm*" (Lev 4:10) or when the text states that the *ʾāšām* should be sacrificed "in the place where they slaughter the *ʿōlāh*" (7:2). However, the cross-referential nature of these passages is likely illusory—a ritual text such as that supposed by the Neo-analytic framework to underlay Lev 4:1-5:13 or 6:17-7:21 was free to refer to other rituals and practices within the common knowledge of its intended audience. In other words, we do not need to posit that these references are additions by the Priestly author, they function just as well in the originally independent documents posited in the Neo-analytic model. Such statements were likely illustrative, in keeping with the place these texts may have had in the scribal curriculum. That they function so well in their current setting likely indicates that the arrangement of Leviticus 1-7 was based, at least in part, on their curricular order.

Yet another phenomenon that we see in our Šebaṭ-Adar texts involves the presence of blocks of material in one text that are absent from another. When we compare SAA XX 1, from the Kiṣir-Aššur archive, to SAA XX 2, from Nineveh, we find that XX 2 inserts a long block of incense offerings into the ritual for Šebaṭ 18. According to XX 1, after the performance of the *kispu*-ritual, the king takes a particular position in the temple and places specific parts of an ox and a sheep along with incense onto a "censers" (*šeḫtu*). He should then "treat the gods" (*ilāni*

[150] Lev 4:10, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33, 35; 5:10, 13; 6:18, 23; 7:2, 20-21.

uppaš) before burning oil and honey (XX 1.o.21-23). When we turn to SAA XX 2, we find that the text contains a seven-line list intervening between the instruction for the king to "treat the gods" (XX 2.i.28') and the instruction to burn oil and honey (XX 2.i.36')—instructions that occur on the same line in XX 1 (o.23). This list specifies the appropriate amount of incense for each of several censers. Barring further discoveries, it is impossible to determine whether XX 1 is abbreviating or XX 2 is expanding.

Nevertheless, the above case is rather interesting for the purposes of the Neo-analytic framework. Were a text such as SAA XX 2 in Leviticus (or, even, SAA XX 1 and 2), scholars would likely identify the list of incense offerings as an interpolation. They may or may not be correct about this, but the more important issue is where they would locate that interpolation—as an addition to the Priestly text itself rather than to the text that underlies the Priestly text. However, the Neo-analytic framework enables us to restore features of the non-narrative materials embedded into the Priestly text to a cultic and scribal *Sitz im Leben* based on comparative data such as these archival texts. This allows us to see that, if there are interpolations in the non-narrative materials in Leviticus, they are just as or more likely to be interpolations that were made into the underlying material, already present when they were received and used by the Priestly author.[151] The reuse and reproduction of originally independent

[151] Nihan 2007: 273-274 comes to a similar conclusion regarding the *ṣāraʿat* material in Leviticus 13-14: "However, contrary to the prevailing view, these observations merely imply that the *tôrâ* on *ṣāraʿat* of persons was gradually completed, at some stage of its transmission, by instructions for fabrics and houses that were derived from the principles laid out in 13:2-46. It is difficult to understand why such development should have occurred only after the Priestly writer edited 13:2-46, and the arguments that have usually been adduced in support of this theory are simply not compelling." Despite this observation from Nihan, he does not consider this precise scenario for any of the other texts to which he attributes developmental strata. Note too that Nihan still describes the Priestly author as the author of the text before us despite having sources: "[a source] which was certainly already known by the Priestly writer when he *composed* Lev 12–15 [emphasis added]."

ritual texts makes a far more compelling scenario for such adjustments than the supposition that the Priestly text, a narrative work, was supplemented in such a fashion.[152]

There are further signs that individual ritual texts are not internally consistent in their presentation. In our archive, SAA XX 9 appears to be a report of the Šebaṭ-Adar rituals performed by Ashurbanipal (9.o.i.1-4). Within this text, the actions of the participants are rendered in the perfect the majority of the time. However, there are several instances where the actions are instead described in the durative, just as in the instruction texts (9.0.i.17, 31'; r.iii.18', 20'-21', 23'). In his study of this text, van Driel suggests that the shift in tenses may be due to the use of an instruction text to fill in particular details.[153] Regardless, this is yet another indicator that formal consistency is not a consistent feature of archival texts.[154]

Outside of the Kiṣir-Aššur archive, a text from Nimrud/Kalḫu (SAA XX 55) contains another mix of perfect and durative verbs. Here, the obverse is mostly in the perfect, presented as the report of a ritual during the time of Sargon II (55.o.1-3; cf. 55.r.22'-23'). The reverse, on the other hand, is entirely in the durative, presenting instructions for a kind of ritual. While the relationship between the two sides is unclear due to the bottom of the tablet being broken, van Driel has suggested that the reverse may contain instructions for a ritual that was centered around the items whose installation was reported on the obverse.[155] If his interpretation is correct, here we have not only a mixing of tenses, but a mixture of two different forms of ritual text—report and instruction. We have already observed that ritual texts can contain composite types of

[152] This should give us pause over attempts to determine the relative dates of Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 (see, e.g., Milgrom 1991: 698-704; Nihan 2007: 288-294). Different cities or different contexts may have produced distinctive versions of the same underlying sources, in a small-scale version of Kaufmann 1972: 166-171's observation about the independent crystallizations of a common tradition.
[153] 1969: 72-73. Menzel 1981: II.T36 suggests that the perfect verbs all pertain to the king, while the durative verbs pertain to other cultic actors. A study of the text shows that this is not quite correct, as the king is at least once the subject of a durative (9.o.i.31').
[154] See also, van Driel 1969: 69's general comments on the nature the composite nature of numerous ritual texts, including the observation that "what was taken from elsewhere was not made into a really well-composed new text."
[155] 1969: 198-199.

information, here we see that whole forms can also be combined in a single text. In a similar vein, SAA XX 15, a ritual text from Aššur but not from the Kiṣir-Aššur archive, moves between third-person and second-person instructions in different parts of the text.

These examples bring to mind the mixed second- and third-person nature of Leviticus 11. The majority of this text is presented as second-person instructions, with a handful of instances of third person address (Lev 11:24b-25, 27b-28, 39b-40). Notably, in each of these cases the shift occurs when the manual changes topics from providing instructions on what is permissible to eat and handle to instructions on purification after contracting *ṭāmēʾ*, possibly indicating a generic convention. For example, the statement in Lev 11:24 begins "And by these you will be rendered unclean" before concluding with "anyone touching their corpses will be unclean until the evening." This same phenomena of midsentence switching of person is seen in the other passages as well (11:27, 39).[156]

SAA XX 52, of uncertain origin, presents us with an even larger variety of text types combined into a single document.[157] This document combines ritual instructions with provisioning lists, oracular inquiries, hemerology-adjacent identifications of appropriate days for rituals, and theological speculation. Notably, these categories are scattered all throughout the text rather than each type being gathered together. Again, this calls to mind the variety of materials contained in Leviticus 19. More importantly, such texts should caution us against viewing signs of compositeness as signs of editorial stratification within the Priestly text. Ritual texts are sometimes compiled from multiple sources and multiple types of material, and composite-

[156] Milgrom 1991: 691-698 attributes all of this to growth in the Priestly text. Our study here suggests that this is likely not the case.

[157] SAAo records this as a Kuyunjik text, but van Driel 1969: 74; Menzel 1981: II.T59 suggest that it likely comes from the Aššur excavations. Lambert 1970: 431 cautions against any conclusions about its provenance, given that it was acquired from a dealer. On the variety of material in this text, see van Driel 1969: 74-78; Lambert 1970: 431-432.

seeming segments of the Priestly text may accurately reflect the nature of the texts on which the Priestly author drew. The first divine speech in Leviticus—which combines the third-person instructions for the animal sacrifices of the *ʿōlāh* (Leviticus 1) and *šəlāmîm* (Leviticus 3) with the very different type of second-person instructions pertaining to the grain-based *minḥāh* (Leviticus 2) and with a general prohibition on the consumption of fat and blood (Lev 3:17)—may owe its compositeness to nothing more than the fact that such a composite text existed in the Priestly author's archive.[158] Similarly, a text like Leviticus 20, which combines prohibitions on child sacrifice and necromancy that display a strong first-person component (20:1-8) with a list of mostly sexual crimes and their punishments (20:9-21) may reflect another text whose compositeness is original to the archival text on which it was based.[159]

Our preceding studies—of available text types, of scribal culture, and of an actual ritual archive from a high-ranking cultic official who served at the temple of the national god of Assyria—have demonstrated the strong evidentiary basis on which the Neo-analytic framework rests. We have demonstrated the likelihood of such ritual texts existing in Judah. We have embedded those texts into scribal education and culture to ground our understanding of the relationship between such literature and their writers (not authors). We have shown that the variety of non-narrative materials contained in the Priestly text, as well as the intellectual disposition towards them, aligns with the remains of actual ritual archives. And, finally, we have shown that the variations, divergences, duplications, and compositeness often identified as leverage points for supposing editorial stratification in the Priestly text are, instead, genuine features of ritual texts kept in archives. If such features appear in the non-narrative portions of

[158] contra Noth 1965: 26; Nihan 2007: 198-199, 206-207.

[159] See also van der Toorn 2007: 118-125 for a similar view of compilation as an important tool in the production of new texts. However, his view of this phenomenon is limited by the broadness of his discussion. His statements that "The Book of Leviticus is a compilation of such priestly instructions" (2007: 122) is in line with our view here, but it is unclear whether he also understands the texts from which Leviticus was compiled to also be composites.

the Priestly text, they are explainable as evidence of their origin in an archive and of the fidelity, conditioned by his education, with which the Priestly author copied them.

The Neo-analytic model ultimately provides a robust explanatory framework, grounded in the *realia* of scribal culture and ritual archives, to explain the form of the Priestly text. Given the problems with proposing convincing motivations for the Analytic model's editorial layers, the lack of foundation such layers have in ancient Near Eastern scribal culture, and the ahistorical nature of the transmission model they require, the Neo-analytic framework is preferable in every way. All that remains for us to inquire into at this juncture is the manner in which the Priestly author adapted his archival sources to his narrative of Israelite origins.

Looking Inwards: Adaptations to the Priestly Narrative

The above studies provide three key points of guidance to consider as we examine the Priestly author's method of adapting previously-existing archival texts into his narrative. Our first piece of guidance is drawn from the realm of scribal culture. As we have demonstrated, a scribal education would have instilled an attitude of basic respect and conservativism towards the texts at his disposal. This does not mean that the Priestly author made no changes to these texts, but it does mean that we should be wary of positing such intervention unless there is compelling evidence for it. Our second piece of guidance is based on the features of ritual texts. Actual ritual texts are not abstract exercises intended to present a systematic overview of any individual practice. They are, rather, the byproducts of practical use—whether we imagine them as reference texts, educational texts, or guidebooks—that frequently show both variation of expression and evidence of composite compilation. This means that compositeness and inconsistency can not, on their own, be used to identify interventions the Priestly author may

have made into these texts in the process of adaptation. Our final piece of guidance is related to the features of archives. Ritual archives contained a variety of texts, including multiple texts related to the same realm of practice. Notably, these texts do not always agree with each other. Duplication of topics, the disarticulation of related information, and the variability of practices are reflective of this aspect of archival collections.

In what follows, we will adopt a rather conservative stance towards identifying adaptations in the non-narrative material embedded in the Priestly text based on the above guidance. Our work in previous chapters has already provided evidence that suggest such an attitude of minimal interference. The first of these is the preservation of third-person references to Yhwh in material, frequently sacrificial instructions, embedded in divine speech.[160] This feature, which creates tension with the narrative framing of these texts as speeches, would have required only slight adjustments to ameliorate (*lyhwh* ➔ *ly* ; *lpny yhwh* ➔ *lpny*, etc.). That the Priestly author did not make these adjustments provides confirmation of our conclusions drawn from scribal culture.

We have also suggested that the separation of P's non-narrative material into several discrete speeches likely reflects the fact that the Priestly author is drawing on pre-existing documents. Our review of both ritual texts and ritual archives suggests that this is likely correct—the speeches of the Priestly text reflect the disarray and disarticulation of related information that we see would expect if this were the case. Furthermore, the ritual texts we have examined show that such texts can come in a variety of formats and sizes, further paralleling the different lengths and content of P's speeches. The fact that the Priestly text preserves the disaggregation of information that this situation leads to is another sign of his basically conservative attitude towards his sources. For example, it would have required a minimal

[160] See Chapter 3.

intervention to take the statement concerning the priest's due from the *minḥāh* (7:9-10) and place them with the *tôrat minḥāh* (6:7-11) alongside similar information (6:11).

Our conclusion regarding the presentation of multiple speeches concerning the festival calendar (Leviticus 23) illustrates the same attitude at work.[161] Here the Priestly author would not have had to rearrange anything. He would only have needed to present all of the festivals with one speech introduction as a single speech. The choice to indicate these sources and use such indicators even where it would have made as much sense to present a composite text, as in Leviticus 23, again confirms the basically conservative approach the Priestly author took when adapting these texts to his narrative.[162]

Finally, the presence of multiple speeches on the same topic also illustrates the Priestly author's treatment of his sources. The duplication of topics, such as between Leviticus 18 and 20, is well represented in texts from ritual archives. Even the two texts' disparate presentations—Leviticus 18 is formulated in the second person and Leviticus 20 largely in the third person—is known from archival texts (e.g., SAA XX 1, 9, 37). We have already argued that the presence of both texts was an indicator of pre-existing sources.[163] Additionally, the Priestly author's choice to present both texts rather than synthesize their material was a choice to not only preserve the overlapping texts but to preserve the individual features of each one where they overlap. Both of these choices again show an attitude of respect towards the underlying texts with which the Priestly author was working.

The fact that our previous results from within the Priestly text converge with our results from an examination of scribal culture and ritual archives confirms the general viability of our

[161] See Chapter 3.
[162] The case of Leviticus 23 is particularly compelling, as parallel texts exist in the Pentateuch that use a comprehensive presentation under a single speech rubric (Numbers 28-29; Deut 16:1-17).
[163] See Chapter 3.

approach. As we examine the non-narrative materials in the Priestly text for further insight into how the Priestly author adapted them to his narrative, our working hypothesis will be that his work within these texts was as narrow and tailored as possible. We will test this hypothesis against the material in Leviticus 6-7. These chapters are bound together by a shared genre, *tôrāh*, marked explicitly in the text (Lev 6:2, 7, 18; 7:1, 7, 11) and by a summary statement that points to their content (7:37).[164] Furthermore, we have texts containing similar kinds of information from the Phoenician, Punic, and Neo-Assyrian corpora.[165] These features mark these chapters as a sensible analytic unit.[166]

The material in these chapters is divided into five separate speeches (Lev 6:1-11; 6:12-16; 6:17-7:21; 7:22-27; 7:28-34) with a brief, colophon-like passage at the end (7:35-38). In a minimal application of our Neo-analytic approach, we will treat each speech as representing a separate underlying source text.[167] That this is a reasonable assumption is borne out by comparison with parallel texts—the shortest speech (Lev 6:12-16) contains 66 total words, almost exactly equal to the 65 words in Kition tariff B. On the other hand, the longest speech (Lev 6:17-7:21) contains 498 words, about 18% longer than a conservative estimate of 420

[164] Milgrom 1991: 436.

[165] For Phoenician, see discussion of the Kition tariff (KAI 37) above; for Punic, see discussion of the Marseilles (KAI 69) and Carthage tariffs (KAI 74-75) above; for Neo-Assyria, see discussion of royal decrees above, as well as the other texts in SAA XII 69-81. In addition to the parallels noted in Baker 1987, note that the Marseilles Tariff shares with the Priestly text a concern that the poor also be able to make offerings (KAI 69.15, cf. e.g. Lev 5:7-13; see also SAA XX 31.r.6-7), while the Priestly text's assertion that these dues are normative portions put in place by Yhwh is paralleled by the Marseilles Tariff's ban on any deviation from its instructions (KAI 69.20-21).

[166] The data presented below are summarized in Appendix 5.2.

[167] Alternative suppositions are possible. The shared subject matter and structure of the first, third, and fifth speeches suggest that they could have originally been a single collection into which the Priestly author chose to insert other material set off as separate speeches. Note that the second (Lev 6:12-16) and fourth speech (Lev 7:22-27) do not share the structure of the first (Lev 6:1-11) and third speech (Lev 6:17-7:21) , and that the fifth speech (Lev 7:28-34) is a continuation of the *šəlāmîm* instructions from the third speech. Each of the insertions is sensible—the second speech deals with the grain offering of the priests as an appendix to the other grain offering regulations at the end of the first speech and the fourth speech deals with handling blood and fat of sacrificeable animals as an addendum to the layman's responsibilities for *šəlāmîm* offerings. Nevertheless, we will adhere to a minimal application of our theory at this point.

words for the complete Marseilles tariff.[168] In other words, the ranges of the individual speech sizes in Leviticus 6-7 accord fairly well with other tariff texts from the ancient Near East.

Our method for identifying ways that the Priestly author may have modified these underlying texts is fairly simple. Anything that makes direct reference to the narrative framework into which the Priestly author has embedded these texts is likely to constitute an addition. The most obvious of these is the speech introductions themselves—both the narrative statement *wydbr yhwh ʾl mšh lʾmr* and the imperative phrase opening these speeches (except 6:12-16), whereby Yhwh charges Moses with conveying these materials to their intended audience (6:2a, 18a, 23a, 29a).

We also find such adjustments to the narrative framework within these speeches. Wherever the text refers to the camp, the Tent of Meeting, and Aaron as an active priest, we can presume that the Priestly author has modified his source texts in some way. Each of these likely replaces a comparable element in the underlying text. For the term "camp" (*mḥnh*) we might suppose that it replaces the word "city" (*ʿyr*). The instructions regarding *ṣāraʿat* in houses (14:33-53) provides support for this assessment. Due to the nature of these instructions, which regard how to handle matters related to stone-built houses, the Priestly author was required to avoid his typical retrojection of events into the world of his narrative framework. Instead, these instructions are introduced with the heading that they regard what to do "when you come to the land of Canaan" (Lev 14:34). In these instructions we find several parts of the procedure (14:40, 41, 45, 53) that require the movement of debris, and in one case a bird, "to the outside of the

[168] There are 315 words on the extant portions of the Marseilles tariff. However, more than 25% of the stone, comprising the bottom-left corner, is missing. The number 420 was arrived at by assuming a relatively equal distribution of text on the missing part of the inscription. Possibly irrelevant, this is close to the length of the decree (SAA XII 68) preserved in the Kiṣir-Aššur archive. Such texts could, however, also be longer; SAA XII 69 contains approximately 720 words.

city" (*ʾl mḥwṣ lʿyr*).[169] This precise phrase occurs in Leviticus 6-7 in the same context of debris removal (6:4), with the key difference that the term *mḥnh* is used in place of *ʿyr*.

For mention of the Tent of Meeting (Lev 6:9, 19, 23), we may expect that these references replace either the term *byt* (house, temple) or possible *byt yhwh* (house/temple of Yhwh), though we have no direct confirmation of this from the Hebrew Bible (cf. Exod 23:19; 34:26; Deut 23:19). Nevertheless, our comparative texts suggest that this is the case. The Marseilles tariff opens with the heading *bt bʿlṣpn* (KAI 69.1) and one of the Neo-Assyrian temple decrees similarly opens with the statement that it concerns *bēt Aššur* (SAA XII 69.o.5).[170] Another alternative is that this phrase replaces the term *miqdāš*, as seen in the *tôrāh* on post-partum women (Lev 12:4). In many cases, however, the Priestly author allowed the ambiguous phrase *lpny yhwh* to stand (6:7, 18; 7:30). This phrase accurately convey the location in a sacred precinct while being noncommittal about the specific structure. It is likely that these phrases were part of the underlying documents—whether they were accompanied by references to a *byt* or *mqdš* which the Priestly author has deleted is impossible to tell.

As for the occurrence of the name Aaron, we must distinguish between two different uses. In one case, Aaron is mentioned as an active participant in ritual activities (Lev 6:9, 13; 7:31, 34). In these cases, we should assume that the name Aaron is an adaptation to the narrative framework of the Priestly text. These likely stand in place of the more general term "the priest" (*hkhn*), which occurs on its own numerous times in these texts.[171]

---

[169] The case of the bird (14:53) is interesting. As part of the purification ritual, the priest releases this living bird *ʾl mḥwṣ lʿyr ʾl pny hśdh*. This is parallel to the instructions for the purification of a human from *ṣāraʿat*, which requires the release of the bird simple *ʿl pny hśdh* (14:7). This suggests that the Priestly author had two choices for dealing with mentions of "the city" in his texts—he can change them to "the camp" or simply the reference if the remaining words still capture the sense of the procedure and are ambiguous enough to apply to either the world of the narrative or the world of the reader.

[170] See also, SAA XII 76.10'-11', 26'; 80.o.1; XX 51.o.i.1.

[171] See discussion below.

In the other case, the name Aaron is used to define a group of priests, the *bny ʾhrn* (Lev 6:7, 11; 7:10, 33). In these cases, we do not need to posit any intervention on the part of the Priestly author. The use of the phrase *bny* X to indicate a group or guild is well-known in the Hebrew Bible. The supposition that this reading is original is supported by the fact that while the term "the priest" appears without a preceding "Aaron" quite frequently, the term "the priests" (plural) is almost always accompanied by phrase "the sons of Aaron."[172] The only two exceptions in these speeches are both statements concerning the accessibility of prebends (6:22; 7:6).[173]

Finally, we should note that these texts are largely phrased in the third person. However, there are also passages that are either presented as first-person speech from Yhwh (Lev 6:10; 7:34) or that contain second-person forms of address (6:11; 7:22-26). As we have already discussed, the presentation of instructions such as those in Leviticus as divine revelation is unknown in the ancient Near East.[174] The form of the materials in Leviticus 6-7 largely confirm this, with their frequent use of third-person reference to Yhwh in what are supposed to be speeches he is giving. Therefore, we should view these occurrences of first-person speech as interventions from the hand of the Priestly author. Notably, both of these examples occur at the ends of their respective speeches.[175]

---

[172] See Nihan 2007: 200-204 for a review of arguments over the singular versus plural priests in Leviticus 1; 3 and what role they might play in the history of composition. Nihan concludes that the plurals are original to the instruction in Leviticus 1; 3, though he would delete the phrase *bny ʾhrn*. We might also suppose that in places that read "Aaron and his sons" (6:9, 13), the underlying text may have read "the sons of Aaron," again minimizing interference with the sources.

[173] Outside of these two exceptions, the only other exception to this phenomenon in the Priestly text is Lev 13:2; 16:33. In Lev 13:2, the plural occurs in the phrase "to Aaron the priest or to one of his sons, the priests" which still implies the class of *bny ʾhrn*. Lev 16:33 is a statement summarizing the *kippēr* ritual, stating that the priest performs atonement "over the priests and over all the people of the assembly."

[174] See Chapter 3.

[175] One possible way to understand the function these first-person speeches have in relation to the narrative fiction within which the author is working is that they could indicate that the main content of these speeches are meant to be the exact words that Moses is intended to speak to his audience (consonant with the third person references to

The cases of second-person address are more difficult to evaluate. In one case, we have an entire speech phrased in the second-person (Lev 7:22-26). The fact that the whole speech is phrased this way almost certainly indicates that the underlying document was phrased in the second person. Our above survey of ritual texts tells us that this is one form that such texts can take. In the other case, however, we should note that the second-person address comes at the end of a third-person speech and accompanies a first-person address from Yhwh (6:10-11). Although variability of verbal form does occur in ritual texts, these indications suggest that this particular passage is either an addition or an adaptation by the Priestly author.

The Priestly author's adaptations of his material do not, however, tell the entire story. We must also examine places where he does not adapt his material. The largest category of non-adaptations is the preservation of third-person reference to Yhwh.[176] Other examples include the frequent mention of the generic priest with no further specification towards Aaron or his sons.[177] There are also numerous mentions of "the altar" with no further definition of it as being "the bronze altar" or "the altar in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting" (cf. Lev 1:5; 4:7, 18).[178] In both of these cases—the priest and the altar—the Priestly author depends on the total narrative context of these speeches to inform the reader's interpretation of them. But he does not feel the need to intervene in his texts to offer this further specification. Finally, we should note a single reference to a setting in Canaan in contrast to the wilderness setting of these speeches (Lev 7:26). In the context of the Priestly text, we must understand this as proleptic. This is not, however, specified by the text itself. Instead, the Priestly author allowed this disjunction between content

---

Yhwh), while these speech-ends where Yhwh speaks directly are meant to signal asides from Yhwh to Moses, offering commentary on these subjects.

[176] Lev 6:7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18; 7:5, 11, 14, 20, 21, 25, 29 (x2), 30 (x2).

[177] Lev 6:3, 5, 15, 16, 19; 7:5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 31, 32.

[178] Lev 6:2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8; 7:2, 5, 31.

and context to stand, reflecting the wording of the underlying text. These cases of non-adaptation far outnumber the places where the Priestly author intervened in his texts.

Finally, we should note the distribution pattern of these types of adaptation among these speeches. In the first speech of this material (Lev 6:1-11), we find all of the possible adaptations deployed: references to the camp (6:4), the Tent of Meeting (6:9), Aaron as an active priest (6:9), first-person person speech from Yhwh (6:10), and a second-person address that accompanies the latter (6:11). However, in each of the following speeches, we find minimal adaptations. The second (6:12-16) and third speeches (6:17-7:21) only contain one adaptation each. In the second speech, this is a mention of Aaron as an active priest (6:13). In the case of the third speech, we twice find the Tent of Meeting (6:19, 23). The fourth speech (7:22-27) contains no adaptations, while the fifth speech (7:28-34) contains two types: a first-person speech from Yhwh (7:34) and two mentions of Aaron as an active priest (7:31, 34), one of which is contained within the first-person speech.

A comparison of the third speech, the longest at 498 words, with the first speech, which is less than half its length at 218 words, is instructive. Despite the length of the third speech (Lev 6:17-7:21), we find only a single type of adaptation—a mention of the Tent of Meeting (6:19, 23)—deployed twice. On the other hand, the first speech (6:1-11) contains five types of adaptation.[179] The above patterns suggest that the Priestly author worked on the speeches in Leviticus 6-7 as a unit, as further indicated by the subscript (7:35-37). The first speech, with its maximal adaptations, was intended to program the reader's understanding of what follows in this segment of the Priestly text. One suspects that if the third speech had not dealt with the *ḥaṭṭāʾt*—

[179] See Appendix 5.2. Speech One mentions the camp, the Tent of Meeting, and Aaron as an active priest, while also containing anomalous 2nd person address and first-person speech from Yhwh.

which required consumption in the courtyard of the sacred precinct (6:19, 23)—we would find no adaptations in this speech despite its length.

Our analysis of how the Priestly author adapted the speeches in Leviticus 6-7 confirms our working hypothesis. The Priestly author primarily uses the speech introductions to contextualize his non-narrative material and then intervenes as little as possible in that material to bring it into line with his narrative framework. These results, then, match the expectations we derived from our study of scribal culture.

When we turn our analytic to other segments of the Priestly text, we find similar results.[180] These texts have been adapted to their narrative framework, but such adaptations remain minimal. For example, in the purity manuals (Leviticus 11-15), Aaron is mentioned precisely one time in these six speeches.[181] At the beginning of the *ṣāraʿat* manual we find the statement "…and he will be brought to Aaron the priest or to one of his sons, the priests" (Lev 13:2). Outside of this one statement, the generic term "the priest" occurs 101 times in these chapters.[182] Tellingly, the *tôrāh* on purification from *ṣāraʿat* begins with an almost identical phrase, but without this adaptation: "…and he will be brought to the priest" (14:2), thereby preserving the underlying phraseology. As with the "tariffs" of Leviticus 6-7, it appears that part of the Priestly author's method was to allow a small number of adaptations to program the reader's expectations and interpretation—a process aided by the speech introductions and the broader narrative into which these texts are embedded.

Notably, this particular information does more than tell us about the Priestly author's adaptations. This distribution is also further evidence that these texts had a prior existence—

[180] See Appendix 5.1-5 for data summaries.
[181] See Appendix 5.3 for data summary.
[182] See, similarly, the *tôrōt* in Numbers 5-6, where generic "the priest" occurs 23 times, while Aaron occurs 0 times. Nevertheless, these chapters follow immediately upon the Levite census in Numbers 3-4, which mentions Aaron repeatedly.

otherwise one would expect a writer composing a text addressed to Aaron (11:1; 13:1; 14:33; 15:1) to write about Aaron rather than a generic "the priest." Or, at the very least, we might expect the balance to be more even than 101:1.

Understanding the minimal nature of the Priestly author's adaptations of these texts also helps us identify places where that minimalism is violated. One minor such case occurs in Leviticus 1-5.[183] Here, we generally see the same pattern of minimal adaptations, with a subtle exception in the first speech (Leviticus 1-3). In this speech, the Tent of Meeting is mentioned at the outset to signal the place where sacrifices should be brought (Lev 1:3) and then a second time to define the altar where the *ʿōlāh* is offered as the "the altar…which is at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting" (1:5). In the rest of the *ʿōlāh* instructions, the Tent of Meeting goes unmentioned and the altar occurs twelve more times with no further specification.[184]

Based on our earlier analysis, this leads us to expect no further mentions of the Tent of Meeting in this speech—the Priestly author has connected the location and specific altar to his narrative framework and need not intervene again in his texts to make this point. And, in fact, the *minḥāh* instructions in the speech (Leviticus 2) pass with no further mention of the Tabernacle. However, when the Priestly author reaches the last part of this speech, on the *šəlāmîm* (Leviticus 3), the specification of the Tent of Meeting as the place of sacrifice occurs three times—once with each type of animal for which instructions are provided (Lev 3:2, 8, 13). The anomalous nature of this repeated mention of the Tent of Meeting is brought home by referral to the part of the speech dealing with the *ʿōlāh*. Like the *šəlāmîm* instructions, the *ʿōlāh* is structured around the procedure for different animal types. Nevertheless, we find no further mention of the Tent of Meeting as that speech moves from dealing with cattle to caprovid. What is more, it is unclear

[183] See Appendix 5.1 for data summary.
[184] 1:7, 8, 9, 11 (x2), 12, 13, 15 (x3), 16, 17.

that this adaptation replaces an underlying form or constitutes an actual addition in Leviticus 3. The mention of the Tent of Meeting in that chapter does not serve as the location of the altar (cf. 1:5) or a location related to the ritual (cf. 4:5) or the place to which the sacrifice is initially brought (cf. 1:3; 4:4), but instead specifies the precise place where the slaughtering of the animal takes place.

This suggests that the specification of the Tent of Meeting as the place of sacrifice for each animal case in the *šəlāmîm* is meant to be emphatic. This emphasis on the appropriate sacrificial precinct for the *šəlāmîmi* of the ox, the sheep, and the goat parallels the instructions concerning the appropriate sacrificial precinct for the *šəlāmîm* of the ox, sheep and goat that opens the so-called Holiness Code (Lev 17:1-7). Furthermore, in both cases—Leviticus 3 and 17—it is the slaughter (*šḥṭ*) of these animals that is of central concern (3:2, 8, 13; 17:3-4). The seeming departure from normal practice in the first speech of Leviticus 1-5, while still a minimal intervention, allowed the Priestly author to create coherence and emphasis in his larger work by way of his adaptations.[185]

A more major departure from the Priestly author's otherwise minimal intervention in his texts comes in the atonement ritual (Leviticus 16). After the ritual's introduction (Lev 16:1-2), Aaron is mentioned, by name, as the active priest six times in the body of the ritual (16:3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 21, 23). Conversely, the generic "the priest" does not occur a single time in the body of the ritual (cf. 16:32-33). That this follows on the purity manuals (Leviticus 11-15), in which Aaron is only mentioned once, makes this even more remarkable. There are two possible, non-mutually exclusive reasons for this. The first is that the underlying text which the Priestly author has adapted here contained a proper name throughout. We have already seen that professionals made

[185] Note that this is yet another piece of evidence that suggests that Leviticus 17 is of a single piece with the rest of the Priestly text.

copies of texts describing annual and reoccurring rituals and it is possible that one prepared for a specific priest may have mentioned his name. However, our evidence for this in parallel ritual texts is weak. In our most complete copy of a Šebaṭ-Adar report, the text opens by stating that it is describing the ritual acts completed by Ashurbanipal (SAA XX 9.o.i.1-4) but thereafter refers to him only as "the king." We must leave this as a possibility, but a highly speculative one.

The other possible explanation for this pattern is that the Priestly author intends to bind this ritual description more closely to his narrative framework than is the case in other instances. Other signs point in this direction as well, such as the introduction to this ritual including one of the few chronological markings in the book of Leviticus (16:1). Yhwh's speech at the beginning of this ritual is also distinct from other ritual introductions, as Yhwh provides the rationale for the following ritual—it is the only way to enable Aaron's presence within the *pārōket* (16:2-3). This chapter then ends with the note "and he [Aaron] did according to what Yhwh commanded Moses" (16:34), indicating Aaron's immediate execution of these instructions.[186] Whereas the Priestly author included both an instructional and narrative version of previous passages—such as the installation of the priesthood (Exodus 29; Leviticus 8)—here he appears to have attempted to merge the two, so that the atonement ritual's instructions become their own narrative by deeper integration into the narrative framework. Other possibilities for explaining the abundance of Aaron in this chapter may also be possible.

When we turn our analysis to texts in the so-called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17:1-26:2), we generally find the same level of minimal intervention at work.[187] Each speech has relatively

[186] Milgrom 1991: 1059. However, we need not endorse Milgrom's argument that this indicates that the idea of the atonement taking place only once per year (Lev 16:29-34a) is a later addition. The entire text of the ritual (16:3-34a), including the general instructions at the end, are almost certainly from a source. Given the Priestly author's work elsewhere, we would expect him to add a summary note of narrative execution only after he had finished copying that text. After Aaron's first performance, it becomes a once-per-year ritual taking place in the seventh month.

[187] See Appendix 5.4-5 for data summaries.

few adaptations, and larger interventions tend to occur at the beginnings and endings of speeches.[188] However, there does seem to be a greater trend of first-person references to Yhwh occurring within the bodies of these speeches. This is particularly the case with the phrase *ʾny yhwh* in Leviticus 19, but the land release laws in Leviticus 25 also have a greater than usual admixture of first-person references to Yhwh.[189]

For the most part, however, we should stress that these texts do not deviate meaningfully from the relatively conservative approach we have traced here. References to the Tent of Meeting are rare (Lev 17:4, 5, 6, 9; 19:21; 24:3). Mentions of Aaron as an active priest (24:3, 9) are outnumbered by the generic "the priest."[190] The absence of mentions of Aaron the narrative figure are obviated by the use of the phrase "seed of Aaron" to define the priesthood (21:21; 22:4)—likely an original part of the document.[191] The altar is only once defined in relationship to the Tent of Meeting (17:6), all other occurrences are left ambiguous (17:11; 21:23; 22:22). And, as we have already discussed, sacrificial contexts continue to refer to Yhwh in the third person.[192]

This relative consistency suggests that we should ground our explanations of the seemingly anomalous intrusions of first-person speech in two factors—the genre of the underlying material and the Priestly author's desire to communicate with his audience. Importantly, we should note that none of the chapters where these disruptions occur are instructional texts in the same vein as Leviticus 1-5 or 11-15. In the case of Leviticus 19, we have already observed that this text is highly composite. Such compositeness may have made the addition of first-person references to Yhwh seem less intrusive to the Priestly author as he

[188] See discussion in Chapter 3.
[189] See Appendix 3.2-3 and 5.4-5.
[190] Lev 17:5, 6; 19:22; 21:9, 10; 22:10, 11, 12, 13, 14; 23:10, 11, 20.
[191] See discussion of *bny ʾhrn* above.
[192] See Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.2a, entries 1-5.

worked on this material. Alternatively, we might attribute these statements to the underlying document that the Priestly author adapted. However, the genre of such a text would be difficult to place. Finally, we could attribute Leviticus 19 to the hand of the Priestly author as his own compilation. It is possible that he assembled the various segments of this speech from diverse sources and rendered them directly as a speech for use in his narrative. The existence of composite texts in ritual archives would have provided him with a model for such compilations.

Leviticus 25's integration of first-person speech from Yhwh, on the other hand, is likely due to the importance of the land theme to the Priestly author.[193] From the so-called Table of Nations (Genesis 10*) to the promises to the patriarchs (Gen 17:8; 28:4; 35:12; 48:4) to the purchase of Machpelah (Genesis 23) to Yhwh's declared intention in the exodus (Exod 6:4, 8), the Priestly author shows a deep and abiding interest in the concept of land and land ownership. The Priestly author's interest in this concept may have led him to add commentary to the basic legal text that underlies Leviticus 25. The particular first-person statements in this chapter lend support to this view. Here we do not find *ʾny yhwh* used as punctuation, but instead the insertion of first-person comments on Yhwh's relationship to the land and to Israel (25:17-18, 20-23, 38, 55).

The opening of the speech in Leviticus 20 may be a further example of composition from the hand of the Priestly author. This chapter opens with a long segment of first-person speech from Yhwh condemning the *mlk*-offering and consultation with necromancers (Lev 20:1-8).[194] As we previously observed, this both aligns with our expectations of adjustments placed at the edges of inherited texts and differs from other examples in that actual prescriptions are set forth

[193] See discussion in Chapter 6.
[194] On child sacrifice in the intellectual history of Israel and Greece, see Heth & Kelley 2021 and references there.

here.[195] This is likely from the hand of the Priestly author. Note that, despite the overlaps between Leviticus 18 and 20, one major difference between the two texts is that the former integrates the crime of child sacrifice into its list of prohibited sexual relationships (Lev 18:21). If we examine only the third-person list of crimes and punishments in Lev 20:9-21, this particular act is missing in a text that otherwise parallels (though not perfectly) the list in Leviticus 18. This defect may have been supplied by the Priestly author who, rather than integrating an addition to the document underlying Leviticus 20, instead wrote his own version of an anti-*mlk* law. Nevertheless, he placed this new composition at the beginning of the divine speech so as to leave his source text undisturbed.

We may also want to invoke the specter of fresh composition in the case of some or all of Lev 17:8-16. This segment of speech is uniquely marked off by a speech-internal reoccurrence of Yhwh telling Moses to address his audience (Lev 17:8), after which the first-person material concentrates (17:10-14). Beyond its first-person references, this part of the Leviticus 17 speech also appears to allude to the Priestly flood narrative (17:14; cf. Gen 9:1-5).[196] These features are suggestive but not probative.

Regardless of how one explains the anomalous features of Leviticus 17; 19; 20; 25, the above studies of the Priestly author's method of adaptation show that we can not view this as a mechanical process. In other words, an analysis of the Priestly author's adaptations and non-adaptations does not result in a metric that we can apply in a reflexive fashion. We must instead always be alive to the genre, content, and narrative placement of the underlying source materials. Such attention places us alongside the Priestly author, whose successful creation of a narrative of

[195] See Chapter 3.
[196] Milgrom 2000: 1484 takes the proximal reference to be Lev 17:10, but acknowledges that this statement must also be understood in relationship with the flood narrative's universal prohibition of blood consumption.

Israelite antiquity into which such pre-existing materials have been embedded is clear evidence of an intellectual at work.

Looking Forward: The Neo-analytic Framework's Explanatory Strength

What we have offered above is nothing more than a first effort at understanding the Priestly author's relationship with the materials in his archive. Ultimately, the details of how we explain the Priestly author's adaptations of pre-existing material can be left open. The Neo-analytic model is a framework—an explanatory outline within which scholars can take their own approach to the Priestly text.

What makes the Neo-analytic framework preferable to other approaches to the Priestly text is its grounding in the unique features of P, in the practices of contemporary scribal culture, and in the characteristics of actual ritual texts and archives. The model of composition it offers is consonant with what we know about ancient Near Eastern writing, archives, and ritual—or scholarly—texts. This framework uniquely allows us to offer a comprehensive account of the shape of the Priestly text. It explains the separation of materials into discrete speeches, the disorganization and disarticulation of information, the disjunction between speech frames and their content, the multiplicity of forms of address, the occasional tension between non-narrative segments, and the sheer variety of materials subsumed under the label P. It accomplishes all of this by offering a single supposition—that the Priestly author had access to an archive of texts containing ritual, disciplinary, genealogical, legal, and educational materials.

Importantly, this model replaces the Analyst's fixation on identifying hypothetical layers and strata within the Priestly text with an explanation that better accords with what we know about both ancient Near Eastern ritual archives and the nature of ancient textual composition and

transmission. It has always been an unproven assumption of biblical scholarship that P functioned, in part, as a reference work on theology, ritual, and practice and that changes in theology, ritual, and practice therefore required a change in the Priestly text. A related assumption was that two different forms of a practice or view could not co-exist.[197] Under these assumptions, contradiction was thought to be anathema to these goals, and updating was assumed as the normal course of events to bring the text into line with contemporary practices as they changed.

However, given the shape of the Priestly text as a primarily narrative document, there is no reason to suppose that it was intended to serve as an instruction manual for ritual practice.[198] Ritual and instructional texts, regardless of whether one accepts the hypothesis proposed here for their use in P's composition, surely existed in Judah during both the First and Second Temple periods. It is to these texts that priests likely made reference when they needed clarification, instruction, or training—not the long, narrative Priestly text. Such texts would have existed prior to and alongside of the Priestly text. When changes arose in ritual practice, it is the discrete texts that would have been modified, either directly, as needed, or through the means of oral interpretation and practical instruction. Such changes and development are what give rise to the composite shape of ritual archives and their texts.

When we surveyed the Kiṣir-Aššur archive it was clear that the diversity among and within those texts was a matter of course, reflective of changes in Neo-Assyrian practice. Neo-Assyrian religion experienced change and growth, especially in the Sargonid era, but all of these views found a home in the archives. The Neo-analytic model can comfortably posit that the

[197] We should note that this view of the Priestly text as needing to be a sufficient text and an internally non-contradictory one are simply transpositions from Protestant theology (*solā scripturā* and inerrancy) onto ancient religious and scribal cultures.
[198] See Chapter 7 for further discussion.

Priestly author was likewise the inheritor of a collection of texts that unevenly expressed particular ideological claims and practical instructions. Contradiction and tension between two different non-narrative texts is, then, not a sign of editorial strata in the Priestly text—it is a sign that his archive contained diverse materials, as is typical of archives. The composite nature of individual archival texts also warns us against assuming that tensions within a particular non-narrative segment are unambiguous signals about the history of the Priestly text.

The Neo-analytic perspective thus shifts the target of the identification of editorial intervention in the Priestly text. Granting that the Priestly author used archival documents as sources, we have two options before us when we identify something as a contradiction or interpolation. Either these tensions are a part of the editorial history of the individual documents prior to their incorporation into P or they were are changes made by the Priestly author when he incorporated them. When it comes to elements that conform the sources to P's narrative—what we have termed adaptations—the answer is the latter. When it comes to disagreements or signs of compositeness in ritual or other non-narrative texts, we should presume, in the absence of compelling evidence, that what we are seeing is part of the editorial history of the individual sources or the result of the diversity of the Priestly author's archives. To state this another way—the burden of proof is on the Analysts to demonstrate that the variegation they have identified is a compositional indicator in the Priestly text itself rather than in the source documents he was using. More broadly, the Analyst approach requires a thorough-going defense to demonstrate that its approach is preferable to the one offered here.

Our survey of scribal culture and archives in this chapter elevates the Neo-analytic framework from being a mere supposition to a comprehensive hypothetical model for the Priestly text's composition—one grounded in the reality of ancient Near Eastern texts and text

production. To put a fine point on it, the Neo-analytic framework allows the ancient Judahites to have the same forms of cultural expression that we allow their neighbors and provides the Priestly author with a concrete reality within which he could have plausibly worked. Such an approach places the Priestly author where he belongs—at the end point of a curriculum, as an inheritor and copier of texts whose genius lies not in their composition but in their integration into a larger narrative of Israelite antiquity. Such an image puts the capstone on our borrowing of the term Neo-analytic from Homeric studies—there too, Homer stands at the end of a long tradition of songs and performances about the Trojan war, his genius lying in their integration into the overarching theme of Achilles' wrath.

It remains to be seen how far the Priestly narrative reaches past Sinai. We turn to this question next, equipped with a newly fortified Neo-analytic model to help us determine how best to trace that path. In the following chapter, we will see whether the Priestly author reaches his ending in Canaan or stops short, just as the *Iliad* leaves Achilles' death and the fall of Troy perpetually out of reach.

Excursus 1: The Book of Generations

Scholars have long recognized that the *tôlədōt* embedded in the Priestly text in Genesis are drawn from a pre-existing work.[199] This contention requires no particular defense—it is *a prior* likely. However, some have argued that these genealogies are not, in fact, part of the Priestly text but instead belong to the work of the Redactor who combined the sources of the Pentateuch.[200] In this model, the genealogies still come from a pre-existing source. However, they were added to the Pentateuchal sources by R, who used them as the framework within which to combine the primeval and patriarchal narratives of JE and P. This approach is usually based on two factors—the fact that the genealogies do seem to serve a structuring function that unites the Priestly and non-Priestly materials in Genesis and on the fact that there are doublets between the Priestly text and the *tôlədōt*. These arguments receive brief consideration here.

The structural argument—that the genealogies serve to frame the combination of JE with P—is irrelevant to the question of whether the *tôlədōt* are an original part of P or not. The Redactor could just as easily have found these genealogies as an already-existing part of the Priestly text and still used them to structure his own combination of Priestly and non-Priestly materials. Such an approach is consonant with R's preference for P as the base-text/structuring text throughout the Pentateuch. Perhaps strengthening this argument is that the *tôlədōt* note in Gen 2:4a is deployed anomalously when compared to the rest of the genealogical headings.[201] This may indicate that R found these headings already in P and felt the need to add an imitation of them in order to smooth the connection between the 2 creation accounts.[202]

---

[199] See, e.g., Noth 1981: 235; Cross 1973: 301, 321; ten Hoopen 2017: 183-184. See Wilson 1975 for a general orientation towards genealogies; Hasel 1978 for a still valuable rebuttal of the attempt to connect the genealogies in Genesis 1-11 to Mesopotamian literature such as the Sumerian King List.
[200] Friedman 1981a: 77-91, drawing on Cross 1973: 301-305.
[201] Cross 1973: 302.
[202] Friedman 2003: 35 n. also supposes that Gen 2:4a is an imitation of a work that doesn't truly begin until Gen 5:1.

In regard to the supposed doublets between the genealogies and the Priestly text, they are amenable to non-editorial explanations in almost every case. Three sets of doublets (Gen 5:32//6:10; 10:22, 31//11:10; 11:26//11:27) all serve a real purpose in the genealogical schema. Gen 5:32//6:10 and Gen 11:26//11:27 signify a shift from one type of genealogy (linear) to a different type (collateral/segmented). Inversely, Gen 10:22, 31//11:10 serves the opposite purpose, signaling a shift from collateral/segmented to linear genealogy. These shifts can be seen clearly when the genealogies are extracted from the narrative and invite interesting questions about the nature of the *tôledōt*-source(s). For instance, it is unclear whether the "*sēper tôlədōt*" already contained the "Table of Nations" (Genesis 10*)—which triggers the first linear>collateral>linear sequence—or whether its fusion with the *tôlədōt*-book was the work of the Priestly author who used the doublings to ease the transition from one to the other. Furthermore, there is thematic parallelism between passages such as Gen 6:9b (P) and Gen 5:22, 24, which belong to the *tôlədōt*-book. This parallelism strengthens the argument that the *tôlədōt* were used by P and incorporated into his work.

In terms of other duplications between the Priestly text and the *tôlədōt*, Gen 7:6 (part of the *tôlədōt*) and 7:11 (P) are not really doublets, as they convey two different kinds of information.[203] This type of repetition is common throughout the Priestly text in a variety of contexts.[204]

This leaves the truly problematic disjunction between Gen 26:34; 28:9 on the one hand and Gen 36:2-3 on the other.[205] While it is unclear how to explain this disconnect, the tension between these passages is insufficient to identify either set of texts as not part of P. Options for understanding this particular issue include: the Edomite-*tôlədōt* is not part of P (either R or J);

[203] On Gen 7:6 as part of the *Tôlədōt*-book, note its resumption in Gen 9:28; 10:1; 11:10.
[204] See discussion in Chapter 1.
[205] See Friedman 2003: ad loc. for the suggestion that these are both part of P.

The Edomite-*tôlədōt* is part of P, but the author had two different traditions about the wives of Esau and used both, one embedded in a documentary source and the other being given in the narrative; the contradiction between the names is the result of exegetical arguments we are no longer privy to; textual corruption/conflation (either in the copying of P prior to R's work or during R's combination of JE and P).

Additionally, there are positive arguments for viewing the *tôlədōt* material as part of the Priestly text. The coherence of the Priestly text is severely compromised when the genealogies are removed. Friedman, one of the supporters of the *tôlədōt*'s separation from P, nevertheless observes that "If, however, we separate out the *tôlədōt* and Station headings, which are part of the second, combinatory stage of JEP, the Priestly material which remains does not 'connect smoothly' at several junctures."[206] This is a serious weakness with the hypothesis that these are not an original part of P. More importantly, the genealogies make P flow correctly—they do not, however, have this impact on JE and only secondarily serve such a role in JEP.

Furthermore, given that the Priestly author uses archival documents as source materials elsewhere in his work, his use of pre-existing genealogies aligns very nicely with his practice elsewhere.[207] The observation that the genealogies are not by the Priestly author, then, stands. But this does not mean that they are not part of the Priestly text. Additionally, P displays an interest in precisely this type of information elsewhere (e.g., Genesis 46; Numbers 1-4; 26). We might also note, as a weaker form of argument, that the form of the genealogy in Genesis 5 is sympathetic with P's worldview. In particular the explicit mention of daughters—rather than allowing the word *bānîm* to stand for "children"—corresponds with other parts of P where both genders are separately specified (e.g., Exod 35:22-29; 36:6).

---

[206] 1981a: 80.
[207] See discussion in Chapter 5.

Finally, we should observe that the Redactor's method suggests that he was not responsible for the addition of the *tôlədōt*. Friedman describes the work of R thus: "The Exilic tradent's [= R] task was manifestly not the composition of alternative Torah to JE and D, but just the opposite: to house the various conflicting materials...so as to achieve a single, unified Torah."[208] However, in several cases, the *tôlədōt* material do, in fact, serve as an alternative to the JE version, directly contradicting it at several points. The first is in Genesis 5, which clearly reprises many of the names from Gen 4:17-24 in a different order and as part of a different family branch. If the old theory that Lamech was the original Flood hero in J is correct, then Genesis 5 also disputes that notion. Another case is found in the Table of Nations, which has alternative placements for ethnic groups than that presented in J's equivalent account of post-Flood peoples. This conflicting information extends to the genealogy of Nahor from J (Gen 22:20-24), which attributes to Nahor groups accounted for otherwise in the Table of Nations. The genealogy of Abraham in the *tôlədōt* also disagrees with the presentation in JE in that it ignores the entire Qeturah branch. Even more tension is created by the fact that some of the families listed in the Qeturah branch are accounted for differently in the *tôlədōt*-material. Even ideologically, the genealogical emphasis on death and reproduction as part of the functioning system of creation in Genesis 5 contradicts the J text's Garden-of-Eden view that death is not an original part of creation. In other words, if R's purpose was to combine the material in JE and P as coherently as possible, the use of genealogies that directly conflict with JE at several points seems an odd way of accomplishing this. The more likely explanation is that R found these genealogies already embodied in the Priestly text.

[208] 1981a: 77.

Excursus 2: Leviticus 27

Throughout this work, we have delayed the evaluation of Leviticus 27's relationship with the rest of the Priestly text. Milgrom notes, echoing many others, that "the fact that this subscription [Lev 27:34] follows and resembles the one in Lev 26 renders the entire chapter as a glaring appendix."[209] We can observe two further facts about this chapter. First, the author of the subscription intentionally wrote this passage to serve as a complement to rather than a repetition of the one that closes Leviticus 26.[210] This is indicated by the use of the term *mṣwt* as an addition to the terms *ḥqym*, *mšpṭym*, and *twrt* which occur in the earlier closing (Lev 26:46). Such careful complementation likely indicates the hand of a conscientious editor at work.

The second fact about this chapter is that the reason for its placement is obscure. Milgrom offers a review of four major views, none of them particularly persuasive.[211] Despite our secondary analytic principal that sees an explanatory reason as a *desideratum* for identifying something as an editorial addition, we have no better one to offer. Milgrom's observation that this text was likely placed after Leviticus 25 because it informationally depends on the law given there (Lev 27:16-25) is well taken, if not probative.[212] If we push his conclusion a bit further, we might suppose that an editor may have been unwilling to sever the connection between the land-release laws in Leviticus 25 and the promises and threats in Leviticus 26—they are, after all, presented as a single speech.

This leaves two options for the placement of Leviticus 27. Either its current place or between Leviticus 24 and 25. The disarray of information in the rest of the Leviticus material should make us skeptical of the idea that putting Leviticus 27 prior to Leviticus 25 would have

[209] 2001: 2401.
[210] As also observed by Milgrom 2001: 2401-2402.
[211] Milgrom 2001: 2407-2409.
[212] Milgrom 2001: 2407.

been considered detrimentally disruptive. Were this text placed there, we would likely understand the references to the Jubilee as forward-looking to the next speech. Nevertheless, a later editor may have had a different sensibility about the organization of information than the Priestly author did.

We can only mount a weak positive case for the current placement of Leviticus 27. Its association with the monetary valuation of persons has a direct relationship with the censuses that follow in Numbers 1-4 (Num 3:40-51; cf. Exod 30:11-16). Furthermore, its interest in land and houses is related to the larger concerns of land that connect Leviticus 25 and Numbers 1-4.[213] These are only rough guesses however. It seems relatively certain that Leviticus 27 is, in fact, an addition to the Priestly text. It is still unclear, however, at what stage it was added (to P or to JEP?) and what motivated the placement of this material in this location.

[213] See Chapter 4 for discussion.

CHAPTER 6

THE MARCH TO AN ENDING

Wandering Between Tetrateuch and Hexateuch

Up to this point, our compositional analysis of the Priestly text has focused on the Sinai episode, as this section of the Priestly text constituted the main focus of the Analysts' stratified reading of P. The Analysts extend this approach to P into the post-Sinai sections, continuing to attribute various pieces of both the narrative and non-narrative material to diverse strata of the Priestly text.[1] However, the major issue in the post-Sinai material is not simply the question of stratification. While the artificial separation of narrative *Erzählung* and legal *Gesetzgebung* continues to play a role in approaches to this section of the Priestly text, the major debate about the composition of this part of P is instead centered around a narrative issue—identifying the ending of the Priestly text.

This argument over the ending of the Priestly text has undergone a major shift since Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen argued for their "new" Documentary Hypothesis. A key part of their analysis extended the Pentateuchal documents into the book of Joshua—Kuenen and Wellhausen adopted the term "Hexateuch" to describe the close connection between the conquest and the narrative of the various Pentateuchal sources.[2] This approach represented the consensus of the field until the 1943 publication of Martin Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*

[1] See Kuenen 1886: 95-107; Wellhausen 1899: 98-133, 175-176, 179-186 for foundational accounts.
[2] Kuenen 1886: 3, 10-12; Wellhausen 1899: 61, 116-117; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby 1900: II.303-319; Driver 1910: 103-104.

fundamentally challenged the prevailing view.[3] In a rare exception to the typical factionalism of biblical scholarship, Noth's argument for a Deuteronomistic History extending through the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings won widespread acceptance.[4] In his presentation of this larger historical work, Noth undercut the Hexateuchal perspective by severing the book of Joshua from the source texts extant in Genesis-Numbers.[5] While this aspect of Noth's thesis proved controversial,[6] discussions of Pentateuchal and Tetrateuchal sources have become more common than explorations of Hexateuchal ones.[7]

Noth's weakening of the Hexateuch model had clear ramifications for how scholars understood all of the Pentateuchal sources. However, it particularly affected analyses of the Priestly text because of the way that Noth differentiated his treatment of this corpus from the non-Priestly material. Whereas Noth allowed that the J and E corpora likely once contained no-longer extant conquest traditions,[8] he argued that the Priestly text showed no interest in the conquest or the land of Canaan and had originally ended at the death of Moses.[9] In fact, although

[3] While Noth 1943 and Noth 1957 are labeled as separate editions (e.g. Noth 1981: xiv n. 4), the content is identical between the two and only the pagination differs. As the 1957 2nd edition is more readily available, page numbers will be referred to Noth 1957.

[4] For an early rejection of Noth's argument, see Fohrer 1968: 192-195. For a review of challenges to the idea of a Deuteronomistic History, see Knoppers 2000. For a history of the idea of the Deuteronomistic History, both before and since Noth, see Römer 2005: 13-43.

[5] Noth 1957: 3-12, 40-47. Noth 1938: ix-xiii developed several arguments in favor of the relative independence of Joshua from the sources of the Pentateuch, but it was not until Noth 1943 that these arguments were placed into a synthetic framework (as Noth 1957: 210 n. 2 acknowledges). See further discussion of Joshua's relationship to the Pentateuch below.

[6] See, e.g., Mowinckel 1964: 1-8, 12-16, 51-67 for an early refutation of Noth's view on this matter. See also Fohrer 1968: 192-205.

[7] See the titles and content of, e.g., Rendtorff 1977; Blum 1990; Friedman 1997; 2003 (though note the argument for the continuation of J into Joshua and beyond in Friedman 1998); Nicholson 1998; Rofé 1999; Van Seters 1999; Nihan 2007; Baden 2012. Nevertheless, the issue is not settled, and Kratz 2016's presentation of scholarly consensus in biblical studies treats both Tetrateuchal/Pentateuchal and Hexateuchal perspectives as viable alternative working models in a variety of scholarly paradigms. Auld 1980: 1-51 remains a valuable overview of Noth's proposal's impact up to that time. Schmid 2011c provides an overview of the impact of the separation of the Tetrateuch/Pentateuch from the Deuteronomistic History on scholarship and calls for a reevaluation of this divide. See also the desideratum for a reevaluation of the sources in Joshua in Yoo 2014: 666-667.

[8] Noth 1938: xiii; 1957: 41 n. 3, 210-211.

[9] While some (e.g., Blum 1990: 225; Lohfink 1994: 145 n. 30; Frevel 2013: 7) have identified this position as originating with Wellhausen 1885: 357-358, 385, his stance on this issue is distinct from Noth's. Wellhausen does

Noth's book is most remembered for his analysis of the Deuteronomistic and Chronicler's histories,[10] he also devoted a five-chapter appendix to the ending of the Priestly text and its relationship to the formation of the Pentateuch in his new model.[11]

In this appendix, Noth argued two major points. First, he treated the material in the book of Joshua that scholars had previously identified as originating from the Priestly text, asserting that "…it can be proven that this [= the presence of P in Joshua] is false with rare certainty for a literary-critical issue."[12] He then turned his attention to the Priestly material in Numbers 11-36, from which he made the novel argument that the lack of P in Joshua is due to the fact that "the theme of the conquest lay outside of the circle of the materials held in mind by him [the Priestly author] for his work."[13] Noth drew on the well-established Analyst tradition of positing multiple layers in the Priestly text but realigned this approach by identifying every reference to the acquisition of land in Canaan in these chapters as a secondary addition.

---

not deny that there is Priestly material in Joshua, as Noth would do. Rather, Wellhausen suggests that he no longer views this material as deriving from Q, though he clearly states that it is part of the expansion of Q into the Priestly Code. This represents a departure from the previous position espoused in Wellhausen 1899: 127-133. Wellhausen's shift in perspective seems to derive from his inability to extricate a Q narrative from the first half of Joshua that could serve as a connection between the death of Moses and the material in the second half of Joshua. However, Wellhausen 1885: 374-375 makes clear that his stance was also conditioned by his desire to demonstrate that there was no Priestly influence on Deuteronomistic material, in accordance with the Graf hypothesis of P as the youngest Hexateuchal source. Nevertheless, Wellhausen's assertion that material in Joshua belongs to PC rather than Q is still very distinct from Noth 1957: 45-47, 182-190's claim that the material in Joshua has no relation whatsoever to P and is instead akin to the work of the Deuteronomist. Furthermore, Wellhausen 1885: 358 makes explicit that he believed that the Q account of the conquest was lost, not that it never existed. Finally, as Mowinckel 1964: 51 notes, Wellhausen later changed his position on the attribution of Joshua 13-21, acknowledging its connection to P in light of arguments by Graf and Kuenen.

[10] This focus is reflected in the titles of the two English translations of the first and second half of Noth 1957—Noth 1987 (*The Deuteronomistic History* = Noth 1957: 1-110); 1991 (*The Chronicler's History* = Noth 1957: 110-217). The idea of a Chronicler's History that includes both Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah has since been decisively refuted by Japhet 1968; Williamson 1977. For a thorough history of research into Chronicles, see Peltonen 1996.

[11] Noth 1957: 180-217. The conclusions reached in this material served as the basis of his later extended analysis in Noth 1981: 8-19, 239-247.

[12] Noth 1957: 184,"Es läßt sich jedoch mit einer in literarkritischen Dingen seltenen Sicherheit beweisen, daß das falsch ist." His certainty on this point has not always been positively received; see, Albertz 2007: 288-289; Guillaume 2009: 10, n. 40 for evaluations within programs both sympathetic and unsympathetic, respectively, to Noth's ultimate conclusions.

[13] Noth 1957: 191, "…*das Thema Landnahme außerhalb des Kreises der von ihm für sein Werk in das Auge gefaßten Stoffe lag*... " Emphasis original.

This new model of the Priestly text attracted several adherents, but Noth ultimately failed to forge a new consensus around the extent of P. This has left the state of research into the ending of the Priestly text and its relationship to both Joshua and Numbers in a state of flux. Some continue to defend the old consensus that the Priestly text includes an account of the conquest that is still partially extant in Joshua.[14] Others have implicitly accepted Noth's Pentateuchal limits on the Priestly text without engaging in the question of whether it once contained an account of the entry into the land.[15] Another group has actively embraced Noth's analysis,[16] while yet another camp has built on Noth's unraveling of the Priestly text to argue for an even more limited corpus with a narrative that ends prior to the death of Moses.[17]

This proliferation of models justifies a reexamination of Noth's arguments for the curtailment of the Priestly text, examining more recent scholarship only where it has improved on Noth's analysis rather than simply building from his conclusions. As Noth himself recognized the related but distinct nature of his two contentions—that there is no P in Joshua and that P has no interest in the entry into the land—we too will treat these issues separately. However, in our own inquiry we will reverse the order in which we treat these subjects. We must first determine whether the broader Priestly text substantiates Noth's conclusion that P shows no interest in the entry into Canaan. Only then can we evaluate his contention that there is no material from the original Priestly text present in the book of Joshua.

---

[14] E.g., Mowinckel 1964: 51-67; Fohrer 1968: 196-205; Blenkinsopp 1976; Haran 1978: 129-130; Petersen 1980; Lohfink 1994: 145-148.

[15] See works cited in note 7 above.

[16] E.g., Elliger 1952; McEvenue 1971: 19-21; Auld 1980; Blum 1990: 225-228; 2009: 39-41; L. Schmidt 1993: 207-271; 2008; Frevel 2000; Albertz 2007.

[17] E.g., Rendtorff 1977: 160-162; Perlitt 1988; Pola 1995; Otto 1997; Achenbach 2003; Nihan 2007: 20-68, 370-394; Römer 2009: 159-161; Boorer 2016: 71-90. For the influence of Perlitt 1988 on this camp and others who belong to it, see Frevel 2013: 6-7; for a refutation of Perlitt's position and the attempt to reduce the Priestly text in this manner, see Frevel 2000; L. Schmidt 2008. For a perceptive overview of one spur of these approaches, see Van Seters 2004's review of Achenbach 2003.

Retracing Our Steps: The Priestly Narrative Before Numbers 11

Noth grounds his argument for the Priestly text's lack of a conquest account in a comparison of the various versions of the appointment of Joshua: the Priestly account (Num 27:12-23), the Deuteronomistic account (Deut 3:23-28; 31:1-8), and an older/JE account (31:14-15, 23).[18] Noth observes that the non-Priestly versions of Joshua's appointment all make direct reference to his future role in the conquest and distribution of Canaan (Deut 3:28; 31:7, 23), while the Priestly version of this story does not. Instead, P describes Joshua's role using general warfare language without directly connecting this role to the upcoming conquest of Canaan (Num 27:17, 21). Furthermore, Noth points out that in P's account of the death of Moses, the Priestly author once again makes reference to Joshua's leadership without an explicit connection to the land of Canaan (Deut 34:9). From this limited constellation of data, Noth concludes that the entry into Canaan was never part of the Priestly text's narrative.

Immediately following this brief argument, Noth admits that there are in fact a number of passages in the latter part of the book of Numbers that scholars traditionally identify with P and that make explicit reference to the Israelites' future possession of Canaan. He then presents an analysis of the Priestly material in Numbers 10-36; Deuteronomy 31-34, concluding that—with the exception of a few references to groups or individuals not allowed to enter the land (Num 14:28-29, 34-38; 20:12)—all other putative P passages dealing with the land of Canaan are, in fact, additions to either P or to the completed Pentateuch.[19] The Priestly text after Numbers 10 consists, in Noth's reading, of only the spies narrative (Numbers 13-14*), the Korah rebellion and its aftermath (Num 16:1-18:7*), the Meribah conflict (Num 20:1-13), and the deaths of Aaron and Moses (Num 20:22-29; 27:12-23; Deut 34:1*, 7-9). Noth contextualizes this curtailed

[18] Noth 1957: 190-192 = 1987: 121-122.
[19] Noth 1957: 192-206 = 1987: 122-134.

Priestly narrative within a broader view of the purpose of the Priestly text, arguing that it had no need to speak of the conquest or much else after the departure from Sinai because "the principal emphasis in P is laid on the theme of the constitution of the people and cultic community at Sinai."[20]

Noth's analysis of P's narrative purview is weakened by his lack of engagement with any Priestly material outside of Numbers—a trend he continued when presenting this argument in his later work.[21] As outlined in our principles of secondary analysis, we must treat P as a narrative text and this means directing narrative questions to the Priestly text as a whole. Noth's argument centers on inherently narrative questions, attempting to identify where P ends and with what events the Priestly text concerns itself. Any attempt to answer these questions by reference to the book of Numbers alone is methodologically unsound.

We must instead survey the total sweep of the Priestly text's narrative in order to have a firm basis from which to address these issues. We will begin this process by tracing the course of the Priestly text up to the departure from Sinai in Numbers 10, evaluating the material that Noth's own inquiry either omits or only partially acknowledges. We are not the first to attempt such an analysis in response to Noth's project; however, these previous surveys either accept Noth's compositional curtailment as the basis for their exploration or are more broadly engaged

[20] Noth 1957: 208, "…daß der Hauptnachdruck bei P auf das Thema der Konstituierung der Volks- und Kultgemeinde am Sinai gelegt ist..." Noth 1981: 234, 239-247 contains further reflections on the implications of this view for understanding the work of P, on which see discussion below. Mowinckel 1964: 55 identifies this (somewhat incorrectly) as Noth's only positive argument in favor of his view and notes its weakness: "Von positiven Argumenten dafür, daß P keine Eroberungsgeschichte gehabt habe, findet man bei Noth eigentlich nur das eine, daß die Sinaiperikope das eigentliche Interesse des P hat. Das genügt aber, wie wir sahen, nicht als Beweis." For the impact of Noth's view on this point, see Boorer 2016: 10-34's use of Sinai and land as oppositional frameworks for organizing her review of scholarship on P.

[21] Noth 1981: 16. Mowinckel 1964: 52-57 similarly restricts his detailed analysis to the material in Numbers while refuting Noth's position.

in the Analytic model.[22] Given the radically different compositional model we have outlined in the preceding chapters, we will undertake a fresh analysis of the Priestly text as part of our evaluation of Noth's arguments.

The scope of the Priestly text in Genesis 1-11* already gives us reason to be skeptical of Noth's understanding of the singular focus of P. While the long-noted connection between the creation account in Gen 1:1-2:4a and the construction of the Tabernacle appears to vindicate his view,[23] the same can not be said for the rest of the materials in the opening chapters of Genesis. The Priestly author's version of the flood story—which includes the only detailed chronology outside of the Sinai episode (Gen 7:11, 24; 8:4, 5, 13, 14), a covenant with all creation (Gen 9:8-17), and an excursus on the origin of human carnivorousness (Gen 9:1-7)—suggests a broad range of interests. None of this has a direct bearing on Noth's insistence that P does not recount the entry into Canaan, but it suggests that Noth is wrong to justify his view by claiming a very limited set of interests for the Priestly author.

More probative for our own concerns, the incorporation of the *tôlədôt* and "table of nations" (Genesis 5*; 10-11*) indicates that the Priestly author's interest in the national and cultic makeup of Israel includes the relationship of Israel to the broader world around it. This material is placed so that the genealogy from Shem to Terah (Gen 11:10-26), which forms the bridge into the patriarchal period and the story of Abraham, is subsumed under the table of nations' closing comment that "from these the nations were separated on the earth after the flood" (10:32). Since Shem and his son Arpachshad are already included in the table (10:22), this arrangement may signal that the account of this particular lineage, eventuating in the Israelites, is

[22] See, e.g., Elliger 1952; Brueggemann 1972; Blenkinsopp 1976; Lohfink 1994: 136-172; Boorer 2016: 89-90, 455-502.
[23] See Propp 2006: 675-676 for overview and references; Stackert 2023 for a recent evaluation.

an examination of how this group became a "nation on the earth."[24] Given the geo-political valence of other groups in the table of nations, this could reasonably include an account of Israel's settlement in a particular place. Regardless of whether one accepts this reading of Genesis 10-11*, the broad sweep of the material in the Priestly text's primeval history weighs in favor of a less restricted view of P's narrative arc than Noth allows.

When we turn to the rest of the Priestly narrative, we encounter material more directly relevant to Noth's claims. The Priestly account of the patriarchal era begins with a brief description of Terah's family (Gen 11:27-30) before focusing on Abraham, who travels to the land of Canaan (Gen 11:31; 12:4b-5) and stays there when Lot separates from him (Gen 13:6, 11b-12). Abraham then fathers Ishmael and lives in Canaan for twenty-four years (Gen 12:4b-5; 16:3, 15-16; 17:1; cf. 12:1-4a) before Yhwh appears to him. When Yhwh does so, he introduces himself as El Shaddai (Gen 17:1; cf. Exod 6:3) and makes an eternal covenant with him (17:7). This covenant contains three promises: Yhwh promises to multiply Abraham and to "set you as nations" (Gen 17:2, 6), he promises "to be a god for you and for your descendants after you" (Gen 17:7, 8b), and he promises to give Abraham and his descendants "the land of your sojournings, all the land of Canaan, as an eternal holding" (Gen 17:8a).[25]

The Priestly author's explicit inclusion of the promise of Canaan to Abraham would seem to undermine Noth's position that P has no interest in this subject. Nevertheless, Noth argues that the covenant introduced in Genesis 17 holds no real meaning for the Priestly author but served "only as a decorative feature of the narrative which serves to give a divine promise a solemn

[24] See also, Lohfink 1994: 154 n. 43's more general view of the table of nations' function within P. For a similar view on P's interest in Israel as a nation, but with different emphases, see Nihan 2007: 63-64.
[25] For an analysis of these promises within a compositional schema broadly similar to Noth's own, see Boorer 2016: 474-487.

form; it might without any real loss be omitted from the passage in question."[26] He asserts that the Priestly author has mechanically taken over the concept of the covenant from older Pentateuchal traditions and has, in a similar manner, included the promise of land "because in the ancient tradition these matters [land and descendants] belonged closely together, although he himself [= P] had no intention of speaking further about the fulfillment of this promise, namely, the occupation of the land by the Israelite tribes."[27]

This is a testable hypothesis, as long as we accept, in accordance with our principles of secondary analysis, that the content of the Priestly text is our surest guide to understanding its interests and concerns. When we trace the motifs introduced by the three promises that constitute the covenant with Abraham, we find that Genesis 17 functions as a large-scale argument for the Priestly text.[28] The promises in this version of the Abrahamic covenant set out the major expectations for how Yhwh will act in Israel's history according to the Priestly author, and the fulfillment of these promises is the backbone of P's plot. Each of the promises helps structure and drive the Priestly narrative—none of them is merely decorative. In what follows, we will trace the ways these promises are integrated into the Priestly narrative, demonstrating that the promise of land has as much of an impact on the shape of the Priestly text as the other two promises.[29]

---

[26] Noth 1966: 92; see also, 1957: 208 n. 2 = 1987: 186 n. 7. The term *bərît* occurs 38 times in P, versus 16 times in JE/non-Priestly material. The expanded use of this term in P superficially suggests that it is more than a merely "decorative feature." P does, however, deploy the concept of covenant in a different way than JE does—in contrast to J and E, P never speaks of a covenant made at Sinai and seems to view the stipulations granted there as simply another part of the original covenant made between YHWH and Abraham (see as well Lev 26:45). For an analysis of P's Sinai account and its view of covenant, see Schwartz 1996a: 126 n. 52, 130-132. See also, Nihan 2009.

[27] Noth 1981: 234 n. 617. Noth consistently deploys this argument to explain features of the Priestly text that do not align with his assertion that its sole interest is in Sinai—he attributes these elements to P's reliance on older forms of the Pentateuchal material, primarily J; see, e.g., Noth 1957: 207-209 = 1987: 136-138; 1981: 234, 246.

[28] For smaller-scale arguments in P (Exodus 40; Lev 10:10-11; Num 10:1-10), see discussions in Chapters 2, 3, & 4.

[29] Note that Elliger 1952; Brueggemann 1972; L. Schmidt 1993: 251-271; Boorer 2000; 2016: 479-480, 485-488; Frevel 2000, which all agree with Noth's hypothesis of P ending with the death of Moses (or, for Boorer 2016: 84-89, with the appointment of Joshua in Num 27:12-14), all also argue against Noth's conclusion that the land had no value for P on the basis of their evaluation of the larger Priestly narrative.

The fulfillment of Yhwh's first promise to Abraham, to multiply him, serves as the dominant focus of the patriarchal material in the Priestly text. The Priestly author traces the growth of Abraham's family, including Ishmael (Gen 25:12-17) and Esau (36:1-30), through a combination of genealogies and narratives. The Priestly text notes that Abraham's blessing passes to Isaac (Gen 17:19, 21; 25:11a), who then passes it on to Jacob (28:3-4)—Yhwh then reaffirms the promise of multiplication to Jacob when he returns to Canaan from Aram with twelve sons (Gen 35:11, 22b-26). When Jacob's family travels to Egypt, the Priestly text presents a clan list that shows that his twelve sons have grown into a family of seventy descendants (Gen 46:8-27).[30] Once they are settled in Egypt, P states that "they were fruitful and multiplied very much" (Gen 47:27b), directly echoing the words of Yhwh when he relayed his promises to Jacob (Gen 35:11). The Priestly author then has Jacob recount his memory of this promise in the immediately following text (Gen 48:3-4).

While the promise of descendants and the generation-by-generation expansion of Abraham's family are traditional, P's presentation of these features is not. The Priestly author does not merely take over the promise of descendants from the traditional patriarchal narrative, but modifies it to reflect his own particular interests and method. He does not include any reference to the innumerability of Abraham's descendants that are common-place in non-Priestly material, usually accompanied by a comparison with stars, sand, or dust (Gen 13:16; 15:5; 16:10; 22:17; 26:4; 28:14; Exod 32:13; cf. Deut 1:10; 10:22; 28:62).[31] P instead has Yhwh promise that the descendants of Abraham will constitute nations or an assembly of peoples (Gen 17:5-6, 16, 20; 28:3; 35:11; 48:4).

---

[30] Note that this count includes Dinah (Gen 46:15), but not any of the wives of Jacob's sons (46:26).

[31] Note that the Priestly author does not precisely eliminate the comparison of Abraham's descendants to the number of stars, but recasts the meaning of this promise by identifying the Israelites with the "hosts of Yhwh" (Exod 7:4; 12:41). See Halpern 1991: 78 n. 1.

The Priestly author's account of the fulfillment of this promise reflects these modifications. P's omission of any promise of innumerability accords with his penchant for detailing the precise number of descendants at several points in his account (Gen 35:33b; 46:26-27; Exod 38:26; Num 1:46; 2:32). Yhwh promises to make Abraham and Sarah into nations (Gen 17:5-6, 16) and extends a promise to make Ishmael into a nation as well (16:20). The Priestly text then dutifully records the blossoming of Ishmael's descendants into a nation (Gen 25:12-16) and the emergence of both Israel and Edom from Isaac (Gen 36:1-30).[32] Notably, only Abraham receives a promise of nations in the plural—the other forms of this promise either contain the singular nation (Gen 35:11) or refer to a singular "assembly of peoples/nations" (*qəhal ʿammîm*/*gôyim*) as the outcome of Yhwh's multiplication (Gen 28:3; 35:11; 48:4).[33] This aligns with P's story—of the people to whom Yhwh makes an explicit promise, only Abraham is the ancestor of multiple nations (Ishmael, Edom, Israel). The other person who receives this promise, Jacob, is the ancestor of only a single nation, though one made up of multiple tribal groups.

When the patriarchal era comes to a close, the motif of the first promise recedes. Nevertheless, the Priestly author still periodically emphasizes the multiplication of Israel, integrating this promise into his plot by directly connecting Israel's growth to the Egyptian oppression (Exod 1:7, 13-14). At Sinai, the Priestly author informs us through the census that the

[32] While the Edomite kings list (Gen 36:31-39) has frequently been attributed to J, this has never been based on anything other than a perception that the Edomite genealogies represent a mixed source (see, e.g., Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: ad loc., "With this verse [36:31] R introduces an extract [vss.] 32-39 from a document wholly different in style from the context. Its source is unknown, but on analogy of other passages of composite origin, e.g. [ch] 10, it is provisionally assigned to J."). However, it is possible that this mixture of sources should be attributed to the Priestly author and that the inclusion of a genealogy, clan list, and kings list for Edom is part of P signaling that Yhwh has kept his promise.

[33] While the phrase "an assembly of nations" in Gen 35:11 might be construed as a promise to Jacob of multiple *gôyim*, we should note that Yhwh's promise is limited by this phrase occurring as a modification of the singular *gôy*—"a nation and an assembly of nations will come from you" (*gôy ûqəhal gôyim yihyeh mimmeka*). The reference to "an assembly of peoples/nations" may be an acknowledgement of the separate but related states of Judah and Israel.

singular Abraham has grown into a multi-tribal group of 603,550 non-Levite males (Exod 38:26; Num 1:46; 2:32). The multiplication theme is also projected into the future—Yhwh promises to extend the promise of fecundity to the entire Israelite community, sustaining their growth as long as they continue to obey his commands (Lev 26:9).[34] The Priestly author thoroughly integrates the promise of descendants into his narrative and casts it in a form that is consonant with his own interest in numerical precision and genealogical records.

The fulfillment of the second promise Yhwh makes to Abraham—"to be a god to you and to your seed after you" (Gen 17:7-8)—plays a minimal role in the patriarchal segment of P. It is detectable with certainty only in the two narratives that show Yhwh's continued interest in Abraham's family: Yhwh's blessing of Isaac (25:11a) and his appearance to Jacob in accordance with Isaac's transmission of Abraham's blessing (28:1-5; 35:9-13). Additionally, the statement by the Hittites of Hebron addressing Abraham as "a *nāśîʾ* of god" (23:6) may be associated with this promise. We should nevertheless note that even when he appears to Jacob, Yhwh does not reiterate the promise to be a god for Abraham's descendants. P's account of the patriarchal period contains no further elaboration on this part of Yhwh's relationship with Israel.

Instead, Yhwh's role as Israel's god comes into prominence in the exodus account, just as the motif of the first promise begins to recede. The fulfillment of the promise to be a god for Abraham's descendants dominates Yhwh's first speech to Moses (Exod 6:2-8), a major turning point in the Priestly text's narrative. The first indication of the shift to this motif comes in the opening of this speech, where Yhwh reveals his personal name for the first time (Exod 6:2). Motivated by his memory of the covenant he made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 2:24; 6:5), Yhwh reaffirms his intention to be Israel's god (Exod 6:7a).

[34] For the role this promise continues to play in the post-Sinai material, see discussion of Numbers 11-36* below.

Rather than simply stating that he will be Israel's god, Yhwh then provides details about how he will set about doing so. Yhwh declares that he will fulfill this part of his covenant by bringing the Israelites out of Egypt (Exod 6:6-7), telling Moses that when he does so they "will know that I am Yhwh, your god, who brought you out of the land of Egypt" (Exod 6:7b). Following the exodus, the Priestly author returns to this phrase multiple times, emphasizing that Yhwh kept his promise to be Israel's god through his role in the exodus (Exod 16:6; 29:46a; Lev 11:45; 19:36; 22:32-33; 25:38, 55; 26:12-13).[35] The Priestly text then closes its list of promises and punishments by projecting Yhwh's commitment to this promise into the future, maintaining the connection between Yhwh's covenant with Abraham, his status as Israel's god, and his actions in the exodus (Lev 26:45). In the Priestly account of the exodus, Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise to be a god for Abraham's descendants provides the motivation for his actions in the narrative. That Yhwh kept this promise by leading the Israelites out of Egypt becomes a touchstone of the Priestly text, the evidence that Yhwh is indeed "your god."

After the exodus from Egypt, the Priestly author continues to organize his narrative around Yhwh's promise to be a god for the Israelites. In the Sinai material, the fulfillment of this promise finds its ultimate expression in the Priestly account of the Tabernacle. The Priestly author emphasizes the importance of the Tabernacle to his view of the Israelite past through the two panels of instruction and execution in which the details of its measurements and construction are given twice (Exodus 25-31; 35-40). In the midst of this material, the Priestly author directly connects this crucial institution to the fulfillment of Yhwh's promise to be a god to Israel and to the exodus event. In a speech describing the function of the Tabernacle, Yhwh states, "I will be met there by the children of Israel and it will be sanctified by my *kābôd*…and I will tent in the

[35] The phrase "I am Yhwh" (*ʾny yhwh*) should likely be understood as shorthand for this fuller expression—for a list of occurrences, see Appendix 3.3.

midst of the children of Israel and I will be to them a god, and they will know that I am Yhwh their god who brought them out from the land of Egypt so that I could tent in their midst; I am Yhwh their god" (Exod 29:43, 45-46).[36]

The Tabernacle's role as the earthly dwelling for Yhwh's presence represents a literal fulfillment of the promise to Abraham, providing a "Tent of Meeting" (*ʾhl mwʿd*) where the Israelites can interact with Yhwh.[37] The Priestly author concretizes Yhwh's presence among the Israelites by describing his *kābôd* filling the Tabernacle's interior (Exod 40:34-35) and then appearing to "all the people" at the culmination of Aaron's consecration (Lev 9:23-24). We find this same view of the Tabernacle as the site of Yhwh's availability as Israel's god expressed in the various sacrificial regulations incorporated into the Priestly text, which deploy the phrase "before Yhwh" as synonymous with "at the Tent of Meeting" (e.g., Lev 1:3; 3:1-2; 17:3-5). The Priestly author's choice to narrate the organization of the Israelite camps further emphasizes Yhwh's availability in the Tabernacle by placing it at the center of the tribal camps (Num 1:48-2:34). Here again we find the Priestly author concretizing Yhwh's promise—just as Yhwh declared that he brought the Israelites out of Egypt in order to "tent in their midst" (Exod 29:45-46), so the Priestly author describes him as doing exactly that. The Priestly author has not limited Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise to be a god for Abraham's descendants to his work in the exodus, but extended it into Yhwh's commission of a physical dwelling for himself among the Israelites. In the Tabernacle, as much as in the exodus, Yhwh actualizes his role as Israel's god.

The Priestly text further elaborates on what it means for Yhwh to be Israel's god by its exposition of what it means for Israel to be Yhwh's people. Yhwh introduces this reciprocal

[36] See Nihan 2007: 63-65 for a review of the nexus of Gen 17:7; Exod 6:7; 29:45-46 with different emphases.
[37] Blenkinsopp 1976: 278-279, which does not emphasize the role of the Abrahamic covenant in P (preferring to emphasize the creation account as a controlling element of P's structure), also recognizes the fulfillment of Yhwh's promise to be a god for Abraham's descendants in the construction of the Tabernacle.

element when he reaffirms the Abrahamic promise to Moses, stating that he will take Israel for himself as a people (Exod 6:7a; cf. Lev 20:26). The Israelites are then described as Yhwh's "hosts" (*ṣəbāʾôt*) as they leave Egypt (Exod 7:4; 12:41). After the construction of the Tabernacle, the need for Israel to fulfill its role as the people for whom Yhwh is god motivates the Priestly author's inclusion of the various regulations, manuals, and collections that constitute the bulk of Leviticus. The purification manuals (Leviticus 11-15) directly connect their purpose to Yhwh's presence in the Tabernacle, stating that separation from impurity preserves the people's lives by stopping them from defiling "my Tabernacle, which is in their midst" (Lev 15:31). This nexus of purity and Tabernacle is then reiterated in the organization of the Israelite camp at Sinai (Num 5:1-4). The frequency of the phrase "I am Yhwh your god" as a justification or exhortation throughout the material in Leviticus 18-26 further signals the reciprocal relationship between god and people.[38] Even more explicit are the passages commanding the Israelites to "be holy because I, Yhwh, am holy" (Lev 11:44-45; 19:2; 20:26). The promises list at the close of this section of P returns to this motif, again connecting Yhwh's presence in the Tabernacle with Israel's role as his people and their obedience to his commands (Lev 26:11-12). In other words, the incorporation of these non-narrative materials directly contributes to the Priestly text's larger plot, participating in the fulfillment of Yhwh's promise to be a god to Abraham's descendants.

Throughout the exodus and Sinai sections in P, the Priestly author centers Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise to be a god to Abraham and his descendants. As P's Sinai pericope draws to a close, we find all of the elements that we have examined here tersely connected together in Lev 26:11-13—Yhwh's role as Israel's god, Israel's role as Yhwh's people, the work of Yhwh in the exodus, and Yhwh's presence in the tabernacle—signaling that Yhwh has completely fulfilled his promise to Abraham. We then find that the motif of Yhwh fulfilling his

[38] See Appendix 3.3 for a list of occurrences.

promise to be Israel's god recedes after the end of P's exodus and Sinai narratives, just as the promise of descendants receded as a motif once the patriarchal narrative ended.[39] The above survey demonstrates that, like the promise of descendants, the Priestly author used Yhwh's promise to be a god to Abraham's descendants as a structural element, introducing it in Genesis 17 and then deploying it as the major motivation for Yhwh's actions from the close of the patriarchal era to the departure from Sinai.

Unlike the promise of descendants, there are no grounds for suggesting that the Priestly author has merely taken over a traditional element into his patriarchal narrative—Yhwh's promise to be a god to Israel as a plot element is unique to the Priestly text among Pentateuchal sources.[40] The closest that JE/non-Priestly material in Genesis comes to this idea is Jacob's oath to make Yhwh his god if he returns safely to Canaan from Aram (Gen 28:21). In Deuteronomy, the motif of Yhwh having selected Israel as his people is emphasized (Deut 4:20; 14:2; 26:18-19; 27:9; 28:9), but its inverse occurs in only two places (26:17-18; 29:12). However, these two Deuteronomistic occurrences differ from the Priestly deployment of this phrase. In both of these cases, Yhwh's role as a god to Israel is associated with "today," the moment of the Mosiac covenant instantiated in the plains of Moab, rather than with Yhwh's work in the exodus and at Sinai. And while Deut 29:12 connects Yhwh's role with "what he swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," both of these passages more strongly connect the idea of Yhwh as Israel's god to the Israelites' exclusive fidelity to Yhwh rather than to Yhwh's fidelity to Israel

[39] For the role this promise continues to play in the post-Sinai material, see further discussion of Numbers 11-36* below.

[40] See also, Boorer 2016: 146. In the Former Prophets, 2 Sam 7:23-24 also expresses this idea—this is not the only point of contact between 2 Samuel 7 and the Priestly text's conception of Israelite history (e.g., 2 Sam 7:6-7). In the Latter Prophets, the frequent reversion to this motif in Jeremiah (7:23; 11:4; 13:11; 24:7; 30:22; 31:1, 9, 33; 32:38) and Ezekiel (11:20; 14:11; 34:24, 30-31; 36:28; 37:23, 27) can perhaps help us identify a cultural/intellectual matrix for the Priestly text if we move to a discussion beyond questions of literary dependence (see following note). Notably, this motif is absent from the majority of the post-exilic comparanda used for dating P in the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen model (e.g., Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles), though it does occur in Zech 8:8.

(Deut 26:17; 29:15-17).[41] The Priestly author's deployment of this phrase as a structural and motivational element of his narrative is distinct from Deuteronomy's focus on exclusive Israelite fidelity to Yhwh.

Our brief survey of the Priestly narrative through the lens of the first two promises in Genesis 17 supports the contention that these promises were not mere inheritances from preceding tradition. Rather, the Priestly author used these promises to introduce the major plot elements of his narrative and then shaped his narrative to address these plot elements by detailing Yhwh's fulfillment of his promises. This licenses us to evaluate the third promise made to Abraham—the promise of the land of Canaan—in the same terms. Given the patterns we have already observed, we expect to find the Priestly author highlighting this promise as a secondary motif within the patriarchal, exodus, and Sinai materials where the first two promises serve as the primary motifs. We then expect that, after the departure from Sinai, Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise of land will become the most prominent of the three promise motifs. If the Priestly text bears out these expectations, we will have demonstrated that Genesis 17 functions as an argument for the Priestly narrative from that point forward and that the acquisition of Canaan is implicated in the full sweep of the Priestly text. This, in turn, would undermine Noth's claim that the entry into the land was outside of the scope of the Priestly author's narrative concerns.

Within the Priestly text's patriarchal narrative, the importance of the promise of land is expressed most explicitly by its repeated occurrence. After Yhwh's initial promise to Abraham,

---

[41] The difficulty of determining the precise meaning of *ʾmr* in the C-stem in Deut 26:16-19 complicates the relationship between this passage and P's deployment of the phrase. If *ʾmr* C-stem is taken as intensive rather than causative in 26:17, then this passage is distinct from the Priestly text's idea, as it would represent Israel's attestion that Yhwh will be their god rather than Israel abjuring Yhwh to declare himself as their god. Regardless of how one reads the latter passage though, there is no denying the connection Deut 29:12 makes between Yhwh being Israel's god and his promises to the patriarchs. While the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen model would have us derive P's deployment of this idea as a central part of its plot to this one line in Deuteronomy, a different reading of the evidence might see in this passage either an allusion to the Priestly narrative (granting P literary priority over D) or further evidence for a shared late-7th -century cultural/intellectual matrix for this idea, linking P, Dtr, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. See previous note.

Isaac details the promise of land to Jacob as he transmits Abraham's blessing to his son (Gen 28:4; cf. 25:11a). In the particular formulation of this latter passage, Isaac defines the "blessing of Abraham" primarily in regard to the promise "to inherit the land of your sojournings" (28:4).[42] The promise of land is then confirmed to Jacob by Yhwh himself on his return to Canaan from Aram (Gen 35:12). Shortly before his death, Jacob relates the story of Yhwh's visitation to Joseph, reiterating that Yhwh had promised to grant the land of Canaan to his descendants (Gen 48:4).

The repetition of this promise at each stage of the patriarchal narrative is notable, especially when compared to the lack of transmission that Yhwh's promise to be a god to Abraham's descendants receives in this material.[43] The promise of land instead patterns with the promise of descendants in P's patriarchal account—it is repeated in every narrative of Yhwh's promises. Furthermore, the promise of land, like the promise of descendants, extends beyond these promise narratives and plays a role in other facets of P's patriarchal narrative. The Priestly author's view of the promise of land drives his patriarchal narrative in two primary ways: in attention to the settlement location of Abraham's relatives and in the accounts of the purchase and use of the burial cave at Machpelah.

After Abraham comes to Canaan, the Priestly author relates that Lot separated from him, taking care to contrast Abraham's location "in the land of Canaan" with Lot's settlement in "the cities of the plain" (Gen 13:6, 11b-12). While the separation of Abraham and Lot is also related in pre-Priestly materials (Gen 13:1-5, 7-11a), the Priestly author embeds this event within a different view of Yhwh's communication with Abraham. In the older account, J attributes Abraham's journey to Canaan to Yhwh's instructions (Gen 12:1-4a) and relates a second

[42] See also the discussion of Exod 6:4 below.
[43] See discussion above on the relative absence of this motif from the patriarchal narrative.

theophany upon Abraham's entry into the land (Gen 12:6-7). When Lot and Abraham do separate, Yhwh makes a third appearance to Abraham (Gen 13:14-17). In brief, Yhwh's initial communications with Abraham in J occur prior to his entry into Canaan, while J's account of the first promise of land (12:7) occurs prior to Abraham's separation from Lot.

P's account of these events differs markedly, with the impulse to travel to Canaan attributed to Terah after the death of his son Haran (Gen 11:28, 31) and Abraham completing the journey after his father's death (11:32; 12:4b-5). In the Priestly text, Yhwh does not appear to Abraham until he has lived in Canaan for twenty-four years (Gen 12:4b; 17:1), after he has separated from Lot and Ishmael has been born (13:6, 11b-12; 16:3, 15-16). That P differs so markedly from J on Yhwh's communications with Abraham and that these are the only two events narrated in P between Abraham's entrance into Canaan and Yhwh's appearance to him suggests that Lot's separation from Abraham constituted an important prerequisite for Yhwh's theophany from the Priestly author's point of view. By shaping the narrative in this way, the Priestly author communicates that the promise of Canaan to Abraham and his descendants does not include any space for Lot.[44]

The Priestly author also takes care to account for the settlement of the Ishmaelites and Edomites—groups which are definitively within the Abrahamic line and yet excluded from the promise of Canaan. Ishmael's exclusion is already noted by Yhwh when he makes his initial

[44] Part of the motivation for so explicitly excluding Lot may derive from the Priestly author viewing the presentation of earlier sources as too easily allowing the view that Lot was included in the promises to Abraham (Gen 12:1-4a). However, it is also notable that the Priestly text omits any genealogical account of Moab and Ammon and does not include them among the peoples Israel encounters in the wilderness in Numbers 11-36*. The omission of genealogies for Ammon and Moab may be related to P's genealogical focus on relating the fulfillment of Yhwh's promise to multiply Abraham's descendants—a group which Gen 13:6, 11b-12 makes clear does not include Lot's descendants. Nevertheless, P still presents Moab as a geographic region in the wilderness narrative, though one inhabited by Midianites (cf. Gen 36:35). The claim P is making may be that the Moabites and Ammonites had not yet settled in their respective territories prior to the Israelites arriving in Canaan. If this is the case, the accompanying claim is that the Moabites would have owed the Israelites a debt of gratitude for clearing their land of its previous inhabitants prior to their settlement there.

promises to Abraham (Gen 17:18-21). This early, divine distinction between Ishmael and Isaac takes the place of the story of filial abandonment that serve the same function in JE (21:8-21)—the Priestly text instead presents a narrative in which there is no such rupture in Abraham's household (25:9). Nevertheless, the Priestly text emphasizes Ishmael's exclusion from the promises made to Abraham in the way that it embeds the Ishmaelite genealogy within its patriarchal narrative, placing it after the death and burial of Abraham and the note about the passing of his blessing to Isaac (25:8-11a) but before the Priestly account of Isaac's life. Despite the fact that Ishmael is a contemporary of Isaac, lives for 49 years after Abraham's death, and even figures in the narrative after this point (28:9), the Priestly text attaches the report of Ishmael's death to this genealogy (25:17), signaling the end of his role in the thread of the Abrahamic promises the Priestly text is tracing. Importantly, this account of the Ishmaelites closes with a note placing their settlement outside of Canaan (25:18),[45] while Isaac remains definitively within its bounds (31:18; 35:27). That this notice is associated so closely with the death of Abraham suggests a division of his patrimony in which Isaac was the primary recipient of property.[46]

The Priestly author treats Esau in a similar fashion, though it is Isaac rather than Yhwh who declares that Jacob and not Esau will inherit the promises of land to Abraham (Gen 28:1-5).

[45] The relationship of Gen 25:18 to P has occasionally been contested on the basis of its connection to 16:12 (J). Carpenter & Harford Battersby 1900: ad loc. attribute to J for this reason, while Kuenen 1886: 67 and Wellhausen 1899: 20 simply acknowledge the possibility that it may be J rather than P. Speiser 1964: 188-189 notes the ambiguity of the evidence. In favor of this notice belonging properly to P is the fact that this verse has no explicit subject and so must depend on its context to supply one, which is not possible in either a J (24:67➔(25:5-6?)➔25:11b➔ 25:18) or JE (24:67➔25:1-6➔25:11b➔25:18) sequence. We should note that it is possible to render a cogent subject in an E sequence (25:1-4➔25:18), though this would require us understanding the note at the end of 25:18 to apply to the Keturites rather than the Ishmaelites in mild disagreement with the statement preserved in 16:12 (J). More problematic for this sequence is that Šûr is otherwise associated with Ishmael in 16:7. Additionally, while both the Keturite and Ishmaelite genealogies contain names of known groups from Arabia (Graf 2016: 458-464), the Ishmaelite genealogy seems to better align with the geographic notice in 25:18 (Graf 2016: 460-461). The weight of the evidence makes an ascription of this notice to P the most likely of our options.

[46] The idea of dividing Abraham's patrimony is explicit in Gen 25:5-6 (JE), though the text states that this took place while he was still alive.

Here again we find the Priestly text deviating from older tradition in the way that it handles these matters. Rather than the foolishness of Esau (25:29-34) or the trickiness of Rebekah and Jacob (27:1-45), the Priestly author embeds Isaac's decision in a dispute over marriage and family (26:34-35; 27:46-28:9).[47] This again avoids the familial rupture of the older texts (27:34-45; 32:4-8), with no suggestion of fraternal tension. Additionally, whereas the JE/non-Priestly text has Esau already living in Edom when Jacob returns from Aram (32:4), the Priestly text implies that Jacob and Esau are still living in proximity to Isaac and each other when Isaac dies, and they both bury their father just as Isaac and Ishmael had buried Abraham (Gen 35:27-29).

Esau's genealogy then immediately follows Isaac's death (Gen 35:29-36:5), just as Ishmael's immediately followed Abraham's death.[48] This genealogy is broken into two parts—an account of the children born to Esau in Canaan (36:1-5) and an account of his extended family born in Seir (36:9-14). In between these two genealogies is a short narrative in which the Priestly author informs us that Jacob and Esau amiably parted ways for the same reason as Abraham and Lot (36:6-8; cf. 13:6). Esau settles in Seir (36:8, 43) while Jacob settles in Canaan (37:1) in accordance with Isaac's transmission of Abraham's blessing (28:4). Again, the Priestly author has taken care on the death of a patriarch to note the settlement location of each of his children, one outside of Canaan and one within its bounds.

Each of these stories, by removing a close Abrahamic relative from Canaan—Lot, Ishmael, Esau—implicitly comments on the status of the land and the Israelites' relationship to it. The narrative accounting for the settlement of the different Abrahamic groups is a sign that the

[47] We should note that, just as in JE, Rebekah is still the prime mover of Jacob's selection in the P version of these events. Also worth noting is that Esau's eventual selection of Ishmael's daughter for his wife (Gen 28:9) aligns his marriage patterns with those that underlie the kinship-marriage restrictions in Leviticus 18, where your father's brother's daughter is the closest allowable marriage. Jacob's marriages come from the same genealogical horizon but with a matrilineal preference, as he is instructed to marry his mother's brother's daughters (Gen 28:2).
[48] Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: ad loc.

promise of land to Abraham is more than a rote element of tradition taken up with no impact on the Priestly author's formulation of his work. Instead, the fulfillment of this promise drives part of the plot of the Priestly text in Genesis.

This attention to the settlement of Abraham's family is not the only way that the Priestly text shows its concern for the promise of land in the patriarchal narrative. The Priestly author also includes an account of Abraham's purchase of the burial cave of Machpelah, marking the first acquisition of real property in Canaan (Gen 23:16-18, 20; cf. Lev 27:14-21).[49] The Priestly narrative returns to this burial cave at several points, accounting for the generational burials that take place there (Gen 23:19; 25:8-10; 35:29; 49:29-32; 50:12-13) while emphasizing Abraham's acquisition of this land as property (25:10; 49:30, 32; 50:13). Importantly, the burials that take place in this cave align with P's description of the differentiated settlements of Abraham's family—neither Ishmael nor Esau are buried at Machpelah, but Isaac and Jacob are (49:31; 50:12-13). Attention to these burials and their concentration around a single acquired piece of property are distinctive features of the Priestly text that are not present in the older JE/non-Priestly material.[50] This again indicates that the acquisition of land in Canaan was not merely a

[49] Sarna 1982: 17. See also Brichto 1973 for a broader synthesis of burial practices, ancestral veneration, and land ownership in biblical texts and Bloch-Smith 1992; 2018 for a review of archaeological data on Iron Age burial practices. Wolff 2002 offers a review of Levantine burial practices from the Persian period, noting that "the break with the preceding Iron Age mortuary practices is dramatic and almost total in all respects…" (136). We should note that the Priestly account of the Machpelah burials aligns more closely with Iron Age than Persian era practices.

[50] P's interest in the burial of the patriarchal generations is further confirmed by its inclusion of an account of Rachel's burial (Gen 48:7), taken from E/JE (35:16-20) but adapted so as to eliminate Rachel's death in childbirth in order to align the story with P's view that all of Jacob's children were born in Aram (35:22b-26). On the issue of Rachel's burial outside of Machpelah, see the interesting suggestion of Cox & Ackerman 2009—though they have unfortunately treated Genesis from a synchronic perspective so that the reference to Rachel's death in childbirth is considered alongside the Machpelah material despite the Priestly text explicitly excluding this element from its version of her death and burial. While they center their inquiry on why Rachel is not buried at Machpelah, an approach to this issue from a diachronic perspective might instead ask why Rachel's burial is accounted for at all in E/JE when almost no one else's is—non-Priestly burial accounts include only Deborah (35:8), Rachel (35:19-20), Jacob (47:29-31; 50:1-11, 14), and Joseph (50:23-26; cf. Exod 13:19; Josh 24:32). If the actual burial account of Josheph (Josh 24:32) originally belonged to the E/JE material extant in the Pentateuch, then the Israelites choice to bury him in "the portion of the field which which Jacob purchased" provides a parallel to P's interest in multigenerational burials. The role of this theme is nevertheless distinct in these two sources—E/JE shows interest

relic of tradition for the Priestly author but an important element of his narrative driven by Yhwh's promises to Abraham.

We have seen that the Priestly author accounts for the promise of land in his patriarchal material through the repetition of the promise, through careful attention to the settlement of various Abrahamic groups, and through his account of the purchase of and burials at Machpelah. Disguised within this review of the Priestly text's patriarchal narrative is yet another piece of evidence that undermines Noth's position on the relative unimportance of the land to P. The narratives related to the promise of land that we have analyzed here—the promise stories, the movement of peoples, the burials—account for almost all of the non-genealogical material in the Priestly story of the patriarchs. Given the oft-observed sparsity of the narrative material in this section of P, the fact that almost all of it is in some way associated with the promise of land is a strong indicator of the importance this issue had for the Priestly author.

When we look beyond the patriarchal era, we find that the Priestly text continues to be attentive to Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise to bestow the land of Canaan upon Abraham's descendants. Immediately after Yhwh reveals his name to Moses, the Priestly author has him describe the nature of his covenant with the patriarchs by explaining that "I established my covenant with them to give to them the land of Canaan" (Exod 6:4). This speech further emphasizes the centrality of Yhwh's fulfillment of this particular promise by bracketing the speech with it.[51] Just as he begins with this statement to explain his motivation for bringing the Israelites out of Egypt, so he concludes by saying that he will lead them out and "will bring you to the land which I lifted my hand to give it to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and I will give it to

---

in the burial of a single son of Jacob with his father, rather than the multigenerational burial of fathers, mothers, and sons that P relates.

[51] This bracketing reflects an inversion of the promises to Abraham, in which the promise of land is bracketed by the promise to be a god for Abraham and his descendants (Gen 17:7-8).

you as an inheritance" (Exod 6:8). With these statements, the Priestly author makes clear that the promise of land was an important factor in Yhwh's deliverance of the Israelites.[52]

In our earlier discussion, we noted that this same speech develops Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise to be a god to the Israelites. At this stage we should also note that the fulfillment of that promise is only implicitly connected with the Abrahamic covenant. This stands in stark contrast with the statements on the fulfillment of Yhwh's promise of the possession of Canaan, which the Priestly author has explicitly connected to the contents of his covenant with the patriarchs. Just as we observed the Priestly author using the promise to be a god as an explanation of Yhwh's motivation in delivering the Israelites from Egypt, so too does he use the promise of Canaan. Far from being empty words repeated from older tradition, we find the fulfillment of this promise being used to further the plot of the Priestly text. Yhwh is explicit that the goal of the exodus is not just to be a god for the Israelites, but also to bring them to and grant them the land of Canaan. Despite the fact that the promise of land is secondary to Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise to be a god in the exodus section of the Priestly text, P goes out of its way in this speech to remind the reader of the centrality of that promise to Yhwh's covenant with Abraham.

As the Israelites make their way from Egypt to Sinai, the Priestly author finds another opportunity to indicate the breadth of his narrative concerns in the manna story (Exodus 16*).[53]

---

[52] See also L. Schmidt 1993: 257-258.

[53] See Baden 2010; 2013b for arguments that this unit was originally located between the spies and Koraḥ narratives in the Priestly text and has been relocated here by R so as to unite the J and P versions of the initial giving of manna. While this proposal is attractive in some respects, it is also not a necessary one for explaining the so-called anachronisms in Exod 16:33-35 (Propp 1998: 590-592, correctly to my mind, explains these as proleptic statements). Importantly, Baden's proposal would introduce other problems into the chapter—such as the appearance of the *kābôd* in the wilderness rather than at the Tabernacle (16:10). Were we to suppose that this was a modification by R to accord this story with its new setting, we would then have to ask why he didn't take similar care in modifying 16:33-35. Ultimately, any explanatory value we gain from Baden's proposal is diminished by its introduction of a new supposition into operations on the Pentateuchal sources in the form of the relocation of a whole narrative. The other examples of this procedure that Baden 2010: 501 adduces (Gen 19:29; 35:22b-26) are

The Priestly version of this account introduces the concept of the Sabbath to the Israelite community (Exod 16:22-26), an institution that P elevates to a sign of the covenant in the Tabernacle material (31:12-17). At the end of this narrative, P notes that Yhwh provided manna for the Israelites up until the point that they entered the land of Canaan (16:35).[54] This statement's explicit reference to the entry into the land suggests that this event was within the narrative purview of the Priestly text. Beyond this surface reading, the Priestly author's inclusion of this note is consonant with the structuring of his narrative as an account of Yhwh's fulfillment of his promises. By projecting the provision of the manna up to the borders of Canaan, the Priestly author makes this more than a narrative about Yhwh's response to a particular need of the Israelite community in the wilderness. Instead, this note renders this a story of how Yhwh kept part of his promise to bring the Israelites into Canaan by continuously providing food for them until they reached arable land.

As in the exodus account, Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise of land continues to be a concern within the Sinai material of the Priestly text. One way the Priestly author expresses this is through Yhwh's acknowledgement that the wilderness setting precludes the enactment of certain regulations, stating that they should be done "when you come to the land" (Lev 14:34; 19:23; 23:10; 25:2). In all but one of these cases (19:23), this is not a neutrally phrased observation but is accompanied by Yhwh's reaffirmation that the land is the one "which I am

---

both unpersuasive—their current positions do not interfere with our understanding and relocating them adds very little if anything to such an understanding—and do not involve full narratives.

[54] Some scholars (e.g., Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: II.106; Driver 1910: 30-31; Propp 1998: 590) attribute the entirety of this verse to P, while others (e.g., Wellhausen 1899: 78-79; Noth 1962: 137; Friedman 2003: 148) split this verse between the J and P sources in accordance with their presence in the rest of the chapter (for the view that the entire chapter belongs to P and subsequent P-like expansions, see Kuenen 1886: 70, 331-332). While this author finds the attribution of the entirety of this verse to P persuasive, the argument presented here stands regardless of whether this is the case.

giving to you."[55] This statement echoes the promises in Genesis and its use of the participial *nōtēn* indicates that Yhwh's giving of the land is a work in progress within the realm of the narrative. In the midst of the Sinai account's mass of non-narrative material, these statements remind the reader of Yhwh's attention to his promise to give the Israelites the land of Canaan. Moreover, they center Yhwh's fulfillment of that promise as a necessary prerequisite for the complete observance of his commandments.[56] Israel is unable to serve Yhwh as he has demanded until they have settled in the land that Yhwh promised.

The Priestly author further signals the importance of the promise of land by framing the commands of Leviticus 18 and 20 with a report from Yhwh on the progress of this promise's fulfillment. The paraenetic framework of Leviticus 18 opens by locating the Israelites at a narrative midpoint between Egypt and Canaan, with Yhwh contrasting his statutes with both the "work of the land of Egypt where you dwelt" and the "work of the land of Canaan where I am bringing you" (Lev 18:3). Here again we see the use of the participle (*mēbîʾ*) to indicate Yhwh's ongoing work in fulfilling his promise to Abraham. This use of the participle continues in the close of this divine speech, where Yhwh informs the Israelites that he is "casting out" (*məšallēᵍḥ*) the people who currently occupy Canaan due to their continuous defilement of the land (18:24). He tells them that this defilement has also caused the land itself to "vomit out" (*qāʾā́h*) its inhabitants (18:28). This report about the ongoing expulsion of the peoples who already live in Canaan does more than encourage the Israelites to keep the commands of Yhwh—it also informs the reader that Yhwh is preparing the land for Israel's entry and settlement.

[55] LXX adds this phrase, though in the 3rd person, to Lev 19:23 as well. There are no obvious anableptic triggers to explain its absence in MT, so this is likely a harmonistic addition.
[56] See, similarly, Mowinckel 1964: 54-55.

We see these statements reinforced at the end of Leviticus 20. Here, as Yhwh exhorts the Israelites to observe his statutes, he once again describes the land as the place "where I am bringing (*mēbîʾ*) you to settle in it" (Lev 20:22) and speaks of the nations "who I am casting out (*məšallēᵍḥ*) from before you" (20:23). As before, these participles indicate his ongoing actions with regard to Canaan. In this speech, however, the Priestly author does not leave the connection between these statements and Yhwh's promise implicit. Instead, he has Yhwh follow his report on the expulsion of the Canaanites by stating "I have said to you that you will inherit their land and I will give it to you to inherit it" (20:24; cf. Exod 6:8), making direct reference to his previous promise and his ongoing intention to keep this promise.

As importantly, the Priestly author connects Yhwh's promise to be Israel's god to his fulfillment of the promise to give them the land of Canaan. Yhwh ends the above-discussed statement about his promise of land with the assertion that "I am Yhwh your god, who has distinguished you from the peoples" (Lev 20:24).[57] We see the conjunction of these ideas expressed again in the Jubilee law, where Yhwh states that "I am Yhwh your god who brought you out from the land of Egypt in order to give you the land of Canaan, to become god for you" (25:38). The inclusion of both of these notions in a single statement in this speech captures in miniature the broader structure of Leviticus 25, which deals with both land ownership guaranteed by Yhwh (25:2, 13-34) and the special status of the Israelites as Yhwh's people due to his actions in the exodus event (25:35-55).[58] The placement of these two promises in relation to each other in Leviticus 20 and 25 reflects the same confluence we saw in Yhwh's first speech to Moses

[57] See discussion above.

[58] Note as well that the conjunction of these issues reflects an innovation over CC, which separates the law on Israelite slaves (Exod 21:1-11) from the seventh-year law (23:10-11). Interestingly, DC brings these subjects together (Deut 15:1-18), but its seventh-year law does not concern land ownership or care-taking in any way. The law in Leviticus 25, then, reflects a middle ground between the two other codes—uniting the seventh-year law with the slave law as in DC, but connecting the seventh-year law to land care as in CC. For an analysis of the relationship between these laws in all three codes, see Stackert 2007: 113-164.

(Exod 6:2-8), with Lev 25:38's assertion that the entry into Canaan was the purpose of the exodus matching the similar statement in that first speech (Exod 6:7-8). The consistent positioning of these elements in conversation with each other suggests that the Priestly author viewed these two features of the covenant with Abraham as intertwined and of equal importance to his narrative.

Finally, we should note that the content and organization of the divine speeches within Leviticus also emphasizes the Priestly author's view of the importance of land ownership for Yhwh's relationship with Israel. The final divine speech in this section of P comprises both the land ownership laws of Leviticus 25 and the promises and punishments of Leviticus 26.[59] Together, these chapters form the climax of this section of the Priestly text, a position that emphasizes the importance of their contents. The complex of land-Sabbath and Jubilee laws in Leviticus 25 is one of the cases, noted above, whose observance is conditioned on a future moment when the Israelites will enter the land. Beyond this, the inclusion of a complex of laws related to land ownership and caretaking uniquely framed in relation to the idea of Sabbath (Lev 25:4, 6, 8; cf. 26:34-35, 43) suggests that the issue of Israel's settlement in the land of Canaan was not a minor concern of the Priestly author.[60]

The fact that these land-related laws segue directly into the closing list of promises and punishments without a new speech rubric further indicates the value the Priestly author attached to them. These promises and punishments presuppose that Yhwh will keep his promise and that the Israelites will be settled in their own land (26:4-6; 19-20, 25, 30-31). Yhwh's blessing primarily takes the form of Israel's security in their land (26:4-6), while the purpose of the final punishment is also described in relation to the land—if the people are exiled, it is so that the land

[59] See excursus 2 in Chapter 5 on Leviticus 27.
[60] The related law in CC (Exod 22:10-11) only makes a connection to the Sabbath via context (22:12), while DC (Deut 15:1-18) does not connect the seventh year with either the concept of Sabbath or with land.

can receive its Sabbaths as Yhwh intended (26:34-35). When Yhwh describes the eventual cessation of his anger, he attributes this to both his remembrance of his covenant with the patriarchs and his remembrance of the land itself (26:42). This statement, putting the covenant on equal footing with the land, is a clear statement that the Priestly author views Yhwh's promise of the land of Canaan to the Israelites as of major importance. The covenant, according to this speech, does not function separately from Yhwh's guarantee of the Israelites' settlement in Canaan.

Overall, the role that the promise of Canaan plays in these divine speeches suggests its importance to the Priestly author's concept of Israel's worship of and relationship with Yhwh. If, as Noth insists, the establishment of the cultic community united in worship to Yhwh is of prime importance to the Priestly author,[61] then the repeated connection of this concept to the settlement of Canaan should indicate P's interest in this subject as well. If part of the Priestly author's intent is to describe the instructions, laws, and regulations that Yhwh requires of Israel, then we must also take seriously the Priestly text's repeated assertions that the observance of these laws requires that Yhwh fulfill his promise to give the land of Canaan to the Israelites. In other words, the presence of the promise of Canaan in this material indicates that—even accepting Noth's own evaluation of P's primary concern—the Priestly author does not and can not have a neutral stance towards the settlement of Canaan.[62]

The references to the land of Canaan in these divine speeches indicate the ongoing importance of Yhwh's fulfillment of the promise of land to the Priestly author. However, the Priestly author also attends to the fulfillment of this promise in the narrative material of the Sinai episode. We have already noted the way that a connection to the laws of land ownership in

[61] Noth 1957: 208; Noth 1981: 234, 239-247.
[62] Mowinckel 1964: 54-55.

Leviticus 25 likely programmed the decision to open Numbers with a narrative of the Israelite tribal census due to the implicit relationship between the census and the division of the land.[63] Furthermore, as we also noted in the previous chapter, the Priestly author has bracketed the Sinai material that occurs after the construction of the Tabernacle with descriptions of how Yhwh's cloud provides guidance to the Israelites (Exod 40:36-38; Num 9:15-23). The use of this particular material as a bracket reminds the reader that the Sinai moment is only a temporary stop in a longer journey. The Priestly author's deployment of the cloud description at the moment of the Tabernacle's completion points beyond Sinai into the next part of the Priestly narrative. The resumption and elaboration of this material at the end of the Sinai narrative emphasizes the importance of the next phase of the narrative by careful description of Yhwh's guidance of the Israelites on their journey away from Sinai. In both of these cases, Yhwh's repeated explanation of the purpose of the exodus makes clear that the goal of this journey is the land of Canaan (Exod 6:2-8; Lev 20:24; 25:38). This same explanation informs the reader's understanding of the very fact that P recounts the Israelites' departure from Sinai (Num 10:11-12)—to leave Sinai is to travel to Canaan, in accordance with Yhwh's assurance that he will uphold his promise to give that land to Abraham's descendants.

In all three sections of the Priestly text evaluated here—patriarchs, exodus, and Sinai—the Priestly author has taken care to align the material with the promise of land to Abraham, just as he did for the promises of descendants and of divine relationship. Yhwh's fulfillment of each of these promises drives the narrative and programs the reader's expectations. If we accept that the promise of descendants and the promise to be Israel's god were both programmatic for the Priestly text, then we must also accept that the promise of land functions in a similar way. This analysis directly contradicts Noth's claim that the land held no real importance for P.

[63] See Chapter 4.

Apart from the narrative use of the promise of land as a motif in the Priestly text up to Numbers 10, the formulation of this promise in Genesis 17 provides further evidence that weighs against Noth's contention that it was simply taken over by the Priestly author from older traditions. Just as the first two promises appear in unique formulations, so we find that the Priestly author has also presented the promise of land in unique terms. Unlike the non-Priestly accounts of this promise, P describes the land Yhwh promises to Abraham as "the land of your sojournings" (*ʾrṣ mgryk*) and frames the future status of the promised land as a "perpetual holding" (*ʾḥzt ʿwlm*) for the Israelites (Gen 17:8).[64]

As we saw with the promise of descendants, we find reflections of these formulations in the places where the Priestly text touches on the issue of the ownership of Canaan. For example, the use of the phrase "land of sojournings" to describe the land of Canaan in relation to the patriarchs follows the narrative arc of P precisely. Yhwh's promise to Abraham (Gen 17:8) introduces this term, which is complemented by later Abraham's description of himself as an alien (*gēr*) during his negotiations over a burial place for Sarah (Gen 23:4). That Abraham does so in the context of his first acquisition of real property in Canaan reflects the same conceptual transformation of *māgôr* to *ʾăḥuzzāh* in Yhwh's original promise.[65] Nevertheless, the status of the patriarchs as "aliens" in Canaan continues to be a feature of the Priestly narrative in Genesis—P describes Hebron as the place "where Abraham and Isaac sojourned there" (35:27), Isaac tells Jacob that Yhwh will give him "the land of your sojournings" (28:4), and Jacob lives in "the land of the sojournings of his father," directly equated with Canaan (37:1).

The equation of the patriarchs' sojournings with the land of Canaan continues up to the end of the Priestly account of the patriarchs. When Jacob stands before Pharaoh, he recounts his

[64] Boorer 2000: 176-177. Note that these terms occur alongside more common terms derived from *yrš* (Gen 28:4; Exod 6:8; Lev 20:24).
[65] See further discussion below.

age in terms of "the days of the years of my sojournings" (Gen 47:9), and the Priestly text is careful to distinguish between those years, when Jacob was in Canaan, and the later years he spent in Egypt (47:28). When the Priestly text transitions into its account of the exodus, we come across the final deployment of the term *māgôr* in Yhwh's opening speech to Moses. Here Yhwh places the land of Canaan in apposition with "the land of their [= the patriarch] sojournings (*māgôr*) where they sojourned" as he tells Moses of his promise to give this land to them (Exod 6:4). The absence of *māgôr* after this point in P reinforces the notion that Yhwh is acting to fulfill his promise—when he brings the Israelites back into Canaan it will no longer be a land of sojournings, but an *ʾăḥuzzāh* as he promised. The lack of further reference to Canaan as a "land of sojournings" also aligns with the narrative situation of the Mosaic generation. None of the Israelites addressed in the Mosaic period had lived in Canaan, so it can not be "the land of sojournings" with reference to them. They will only experience it as the "perpetual holding" (*ʾăḥuzzat ʿôlām*) that Yhwh promised to Abraham's descendants (Gen 17:8; cf. Lev 14:34).[66]

The term "holding (*ʾăḥuzzāh*) follows a similar trajectory.[67] Where the term *māgôr* passes out of use as no longer relevant to the situation of the Mosaic generation, P uses the term *ʾăḥuzzāh* in the patriarchal era and beyond. The first use of this term after Yhwh's promise comes in Abraham's purchase of a burial cave for Sarah (Gen 23:4, 9, 20). This purchase constitutes Abraham's first acquisition of real property in Canaan, indicating the beginning of

[66] The opposition between "land of sojournings" and "holding"/*ʾḥzh* can also be seen in the account of Esau's migration, where he leaves the "land of their [=Jacob and Esau's] sojournings" (Gen 36:6-7) and takes up permanent residence in Edom/Seir, which is described as "the land of their [=the Edomites'] holding" (Gen 36:43). Describing Esau's ultimate settlement in Seir as an *ʾăḥuzzāh* further reinforces the Priestly author's portrayal of Esau as no longer a participant in the promise made to Abraham, in which Canaan will serve as the final *ʾăḥuzzāh*.

[67] Westbrook 1991: 29 defines the legal implications of this term by stating that "it denotes an inheritable estate, associated with family or tribe rather than the individual." The meaning of the term *ʾăḥuzzāh* in the Priestly text may be further illuminated by its use to describe the land in Egypt that Pharaoh grants to Jacob through Joseph's agency (Gen 47:5-11). Describing the land in these terms indicates that it is not a temporary grant, but an inheritable one that creates more permanent attachments—it is notable that the Israelites depart from the same place where Joseph settles them (Gen 47:11; Exod 12:37a) despite the intervention of 430 years. The disposition of this property in Egypt matches the implications of Yhwh's promise—the land is granted by a higher authority and creates a permanent ability for the settlers on it to transfer the land via inheritance.

Yhwh's fulfillment of his promise.[68] The Priestly text further emphasizes the importance of this property by referring to it as an *ʾăḥuzzāh* in later references in the patriarchal narrative (49:30; 50:13), signaling the incipient fulfillment of the promise of land.

While the land is never referred to as an *ʾăḥuzzāh* in the exodus account of the Priestly text, in line with its focus on Yhwh's promise to be Israel's god, the Sinai material reverts to this description of Canaan in its divine speeches. It reappears in the first of the "when you come to the land" clauses, where Yhwh describes the land as "the land of Canaan which I am giving to you as a holding (*ʾăḥuzzāh*)" (Lev 14:34). Despite the lack of repetition of this term in the related passages (19:23; 23:10; 25:2),[69] we should note that this first deployment contains the fullest expression of this phrase and should likely be taken as programmatic for how we understand the phrase in its other contexts. The use of the phrase "when you come to the land" at the head of the various land laws contained in Leviticus 25—which repeatedly refers to the individual clans' patrimonies in Canaan as *ʾăḥuzzāh* (25:10, 13, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 41)—reinforces this supposition.

The inclusion of this body of laws regulating land ownership (Leviticus 25) is motivated by and connected to Yhwh's promise to give the land of Canaan as a "holding." The use of the term *ʾăḥuzzāh* in both the promise and these laws communicates that Yhwh is the ultimate owner of the land (25:23), as he is the one who can dispose of it. However, the term also describes the inheritability of the land within families, which is what renders it "perpetual." This dual supposition, encapsulated by the term *ʾăḥuzzāh*, is the source of the ultimate inalienability of

[68] See also, Boorer 2000: 177-180. Note as well that there may be an implied pun between Genesis 23's description of Abraham's purchase as an *ʾăḥuzzat qeber* and the phrase *ʾăḥuzzat ʿôlām* from in Gen 17:8—while the latter certainly means "perpetual/eternal holding" here, *ʿôlām* can also indicate the underworld, i.e., where the dead live.
[69] See discussion above.

family property which serves as the basis of the Jubilee and redemption laws.[70] Through the reoccurrence of the term "holding," Leviticus 25 functions narratively as an assertion of Yhwh's intent to keep his promise to give Canaan to the Israelites by outlining, in concrete detail, the legal procedures associated with their possession of the land of Canaan as an *ʾăḥuzzāh*. The placement of this speech at the climax of the Sinai speeches further prepares the reader to expect Yhwh's fulfillment of this promise as the narrative continues.[71]

The preceding survey has demonstrated that the Priestly text relates the fulfillment of Yhwh's promise of land through both its narrative and use of distinctive terminology, much as it does for the promises of descendants and divine relationship. This sustained attention to the issue of land undermines Noth's contention that the Priestly text has no real interest in the subject. The unique way in which the Priestly text formulates the land promise renders Noth's attempt to view it as inherited decoration from older tradition likewise untenable. The fact that this conclusion aligns with the conclusions of other studies of the Priestly text undertaken by those who largely agree with Noth's view of the restricted extent of P further underscores the weakness of his position.[72] An analysis of the Priestly text that embraces material from creation to the departure from Sinai leads to the inescapable conclusion that Yhwh's promise of land mattered as much to the Priestly author as his promise of descendants and to be Israel's god.

---

[70] Weinfeld 1970 situates these dual concepts in the cognate genre of ancient Near Eastern royal grants. See also, Lauinger 2015 for a study of the practical reality of land grant, purchase, and ownership at Middle-Bronze Alalaḫ.
[71] See also, discussion in Chapter 4 for the connections between these laws and the opening census of Numbers.
[72] E.g., Elliger 1952; Brueggemann 1972; L. Schmidt 1993: 251-271; Frevel 2000: 349-371; Boorer 2000; 2016: 479-480, 485-488. Nihan 2007: 63-68 attempts to both acknowledge the role of the land in P and accept Noth's conclusion that it is not a meaningful subject to the Priestly author, concluding that "In P, actually, the land is no longer decisive for Israel's identity" (2007: 66). He does this by attempting to argue that Yhwh's promise is fulfilled already in Genesis because "*the land given to the Israelites in Ex 6:2-8 does not differ from that given to the Patriarchs*" (2007: 67, emphasis original; see also, Hutzli 2023: 194-197). This collapses the distinction P draws between the "land of sojournings" and the "perpetual holding" and erases the difference between a promise made and a promise kept. The narrative analysis offered here makes this position untenable; see also, Boorer 2016: 73-74's refutation of this view.

However, this analysis has done more than demonstrate that the Priestly text has an interest in Yhwh's promise of land. We have also seen that the promise of land is implicated in the plot of the Priestly text alongside the two other promises made to Abraham. The relationship between the plot of the Priestly text and these promises suggests that we are correct in seeing Genesis 17 as an argument for the Priestly narrative. Moreover, the order of the promises made to Abraham in Genesis 17 accords precisely with the order of their fulfillment in P's narrative. The promise of descendants (17:4-6) is the major focus of the patriarchal period and finds its fulfillment in the early part of the exodus account (Exod 1:7) and its affirmation in the Sinai account (Lev 26:9; Num 1:17-46). The promise to be a god (Gen 17:7) appears in the patriarchal account but becomes the major focus of the exodus and Sinai narratives, finding its fulfillment in the establishment of the Tabernacle (Exod 29:43-46; 40:34-35; Lev 9:23-24; 26:11-12). Genesis 17 thus functions as an argument for the first two promises by forecasting both the content of major themes and the order they receive prime attention in the narrative.

The promise of land is the final promise that Yhwh makes in Genesis 17 (17:8) and our analysis has shown that this placement accords with the notion of the Abrahamic covenant as an argument for the Priestly text. We see this in two ways: in the fact that the promise of land is present as a major theme in the patriarchal, exodus, and Sinai narratives and in the fact that it does not receive its fulfillment in any of these sections. The pattern of the other promises leads us to expect that the land promise will receive its narrative fulfillment in the post-Sinai section of the Priestly text. Such an arrangement would not only accord with the order of promises in Genesis 17, but also agree with the placement of this *topos* in the Israelite/Judahite tradition of origins; that is, in the entry into Canaan after the exodus. Our detailed analysis of the Priestly

text up to Numbers 10 affirms Mowinckel's assertion that "without the crowning report of this fulfillment [of the land promise], P's work would only be a torso."[73]

Scouting Ahead: The Land in P and the Post-Sinai Material

We may now claim an answer to the first of Noth's contentions that we have set out to evaluate. Noth's claim that the entry into Canaan "lay outside of the circle of the materials held in mind by him [the Priestly author] for his work" can not stand in the face of the thoroughgoing integration of the land promise into the plot and structure of the Priestly text.[74] Instead, we must treat these indications within the Priestly text as a sign that the Priestly text likely contained some form of narration of the entry into Canaan—in the same way that Noth treated the similar indications in the non-Priestly/JE corpus, including the promises to the patriarchs, as a sign that they also once contained such an account.[75] While not a necessary outcome, our analysis thus brings methodological balance to Noth's approach to the Pentateuchal sources.

What is more, we can easily integrate our own analysis of the role of the land promise in P with Noth's contention that the Sinai material was of prime importance to the Priestly author. Where Noth goes astray is in arguing that this requires us to think that the Sinai material was, therefore, also P's sole concern.[76] Our review of the Priestly text undercuts this notion, showing that there is no way of divorcing the Sinai material, with its focus on Yhwh's relationship to Israel, from the promise of land. Instead, the Priestly author presents these ideas as interdependent. Any evaluation of the Priestly material that follows the departure from Sinai

---

[73] 1964: 54, "Ohne die empirische Verwirklichung wäre doch die ganze Offenbarung, die eben zur Realisierung im täglichen und festlichen Leben des Volkes und der Einzelnen gegeben war, eine Luftspiegelung, und ohne den krönenden Bericht von dieser Verwirklichung wäre das Werk des P nur ein Torso."
[74] Noth 1957: 191, "…*das Thema Landnahme außerhalb des Kreises der von ihm für sein Werk in das Auge gefaßten Stoffe lag*... " Emphasis original.
[75] 1981: 16; 1957: 210-211 = 1987: 139-141.
[76] As Mowinckel 1964: 54-55 so elegantly recognized.

must take account of both the role of the land promise across the plot of the Priestly narrative and its integration into the concerns of the Sinai pericope.

For Noth, the Priestly text after Sinai originally included only the departure from Sinai (Num 10:11-12), the spies account (Numbers 13-14*, excluding 14:30-33), the Korah account (16-17* and 18:1-7), the Meribah incident (20:1-13), and the deaths of Aaron and Moses (20:22-29; 22:1; 27:12-23).[77] When we approach his delineation of the Priestly text from the perspective of the promises, we find that it does not adequately align with what we would expect from our review of the Priestly material from before the Sinai departure. What is more, Noth's claim that the post-Sinai Priestly material—even as he defines it—does not show any concern for the entry into the land or the traditional course of the wilderness narrative also does not withstand closer scrutiny. In what follows, we will review Noth's identification of the Priestly *Grundschrift* in Numbers 11-36* for its relationship to the land promise and the larger Priestly narrative, highlighting the incongruences and tensions inherent in Noth's model.

We have already noted that the departure from Sinai (Num 10:11-12) implicitly points towards an arrival in Canaan. Noth also recognizes this reality, explaining it as a narrative movement that the Priestly text was forced by preceding tradition to include.[78] We have already seen the weakness, in general, of Noth explaining features of the Priestly text in this way—both our above examination of the promises in P and our principles of secondary analysis lead us to conclude that this approach to the Priestly text simply does not account for its creative reshaping

[77] Noth 1957: 190-206, 217 = 1987: 121-134, 148. Note that the inclusion of Num 22:7 on Noth's chart of the original Priestly material (1957: 217 = 1987: 148) must be regarded as an error for 22:1 (cf. 1957: 201 = 1987: 130; 1968: 176; 1981: 19).

[78] Noth 1957: 207-209 = 1987: 136-138; Noth 1981: 234. We should note that Noth's insistence on the importance of Sinai to P led him to frequently argue that the Priestly text only included other material—such as the flood and patriarchs—because of their inclusion in the older literary Pentateuchal narratives (JE). This causes him to minimize the originality with which the Priestly author deploys and integrates these materials into his own narrative. Noth is instead forced over and over again to explain these features as mere mimicry of older sources at odds with his perception of the Priestly text's "true" intent (e.g., 1957: 207-209 = 1987: 136-138; 1981: 234, 246).

of the traditions of Israelite antiquity. But even if we were to grant Noth's explanation, a major weakness remains here. It is logically inconsistent for Noth to claim that the Priestly text includes material prior to the Sinai event only because it was following received tradition and yet also insist that the Priestly author felt free to reject the received tradition when it came to the entry into the land.[79] Especially given Noth's description of the pre-Sinai material as merely "summary,"[80] one is hard-pressed to explain why the Priestly author would not have also presented a similarly summary account of the post-Sinai events. Noth's explanation requires such a radically inconsistent Priestly author—at one moment bound completely to received tradition and at another point able to discard it completely—that even within his own framework, he is unable to provide a convincing explanation for why the Priestly author related the departure from Sinai.

The depth of this weakness becomes more apparent when we follow Noth into the wilderness. While Noth insists that the Priestly author only needed to relate the deaths of Aaron and Moses to complete his narrative after the Sinai event, he also identifies other narratives as part of the Priestly text in Numbers 11-27*.[81] Though we may readily agree that the Meribah account (Num 20:2-13) is consonant with Noth's assertion that the deaths of Moses and Aaron are the only concerns P had left to relate, the accounts of the spies and the Korah rebellion have no such connection. As he does for the other material that disagrees with his understanding of P, Noth attempts to attribute the Priestly text's recounting of these stories to an adherence to tradition.[82] Here too, we can easily see the weakness in this analysis. Given the Priestly author's

[79] Noth 1957: 207-208 = 1987: 136-137; Noth 1981: 234, 246.
[80] Noth 1981: 246.
[81] Noth 1957: 201-205, 208-209 = 1987: 129-133, 137-138.
[82] 1957: 209 n. 2 = 1987: 186 n. 11. Noth 1957: 203-204 = 1987: 132-133 also takes pains to argue that neither of these stories contained references to the land (Num 14:30-33 and 18:8-32, respectively) in their original form in P. On this issue, see discussion below.

omission of numerous patriarchal stories, we have no reason to think he would have included an entire narrative of the scouting of the land unless it had some connection to his overarching narrative. As Noth himself admits, the spies account necessarily involves the subject of the land.[83] This inherent association between the spies narrative and Israel's eventual entry into Canaan further suggests that the Priestly author would have had strong motivation to elide this narrative if Noth were correct that he had no interest in the place of the land in Israel's past. Such elision would be consonant with the Priestly author's practice elsewhere—for Noth to be correct would, as we noted above, therefore require a model of a Priestly author who operates with no discernible pattern for when he will and will not follow his own concerns.

Noth's case is even weaker in regard to the Korah rebellion, which has no reflex in any extant older tradition. While the non-Priestly/J material contains an account of a rebellion against Moses' authority in the wilderness, the Priestly Korah account is not an alternative rendering of those events, but an entirely different story. In fact, the Priestly and non-Priestly material in Numbers 16 only very distantly share a related theme.[84] Noth's other explanation for the inclusion of this material in P—the common assertion that this story is a historical allegory meant to comment on contemporary events—is no more satisfactory.[85] That the Priestly author would include even one narrative wholly unrelated both to Moses' and Aaron's death and previous tradition suggests that Noth's conclusion that P had no more to relate after the end of the Sinai event is simply wrong. Under Noth's model, we would expect P to have conveyed the central message of the Korah story within the Sinai account. This narrative's inclusion in the post-Sinai material again shows the radical inconsistency of Noth's image of the Priestly author.

[83] Noth 1957: 203 = 1987: 132.
[84] As Noth 1968: 121 admits: "Different persons are involved and they have in common only the fact that they rebel against something or other."
[85] Noth 1957: 204 = 1987: 133.

Even more problematic for Noth's thesis is the fact that he has to admit at least two explicit references to the upcoming entry into Canaan in the events that occur between the departure from Sinai and the death of Moses.[86] The first comes at the head of the spies narrative, where Yhwh instructs Moses to send spies to scout "the land of Canaan which I am giving to the children of Israel" (Num 13:2). As we observed above, the mere presence of a spies narrative in P suggests a concern with the land that Noth can not wave away by reference to an older tradition that P was bound to follow. The fact that even Noth must admit that this story begins with an explicit invocation of this connection underscores the weakness of Noth's analysis of the shape and concerns of the Priestly text.[87]

Nevertheless, we can admit that the inclusion of the second passage referring to the entry—the punishment of Aaron and Moses in the Meribah account (Num 20:12)—does not similarly undermine Noth's view of the Priestly text. As he explains, this is a largely negative reference to the land, mentioning it only to assert that Moses and Aaron will not lead the Israelites there.[88] However, this single data point that is consonant with Noth's vision of the Priestly text does not weigh the balance in his favor. Rather, this passage is just as amenable to a vision of the Priestly text that includes a concern for the land and that does not share the other weaknesses in Noth's analysis as outlined above. Noth's own explanation for the presence of both of these passages (13:2; 20:12)—the by-now-familiar refrain that P was forced to inconsistency by his adherence to old tradition—inspires no more confidence here than it did in

[86] This was already recognized as a crucial weakness in Noth's argument by Mowinckel 1964: 55.
[87] Noth 1957 203 n. 5= 1987: 185 n. 66. Noth 1957: 204 = 1987: 132 invokes Wellhausen 1899: 101-102 (see also, Kuenen 1886: 95 n. 37, 333-334; Gray 1903: 132, 161-163) to dismiss the other reference to the future entry in 14:30-33 (see also, Noth 1968: 110-111). Friedman 1981: 106-107; 2003: 265; Artus 1997:148-150 have refuted this position, arguing that these verses are well-integrated in their context. For mediating views, see Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: 209; Driver 1910: 62-63; Boorer 2016: 77. Part of this is related to the controversy over the attribution of Num 14:3, to which 14:31makes reference—see Artus 1997:124-127 on the variety of views and the tentative admission of this verse to P. Boorer 2016: 76, despite a traditional Analyst view of P that largely aligns with Noth's arguments, also admits 14:3 to P (and so, also, 14:31).
[88] Noth 1957: 204-205 = 1987: 133.

other cases.[89] Noth's model of the Priestly author's approach once again insists on its inconsistency.

Our review of Noth's identification and explanation of the Priestly text in Numbers 11-36* has identified three major weaknesses in his model. The first is that the Priestly text he has identified in these chapters does not align with our analysis of the Priestly text's own presentation of its plot in Genesis 17. The second is that Noth's claim that the Priestly text he has identified in Numbers shows no interest in the upcoming entry into Canaan does not withstand close scrutiny. The last weakness is that Noth's Priestly author is inconsistent in his method of approaching traditional material, with the only motivation for his decisions being an alignment with Noth's own hypothesis about the Priestly text's true purpose.

Nevertheless, Noth's model continues to attract supporters who have adopted various approaches to addressing these weaknesses.[90] One approach is to further restrict the Priestly text so as to better align it with Noth's model and produce a more consistent image of the Priestly author. This approach was adopted by Noth himself in later works, where we find him tentatively eliminating the Korah rebellion (Num 16:1-18:7*) from P and definitively marking the instructions concerning Joshua's leadership (27:15-23) as a secondary text.[91] Other scholars have continued to follow this path, further curtailing the Priestly text to greater and lesser extents.[92]

---

[89] Noth 1957: 208 = 1987: 137-138.

[90] For review of approaches to the book of Numbers in recent research, see Frevel 2013; Ska 2014.

[91] On Num 16:1-18:7*, Noth 1981: 19 continues to attribute these materials to the main corpus of P, though placed in parentheses with a footnote (19 n. 59) offering the alternate proposal that all the Priestly material in these chapters should be considered part of a supplement to P. Noth 1968: 120-131, 133-134 (though translated earlier, a later work than Noth 1981), revised this opinion again, attributing only the "250 men" Korah material to the original stratum of P and relegating the "Levite" Korah material in Numbers 16 and related texts (17:1-18:32) to a P supplementary layer (see also, Frevel 2000: 346-347). The succession of Joshua at the announcement of Moses' death (Num 27: 12-23) still constitutes part of P for Noth 1957: 190-191, 203 n. 6 = 1987: 121-122, 185 n. 67; 1981: 19, but in 1968: 213-216 he argues that the epanalepsis in Deut 32:48-52 more accurately reflects the original intentions of the Priestly author and so eliminates these instructions, leaving only the announcement of Moses' death in Num 27:12-14 as part of the original P narrative.

[92] See references in nn. 16-17 above.

Another approach, often adopted concomitantly with the above, is to challenge Noth's claim that the land was a merely decorative element of the Priestly text copied from earlier tradition.[93] Scholars who take this approach highlight and emphasize the importance of the land to the Priestly text—however, they do so within the confines of the compositional boundaries determined by Noth. In other words, the importance of the land in P has no impact on their own identification of what passages belong to the Priestly text in Numbers. Instead, the evaluation of the land's importance is a narrative evaluation of a Priestly text previously identified using largely non-narrative criteria.[94] Both of these attempts to account for the weaknesses in Noth's model of P are themselves flawed by their continued reliance on a fundamentally Analyst approach that, as we have demonstrated, lacks robust explanatory power.

Rather than modify Noth's model in an attempt to address its flaws, we will instead undertake a fresh assessment of what should be attributed to the Priestly text in Numbers 11-36. Such a reevaluation enables us to integrate both our preceding analysis of the role of the land promise in the Priestly text and the results we have obtained in previous chapters. The integration of these factors into our analysis provides us with a substantially different basis from which to approach this material, one that possesses several advantages over prior attempts to identify what does and does not belong to the original Priestly text after the departure from Sinai.

In the first place, our principles of secondary analysis compel us to treat the Priestly text as a narrative in the course of determining whether we should attribute particular material to P.[95] This allows us to integrate the role of the land promise into our criteria for identifying P, rather than retroactively recognizing it as a feature of a text we have identified by other means. As

---

[93] See references in n. 70 above.
[94] For a description and evaluation of these arguments, see discussion below. In general, the postponement of narrative analysis until after non-narrative criteria have been used to delimit the Priestly text constitutes a methodologically problematic approach to the secondary analysis of P; see Chapter 1 for further discussion.
[95] See Chapter 1 for principles of secondary analysis.

importantly, this narrative approach allows us to view the material in Numbers 11-36* from the perspective of the full sweep of the Priestly text, evaluating it in concert with what we know about P in Genesis 1-Numbers 10*.[96] Unlike the Analyst model and its modification by Noth and his successors, our own model of the Priestly text suffers no gaps in the narrative between the arrival at and departure from Sinai, thus strengthening the basis of our narrative analytic as we turn to the post-Sinai material.[97] Finally, having repeatedly demonstrated the failure of the Analyst program and its artificial opposition of narrative and "legal"/non-narrative in the Sinai material, our own engagement with P in Numbers 11-36 will not rely on this untenable, stratigraphic approach. Instead, we will allow the narrative of the Priestly text itself to drive our understanding of what issues we need to address, deploying the Neo-analytic framework where it may be useful for explaining the shape of P as we identify it.

While the combination of these factors may seem to require a return to the pre-Noth Analyst position on the extent of the Priestly text, this is not necessarily the case. We must first understand the Priestly text in the rest of Numbers in order to have the firmest possible foundation from which to evaluate Noth's claim that there is no Priestly material preserved in the book of Joshua. We must also acknowledge the possibility that we may find the Priestly author's concern for Yhwh's promise of the land reaching its final expression within essentially Pentateuchal narrative bounds. In order to adjudicate these issues, we must identify the Priestly material in Numbers 11-36 and place it into conversation with the rest of the Priestly text.

[96] Bauks 2003, in part a response to Frevel 2000, also advocates for such an approach to evaluating Priestly material in Numbers and Deuteronomy.

[97] See Chapter 4 for Kuenen 1886: 95's caution that "we must bear in mind that we no longer hold the thread of P^2 [= P^G] in hand" when approaching the book of Numbers.

Following the Trail 1: The Paran Narrative in the Priestly Text (Numbers 10-19*)

Our evaluation of the post-Sinai material of the Priestly text will divide the material in Numbers 11-36* into three units on the basis of the geographic setting in which they take place: the events in the Wilderness of Paran (Numbers 13-19*), the events in the wilderness between Paran and Moab (Numbers 20-22*), and the events in the plains of Moab (Numbers 25-36*).[98] For each of these units we will offer an evaluation of two major issues affecting their relationship with the Priestly text. First, we will describe the broad course of the Priestly narrative within each unit and its connection to the larger Priestly narrative. Then, we will undertake a secondary analysis of each unit in order to identify possible additions to the Priestly text in these segments. Once we have completed this process for each of these units, we will be well positioned to evaluate the relationship between this part of the Priestly text and the issue of the land promise's fulfillment in the Priestly narrative.

We turn first to the Paran unit. When the Israelites depart from Sinai, the Priestly author immediately informs us that their destination is the Wilderness of Paran (Num 10:11-12).[99] This constitutes the location of the following narrative of the dispatch and report of the spies (13:3,

---

[98] For other views of the structure of Numbers 11-36, see Olson 1985: 31-125; Douglas 1993b: 102-126; Knierim & Coats 2005: 135-144; Lee 2003: 1-46, 73-119.

[99] While there is general agreement on the primary analysis of Numbers 13-19 into separate JE and P accounts, the variety of specific treatment of Numbers 13-14; 16 necessitates that we set out our own views on their division here. To the Priestly text we attribute the following:

13:1-17a (to "כנען"), 21* (from "ויתרו" to end of verse), 25, 26* (minus "וילכו", "קדשה", and "ויראם" to end of verse), 32;

14:1a (up to "ויבכו"), 2-3, 5-10, 26-38, (39a?)

16:1*, 2b (from "ואנשים" to end of verse), 3-11, 16-23, 24* (minus "Dathan and Abiram"), [26*?], 27a* (up to "מסביב," minus "Dathan and Abiram"), [32b? (from "ואת כל־האדם" to end of verse)], 35.

This division is largely based on Friedman 2003: 262-266, 268-270, with reference to Kuenen 1886: 95-96; Wellhausen 1899: 101-106; Gray 1903: 128-133, 186-193; Noth 1968: 101-112, 120-129; Levine 1993: 347-372, 405-417; Artus 1997: 89-157, 163-197; Baden 2009b: 114-118; Boorer 2016: 75-77. The advantage of Friedman 2003's analysis of 13:32; 14:5-10, 26-38 (typically split between JE & P, but attributed to P in its entirety by Friedman) is that he is able to wrest two complete, coherent accounts from the present material without recourse to supposing that speech introductions have been dropped by R or that fragments of JE material with no surviving context have been transposed into the midst of P material.

26*).[100] As the Priestly text does not provide a new setting until the Israelites arrive at the Wilderness of Zin (20:1*), we should understand this as the setting of the Korah narrative as well.[101] Although frequently treated as discrete "episodes" in commentaries, the united setting of these narratives suggests that the Priestly author viewed them as a unified sequence of events.

The Priestly author further signals the related nature of these narratives by his repeated emphasis on leadership that begins with the departure from Sinai and extends to the end of the Paran incidents. The first indication of this theme occurs in the narrative of the tribal encampments' travel to Paran, in which the travel order of each tribe is accompanied by the mention of its *nāśîʾ* (Num 10:13-27). In the originally separate Priestly text, this narrative is immediately followed by the spies account, which opens with a list of men described by Yhwh as *nāśîʾ* (13:1-16). After ten of these leaders die before Yhwh (14:36-38), Korah gathers together a group of other *nəśîʾîm* (16:2b) and questions Moses' and Aaron's authority by asking them, "Why have you (pl.) acted the *nāśîʾ* over the assembly of Yhwh?"[102] Following Yhwh's incineration of Korah's group (16:35) and a plague against the camp (17:6-15), the Paran events culminate in a miracle pitting Aaron's staff against the staves of the other *nəśîʾîm* (Num 17:16-20). Yhwh describes the purpose of this miracle as two-fold, intending it both to end the complaints of the Israelites (17:20, 25) and as a sign to rebels (*bny mry*), i.e., those who would

[100] The coherence between Num 10:12 and 13:3 marks the travel notices in 11:35; 12:16 as non-Priestly, originating from either JE or R. P and JE/non-P have distinct geographical conceptions about the location and itinerary of the Israelites in the post-Sinai material, which R has only semi-successfully harmonized. See Levine 1993: 52-64 for a general overview (though the geographic confusion Levine attributes to "Priestly writers" more broadly should likely be attributed instead to R's fusion of JE and P, for which see Friedman 1981a: 77-81, 118-119; 1997: 229-231). For more detailed reflections on the itineraries in Numbers, though based in a different compositional model, see Roskop 2011: 136-232. See below for further discussion.

[101] Though they attribute this to the final redaction, Knierim & Coats 2005: 206 also see Paran as the setting of Numbers 16. On the ambiguous "in the wilderness" of Num 15:32, see discussion below.

[102] This rendering construes tD of *nśʾ* as a denominative in this passage (Milgrom 1990: 131 makes a similar suggestion, though he does not adopt it in his translation). See narrative analysis below for further justification. Even should the more traditional rendering be maintained ("Why have you (pl.) elevated yourselves (*nśʾ* tD) over the assembly of Yhwh?"), the fact remains that Korah's accusation against Moses and Aaron centers on the term *nśʾ*. Note as well the connection between *nśʾ* tD and oppositional, illegitimate, or abusive leadership in 1 Kgs 1:5; Ezek 17:11-15; 29:15; Prov 30:32-33.

dispute with the leadership of Yhwh and those he appoints (17:25; cf. 14:9). The unified geographic setting and the consistent concern with issues of leadership provide sufficient grounds for proceeding with a narrative analysis premised on the working hypothesis that Numbers 13-19* constitute a single narrative in the Priestly text rather than a sequence of self-contained episodes.[103]

Viewing these chapters as a single narrative with a focus on communal authority opens several interpretive avenues that we could not otherwise access.[104] On Yhwh's instructions, Moses dispatches men who are viewed as leaders of the community in order to scout out the land of Canaan (13:1-17a). The narrative that follows on their return seems to reflect a form of communal deliberation over what to do with the scouts' report.[105] In the Priestly account of these events, the leaders who went as scouts split into two factions when presenting their view of the land to the Israelites.[106] On the one hand, a group of ten spies present the land as dangerous (13:26*, 32).[107] On the other hand, Joshua and Caleb argue that Yhwh will give the land to the

[103] Note that this is certainly true of the JE/non-P material in Numbers 13-16, where the inciting incidents of the Dathan and Abiram rebellion (16:12-14) have to be understood in relation to the people's demand for new leadership (Num 14:4) and Moses' subsequent apparent abdication as the Israelites suffer military defeat (14:39-45). The redactor's decision to unite the Korah event with the Dathan and Abiram event, which has long provoked confusion, may be due to the redactor's perception that these events were not separate from the spies accounts in either P or JE/non-P—rather than create an intertwined spies account and then separately creating an intertwined "rebellion" account, the redactor may have perceived his task as instead being the unification of two "spies and aftermath" accounts.

[104] This is not to gainsay the more typical episodic approach to these chapters, which also provides valuable insights into the theology and Levite-Aaronid tensions that may undergird some of this material. The following analysis should be viewed as complementary or supplementary to previous interpretations, rather than being in competition with them—it is concerned with understanding the narrative within the framework of the narrative itself rather than what the narrative communicates about the world outside of the narrative.

[105] Magonet 1982: 16 reaches a similar conclusion, though from a synchronic approach to Numbers 13-14.

[106] While many Hebrew lexica assert that the term *dibbāh* (Num 13:32; 14:36, 37) has an inherently negative polarization, its use with the modifier *rʿh* (Gen 37:2; Num 14:37) suggests that it can be construed more neutrally. Its use in Numbers 13-14 may evoke the notion of an obligated report to authorities, in line with the use of its Akkadian cognate *dibbu*, especially in its use in Neo-Assyrian treaties and letters (see CAD D ad loc. sub 2).

[107] The precise nature of the bad report is somewhat unclear due to the use of metaphoric language to describe the land as one which "devours its inhabitants" (ארץ אכלת יושביה הוא). This phrase also occurs in Lev 26:38; Ezek 37:13-15, which are frequently invoked to explain it. Gray 1903: 151; Levine 1993: 358 take the accusation as denying the fertility of the land, while Noth 1968: 107; Milgrom 1990: 106-107; Boorer 2016: 75-76 understand the phrase to indicate a land consumed with military conflict. Given the people's response to the report (Num 14:3) and

Israelites as long as he is pleased with them and tells them not to be afraid (14:6-9). Both of these reports are made before the entire *ʿēdāh,* including Moses and Aaron (13:26*).

The responses of the various parties present further indicate the deliberative nature of this scene. While the first report evokes a reaction of despair from the Israelites directed against their leaders (Num 14:1a, 2-3), neither Moses nor Aaron make a verbal response. Instead they fall on their faces in front of the entire *ʿēdāh* (14:5), an expression of disapproval that is nevertheless an act of submission to the will of the people.[108] Rather than respond, they wait for the rest of the spies to offer their own report on the land. As with the report from the first ten spies, in this case too it is the *ʿēdāh* who offer a response—they seek to execute Joshua and Caleb by stoning (14:10).[109] It is at this point that Yhwh intervenes, appearing to all of the people and speaking to Moses and Aaron (14:10, 26). What follows is not just a curse preventing the exodus generation from entering the land, but something that resembles both a perverse commitment to and inversion of the community's will. Yhwh promises to fulfill their request to die in the wilderness, stating that he will act "according to what you spoke in my ears" (14:28-29, 35, cf. 14:2-3).[110] But, as importantly, he subverts the community's decision to execute Joshua and Caleb by

---

Joshua and Caleb's counter-argument (14:9), the military interpretation seems more likely. Joosten 1996: 152-154 suggestively connects this statement to the divine speech in which Yhwh describes the land as vomiting out its inhabitants (Lev 18:24-30). This is an attractive suggestion, as the counter-speech by Joshua and Caleb describes the land as one "flowing with milk and honey"—a phrase that is also drawn from an earlier divine speech (Lev 20:24), which constitutes the only other use of this traditional phrase in the Priestly text. This creates a nice parallelism whereby each side has invoked an earlier image from one of Yhwh's speeches to justify its view.

[108] Magonet 1982: 16 also interprets Moses' and Aaron's response as one of assent. Other than the ambiguous case of Num 16:4, this is the only time in P that a character explicitly falls on his face before anyone other than Yhwh: Gen 17:3, 17; Lev 9:24; Num 16:22; 17:10; 20:6.

[109] The use of stoning as the response of the community further suggests a deliberative context due to its association with judicial punishments (Lev 24:10-23; Num 15:32-36; Deut 17:2-7; 21:18-21; 22:13-21, 23-24; 2 Chron 24:21 ["at the command of the king"]). The only extra-judicial stoning in biblical narrative is that of Adoniram (1 Kgs 12:18//2 Chron 10:18). See also, Magonet 1982: 16.

[110] Boorer 2016: 159-160 perceptively notes that Yhwh's description of the community as "the ones meeting against me" contains an inversion of Yhwh's description of the purpose of the Tabernacle (Exod 29:42-43). While she does not count this as part of the Priestly text, the same inversion is deployed in the Korah incident as well (16:11).

instead putting to death the faction whose report the people favored, killing ten communal leaders at a blow (14:36-38).

What follows is two speeches on various obligations, including the different treatment that inadvertent violations of Yhwh's commands should receive (Num 15:1-31), another judicial deliberation that eventuates in stoning (15:32-36), and Yhwh's command to put fringes on all garments as a reminder to do his commands in order to be holy (15:37-41).[111] This last passage seems most directly connected to our narrative—its warning not to "scout/turn (*twr*) after your heart and your eyes which you are whoring (*znh*) after them" recalls language used in the preceding narrative (15:39).[112] Similarly, its reassertion that Yhwh is the one who brought the Israelites out of Egypt may be seen as a direct rejoinder to the people's wish to have died there (14:3-4).[113] This passage also looks ahead, as its statement that Yhwh's people are holy (15:40) will soon be echoed by Korah (16:3).[114]

Viewing the Korah narrative as continuous with the spies narrative allows us to better appreciate the motivation and meaning of Korah's confrontation with Moses and Aaron.[115] At the outset, the presence of a group of *nəśîʾîm* alongside Korah (Num 16:1-2*) appears as a sensible response to the death of ten other *nəśîʾîm*. Furthermore, the subversion of the community's will in the matter of these deaths motivates the particular charge that Korah levels against Moses and Aaron, accusing them of "playing the *nāśîʾ* over the assembly of Yhwh"

---

[111] The majority of these elements have an obscure relationship to our narrative. See below for discussion of the secondary analysis of these passages.
[112] Milgrom 1990: 127. *twr* occurs in 13:2, 17a, 21b, 25, 32; 14:6, 7, 34, 36, 38; elsewhere in the Pentateuch, only Num 10:66 = Deut 1:33, both in reference to Yhwh rather than humans. *Znh* recalls Yhwh's statement that "you children…will bear your harlotry (*zənût*)" (Num 14:33), a term that occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch.
[113] The description of fringes on the edges of garments may also connect to the death of the ten scouts by recalling the removal of Nadab and Abihu's bodies by their garments after they also died before Yhwh (Lev 10:4-5).
[114] Milgrom 1990: 131; Knohl 1995: 90 also make this connection. Milgrom 2000: 1342-1343 offers further commentary on this, though from the point of view of an H vs. P distinction that appears no longer tenable in light of our conclusions in Chapter 3.
[115] Contra Lee 2003: 143-144, who views this story as the resumption of the narrative from Numbers 14 but states that "the rebellion…has no apparent cause."

(16:3). Just as Yhwh construes the community's complaints against Moses and Aaron (14:2) as complaints against himself (14:27, 29), Korah appears to similarly lay Yhwh's subversion of the people's will at Moses' and Aaron's feet. While this may seem speculative, such a reading is made plausible by the fact that the next narrative explicitly shows the Israelites attributing Yhwh's actions to the Mosaic siblings, as the people accuse Moses and Aaron of being responsible for the death of Korah's group (17:6). Korah's use of the verb *nśʾ* in an accusation that follows on the heels of the death of a group of *nəśîʾîm* further suggests the connection.

Korah and his group of leaders further ground their questioning of Moses' and Aaron's authority in two statements that the Priestly author indisputably endorses—the assertion that all of the congregation is holy (Exod 31:13; Lev 11:45; 19:2; 20:8, 26; Num 15:40) and that Yhwh is in their midst (Exod 29:45-46; Num 1:52-53; 2:2, 17; 5:3). These claims may explain the reason why these leaders blame Moses and Aaron for the actions of Yhwh, expressing their dissatisfaction with the outcome of the scouts episode. By claiming an equal relationship with Yhwh, the *nəśîʾîm* may either be claiming that Moses and Aaron unjustly interfered with the will of the community or that the community had the right to consult on the matter with Yhwh directly rather than through Moses' and Aaron's mediation. This expectation may have been further informed by the fact that Yhwh's *kābôd* appeared to the entire community just prior to Yhwh's execution of the ten spies (Num 14:10).

Moses responds to these questions in two speeches, each one addressed to a different audience. His first speech, addressed to the entirety of Korah's group (Num 16:5), encodes the claims of holiness and closeness to Yhwh in his proposed contest to determine Yhwh's identification of who is holy and near to him (16:5-7).[116] Moses then turns to Korah and the other

[116] The vocative *bny lwy* that ends this speech (Num 16:7) has long drawn critical attention for its seeming disagreement with the named audience of Moses' address, which includes the entire group assembled against him

Levites among the group of *nəśîʾîm* (16:8). He reminds them that, unlike the rest of the congregation, Yhwh has already drawn them close (16:9-10; cf. 8:14-15). Moses also corrects the congregation's identification of himself and Aaron as the ones responsible for Yhwh's actions in the scouts episode, echoing Yhwh's earlier speech (14:35) by telling Korah that he and his group are "meeting against Yhwh" and not Aaron (16:11). He then repeats his instructions for the proposed test but adds Aaron's participation to the procedure (16:16-17).[117]

Up to this point in the narrative, these conversations have taken the form of a deliberation that is not too far removed from the deliberative aspects of the scouts episode. While we may detect frustration in Moses' responses—his echoing rejoinder of "enough of you!" (*rb lkm*) and his accusation of Korah's underappreciation of the Levites' status—he does not challenge the essential right of Korah and the other *nəśîʾîm* to bring their case. In fact, Moses proposes a solution to allow them to test their claims and his speeches give no indication that their death is a possible outcome.[118]

(Gray 1903: 197, 199; Noth 1968: 123; Ashley 1993: 308; Knohl 1995: 77). However, we may be able to glean its meaning here by placing this passage in conversation with Moses' next speech. In that speech, Moses addresses only Korah and his fellow Levites (Num 16:8) and accuses them of desiring a priesthood, i.e., drawing closer to Yhwh than they already are (16:10). If the outcome for the Levites is that they would become priests, perhaps the outcome Moses envisions for the rest of the community is that they would become the functional equivalent of Levites—the address to the congregation as "children of Levi" may then be his sarcastic recognition of what they would achieve. If we wanted to be too clever by half, we could extend this reading into an explanation of why the community would desire this. While the common reading of Yhwh's condemnation of the Israelites at the end of the scouts episode is that the entire exodus generation will die in the wilderness (Num 14:26-35), what Yhwh actually states is that "all your accountings for all of your number from the age of twenty years and upwards" will die (14:29). This is a clear reference to the census in Numbers 1, from which the Levites were explicitly excluded (1:47). If we understand this to mean that the Levites are excluded from Yhwh's punishment over the scouts' report (which would also align with the exclusion of a Levite *nāśîʾ* from the dispatched scouts), then the desire of the rest of the community to be accorded the status of Levites becomes sensible. The blossoming of Aaron's staff (17:16-26) would also address both issues raised by Korah's group—Aaron's role as select priest is preserved by the presence of his name on the staff, but the uniqueness of Levi among the tribes is also preserved in the fact that it is the "staff of Levi" (17:18) that blossoms.

[117] As Knohl 1995: 77 notes, these instructions are not the repetition that many commentators (e.g., Gray 1903: 202; Noth 1968: 126) describe them as.

[118] Noth 1968: 129 offers this and other possible interpretations of Moses' proposed test. See Knierim & Coats 2005: 207 for a more typical approach, asserting positively that "the implication is that the unauthorized faction will be consumed by the sacrificial fire."

The deliberative aspect of this narrative changes, however, when Korah assembles not just the *nəśîʾîm* of the original confrontation, but the entire *ʿēdāh* (Num 16:19).[119] It is at this point that Yhwh's *kābôd* appears to the entire congregation (16:19), just as it had at the climax of the scouts narrative (14:10), and Yhwh threatens to destroy the entire community other than Moses and Aaron (16:20-21). Several features of this narrative suggest that Korah's gathering of the *ʿēdāh* is the turning point that triggers Yhwh's wrath. The first is that it is only after Korah assembles the *ʿēdāh* that Yhwh appears, rather than after the confrontation with Moses or after the *nəśîʾîm* had prepared their incense pans at the tabernacle (16:18). The second is Aaron's and Moses' anguished response, entreating Yhwh not to destroy the *ʿēdāh* because of the actions of Korah (16:22), which suggests that they had not expected this threat. Finally, the fact that Yhwh targets the entire congregation, rather than the smaller group of *nəśîʾîm*, and then relents by telling Moses to instruct the Israelites to disperse (16:24) suggests that it was the action of gathering at the Tabernacle that incited his anger.[120]

Korah's crime appears to be that he has prejudged the outcome of the contest by presuming the authority to assemble the people in the first place. In other contexts, it is Moses or Moses and Aaron who exercise this authority (Exod 35:1; Lev 8:3-4; Num 1:18; 8:9; 20:8, 10), while the instructions for the silver trumpets grant priests a role in the assembly of the *ʿēdāh* (Num 10:7). Korah's gathering of the people preempts the process of Moses' proposed test—the larger *ʿēdāh*'s conformity with his instructions suggests that they had also assumed the outcome.

---

[119] The phrase *qhl* (C) + *ʿl* may indicate something more forceful on Korah's part (see also, Num 17:7), Levine takes it as "rallied against" (1993: 414).

[120] This reading accords with the longstanding critical view (see, e.g., Gray 1903: 204; Artus 1997: 185-186) that 16:24 may have originally read "tabernacle of Yhwh" or simply "tabernacle" rather than "tabernacle/dwelling/district of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram." Ashley 1993: 315-316 reviews other proposals. This reading also accords with the solution offered by Yhwh in Num 18:22, on which see below.

If this reading is correct, we are once again confronted with the issue of leadership as a driving force in these chapters.

After the *ʿēdāh* remove themselves from the situation (16:27*), Yhwh incinerates the incense-offering *nəśîʾîm* (16:35) and commissions Eleazar to collect the censers and make them into a covering for the altar (17:1-5). At this point, the *ʿēdāh* approaches Moses and Aaron with the same confusion that Korah and his group initially did, attributing the actions of Yhwh to Moses and Aaron and telling them that "you have killed the people of Yhwh" (17:6). The motivation behind this claim may also be similar to the one behind Korah's initial complaint—just as it seemed that Moses and Aaron had subverted the communal decision in the case of the scouts, so it would seem that the incense test's ending in the consumption of Korah's group was understood by the rest of the *ʿēdāh* as interference with the expected process.[121]

This time, when Yhwh threatens to eliminate the entire *ʿēdāh*—in words almost identical to the ones he used during the Korah incident (16:21)—Moses and Aaron do not make an attempt to dissuade him (17:7-10). In this case, there is no one else to hold responsible for the *ʿēdāh*'s rejection of authority (cf. 16:22). Instead, Moses instructs Aaron to exercise the exclusive prerogative recently granted to him by taking his censer and offering incense as an atonement for the Israelites (17:11). Aaron does so, stopping the plague after it kills 14,700 Israelites (17:12-15).

[121] One possible implication of the community's accusation against Moses and Aaron is that they expected the incense test to have provided an answer to the question of leadership without causing any death. The use of incense in divination is known from Mesopotamia (Finkel 1983/4) and this may have been Moses' intent here. This would also change our understanding of the statement that the bronze plating made from the censers of Korah's group would serve as a reminder that "a 'strange man' who is not from the seed of Aaron will not approach to burn incense before Yhwh" (Num 17:5). While this is usually taken, correctly, as a statement reserving the prerogative of incense-burning to the Aaronid priesthood (e.g., Gray 1903: 208; Noth 1968: 129; Ashley 1993: 323; Knohl 1995: 79; Knierim & Coats 2005: 208), there may be another subtle point being made. This interdiction may also intend to reserve the use of incense for ritual purposes within the priesthood rather than allowing its use as a form of divination during communal deliberations. Baden 2013a: 240 similarly attributes the community's anger to Moses' role in the incense test, but states, "From the perspective of the people, the test that led to the deaths of Korah and his band was of Moses's own devising, as the people were not privy to Yahweh's instructions to Moses." However, Numbers 16 nowhere attributes the incense test to Yhwh's instructions to Moses.

At this point, Yhwh attempts to put a stop to the larger pattern of complaints and retribution by proposing his own test. Yhwh's speech describing the contest of the staves addresses several of the issues that have arisen up to this point. First, it changes the nature of the competitors to a group of people who have all been recognized by Yhwh. Rather than confronting the entire *ʿēdāh* or the anonymous *nəśîʾîm* of Korah's group, each tribe is to designate a single *nāśîʾ* to represent it through their name written a staff (Num 17:16-17). The implication is that we have returned to the twelve *nəśîʾîm* who were originally designated by Yhwh (1:4-15) and who were last listed as the Israelites set out for Paran (10:12-27).[122] The explicit instructions to Moses that Aaron's name should be written on the Levite staff "because there is one staff for each head of a patriclan" (17:18) reinforces this notion. Had Yhwh not specified this, there would have been no place for Aaron, as he is not considered a *nāśîʾ* of the Levite clan (Num 3:24, 30, 32, 35). Furthermore, Yhwh's instructions to place Aaron's name alongside the other *nəśîʾîm* is an implicit rejoinder to the original question "why do you play the *nāśîʾ*" (16:3). The selection of Aaron and the already-named *nəśîʾîm* in this competition of the staves thus privileges choices that Yhwh has already made in determining who has authority over the community.

Yhwh's competition further acknowledges the confusion between his actions and the actions of Moses and Aaron, a kind of misattribution that both Yhwh and the community had engaged in up to this point. Here, Yhwh states that through the flowering of the rod he will "diminish from upon me the complaints of the children of Israel which they complain against you (pl.) [i.e., Moses and Aaron]" (Num 17:20). This address, which Moses communicates to the

[122] This group may also have been considered superior to Korah and the rest of the Levites, as indicated by the fact that these twelve joined Moses and Aaron in overseeing the Levite labor census (Num 4:34, 46), dedicated the gifts that made a majority of Levite service possible (7:1-9), and offered their dedicatory gifts at the Tabernacle prior to the Levites' dedication to service (7:10-88; see Chapter 4 for the chronological relationship between Numbers 7 and 8).

Israelites (17:17, 21), informs them for the first time that Yhwh understands complaints against Moses and Aaron to be complaints against himself. Presumably, this identification would give the Israelites pause in future situations.

Finally, this competition reverses the dynamics of the previous confrontations. In the course of these previous conflicts, Yhwh accused the *ʿēdāh* of "meeting (*yʿd*) against me" in the spies encounter (Num 14:35), and Moses accused Korah and the Levites of "meeting (*yʿd*) against Yhwh" (16:11). However, when it comes to the staves, Yhwh instructs Moses to bring them into the Tent of Meeting where "I am met (*yʿd*) with you there" (17:19). Rather than the Israelites coming into conflict with Moses and Aaron in a way that provokes the appearance of the *kābôd* (14:10; 16:19; 17:7), Yhwh provides a venue for settling the dispute in which he will voluntarily come to meet the Israelites through the intended use of the Tabernacle (Exod 29:42-43). Notably, these are the only occurrences of the verb *yʿd* in the Paran episode.

Aaron's staff, as we would expect, blossoms (Num 17:23). Moses displays it to the people before returning it to the Tabernacle at Yhwh's instructions (17:24-26). Like the censers of Korah's congregation, Yhwh declares that Aaron's staff will serve as a sign for the Israelites and end their complaints against him "so that they won't die" (17:25). The Israelites, however, are unconvinced that this is sufficient to address their concerns. However, rather than complain (*lwn*) against Moses, they simply speak (*ʾmr*) to him, wondering whether they will all perish from living so close to Yhwh's Tabernacle (17:27-28).

The flowering of Aaron's rod and the people's changed approach to their situation apparently combine to effect a change in Yhwh's response. Here he addresses Aaron alone (Num 18:1, 8, 20) for the first time since giving the basic instructions of the priesthood (Lev 10:8-11). In these instructions, Yhwh offers a restructuring of the relationship between the priests, the

Levites, and the Israelites, addressing their concerns so that "there will not be wrath again against the children of Israel" (Num 18:5).[123] This restructuring returns us to the issue of land that opened this unit (13:1-2), as we are told for the first time that the Aaronids and Levites will not inherit land alongside the rest of the Israelites (18:20-24).[124] Instead, the dues from their sacred service takes the place of their right to claim property. The Paran unit then draws to a close with instructions for purification from corpse contamination (Numbers 19). This manual provides the Israelites with the means of addressing the consequences of the large number of dead in the camp (14:36-37; 16:35; 17:14) and ends a unit fraught with conflict on a remedy.

The above analysis offers a reading of the Paran section of the Priestly text as a unified narrative with a plot centered on the issues of communal deliberation, leadership, and authority. When we examine the contributions that the Paran unit makes to the broader Priestly narrative, we find further evidence that the Priestly author intended the Paran material to be read as a unified sequence of events rather than a series of discrete episodes. When taken as a whole, the Paran narrative furthers the plot of the Priestly text as expressed in the promises of Genesis 17. In the course of the events we have examined above, the Priestly author touches on all three of the major themes associated with the promises made to Abraham and presents the Paran narrative as a crisis in the Abrahamic promises.

In the course of the Paran episode, the Priestly text accounts for an increasing number of deaths among the Israelites—first the ten scouts (Num 14:36-37), then the 250 *nəśîʾîm* (16:35), and finally the 14,700 who died in the plague (17:14). Coming on the heels of the censuses that enumerated in precise detail the fulfillment of Yhwh's promise of multiplication (Numbers 1-4),

[123] Gray 1903: 218-219; Driver 1910: 65; Milgrom 1990: 145; Ashley 1993: 337; Lee 2003: 147-148; Knierim & Coats 2005: 217; Stackert 2007: 195; Nihan 2013: 120.

[124] That the Levites would not receive land may have already been intimated in the lack of a scout representing Levi in Num 13:1-16. Korah's protest that all the congregation are holy (16:3) may also, then, have been motivated by this seeming exclusion of Levi from having a representative in deliberations over the entry into the land.

the explicit numbering of the dead in these chapters represents a regression away from the fruitfulness of Abraham's descendants. What is more, the source of all of these deaths is Yhwh himself. While he had promised to be a god to Abraham's descendants, he announces in his response to the scouts' report that "you [i.e., the Israelites] will know my opposition" (14:34). In P, other instances of the declaration "you/they will know" are followed by "that I am Yhwh" (Exod 6:7; 7:5; 14:4, 18; 16:6, 12; 29:46).[125] That Yhwh's statement in the scouts narrative instead has the Israelites knowing Yhwh's opposition confirms that this represents some form of subversion of Yhwh's promise to be Israel's god. Despite the people who confront Moses and Aaron continuing to assert their relationship with Yhwh after this (16:3; 17:6), they too will eventually associate being close to Yhwh with death (17:27-28). Finally, Yhwh withholds the land promise's fulfillment from the exodus generation (14:26-35). While this only delays its ultimate fulfillment, it compromises Yhwh's stated intention to lead the exodus generation into Canaan (Exod 6:6-8). All three promises are thus in some way compromised in the course of the Paran narrative.

Yhwh eventually addresses this crisis in the Abrahamic promises through the flowering of Aaron's staff and the reorganization of the priest-Levite-Israelite relationship. Effectively, these solutions change elements of his relationship with Israel (Num 17:25; 18:5, 20, 22-24). This pattern of crisis and renewal makes the Paran narrative a parallel to the Priestly flood narrative. In P, the flood represents an undoing of the Priestly creation account's vision of the cosmos, with the waters stationed above and below reuniting within the dome of the skies.[126] This story ends with the flood subsiding and Yhwh establishing a new order wherein humans are

[125] One exception is present in Lev 23:43, "in order that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel live in booths..." Nevertheless, even in this instance the focus is on Yhwh's positive relationship with Israel.
[126] Skinner 1930: 164; Friedman 1997: 192. See Halpern 2003: 74*-76* for a description of the Priestly creation account's understanding of the formation of the cosmos.

permitted to eat meat. In the same way that the Priestly flood narrative envisions a crisis in creation, in which Yhwh both unmakes and then remakes his work in a new form, the Priestly Paran narrative presents Yhwh both compromising and then refashioning his fulfillment of the Abrahamic promises.

Our narrative evaluation of the Paran events provides a framework for our secondary analysis of the Priestly text in this section. Scholars have identified several issues in these chapters and we will use their work as a signpost to material that requires a closer look. The first of these is the relationship of the corpse-purification *tôrāh* (Numbers 19) to its context. Scholars have frequently charged this chapter with being unrelated to the material that precedes or follows.[127] Our own analysis has shown that these instructions are responsive to the preceding mass death within the Israelite camp and that their placement is perfectly sensible in relation to the Priestly narrative.[128] Furthermore, the instructions' designation of Eleazar as the priest who should carry out the preparation of the waters of purification (Num 19:3, 4) is evidence of a careful orientation to the world within the Priestly narrative, as it keeps Aaron, the practicing high priest, from contracting impurity in the course of carrying out its instructions (19:7).[129]

In terms of our Neo-analytic model, we may observe that while this manual would have fit comfortably with the purity collection in Leviticus 11-15,[130] its location here presents no problems. We have already explored ways in which the Priestly author made decisions about the arrangement of the materials available to him.[131] The decision to place this particular *tôrāh* in this location elevates the ritual of the red heifer, making it part of Yhwh's rapprochement with

[127] Kuenen 1886: 96; Wellhausen 1899: 175-176; Gray 1903: 241; Noth 1968: 139; Milgrom 1990: 157; Knierim & Coats 2005: 222.
[128] Ashley 1993: 361-362 also observed the connection between this chapter and the plague in Numbers 17. Leveen 2013: 263-266 further argues that this *tôrāh* constitutes a response to the people's complaint about perishing in Num 17:27-28.
[129] Gray 1903: 250.
[130] Gray 1903: 241-242.
[131] See Chapters 2, 3, and 4.

the community in the wake of the scouts and Korah incidents. The singling out of this ritual by its placement—it is the only post-Sinai *tôrāh*—accords with the strangeness of the purifying waters, which render corpse-contaminated persons clean (Num 19:19) but renders impure anyone who handles or prepares them (19:6-10, 21).[132] Finally, as we have already argued, the location of Numbers 19 makes good narrative sense. Absent compelling reasons to the contrary, we should accept it as an original part of the Priestly text.

Another area that has attracted scholarly interest is the collection of divine speeches in Numbers 18. Though earlier scholarship was comfortable attributing the entirety of this chapter to the original version of the Priestly text,[133] more recent voices have called this into question from either the perspective of Analyst-style stratification or on the model of an extensive H strata in P.[134] The speeches in this chapter, however, are well-integrated into the Priestly narrative as Yhwh's response to the crisis at Paran.[135] These speeches address the complaints of the Israelites by limiting their responsibility for violations of the sanctuary (Num 18:1-5, 21-22) and by setting clear boundaries between the Aaronid priests, the Levites, and the rest of the Israelite community (18:1, 3-4, 20, 21-24, 26-28).[136] While many scholars have described the majority of Numbers 18 as repeating or restating previously given regulations, this is only a partial description of what this chapter does.[137] Careful attention to the details of these speeches reveal "striking innovation in the role of priest and Levite in Israel, which, although built on the earlier foundations of

---

[132] See Milgrom 1990: 438-443 for reflections on the reception of this ritual in Rabbinic Judaism.
[133] Kuenen 1886: 95; Wellhausen 1899: 179-181; Gray 1903: 218-219.
[134] Noth 1957: 204 = 1987: 133; 1968: 133-134; Knohl 1995: 53-54; Artus 1997: 257-260; Knierim & Coats 2005: Stackert 2007: 191-198; Nihan 2013: 132-134.
[135] Noth 1968: 133's assertion that Numbers 18 is only imperfectly connected to its context because "there had never been any mention in ch. 16-17 of the Israelites having come too near the 'tabernacle of [Yhwh]'" as stated in Num 17:28 is simply not correct, as the *ʿēdāh* is described as gathering at the Tabernacle on two occasions (16:19; 17:6-8).
[136] Leveen 2013: 252-263. See also, Milgrom 1990: 423-424.
[137] E.g., Gray 1903: 218; Levine 1993: 435; Knierim & Coats 2005: 219.

[Numbers] 1, 3-4, is anything but unnecessary repetition."[138] Given its strong connection to the Priestly narrative of the Paran episode, there is no positive reason to identify the speeches of Numbers 18 as an interpolation into the Priestly text.

From a Neo-analytic perspective, the interaction between the speeches in Numbers 18 and similar non-narrative material from earlier in the Priestly text is instructive for the method of the Priestly author. The speeches in Numbers 18 have more than a passing resemblance to the royal decrees and dedications related to the personnel and maintenance of temples.[139] The strong use of first person through these speeches, attributed to Yhwh, may in fact have stood in relationship to a king in their underlying originals. Importantly, such decrees were made by multiple kings over time—some Neo-Assyrian tablets even compile the decrees from several kings. In other words, the Priestly author may have had several such documents or a compilation of several such documents, detailing the responsibilities of and payments due to cultic personnel.

Nevertheless, we should leave open the possibility that some amount of this material may be fresh composition of the Priestly author. Either possibility yields interesting insights into the Priestly author's treatment of the pre-existing non-narrative material our Neo-analytic framework has proposed to explain the form of the Priestly text. If these speeches represent pre-existing materials that were similar to but distinct from other materials the Priestly author used, then the Priestly author found a way to incorporate more than one version of similar material by presenting one group as a modification of previously given regulations triggered by the narrative events of the Paran episode. In other words, rather than using either one decree-type text or the other, the Priestly author used narrative contextualization to present both of them. If, on the other

[138] Ashley 1993: 337. For analysis of these divergences, see Ashley 1993: 337-361; Achenbach 2003: 153-157; Meyer 2017. For details of the tithe regulations in this chapter and their relationship to similar laws in Deuteronomy and Leviticus, see Stackert 2007: 165-191, 204-208; Nihan 2013: 120-132. This author hopes to write-up a full analysis of how Numbers 18 interacts with and modifies previously given regulations in the Priestly text.
[139] e.g., SAA XII 68-81, 86. SAA XII 68 is from the Kiṣir-Aššur archive examined in Chapter 5.

hand, the texts of Numbers 18 represent a fresh composition in which the Priestly author himself undertook a modification of non-narrative materials that he had previously included, then this indicates a basic inclination to interfere as little as possible with those pre-existing texts. Rather than modify those texts directly, the Priestly author used Yhwh's resolution of the Paran crisis to offer commentary on the archival texts at his disposal. Both of these scenarios show the care with which the Priestly author related pre-existing materials to his narrative.

The Korah incident and its aftermath have also been the subject of scrutiny. Many scholars have seen in the Priestly material the fusion of two distinct elements—an original narrative of a revolt against Moses and Aaron by 250 *nəśîʾîm* seeking broader access to Yhwh and an editorial expansion to this account that details an attempt by a group of Levites led by Korah to wrest the priesthood from Aaron.[140] Arguments for detecting two different strata in the Priestly material revolve mainly around two issues: the doubling of Moses' instructions for the incense trial (Num 16:6-7, 16-17) and the presence of two different issues in the two speeches Moses addresses to the dissidents (Num 16:3-5, 8-11). The well-known difficulties with the primary analysis of Numbers 16 into its constituent JE/non-Priestly and Priestly components further contribute to a lack of clarity regarding the Priestly narrative in this chapter.[141]

The supposition of two layers in this material is not, however, a necessary conclusion.[142] There is nothing inherently improbable about the Priestly text presenting a mixed group of Levites and non-Levites protesting against the leadership of Moses and Aaron in the aftermath of

[140] Kuenen 1886: 95-96, 334; Wellhausen 1899: 102-106; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: II.212; Gray 1903: 186-188, 191-193; Noth 1968: 120-122; Milgrom 1990: 414-423; Knierim & Coats 2005: 207-208. In a similar but distinct vein, Blum 1990: 265-266; Knohl 1995: 73-85; Artus 1997: 160-197; Jeon 2015: 383-395 also see 3 layers in Numbers 16—a non-Priestly Dathan-Abiram account, a Priestly account about the *nəśîʾîm*, and a later Priestly editorial layer that unites the two different narratives around the person of Korah the Levite. However, Baden 2013a has demonstrated that the character of Korah, at whatever stage he was introduced, must have been part of the Priestly narrative prior to its redactional uniting with the Dathan-Abiram account, a conclusion already adumbrated in Gray 1903: 187.

[141] See n. 99 above.

[142] Levine 1993: 405-407, 428-432; Friedman 1997: 192-196; 2003: 268-270.

the death of the scouts before Yhwh. The Priestly text has already, at this point, divided the Israelite community into three groups: Moses and the priests, the Levites, and the non-Levites. In the scouts narrative, it is Moses and Aaron who stand athwart the will of the people, Levite and non-Levite alike.[143] The fact that Moses' speech addresses the groups separately does not require a compositional explanation—should Moses' and Aaron's authority be overturned, it would have different implications for the Levite and non-Levite Israelites.[144] Moses' speeches reflect these differences. These differences also account for the repeated instructions. The second set (Num 16:16-17) are not an actual repetition, but a refocusing on Aaron's role in the test, responsive to the implications of the outcome for Korah and the Levites.[145]

There are two other reasons to be suspect of attributing the mixture of Levites and non-Levites to an editorial expansion of an originally single-issue Priestly narrative. The first is that the editing supposed in this latter scenario is inefficient at best. Were an editor seeking to transform a story about non-Levites seeking greater access to Yhwh into a story about Levites attempting to wrest the exclusive rights of priesthood from Aaron—as most scholars who see these layers suppose—then the speech Moses gives to Korah (Num 16:8-11) could have been inserted into the same speech rubric as the original speech, just before Moses gives the first set of instructions (i.e., between 16:5 and 16:6). These instructions could have then been expanded with the addition of the elements that make the second set of instructions distinct. The fact that we instead have two different speeches with two different instructions suggest that, even if we attribute the Levite-Aaron competition to an editorial expansion, the goal of the editor was not to obscure or change the nature of the original conflict, but rather to supplement it. At this point, it

[143] Admittedly, the protest of the Levites must be inferred from the text of Numbers 13-14*, but we should note that Moses does not send a Levite delegate into the land as a scout, robbing the Levites of representation in the communal deliberation that follows.
[144] See n. 113 above for an explanation of the *bny lwy* that ends Moses' first speech.
[145] Knohl 1995: 77 also recognizes this, even though he attributes the instructions to an editorial layer.

becomes unclear why supposing a supplementary editor is preferable to attributing the entire narrative to the Priestly author. The Priestly author was surely capable of a sophisticated, nuanced depiction of a conflict among the three parts of the Israelite community that existed within the world of his text.

The second reason to view both conflicts as an original part of the Priestly text lies in Yhwh's responses to the Paran conflicts (Num 17:16-18:32). In the test of the staves (17:16-26), we see both conflicts acknowledged. This narrative, for the first and only time in P, places the tribe of Levi alongside the twelve non-Levite tribes (17:17-18, 21). The selection of the staff of Levi over that of the staves representing the other tribes confirms the special relationship that that tribe enjoys with Yhwh. For this reason, scholars have typically seen this as the sequel to the non-Levite Priestly account in Numbers 16.[146] However, this staff has Aaron's name inscribed on it at Yhwh's explicit instructions (17:18). This goes against the procedure for the other tribes, which all have the name of a *nāśîʾ* on them—a role that Aaron does not hold (Num 3:24, 30, 32, 35). The demand that Aaron's name be inscribed on the staff of Levi indicates Yhwh's affirmation of his special status.[147] What starts as the "staff of Levi" (17:18) is described as "the staff of Aaron for the house of Levi" (17:23) when the rod blossoms, indicating its dual role as representing Levi against the non-Levites and Aaron against the rest of Levi.

Finally, as we have detailed above, both priests and Levites are addressed in relationship to each other and the rest of the Israelite community in Yhwh's instructions that follow the

[146] E.g., Gray 1903: 214-215; Noth 1968: 130-131; Knohl 1995: 79.

[147] Contra Gray 1903: 214-215 assertion that "Aaron is the *tribal* representative corresponding to the representatives of the other *tribes*; he is not here the representative of the priestly section of that tribe as distinguished form the merely Levitical families." Artus 1997: 200-202 comes to a similar conclusion as that presented here, but because he views Korah and his Levites as a late redactional elements, also attributes the elements that exalt Aaron in this narrative to an editorial revision meant to bring this account into line with the revised Korah account. However, absent his prior commitment to viewing the Korah/Levite material in Numbers 16 as a redactional element, it is unclear if anything in the text of Num 17:16-26 itself would have compelled him to view these statements as additions.

blossoming of Aaron's staff (17:27-18:32). In both of these responses, then, we see evidence that both the *nəśîʾîm* and Korah and his fellow Levites were original parts of the Priestly text. In light of the above, nothing compels us to view the Priestly material in Numbers 16 as consisting of an editorial expansion to an originally simpler text. Instead, we are better able to account for its shape and relationship with surrounding materials by understanding it as a sophisticated text originating from a single compositional layer.

Scholars have also identified the narrative in which Eleazar gathers the censers of the 250 incinerated by Yhwh in order to make a bronze covering for the altar (Num 17:1-5) as a secondary accretion to the original Priestly text. For many, this proposal is underwritten by its connection to the previously-supposed Korah and Levite layer of Numbers 16*.[148] In light of our above analysis, that issue need not detain us here. However, some scholars have also seen this narrative's account of the creation of a bronze plating for the altar (17:3-4) as conflicting with the Priestly account of the bronze altar's manufacture at Sinai (Exod 27:1-8; 38:1-7; 39:39).[149] This too is not a persuasive reason for identifying this passage as a supplement to P. In this narrative, the bronze plating is manufactured for an altar that already exists. If we suppose this altar to lack a metal plating prior to this point then we must either imagine that it is a wooden frame that was completely destroyed each time it was used or that it was made of stone and therefore not portable as this text—in agreement with the rest of P—presupposes in its statement that the bronze plating should serve as a *zikkārôn* (Num 17:5). The only viable narrative option is to understand the plating Eleazar creates as either a second covering for the alar or as a type of decorative addition to it.

[148] Gray 1903: 192-193; Noth 1968: 122; Knohl 1995: 79; Artus 1997: 192.
[149] E.g., Gray 1903:208; Noth 1968: 129. See also, Ashley 1993: 325-326 for a review of other options. LXX Exod 38:22 attempts to anachronistically harmonize the two accounts, demonstrating the antiquity of this exegetical understanding.

We come, finally, to the material in Numbers 15. At the broadest level, the very placement of the divine speeches and isolated narrative in this chapter have motivated scholars to view this material as secondary to a greater or lesser extent.[150] Given the strong narrative connection between the scouts narrative and the Korah narrative we have argued for here, this view is attractive. However, we must also remember that speeches take up very little time within the world of the narrative. Below, we will offer a tentative evaluation of each of the four units that make up this chapter in an attempt to determine their relationship to the Priestly text. In doing so, we must keep in mind that our principles of secondary analysis require us to offer an explanation for the placement of any of the texts that we identify as an addition.

We will begin with the last divine speech of the chapter, which commands the Israelites to place tassels on their garments (Num 15:37-41).[151] We observed above that this chapter's language connects it both with what precedes in the spies narrative and what follows in the Korah narrative. In this way, this divine speech shows a high level of integration with the Priestly text. Moreover, its ending reassurance from Yhwh that he will continue to be Israel's god is thematically related to the crisis in the Abrahamic promise that we have traced in the Paran narrative. Finally, it's exhortation to the Israelites to remember and not "spy (*twr*) after your heart and after your eyes" (15:39) is not an inappropriate response to the people's rejection of the land in the scouts' narrative and its reminder of the holiness of Israel paves the way for the

[150] E.g., Gray 1903: 168-169; Noth 1968: 114; Artus 1997: 45-47. Kuenen 1886: 96 n. 38; Gray 1903: 168-183; Knohl 1995: 53, 90; Milgrom 2000: 1341-1343; Achenbach 2013; Baden 2013b connect the various materials in these chapters in part or in whole with the so-called Holiness Code on the basis of certain linguistic usages. Given our results from Chapter 3, we would recognize this simply as the language of P.

[151] Several scholars have connected the language of this speech in particular to the so-called Holiness Code—e.g., Gray 1903: 183; Knohl 1995: 53, 90; Milgrom 2000: 1342-1343. As stated above, our results from Chapter 3 lead us to recognize this simply as the language of P. From this point of view, this speech contributes to the Priestly author's continued assertion and explication of the holiness of Israel within the dynamics of the Priestly text's plot, as detailed in Chapters 2 and 3.

argument that opens the following narrative.[152] If this speech is an original part of the Priestly text, then it functions admirably well as a transition between the scouts and the Korah narratives.[153] Nevertheless, we must still admit uncertainty about whether this speech is an original component of the Priestly text.

When we turn to the narrative of the Sabbath-breaker (Num 15:32-36), we find an introduction that places the Israelites "in the wilderness" (15:32). There are two different ways to read this statement, with implications for whether we accept it as an original part of P. If we view this statement as a geographic locator—taking "wilderness" as a defined place such as the Wilderness of Paran or the Wilderness of Zin—then this passage is almost certainly not a part of the Priestly text.[154] As we have argued above, the material in this chapter is united by its location within the wilderness of Paran. The introduction of a new location would disrupt this otherwise strong connection. Furthermore, the lack of specificity to this location is uncharacteristic of the Priestly author.[155] However, if we take the term "wilderness" in a more general sense, understanding it to report that the Israelites who found the Sabbath violator were in the steppe rather than in the camp (cf. Exod 16:10), then this introduction has no bearing on the question of whether this narrative is part of the Priestly text.

Thematically, this story's focus on a judicial issue (Num 15:34, 36) resonates with the issue of communal authority that permeates the scouts narratives. That it ends with the stoning of

---

[152] For a possible relationship between the subject of tassels and the death of the spies, on analogy with Lev 10:5, see n. 111 above.

[153] Milgrom 2000: 1343 recognizes that Num 15:37-41 in particular seems to function "as a transition between the two larger blocs (Num 13-14 and 16-18)," yet he nevertheless associates it with all of Numbers 15 as a single unit constituting a later addition to P.

[154] Chavel 2009: 51-52 identifies this as a sufficient reason to regard the passage as secondary. Chavel 2014: 187-188 argues in favor of the view that this line should be read as a temporal indicator instead—"in the wilderness (period)"—though he maintains his opinion that this is a sign of disjunction between this text and the Priestly narrative.

[155] Gray 1903: 182.

an Israelite echoes the attempt by the Israelites to execute Joshua and Caleb (14:10).[156] However, this story presents the image of a well-functioning community, one in which Moses, Aaron, and the *ʿēdāh* work in harmony to determine what to do (15:33, 36). This stands in stark contrast to the image of communal crisis that exists on either side of this narrative. While we can not establish its relationship to P with certainty, the fact that it obscures the connection between the scouts and Korah events suggests that this is an interposition into either the Priestly text or into the combination of P with JE/non-P.[157]

The divine speech that opens this chapter details a schedule of grain and wine offerings that should accompany every *ʿōlāh* and *zebaḥ* (Num 15:1-16). While this chapter provides information that is supplementary to the instructions in Leviticus 1-7, our principles of secondary analysis and the Neo-anayltic framework dictate that this is no reason to immediately identify them as an addition to the Priestly text.[158] We have already seen that the Priestly author creatively deploys the various non-narrative materials at his disposal in relationship to this narrative. Nor are we persuaded by the idea that such a schedule of required offering accompaniments must inherently be late simply because of the presence of requirements.[159]

Nevertheless, when we look more closely at the way that this speech has been contextually adapted to the Priestly narrative, we find indications that this particular material was handled in ways that don't align with the adaptation of other divine speeches in P. As Friedman observed, this speech's lack of mention of the Tent of Meeting or Tabernacle as the place where offerings are brought makes this text stand out against other instructions in the Priestly text.[160]

---

[156] Chavel 2009: 48-51 argues that the introduction of stoning as the method of execution for Sabbath violation is the primary purpose of this passage.
[157] See below for further discussion.
[158] See Gray 1903: 169-172 for a discussion of the relationship between Num 15:1-16 and related texts in the Hebrew Bible.
[159] Gray 1903: 170. See Ashley 1993: 275-276 offers an excellent rejoinder to such views.
[160] Friedman 1981: 108; 2003: 266n.

While the expression *lyhwh* is also used in P as shorthand for offerings at the Tabernacle, these are almost always accompanied by some contextualizing phrase that associates it with the Tent of Meeting.[161] The speech in Num 15:1-16 does not offer an alternative location for sacrifice, so we can not claim that it contradicts the Priestly text. However, the total absence of the Tabernacle in a speech centered on sacrifice may be indicative of a different method of contextualization than we see elsewhere in P.

Other features that seem to distinguish the handling of this speech from what we see elsewhere in the Priestly text are found in its opening and closing. The statement that opens Yhwh's instructions, "when you come to the land of your dwellings" (Num 15:2), does not correlate with the content of the speech in the same way as in other deployments of this phrase. In the Sinai speeches, this phrase accompanies instructions that would simply be impossible to complete in the wilderness setting of the Priestly narrative—*ṣāraʿat* in stone-built houses (Lev 14:34), dedication of fruits from newly-planted orchards (19:23), the first omer from the harvest (23:10), and the procedures for land-Sabbath and Jubilee (25:2). These speeches are all associated with features of permanent occupancy and residence in Canaan—houses, orchards, harvests, and land ownership.[162] No such apparent connection exists between coming to the land and the content of the first divine speech in Numbers 15. While the grain-offerings (*minḥāh*) and wine libations regulated in this speech are processed agricultural products, nowhere else does P reserve the general presentation of agricultural products for "when you come into the land."[163]

---

[161] See Appendix 3.2a, entries 1 and 5 for uses of *lyhwh* in sacrificial contexts.

[162] Contra Gray 1903: 172; Milgrom 1990: 118 who reduce the association of this phrase to laws referring to agriculture.

[163] See, e.g., the directly comparable instructions about the offerings that accompany the daily *tāmîd* (Exod 29:38-41), the independent *minḥāh* offering (Leviticus 2), the various breads that accompany the *šəlāmîm* (Lev 7:12-13), the offerings that accompany the Nazirite vow (Num 6:15, 17), the oil for the *mənōrāh* (Exod 27:20; Lev 24:2), and the grain for the weekly replacement of the *pānîm* bread (Lev 24:5, 8). Milgrom 1990: 118; Achenbach 2013: 211-213 attempt to argue that it is precisely the presence of agricultural products that triggers this expression, but they do not address the full range of agricultural products described with no such delay in P (or, for them, P and H).

This speech's closing—the declaration that Israel should have one *ḥuqqāh*, one *tôrāh*, and one *mišpāṭ* for both the native and the alien (15:15-16)—also does not seem to reflect the content of the speech. In parallel phrases found in the Priestly text, such a declaration consists of only a single genre marker—having one *tôrāh* (Exod 12:49) or one *mišpāṭ* (Lev 24:22) or one *ḥuqqāh* (Num 9:14).[164] These parallel phrases accompany material of clear significance, with two of them occurring alongside Passover prescriptions (Exod 12:43-49; Num 9:9-14) and the other occurring in Yhwh's description of the general *talion* principle (Lev 24:17-22). The content of this speech, a simple table of offering accompaniments, does not seem capable of supporting the grandiose pileup of these equality statements at its end.[165] The absence of the Tabernacle, the opening line with no connection to the following content, and this incongruent closing would each mean very little on their own. However, their combination in a single speech with no clear connection to its context all suggest that this material was handled by someone with a different editorial method than the Priestly author.

The second divine speech (Num 15:17-31) in this chapter covers two unrelated subjects: the matter of the *ʿărîsāh* firstfruits (15:19-21) and the differential treatment of inadvertent and intentional violations of divine commands (15:22-31).[166] Here too we find evidence of different

---

Achenbach 2013: 212's attempt to align the delay of *minḥāh* until Canaan in this speech with a general view of the Holiness Code by reference to Lev 23:9-14 ignores the fact that Lev 23:9-14 is not a law about the *minḥāh* in general, but is instead a regulation about a particular offering for a particular festival (Lev 23:4) taking place in association with harvest time (23:9) in association with other elements of the festival calendar (23:15-16).

[164] See also Lev 7:7, which declares that there will be one *tôrāh* but refers to the handling of the *haṭṭāʾt* and the *ʾāšām* rather than to the equal treatment of citizen and alien.

[165] It is unclear to this author whether it is relevant that these equality statements occur one time with each genre marking, all prior to their combination in Num 15:15-16. Note as well that an equality statement occurs in the next divine speech, declaring "one *tôrāh*" for both citizen and alien (15:29). While this author doubts that the latter case is an original part of the Priestly text, we should note that the context is at least appropriate for such a declaration, coming as it does in a regulation that requires discerning the difference between intentional and unintentional violations of Yhwh's commands.

[166] On the relationship between the inadvertence regulation here (Num 15:22-31) and the related regulations in Leviticus 4, see Gray 1903: 178-180; Milgrom 1991: 264-269; Achenbach 2013: 221-225. Milgrom argues that the instructions in Numbers 15 were formulated independently of those in Leviticus 4 (though in Milgrom 2000: 1341 he confusingly asserts that he argued that Num 15:22-31 is a reworking of Leviticus 4). For either scenario, he may

editorial methods than that seen elsewhere in the Priestly text. As with the previous speech, we again find no references to the Tent of Meeting in this speech.[167] This speech, like the previous one, opens by once again framing the following commands as applying "when you come to the land" (15:18). This causes no conflict with the regulations concerning the *ʿărîsāh* offering, which is explicitly drawn from the "bread of the land" (15:19). However, this framing clashes with the following instructions, which address no issues requiring settlement in Canaan and which frame themselves as applying to all commands "from the day Yhwh commanded you and onward" (15:23).[168] The only thing within the second part of this speech that may be construed as requiring a delay until settlement is the fact that it mentions offering *minḥāh* and libations alongside the requisite *ʿōlāh* (15:24). If this is the reason why the editor was comfortable subsuming these instructions under a rubric of delayed observance, then this would indicate an approach similar to the previous speech and out of step with that practiced by the Priestly author. This incongruent introduction and the lack of mention of the Tabernacle, combined with the lack of connection to the context of the Priestly narrative, once again suggest that this is not an original part of the Priestly text.

---

be correct, though this has no bearing on the question of whether these texts are from different strata, as he concludes (Milgrom 2000: 1341-1342). From a Neo-analytic perspective, neither of these texts were compositions authored by the Priestly author and they may have both been available in the archive from which he drew his materials.

[167] Friedman 1981: 108; 2003: 266n. Gray 1903: 181 points to additional peculiarities of language in 15:31 as a sign that this passage may be a later interpolation—however, the context of this statement is itself fairly unique and that may be a better explanation of the language here; i.e., it has no bearing on the compositional issues of this speech.

[168] Baden 2013b: 354-360 argues that the Priestly manna story (Exodus 16*) originally stood between Num 15:16 and 15:17 (see Baden 2010 for the original argument about the alleged misplacement of P's manna story) and that the two parts of the divine speech in Num 15:17-31 respond to different aspects of the manna story. In addition to being unpersuaded about the misplacement about the manna story, his argument also does not resolve the disjunction between the postponement of observation implied by the opening of this speech (15:18-21) and the immediately present validity of the regulations concerning inadvertence implied in the second part of this speech (15:22-31). Furthermore, his own analysis of the relationship between this speech and the following story of the Sabbath-gatherer (Baden 2013b: 360-361) acknowledges that the regulations about inadvertence were immediately binding.

Finally, we should note one more feature of the speech opening "When you come to the land," shared by these first two divine speeches (Num 15:2, 18). The mere presence of this opening address is in tension with the Priestly narrative that precedes it. In P, the Israelites have just been told by Yhwh that everyone over the age of twenty will die in the wilderness and not enter the land. For Yhwh to then address the Israelite community in this way, as though the Israelites who receive this address will reach the land, seems perverse. While some have argued that these speech openings are meant to be a comfort to the community that Yhwh will still ultimately keep his promise, this is unnecessary in light of his own statement to that effect (14:31).[169] Furthermore, such reassurance would run counter to the escalating crisis of the Paran narrative as presented in the Priestly text.

In the above analysis, we have found reason to strongly doubt the Priestly affiliation of three of the four elements in Numbers 15 (15:1-16, 17-31, 32-36). The first two divine speeches and the story of the Sabbath-breaker seem to have no connection with the Priestly narrative as we have reconstructed it, while the divine speeches show signs of a different method of narrative contextualization than we see elsewhere in P. Moreover, if these two speeches were part of P, we might plausibly expect them to be located with the material in Numbers 18-19 had the Priestly author wished to introduce new or supplemental regulations in the Paran episode.[170] However, unless we can explain why this material has been placed in its current setting setting, our job will

[169] In agreement with Baden 2013b: 363 n. 40.

[170] Alternatively, their headings declaring their effectiveness as dating to "When you come to the land" would also have been at home among the divine speeches that close the book of Numbers and which offer a view of the coming settlement in Canaan. Douglas 1993b: 102-122; Milgrom 2000: 1343's attempt to explain Numbers 15's location by reference to an alternating pattern of law and narrative is descriptive rather than explanatory, while the supposed parallelism between Numbers 15 and 18-19 (Douglas 1993b: 112) is simply unpersuasive. What is more, it is not clear that this structure would have been at all compromised if Numbers 15 had been placed alongside Numbers 18-19. Finally, the classification of Num 15:32-36 as "law" is simply incorrect—this is a narrative.

be left only half-done.[171] When we turn away from the Priestly text alone and towards the context of the combined JE/non-Priestly and Priestly material, the reason for these speeches' presence becomes more clear.

In the JEP combination, the death of the ten spies (Num 14:36-38) is followed by a narrative in which the people attempt to enter Canaan despite Yhwh's instructions to them to turn away from it (14:39-45). The people justify this attempt by declaring that "we have sinned" (14:40); when Moses attempts to stop them, they nevertheless "presumed (*ʿpl*) to go up to the head of the hill country" (14:44) and were soundly defeated (14:45). These events—in which the Israelites declare their wrong-doing and then proceed with a plan against Mosaic advice to not "transgress the command of Yhwh" (14:41)—constitute an excellent example of the type of intentional command-breaking, done "with a high hand" (15:30), envisioned in the second divine speech in Numbers 15.[172] Further strengthening the connection between this second speech and the received version of Numbers 13-14, is the fact that this speech focuses on the issue of Yhwh's forgiveness (*slḥ* N: 15:25, 26, 28), an issue that is also central to Moses' intercession in the JE/non-Priestly spies' narrative (14:19, 20).[173]

However, the speech on inadvertences does not just connect with the preceding JE/non-Priestly account of the aftermath of the spies account. It is also placed in near-proximity to the command concerning tassels (Num 15:37-41), which we have tentatively identified as being an

[171] Baden 2013b: 362-365 attempts to explain the relationship between Num 15:1-16 and the spies narrative by saying that H inserted this passage here to signal that P's laws may only apply to the exodus generation. Even were we to grant the existence of an H and P with distinguishable viewpoints, this is not a persuasive argument, given that the subject of this speech is no more or less than what libations and grain offerings accompany various sacrificial animals.

[172] Gray 1903: 182; Milgrom 1990: 409-410; connect the "high hand" with the following narrative of the Sabbath-violator.

[173] Baden 2013b: 357 rightly notes that the *ʿărîsāh*-firstfruits (15:17-21) are often neglected in analyses of this chapter and that scholars have long been puzzled by the relationship between the two parts of this second speech; see, e.g., Gray 1903: 180; Noth 1968: 116. While we agree with Baden and Milgrom 1990: 122 that the two parts of this speech are definitively connected, we have no better explanation than the possibility that both parts existed as part of a *Sammlung*-type text that was used by the editor who inserted this speech.

original part of the Priestly text. According to this speech, the purpose of the tassels is to remind Israelites of Yhwh's commands so that they will perform them (Num 15:39-40). The concept of the inadvertent and intentional violation of Yhwh's commands aligns well with the theme of remembering and doing Yhwh's commands within the tassels speech. That the speech on inadvertences has connections to both the JE and P material that surrounds it suggests that this was the motivation for placing the text in this location.

If the decision to locate the second speech here was due to its connection to neighboring JE and P elements, the first speech was likely included due its connection with the second speech. The first speech makes reference to performing an *ʿōlāh* along with its accompanying grain-offering and libation "according to the rule/judgment (*mišpāṭ*)" (Num 15:24). Since there are no ordinances in P that deal with the appropriate grain-offerings and libations that accompany general sacrifices, the schedule in the first speech was supplied to fill this lacuna.

Finally, the inclusion of the Sabbath-violator narrative—if it is not an original part of P—may have been motivated by both the presence of the inadvertence speech and by the larger context. Many commentators have connected the story of the wood-gatherer to the offense committed "with a high hand" (Num 15:30).[174] Furthermore, as we observed above, this narrative portrays Moses, Aaron, and the *ʿēdāh* acting in judicial harmony (15:33-34). This portrayal may have been intended to soften the image of a community in crisis that otherwise exists in Numbers 13-19*. When set alongside the long speeches that precede it, this narrative helps sever the connection between Numbers 13-14 and 16-19—in both the JE/non-Priestly version and the Priestly version, the individual scouts narratives were followed immediately by the Dathan and Abiram narrative and the Korah narrative, respectively. When combined, the JEP

[174] Gray 1903: 182; Milgrom 1990: 125-126; Ashley 1993: 290-291; Baden 2013b: 360-361. For some issues with this general conclusion, see Seebass 2003: 153; for refinements, see Chavel 2014: 185-195.

version of these accounts only heightens the dramatic portrayal of disarray in the Israelite camp. The narrative of the Sabbath-violator presents a respite from this portrayal, preventing the reader from perceiving the Israelites as being constantly at odds with Mosaic authority.

By anchoring both this narrative and the speeches that precede it to the surrounding JE/non-Priestly and Priestly contexts, the editor who has inserted these texts has creatively contextualized these materials while reshaping the impact of the overall narrative. It is to the intervention of Numbers 15 that we should attribute the general perception of the scouts narrative and the Dathan-Abiram/Korah rebellion as "episodes" in the wilderness. By transforming the Kadesh(JE)/Paran(P) narratives into a series of discrete episodes through the interposition of Num 15:1-36, the editor creates a space for the importance of the failed entry into Canaan to resonate. He also, however, allows the Dathan, Abiram, and Korah rebellions to appear as unmotivated responses to Mosaic authority, rather than as a continued rebellious response on the part of the Israelites who had already affronted Yhwh to the point that they were condemned to death. In sum, the presence of Num 15:1-36 are responsive to the larger project of the JEP combination and so do not belong to the Priestly text, whose own narrative is disrupted by their presence.[175]

Following the Trail 2: The Wilderness Narrative in the Priestly Text (Numbers 20*)

When we turn from the Paran narrative to the events that transpire between Paran and the plains of Moab (Num 20:1-13*, 22-29), we confront a much more straightforward narrative.[176]

[175] For a very different view of the placement of Numbers 15 that nevertheless attempts to account for its connections to the surrounding narrative, see Achenbach 2013: 201-213.

[176] Levine 1993: 60-61; 2000: 79; Baden 2009: 132-134 argue that Num 21:1-3 should also be attributed to P in this section. However, their argument rests on the relationship between this narrative and Num 33:40, which Baden mischaracterizes as part of "a later summary of the travel of the Israelites derived exclusively from P" (2009: 133). Num 33:1-49 in fact contains travel notices drawn related to all the Pentateuchal sources (Gray 1903: 442-444; Ashley 1993: 624-625; though based in a different compositional model, Roskop 2011: 185-232's analysis comes to

The Israelites arrive in the Wilderness of Zin, likely in the fortieth year (20:1*).[177] They arrive at a place with no water and complain to Moses and Aaron about this (20:2-5). Moses and Aaron approach Yhwh about the issue, and he instructs them to take the staff from before him and command a rock to give water to the community (20:6-9). Moses and Aaron gather the people as instructed, Moses strikes the rock twice, water comes out, and Moses and Aaron are condemned for some obscure misstep to not enter the land of Canaan (20:10-13). The Israelites then travel to Mount Hor (20:22), where Yhwh commands Moses, Aaron, and Eleazar to ascend the mountain so that Aaron may die and be replaced by his son (20:23-26). The three comply, and when Moses and Eleazar return, the entire community mourns for Aaron (20:27-29).[178]

These narratives connect and contribute to the Priestly text in several ways. In the first place, the Meribah narrative illustrates that the changes Yhwh made to his relationship with Israel at the end of the Paran episode were effective. The flowering of Aaron's staff was meant to stop the "murmurings" (*tlwnt*) of the Israelites (Num 17:25), and indeed we do not find this term used here. Rather than complaining, the Israelites bring a formal suit (*ryb*) to Moses (20:3).[179]

---

a similar conclusion). Two examples are sufficient to demonstrate this: Num 33:16-17 matches the place names in the non-Priestly Num 11:34-35; 12:16, which contradict the Priestly statement in Num 10:12; on the other hand, Num 33:48-49 combines the Priestly (Num 22:1) and non-Priestly (Num 25:1) location of the Israelites' final camp in Transjordan. The reference to the Arad story in Num 33:40, then, can not be used to identify Num 21:1-3 as belonging to P (for further discussion of Num 33:1-49, see below). Furthermore, the use of "Israel" as a collective noun that acts in a semi-eponymic fashion in Num 21:1-3 is not found elsewhere in P.

[177] The presence of a month date with no accompanying year is suspicious, and many think that the number 40 has dropped out here; see, Gray 1903:259; Noth 1968: ; Milgrom 1990: 164; Ashley 1993: 380; Levine 1993: 488. This interpretation aligns as well with the view of Num 33:37-39, which is not part of the Priestly text (on which, see below). Gray 1903: 256-259 argues that the missing year was an intentional omission on the part of the Redactor who was attempting to preserve aspects of both the Priestly and JE/non-Priestly chronological and geographic schemes via ambiguity. It is unclear whether the death and burial of Miriam in this verse should be attributed to P or JE—the only other mention of Miriam in the Priestly text is Num 26:59.

[178] The travel notices in Num 21:4a, 10-11 are likely part of the Priestly text as well (e.g., Gray 1903: 274, 281). The question of how best to understand the relationship between the travel notices in Numbers 21 and the various Pentateuchal sources is vexed—see, e.g., Cross 1973: 308-317; Walsh 1977; Friedman 1981a: 77-80, 118; Davies 1983; Roskop 2011.

[179] Leveen 2013: 270-271 also contains the perceptive insight that the Israelites' speech (Num 20:3-5) has a different impact than in previous engagements—at this point in the narrative, the people all know that they are doomed to die, and soon. Note as well that when the people wish for death, they do not do so in the abstract but in relation to the

Then, in alignment with the new arrangement of greater separation between the *ʿēdāh* and the Tabernacle (17:27-28; 18:5, 22), Moses and Aaron leave the assembly to consult with Yhwh about this issue (20:6). Despite the people's suit, there is no wrath (*qṣp)* released against them, just as Yhwh had promised in regard to their new arrangement (18:5). Moreover, as Propp brilliantly demonstrated, Aaron's staff from the end of the Paran narrative reappears in this story—taken from before Yhwh and displayed to the rebellious (20:9-10; cf. 17:25).[180]

To the many attempts to understand the crime of Moses and Aaron in this narrative, we may add one more based on these connections to the preceding Paran events.[181] While Aaron's blossoming staff is indeed designated as a "sign for the rebellious" (Num 17:25), it is unclear whether the Israelites in this narrative have in fact done anything rebellious—their lack of complaining (*lwn*) suggests that the staff has already had its intended effect. Moses' decision to nevertheless address them as rebels (20:10) suggests a characterization of the community's behavior that is out of step with Yhwh's intention to provide them with what they have requested (20:7-8). Moses' words here may instead imply the threat that Yhwh's wrath was about to break out against the community despite their conformity to Yhwh's own reorganization of their relationship at the end of the Paran narrative. By labeling the Israelites as "rebels," Moses suggests that Yhwh will lash out just as he had during the Paran conflicts. In this way Moses and

---

divine plague that followed the Korah incident (Num 20:3; cf. 14:2), while their complaint about being brought into the wilderness does not contain any wish for an alternative (20:4-5; cf. 14:3).

[180] Propp 1988.

[181] See Milgrom 1990: 448-456; Artus 1997: 215-217 for a review of proposals; Eichler 2019 for a new proposal. See Propp 1988: 21-26 for judicious comments on the nature of the infraction and the argument that Aaron's punishment comes through his presence and through Moses' use of his staff. Frevel 2000: 328-330, 340-341; Blenkinsopp 2012: 93 argue that the crime of Moses described here is a later addition and that Moses' death was originally associated with the death of the condemned exodus generation (Num 14:29; cf. Deut 1:34-39). However, what Num 14:29 specifies is that those condemned to die are those who were counted in the census at Sinai. That Moses (and likely Aaron) were not included in this count is demonstrated implicitly by their separately recorded genealogy (Num 3:1-4) and explicitly by the closing statement of the second census (Num 26:63-65) which states that in the census of Moses and Eleazar there was no man left from the census of Moses and Aaron—i.e., Moses is not an included figure in the censuses he oversees. While we have no firm data on his age, the fact that Eleazar, Aaron's son, is also spared from the condemnation of the exodus generation may further indicate that Moses and the Aaronids were not included in Yhwh's proclamation of death in the wilderness.

Aaron failed to, as Yhwh charged, "trust in me and sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel" (20:12)—their address to the Israelites instead suggests that Yhwh would not uphold his end of the Paran bargain (17:25; 18:5).[182] Furthermore, the crime of falsely labeling the Israelites as "rebels" (*mōrîm*) may also explain why Moses and Aaron are said to have "rebelled" (*mrh*) against Yhwh's command (20:24; 27:14). The fact that Yhwh provides water rather than wrath to the community, in accordance with the Paran reorganization and despite the expectations encouraged by Moses' speech, may be why the story ends with the statement "he [= Yhwh] was sanctified by them [= the waters]" (20:13).

The death and succession of Aaron also show broader connections to the Priestly text. The transfer of clothing from Aaron to Eleazar (Num 20:26, 28) reflects the instructions for succession given in the first Tabernacle speech (Exod 29:29-30). Yhwh's specific command to pass the priesthood from Aaron to his son (Num 20:25-26) reinforces the divine endorsement of Aaron's family's claim to the priesthood, last affirmed in the Paran narrative (17:20, 23). We should also understand the community's mourning for Aaron (Num 20:29) to reflect both their sadness at the passing of the high priest and the community's responsibility to mourn on behalf of priests during their installation. Just as the community mourned for Nadab and Abihu while Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar finished their dedication period (Lev 10:6-7), so we should understand this mourning to function, in part, in lieu of Eleazar's own mourning for Aaron during his dedication (Exod 29:29-35; Lev 21:10-12).

Finally, these stories show the continued importance of Yhwh's fulfillment of the land promise to the Priestly text. It is significant that the Priestly author does not relate any events that transpire in the forty years between the Paran narrative and the Meribah incident. The so-called

[182] We may see further support for this interpretation in the fact that Ps 106:32-33 locates Moses' error at Meribah in the fact that he spoke rashly.

wanderings in the wilderness simply have no place in the Priestly text. After the Paran crisis—which begins with an attempt to survey and enter Canaan—passes, the Priestly author jumps forward forty years to the next possible moment in which the entry into the land could take place (Num 14:34). What is more, the Meribah story that resumes the Priestly narrative after this forty-year elision addresses the issue of the upcoming entry by forbidding the two leaders of the community from taking part in it (20:12). Aaron's death then signals the rapidly approaching moment when the exodus generation will fully pass from the scene so that the new generation can embrace Yhwh's promise.

As for the secondary analysis of these passages, there is very little to say. Scholars have frequently attempted to view the Meribah account (Num 20:1-13*) as a fusion of a Priestly and J/non-Priestly narrative or a Priestly narrative overlain by editorial layers.[183] However, none of these reconstructions is persuasive. The text may be read as a unified composition with no difficulty and its supposed doublings and complexities are best viewed as the result of literary artistry.[184]

Following the Trail 3: The Moab Narrative in the Priestly Text (Numbers 22-36*)

This brings us to the final section of the Priestly text in Numbers, the events that take place in the plains of Moab (Num 22:1, 25-36*; Deut 32:48-52*; 34*). For the most part, we encounter a coherent narrative in which the connection between events is evident. Once the Israelites arrive across the Jordan from Jericho (22:1), they confront their final crisis in the obscure "matter of Peor" (25:6-15) that leads to Yhwh declaring a vendetta against Midian

[183] Gray 1903: 257-259; Noth 1968: 144; Levine 1993: 484; Artus 1997: 218-243; Frevel 2000: 306-336; Seebass 2003: 270-278. See Artus 1997: 207-214 for a review of proposed compositional models.
[184] Propp 1988: 21 n. 15; Nihan 2007: 26-30.

(25:16-18). Yhwh then commands a second census (25:19-26:51, 57-62) in which the death of the exodus generation is officially registered (26:63-69).[185]

As this generation's passing signals the imminent entry into Canaan, Yhwh gives preliminary instructions for the distribution of land by lot to the just-enumerated Israelite tribes (Num 26:52-56). In light of this upcoming distribution, the daughters of Zelophehad approach Moses, Eleazar, the *nəśîʾîm*, and the *ʿēdāh* to request the right to receive the property since their father had no sons—a request Yhwh grants (27:1-11).[186] The upcoming entry into Canaan also prompts Yhwh to instruct Moses to climb a nearby mountain and die (27:12-14) in accordance with his condemnation at Meribah (20:12). Rather than comply, Moses asks Yhwh to appoint a new leader for the people (27:15-17). Yhwh selects Joshua for this role and Moses installs him in a ceremony involving Eleazar and the *ʿēdāh* (27:18-23). Yhwh then gives a long speech detailing the specific sacrifices for various sacred occasions (Numbers 28-29) and a shorter speech about women's vows (Numbers 30).

Yhwh then instructs Moses to prosecute his vendetta against Midian, after which Moses will die (Num 31:1-2). Moses sends an army which successfully conquers Midian, killing its men

---

[185] Within this census, 26:8/9-11 are widely and (likely) correctly regarded as an interpolation reflecting the combined JEP narrative in Numbers 16. See, e.g., Kuenen 1886: 100; Gray 1903: 389; Noth 1968: 205-206; Levine 2000: 317.

[186] Chavel 2014: 214-217 argues for the close connection between the census and this narrative—though he nevertheless considers the narrative an addition to P. Chavel 2014: 219-232 offers a detailed analysis of the relationship between Num 26:29-34; 27:1; Josh 17:1-6 to argue that the daughters of Zelophehad episode is a later addition that conditioned changes to the Mannaseh clan list in Numbers 26. However, his analysis falters on at least two points—an expected consistency in genealogical formulation that is uncharacteristic of attested genealogies (see especially Wilson 1975) and the improbable assumption that the phrase בני מנשה in Josh 17:2 is meant to indicate the literal sons of Manasseh rather than the class of Manassites (thus creating, for him, a genealogical conflict between Josh 17:1-2 and Num 26:29-32—see also Fistill 2007: 105-107 for a similar misreading).

Chavel 2014: 202-211 further argues that Num 27:1-11 consists of two texts—roughly an original Priestly Num 27:1-7a, 11b in which Yhwh simply grants the daughters' request and a later supplement in 8-11a that has its own editorial history—that have been artificially fused together by the statement in 7b. However, in this author's opinion the arguments he mounts for this reconstruction are far too subtle to support this conclusion, while the tensions he describes do not require the supposition of layers to explain. Furthermore, Chavel 2014: 235-243's argument that the law in this passage undermines the granting of property rights to the daughters of Zelophehad as described in the narrative is not persuasive to this author. While there may be a legal distinction in the use of the verb *ntn* versus *ʿbr* C, I am not certain that he has convincingly established what this difference is.

and destroying its cities before returning to the Israelites with plunder and captives (31:3-12). Moses then orders them to kill all the male children and non-virgin women and to stay outside the camp while they undergo a purification process (31:13-20). Eleazar then provides details about how they should purify themselves and their plunder (31:21-24). Yhwh gives instructions for how plunder should be divided among the Israelite community, which Moses and Eleazar carry out (31:25-47).[187] Finally, the military officers approach Moses with a voluntary offering of gold for the sanctuary in thanks for suffering no casualties during the war (31:48-54).

Following the successful conclusion of this war, the tribes of Gad and Reuben approach Moses and request permission to settle in the Transjordan (Num 32:1-5*).[188] Moses grants them permission to do so, granted that they first cross the Jordan with the other tribes and help them gain their own land allotment (32:6-42*). There follows an itinerary of the Israelites' travel from Egypt to Moab written by Moses (33:1-49), which seems to interrupt the connection between the previous narrative and Yhwh's instructions on how to handle the inhabitants of Canaan and their sacred precincts (33:50-56).[189] This speech also repeats the instructions for distributing the land among the Israelites (33:53-54).

Yhwh then describes the boundaries of Canaan (Num 34:1-12), in direct association with the preceding instruction. Moses relates these borders to the Israelites along with a reminder that

---

[187] Note that here we find the classic Priestly pattern of a summary proleptic statement of compliance with Yhwh's commands (Num 31:31) followed by a detailed recounting of their execution (31:32-47).

[188] While this chapter clearly consists of both a Priestly and non-Priestly account of these events, their separation is a well-known issue. The difficulty is so great that Gray 1903: 425-427; Noth 1957: 196-199 = 1987: 126-128; Levine 2000: 477-480 argue that this chapter has to be understood as a later rewriting of Priestly and non-Priestly material rather than a mixture of pre-existing sources as in other section of the Pentateuch, a possibility also considered (though not fully embraced) by Kuenen 1886: 101-102. See Mowinckel 1964: 55-56 for a refutation of this position and Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: II.239-241; Friedman 2003: 302-303; Baden 2009: 141-153 for comments on the narrative and linguistic connections of various parts of this chapter and a proposed source division. Marquis 2013 presents a compelling case for regarding 32:7-15 as a secondary insertion (see already, Kuenen 1886: 101) into a chapter that is otherwise divisible into two coherent narratives. The arguments for viewing this chapter as consisting of two distinct sources are more persuasive to this author, but I do not wish to commit to a particular schema for that separation in what follows.

[189] See discussion of the itinerary list below.

only nine and a half tribes will receive an inheritance there (34:13-15). Yhwh then places Eleazar and Joshua in charge of the upcoming distribution of the land and appoints a new generation of *nəśîʾîm* to aid them in this project (34:16-29).[190] He then provides instructions for the assignment of cities and surrounding countryside to the Levites (35:1-8). He then instructs the Israelites to set aside cities of refuge for those guilty of manslaughter (35:9-15) and expands on this by giving regulations concerning murder and cities of refuge (35:16-32), explaining that these will help preserve the purity of the land from uncleanness and defilement (35:33-34).[191] Finally, a group of Manassite Gileadite leaders approach Moses and the other tribal leaders to complain about the possible decrease to their territory due to the dispensation given to Zelophehad's daughters (36:1-4). Yhwh modifies his earlier judgment by requiring that women who inherit property must marry within their father's tribe to prevent this issue from arising (36:5-9), a ruling with which Zelophehad's daughters comply (36:10-12).

The Priestly text then presents a summary statement indicating the preceding texts as belonging to the commands and instructions given by Yhwh in the plains of Moab (Num 36:13).

---

[190] While Noth 1957: 192-195 = 1987: 122-125 admits a literary connection between the conquest instructions, boundary list, and land distribution instructions in Num 33:50-34:29 and the narrative and boundary system in Joshua 13-19, he argues on the basis of this that the boundary system in Numbers must not belong to P because Noth has already dismissed Joshua 13-19 as being part of P. However, as Mowinckel 1964: 56 points out, Noth must assume his conclusion to prove his conclusion in this case—Noth makes no independent case for why Num 33:50-34:29 must not be part of the Priestly text. For further discussion of Noth's handling of Joshua 13-19, see below.

[191] Some (e.g., Rofé 1985: 144; Rofé 2002: 140-145; Stackert 2007: 61-68; Kislev 2020) have argued that the asylum law is composite. However, as L. Schmidt 2002: 104-105 notes, the text's logical flow (at least in 35:9-29) is coherent and there is no need to posit textual compositeness to explain any of its features. Furthermore, the evidence from LXX Joshua 20, which supports the idea that Josh 20:4-5, 6b (reflecting principles in Num 35:16-29) are later interpolations (Holmes 1914: 71) has no bearing on the issue of stratification in Num 35:9-34—there is no reason to suppose that a narrative about the appointment of cities of refuge would have needed to recapitulate the entire content of the law related to these cities, while the pluses in MT Joshua reflect the type of harmonistic readings that are well-attested in SamP. In addition to this, we may note that from a Neo-analytic framework, the end of this passage (Num 35:33-34)—often attributed to a separate layer or as originating from a different law alongside 35:30-32 (e.g., Levine 2000: 548; Stackert 2007: 68)—is likely commentary from the Priestly author as part of his adaptation of this law to his narrative. Ultimately, many arguments for the compositeness of Num 35:9-34 seem to rely on the expectation of consistency from an author. However, from the Neo-analytic perspective this law is not the work of the Priestly author and any alleged unevenness is likely to originate from the source text(s) used, in which we might expect distinct but related laws of murder to be compiled. See Chapter 5 for further discussion of the Neo-analytic framework's approach to composite texts in P.

Yhwh repeats his command to Moses to climb a nearby mountain and die there after seeing the land (Deut 32:48-52*). Moses complies with this command (34:1a*). The people then mourn for him for thirty days (34:8), just as they had done for Aaron, and Joshua takes his position as leader of the Israelites (34:9).[192]

Despite the relative coherence of this narrative, there are a number of apparent issues that invite a closer look, and we will undertake our secondary analysis of this unit before discussing its relationship to the broader Priestly narrative. To open our secondary analysis, we will examine three major bodies of non-narrative material that occur in this section of the Priestly text and that exhibit an unclear connection to their narrative context. The first of these is the itinerary list (Num 33:1-49), which intervenes between the Reubenites and Gadites negotiating their settlements in Transjordan and the body of regulations related to the entry into Canaan (33:50-35:34). Despite some claims to a largely Priestly orientation of this itinerary list, there are several signs that it does not belong to the Priestly text.[193] First is the fact that this itinerary reflects notices that exist outside of the Priestly text.[194] Additionally, this text supplements the Priestly text, providing information that we would expect the Priestly author to present in its appropriate context—this is especially the case with regard to the precise dating of Aaron's death in this list (33:38).[195] Finally, the editorial adaptation of this text to its narrative context is out of step with the Priestly author's methods elsewhere. The itinerary list presents itself as a writing from the hand of Moses himself (33:2). This strongly disagrees with the presentation of Mosaic teachings

[192] For a recent stimulating discussion of source analysis and the last chapter of Deuteronomy, see Yoo 2012; Frolov 2014 and the responses in Yoo 2014; Dolansky 2014; Carr 2014.
[193] See, e.g., Levine 2000: 79, 511-512; Baden 2009: 133.
[194] Gray 1903: 442-444; Noth 1968: 242-243; Cross 1973: 308-317; Friedman 1981a: 77-80, 118; Davies 1983; Ashley 1993: 624-625. See also nn. 174 & 182 above.
[195] If we are correct that the year number 40 has dropped out of Num 20:1a, then P only provides the year of Aaron's death. The supplementary information in the itinerary list may, in fact, be based on the combined JEP text and reflect an exegesis that takes into account the non-Priestly Edomite embassy and subsequent modification of route (20:14-21) to provide the month of Aaron's death (cf. the *yāmîm rabbîm* of Deut 2:1).

and records in the rest of the Priestly text, which are otherwise attributed to oral transmission (e.g., the speeches in Leviticus) or left with their source unstated (e.g., the censuses and the list of the chieftains' donations).

Though this list clearly does not belong to the Priestly text, both its purpose and placement are relatively easy to discern. Roskop has compellingly argued that the itinerary list in this chapter is intended to provide a smoothing-over of the geographical problems that arose through the combination of the Priestly and non-Priestly narrative.[196] In effect, this itinerary list is an argument that there are no geographic difficulties in Exodus-Numbers and that the route presented in the final form of the Pentateuch is, contrary to the plain reading of these texts, a coherent route from Egypt to Moab. In terms of its placement, the editor who inserted it seems to have taken the narrative of the first permanent settlement of the Israelites (Num 32:33-42) as an opportunity to reflect on their total progress towards Canaan. By placing the itinerary just after this narrative, it also allows the following instructions for how to deal with the Canaanites (33:50-56) to symbolically serve as the indicator of the ultimate goal of the itinerary list—arrival in the promised land.

Finally, recognizing this list as an interposition into P clarifies the narrative connection between the materials on either side of it. One of the major issues in the Reubenites' and Gadites' request for land in the Transjordan is the upcoming crossing of the Jordan, which the Transjordanian tribes agree to take part in as military support to the other tribes (Num 32:28-32). Yhwh's following speech then opens with this exact narrative situation, giving instructions for "when you cross the Jordan" and commanding the Israelites to dispossess the inhabitants of Canaan (33:51-52). While arguments for the creation of a coherent narrative through the process of deletion should provoke skepticism, here we have already established numerous grounds for

[196] Roskop 2011: 223-232.

identifying the itinerary list as a secondary insertion before proceeding to analyze its removal's effect on our narrative.[197]

The next body of non-narrative material that sits uneasily within our narrative is the schedule of offerings for sacred occasions (Numbers 28-29). Scholars have long noted this speech's lack of connection to its context, as well as numerous minor disagreements between it and other materials that are part of the Priestly text.[198] While the latter don't concern us from a Neo-analytic viewpoint, as they are attributable to the diversity of sources used, the former presents a real challenge. Additionally, we should note that the editorial method exhibited in this chapter does not align with those we know from other texts adapted by the Priestly author. In particular, this calendar makes no reference to the Tabernacle, much like the two divine speeches that open Numbers 15.[199] What's more, this reference is eschewed in a text that focuses on sacrifices and even makes reference to the *tāmîd* commanded at Sinai (Num 28:6) as part of the basic function of the Tabernacle's altar (Exod 29:38-42). Another missed opportunity for such specification occurs in the description of the libations for the *tāmîd* (Num 28:7) which are supposed to occur "in the holy place" (*bqdš*)—this likely represents the original wording of the underlying source document which the editor did nothing to coordinate with the narrative presentation of the Priestly text. The opening of this calendar also exhibits some peculiarities, such as the unique expression "you will keep to offer" (*tšmr lhqryb*), which Gray observes is closer to the Deuteronomistic expression "keep to do" (*šmr lʿśwt*) than to any Priestly

[197] There is no easier operation to undertake on a narrative than producing coherence through deletion, and the elimination of "extraneous" material does not necessarily indicate that a more original form has been recovered. One could go through any modern novel, that we know is by a single author, and delete any number of passages while still maintaining a coherent narrative. This does not mean that all the deleted passages are not original.
[198] Gray 1903: 402-413; Noth 1968: 219-223; Milgrom 1990: 237-250, 486-488; 2000: 1350-1351; 2001: 1964-2056; Knohl 1995: 8-45; Levine 2000: 365-422.
[199] Friedman 2003: 296 n.

expression.[200] Additionally, this speech introduction doubles the expression "and you will say to them" in a way unparalleled elsewhere in the Priestly text (28:2, 3). Finally, in neither opening nor closing (28:1; 30:1) does this speech attempt to attach itself to the narrative context of the plains of Moab (cf. 22:1; 26:3, 63; 31:12; 33:50; 35:1; 36:13).[201] All of these features strongly suggest that the person who placed this text in its current position was not the Priestly author.

Our principles of secondary analysis compel us to offer some reason for why an editor may have placed this text in its current location, so we can compare the logic to that of the Priestly author elsewhere. This is a more difficult proposition than for perhaps any other text commonly recognized as an insertion into the Priestly text. Nevertheless, we can point to a few implications of this text's placement. First, we should note that this text does not contain anywhere in it the temporal statement "when you come to the land." Given the attention paid to the grain-offerings and libations that should accompany sacrifices, we may perhaps have expected this statement on analogy with the first divine speech in the Paran episode (Num 15:1-16). This statement is also missing before the introduction of the *Bikkûrîm* offerings (28:26), where we may have expected it on analogy with the Sinai festival calendar (Lev 23:10).

Unless these are oversights, the absence of this phrase may indicate that the editor's placement of this material took account of the time frame into which he was placing them—chronologically, they occur in the plains of Moab after the death of the exodus generation and, therefore, just before the entry into the land. In other words, the editor expected only a short lapse of time between the giving of these instruction and the entry into the land in which they could be observed. Alternatively, if this text was added by the same editor who inserted the itinerary list, he may have understood the plains of Moab unit to take place in the sixth month,

[200] Gray 1903: 408. For a full list of this expression's use in Deuteronomy, see Driver 1901: lxxxiii. However, note that Exod 31:16 deploys the expression *šmr…l'śwt*, however in parallelism rather than in concatenation.
[201] Presumably, the reference to Mount Abarim in 27:12 also signaled the Moabite context to its original readers.

thirty days after the death of Aaron in the fifth month (Num 20:29; 33:38).[202] This would set the chronology just before the three major festivals that take place in the seventh month—including Sukkot, to which this calendar devotes so much attention (29:12-38).

However, these chronological considerations would only explain the general placement of this material in the plains of Moab unit; it does not explain the specific location between the appointment of Joshua and the Midianite war. Indeed, several other locations seem more fitting. One such location is after the Midianite war, when the Israelites have acquired numerous domesticate animals (Num 31:9, 32-35)—such an acquisition of property could have provided the context for a list of offerings. Alternatively, placing the festival calendar after the distribution of land in the Transjordan would have contextualized it alongside a number of other speeches dealing with actions that should take place in the land of Canaan (33:50-35:34). Perhaps the image of the people assembled altogether—leaders, priest, and *ʿēdāh*—for the appointment of Joshua (27:22-23) triggered the thought of other occasions on which the Israelite community would gather altogether before Yhwh.[203] The editor who placed this speech in its present location must have had a reason for doing so, but we must admit that the logic is opaque. Nevertheless, this lack of connection to the narrative further affirms our view that this speech is not an original part of the Priestly text.

This brings us to the last body of non-narrative material that has an uneasy connection to the surrounding narrative—the speech on vows (Num 30:2-17). Again, we note a difference in

[202] He possibly may have also calculated in twenty additional days for the census taking on the basis of the difference in time between Num 1:1 and 10:11).

[203] We should note as well that the overwhelming focus of Numbers 28-29 is on the number of *ʿōlāh* offerings at various occasions—the grain-offerings and libations are strictly accompaniments to this major offering, while the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* offering only occurs as a singular offering per occasion (Num 28:15, 22; 29:11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38). Among the functions of the *ʿōlāh* was the consecration of communal assemblies (Halpern 2021: 106), such as the one that occurs at the end of Numbers 27.

narrative contextualization regarding the introduction of this speech.[204] Rather than being introduced as a speech from Yhwh, this speech is anomalously formulated as a speech by Moses to the tribal leaders in which he tells them that he received the following regulations from Yhwh (30:2).[205] Additionally, the contextualization of this speech into a narrative scene in which Moses is directly addressing the tribal leaders makes the closing description of the contents (30:17) far more jarring than when similar phrases are used to close speeches given directly by Yhwh himself. This editorial approach, unique in the Priestly text, raises the likelihood that this speech is not an original part of the Priestly text.[206]

Nevertheless, when we turn to the question of why this speech is located here, we find that its contents are responsive to the narrative context.[207] The regulations on vows is notable for what it does not say as well as what it says—effectively, it allows women who are neither living in the house of their father nor married to make oaths and vows (Num 30:4, 7, 10). While the text explicitly affirms only the vows of widows and divorced women, the preceding narrative of the daughters of Zelophehad (27:1-11) introduces another circumstance in which women are neither in the house of their father nor married. What is more, the decision to grant women the inheritance of property is connected with the issue of oaths and vows by affirming their ability to dispose of their own property.[208] However, if this text were truly a response to the daughters of Zelophehad narrative, we would have expected it to follow immediately rather than having the appointment of Joshua intervene. In this regard, we should observe that scholars have seen a connection between this chapter's focus on vows and the closing statement of the preceding

[204] While this material lacks mention of the Tent of Meeting, this is not probative for a speech that does not concern sacrifice.
[205] Gray 1903: 414; Levine 2000: 427.
[206] Note that Moses' report of Yhwh's commands concerning the Manassites' complaints about the daughters of Zelophehad (36:5-6) presents a similar situation, but one contextualized within a narrative setting of Moses having received a command (36:5), implicitly via an oracular consultation (Chevel 2014: 246).
[207] Contra Noth 1968: 224.
[208] Ashley 1993: 575-576.

offering schedule (29:39) which singles out vows and free-will offerings as categories additional to the festival sacrifices mentioned in this speech.[209] Additionally, the address to the Israelites that closes the offering calendar (30:1) may have provided the narrative context within which the editor understood Moses' speech on vows. On the balance, we should tentatively identify this speech as an interposition in the Priestly text, perhaps added as an accompaniment to the offering schedule in Numbers 28-29 and only loosely connected to the narrative context.

In the foregoing, we have identified the itinerary list (Num 33:1-49), offering schedule (28:1-30:1), and vow regulations (30:2-17) as secondary elements in the plains of Moab unit. With these materials bracketed off, we can now turn to issues in the broader narrative of this unit. Despite their overall coherence, these narratives confront us with three major interrelated issues: the nature of the Peor incident and its relationship to the non-Priestly material that precedes it (25:1-5), the separation between the announcement of Moses' death (27:12-14) and his actual death (Deut 32:48-52*; 34:1a*, 8-9), and the relationship of the Midianite vendetta (Num 25:16-18; 31:1-2, 14-18) to the above two issues.

Traditionally, scholars have divided the narrative in Numbers 25 into two component parts—a JE narrative concerning the Israelites' worship of Baal Peor mediated by a group of Moabite women (Num 25:1-5) and a Priestly narrative centered around Phinehas' actions in response to an Israelite man who brought a Midianite woman into the community (25:6-18).[210] In this model, both the ending of the JE/non-Priestly account and the beginning of the following Priestly account must be accounted as lost. In recognition of this, more recent scholarship has

[209] Milgrom 1990: 250; Ashley 1993: 575. Albertz 2013: 227 n. 23 also points to the connection between the use of the verb *nw'* in the vows speech and its use in Moses' exhortation in the following chapter (Num 32:7, 9). If this connection is relevant and Marquis 2013: 429-431 is correct that 32:7-15 constitute an addition to Numbers 32, then this strengthens the case for the vow regulations being a supplement to the Priestly text (or to the combined JEP).
[210] See, e.g., Kuenen 1886: 99-100; Wellhausen 1899: 111-112; Gray 1903: 380-387; Noth 1957: 201-202 = 1987: 130-131; 1968: 195-199; Levine 2000: 279-291; Friedman 2003: 287-288.

argued that the Priestly material in this section is not an original part of the Priestly narrative but is instead a part of a Priestly redaction of Numbers that was composed to intentionally supplement the non-Priestly narrative that precedes it and to allow for the inclusion of other Priestly material that was also added as a supplement (e.g., Numbers 31).[211]

The latter view suffers from several difficulties, however. If the Priestly account was written as a supplement to the non-Priestly account that precedes it, then we must conclude that the supplementary author has failed to truly accommodate the non-Priestly narrative to his own material. The Priestly text ignores the Moabite women that are the central issue in the non-Priestly account (Num 25:1) and instead focuses exclusively on Midianite women (Num 25:4-8, 15; 31:9, 15-16).[212] If this text and ones related to it were a later supplement meant to expand on the non-Priestly story, we would expect Moabite women to at least be mentioned alongside the Midianite women. Furthermore, the Priestly material makes reference to the end of a plague that has no introduction (25:8-9). Again, if this text were written as an expansion to the non-Priestly narrative, there is no reason why the supplementary author could not have somewhere indicated the beginning of this plague.

The existence of the plague also highlights different assumptions these narratives make about how Yhwh's wrath is to be assuaged. According to the non-Priestly narrative, the execution of a group of Israelite leaders is intended to function to turn aside Yhwh's wrath (25:4). However, in the Priestly account, Phinehas is the one responsible for turning aside

---

[211] Achenbach 2003: 425-440; Fistill 2007: 89-101; Nihan 2009: 119-126 (some aspects of this are adumbrated already in Kuenen 1886: 334-335; Gray 1903: 387; Noth 1957: 201-202 = 1987: 130-131).

[212] Nihan 2009: 120 unconvincingly argues that the supplementer has confused Moab and Midian due to the fact that the term Midian had "become a common name for various Arabic tribes living south of Judah." However, it is unclear why any meaning of Midian would have caused a supplementer to change his text's focus from Moab to Midian if he was, in fact, attempting to extend the previous narrative. Nihan further points to "the same confusion between Moab and Midian" in the Balaam story (Num 22:4, 7). These brief references are, however, rightly considered later interpolations into the Balaam account that attempt to smooth over the Moabite-Midianite tension in the current form of Numbers 25 (see, e.g., Levine 2000: 144-145). See Dozeman 2008 for a summary and analysis of the various traditions about Midian in Numbers.

Yhwh's wrath through his killing of a single Israelite and a single Midianite woman (25:8-9, 11). Again, if the Priestly material in this chapter was intended as a supplement, then we would not expect it to disregard the mechanics of the story it is supplementing—instead, we would expect it to relate that Yhwh's anger was turned aside by the execution of the tribal leaders and to see a different function assigned to Phinehas's actions. Finally, it is unclear whether the narrative scene envisioned in the Priestly account—where the community is gathered and weeping at the Tabernacle (25:6)—is dependent on the preceding action in the non-Priestly narrative.[213] If this were a supplement, we may have expected at least some report of what caused this weeping—if we are intended to understand it as the consequence of the execution of community leaders from the preceding story (25:4-5), then we might reasonably expect the author expanding that account to include some statement that Yhwh's and Moses' directions were carried out and that the people thereupon started weeping. For these narrative reasons, we should likely view the two narratives in Numbers 25 as independently composed texts, neither written as a supplement to the other. As unsatisfying as this explanation is, we should likely accept that we are missing the beginning of the Priestly narrative here, either due to an editor's elimination of it or due to damage to the copy of the Priestly text used by the editor who combined the JE/non-Priestly and Priestly texts.

This does not, however, eliminate the problems with the Priestly narrative in this chapter. Nihan has also argued that the language of this passage is indicative of a non-Priestly origin, focusing in particular on the use of the term *qnʾ* and the phrase *šwb* C *ḥmh* (Num 25:11, 13),

[213] Friedman 2003: 288n. argues that the weeping at the Tabernacle should be connected to the mourning for Aaron in the immediately preceding Priestly narrative (Num 20:29). While attractive, we should probably understand the change of location between that story and this one to indicate that the mourning was completed before the Israelites decamped from Hor.

neither of which have a parallel in P and the latter of which has no parallel in the Torah.[214] However, given that we appear to be missing the beginning of this narrative, it is difficult to evaluate how heavily we should weigh this evidence. The promise of an eternal covenant with Phinehas (25:12-13) is a substantive reward from Yhwh which suggests some extraordinary action that the Priestly author may have described in unique language in order to emphasize the importance of what he accomplished.[215] Furthermore, we have already argued that the Israelites and Yhwh had ended the possibility of divine *qeṣep* against the community through their renegotiation of the Abrahamic promises during the Paran episode (17:25; 18:5, 22). What is more, we have seen that this strategy was effective in the Meribah episode, wherein Yhwh's wrath does not break out against the Israelite community (20:1-13). The outbreak of plague and Yhwh's anger would, within the narrative world of the Priestly text, require a different description in order to explain why Yhwh's anger against the community was unable to be restrained by the previous arrangements. Lacking the opening of this account, we are unable to judge how the Priestly text handled these issues.[216] However, these terms were surely available

[214] Nihan 2009: 120-121. Nihan also argues that the threat for Yhwh to end (*klh*) the Israelites is unparalleled in P, which is true in the post-Noth model that Nihan works within. However this phrase occurs in Num 16:21; 17:10 in the Korah story which we have seen no reason to deny to the Priestly author.

[215] Nihan 2009: 124-126 offers an analysis of the relationship between this covenant and the other covenants in the Priestly text. While his view is, on the whole, enlightening, his argument that the covenant in Numbers 25 must be read as an assertion of general priestly superiority, of elevation of the Aaronite line, and of the combination of priesthood with kingship, overreads the evidence. In particular, he ignores the particularity of the covenant made here, which is not with the "Aaronite dynasty" (as he calls it), but with Phinehas, a specific grandson of Aaron and the son of one of his two surviving sons. In other words, the narrative of the Priestly text suggests that this covenant is better read as commenting on inner-Aaronid dynamics rather than on the relationship between all priests and all Israel. In a similar vein, the genealogy in Exod 6:14-25 (which may or may not be part of the Priestly text; see Propp 1999: 267-268) elevates Phinehas in particular over other collateral lines within Aaron's family (Fowler 1998 outlines important features of genealogies, including how different forms highlight the significance of particular groups and figures).

[216] Nihan 2009: 121 n. 118 likewise introduces, as subsidiary evidence, the unique use of the terms רמח, קֻבָּה, and קֻבָּה in this narrative. However, these terms have no home in other parts of the Priestly text, so their occurrence here does not indicate a different author—their use is contextual. As for his statement that the description of Cozbi's father's position among the Midianites "is certainly not from the hand of P," this presumes too much about how the Priestly author may have understood and described the social arrangements of non-Israelite groups.

to the lexicon of the Priestly author and there is no reason to see their deployment as ideologically problematic for the Priestly author.[217]

We must also acknowledge that the Peor narrative contributes to the Priestly narrative at this point in the story. As Nihan observed, its report of a plague is directly connected to the census of the post-exodus generation (Num 25:19-26:2)—the plague thus serves to mirror the plague that marked the beginning of the death of the exodus generation (14:36-37) while also marking the end of that same generation.[218] The Peor narrative thus marks the transition point from the group of Israelites who were counted in the first census, to the new group counted in the second. In a similar manner, the elevation of Phinehas' line over other Aaronid lines echoes the similar elevation of Aaron during the communal plague of the Paran narrative.[219] This marks Yhwh's choice for succession as the next generation of priests comes into service, an issue that the Priestly author also addressed in the Mount Hor narrative's choice of Eleazar over Ithamar (20:25, 28). The Peor narrative thus participates in the issue of succession—of both a generation of Israelites and Yhwh's selection of their priests—introduced during the Paran episode.

While we have found no reason to reject this narrative as a whole from being part of the Priestly text, we must also consider whether there is evidence that the text has undergone editorial expansion.[220] In particular, scholars have long viewed the announcement of the

---

[217] Note as well that this text describes the ultimate forgiveness of Israel in terms of *kpr* D, in keeping with the view of P elsewhere (Milgrom 1991: 373-378) and in parallel to Aaron's actions in the plague following the Korah incident (Num 17:6-15).

[218] Nihan 2009: 122-123.

[219] Nihan 2009: 121-122. The importance of Phinehas as a major early priest outside of the Priestly text (Josh 24:33 [LXX Josh 24:33-33a, on which see Holmes 1914: 80; Rofé 1977; Tov 1999: 385-396]; Judg 20:28) may have impelled the Priestly author to account for his prominence in pre-existing traditions. See as well the way that P's omission of kingship as an issue aligns with the presentation in JE and Samuel against that in Deuteronomy, or its account of the Tabernacle according with the presentation of Yhwh's abode in Samuel (e.g., 2 Sam 7:6)—overall, the historiographic/mythographic interactions between the Priestly text and other Israelite traditions deserves more exploration.

[220] We will leave aside in this discussion the issue of the names and affiliations of Phinehas' victims (Num 25:14-15). While these may be additions to P, it is difficult to mount a reasonable case based on anything other than their position, which Nihan 2009: 119 n. 108 notes may be explicable by the fact that any other location for these names

Midianite vendetta (25:16-18) as an addition meant to connect this narrative with that in Numbers 31.[221] The status of this connection as secondary is dependent on the idea that all or nearly all of the Priestly material that intervenes between the announcement of Moses' death (27:12-14/23) and his actual death (Deuteronomy 34*) should be counted as a layer added to an originally shorter Priestly text.[222] We can not, then, evaluate whether the announcement of the Midianite vendetta is secondary until we examine the announcement of Moses' death and its role in the Priestly text.

Before proceeding to this demonstration, we should note that the execution of the Midianite vendetta is one of the foundational texts for the events that follow in the Priestly text.[223] The conquest of the Midianites sets the scene for the following distribution of land to the Reubenites and Gadites in three ways. First, the conquest of the Midianites is the only event that would have freed the land that Reueben and Gad request.[224] Second, the destruction of the Midianite cities (Num 31:10) triggers their need to rebuild those same cities before they can accompany the rest of the Israelites across the Jordan (32:34-38).[225] Finally, Moses' demand that they accompany their fellow Israelites to secure their inheritance (32:28-32) reflects the fact that the entire Israelite community was involved in securing the land that the Reubenites and Gadites will now claim (31:3-6). This extracted promise of aid during the upcoming crossing of the Jordan triggers Yhwh to give further instructions on that war (33:50-56) and the boundaries of

---

would have interrupted the narrative. Furthermore, Albertz 2013: 223 has also connected a Simeonite's participation in the Peor incident with the reduction of Simeon by two-thirds in the census that follows (Num 26:14, cf. 1:23). While the choice of a Simeonite in 25:14 may represent an exegesis of Numbers 26, this is just as easily attributable to the Priestly author—who would have had that document before him—as it is to a later editor.

[221] Kuenen 1886: 335; Gray 1903: 387; Noth 1968: 199; Fistill 2007: 38, 101-102; Nihan 2009: 123.

[222] Alternatively, this addition is seen as part of the redaction of the Pentateuch and as a way of drawing a closer connection between JEP and the opening of the Deuteronomistic History in Deuteronomy-Joshua. See, e.g., Noth 1957: 190-201, 211-216 = 1987: 121-130, 143-147; Achenbach 2003; Nihan 2009: 123-124.

[223] See also, Albertz 2013: 222-226.

[224] Note as well that Josh 22:17-19 invokes a connection to Peor (and presumably the Midianite vendetta) while inviting the Reubenites and Gadites (and half-Manasseh) to resettle in Canaan rather than turn away from Yhwh.

[225] Marquis 2013: 415-416, 419.

the land to be conquered (34:1-12).[226] Moses' following instructions on distributing Canaan explicitly acknowledge the land granted to Reuben and Gad (34:13-15), which in turn was dependent on the execution of the Midianite vendetta. The following speeches on Levite cities and cities of refuge (35:1-34) also depend on the context of Yhwh's and Moses' instructions for dividing the land of Canaan. Finally, the conclusion of the arrangements for distributing land and cities in Canaan provides the context in which the narrative of the Gileadites request for a review of the Zelophehad decision take place. In this way, the entire complex of Numbers 32-36* depends on the execution of the Midianite vendetta in Numbers 31.[227] Determining the relationship between the announcement of Moses' death and the Midianite vendetta thus has implications for a large portion of the Priestly Moab unit.

The major obstacles to accepting that the Priestly text originally included the material that follows the appointment of Joshua (27:15-23) are whether the Priestly author could have conceived of a lapse between Yhwh's command being given and it being executed and whether the Priestly author would have had Yhwh command Moses to ascend Mount Abarim and die (Num 27:12-13) only to instruct him to wait to do so (31:2).[228] At the outset, we should admit that there are no objective tests that we can apply to determine whether the Priestly author would have allowed so much text to intervene between Yhwh commanding Moses to die and Moses

[226] Albertz 2013: 224 further connects the instructions about destroying the Canaanites' cultic installations to the experience of the Peor incident.

[227] Other scholars (e.g., Baentsch 1903: 637-638) have had no problem excising solely the announcement (Num 25:16-18) and execution (Numbers 31) of the Midianite vendetta, but the web of entanglements discussed above renders such an approach improbable, though not impossible.

[228] We should further note that if Numbers 31-36 constitute an addition to the Priestly text, they must have been added to a text that contained both Yhwh's command for Moses to die and Joshua's appointment (Num 27:12-23). This is because these texts make reference to both of these things—to the command to Moses (31:2) and to the status of Joshua as future leader of the Israelites (32:28; 34:16-17). If the appointment of Joshua was not part of the Priestly text when Numbers 31-36* were added to it—i.e., if the Joshua material in 27:15-23 is also reckoned an addition by the same supplementer who added 31-36*—then nothing would have prevented the editor from simply placing all of this material prior to the announcement of Moses' death (e.g., between what is now Num 27:11 and 27:12), thus reducing the tension caused by his additions. We should, perhaps, also question whether an editor who was willing to add so much material to a received text would not also have been willing to simply delete or rearrange material in order to diminish the narrative tensions he was otherwise creating.

complying with that command. Different scholars will have a different allowance for the tension this introduces into the narrative, on the basis of their understanding of how the Priestly author operates.[229]

We can, however, turn to how Moses' death is handled in Deuteronomy as a comparandum. In Deuteronomy, the condemnation of Moses is associated with the spies episode (Deut 1:34-38).[230] Deuteronomy returns to this issue after a recounting of the wilderness wanderings, stating that Moses entreated Yhwh to relent and allow him to enter Canaan (3:23-25). Yhwh refuses—instead commanding him to ascend Pisgah (3:27) and to install Joshua as his replacement (3:28). In other words, Deuteronomy contains the same combination of Yhwh's command to die and the appointment of Joshua as we find in the Priestly text (Num 27:12-23).[231] A large portion of the book of Deuteronomy then intervenes between Yhwh giving these instruction and their fulfillment—Joshua is not charged by Moses until after his long speech (Deut 31:1-8) and he does not ascend the mountain (34:1-4*, 10-12) until after he writes a scroll, sings a song, and offers a further blessing (Deuteronomy 31-33*).

What is more, Yhwh's command for Moses to ascend the mountain does not appear to happen just before Moses' speech begins. Moses states that he received this command after entreating Yhwh "at that time" (בעת ההִוא), a leitmotif phrase throughout this chapter (3:4, 8, 12, 18, 21, 23). This system of references coordinates with the event that opens the chapter—the

[229] See, e.g., Albertz 2013, which argues that all of Numbers 25-36 represent a single, coherent, sophisticated compositional whole (despite several notable tensions) that has been added during the redaction of the Pentateuch. While his holistic reading evokes sympathy, this author is unpersuaded that viewing these materials, Priestly and non-Priestly alike, as a single compositional whole is a better solution than traditional source-critical approaches.
[230] Note that Deuteronomy also associates the appointment of Joshua as future leader with the spies episode—here we find a similar though distinctive view of Joshua and Caleb's survival as found in P. In other words, Dtr and P are in agreement against JE (likely J's) view that only Caleb was exempted from the condemnation aroused by the people's response to the scouts' report. For Moses' condemnation in association with the spies episode, see Stackert 2023b: 354-357.
[231] Driver 1901: 61.

defeat of Og and the conquest of Bashan (3:1-7).[232] While the beginning of Deuteronomy seems to coordinate Moses' large speech with the same moment (1:4-5; 29:6-7), the number of events that Moses describes as occurring "at that time" of the conquest of Bashan tells us that his large speech could not have taken place immediately following that success. Furthermore, Moses' reference to the Peor incident (4:3-4) suggests that at least that event has also intervened between the defeat of Og and the beginning of his speech.[233] This is because Moses does not note the Israelites' settlement opposite Peor until after his relation of Yhwh's commands to ascend Pisgah (3:29). We should also note that Moses' reference to these events as being "at that time"—including Yhwh's command for him to climb the mountain and install Joshua—rather than "today" (1:10; 2:15; 4:4, 8, 26, 39, 40; etc.) suggests a level of anteriority, marking distance from their occurrence. At least some time and one major event must have lapsed between Yhwh telling Moses to climb the mountain and install Joshua and the beginning of Moses' large speech in Deuteronomy 1-26. The presentation in Deuteronomy leads to the conclusion that Moses' fulfillment of Yhwh's commands in Deuteronomy 31-34* was not immediately consequent on his receiving those commands and, in fact, some time must have passed between their reception and their execution.

In other words, Deuteronomy exhibits the same delay as we find in the Priestly text between Yhwh telling Moses to ascend the mountain and his actual ascent of the mountain. This, of course, does not tell us what the Priestly author would do. But it does suggest that such a delay between command and execution regarding Moses' death was an available option for those reimagining the Israelite past. Furthermore, the delay between Yhwh commanding Moses to die

[232] Driver 1901: 60.
[233] This also places Deuteronomy's internal chronology in agreement with JE, which relates the Peor events after the defeat of Og. However, this may not be probative, as Deuteronomy places the division of Sihon and Og's territory just after the conquest of Bashan (Deut 3:12-17), while JE places this event after the Peor incident (Numbers 32*).

and Moses' actual death have parallel purposes in both Deuteronomy and the Priestly text—in both, this gap allows Moses to present a final set of instructions to the Israelites (Num 36:13; Deut 28:69). It is possible that both the Priestly author and the Deuteronomist shared a view of the relationship between Yhwh's command for Moses to ascend a mountain before his death and Moses' final acts of leadership over the Israelite community.[234] The mere fact of the delay, then, is not probative.

We may, though, still ask why the Priestly author chose to narrate Yhwh commanding Moses to ascend the mountain in this location (Num 27:12-14) rather than delaying this command until after he narrated the series of events in Numbers 31-36* in which Moses participates. We may conjecture that Yhwh's command for Moses to die serves a twofold purpose—on the one hand it acknowledges that the end of the second census (Num 26:63-65) has signaled that the narrative moment for this event has arrived and on the other it provides the motivation for the installation of Joshua. Narratively, Moses' demand for a successor to lead the Israelites (27:15-16) appears as his direct response to being told to comply with Yhwh's wishes.[235] Unlike Aaron, whose succession was guaranteed by the promise of a hereditary priesthood (Exod 29:29-30; Num 18:1, 19), the Priestly author provides no reason to expect that Moses' position is anything but unique. When Moses hears that it is time for him to die, he requests that Yhwh replace him, in some fashion, first.[236]

In other words, Moses resists. What is more, Yhwh accedes to this resistance, granting Moses' request and giving him instructions for charging Joshua with his responsibilities. Rather than repeating his command for Moses to die immediately, the Priestly author uses the narrative

[234] Note that this is not an argument for literary dependence in either direction—this is, rather, a statement about how two different intellectuals approached the reconstruction of Israelite antiquity in a similar way in this particular case.
[235] Though note that MT places a *petuḥah* between Yhwh's command and Moses' request.
[236] Moses' request for a new leader may also be related to Yhwh's instruction to view the land.

reprieve represented by Joshua's selection to introduce a longer reprieve, having Yhwh demand the fulfillment of the Midianite vendetta prior to Moses' death (Num 31:1-2). As we argued above, the rest of the events of Numbers 32-36* rely directly on the Midianite vendetta, providing the pretext for Moses' continued participation as leader of the Israelites. In this way the announcement of Moses' death both acknowledges the nearness of the entry into Canaan and motivates the request that will allow Moses to continue to serve as leader of the Israelites as they prepare for that entry. We should also note that these events need not have occupied very much time in terms of the internal chronology of the Priestly text. The majority of the narrative after the command for Moses' death consists of dialogue and speeches (Numbers 32-36*) which could have all occurred on a single day—only the Midianite war and its aftermath imposes any kind of time-strain on the narrative, adding the length of the war plus a week to Moses' life (31:19, 24, 48).

In support of the contention that Yhwh's command (Num 27:12-14) introduces the narrative pretext for a Mosaic reprieve, we should turn back to the announcement of the Midianite vendetta (25:16-18). In this speech, we find that Yhwh does not command Moses to personally execute this vendetta. Instead, the vendetta is phrased as a general obligation of the whole community, while the command to carry it out is phrased as a second person plural verb (*wəhikkîtem*). Yhwh provides no time-frame for when this should be carried out, he only asserts that it should be done. In this way, the Midianite vendetta bears some resemblance to the Amalek vendetta in the non-Priestly sources (Exod 17:14-16; Deut 25:17-19). In other words, the announcement of the Midianite vendetta does not create a narrative expectation of its execution.[237] When, immediately following Moses' request for a new leader, Yhwh then

[237] Note that the reading offered here means that for those scholars who would still like to see Numbers 31 as a later addition, they no longer need to eliminate the Midianite vendetta in Num 25:16-18 to make that argument.

commands him to execute the Midianite vendetta before his death, the audience is meant to be surprised—not just by the delay in Moses' compliance, but also by the announcement of the immediate carrying-out of revenge against Midian. Moses' refusal to immediately comply with Yhwh's command is acknowledged and licensed by Yhwh in his transformation of the Midianite vendetta from a general idea to a concrete action for Moses to perform.

One final piece of evidence may support the reading offered here, which is the repetition of Yhwh's command for Moses to ascend the mountain (Deut 32:48-52*). The relationship between the command in Numbers and its echo in Deuteronomy has been a longstanding problem in Pentateuchal scholarship.[238] While most scholars have frequently treated these texts as in opposition—either one or the other representing the true original from the Priestly text, with the other serving a redactional function—at least some scholars have also entertained the notion that both belong to the Priestly text.[239] In his own review of the ending of the Priestly text, Frevel has argued that the passage in Deuteronomy does not truly serve a redactional function. As Frevel notes, this passage does not contain any Deuteronomistic language, makes no attempt to unite the Priestly and Deuteronomistic views of Moses' death (e.g., the absence of Pisgah; cf. 34:1), nor is it a necessary recapitulation in light of Deuteronomy's own awareness of Moses' impending death (Deut 3:23-28; 31:1-2; 33:1).[240] While the passage may have undergone some editorial expansion when the Pentateuchal sources were combined, the second command from

[238] See Driver 1901: 382-383 for a judicious review of the options; Frevel 2000: 290-300 for a more recent review of approaches (including evaluations of Perlitt 1988: 72-76; L. Schmidt 1993: 211-221). See also von Rad 1934: 125-128, for the foundation of Noth's views on this subject.
[239] See already, Wellhausen 1899: 116, 205-206. Gray 1903: 399 astutely observes that "the originality of the repetition becomes more defensible in proportion to the amount of matter admitted to have intervened;" i.e., the more material in Numbers 27-36 that one reckons as belonging to the original Priestly text, the more likely it is that the repetition also belongs to P.
[240] Frevel 200: 293-300.

Yhwh for Moses to ascend the mountain (32:48-52*) is best reckoned as being an original part of the Priestly text.[241] This repetition is, then, no repetition, but its own narrative.[242]

If both commands are an original part of the Priestly text, then we can see how the second instance of this command responds to Moses' reprieve from the original command. While the first command tells Moses to ascend so that "you might be gathered to your people, also you, just as Aaron your brother was gathered" (Num 27:13), the second adds the verb *mwt* to the description on both sides of the parallelism (Deut 32:50):

Num 27:13	וְרָאִיתָה אֹתָהּ וְנֶאֱסַפְתָּ אֶל־עַמֶּיךָ גַּם־אָתָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר נֶאֱסַף אַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ׃	וּמֻת בָּהָר אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עֹלֶה שָׁמָּה וְהֵאָסֵף אֶל־עַמֶּיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר־מֵת אַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ בְּהֹר הָהָר וַיֵּאָסֶף אֶל־עַמָּיו׃	Deut 32:50

Figure 6.1: Num 27:13 & Deut 32:50

Here, Moses is instructed to die (*mwt* imperative) just as Aaron had died. This explicit emphasis on death—rather than the idiomatic *ʾsp* (N) *ʾl-ʿm*—may be read as a narrative acknowledgment of the reprieve Yhwh granted in the first instance. Where, before, Moses could refuse and delay, he now no longer has that option.[243] Ultimately, the delay of Moses' death and his execution of the Midianite vendetta do not require us to posit compositional strata in the Priestly text—narratively, they can be read in unison, especially if we accept the second command for Moses to ascend Mount Abarim as part of the Priestly text.

Not everyone will find this narrative reading persuasive. However, the combination of the narrative role suggested here for the announcement of Moses' death with the similar delay in Deuteronomy at least allows us to entertain the idea that the Priestly material in Numbers 31-36,

[241] Frevel 2000: 300-306's own conclusion from this is that Deut 32:48-52 is the original Priestly command and Num 27:12-14 a later addition. This position has been argued by other scholars (see n. 234), but the position seems, to this author, to be nonsensical. The addition of Num 27:12-14 adds nothing to its context while instead introducing the exact problems we have been discussing here—it is difficult to posit an editor who would operate in this fashion when leaving the material alone would have produced a more harmonious result.
[242] Frevel 2000: 294.
[243] Other differences between the two announcements deserve a fuller exploration under the assumption that both are part of the same narrative.

except for the itinerary list, belong to the original Priestly text. Our secondary analysis has shown that there is no need to posit stratification or supplementation to explain the presence of both the announcement of Moses' death and the execution of the Midianite vendetta. Rather than being in competition with each other, both of these events contribute to the narrative of the Priestly text. Yhwh's command for Moses to ascend Mount Abarim both acknowledges Yhwh's attention to the impending crossing of the Jordan and provides the motivation for Moses to request a successor, while the execution of the Midianite vendetta extends the reprieve Yhwh granted by allowing Moses to install Joshua as his successor. The rest of the events of the Moab unit flow directly from this complex—the death of the exodus generation, the impending death of Moses, the appointment of Joshua, and the conquest of parts of the Transjordan during the Midianite war all point to the upcoming entry into the land of Canaan which form the central concern of the events that result from the successful execution of the Midianite vendetta.

Having established a framework in which the material that intervenes between Yhwh's command for Moses to die and his actual death are part of the Priestly text, one last narrative issue remains in the Moab unit that we can now explore. This is the narrative of the Gileadite leaders' request for a modification to the original ruling Yhwh gave to the daughters of Zelophehad (Numbers 36). This text is often considered a later addition to the Priestly text due to the fact that it modifies a ruling given just prior in the Priestly text (Num 27:1-11).[244] This closeness of subject is not, however, a sufficient basis on which to identify this narrative as secondary.[245] From a Neo-analytic perspective, we have already observed how the Priestly author uses narratives to comment on the non-narrative materials that he incorporates into his

[244] E.g., Gray 1903: 477; Noth 1968: 257; Levine 2000: 575; Chavel 2014: 243-250. Note that Chavel bases his view of the lateness of this text on its clear reflection of the received version of Num 27:1-11, which he views as the result of a history of expansion; see n. 183 for discussion.
[245] See, already, Kuenen 1886: 98.

narrative, sometimes at a remove from those texts (e.g., Leviticus 8-9's narrativization of Exodus 29).[246] In this case, we should note that while the modification of Yhwh's original ruling (Num 36:5-9) is referred back to a divine speech (36:5), the narrative does not present the ruling as such—instead, it reports it as a communication from Moses. The choice to not embed this ruling in a divine speech and instead present it at a remove may suggest that here we have the Priestly author's own interpretation of the non-narrative text he incorporated into the earlier narrative (27:6-11). The direct relationship between these two texts can, then, be explained without recourse to stratification and on analogy to the Priestly author's practice elsewhere.

Chavel, however, has also mounted a narrative case for viewing Numbers 36 as a later addition to P.[247] He argues that the placement of the text suggests that some amount of time has passed between the original ruling and the Gileadites' requested modification as though the Gileadites were unaware of the implications of Yhwh's initial solution—and that the narrative provides no justification for this delay or context for their sudden realization of the problem.[248] Chavel, however, is simply incorrect on this point. First, at least some time must be allowed for the Midianite war (Numbers 31). More importantly, though, the original request from the daughters of Zelophehad came after the census and concerned a theoretical upcoming situation. In 34:13-15, however, Moses recognizes the current land-rights of a portion of Manasseh—including rights over the Gilead (Num 32:26).[249] When the Gileadites approach Moses about the

[246] See Chapter 2 for discussion.
[247] Chavel 2014: 249 also suggests that Numbers 36 is theologically problematic as it requires human prompting for Yhwh to solve a problem that he himself introduced. Given the amount of human-divine interaction in the Priestly text that results in changes to Yhwh's previously issued commands—acknowledged by Chavel himself—this author does not consider Numbers 36 to represent "a distinctly, qualitatively new limit." This story no more suggests that "[Yhwh] issued a ruling without having thought it through sufficiently" than does his change to the Israelite-Levite-priest relationship in response to the people's fear of living near him (Num 17:27-18:32) or his decision to install Joshua before Moses' death at Moses' prompting (27:12-23).
[248] Chavel 2014: 249-250.
[249] We should also note the possibility that part of Num 32:39-42 belongs to P, though see Marquis 2013: 420-422 for counterarguments.

earlier decision, they do so in light of the fact that they are now dealing with a concrete reality. In other words, the narrative provides precisely the context in which the Gileadites might be compelled to revisit Yhwh's earlier decision. Given the reasonable contextualization of this narrative along with its resemblance to other inner-Priestly interpretations, we should consider Numbers 36 part of the original Priestly text.[250]

With our secondary analysis in hand, we can now turn to the relationship between the Paran unit and the larger Priestly narrative. In this material we can still find traces of the first two Abrahamic promises. The census in Numbers 26, though exhibiting a small net-decrease in the Israelite population from the first census (-820), nevertheless continues to demonstrate Yhwh's fidelity to his promise to multiply Abraham's descendants. Though we lack the specifics of the Priestly narrative of the Peor incident, it seems clear from Yhwh's response to Phinehas' actions that part of the issue involved Israel's zeal for and fidelity to Yhwh (Num 25:11-13; 31:16). This narrative thus seems to continue to define what it means for Yhwh to be Israel's god and for them to be his people. Furthermore, the instructions about cities of refuge conclude with Yhwh's reaffirmation of his intent to live amongst the Israelites (35:34; cf. Exod 29:45-46). However, while traces of these themes are present, all of the events in the Moab narrative contribute to the last major thread of the Priestly narrative—Yhwh's fulfillment of the land promise.

The Peor incident marks the passing of the exodus generation (Num 25:19; 26:63-65), indicating the end of Yhwh's imposed delay on the entry into the land (14:26-35).[251] The following census serves as the basis on which the land will be distributed (26:52-56). The daughters of Zelophehad case revolves around land ownership (27:4, 6-11) and also marks the

[250] It is also unclear that an issue such as the marriage requirements for inheriting daughters necessitated recourse to a narrative text like P for substantiation. That is to say, such an issue is culturally defined and we should be wary of suggesting that an author needed to adjust the Priestly text to such a reality in order to accept such a practice, or that others would be persuaded to accept such a practice solely because of its occurrence in the Priestly text.
[251] Nihan 2009: 122-123.

return of the term *ʾăḥuzzāh* which plays such a prominent role in the Priestly land promise (27:4, 7). The post-Sinai pause in the usage of this term up until this point subtly signaled the delay of the land promise following the scouts episode. Its return here, then, indicates the nearness of Yhwh's giving of Canaan to the Israelites and we see it used several times throughout the Moab unit after this point (32:5, 22, 29, 32; 35:2, 8, 28; related verbal use in 32:30).

Moses' appointment of Joshua involves warfare language that points to the entry into Canaan (Num 27:17; cf. 1 Sam 18:13, 16).[252] Furthermore, Joshua's role in the Canaanite conquest is a well-known facet of the Israelite mythic past—his mere presence as the chosen successor of Moses points to the other side of the Jordan as well. Meanwhile, Yhwh's command for Moses to ascend Mount Abarim—the event that triggers Joshua's appointment—tells Moses that he will view the land from there, emphasizing that this land is the one that Yhwh is giving to the Israelites (27:12). The Priestly author then repeats this description twice when Yhwh issues his final instructions for Moses' death (Deut 32:49, 52).

The Midianite war that follows Joshua's appointment clears the land that the Reubenites and Gadites settle.[253] Their own settlement involves a controversy over their role in the upcoming entry into Canaan (32:28-32). Yhwh then gives a series of instructions for the conquest and distribution of the land (33:50-35:34), including the definition of the land to be distributed (34:1-12) and the appointment of leaders to oversee this process (34:16-29). When the Gileadite leaders ask for a modification of the earlier ruling in favor of Zelophehad's daughters, they center their request around the issue of land ownership (36:2-4). Finally, this section of the Priestly narrative comes to a close with the recognition that Joshua has assumed his leadership role and that the Israelites were set to act "according to what Yhwh commanded

[252] Noth 1957: 191 = 1987: 122.
[253] See discussion above.

Moses" (Deut 34:9)—that is, to carry out the instructions for conquest and distribution that Yhwh gave following the Midianite war. The Moab unit of the Priestly text shows a unified focus on the issue of the entry into Canaan and brings Yhwh's promise to give the Israelites that land to the verge of fulfillment.

What is more, the Priestly Moab narrative is also thoroughly integrated into the preceding Priestly text. Events directly pointed to in earlier parts of the Priestly text, such as the death of Moses and the succession of the exodus generation by a new group of Israelites, find their natural end in the Moab unit. As discussed above, the Peor incident (Num 25:6-18) marks another evolution in the relationship between Yhwh and the *ʿēdāh* in terms of how his wrath is managed—as importantly, the Peor narrative does not revert back to the same issue of *qeṣep* that occupied the Paran unit and which was shown as solved during the Meribah incident.[254] The Midianite vendetta's announcement and the instructions for the conquest of Canaan (25:16-18; 33:50-56) key into the same conflict language of *ṣrr* that the silver trumpets speech suggested would play a role in the post-Sinai material (10:9).[255] The second census explicitly invokes Yhwh's curse on the exodus generation (26:63-65), while the daughters of Zelophehad speak about the Korah incident (27:3). Yhwh's command for Moses to climb the mountain makes reference both to the Meribah event and to Aaron's death (Num 27:13-14; Deut 32:48-52*). Eleazar plays the role of high priest throughout this unit, while his son Phinehas performs the same kind of subsidiary tasks that Eleazar had performed when Aaron was still alive (Num 31:6; cf. 17:1-5; 19:1-4). The *nəśîʾîm* continue to be a major institution in these chapters (25:14; 27:2; 31:13; 32:2; 34:16-29; 36:1), just as they are in the preceding ones. When the Levites are given cities (35:1-8), the text is reaching back to an eventuality already contemplated in the Jubilee law

[254] See discussion above.
[255] See Chapter 4 for a discussion of Num 10:1-10 as an argument for the post-Sinai material in P.

(Lev 25:32-34), while the cities of refuge conclusion harkens back to the Tabernacle instructions (Num 35:34; Exod 29:45-46).

These cross-references and the continued focus on Yhwh's promise of land are all signs of a well-integrated text with a strong narrative throughline. Given the weakness of Analyst identifications of strata in the preceding sections of the Priestly text, it is unclear why we should prefer a supplementary approach to this part of P in the face of this narrative coherence.[256] The Moab narrative, just as much as the Paran and wilderness narratives, contributes to the overarching Priestly narrative in precise alignment with what our analysis of the promises in Genesis 17 led us to expect for the Priestly post-Sinai material. Just as earlier parts of the narrative were focused on the issues of the multiplication of descendants and Yhwh being Israel's god, so the post-Sinai material is focused on the promise of land.

This brings us, finally, to a Neo-analytic interpretation of the texts in the Moab unit. Here, we find that the Priestly author continues his method of incorporating non-narrative materials into his narrative. The first is the clan-segmented census list that has been adapted in Numbers 26. While a similar but distinctive text was used as the basis for Numbers 1, this census's focus on clan segments is directly related to the express purpose of this text as the basis for the upcoming distribution of land (Num 26:52-56; cf. Lev 25:10).[257] These clan names reflect local affiliations, collections of lineage groups that likely also served as convenient

[256] See, e.g., Albertz 2013: 229, whose self-described "strongest argument" for why the composer of Numbers 25-36 could not be the same as the Priestly writer operative up to Num 22:1 is the fact that, in the latter verse, the location of the Israelites is described as "across the Jordan at Jericho" (*mʿbr lyrdn yrḥw*), while in Numbers 25-36 the location is "by the Jordan at Jericho" (*ʿl yrdn yrḥw*). While we can readily admit this difference, we also note that Num 22:1 is a statement of arrival and encampment, while the other statements provide the geographical setting of the narrative. Furthermore, it is difficult to attach much ideological weight to this prepositional change. This one small shift in preposition simply can not outweigh the multiple signs of continuity and integration discussed above. The position advocated for here is well represented by Crüsemann 1996: 282's statement that "The question of the inner unity of the text should be of equal importance to that of potential stratification. Careless preference for literary-critical operations over structural analysis and exegesis of content is methodological stupidity."

[257] Kislev 2016 presents an analysis of the similar handling of the distinctive lists that underlie Numbers 1-2 and 26.

administrative groupings under the Israelite and Judahite states.[258] The discovery of the Samaria Ostraca, a group of what seem to be tax receipts excavated from the capital of Israel, has allowed us to confirm the accuracy of the names of the Manassite clans listed in this genealogy—we have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the other clan names.[259] In other words, a record of some kind likely underlies this list—either an old census document directly adapted or a list of Israelite clans that has been adapted to serve as the framework for a census.[260] In either case, the Priestly author has repurposed this document to mark a major turning point in the larger Priestly narrative, using it to signal the death of the exodus generation and the upcoming conquest.

In other parts of the Moab unit, we find a close alliance between non-narrative texts and individual narratives. The daughters of Zelophehad exception (27:1-11) incorporates what appears to be a non-narrative text into its narrative of oracular consultation.[261] In this way, the daughters of Zelophehad narrative does double-duty—it both explains the existence of Manassite matriclans (whose reality is secured by the Samaria ostraca) and also provides the framing for

[258] For an analysis of the history of clan-state relations in the 8th and 7th centuries, see Halpern 1991 and Faust 2012: 39-177 for the archaeological reflexes of state-kinship interactions and of clan organization, concentrated largely in the rural sector.

[259] For an overview discussion of the Samaria Ostraca, see Shea 1977; Aharoni 1979: 356-368. For recent interpretations of what these texts tell us about the relationship between the state and the clans, see Niemann 2008; Nam 2012.

[260] Gray 1903: 389-390; Noth 1968: 204-205; Levine 2000: 313; Kislev 2013; idem 2016: 197, 199-200's proposal that the statement in 26:4—which titles the census as "the children of Israel who came out from the land of Egypt"—reflects the original location or content of this document should likely not be accepted. While the Neo-analytic framework has no problem with positing that the Priestly author may have used a document with this title and repurposed it for a new context (as Kislev 2013; 2016 argues), there is also a possible narrative explanation for this statement. By marking this clan list as representing the Israelites who left Egypt, the Priestly author may be signaling that the same clan-segmentations that originally went to Egypt (Gen 46:8-27; Exod 1:1-5) survived and departed Egypt. That is to say, rather than marking the individuals counted in the census as the ones who came out of Egypt, this verse indicates that the clans counted in the census are the ones who came out of Egypt. In effect, this both closes an earlier motif of the Priestly text and further confirms Yhwh's fidelity to the promise of multiplication (Exod 1:1-7).

[261] Chavel 2014: 202-214, 235-241 also sees a distinction between the non-narrative legal principle (27:8-11a) and the narrative framework (27:1-7a, 11b), though he attributes this to two different stages of composition. However, his arguments for regarding 27:7b as an addition meant to ease the transition to the non-narrative text do not need to imply that a different author/editor is at work here. Furthermore, the absence of the issue of the father's name from the non-narrative legal principle is an insufficient basis on which to suppose a deep opposition between the two parts of this short passage. The narrative the Priestly author composed to frame this legal principle is allowed to express additional emphases without us viewing them as conflicting with the legal principle itself. Or, to put it another way, there is no reason to expect a 1:1 correspondence between a narrative framework and its embedded legal principle.

the law regarding land inheritance for daughters.[262] The Priestly author then uses the narrative of the Gileadite approach to offer further commentary on this non-narrative text and how it would function in relationship to larger issues of familial inheritance (Numbers 36).[263] We also see the incorporation of a post-war purification ritual and a regulation concerning plunder into the narrative of the Midianite war (Num 31:21-24, 25-30), complete with a detailed report of compliance for the latter (31:31-46).

The other non-narrative texts in the Moab section are more broadly connected to the upcoming entry into Canaan. The description of the boundaries of Canaan (Num 34:1-12) likely represents either a pre-existing document or an abstraction from a document similar to the boundary list that likely underlies Joshua 13-19.[264] We also encounter another list of *nəśîʾîm* (Num 34:16-29), whose names were likely drawn from an older list. Alternatively, the narrative of the military leaders' offerings at the end of the Midianite war (31:48-54) may imply a votive context for the preservation of these names. Finally, we encounter two laws about the setting aside of cities for Levites (35:1-8) and for those seeking asylum after a homicide (35:9-34).[265] The latter text contains not just information about cities of refuge, but also laws concerning how to handle those who seek asylum in them. Given the lack of internal division into multiple divine speeches, this speech may reflect a type of topical collection/*Sammlung* text that gathered several separate regulations on the same subject. As we have noted in other cases, we find what appears to be the Priestly author's own views on the preceding law located at the end of the speech. Here, he directly connects the laws about murder to his own narrative and theological view of Yhwh's

[262] See Aḥituv 2008: 260-261 for the daughters of Zelophehad in the Samaria ostraca.
[263] See discussion above.
[264] Noth 1957: 192-195 = 1987: 122-125.
[265] See Stackert 2007: 31-112 for an excellent exploration of the various asylum laws in the Pentateuch and especially the relationship between the Priestly cities of refuge law (which Stackert attributes to H) and its parallel in Deuteronomy.

dwelling among the Israelites and the effect of their ethical behavior on the land (35:34; cf. Exod 29:45-46; Lev 18:28).

The Priestly author, then, continues to deploy non-narrative materials in a narratively creative way in the Moab unit (Numbers 25-36*; Deut 32:48-52*; 34:1a*, 8-9), just as he has done throughout the Priestly text. Again, we should note that the continuity of method across the Priestly text is an additional strong argument in favor of presuming the unity of the text absent strong contextual indicators of stratification or addition. With the very few exceptions discussed above, the material scholars have identified as Priestly in Numbers 25-36 should be counted as an original part of P. The Moab unit is narratively coherent, contributes to the plot of the Priestly text, and exhibits the same method of approach that we have found elsewhere in P.

Our own analysis of the Priestly post-Sinai material (Numbers 10-Deuteronomy 34*) has shown that it consists of a coherent narrative that continues the plot of P from the end of the Sinai unit, with only a few later additions interposed. Given the clearly marked nature of Priestly material after Numbers 10 that furthers the trajectory of the plot outlined in the Abrahamic promises of Genesis, the burden of proof is on those scholars who would curtail the limits of P to the Sinai incident or who would eliminate elements of the Priestly narrative in Numbers in order to speed towards the death of Moses. The issue of Yhwh's fulfillment of the promise of Canaan plays a clear role in the Priestly author's conception of Israelite antiquity at every turn of the Priestly narrative, and the post-Sinai material is where that topic finds its fullest expression yet.

The question we must now address is whether the Moab narrative provides the fulfillment of Yhwh's land promise or whether we should once again entertain the possibility of Priestly material in Joshua that contains this fulfillment. Our exploration of these issues will once again bring us into conversation with Noth's arguments about the nature of the Priestly text and the

relationship between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History. But we do so with the plot of the Priestly narrative from creation to the plains of Moab firmly in hand.

The End of the Trail: The Priestly text and Joshua

Our above analysis has emphasized the programmatic nature of the Abrahamic promises in the Priestly text and outlined the ways that Yhwh's promise of land plays an abiding role throughout the Priestly narrative from the point of its introduction forward. When we come to the close of the Moab unit, we are told that the Israelites obeyed (*šmʿ*) Joshua and that "they acted according to what Yhwh commanded Moses" (Deut 34:9). In the narrative analysis offered above, this is a clear reference to the various commands that Yhwh gave for the acquisition and distribution of land in Canaan (Numbers 33:50-35:34). In light of the way that the promises to Abraham motivated other aspects of the Priestly narrative, we should consider in what ways this brief note might serve to bring the land-promise motif to a close.

Many scholars have continued to work within Noth's literary framework of a restricted Priestly text in Numbers—at a minimum, lacking all of the Moab material except the command to climb Mount Abarim and the appointment of Joshua—while rejecting his notion that the land was simply unimportant to the Priestly author. For those scholars who restrict the Priestly text even more than Noth was willing to, the promise of land often plays an ideological role—it is fulfilled in symbolic ways or is left open-ended to reflect Yhwh's continued work in history.[266] Our own analysis of the Priestly text has shown that such attempts to read P in such symbolic or ideological fashions have no purchase in the text itself. Such readings largely arise out of a mixed methodology—one that eschews narrative as a criterion for identifying what does and

[266] See, e.g., in their different ways, Pola 1995: 324-338; Nihan 2007: 63-68; Boorer 2016: 480-481. See also n. 70 above.

does not belong to the Priestly text while embracing narrative as a means for analyzing the Priestly text thus obtained with no or little reference to narrative. Thus, scholars identify various points for the ending of P on non-narrative grounds—Exodus 40* (Pola) or Leviticus 16 (Nihan) or Num 27:12-14 (Boorer)—and then must explain how the identified ending interacts with the explicit importance of the land promise in texts such as Genesis 17 and Exod 6:2-8. Additionally, these readings have a difficult time accounting for why the other two promises to Abraham are fulfilled within the text in strikingly literal ways—especially the promise for Yhwh to be Israel's god and its fulfillment in his literal encampment in their midst. The text gives us no reason to think that the Priestly author intended to treat the land promise in a manner so different from the other two promises.

For those scholars whose identification of the extent of the Priestly text more closely matches Noth's, the moment our analysis has identified as the end of the Moab unit also serves as the end of the Priestly text. In this way, their model of the Priestly text brings the Israelites to the edge of Canaan and continues to emphasize the importance of the land in Yhwh's intentions towards his people.[267] While these models suffer from the same relative neglect of narrative in their initial identification of what belongs to the Priestly text as those discussed above, they nevertheless include a narrative movement towards the land in accordance with what the promises of Genesis 17 would lead one to expect. For those who accept Noth's arguments about the lack of Priestly material in the book of Joshua, embracing the close of the Moab unit as the conclusion to the Priestly text does not require as radical a reimagining of the relationship between this ending and the promises to Abraham as those who would further curtail the Priestly text. The statement that the children of Israel enacted what Yhwh commanded Moses (Deut 34:9), which would refer to the appointment of Joshua as leader in this model, implicitly points

[267] See, e.g., Elliger 1952: 140-143; L. Schmidt 1993: 251-271; Frevel: 2000: 361-371, 380-382.

to his role as leader during the conquest.[268] The only thing lacking in the Priestly text is any detailed narration of this event.

In our own model, the connection between this last statement in the plains of Moab and the upcoming entry into Canaan is even more clear. The most recently given commands all deal with the subject of the distribution of the land and the treatment of its inhabitants. In other words, rather than being a moment implicitly pointing towards the fulfillment of the land promise, this statement may function as an explicit—though brief—narrative stating that the Israelites carried out Yhwh's will in regard to Canaan. Such brief statements affirming the execution of Yhwh's commands occur elsewhere in the Priestly text (e.g., Gen 6:22; Exod 12:28; Lev 10:7; Num 9:5; 17:26), and we could accept that this brief narrative statement brings the land-promise motif to a close and functions as the end of the Priestly text.

On the other side of the balance, the type of statement we find in Deut 34:9 is more often used by the Priestly author as a proleptic indicator of obedience which is followed by a recounting of how Yhwh's commands were carried out.[269] Sometimes these accounts immediately follow and can be very brief (e.g., Exod 7:10; Lev 8:4; Num 8:20-21; 20:27-28; 27:22-23) or very detailed (e.g., Exod 34:32-36:1; Num 31:31-47). However, in other cases, such proleptic statements introduce a much broader segment of material—such as the statement that introduces the entirety of the plagues material (Exod 7:6) or the one that introduces the erection of the Tabernacle and the inauguration of the priesthood (Exod 40:16). All of these kinds of statements, proleptic and not, are part of a command-fulfillment paradigm that the Priestly author

[268] Note that Frevel 2000's view differs from others who extend P into Deuteronomy 34 due to his position that the original Priestly text did not include Joshua (or anyone) as a successor to Moses—for him, P ends with the completion of the people's mourning for Moses (Deut 34:8), which he understands as implicitly indicating the moment of their own decision to enter the land that was just shown to Moses in Deut 32:48-52* (2000: 371).
[269] On prolepsis in the Priestly text, see also our discussion in Chapter 1.

deploys throughout his narrative—Yhwh commands and the narrative dutifully reports the execution of those commands.

We can, then, read the statement that closes the Moab unit as either the narrative conclusion of both the Priestly text and the land promise or as a proleptic introduction to a detailed account of the Israelites' execution of Yhwh's commands for the distribution of the land. There are no sure means of deciding between these two options and we should recognize both of them as viable. Whichever option we entertain, however, we must also take into consideration Noth's arguments about the Priestly text and its relationship both to the shape of the Pentateuch and to the Deuteronomistic History.

For Noth, the conclusion that the Priestly text had no interest in or narrative of the conquest explained an important feature of Pentateuchal redaction. Noth's examination of Joshua had led him to conclude that there was no sign of the Pentateuchal Redactor (R) at work in that book—this is the basis of his rejection of the concept of a Hexateuch in the sense of a unified, edited work spanning from Genesis to Joshua.[270] Noth further maintained that the J and E sources did not form the substratum of the book of Joshua, but that those older materials had nevertheless originally been Hexateuchal in orientation and contained an account of the conquest.[271] These stances together created a problem for Noth. If JE originally had an account of the conquest but that account is not part of Joshua, Noth needed an explanation for what had happened to that material. He found this answer in his view of the Priestly text. Since, for him, P contained no account of the conquest and served as the framework into which the Redactor fitted

[270] Noth 1938: ix-xv; 1957: 180-182 = 1987: 107-109. Noth, nevertheless maintained that an older compilation underlays the Deuteronomistic book of Joshua, contrary to the type of "authorial" reading seen in, e.g., Peckham 1994. Some recent work on Joshua has moved increasingly in the direction of treating the work as an independent book unit, with no original connections to either the Pentateuch or the Deuteronomistic History, see Dozeman 2015: 18-32 for a review of recent post-Noth work on Joshua and a defense of treating it as an independent entity.
[271] Noth 1957: 210-211 = 1987: 139-140; 1981: 16, 71-74.

the older sources, he argued that the limits of the Redactor's work on the Pentateuch—spanning from creation to the death of Moses—were identical to the limits of the Priestly text.[272] In other words, once the Redactor reached the end of the Priestly text, he simply ceased his work, leaving out the original ending(s) of JE which were consequently lost.

There are numerous reasons to object to Noth's premises. His conclusion that the JE sources do not serve as the basis of Joshua has always been an assertion based on negative evidence rather than an argument and is, in many ways, improbable given his own position that JE once contained a conquest account of their own.[273] Furthermore, the clear reliance of the Deuteronomistic Historian on the JE account in his own introduction (Deuteronomy 1-4*) makes it unlikely that he would have neglected the same sources in his account of the conquest.[274] Finally, we have demonstrated that the Priestly author was, in fact, deeply interested in the land and contains numerous indicators that point towards an entry into it.

Nevertheless, enough of Noth's proposal is compatible with the model of the Priestly text offered here to entertain it with modifications. If the Priestly text ended with the statement that the Israelites acted according to what Yhwh commanded Moses (Deut 34:9), then this makes the boundaries of the Priestly text functionally identical to Noth's supposition, though with different content within those boundaries. If we are correct that some form of JE also underlay the Deuteronomistic Joshua, then this already existing re-edition of the JE material may have compelled the Pentateuchal Redactor to stop his work once he reached the close of the Moab unit—if that was indeed also the end of the Priestly text. Noth's model, with these few modifications, may still be a viable explanation for the shape of the Pentateuch and R's non-interference with the already-extant conquest account.

---

[272] Noth 1957: 206-211 = 1987: 135-141; 1981: 16.
[273] Beer 1941; Mowinckel 1964: 33-51. See also the review of studies in Auld 1980: 88-93.
[274] See Baden 2009b for a thorough analysis of the relationship between J/E and the narrative of Deuteronomy.

However, we should also explore the possibility that the closing statement of the Moab unit is proleptic and originally stood at the head of a Priestly account of the entry into and distribution of Canaan. In this regard, it is difficult to dismiss out of hand the number of scholars, both prior to and since Noth's work, who have identified Priestly material in the book of Joshua.[275] This identification of Priestly material in Joshua is even more compelling in light of our foregoing analysis of the Priestly text as a coherent body of literature. Whereas the Analyst model provided a framework into which the supposition of a late, post-Priestly stratum in Joshua would have comfortably fit, our own model makes supposing such a state of affairs more difficult, especially where the Joshua material provides a narrative of the execution of commands given in the Priestly text (e.g., Josh 14:1-5; cf. Num 34:13-29).[276] The presence of the command-fulfillment paradigm elsewhere in P increases the likelihood that a fulfillment narrative extant in Joshua and connected to the commands in Numbers would be part of the Priestly text.

To the oft-cited elements of vocabulary, world view, and narrative continuity that scholars have adduced for seeing the continuation of P in Joshua, we may also add one more factor—compositional method. The frequently acknowledged use of pre-existing documents describing tribal territories and cities in the section most often attributed to P (Joshua 13-21*) accords well with the method of the Priestly author according to the Neo-analytic framework.[277] In this regard, Noth's argument that the texts in Joshua 13-19* which are identified as P largely serve as nothing more than a framing device around these lists is not an argument against their

[275] E.g., Kuenen 1886: 102-107; Wellhausen 1899: 116-133; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby 1900: II.303-319; Driver 1910: 103-113; Mowinckel 1964: 51-76; Fohrer 1968: 203-205; Blenkinsopp 1976; Haran 1978: 112-131; Petersen 1980; Kloppenborg 1981; Lohfink 1994: 136-172; Guillaume 2009: 6-11, 157-163.
[276] See, e.g., Albertz 2007 for an attempt to correct Noth's rejection of Priestly material in Joshua while maintaining the framework Noth constructed around that rejection.
[277] Noth 1938: ix; Boling & Wright 1982: 70-71.

being part of the Priestly text.[278] Rather, this is precisely how the Priestly author has operated elsewhere—providing narrative framing around non-narrative materials.

These counterweights notwithstanding, Noth's arguments for denying a role to the Priestly text in Joshua deserve consideration. Guillaume once described Noth's approach to this issue as a "brazenly biased discussion of Joshua material," and, at first blush, it is tempting to agree with this assessment.[279] However, we must keep in mind the scholarly framework within which Noth was working. The dominant model of Noth's day was one of a Hexateuch—by which was meant not just that the sources underlying Genesis-Deuteronomy all eventuated in the entry into Canaan, but that a single redactor was responsible for unifying the material of those sources in Genesis-Joshua.[280]

As discussed above, Noth's investigation of Joshua found a situation that was irreconcilable with that dominant view, especially in regard to the Priestly material in Joshua 1-12. Where P serves as the dominant framework into which the other sources are fitted in Genesis-Deuteronomy, this was not the case in the first half of Joshua. However, the material scholars long identified as Priestly appears as nothing more than a series of supplemental notices in Joshua 1-12, from which it is impossible to reconstruct a continuous narrative.[281] Instead, the Deuteronomist's revision of pre-existing sources dominates and frames the first half of Joshua.[282]

For Noth, this was sufficient to conclude that the same editor could not be responsible for the book of Joshua as was responsible for the combination of sources in Genesis-Deuteronomy.

---

[278] Noth 1957: 188-189 = 1987: 116-117. See further discussion below.
[279] Guillaume 2009: 10, n. 40.
[280] See n. 7 above.
[281] Noth 1957:182-183 = 1987: 111-112; cf. Wellhausen 1885: 357-358 and n. 9 above. Noth 1957: 111 identifies the following passages as being widely considered Priestly: Josh 4:15-17, 19; 5:10-12; 9:14, 15b, 17-21. This well aligns with most reckonings of the material in Joshua 1-12, though some differences occur as seen in, e.g., Driver 1910: 159 (who reckons Josh 4:13, 19; 5:10-12; 7:1; 9:15b, 17-21 to P) or Mowinckel 1964: 59-60 (who argues that 12:7-24 also belong to P).
[282] Noth 1957: 40-45 = 1981: 36-40.

Had the Priestly text contained a more expansive narrative account of the entry into Canaan, the Redactor of the Pentateuch would not have hesitated to use that narrative as the dominant framework of Joshua in the same way that he uses P elsewhere. The fact that the P-like texts in Joshua 1-12 do not serve as part of the structural frame of Joshua led Noth to reconsider whether these materials should be considered as Priestly at all. He ultimately concluded that the short Priestly-seeming texts extant in Joshua 1-12 do not even come from the same compositional horizon, but could be instead attributable to older materials, subsequent revisions, or later additions made with the Priestly narrative in mind.[283] Importantly, the Deuteronomistic framing of the book of Joshua remained dominant through all of these processes, highlighting Joshua's embeddedness in the Deuteronomistic History and its separation from the Tetrateuch/Pentateuch. Far from being brazenly biased, Noth's conclusion about Joshua 1-12 operates within the well-established parameters of contemporaneous Hexateuchal criticism.

Noth approached the question of the Priestly materials in Joshua 13-22 from a different viewpoint. Here, Noth argues that none of this material was an original part of the Deuteronomistic book of Joshua. According to Noth, the epanalepsis in Josh 13:1; 23:1 is indicative of a later editorial expansion, while the brief statement in Josh 11:23 constituted the extent of the Deuteronomistic Historian's interest in the distribution of the land.[284] However, Noth did not allow that this could indicate the presence of non-Deuteronomistic, specifically Priestly, material in Joshua 13-22. Instead, Noth insisted that these materials were so closely related to the Deuteronomist's language and worldview, that one would suppose they were an

[283] Noth 1938: 13-17, 29-33; 1957: 182-183 = 1987: 111-112.
[284] Noth 1957: 45 = 1981: 40.

original part of the Deuteronomistic Joshua if they were not located after the conclusion of this subject in 11:23.[285]

Noth based this position on an analysis of the frameworks of the material in Joshua 13-22. In Joshua 13-19, Noth consistently found a Deuteronomistic framework for the division of the land into which Priestly expansions have subsequently been added.[286] For Noth these Priestly notices (Josh 14:1b; 18:1; 19:51a) do not indicate the presence of a Priestly narrative of the distribution of the land, but are simply brief notices meant to bring a secondary but still Deuteronomistic account of the distribution of Canaan into line with late, post-Priestly/Priestly-supplemental material in Numbers. Noth sees a similar process at work in the narratives beyond these core chapters. For the account of the cities of refuge (Joshua 20), Noth asserts that we have a Deuteronomistic introduction to an account that was only subsequently expanded to align with the Priestly view of these cities.[287] In contrast, Noth does allow that Joshua 21's account of the Levitical cities shows no sign of Deuteronomistic interference, but argues that its heading's description of a committee consisting of Joshua, Eleazar, and a group of tribal leaders (Josh 21:1) connects it with the other Priestly headings in Joshua—since these headings have no independent existence apart from the Deuteronomistic framework and distribution narrative, this account of Levitical cities must likewise be taken as a text composed for this location rather than a remnant of a once-continuous Priestly narrative.[288] Finally, Noth asserts that while appearing similar to the Priestly text, the narrative of the great altar (Josh 22:9-34) deviates from typical

[285] Noth 1957: 45 = 1981: 40.
[286] Noth 1957: 183-189 = 1987: 112-117.
[287] Noth 1938: 95-97; 1957: 189 = 1987: 117-118.
[288] Noth 1957: 189-190 = 1987: 118.

Priestly interests and, once again, comes embedded in a Deuteronomistic framing (Josh 22:1-8).[289]

Here we begin to hone in on what Guillaume described as "brazenly biased" about Noth's analysis, but here too we must demure. At a glance, it can appear that Noth is simply working to remove the possibility of P in Joshua from consideration. Noth's insistence that Joshua 13-22 are more closely aligned to the Deuteronomistic History than to the Priestly text can strike one as special pleading. But Noth's analysis of Joshua must be taken on good faith. What he found in Joshua 1-12 was enough to persuade him that there was no Hexateuchal redaction. What he saw in Joshua 13-22 was a Deuteronomistic framing of Priestly materials which—because he was an adherent of the Kuenen-Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis—he could only explain by supposing an original Deuteronomistic account that had been subsequently expanded in minor ways in the direction of a Priestly or post-Priestly view of the Israelite past.[290]

We can, however, imagine other possible explanations for these phenomena. First, we should note that Noth's argument for the secondary nature of Joshua 13-22 is weak. Whether the brief statement in Josh 11:23 represented all that the Deuteronomistic Historian had to say about the division of Canaan is a subjective judgment and it is not uncommon in Judahite historiography for brief statements to be followed by fuller accounts. Furthermore, the epanalepsis in Josh 13:1; 23:1 does not have to represent a later editorial imposition in the book—the Deuteronomistic Historian elsewhere uses such reversions to the same moment to integrate complex materials into his work and this may be another such case.[291] Noth's

[289] Noth 1938: 101-105; 1957: 190 = 1987: 118. On the connections of this narrative to the Priestly worldview, see Kloppenborg 1981.
[290] Auld 1980; 1998 represent one logical conclusion of Noth's view, offering several arguments for viewing Joshua 13-22 as the source of the material in Numbers 26-36. Albertz 2007 still works within the Nothian framework but maintains the direction of dependence from Numbers to Joshua to explain the Priestly materials in Joshua.
[291] Halpern 1996: 134-137.

perception that the material in Joshua 13-22 is closely aligned with the Deuteronomistic work in the rest of Joshua is a surer guide to the nature of these chapters than the existence of the epanalepsis. In other words, we should attribute the resumptive repetition in Josh 13:1; 23:1 to the Deuteronomist himself rather than to a later editor of Joshua.

For those who have no precommitments about the relative dating of the Deuteronomistic History and the Priestly text, this offers an enticing possibility. If Noth's analysis of Joshua 13-22 is correct in regard to the consistent Deuteronomistic framing of otherwise Priestly material—narrative material that aligns with what we would expect from Yhwh's commands in the Priestly Moab narrative which we have argued constitutes an original part of the Priestly text—then one possible explanation for this is that the Priestly text was the Deuteronomist's source for this section of his history. Rather than the Priestly additions to Deuteronomistic framing around a distribution narrative that Noth posited, we could just as easily suppose Deuteronomistic framing added around a Priestly distribution narrative. This view in fact aligns with Noth's observation that the Priestly material in Joshua is treated in a way quite distinct from the way the Redactor of the Pentateuch treated it. Just as Noth argued that the Deuteronomistic Historian reframed older material, of whatever origin, in his production of Joshua 1-12, so too we might suppose him to have reframed material from the Priestly text for his own purposes in Joshua 13-22. This may also explain the occasional Priestly notice in the first half of Joshua, if those notices are indeed Priestly—the Deuteronomistic Historian may have extracted what seemed suitable to him from P and discarded the rest. In this scenario, when the redaction of the Pentateuch took place, there was no need for the Redactor to formulate a new combination of JEP for the conquest—the Deuteronomistic Historian had already accomplished that combination.

For those who would prefer to work within the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen model for the Priestly text's relative date, another scenario suggests itself. While scholars are correct that the Redactor of the Pentateuch operates in a fashion that privileges the Priestly text as a framework, this choice is accompanied by another editorial habit—the Redactor also appears to have a policy of relative non-interference with the Deuteronomistic History. The extent of the Redactor's imposition in the book of Deuteronomy appears to include only a JE/non-Priestly account of Joshua's installation (Deut 31:14-15), the second Priestly account of Yhwh's command for Moses to ascend Mount Abarim and die (Deut 32:48-52*), and the fusion of accounts at the death of Moses (Deuteronomy 34). Other impositions were, however, possible, especially under the rubric of the analysis offered here in which the majority of the material in Numbers 26-36* constituted an original part of the Priestly text. For example, the Priestly commands to conquer and distribute the land from the Moab unit (Num 33:50-36:13) could have been integrated into the end of Deuteronomy just as easily as left in their current locations—they could have been inserted after Deut 31:8 or 31:14 or 32:47. More radically, we could imagine this same unit being inserted just before Deut 4:41-43's account of the appointment of cities of refuge in Transjordan, with the concluding statement in Num 36:13 being held over for placement in Deuteronomy 32 or 33. Furthermore, the insertion of the station list in Num 33:1-49, which includes the element of Mosaic writing (Num 33:2), could have been held over for the closing section of Deuteronomy which also makes reference to such activities (Deut 31:9, 22, 24). The relatively restricted insertion of materials in the book of Deuteronomy suggests that the Redactor attempted to interfere with the Deuteronomistic History as little as possible when combining it with the JEP material.[292]

[292] Noth 1957: 211-216 = 1987: 143-147 draws a different conclusion from this phenomenon, arguing that the combination of JE and P preceded the combination of JEP with the Deuteronomistic History. However, the relative

This policy of relative non-interference may explain the different handling of Priestly material in Joshua versus the Pentateuch. If we are correct that JE served as the basis of the Deuteronomistic book of Joshua, then the Redactor may have been comfortable merely supplementing this Deuteronomistic revision with notable extracts from the Priestly text. This would account for Noth's observation of the very different editorial habits at work in Joshua 1-12.[293] Furthermore, since the Priestly text post-dates the Deuteronomistic History in this scenario, we might suppose that the Deuteronomistic narrative of the division of the land that Noth claims underlies Joshua 13-22 served as the source for the Priestly text's own account of the distribution of the land—the major difference between the two would be the introduction of the Levitical cities and the concept of distribution by committee and lot. This would mean that the Redactor was faced with largely identical material between Deuteronomistic Joshua 13-22 and the Priestly narrative of the division of the land. The unified frameworks of the two that Noth detected may have been among the only operations the Redactor needed to undertake in order to preserve both accounts.[294] This scenario would, notably, require us to return to a Hexateuchal model of redaction, but one with a much more limited scope once the Israelites

---

non-interference in Deuteronomy, is not non-interference and it is probably preferable to view the redactional combination of the sources underlying Genesis-Deuteronomy as a single process. Furthermore, Noth's supporting arguments for his position relies on his view that the Priestly material in Numbers 28-36 is all a late supplement and his assertion that a Pentateuchally oriented corpus (i.e., one that stops at the death of Moses) must have preceded Deuteronomy's combination with JEP in order for the concept of the Five Books of Moses to acquire canonical status. The former argument has been rendered null by our analysis in this chapter and the latter argument is clearly *ad hoc*—there is no reason to suppose two different Pentateuchal stages were needed in order for a community to accept the death of Moses as the bounds of a body of literature. Noth's view on this matter, however, continues to be influential and is, in part, the basis for the view of oppositional Pentateuchal and Hexateuchal redaction layers in Numbers-Joshua seen in Otto 2000; Achenbach 2003; Albertz 2007; 2013. We should likely question whether the creation of a Pentateuch could ever have been opposed to the perception of a Hexateuch in some form—a hard stop at Deuteronomy does not make the existence of Joshua (a book that predates the Pentateuchal redaction in virtually every model) null. Not even the Samaritan preference for the Pentateuch alone is probative on this count, as even the Samaritans created a version of Joshua and the role of the figure Joshua is just as clear in SP as in MT.

[293] Whether or not Noth is correct that the Priestly materials in Joshua 1-12 are insufficient to posit a continuous narrative would require a fullscale reanalysis of Joshua that is beyond the scope of this dissertation. See the desideratum for a reevaluation of the sources in Joshua in Yoo 2014: 667.

[294] The inclusion of Josh 17:2-6 from the putative Priestly account may have been the most major operation outside of the framework fusion.

entered Canaan and one that allows for the Redactor's deference to both the Priestly and Deuteronomistic corpora.

We have before us, then, four possibilities for understanding the relationship between the Priestly text as we've identified it and the book of Joshua. In the first two models, there is a null connection between Joshua and the Priestly text—either the Priestly text ended with the end of the Moab unit in Deut 34:9 or the Priestly conquest account has been lost to us through some process. The second two models offer alternative ways of understanding the Priestly-seeming material in Joshua—either the Deuteronomistic Historian used the Priestly text as one of his sources in constructing this part of his history or the Deuteronomistic History and the Priestly text were substantially identical in the part of their narrative concerning the distribution of land, necessitating no more than the fusion of frameworks by the Redactor. The level of persuasiveness of each of these scenarios depends on an array of scholarly precommitments concerning the date of the Priestly text and the relationship between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History. Each scholar will be differently persuaded depending on where they stand in the network of these precommitments. To go any further than this would require a reanalysis of the entire book of Joshua, not just its Priestly elements, and such an investigation lies outside the scope of this project.

We will end, then, with a subjective evaluation rather than with an argument. For this scholar, the most persuasive scenario is one that rejects the Kuenen-Graf-Wellhausen determination of a post-exilic date for the Priestly text—the legs that support that hypothesis have long since individually decayed, and yet the table floats. The Priestly text is likely a pre-exilic work, one that is likely either just prior to or contemporaneous with the composition of the

Josianic Deuteronomistic History.[295] The Priestly text likely contained a narrative of the entry into Canaan and the distribution of the land which served as one of the sources of the Deuteronomistic Joshua. What is more, that narrative likely used non-narrative sources as its basis, just as the Priestly author used such materials elsewhere. The Redactor's work likely ceased at the end of the book of Deuteronomy because the Deuteronomistic Historian's use of JE and P among his sources for the settlement of Canaan did not necessitate R going further in his combination of extant Judahite texts on Israelite antiquity.

We will hold the above evaluations only very loosely as we move towards our conclusion. Having offered an evaluation of the Priestly material from creation to the entry into Canaan and examined what contributions a Neo-analytic framework might make to our understanding of the Priestly text, it is time to step back and suggest some broader implications of our work here.

[295] See Cross 1973: 274-289; Friedman 1981: 1-43; Halpern 1996: 107-118 for arguments concerning the Josianic character of DtrH.

CHAPTER 7

A NEW OLD MODEL

Our Results

In the preceding chapters we have argued for two distinct but related positions. In the first case, we have attempted to show the weaknesses in the traditional Analyst approach to the Priestly text. Our approach to P has prioritized the fact that it is a narrative, literary work that must be judged by its own standards. To this end, we fashioned principles of secondary analysis that allowed for variation and repetition and that privileged narrative explanations for features of the text over compositional ones wherever possible. This approach allowed us to set aside the law-narrative dichotomy and its heritage, arguing that even where the Priestly text is replete with non-narrative materials, it has integrated them into its narrative and arranged them according to a narrative sequence. Repeatedly, we have seen that this approach provides fruitful readings of the Priestly text, producing a more coherent text than the atomizing tendencies of the Analyst model allow. This approach has allowed us to trace a consistent narrative thread through the entire Priestly Sinai episode and to identify its continuation in the post-Sinai material, all the way to the edge of Canaan. The Analyst model of positing a Priestly text that was slowly accumulated through a series of poorly-motivated additions has very little to recommend it over the reading offered here.

Our second line of argument has been to propose a new approach to the composition of the Priestly text. In reality, this new approach has been proposed numerous times—we are not

the first to suppose that the Priestly author drew on pre-existing sources.[1] What distinguishes our new version of this old model is its comprehensiveness. We have, first, applied this supposition to a far wider range of texts—almost the entirety of the non-narrative materials embedded in P. Furthermore, rather than simply observing that the Priestly author likely had access to older sources, we have contextualized those sources in the scribal and archival habits of the ancient Near East. This has allowed us to understand that positing that the Priestly author used documents does not just explain the sources of his materials—it also explains their shape and form. That is to say, the types of documentary sources that were kept in actual archives explains the compositeness of the Priestly text. The tension and variation that scholars have long observed in the Sinai material is not a product of compositional layering in the Priestly text, but rather an accurate image of the archives from which he drew.

A Bias Towards Unity

In the course of posing an alternative to the Analyst model's atomization and proposing a Neo-analytic framework for the Priestly text's composition, this study has unapologetically favored the supposition of unity for the Priestly text. This has not been the simple unity of the Unitarians—our Neo-analytic model both allows for and explains the composite nature of the Priestly text. Nevertheless, our working assumption has been that the material scholars have identified as Priestly is, by and large, part of a single compositional horizon.

This bias towards unity serves several important purposes. Unity is, first and foremost, an experimental rubric. The best method by which to test a compositional hypothesis is to build the

[1] E.g., Kuenen 1865: 35; 1886: 81-87; Carpenter & Harford-Battersby 1900: 141-157; Noth 1965: 10-15; 1981: 234-236; Levine 1965; 1993: 81-82, 259-266; Fohrer 1968: 144-145; Cross 1973: 293-325; Nihan 2007: 150-159.

text that one imagines.[2] Once a text has been reconstructed on the basis of such a hypothesis, it is easier to determine whether the hypothesis is actually productive for the advancement of our understanding. We hope that the reconstruction of the Priestly text offered here, using unity as an experimental rubric, meets that standard.

Unity also provides a challenge to the exegete. Recourse to compositional explanations when we encounter a difficulty in the text excuses us from trying to understand the text as it exists. The surest sign of this is the way in which scholars frequently have trouble explaining why a particular editor or supplementor added his material, much less added it in a particular place and in a particular fashion.[3] The bias towards unity forces us to instead attempt to understand the Priestly text on its own terms, to set aside our own expectations for how an author should present a narrative. We hope that the analysis of the Priestly text offered here has contributed to this endeavor, that it brings the thoughts and intentions of the Priestly author closer to the surface.

Finally, the bias towards unity is practical. As we discussed in Chapter 1, compositional models imply transmission models that must be historically plausible. The larger the number of layers we posit for an individual text, the more ahistorical the transmission model becomes. Any addition of layers and editorial supplements to the Priestly text would have occurred during the preparation of a new copy of P—the only way for every single one of them to have made it into our received Priestly text is to imagine that there was only one copy of P in existence. This may have been the case, but an argument would need to be made to support it.[4] As the case stands

---

[2] Auld 1994 is an admirable example of a compositional hypothesis that was tested by carrying through its logic in order to reconstruct the proposed text. Although Auld's model must be rejected, his method is exemplary. Another sterling example is Robinson, Hoffmann, & Kloppenborg 2000's reconstruction of the Q source.

[3] See Olson 1985: 29 for this issue in Numbers.

[4] The public orientation of the Priestly text—visible in its constant commands to "say to the children of Israel"—combined with its engagement in popular genres such as genealogy and exodus stories, suggests that it was intended for some kind of audience, even if that were only an audience of intellectual elites. This suggests that more than one

now, the mere survival of the Priestly text suggests that, whatever its purpose, its import was such that it was copied and recopied long enough to survive until its incorporation into the final form of the Pentateuch.[5] If more than one copy of the Priestly text existed at a time, as the above evidence suggests, then it becomes increasingly difficult to explain how all of our layers and editorial additions ended up in the same, single manuscript tradition with no evidence of an alternative one. The bias towards unity keeps the number of editorial events to a minimum, thereby ensuring that our compositional model produces a historically viable transmission model.

What We Talk About When We Talk About P

In her review of proposed identifications of the Priestly *Grundschrift* material, Boorer observed that although scholars like Blum, Römer, and Nihan include non-narrative material from Leviticus in their P^g, this "does not have a very significant bearing on [their] conclusions regarding the meaning of P overall…"[6] Our own approach to the Priestly text, with its integration of a variety of non-narrative materials, seeks to avoid this nullification of meaning for such texts. The Neo-analytic framework, in fact, requires an account of the meaning and purpose for the inclusion of so many pre-existing texts into a narrative framework built around Israelite antiquity. Here we will offer a brief sketch of the implications of our model for how we should understand the work of the Priestly author.

---

copy of this text existed, just as the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, a long, genealogical-poetic text was copied and referenced extensively in the Hellenic world (see West 1985: 1-11).

[5] How impressive this feat is depends on the date of P's composition relative to the JEPD redaction, but for the minority group who view P as a pre-exilic text, its copying tradition survived the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. Related to the issue of P's incorporation into the Pentateuch, we should also at least consider that there were other texts that have not come down to us that retold the story of Israel's national origin. That R worked with JE, P, and D does not mean that he did not have other options. His choice could, instead, suggest the importance of these particular works.

[6] Boorer 2016: 69. See also, Rendtorff 1993: 76: "But even among those who would not accept Noth's rigid separation of the cultic and legal material from P the majority would see P as a work structured by a narration that begins with creation and leads through to the borders of the promised land. For many of those the relation of the cultic and legal material to the basic narration is a rather difficult problem."

The adoption of the Neo-analytic framework means that we must be careful with how we speak of the Priestly text and the Priestly author's work—much that belongs to the Priestly text is not by the Priestly author. We must learn to distinguish between what is by the Priestly author and what is part of the Priestly text. The Neo-analytic framework has implications for both of these levels of analysis.

In arguing that the non-narrative materials embedded in the Priestly text are drawn from archives, we leave scholars with both more and less material for the study of the development of cultic practice in ancient Judah. Less, because the numerous layers in the Priestly text that have been posited as reflecting the slow refinement and evolution of cultic-ritual activity and their related ideologies have been shown to be illusory. However, the Neo-analytic framework nevertheless points the way to a richer understanding of such activity, by suggesting that the Priestly text preserves within it the remains of what would have once been kept in a temple archive in Jerusalem. At the very least, these materials point towards the breadth of some of those archives. By taking the investigation of these materials out of the realm of the Priestly text itself and into the realm of temple-based practice and disciplinary-scribal training, we may be able to gain different kinds of insights into these materials than those that have been traditionally gained.

In other words, the Neo-analytic framework proposes that when we study the content of a text like Leviticus 1 or Numbers 5, we are only incidentally studying the Priestly text. What we are, in fact, studying is an archival text that once had a place in a particular disciplinary matrix. These texts only express the views of the Priestly author insofar as the Priestly author stood in a stream of tradition of which these texts were also a part.[7] The conservative manner in which he treated these materials—including the lack of harmonization across disparate texts and the non-

[7] For the concept of the "stream of tradition" in relationship to Mesopotamian texts, see Oppenheim 1977: 7-30.

homogenization within individual texts—indicates that he shares a worldview with these materials, but that we would be remiss to take them individually as reflecting his own thoughts. We must, then, treat these texts as the reflections of a real culture—of disciplinary specialization and actual practice—rather than as repositories of the abstract theology of the Priestly author. Stated plainly—there is theology embedded in these texts, but that is not their "point."[8] Studies of the non-narrative materials embedded in the Priestly text are wonderful and provide insight into the religious world of ancient Judah, but they do not provide insight into the Priestly author in any special or unique way.

Where, then, do we locate the work of the Priestly author? Several fruitful avenues of inquiry suggest themselves. Among the most productive that arise out of the Neo-analytic framework are the queries into why the Priestly author felt the need to include such texts in his narrative at all, why he put them into the narrative contexts he put them in, why he arranged them in the order they are given, and to what degree his reconstruction of the Israelite past is founded in antiquarian interest. These types of questions will allow us to gain a new understanding of the project of the Priestly author, and it is to these questions that we must turn if we want to gain insight into his work—rather than insight into the larger cultural framework within which he worked. In other words, the method and purpose of the Priestly author is not found in the details of these collections, but in an analysis of their selection (presumably from a larger corpus), of their arrangement and grouping, and of their contextualization in his narrative. The decision to embed traditional, practical texts into a larger narrative is the decision of an intellect attempting to understand his own culture's tradition. The Priestly author's work

[8] See Cornford 1967: 28-46 for the concept of the "unwritten philosophy" that must be distinguished from the subjects under discussion in a particular text.

deserves attention in these terms—studies on how he arrived at his view of the Israelite past and what he means to communicate about that past through the form of his work.

When we approach the Priestly author in this fashion, we gain an image of a deeply curious writer who attempted to account for a variety of phenomena in his reconstruction of Israelite national origins. His work calls to mind the work of Greek mythographers, who attempted to integrate a variety of their own culture's materials into a coherent framework that linked the mythical past with the historical era.[9] The question of the extent to which the Priestly author is serious about his reconstruction of the past is one worth addressing anew in light of this parallel and in light of the Neo-analytic model.[10]

We hope in future studies to address precisely these issues. In continuing to seek the Priestly author from a Neo-analytic perspective, we hope ultimately to show that his work, the Priestly text, deserves its place as one of the crowning achievements of the Judahite intellectual tradition.

[9] For orientation towards mythography and its relationship to historiography, see Fowler 1996; 2000; 2006; 2013.
[10] Lohfink 1994: 156-157 also makes this comparison, though at a chronological level as well as a generic one, ultimately Lohfink 1994: 149-163, incorrectly, rejects the attempt to view the Priestly text as serious about antiquarian issues.

REFERENCES

Achenbach, Reinhard

2003 *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuchs im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

2013 "Complementary Readings of the Torah in the Priestly Texts of Numbers 15." In *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, edited by C. Frevel, T. Pola, and A. Schart, 201-232. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli

1992 "Septuagintal Translation Techniques—A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account." In *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Manchester, 1990*, edited by G.J. Brooke & B. Lindars, 381-402. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.

Aharoni, Yohanan

1979 *The Land of the Bible*. Revised edition. Translated by A.F. Rainey. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

1981 *Arad Inscriptions*. A.F. Rainey, ed. Translated by Judith Ben-Or. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Aḥituv, Shmuel

2008 *Echoes from the Past*. Translated by A.F. Rainey. Jerusalem: Carta.

2012 "A Rejoinder to Nadav Na'aman's 'A New Appraisal of the Silver Amulets from Ketef Hinnom.'" *Israel Exploration Journal* 62.2: 223-232.

Aḥituv, Shmuel and Esther Eshel

2015 *To Yahweh Teiman and His Ashera, the Inscriptions and Drawings from Kuntillet ʿAjrud*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Aḥituv, Shmuel, Esther Eshel, and Ze'ev Meshel

2012 "The Inscriptions." In *Kuntillet ʿAjrud (Ḥorvat Teman): An Iron Age II Religious Site on the Judah-Sinai Border*, edited by Z. Meshel & L. Freud, 73-142. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Al-Rawi, F.N.H. and J.A. Black

1989 "The Second Tablet of 'Išum and Erra.'" *Iraq* 51: 111-122.

Albertz, Rainer

1994 *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. 2 volumes. Translated by John Bowden. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

2007 "The Canonical Alignment of the Book of Joshua." In *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, edited by O. Lipschits, G.N. Knoppers, R. Albertz, 287-303. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

2013 "A Pentateuchal Redaction in the Book of Numbers? The Late Priestly Layers of Num 25-36." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 125.2: 220-233.

Annus, Amar

2001 *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Anzu*. State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts 3. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.

Arie, Eran, Baruch Rosen, and Dvory Namdar

2020 "Cannabis and Frankincense at the Judahite Shrine of Arad." *Tel Aviv* 47.1: 5-28.

Arnold, Bill T.

2014 "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative (Genesis 6:9-9:29)." In *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus*, edited by B.T. Arnold, N.L. Erickson, & J.H. Walkton, 13-40. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

2017 "The Holiness Redaction of the Abrahamic Covenant (Genesis 17)." In *Partners with God: Theological and Critical Readings of the Bible in Honor of Marvin A. Sweeney*, edited by S.L. Birdsong & S. Frolov, 51-61. Claremont: Claremont Press.

Artus, Olivier

1997 *Etudes sur le livre des Nombres: Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1-20,13*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Ashley, Timothy R.

1993 *The Book of Numbers*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Auld, Graeme

1980 *Joshua, Moses and the Land: Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

1994 *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

1998 *Joshua Retold*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

2003 "Leviticus: After Exodus and Before Numbers." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, 41-54. SVT 93. Leiden: Brill.

Avigad, Nahman and Benjamin Sass

1997 *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

Awabdy, Mark A.

2019 "The Holiness Contribution to the Hexateuch in Numbers 20-36* and Deuteronomy 32*." *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 25: 247-258.

Baden, Joel

2009a "Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Condiderations." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 13-29. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

2009b *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. FAT 68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2010 "The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 122: 491-504.

2012 *The Composition of the Pentateuch*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

2013a "Source Stratification, Secondary Additions, and the Documentary Hypothesis in the Book of Numbers: The Case of Numbers 17." In *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, edited by C. Frevel, T. Pola, and A. Schart, 233-247. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2013b "The Structure and Substance of Numbers 15." *Vetus Testamentum* 63: 351-367.

Baentsch, Bruno

1903 *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Baker, David W.

1987 "Leviticus 1-7 and the Punic Tariffs: A Form Critical Comparison." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99, no. 2: 188-197.

Barcina, Cristina

2017 "The Conceptualization of the *Akitu* under the Sargonids: Some Reflections." *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 23: 91-129.

Barkay, Gabriel, Marilyn J. Lundberg, Andrew G. Vaugn, Bruce Zuckerman

2004 "The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A New Edition and Evaluation." *Bulletin for the American Schools of Oriental Research* 334: 41-71.

Bauks, Michaela

2003 "'Une histoire sans fin' - L'impasse herméneutique de la notion de 'pays' dans l'oeuvre sacerdotale (Pg): Quelques réflexions suite à la lecture d'un livre récent." *Études théologiques et religieuses* 78.2: 255-268.

Bean, Adam L., Christopher A. Rollston, P. Kyle McCarter, and Stefan J. Wimmer

2018 "An Inscribed Altar from the Khirbat Ataruz Moabite Sanctuary." *Levant* 50.2: 211-236.

Beer, Georg

1941 "Review of Noth 1938." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 66.3/4: 78-79.

Beit-Arieh, Itzhaq

1983 "A First Temple Period Census Document." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 115, no. 2: 105-108.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph

1976 "The Structure of P." *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 38, no. 3: 275-292.

1996 "An Assessment of the Alleged Pre-Exilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108: 495-518.

2009 "Abraham as Paradigm in the Priestly History in Genesis." *JBL* 128, no. 2: 225-241.

2012 "The Baal Peor Episode Revisited (Num 25,1-18)." *Biblica* 93.1: 86-97.

Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth

1992 *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs about the Dead*. JSOTSup 123. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

2018 "Death and Burial in Eighth-Century Judah." In *Archaeology and History of Eighth-Century Judah*, edited by Zev I. Farber and Jacob L. Wright, 365-378. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Blum, Erhard

1990 *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 189. Berlin: de Gruyter.

2009 "Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 31-44. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Boling, Robert G. and G. Ernest Wright

1982 *Joshua*. Anchor Bible v. 6. New York: Doubleday.

Boorer, Suzanne

2000 “The Priestly Promise of the Land: Genesis 17:8 in the Context of P as a Whole.” In *The Earth Story in Genesis*, edited by Norman C. Habel & Shirley Wurst, 175-186. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

2016 *The Vision of the Priestly Narrative*. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 27. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Bordreuil, Pierre & Dennis Pardee

2009 *A Manual of Ugaritic*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Boyd, Samuel L.

2021 *Language Contact, Colonial Administration, and the Construction of the Identity in Ancient Israel: Constructing the Context for Contact*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 66. Leiden: Brill.

van den Branden, A.

1965 “Lévitique 1-7 et le tariff de Marseille, CIS I.165.” *Rivista degli studi orientali* 40.2: 107-130.

Brandl, Baruch

2000 “Bullae with Figurative Decoration.” *Qedem* 41 (*Excavations at the City of David 1978-1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh, Volume VI: Inscriptions* edited by D.T. Ariel): 58-74.

Brett, Mark G.

2014 “The Priestly Dissemination of Abraham.” *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 3: 87-107.

Brichto, Herbert Chanan

1973 “Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife – A Biblical Complex.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44: 1-54.

1976 “On Slaughter and Sacrifice, Blood and Atonement.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 47: 19-55.

Brueggemann, Walter

1972 “The Kerygma of the Priestly Writers.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84, no. 4: 397-414.

Byrne, Ryan

2007 “The Refuge of Scribalism in Iron I Palestine.” *BASOR* 345: 1-31.

Cagni, L.

1970 *Das Erra-Epos: Keilschrifttext*. Studia Pohl 5. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Caplice, R.

1970 "Namburbi Texts in the British Museum IV." *Orientalia Nova Series* 39: 111-151.

Carpenter, J. Estlin and G. Harford-Battersby

1900 *The Hexateuch According to the Revised Version*. 2 Vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Carr, David

1996 *Reading the Fractures in Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

2014 "Unified until Proven Disunified? Assumptions and Standards in Assessing the Literary Complexity of Ancient Biblical Texts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133.3: 677-681.

2020 "Standing at the Edge of Reconstructable Transmission-History: Signs of a Secondary Sabbath-Oriented Stratum in Genesis 1:1-2:3." *Vetus Testamentum* 70: 17-41.

Chavel, Simeon

2009 "Numbers 15,32-36 – A Microcosm of the Living Priesthood and Its Literary Production." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 45-55. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

2014 *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe 71. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Cheyne, T.K.

1893 *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Childs, Brevard

1963 "A Study of the Formula 'Until this day.'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82, no. 3 (Sept): 279-292.

1974a *The Book of Exodus.* Old Testament Library. Louisville: The Westminster Press.

1974b "The Etiological Tale Re-Examined." *Vetus Testamentum* 24, no. 4 (Oct): 387-397.

Cholewiński, Alfred

1976 *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium: Eine vergleichende Studie*. Analecta Biblica 66. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Cogan, Mordecai

1977 "Ashurbanipal Prism F: Notes on Scribal Techniques and Editorial Procedures." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 29, no. 2: 97-107.

1980 "Ashurbanipal Prism Inscriptions Once Again." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 32.3: 147-150.

Cogan, Mordecai and Hayim Tadmor

1977 "Gyges and Ashurbanipal: A Study in Literary Transmission" *Orientalia* 46, no. 1: 65-85.

1981 "Ashurbanipal's Conquest of Babylon: The First Official Report – Prism K." *Orientalia* 50, no. 3: 229-240.

Cohen, Mark E.

1993 *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East*. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press.

Cole, Steven W. and Peter Machinist

1998 *Letters from Priests to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*. State Archives of Assyria XIII. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Colenso, John William

1871 *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. Volume 6. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

1879 *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. Volume 7. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Condren, Janson C.

2013 "Is the Account of the Organization of the Camp Devoid of Organization? A Proposal for the Literary Structure of Numbers 1.1-10.10." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 37.4: 423-452.

Cook, Johann

1996 "Exodus 38 and Proverbs 31: A Case of Different Order of Verses and Chapters in the Septuagint." In *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction-Reception-Interpretation*, edited by Marc Vervenne, 537-549. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Cook, Stephen L.

2018 *Ezekiel 38-48*. AB 22B. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cooper, Jerrold S.

1977 "Symmetry and Repetition in Akkadian Narrative." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 97, no. 4: 508-512.

Cornford, F.M.

1967 *The Unwritten Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, Benjamin D. and Susan Ackerman

2009 "Rachel's Tomb." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128.1: 135-148.

Cross, Frank Moore

1947 "The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological and Historical Perspective." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 10.3: 45-68.

1973 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

1981 "The Priestly Tabernacle in the Light of Recent Research." In *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*, edited by Avraham Biran, 169-80. Jerusalem: Keter Press Enterprises.

Crüsemann, Frank

1996 *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law.* Translated by Allan W. Mahnke. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Dalley, Stephanie

1992 "Review of *Fictional Akkadian Autoiography*." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Third Series, 2, no. 3: 429-31.

Davies, Graham

1983 "The Wilderness Itineraries and the Composition of the Pentateuch." *Vetus Testamentum* 33.1: 1-13.

1991 *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Demsky, Aaron

2007 "The MPQD Ostracon from Tel ʿIra: A New Reading." *Bulletin for the American School of Oriental Research* 345: 33-38.

De Vaux, Roland

1965 *Ancient Israel*. 2 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

De Vries, Simon J.

1963 "The Hexateuchal Criticism of Abraham Kuenen." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82, no. 1: 31-57.

Dever, William G.

2017 *Beyond the Texts: An Archaeological Portrait of Ancient Israel and Judah*. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Dewrell, Heath D.

2019 "'Swearing to Yahweh, but Swearing by Mōlek-Sacrifices': Zephaniah 1:5b." *Vetus Testamentum* 69.4: 737–741.

Dion, Paul E. and P.M. Michèle Daviau

2000 "An Inscribed Incense Altar of Iron Age II at Ḫirbet el-Mudēyine (Jordan)." *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 116.1: 1-13.

Dolansky, Shawna

2014 "Deuteronomy 34: The Death of Moses, Not of Source Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133.3: 669-676.

Donnelly-Lewis, Brian

2022 "The Tabernacle Manual: Exodus 25:1-31:18 in Light of the Cuneiform Procedural Genre." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 141.4: 617-633.

Donner, Herbert and Wolfgang Röllig

2002 *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. 5th edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Douglas, Mary

1993a "The Forbidden Animals in Leviticus." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 59: 3-23.

1993b *In the Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*. JSOTS 158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

1995 "Poetic Structure in Leviticus." In *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, edited by D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman, & A. Hurvitz, 239-256. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Dozeman, Thomas B.

2008 "The Midianites in the Formation of the Book of Numbers." In *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, edited by T. Römer, 261-284. Leuven: Peeters.

2015 *Joshua 1-12*. Anchor Bible 6B. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Driver, S.R.

1901 *Deuteronomy*. 3rd edition. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

1910 *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Dupont-Sommer, A.

1948 "Azitawadda, roi des Danouniens: Étude sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe." *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 42.3/4: 161-188.

Dussaud, René

1914 “Les tarifs sacrificiels Carthaginois et leur rapoort avec le Lévitique.” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 69: 70-93.

Ebeling, Erich

1950 *Parfümrezepte und kultische Texte aus Assur*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

1952 “Kultische Texte aus Assur: (Fortsetzung).” *Orientalia Nova Series* 21: 129-148.

Eichler, Raanan

2019 “The Priestly Asherah.” *Vetus Testamentum* 69: 33-45.

Eichrodt, Walther

1970 *Ezekiel*. Translated by Cosslett Quin. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Eissfeldt, Otto

1965 *The Old Testament: an Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Harper and Row.

Elliger, Karl

1952 “Sinn und Ursprung des priesterlichen Geschitserzählung.” *ZAW* 49, no. 2: 121-143.

1966 *Leviticus*. Handbuch zum alten Testament 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Emerson, R.W.

1841 “Self-Reliance.”

Emerton, J.A.

1988 “The Priestly Writer in Genesis.” *Journal of Theological Studies*39, no. 2: 381-400.

Eph’al, Israel and Joseph Naveh

1989 “Hazael’s Booty Inscriptions” *Israel Exploration Journal* 39.3/4: 192-200.

Ewald, Heinrich

1869 *The History of Israel*. Volume 1. Translated by Russell Martineau. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Faigenbaum-Golovin, Shira, Arie Shaus, Barak Sober, David Levin, Nadav Na’aman, Benjamin Sass, Eli Turkel, Eli Piasetzky, & Israel Finkelstein

2016 “Algorithmic Handwriting Analysis of Judah’s Military Correspondence Sheds Light on Composition of Biblical Texts.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113: 4664-4669.

Faigenbaum-Golovin, Shira, Arie Shaus, Barak Sober, Eli Turkel, Eli Piasetzky, & Israel Finkelstein

2020 "Algorithmic Handwriting Analysis of the Samaria Inscriptions Illuminates Bureaucratic Apparatus in Biblical Israel." *PLoS ONE* 15, no. 1: 1-13.

Faigenbaum-Golovin, Shira, Arie Shaus, Barak Sober, Yana Gerber, Eli Turkel, Eli Piasetzky, & Israel Finkelstein

2021 "Literacy in Judah and Israel: Algorithmic and Forensic Examination of the Arad and Samaria Ostraca." *Near Eastern Archaeology*84.2: 148-158.

Fales, Frederick Mario

1973 *Censimenti e catasti di epoca neo-Assira*. Studio Economici e Tecnologici 2. Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente.

Fales, F.M. and J.N. Postgate

1992 *Imperial Administrate Records, Part I: Palace and Temple Administration*. State Archives of Assyria VII. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

1995 *Imperial Administrate Records, Part II: Provincial and Military Administration*. State Archives of Assyria XII. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Fantar, Mhamed Hassine

2001 "Le fait religieux à Carthage." *Pallas* 56 (*Hommage à Dominique Raynal*): 59-66.

Faust, Avraham

2005 "The Settlement of Jerusalem's Western Hill and the City's Status in Iron Age II Revisited." *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästine-Vereins* 121.2: 97-118.

2008 "Settlement and Demography in Seventh-Century Judah and the Extent and Intensity of Sennacherib's Campaign." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 140.3: 168-194.

2012 *The Archaeology of Israelite Society in Iron Age II*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

2018 "Pigs in Space (and Time)." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 81, no. 4: 276-299.

Feder, Yitzhaq

2011 *Blood Expiation in Hittite and Biblical Ritual*. Writings from the Ancient World Supplement Series 2. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Feldman, Liane (see also Marquis, Liane M.)

2017 "Ritual Sequence and Narrative Constraints in Leviticus 9:1-10:3." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 17.

2018 *Story and Sacrifice: Ritual, Narrative, and the Priestly Source*. PhD diss., University of Chicago.

Field, Frederick

1875 *Origenis Hexaplorum*. Vol 1. Oxford: Clarendon.

Finkel, Irving L.

1983/4 "A New Piece of Libanomancy." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 29/30: 50-55.

Finn, A.H.

1915 "The Tabernacle Chapters." *Journal of Theological Studies* 16.64: 449-482.

Fistill, Ulrich

2007 *Israel und das Ostjordanland: Untersuchungen zur Komposition von Num 21,21-36,13 im Hinblick auf die Entstehung des Buches Numeri*. Österreichische Biblische Studien 30. Munich: Peter Lang.

Fitzmeyer, Joseph A.

1974 "Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93, no. 2: 201-225.

Fleming, Daniel E.

1992 *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.

1998 "The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117.3: 401-414.

2000 *Time at Emar*. Mesopotamian Civilizations 11. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Fohrer, Georg

1968 *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. New York: Abingdon Press.

Fowler, Robert L.

1996 "Herodotos and his Contemporaries." *JHS* 116: 62-87.

1998 "Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's 'Catalogue', and the Creation of the Hellenes." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 44: 1-19.

2000 *Early Greek Mythography, vol I: Text and Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2006 "How to Tell a Myth." *Kernos* 19: 35-46.

2011 "*Mythos* and *Logos*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 131: 45-66.

2013 *Early Greek Mythography, vol II: Mythological and Philological Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraenkel, Detlef

1990 "Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im Zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35-40." In, *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, edited by D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, &

J.W. Wevers, pp. 140-186. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens XX. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Frahm, Eckart

2010 "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations: Politically Motivated Responses to the Babylonian Epic of Creation in Mesopotamia, the Biblical World, and Elsewhere." *Orient* 45: 3-33.

2018 "The Exorcist's Manual: Structure, Language, *Stiz im Leben*." In *Source of Evil: Studies in Mesopotamian Exorcistic Lore*, edited by B.G. Van, M. Luukko, D. Schwemer, & A. Mertens-Wagschal, 9-47. Leiden: Brill.

Frame, Grant

1992 *Babylonia 689-627 B.C.: A Political History*. Istanbul/Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut.

2021 *The Royal Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria (721-705 BC)*. RINAP 2. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Frankena, Rintje

1954 *Tākultu: De sacrale maaltijd in het assyrische ritueel.* Leiden.

Freedman, David Noel

1997 *Divine Commitment and Human Obligation 1: Ancient Israelite History and Religion*, edited by John R. Huddlestun. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Freedman, Sally M.

1998 *If a City is Set on a Height: The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma ālu ina mēlê šakin, Volume 1*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum.

Frevel, Christian

2000 *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung Erinnern: zum Ender der Priestergrundschrift*. Herder's Biblische Studien 23. Freiburg: Verlag Herder Freiburg im Breisgau.

2013 "The Book of Numberes – Formation, Composition, and Interpretation of a Late Part of the Torah. Some Introductory Remarks." In *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, edited by C. Frevel, T. Pola, and A. Schart, 1-37. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Friedman, Richard Elliott

1981a *The Exile and Biblical Narrative.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 22. California: Scholars Press.

1981b "From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr^1 and Dtr^2." In *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblicall Faith*, edited by Baruch Halpern & Jon D. Levenson, 167-192. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

1995 "The Deuteronomistic School." In *Fortunate the Eyes that See*, edited by Astrid B. Beck, et al., 70-80. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.

1997 *Who Wrote the Bible?* 2nd edition. New York: HarperCollins.

1998 *The Hidden Book in the Bible*. New York: HarperOne.

2003 *Bible with Sources Revealed*. New York: HarperCollins.

2004 "An Essay on Method." In *LeDavid Maskil*, edited by Richard Elliott Friedman and William H.C. Propp, 1-15. Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

2012 "The *Sotah*: Why is this Case Different from All Other Cases?" In *Let Us Go Up to Zion*, edited by Iain Provan and Mark J. Boda, 371-382. Leiden: Brill.

Frolov, Serge

2014 "The Death of Moses and the Fate of Source Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133.3: 648-660.

Frymer-Kensky, Tikva

1983 "The Tribulations of Marduk: The So-called 'Marduk Ordeal Text.'" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, no. 1: 131-141.

Gabbay, Uri

2014 "The *kalû* Priest and *kalûtu* Literature in Assyria." *Orient* 49: 115-144.

2016 *The Exegetical Terminology of Akkadian Commentaries.* Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 82. Leiden: Brill.

Gadot, Yuval

2015 "In the Valley of the King: Jerusalem's Rural Hinterland in the 8th-4th Centuries BCE." *Tel Aviv* 42: 3-26.

Gadotti, Alhena and Alexandra Klerinerman

2021 *Elementary Education in Early Second Millenium BCE Babylonia*. CUSAS 42. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Gane, Roy E.

2005 *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2008 "Privative Preposition מן in Purification Offering Pericopes and the Changing Face of 'Dorian Gray.'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127.2: 209-222.

Gane, Roy E. and Ada Taggar-Cohen

2015 *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond.* Atlanta: SBL Press.

Garfinkel, Yosef

1987 "The Meaning of the Word *MPQD* in the Tel ʿIra Ostracon." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 119, no. 1: 19-23.

Garr, W. Randall

1992 "The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111, no. 3: 385-408.

2003 *In His Own Image and Likeness: Humanity, Divinity, and Monotheism*. Leiden: Brill.

Gaspa, Salvatore

2011 "The Tax for the Regular Offerings in the Middle Assyrian State: An Overview on Quantification, Transportation, and Processing of the Agricultural Products in the Light of the Middle Assyrian Texts from Assur." *Oriental Archive* 79: 233-259.

2012 "Meat Offerings and their Preparation in the State Cult of the Assyrian Empire." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 75: 249-273.

Geller, M.J.

2018 "The Exorcist's Manual (KAR 44)." In Steinert 2018: 292-312.

George, Andrew R.

1993 *House Most High: The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Mesopotamian Civilizations 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

1999 *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. London: Penguin Books.

2003 *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*. 2 volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2013 *Babylonian Divinatory Texts Chiefly in the Schøyen Collection*. CUSAS 18 = MSCT 7. Bethesda, MD: CDLI Press.

George, A.R. and Gabriella Spada

2019 *Old Babylonian Texts in the Schøyen Collection, Part 2: School Letters, Model Contracts, and Related Texts*. Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 43. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Gerardi, Pamela

1987 *Assurbanipal's Elamite Campaigns: A Literary and Political Study*. Unpublished University of Pennsylvania diss.

1988 "Epigraphs and Assyrian Palace Reliefs: The Development of the Epigraphic Text." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 40.1: 1-35.

1992 "The Arab Campaigns of Aššurbanipal: Scribal Reconstruction of the Past." *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 6, no. 2: 67-103.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S.

1996 *Leviticus*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Gertz, Jan Christian

2015 "Priesterliche Redaktion, Komposition oder Quellenschrift?" In *Abschied von der Priesterschrift*, edited by F. Hartenstein & K. Schmid, 65-93. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Gilders, William K.

2009 "Sacrifice before Sinai and the Priestly Narratives." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 57-72. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Gitin, Seymour

1989 "Incense Altars from Ekron, Israel, and Judah: Context and Typology." ארץ־ישראל 20: 52*-67*.

1992 "New Incense Altars from Ekron." ארץ־ישראל 23: 43*-49*.

Glassner, Jean-Jacques

2004 *Mesopotamian Chronicles*. Writings from the Ancient World. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Gooding, D.W.

1959 *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goold, G.P.

1977 "The Nature of Homeric Composition." *Illinois Classical Studies* 2: 1-34.

Graf, David E.

2016 "Arabia and the Arbians." In *The World Around the Old Testament*, edited by Bill T. Arnold and Brent A. Strawn, 417-465. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Graf, Karl Heinrich

1866 *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments.* Leipzig.

1869 "Die sogennante Grundschrift des Pentateuchs." *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testamentes* 1: 466-477.

Gray, G.B.

1896 *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*. London: Adam and Charles Black.

1903 *Numbers*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Grayson, A. Kirk

1974/77 "The Empire of Sargon of Akkad." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 25: 56-64.

1975 *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Texts from Cuneiform Sources 5. Locust Valley, NY: J.J. Augustin Publisher.

Grayson, A. Kirk and W.G. Lambert

1964 "Akkadian Prophecies." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 18: 7-30.

Grayson, A. Kirk and Jamie Novotny

2012 *The Royal Inscriptions of Sennacherib, King of Assyria (704-681 BC), Part 1*. RINAP 3/1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2014 *The Royal Inscriptions of Sennacherib, King of Assyria (704-681 BC), Part 2*. RINAP 3/2. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Greenberg, Moshe

1983 *Ezekiel 1-20*. AB 22. New York: Doubleday

1997 *Ezekiel 21-37*. AB 22A. New York: Doubleday

Greenberg, Raphael and Gilad Cinamon

2013 "Stamped and Incised Jar Handles from Rogem Gannim and Their Implications for the Political Economy of Jerusalem, Late 8th–Early 4th Centuries BCE." *Tel Aviv* 33: 229-243.

Greenhut, Zvi and Alon de Groot

2009 "Tel Moẓa in Context." In *Salvage Excavations at Tel Moẓa: The Bronze and Iron Age Settlements and Later Occupations*, IAA Reports 39, edited by Z. Greenhut & A. de Groot, 215-233. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.

Guillaume, Philippe

2009 *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18*. LHBOTS 391. London: T&T Clark.

Hallo, W.W.

1962 "New Viewpoints on Cuneiform Literature." IEJ 12, no. 1: 13-26.

Halpern, Baruch

1981 "Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure – Indications of an Earlier Source." In *The Creation of Sacred Literature*, edited by R.E. Friedman, 35-54. Berkeley & Los Angeles: California University Press.

1987 "'Brisker pipes than poetry': The Development of Israelite Monotheism." In *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, edited by Jacob Neusner, 77-115. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1990 "A Historiographic Commentary on Ezra 1-6: Achronological Narrative and Dual Chronology in Israelite Historiography." In *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, edited by W.H.C. Propp, B. Halpern, & D.N. Freedman, 81-142. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

1991 "Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century BCE: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability." In *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*, edited by Baruch Halpern and D.W. Hobson, 11-107. JSOTSup 124. Sheffield: Sheffield.

1996 *The First Historians*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

2001 *David's Secret Demons*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

2003 "The Assyrian Astronomy of Genesis 1 and the Birth of Milesian Philosophy." *Eretz-Israel* 27: 74*-83*.

2017 "When Chimaeras were Chimaeras." In *Cultural Contact and Appropriation in the Axial-Age Mediterranean World*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 86, edited by Baruch Halpern and Kenneth S. Sacks, 158-176. Leiden: Brill.

2021 "What does Deuteronomy Centralize?" In *Deuteronomy in the Making: Studies in the Production of Debarim*, BZAW 533, edited by D. Edelman, K. Berge, Ph. Guillaume, & B. Rossi, 97-162. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Halpern, Baruch and André Lemaire.

2010 "The Composition of Kings." In *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography, and Reception*, edited by A. Lemairé & B. Halpern, 123-153. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 129. Leiden: Brill.

Halpern, Baruch and David S. Vanderhooft.

1991 "The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries B.C.E." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62: 179-244.

Haran, Menahem

1962 "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81, no. 1: 14-24.

1978 *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1981 "Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source." JBL 100, no. 3: 321-333.

1982 "Book-Scrolls in Israel in Pre-Exilic Times." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33: 161-173.

1983 "Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 54: 111-122.

Harvey, Paul B., Jr and Baruch Halpern

2008 "W.M.L. de Wette's "*Dissertatio Critica…*": Context and Translation." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 14: 47-85.

Hasel, Gerhard F.

1978 "Genealogies of Gen 5 and 11 and their Alleged Babylonian Background." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 16.2: 361-375.

Hawley, Robert, Dennis Pardee, & Carole Roche-Hawley

2015 "The Scribal Culture of Ugarit." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 2: 229-267.

Healey, Joseph P.

1974 "The Kition Tarrifs and the Phoenician Cursive Series." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 216: 53-60.

Heger, Paul

1997 *The Development of Incense Cult in Israel*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 245. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hendel, Ronald

1998 *The Text of Genesis 1-11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hendel, Ronald and Jan Joosten

2018 *How Old is the Hebrew Bible*. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Herrmann, Virginia Rimmer

2014a "The Architectural Context of the KTMW Stele from Zincirli and the Mediation of Syro-Hittite Mortuary Cult by the Gods." In *Contextualising Grave Inventories in the Ancient Near East*, edited by P. Pfälzner, et al, 73-87. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

2014b "The KTMW Stele from Zincirli: Syro-Hittite Mortuary Cult and Urban Social Networks." In *Redefining the Sacred: Religious Architecture and Text in the Near East and Egypt, 1000 BC-AD 300* (Contextualising the Sacred 1), edited by E. Frood & R. Raja, 153-181. Turnhout: Brepols.

Herzog, Ze'ev

2002 "The Fortress Mound at Tel Arad: an Interim Report." *Tel Aviv* 29: 3-109.

Herzog, Ze'ev, Miriam Aharoni, Anson F. Rainey, and Shmuel Moshkovitz

1984 "The Israelite Fortress at Arad." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 254: 1-34.

Heth, Raleigh

2022 "The Stripping of the Bulls: A Reexamination of the Role of Ahaz in Deuteronomistic Historiography," *Vetus Testamentum* (published online ahead of print): https://doi.org/10.1163/15685330-bja10113.

Heth, Raleigh and T.E. Kelley

2021 "Isaac and Iphigenia: Portrayals of Child Sacrifice in Israelite and Greek Literature." *Biblica* 102.4: 481-502.

Hicks, R. Lansing

1983 "*delet* and *megillāh*: A Fresh Approach to Jeremiah XXXVI." *Vetus Testamentum* 33: 46-66.

Hoftijzer, Jacob and Gerrit van der Kooij

1976 *Aramaic Texts from Deir ʿAlla*. Documenta et monumenta Orientis antique 19. Leiden: Brill.

Holmes, Samuel

1914 *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Homan, Michael M.

2002 *To Your Tents, O Israel!: The Terminology, Function, Form, and Symbolism of Tents in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 12. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Horowitz, Wayne

2011 *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*. 2nd edition. Mesopotamian Civlizations 8. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Howard, Margaret

1955 "Technical Description of Ivory Writing-Boards from Nimrud." *Iraq* 17: 14-20.

Huber Vulliet, Fabienne

2011 "Letters as Correspondence, Letters as Literature." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 486-507. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunger, Hermann

1968 *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins.

Hupfeld, Hermann

1853 *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zussamensetzung*. Berlin.

Hurowitz, Victor

1985 "The Priestly Account of Building the Tabernacle." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105, no. 1: 21-30.

1992 *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

1995 "The Form and Fate of the Tabernacle: Reflections on a Recent Proposal." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 86: 127-151.

Hurvitz, Avi

1982 *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel*. Paris: Gabalda.

1983 "The Language of the Priestly Corpus and its Historical Setting – The Case for an Early Date." In *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, edited by David Krone, 83-94. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

1988 "Dating the Priestly Source in Light of the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew a Century after Wellhausen." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100: 88-100.

2000 "Once Again: The Linguistic Profile of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch and its Historical Age, A Response to J. Blenkinsopp." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112: 180-191.

Hutzli, Jürg

2023 *The Origins of P: Literary Profiles and Strata of the Priestly Texts in Genesis 1–Exodus 40*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 164. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ismail, Bahijah Kh. and J. Nicholas Postgate

2008 "A Middle Assyrian Flock-Master's Archive from Tell Ali." *Iraq* 70: 147-178.

Japhet, Sara

1968 "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemia Investigated Anew." *Vetus Testamentum* 18, no. 3: 330-371.

Jeffers, Joshua

2018 "Neo-Assyrian Scribal Practices: The Editorial History of Ashurbanipal's Prism F Inscription." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 108, no. 2: 209-225.

Jeffers, Joshua and Jamie Novotny

2023 *The Royal Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (668-631 BC), Aššur-etel-ilāni (630-627 BC), and Sîn-šarra-iškun (626-612 BC), Kings of Assyria, Part 2*. RINAP 5/2. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Jenson, Philip Peter

1992 *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 106. Shefield: JSOT Press.

Jeon, Jaeyoung

2015 "The Zadokites in the Wilderness: The Rebellion of Korach (Num 16) and the Zadokite Redaction." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 127.3: 381-411.

Jiménez, Enrique

2014 "New Fragments of Gilgameš and Other Literary Texts from Kuyunjik." *Iraq* 76: 99-121.

Johns, C.H.W.

1901 *An Assyrian Doomsday Book*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung.

Joosten, Jan

1996 *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17-26*. SVT 67. Leiden: Brill.

2005 "The Distinction between Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew as Reflected in Syntax." *Hebrew Studies* 46: 327-339.

Joüon, Paul, S.J. and T. Muraoka

1996 *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 vols. Subsidia Biblica 14. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Kataja, L. and R. Whiting

1995 *Grants, Decrees, and Gifts of the Neo-Assyrian Period*. State Archives of Assyria XII. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel

1972 *The Religion of Israel*. Translated and Abridged by Moshe Greenberg from תולדות האמונה הישראלית. New York: Schocken Books.

Kellermann, Diether

1970 *Die Priesterschrift von Numeri 1_1 bis 10_{10}*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 120. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

King, Thomas J.

2009 *The Realignment of the Priestly Literature*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Kinnier Wilson, J.V.

1985 *The Legend of Etana: A New Edition*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, Ltd.

Kisilevitz, Shua

2015 "The Iron IIA Judahite Temple at Tel Moza." *Tel Aviv* 42: 147-164.

Kislev, Itamar

2016 "The Numbers of Numbers: The Census Accounts in the Books of Numbers." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 128.2: 189-204.

2020 "The Cities of Refuge Law in Numbers 35: 9-31: A Study of its Sources, Textual Unity, and Relationship to Deuteronomy 19:1-13." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 26: 249-263.

Kloppenborg, John S.

1981 "Joshua 22: The Priestly Editing of an Ancient Tradition." *Biblica* 62, no. 3: 347-371.

2000 *Excavating Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Klostermann, August

1877 "Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs." *Zeitschrift für die lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 38, no. 3: 401-445.

Knauf, Ernst Axel

1992 "Ishmaelites." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, et al., 3.513-520. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Knierim, Rolf P.

1992 *Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9: A Case in Exegetical Method*. FAT 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Knierim, Rolf P. & George W. Coats

2005 *Numbers*. Forms of Old Testament Literature 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Knohl, Israel

1987 "The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 58: 65-117.

1995 *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Knoppers, Gary N.

2000 "Is there a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?" In *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, edited by T. Römer, 119-134. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Koch, Ido, ed.

2022 *Mass Deportations – To and From the Levant during the Age of Empires in the Ancient Near East*. Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel 11 Supplement. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Koch, Klaus

1959 *Die Priesterschrift von Exodus 25 bis Leviticus 16: eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche und literarkritische Untersuchung*. FRLANT 53. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Koch-Westenholz, Ulla

2000 *Babylonian Liver Omens: The Chapters Manzāzu, Padānu, and Pān Tākalti of the Babylonian Extispicy Series Mainly from Aššurbanipal's Library*. CNI Publications 25. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Kohn, Risa Levitt

2002 *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah*. JSOTSup 358. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Kozuh, Michael

2010 "Lamb, Mutton, and Goat in the Babylonian Temple Economy." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 53: 531-578.

Kratz, Reinhard G.

2016 "The Analysis of the Pentateuch." *ZAW* 128, no. 4: 529-561.

Kuenen, Abraham

1865 *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. Translated by J.W. Colenso. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green.

1882 *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State*. Volume II. Translated by A.H. May. London: Williams and Northgate.

1886 *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch.* Translated by Philip H. Wicksteed. London: MacMillan & Co.

Kugler, Robert A.

1997 "Holiness, Purity, the Body, and Society: The Evidence for Theological Conflict in Leviticus." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 76 (December): 3-27.

Lambert, W.G.

1962 "A Catalogue of Texts and Authors." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16, no. 3: 59-77.

1967 "Enmeduranki and Related Matters. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21: 126-138.

1970 "Reviewed Work(s): The Cult of Aššur. (Studia Semitica Neerlandica, 13.) by G. van Driel. *Journal of Theological Studies,* New Series 21.2: 429-432.

1980 "New Fragments of Babylonian Epics." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 27: 71-82.

1991 "Donations of Food and Drink to the Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia." In *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the International Conference held by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of April 1991,* edited by J. Quaegebeur, 191-202. Louvain: Peeters.

1998 "The Qualifications of Babylonian Diviners." In *Tikip Santakki Mala Bašmu: Festschrift für Rykle Borger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Mai 1994,* edited by S. M. Maul, 141-158. Groningen: Styx Publications.

2013 *Babylonian Creation Myths.* Mesopotamian Civlizations 16. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Lambert, W.G. and A.R. Millard

1969 *Atra-Ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Landsberger, Benno and J.V. Kinnier Wilson

1961 "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma Eliš." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20, no. 3: 154-179.

Lauinger, Jacob

2015 *Following the Man of Yamhad: Settlement and Territory at Old Babylonian Alalah*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 75. Leiden: Brill.

Lee, Won W.

2003 *Punishment and Forgiveness in Israel's Migratory Campaign*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

2008 "The Conceptual Coherence of Numbers 5,1–10,10." In *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, edited by T. Römer, 473-489. Leuven: Peeters.

Leichty, Erle

2011 *The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680-668 BC).* RINAP 4. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Lemaire, André

1981 *Les écoles et la formation del a Bible dans l'ancien Israel*. OBO 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.

1992 "Writing and Writing Materials." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary,* edited by David Noel Freedman, et al., 6.999-1008. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Leveen, Adriane

2013 "'Lo we perish': A Reading of Numbers 17:27-20:29." In *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, edited by C. Frevel, T. Pola, and A. Schart, 248-272. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Levine, Baruch A.

1965 "The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85, no. 3: 307-318.

1974 *In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 5. Leiden: Brill.

1989 *Leviticus*. JPS Torah Commentary v. 3. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

1993 *Numbers 1-20*. Anchor Bible v. 4. New York: Doubleday.

2000 *Numbers 21-36*. Anchor Bible v. 4A. New York: Doubleday.

2003 "Leviticus: Its Literary History and Location in Biblical Literature." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by R. Rendtorff and R.A. Kugler, 11-23. SVT 93. Leiden: Brill.

Levine, Louis D.

1973 "The Second Campaign of Sennacherib." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, no. 3: 312-317.

1981 "Manuscripts, Texts and the Study of the Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions." In *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*, edited by Mario Fales, 49-70. Orientis Antiqui Collectio 17. Rome: Centro per le Antichità e la Stori dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente.

Livingstone, Alasdair

1986 *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1989 *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea*. State Archives of Assyria III. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2013 *Hemerologies of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. CUSAS 25. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press.

Lohfink, Norbert

1994 *Theology of the Pentateuch*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Löhnert, Anne

2011 "Manipulating the Gods: Lamenting in Context." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 402-417. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Longman III, Tremper

1991 *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography : A Generic and Comparative Study*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Longman III, Tremper and John H. Walton

2018 *The Lost World of the Flood*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Lupu, Eran

2009 *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents*. 2nd Edition. Leiden: Brill.

Luukko, Mikko

2012 "On Standardisation and Variation in the Introductory Formulae of Neo-Assyrian Letters." *Iraq* 74: 97-115.

2019 "Letters as a Historical Source: How to Use and Deal with Them." In *Writing Neo-Assyrian History: Sources, Problems, and Approaches*, edited by G.B. Lanfranchi, R. Mattila, and R. Rollinger, pp. 229-246. SAAS 29. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.

Lyons, Michael A.

2009 *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*. LHBOTS (JSOTSup) 507. New York: T&T Clark.

Machinist, Peter

2011 "How Gods Die, Biblically and Otherwise: A Problem of Cosmic Restructuring." In *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism*, edited by B. Pongratz-Leisten, pp. 189-240. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Magonet, Jonathan

1982 "The Korah Rebellion." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 7.24: 3-25.

Mallowan, M.E.L.

1954 "Excavations at Nimurd (Kalḫu), 1953." *Iraq* 16: 59-114.

Mandell, Alice

2021 "'Top-Down' and 'Bottom-up' Monumentality at Kuntillet ʿAjrud: The Evolution of the Benchroom at Kuntillet ʿAjrud as a Communal Monument." *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 10.3: 257-282.

Manor, Dale W.

2016 "A Priest's House at Beth-Shemesh? An Incised *qdš* Bowl." In *Tel Beth-Shemesh: A Border Community in Judah, Renewed Excavations 1990-2000: The Iron Age*, 2 Volumes, edited by Sh. Bunimovitz & Z. Lederman, 470-479. Tel Aviv/Winona Lake: Emery Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology/Eisenbrauns.

Menzel, Brigitte

1981 *Assyrische Tempel*. 2 Volumes. Studia Pohl: Series Maior 10. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Marquis, Liane M.

2013 "The Composition of Numbers 32: A New Proposal." *Vetus Testamentum* 63: 408-432.

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr.

1980 *1 Samuel*. Anchor Bible 8. New York: Doubleday.

McEvenue, Sean

1970 "Word and Fulfilment: A Stylistic Feature of the Priestly Writer." *Semitics* 1: 104-110.

1971 *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Mendel, Anat

2011 "Who Wrote the Aḥiqam Ostracon from Ḥorvat ʿUza?" *Israel Exploration Journal* 61: 54-67.

Meyer, Esias E.

2017 "Ritual Innovation in Numbers 18?" *Scriptura* 116.2: 133-147.

Meyers, Carol

1996 "The 'Misplaced' Incense Altar in the Tabernacle Texts of Exodus." In *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*, edited by Michael V. Fox, et al., 33-46. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Milgrom, Jacob

1976 "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray.'" *Revue Biblique* 83.3: 390-399.

1978 "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of Pre-Monarchic Israel." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* v. 69: 65-81.

1990 *Numbers*. JPS Torah Commentary v. 4. New York: Jewish Publication Society.

1991 *Leviticus 1-16*. Anchor Bible v. 3. NewYork: Doubleday.

2000 *Leviticus 17-22*. Anchor Bible v. 3A. New York: Doubleday.

2001 *Leviticus 23-27*. Anchor Bible v. 3B. New York: Doubleday.

2003 "H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by R. Rendtorff and R.A. Kugler, 24-40. SVT 93. Leiden: Brill.

Milgrom, Jacob and Daniel I. Block

2012 *Ezekiel's Hope: A Commentary on Ezekiel 38-48*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Miller, Jared L.

2004 *Studies in the Origins, Development, and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

2013 *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*. Writings from the Ancient World. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Milstein, Sara J.

2017 "Insights into Editing from Mesopotamian Literature: Mirror or Mirage?" In *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, edited by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala, 81-97. Leuven: Peeters.

Moore, George F.

1890 "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 9, no. 2: 201-215.

Moriggi, Marco

2011 "Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions in the Museo di Antichità di Torino (Turin, Italy)." *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 34: 81-94.

Mowinckel, Sigmund

1964 *Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch: Die Berichte über die Landnahme in den drei altisraelitischen Geschichtswerken*. BZAW 90. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann.

1964b *Erwägungen zur Pentateuch Quellenfrage*. Trondheim: Universitetsforlaget.

Müller, Reinhard & Juha Pakkala

2017 eds., *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Leuven: Peeters.

Na'aman, Nadav

2011 "A New Appraisal of the Silver Amulets from Ketef Hinnom." *Israel Exploration Journal* 61.2: 184-195.

Nam, Roger S.

2012 "Power Relations in the Samaria Ostraca." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 144, no. 3: 155-163.

Naveh, Joseph

1979 "Graffiti and Dedications." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 235: 27-30.

Nelson, Richard

1997 *Joshua*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Nelson, Russell David

1986 *Studies in the Development of the Text of the Tabernacle Account*. PhD diss., Harvard University.

Nicholson, Ernest

1998 *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Niditch, Susan

1996 *Oral World and Written Word*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Nielsen, Kjeld

1986 *Incense in Ancient Israel*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 38. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Niemann, Hermann Michael

2008 "A New Look at the Samaria Ostraca: The King-Clan Relationship." *Tel Aviv* 35, no. 2: 249-266.

Nihan, Christophe

2007 *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2009 "The Priestly Covenant, Its Reinterpretations, and the Composition of 'P'." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 87-134. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

2013 "The Priestly Laws of Numbers, the Holiness Legislation, and the Pentateuch." In *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, edited by C. Frevel, T. Pola, and A. Schart, 109-137. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Noth, Martin

1938 *Das Buch Josua*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

1943 *Die Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

1948 *Überlieferungsgeschite des Pentateuch*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.

1957 *Die Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. 2nd edition. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

1965 *Leviticus*. Translated by J.E. Anderson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

1966 *The Laws in the Pentateuch*. Translated by D.R. Ap-Thomas. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1966b *Das vierte Buch Mose, Numeri*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

1968 *Numbers*. Translated by James D. Martin (from Noth 1966b). London: SCM Press, Ltd.

1981 *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated by Bernhard W. Anderson (from Noth 1948). Atlanta: Scholars Press.

1987 *The Chronicler's History*. Translated by H.G.M. Williamson (from Noth 1957: 110-217). Sheffield: JSOT Press.

1991 *The Deuteronomistic History*. 2nd edition. Translated by David J.A. Clines (from Noth 1957: 1-110). Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Novotny, James R.

2001 *The Standard Babylonian Etana Epic*. State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts 2. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.

Novotny, Jamie and Joshua Jeffers

2018 *The Royal Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (668-631 BC), Aššur-etel-ilāni (630-627 BC), and Sîn-šarra-iškun (626-612 BC), Kings of Assyria, Part 1*. RINAP 5/1. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Novotny, Jamie, Joshua Jeffers, and Grant Frame

2023 *The Royal Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (668-631 BC), Aššur-etel-ilāni (630-627 BC), and Sîn-šarra-iškun (626-612 BC), Kings of Assyria, Part 3*. RINAP 5/3. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

del Olmo Lette, Gregorio

2018 *The Private Archives of Ugarit: A Functional Analysis*. Barcino Monographica Orientalia 11. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona.

Olson, Dennis T.

1985 *The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New: The Framework of the Book of Numbers and the Pentateuch*. Brown Judaic Studies 71. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Olyan, Saul

1994 "'And with a Male You Shall Not Lie the Lying of a Woman': On the Meaning and Significance of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5, no 2 (October): 179-206.

2005 "Exodus 31:12-17: The Sabbath According to H, or the Sabbath according to P and H?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, no 2 (Summer): 201-209.

2011 "An Eternal Covenant with Circumcision as Its Sign: How Useful a Criterion for Dating and Source Analysis?" In *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, 347-358. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Oppenheim, A. Leo

1960 "The City of Assur in 714 B.C." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19: 133-147.

1966 "Analysis of an Assyrian Ritual (KAR 139)." *History of Religions* 5: 250-265.

1977 *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*. Revised Edition completed by E. Reiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ornan, Tallay

2016 "Sketches and Final Works of Art: The Drawings and Wall Paintings of Kuntillet ʿAjrud Revisited." *Tel Aviv* 43.1: 3-26.

Otto, Eckart

1997 "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift." *Theologische Rundshau* 62: 1-50.

2000 *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Pardee, Dennis

1978 "An Overview of Ancient Hebrew Epistolography." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97, no. 3: 321-346.

2000 *Les textes rituels.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit XII. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

2002 *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. Writings from the Ancient World. Atlanta: SBL Press.

2009 "A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincirli." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*356: 51-71.

Parker, Robert

1996 *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Revised edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Parpola, Simo

1983 "Assyrian Library Records" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 42, no. 1: 1-29.

1993 *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. State Archives of Assyria X. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2017 *Assyrian Royal Rituals and Cultic Texts*. State Archives of Assyria XX. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Parpola, Simo and Kazuko Watanabe

1988 *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. State Archives of Assyria II. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Paton, L.B.

1896 "The Holiness Code and Ezekiel." *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 7.25: 98-115.

1897 "The Original Form of Leviticus xvii.-xix." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 16, no 1/2: 31-77.

1898 "The Original Form of Leviticus xxi., xxii." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 17, no 2: 149-175.

1899 "The Original Form of Leviticus xxiii., xxv." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 18, no 1/2: 35-60.

Pearce, Laurie E. and Cornelia Wunsch

2014 *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer*. Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 28. Bethesda, MD: CDLI Press.

Peckham, Brian

1968 "Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)." *Orientalia* Nova Series 37: 304-324.

1994 "The Significance of the Book of Joshua in Noth's Theory of the Deuteronomistic History." In *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*, edited by Steven L. McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham, 213-234. JSOTSup 182. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Pedersén, Olof

1986 *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur: A Survey of the Material from the German Excavations, Part II*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 8. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

1998 *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East, 1500-300 B.C.* Bethesda, MD: CDL Press.

Peltonen, Kai

1996 *History Debated: The Historical Reliability of Chronicles in Pre-Critical and Critical Research*. 2 vols. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 64. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Perlitt, Lothar

1988 "Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100.3: 65-88.

Person, Jr., Raymond F. & Robert Rezetko

2016 eds., *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Petersen, John E.

1980 "Priestly Materials in Joshua 13-22: A Return to the Hexateuch?" *Hebrew Annual Review* 4: 131-146.

Petersson, Lina

2019 "The Linguistic Profile of the Priestly Narrative of the Pentateuch." In *Paradigm Change in Pentateuchal Research*, edited by M. Armgardt, B. Kilchör, & M. Zehnder (BZAR 22), 243-264. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Pfeiffer, Robert H.

1923 "Assyrian Epistolary Formulae." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 43: 26-40.

1941 *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Pietersma, Albert

2010 "Of Translation and Revision: From Greek Isaiah to Greek Jeremiah." In *Isaiah in Context : Studies in Honour of Arie Van Der Kooij on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, edited by M.N. van der Meer, P. van Keulen, W. van Peursen, & B.H. Romeny, 359-387. Leiden: Brill.

Pola, Thomas

1995 *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von P^g*. Neukircken-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Polak, Frank H.

2006 "Sociolinguistics: A Key to the Typology and the Social Background of Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Studies* 47: 115-162.

2017 "Syntactic-Stylistic Aspects of the So-called 'Priestly' Work in the *Torah*. In *Le-maʿan Ziony: Essays in Honor of Ziony Zevit*, edited by F.E. Greenspahn & G.A. Rendsburg, 345-382. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Polzin, Robert

1976 *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 12. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

Pongratz-Leisten, Beate

2017 "The Assyrian State Rituals: Re-invention of Tradition." In *Assyrian Royal Rituals*, edited by S. Parpola, xxxi-lxxv. State Archives of Assyria XX. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Popper, Julius

1862 *Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte*. Leipzig: Verlag von Heinrich Hunger.

Porten, Bezalel

1981 "The Identity of King Adon." *Biblical Archaeologist* 44: 36-52.

Postgate, J.N.

1973 *The Governor's Palace Archive*. Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud II. Hertford: Stephen Austin and Sons, Limited.

1974 *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

2010 "The Debris of Government: Reconstructing the Middle Assyrian State Apparatus from Tablets and Potsherds." *Iraq* 72: 19-37.

Pritchard, James B.

1954 *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Propp, William H.C.

1988 "The Rod of Aaron and the Sin of Moses." *JBL* 107: 19-26

1993 "That Bloody Bridegroom (Exodus IV 24-6)." *Vetus Testamentum* 43, no. 4: 495-518.

1996 "The Priestly Source Recovered Intact?" *Vetus Testamentum* 46, no. 4: 471-474.

1998 *Exodus 1-18*. Anchor Bible v. 2. New York: Doubleday.

2006 *Exodus 19-40*. Anchor Bible v. 2A. New York: Doubleday.

von Rad, Gerhard

1934 *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.

Reich, Ronny, Eli Shukron, and Omri Lernau

2007 "Recent Discoveries in the City of David, Jerusalem." *Israel Exploration Journal* 57.2: 153-169.

Reiner, Erica

1960 "Plague Amulets and House Blessings." *Journal for Near Eastern Studies* 19.2: 148-155.

Rendsburg, Gary A.

2007 "No Stelae, No Queens: Two Issues Concerning the Kings of Israel and Judah." In *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class, and the "Other" in Antiquity–Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*, edited by D.R. Edwards & C.T. McCullough, 95-107. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Rendtorff, Rolf

1954 *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift: eine gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. FRLANT 44. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

1967 *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 24. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

1977 *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrit für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 147. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

1993 "Two Kinds of P? Some Reflections on the Occasion of the Publishing of Jacob Milgrom's Commentary on Leviticus 1-16." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 60: 75-81.

Renz, Johannes and Wolfgang Röllig

2016 *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik*. 4 vols. Darmstadt: WBG/Wissen verbindet.

Rhyder, Julia

2019 *Centralizing the Cult: The Holiness Legislation in Leviticus 17-26*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 134. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds.

2000 *The Critical Edition of Q*. Hermeneia Supplements. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Robson, Eleanor

2011 "The Production and Dissemination of Scholarly Knowledge." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 557-576. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rofé, Alexander

1977 "The End of the Book of Joshua According to the Septuagint / סיומו של ספר יהושע לפי תרגום השבעים." *Shnaton* / *שנתון* 2: 217-227.

1985 "Joshua 20: Historical-Literary Criticism Illustrated." In *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay, 131-147. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1999 *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

2002 *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretations*. London: T&T Clark.

Rogerson, John

1974 *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 134. Berlin: De Gruyter.

1984 *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Fortress Press.

Rollston, Christopher A

2006 "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel: The Old Hebrew Epigraphic Evidence." *BASOR* 344: 47-74.

2010 *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence from the Iron Age*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Römer, Thomas

2005 *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*. London: T&T Clark.

2008 "De la périphérie au centre: Les livres du Lévitique et des Nombres dans le débat actuel sur le Pentateuque." In *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, edited by T. Römer, 3-34. Leuven: Peeters.

2009 "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 156-174. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Römer, Thomas and Marc Z. Brettler

2000 "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch." *Journal for Biblical Literature* 119, no. 3: 401-419.

Rooke, Deborah W.

2000 *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roskop, Angela R.

2011 *The Wilderness Itineraries: Genre, Geography, and the Growth of the Torah*. History, Archaeology, and the culture of the Levant 3. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, IN.

Roth, Martha T.

1997 *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor*. 2nd edition. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Rutz, Matthew

2016 *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and their Tablet Collection*. Ancient Magic and Divination 9. Leiden: Brill.

Ruwe, Andreas

1999 *'Heiligkeitsgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift': literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Levitikus 17-26*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 26. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2003 "The Structure of the Book of Leviticus in the Narrative Outline of the Priestly Sinai Story (Exod 19:1-Num 10:10*)." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, 55-78. SVT 93. Leiden: Brill.

Saggs, H.W.F.

1986 "Additions to Anzu." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 33: 1-29.

Sanders, Seth

2009 *The Invention of Hebrew*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

2013 "The Appetites of the Dead: West Semitic Linguistics and Ritual Aspects of the Katumuwa Stele." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*369: 35-55.

2015 "What if There Aren't Any Empirical Models for Pentateuchal Criticism?" In *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*, edited by Brian B. Schmidt. 281-304. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Sanderson, Judith E.

1988 "The Contributions of *4QPaleoExod*^{m} to Textual Criticism." *Revue de Qumrân* 13.1/4: 547-560.

Sapir-Hen, Lidar, Yuval Gadot, and Israel Finkelstein

2016 "Animal Economy in a Temple City and Its Countryside: Iron Age Jerusalem as a Case Study." *Bulletin for the American Schools of Oriental Research* 375: 103-118.

Sarna, Nahum

1982 "Genesis Chapter 23: The Cave of Machpelah." *Hebrew Studies* 23: 17-21.

Schectman, Sarah

2009 "Women in the Priestly Narrative." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 175-186. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich

Schechtman, Srah and Joel S. Baden, eds.

2009 *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich

Schloen, J. David and Amir S. Fink

2009 "New Excavations at Zincirli Höyük in Turkey (Ancient Samʾal) and the Discovery of an Inscribed Mortuary Stele." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 356: 1-13.

Schmid, Konrad

2011a "Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status." In *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, edited by T. Dozeman, K. Schmid, & B. Schwartz, 17-30. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2011b "The Quest for 'God': Monotheistic Arguments in the Priestly Texts of the Hebrew Bible." In *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism*, edited by B. Pongratz-Leisten, pp. 271-289. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

2011c "The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies." In *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*, edited by T. Dozeman, T. Römer, L. Schmid, pp. 11-24. Atlanta: SBL Press.

2018 "Die Priesterschrift als antike Historiographie: Quellen und Darstellungsweise der politischen und religiösen Geschichte der Levante in den priesterschriftlichen Erzelternerzählungen." In *The Politics of the Ancestors: Exegetical and Historical Perspectives on Genesis 12-36*, edited by M.G. Brett & J. Wöhrle, pp. 93-111. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Schmidt, Ludwig

1993 *Studien zur Priesterschrift*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 214. Berlin: de Gruyter.

2002 "Leviten- und Asylstädte in Num. Xxxv und Jos. Xx; xxi 1-42." *Vetus Testamentum* 52: 103-121.

2008 "Die Priesterschrift-kein Ende am Sinai!" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 120: 481-500.

Schniedewind, William M.

2019 *The Finger of the Scribe: How Scribes Learned to Write the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schwartz, Baruch

1991 "The Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood in Leviticus 17." In *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel* (JSOTS 125), edited by G.A. Anderson & S.M. Olyan, 34-66. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

1995 "The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature." In *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, edited by D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman, & A. Hurvitz, 3-21. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

1996a "The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai." In *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: a Tribute to Menahem Haran*, edited by Michael V. Fox, et al.: 103-134. Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

1996b "'Profane' Slaughter and the Integrity of the Priestly Code." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 67: 15-42.

1999 *תורת הקדושה: עיונים בחוקה הכוהנית שבתורה* // *The Holiness Legislation: Studies in the Priestly Code*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

2009 "The Strata of the Priestly Writings and the Revised Relative Dating of P and H." In *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden, 1-12. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Schwemer, Daniel

2011 "Magic Rituals: Conceptualization and Performance." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 418-442. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seebass, Horst

2003 *Numeri: Teilband Numeri 10,11-22,1*. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament IV/2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

2009 "Moses' Preparation of the March to the Holy Land: A Dialogue with Rolf P. Knierim on Numbers 1:1-10:10." In *Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honor of Ed Noort*, VTSupp 124, edited by Jacques van Ruiten and J. Cornelis de Vos, 99-110. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

2012 *Numeri: Teilband Numeri 1,1-10,10*. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament IV/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Seri, Andrea

2006 "The Fifty Names of Marduk in *Enūma eliš*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126.4: 507-519.

Shea, William H.

1977 "The Date and Significance of the Samaria Ostraca." *Israel Exploration Journal* 27, no. 1: 16-27.

Shoham, Yair

2000 "Hebrew Bullae." *Qedem* 41 (*Excavations at the City of David 1978-1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh, Volume VI: Inscriptions* edited by D.T. Ariel): 29-57.

Singer, Itamar

1983 *The Hittite KI.LAM Festival*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Singer-Avitz, Lily

1999 "Beersheba—A Gateway Community in Southern Arabian Long-Distance Trade in the Eighth Century B.C.E." Tel Aviv 26: 3-75.

Ska, Jean Louis

2014 "Old and New in the Book of Numbers." *Biblica* 95.1: 102-116.

Skinner, John

1930 *Genesis*. 2nd edition. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Smoak, Jeremy D.

2015 *The Priestly Blessing in Inscription and Scripture: The Early History of Numbers 6:24-26*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Christopher, R.

1996 "The Literary Structure of Leviticus." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 70: 17-32.

Smith, Mark S.

2001 *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smoak, Jeremy and William Schniedewind

2019 "Religion at Kuntillet ʿAjrud." *Religions* 10.3: 1-18.

Sokolowski, Franciszek

1955 *Lois sacrées de l'Asie mineure*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

1962 *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplement*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

1969 *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Spada, Gabriella

2014 "Two Old Babylonian Model Contracts." *Cuneiform Digital Library Journal* 2: 1-13.

2018 *Sumerian Model Contracts from the Old Babylonian Period in the Hilprecht Collection Jena*. Texte und Materialien der Hilprecht Collection 11. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Speiser, E.A.

1964 *Genesis*. Anchor Bible vol. 1. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc.

Speleers, Louis

1925 *Recueil Des Inscriptions de l'Asie Antérieure Des Musées Royaux Du Cinquantenaire à Bruxelles; Textes Sumériens, Babyloniens et Assyriens*. Bruxelles.

Stackert, Jeffrey

2007 *Rewriting the Torah*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2011 "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath: Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11: 2-21.

2016 "Political Allegory in the Priestly Source: The Destruction of Jerusalem, the Exile and their Alternatives." In *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah*, edited by P. Dubovský, D. Markl, and J.-P. Sonnet, 211-226. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2016b "How the Priestly Sabbaths Work: Innovation in Pentateuchal Priestly Ritual." In *Ritual Innovation in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Judaism* (BZAW 468), edited by N. MacDonald, 79-111. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

2023 "Creation, Sanctuary, and the Priority of the Priestly Story." In *The Pentateuch and Its Readers*, edited by J.S. Baden & J. Stackert, 255-268. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2023b "Scribal Fatigue in Ancient Revisionary Composition." In *The Scribe in the Biblical World* (BZAW 547), edited by J. Barton, et al., 343-370. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Steele, Philippa M.

2013 *A Linguistic History of Ancient Cyprus*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steinert, Ulrike

2018 ed., *Assyrian and Babylonian Scholarly Text Catalogues*. Die baylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen 9. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Struble, Eudora J. and Virginia Rimmer Herrmann

2009 "An Eternal Feast at Samʾal: The New Iron Age Mortuary Stele from Zincirli in Context." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 356: 15-49.

Sun, Henry T.C.

1990 *An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26).* PhD diss., Claremont Graduate School.

Sweeney, Marvin A.

2015 "The Ezekiel that G-d Creates." In *The God Ezekiel Creates*, edited by P.M. Joyce & D. Rom-Shiloni, 150-161. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Tadmor, Hayim

1958a "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 12, no. 1: 22-40.

1958b "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study (Conclusion)." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 12, no. 3: 77-100.

Talmon, Shemaryahu

1993 "The Presentation of Synchroneity and Simultaneity in Biblical Narrative." In *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible*, 112-133. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Tanret, Michel

2011 "Learned, Rich, Famous, and Unhappy: Ur-Utu of Sippar." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 270-287. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Jonathan

2011 "Tablets as Artefacts, Scribes as Artisans." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 5-31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ten Hoopen, Robin B.

2017 "Genesis 5 and the Formation of the Primeval History: A Redaction Historical Case Study." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 129.2: 177-193.

Thackeray, H. St. John

1903 "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah." *Journal of Theological Studies* 4.14: 245-266.

Thureau-Dangin, François

1921 *Rituels accadiens*. Paris: Éditions Ernest Leroux.

Tigay, Jeffrey H.

1982 *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1985 ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tinney, Steve

1999 "On the Curricular Setting of Sumerian Literature." *Iraq* 61: 159-172.

2011 "Tablets of School and Scholars: The Old Babylonian Corpus." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 577-596. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tov, Emanuel

1976 *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 8. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

1999 *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*. Leiden: Brill.

Tropper, Josef

1993 *Die Inschriften von Zincirli: Neue Edition und vergleichende Grammatik des phönizischen, sam'alischen, und aramäischen Textkorpus*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Tucker, Paavo Nataniel

2016 *You Shall Know that I am Yhwh: The Holiness Composition in the Book of Exodus*. PhD diss., Asbury Theological Seminary.

Van der Toorn, Karel

2007 *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

van Driel, G.

1969 *The Cult of Aššur*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 13. Assen: Van Gorcum & Co.

Van Koppen, Frans

2011 "The Scribe of the Flood Story and His Circle." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 140-166. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Seters, John

1999 *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

2004 "Reinhardt Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora, Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte (BZAR 3). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003, 699 pages." *JANER* 4: 177-182.

Vantisphount, H.L.J.

1979 "How did they Learn Sumerian?" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 31.2: 118-126.

Veldhuis, Niek

2011 "Levels of Literacy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by Karen Radner & Eleanor Robson, 68-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vogelzang, Marianna Egberdina.

1988 *Bin šar dadmē: Edition and Analysis of the Akkadian Anzu Poem*. Goningen: Styx Publication.

Wade, Martha Lynn

2003 *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 49. Leiden: Brill.

Waerzeggars, Caroline

2015 "Review Article: Laurie E. Pearce and Cornelia Wunsch, *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer*, Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology (CUSAS) 28." *Strata: Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 33: 179-194.

Wagenaar, Jan A.

2005 *Origin and Transformation of the Ancient Israelite Festival Calendar*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechsgeschichte v. 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag

Wagner, Von Volker

1974 "Zur Existenz des sogenannten 'Heiligkeitsgesetzes'" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86: 307-316.

Walsh, Jerome T.

1977 "From Egypt to Moab: A Source Critical Analysis of the Wilderness Itinerary." *Catholic Bible Quarterly*39.1: 20-33.

Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor

1990 *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Warner, Megan

2015 "The Holiness School in Genesis?" In *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature*, edited by R.E. Gane & A. Taggar-Cohen, 155-174. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Warning, Wilfried

1999 *Literary Artistry in Leviticus*. Biblical Interpretation Series v. 35. Leiden: Brill.

Watts, James W.

2003 "The Rhetoric of Ritual Instruction in Leviticus 1-7." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, 79-100. SVT 93. Leiden: Brill.

2007 *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: Sacrifice to Scripture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wearne, Gareth James

2015 *The Plaster Texts from Kuntillet ʿAjrud and Deir ʿAlla: An Inductive Approach to the Emergence of Northwest Semitic Literary Texts in the First Millennium B.C.E.*" PhD diss., Macquarie University.

Weiershäuser, Frauke and Jamie Novotny

2020 *The Royal Inscriptions of Amēl-Marduk (561-560 BC), Neriglissar (559-556 BC), and Nabonidus (555-539 BC), Kings of Babylon*. RINBE 2. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Weinfeld, Moshe

1970 "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90.2: 184-203.

1972 *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weippert, Helga

1972 "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher." *Biblica* 53, no. 3: 301-339.

Wellhausen, Julius

1885 *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Translated by W. Robertson Smith. New York: Meridian Books.

1899 *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

Wells, Bruce

2012 "Liability in the Priestly Texts of the Hebrew Bible." *Sapientia Logos* 5.1: 1-31.

2016 "Punishments in the Torah and Their Rationale." *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 22: 245-267.

West, M.L.

1985 *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

2003 "*Iliad* and *Aethiopis*." *Classical Quarterly* 53, no. 1: 1-14.

2011 "The Homeric Question Today." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 155, no. 4: 383-393

Westbrook, Raymond

1991 *Property and the Family in Biblical Law*. JSOT Supplement Series 113. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Westenholz, Joan Goodnick

1997 *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*. Mesopotamian Civilizations 7. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Wevers, John William

1992 *Text History of the Greek Exodus*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens XXI. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

1998 *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 46. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Williamson, H.G.M.

1977 *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, Robert R.

1975 "The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, no. 2: 169-189.

Wiseman, D.J.

1955 "Assyrian Writing-Boards." *Iraq 17*: 3-13.

Wiseman, D.J. and J.A. Black

1996 *Literary Texts from the Temple of Nabû*. Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud IV. Alden, Oxford, Didcot, and Northampton.

Wolff, Samuel R.

2002 "Mortuary Practices in the Persian Period of the Levant." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 65.2: 131-137.

Yadin, Yigael

1985 "The Lachish Letters – Originals or Copies and Drafts? / תעודת לכיש – מכתבים מקוריים או העתקים וטיוטות?" *Erets-Yiśra'el* 18: 141-146.

Yoo, Philip Y.

2012 "The Four Moses Death Accounts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131.3: 423-441.

2014 "The Place of Deuteronomy 34 and Source Criticism: A Response to Sergei Frolov." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133.3: 661-668.

Younger, K. Lawson, Jr.

1998 "The Phoenician Inscription of Azatiwada: An Integrated Reading." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43: 11-47.

Zhakevich, Philip

2020 *Scribal Tools in Ancient Israel: A Study of Biblical Hebrew Terms for Writing Materials and Implements*. History, Archaeology, and Culture of the Levant 9. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Ziemer, Benjamin

2020 *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz*. VTSup 182. Leiden: Brill.

Zimmern, Heinrich

1901 *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion*. Assyriologische Bibliothek 12. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrrichs Buchhandlung.

Zuckerman, Bruce

2003 "Pots and Alphabets: Refractions of Reflections on Typological Method." *Maarav* 10: 89-133.

APPENDICES

Appendix 3.1
List of terms and phrases in Leviticus 17-26[1]

Entry	Phrase	Occurrences in H	Occurrences in P	Occurrences outside P
1.	אני יי	50x See Appendix 3.3	24x See Appendix 3.3	
2.	כי קדוש אני יי	19:2; 20:26; 21:8	(cf. Lev 11:44, 45)	
3.	מְקַדִּשְׁכם/הם	20:8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32	Exod 31:13	Ezek 20:12; 37:28
4.	ונתתי/ושמתי פני בְּ	17:10; 20:3, 5, 6; 26:17		Jer 21:10; 44:11; Ezek 14:8; 15:7
5.	והכרתי מקרב	17:10; 20:3, 5, 6		(cf. Ezek 14:8)
6.	הלך בחקות	18:3, 20:23, 26:3		1 Kgs 3:3, 6:12; 2 Kgs 17:8, 19; Jer 44:10; Ezek 5:6, 7; 11:20; 18:9, 17; 20:13, 16, 19, 21; 33:15
7.	ושמרתם ... ועשיתם	18:4; 19:37; 20:8, 22; 22:31; 25:18; 26:3		
8.	חקותי ומשפטי	18:4, 5, 26; 19:37; 20:22; 25:18; 26:15, 43	(cf. Num 9:3)	1 Kgs 6:12; 11:33; Ezek 5:7; 11:20; 18:9; 20:11, 13, 19, 21 (cf. Deut 11:1; 30:16; 2 Sam 22:23
9.	איש איש	17:3, 8, 10, 13; 18:6; 20:2, 9; 22:4, 18; 24:15	Exod 36:4; Lev 15:2; Num 1:4; 4:19, 49; 5:12; 9:10 (cf. Exod 35:29; 36:6; Lev 13:29, 38; Num 5:6; 6:2)	(cf. Josh 3:12; 4:2, 4)
10.	שְׁאֵר	18:6, 12, 13, 17; 20:19; 21:2; 25:49	Num 27:11	

[1] Adapted from S.R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 49-50. Entries added on the basis of Knohl 1995: 14-19, 46-55; Milgrom 2000: 1325-1344, 1405-1406.

Entry	Phrase	Occurrences in H	Occurrences in P	Occurrences outside P
11.	זמה	18:17; 19:29; 20:14		Judg 20:6; Isa 32:7; Jer 13:27; Ezek 16:27, 43, 58; 22:9, 11; 23:21, 27, 29, 35, 44, 48, 49; 24:13; Hos 6:9; Pss 26:10; 119:150; Prov 10:23; 21:27; 24:9; Job 17:11; 31:11
12.	עמית	18:20; 19:11, 15, 17; 24:19; 25:14, 15, 17	Lev 5:21	Zech 13:7
13a.	לחלל שֵׁם	18:21; 19:12; 20:3; 21:6; 22:2, 32		Jer 34:16; Ezek 20:39; 36:20, 21, 22, 23; 39:7; Amos 2:7; Mal 1:12 (cf. Ezek 20:9, 14, 22)
13b.	לחלל קודש/מקדש	19:8; 21:12, 23; 22:9, 15	Num 18:32 (cf. Exod 31:14)	Ezek 22:26; 12:39; 44:7
13c.	חלל	Lev 19:29; 21:4, 9, 15	Exod 31:14	
14.	שבתת(י)	19:3, 30; 23:15, 38; 25:8; 26:2	Exod 31:13	Isa 56:4; Ezek 20:12, 13, 16, 20, 21, 24; 22:8, 26; 23:38; 44:24; 45:17; 46:3; Neh 10:34; 1 Chr 23:31; 2 Chr 2:3; 8:13; 31:3
15.	שבתון	23:3, 24, 32, 39; 25:4, 5	Exod 16:23; 31:15; 35:2; Lev 16:31	
16.	חקת עולם לדרתם/יכם	17:7; 23:14, 21, 31, 41; 24:3	Exod 12:14, 17; 27:21; Lev 3:17; 7:36; 10:9; Num 10:8; (15:15?); 18:23 (cf. Gen 17:7)	Num 15:15
17.	אלילים	19:4; 26:1		Isa 2:8, 18, 20; 10:10, 11; 19:1, 3; 31:7; Ezek 30:13; Hab 2:18; Pss 96:5; 97:7; 1 Chr 16:26
18.	ויראת מאלהיך	19:14, 32; 25:17, 36, 43		

Entry	Phrase	Occurrences in H	Occurrences in P	Occurrences outside P
19.	דמיו בו/דמיהם בם	20:9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 27		Ezek 18:13; 33:5
20.	לחם אלהים	21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25	(Num 28:2?) (cf. Lev 3:11, 16)	Num 28:2; Ezek 44:7 (cf. Num 28:24; Ezek 16:19)
21.	נשא חטא	19:17; 20:20; 22:9; 24:15	Num 9:13; 18:22, 32	(cf. Isa 53:12; Ezek 23:49)
22.	נשא עון	17:16; 19:8; 20:17, 19 (cf. Lev 22:16)	Exod 28:38, 43; Lev 5:2, 17; 7:18; 10:17; 16:22 Num 5:31; 14:34; 18:1, 23; 30:16	Ezek 4:4, 5, 6; 14:10; 44:10, 12 (cf. Num 15:31)

Appendix 3.2
The Use of First and Third Persons by the Deity in P

Text Unit[1]	First Person Verbs[2]	First Person Pronominal Suffices[2]	Third Person Verbs[2]	Third Person References[3]
Gen 1-11 (**17/40/32**; **155**)	(**15**): 1:26, 29; 6:17, 18; 9:3, 5 (3x), 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17	(**16**): 1:26 (2x); 6:13 (2x), 17, 18; 9:9 (2x), 11, 12, 13 (2x), 14, 15 (2x), 17	(**0**)	(**1**): 9:16
Gen 12-50 (**8/22/45**; **180**)	(**30**): 17:2 (2x), 4[4], 5, 6 (2x), 7, 8 (2x), 16 (3x), 19, 20 (5x), 21; 35:12 (3x); 48:4 (3x)	(**15**): 17:1, 2 (2x), 4, 7 (2x), 9, 10 (2x), 11, 13, 14, 19, 21; 48:4	(**0**)	(**0**)
Exod 1-19 (**17/57/53**; **162**)	(**32**): 6:3 (2x), 4, 5 (2x), 6 (3x), 7 (2x), 8 (3x); 7:1, 2, 3 (2x), 4 (2x), 5; 12:12 (3x), 13 (2x), 17; 14:4 (2x), 17 (2x); 16:12, 32	(**17**): 6:3, 4, 5, 7, 8; 7:3 (2x), 4 (3x), 5 (2x); 12:13; 14:15, 17, 18; 16:32	(**0**)	(**4**): 12:11, 14, 48; 16:23

[1] Format: Text Unit (**Number of speeches**/**Number of speech verses**/**Total references to Yhwh**; **Total P verses in unit**). Only the P portions of these sections are being included in the count. The number of speeches are based on the use of the phrases ויאמר אלהים/יי and וידבר אלהים/יי. For the statistics on number of verses in a unit, a verse which is comprised of both P and non-P elements will still be counted as one verse. The source division is from Friedman 2005, with modifications for Exodus 16 from Propp 1998. The verse counts are meant to be approximate and to indicate the relative density of speech in a given section.

[2] Format: (**Total**): References. Note that first and third person verb usage include the format personal pronoun/name + participle or adjective; included under pronominal suffices counts are instances of a pronominal suffix with the infinitive. Not included are the declarative statements "I am YHWH" or "I am El-Shadday," for which, see Appendix 3.3.

[3] Format: (**Total**): References. This heading includes both third person pronominal suffices in the divine speech as well as YHWH referring to himself in the third person (e.g. Gen 9:16: "And the bow will be in the clouds; and I will see it to remember the eternal covenant between *god* and all the life creatures, with all flesh which is upon the earth."). Not included are the declarative statements "I am YHWH" or "I am El-Shadday," for which, see Appendix 3.3.

[4] "I am here" – אני הנה.

Text Unit[1]	First Person Verbs[2]	First Person Pronominal Suffices[2]	Third Person Verbs[2]	Third Person References[3]
Exod 24-31[5] (**7**/**236**/**73**; **246**)	(**25**): 25:8, 9, 16, 21, 22 (3x); 28:3; 29:35, 42, 43, 44 (2x), 45 (2x), 46; 30:6, 36; 31:2, 3, 6 (3x), 11, 13	(**17**): 25:2 (2x), 8, 30; 28:1, 3, 4, 41; 29:1, 43, 44, 46; 30:30, 31; 31:13 (2x), 17	(**3**): 31:17 (3x)	(**28**): 27:21; 28:12, 29, 30 (2x), 35, 38; 29:11, 18 (2x), 23, 24, 25 (2x) , 26, 28, 41, 42; 30:8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 37; 31:15[6]
Exod 34-40 (**1/14/2**; **221**)	(**0**)	(**2**): 40:13, 15	(**0**)	(**0**)[7]
Lev 1-7 (**9/159/76**; **172**)	(**3**): 6:10; 7:34 (2x)	(**1**): 6:10	(**0**)	(**72**): 1:2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17; 2:1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11 (2x), 12, 13(?), 14, 16; 3:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16; 4:2, 3, 4 (2x), 6, 7, 13, 15 (2x), 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 31, 35; 5:6, 7, 12, 15 (2x), 17, 19, 21, 25, 26; 6:7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18; 7:5, 11, 14, 20, 21, 25, 29 (2x), 30 (2x)
Lev 8-16 (**9/237/31**; **318**)	(**7**): 10:3 (2x); 11:44[8], 45[8]; 14:34 (2x); 16:2	(**2**): 10:3; 15:31	(**1**): 10:11	(**21**): 12:7; 14:11, 12, 16, 18, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31; 15:14, 15, 30; 16:7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 30

[5] The Decalogue is being intentionally skipped, as its assignment to any of the sources is debated.
[6] 31:3 may contain an additional case, but the phrase *rûaḥ ʾĕlōhîm* is likely best treated as "divine spirit" (Propp 2006: 487-488).
[7] Moses does report Yhwh's speech twice in 35:1-3 and again in 35:4-19. The 3rd person references to Yhwh are presumed to be part of Moses' indirect reporting of statements, but for completeness' sake, the statistics are: (**4**): 35:2, 5 (2x), 10.
[8] "I am holy"- קדש אני.

Text Unit[1]	First Person Verbs[2]	First Person Pronominal Suffices[2]	Third Person Verbs[2]	Third Person References[3]
Lev 17-26[9] (**17/312/236**; **335**)	(**87**): 17:10 (2x), 11, 12, 14; 18:3, 24, 25; 19:2[8], 36; 20:3 (2x), 5 (2x), 6 (2x), 8, 22, 23 (2x), 24 (3x), 25, 26[8] (2x); 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32 (2x); 23:10, 30, 43; 25:2, 21, 38, 42, 55; 26:4, 6 (2x), 9 (4x), 11, 12 (2x), 13 (3x), 16 (2x), 17, 18, 19 (2x), 21, 22, 24 (2x), 25 (2x), 28 (2x), 30 (3x), 31 (3x), 32, 33 (2x), 36, 41 (2x), 42 (3x), 44 (2x), 45 (2x)	(**73**): 17:10; 18:4 (2x), 5 (2x), 26 (2x), 30; 19:3, 12, 19, 30 (2x), 37 (2x); 20:3 (3x), 5, 6, 8, 22 (2x), 26 (2x); 21:23; 22:2 (2x), 3, 9, 31, 32; 23:2, 43; 25:18 (2x), 21, 23 (2x), 42, 55 (2x); 26:2 (2x), 3 (2x), 9, 11 (2x), 12, 14, 15 (4x), 17, 18, 21 (2x), 23 (2x), 26, 27 (2x), 30, 40 (2x), 42 (3x), 43 (2x), 44	(**1**): 17:2 (?)	(**75**):[10] 17:4 (2x), 5 (2x), 6 (2x), 9; 18:21; 19:5, 8, 12, 21, 22, 24; 21:6 (4x), 7, 8, 12 (2x), 17, 21 (2x), 22; 22:3, 15, 18, 21, 22 (2x), 24, 25, 27, 29; 23:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 (2x), 20 (2x), 25, 27, 28, 34, 36 (2x), 37 (2x), 38 (2x), 39, 40, 41; 24:3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15[11], 16; 25:2, 4
Lev 27 (**1**/**32**/**16**; **34**)	(**0**)	(**0**)	(**0**)	(**16**): 27:2, 9 (2x), 11, 14, 16, 21, 22, 23, 26 (2x), 28 (2x), 30 (2x), 32
Num 1-10 (**24**/**183**/**49**; **412**)	(**8**): 3:12, 13; 5:3; 6:27; 8:16, 17, 18, 19	(**14**): 3:12, 13 (4x), 41, 45; 6:27; 8:14, 16 (2x), 17 (3x)	(**0**)	(**27**): 5:6, 8, 16, 18, 25, 30; 6:2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21; 8:10, 11 (2x), 12, 13; 9:10, 13, 14; 10:9, 10

[9] Lev 17-25 (**17/269/158/289)**—1st verb (**41**), 1st suffix (**42**), 3rd verb (**0**), 3rd reference (**75**).

[10] I have tentatively excluded the phrase וְיָרֵאתָ מֵאֱלֹהֶיךָ (Lev 19:14, 32; 25:17, 36, 43) from this count. See Note 11 on Lev 24:15 for another marginal case.

[11] It is unclear if this should be understood as a reference to YHWH or if it should be read in contrast with YHWH in the following verse (24:16). See Milgrom 2001: 2115-2116.

Text Unit[1]	First Person Verbs[2]	First Person Pronominal Suffices[2]	Third Person Verbs[2]	Third Person References[3]
Num 11-24 (**18**/**82**/**62**; **183**)	(**28**): 13:2; 14:27, 28 (2x),[12] 30, 31, 35 (2x); 15:41; 16:21; 17:10, 19, 20 (2x); 18:6, 7, 8 (2x), 11, 12, 19, 20[13], 21, 24 (2x), 26; 20:12, 24	(**15**): 14:27 (2x), 14:28, 29, 30, 34, 35; 15:40; 17:20, 25; 18:8, 9; 20:12 (2x), 24	(**1**) 19:2 (?)	(**18**): 14:28; 15:39, 40; 17:3; 18:6, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19 (2x), 24, 26, 28 (2x), 29; 19:13, 20
Num 25-36 (**15/83/16**; **256**)	(**6**): 25:11, 12; 27:12; 35:34 (2x)	(**5**): 25:11 (3x), 12; 27:14	(**0**)	(**5**): 25:13; 27:21; 31:28, 29, 30
Num 15:1-31 (**2/29/23**; **31**)	(**2**): 15:2, 17	(**0**)	(**3**): 15:22, 23 (2x)	(**18**): 15:3 (2x), 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 25 (2x), 28, 30, 31 (2x)[14]
Num 28-29 (**1/69/24**; **70**)	(**0**)	(**5**): 28:2 (5x)	(**0**)	(**19**): 28:3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 24, 26, 27; 29:2, 6, 8, 12, 13, 36, 39
Num 30 Indirect report (**1/14/5**; **17**)	(**0**)	(**0**)	(**0**)	(**5**): 30:3, 4, 6, 9, 13

*For further details of these uses, see Appendix 3.2a and 3.2b.

[12] "As I live" – חַי אֲנִי.

[13] "I am your portion"– אני חלקך.

[14] Note that 15:31 has the only occurrence of a 3rd personal pronominal suffix with antecedent Yhwh in the divine speech corpus in P.

Appendix 3.2a

Uses of the 3rd Person Self-Reference in Divine Speech in P (Genesis-Numbers)[1]

Entry	Use (total)	References
1.	Sacrifices (80)	See entries below
1a.	רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לי׳ (אִשֶּׁה) (13)	Lev 1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9; 3:5, 16; 4:31; 6:8, 14; **17:6; 23:18**; Num 18:17
1b.	אִשֶּׁה...לי׳ (21)	Exod 29:18, 25, 41; 30:20; Lev 2:11, 16; 3:3, 9, 11, 14; 7:5, 25; **22:27; 23:8, 13, 25, 27, 36 (2x), 37; 24:7**
1c.	אִשֵּׁי י׳ (9)	Lev 2:3, 10; 4:35; 5:12; 6:11; 7:30; **21:6, 21; 24:9**
1d.	רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לפני י׳ (1)	Exod 29:25
1e.	קָרְבָּן...לי׳ (4)	Lev 1:2; 2:12; **17:4**; Num 6:21
1f.	קָרְבָּן י׳ (1)	Num 9:13
1g.	קָרְבָּן אלהים (1)	Lev **23:14**
1h.	עֹלָה...לי׳ (5)	Exod 29:18; Lev 1:14; **23:12, 18**; Num 8:12
1i.	עֹלַת תָּמִיד...לפני י׳ (1)	Exod 30:42
1j.	זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים...לי׳ (3)	Lev 7:20, 21; Num 6:17
1k.	אָשַׁם...לי׳ (2)	Lev 5:19; Num 5:8
1l.	לֶחֶם אלהים (6)	Lev **21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25**
1m.	קָדְשֵׁי י׳ (2)	Lev 5:15; **19:8**
1n.	קֹדֶשׁ לי׳ (2)	Lev **19:24; 23:20**
1o.	אֲשֶׁר...לי׳ (8)	Lev **22:3, 15, 18**; Num 18:12, 13, 15, 19, 24
1p.	מֶכֶס י׳ (1)	Num 31:28
2.	Grain offerings (9)	See entries below
2a.	מִנְחָה...לי׳ (5)	Lev 2:1, 8, 11, 14; **23:16**
2b.	מִסַּל הַמָּצוֹת אֲשֶׁר לפני י׳ (1)	Exod 29:23
2c.	הֲנִיף...לפני י׳ (2)	Lev **23:11**; Num 5:25
2d.	בִּכּוּרִים לי׳ (1)	Lev **23:17**
3.	תְּרוּמָה (10)	See entries below
3a.	תְּרוּמַת י׳ (7)	Exod 30:14, 15; Num 18:26, 28 (2x), 29; 31:29
3b.	לי׳ (3)	Exod 29:28; 30:13; Lev 7:14
4.	תְּנוּפָה (9)	See entries below
4a.	לפני י׳ (8)	Exod 29:24, 26; Lev 7:30; 14:12, 24; **23:20**; Num 6:20; 8:11

[1] References from the Holiness Code are in **bold**.

Entry	Use (total)	References
4b.	לי׳ (1)	Num 8:13
5.	Sacrificial rites (54)	See entries below
5a.	שׁחט...לפני י׳ (7)	Exod 29:11; Lev 1:5, 11; 4:4, 15, 24; 6:18
5b.	זבח...לי׳ (3)	Lev **17:5; 19:5; 22:29**
5c.	הַקְרִיב לפני י׳ (8)	Lev 1:3; 3:1, 7, 12; 6:7; 12:7; Num 8:10; 17:3
5d.	הַקְרִיב לי׳ (9)	Lev 4:3; 6:13; 7:11, 29; **22:21, 22, 24**; Num 6:14, 16
5e.	הָבִיא לי׳ (8)	Lev 5:6, 7, 15, 25; 7:29; **17:5, 9; 19:21**
5f.	הָבִיא לפני י׳ (2)	Lev 4:4; 14:23
5g.	נתן...לי׳ (2)	Lev **22:22; 23:38**
5h.	הזה...לפני י׳ (4)	Lev 4:6, 17; Lev 14:16, 27
5i.	הַעֲמִיד לפני י׳ (6)	Lev 14:11; 16:7, 10; Num 5:16, 18, 30
5j.	גּוֹרָל לי׳ (2)	Lev 16:8, 9
5k.	סמך...יד...לפני י׳ (1)	Lev 4:15
5l.	בּא לפני י׳ (1)	Lev 15:14
5m.	שׂמח לפני י׳ (1)	Lev **23:40**
6.	כפר (9)	See entries below
6a.	כִּפֶּר לפני י׳ (8)	Lev 5:26; 14:18, 29, 31; 15:15, 30; **19:22; 23:28**
6b.	כֹּפֶר נַפְשׁוֹ לי׳ (1)	Exod 30:12
7.	Rites in Tabernacle (11)	See entries below
7a.	בְּבֹאוֹ...לפני י׳ (3)	Exod 28:30 (2x), 35
7b.	היה...לפני י׳ (1)	Exod 28:38
7c.	יַעֲרֹךְ...לפני י׳ (4)	Exod 27:21; Lev **24:3, 4, 8**
7d.	שׂים...לפני י׳ (1)	Lev **24:6**
7e.	קְטֹרֶת תָּמִיד לפני י׳ (1)	Exod 30:8
7f.	אֶת־הַקְּטֹרֶת עַל הָאֵשׁ לפני י׳ (1)	Lev 16:13
8.	זִכָּרוֹן (5)	See entries below
8a.	לפני י׳ (3)	Exod 28:12, 29; 30:16
8b.	לפני אלהים (1)	Num 10:10
8c.	נִזְכַּרְתֶּם לפני י׳ (1)	Num 10:9
9.	Sanctuary (5)	See entries below
9a.	מִשְׁכָּן י׳ (3)	Lev **17:4**; Num 19:13; 31:30
9b.	מִקְדָּשׁ י׳ (1)	Num 19:20

Entry	Use (total)	References
9c.	מִקְדָּשׁ אלהים (1)	Lev **21:12**
10.	Incense altar (4)	See entries below
10a.	קֹדֶשׁ־הֶקְדָשִׁם הוּא לי׳ (1)	Exod 30:10
10b.	הַקְטֹרֶת...קֹדֶשׁ תִּהְיֶה לְךָ לי׳ (1)	Exod 30:37
10c.	מִזְבֵּח...לפני י׳ (2)	Lev 4:7, 18
11.	Bronze altar (3)	See entries below
11a.	מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ מִלִּפְנֵי י׳ (1)	Lev 16:12
11b.	הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר לפני י׳ (1)	Lev 16:18
11c.	מִזְבַּח י׳ (1)	Lev **17:6**
12.	Holy Days (19)	See entries below
12a.	שַׁבָּת...לי׳ (5)	Exod 16:23; 31:15; Lev **23:3; 25:2, 4**
12b	שַׁבְּתֹת י׳ (1)	Lev **23:38**
12c.	פֶּסַח...לי׳ (5)	Exod 12:11, 48; **23:5**; Num 9:10, 14
12d.	חַג...לי׳ (4)	Exod 12:14; **23:6, 34, 41**
12e.	חַג־י׳ (1)	**23:39**
12f.	מוֹעֲדֵי י׳ (3)	Lev **23:2, 4, 37**
13.	Be holy (4)	See entries below
13a.	לאלהים (3)	Lev **21:6, 7**; Num 15:40
13b.	לי׳ (1)	Num 6:8
14.	Covenant (3)	See entries below
14a.	מֶלַח בְּרִית אלהים (1)	Lev 2:13
14b.	בְּרִית מֶלַח...לפני י׳ (1)	Num 18:19
14c.	בְּרִית...בֵּין אלהים ובין... (1)	Gen 9:16
15.	Name (4)	See entries below
15a.	שֵׁם אלהים (3)	Lev **18:21; 19:12; 21:6**
15b.	שֵׁם י׳ (1)	Lev **24:16**
16.	Commands (8)	See entries below
16a.	מִצְוֹת י׳ (6)	Lev 4:2, 13, 22, 27; 5:17; Num 15:39
16b.	חָק־עוֹלָם לי׳ (1)	Lev 6:15
16c.	נְאֻם־י׳ (1)	Num 14:28
17.	הַזִּיר לי׳ (4)	Num 6:2, 5, 6, 12
18.	מָעַל מַעַל בִּי׳ (2)	Lev 5:21; Num 5:6
19.	Subject (6)	Exod 31:17 (3x); Lev 10:11; **17:2**; Num 19:2
20.	Yhwh other (4)	See entries below

Entry	Use (total)	References
20a.	לפני י׳ תִּטְהָרוּ (1)	Lev 16:30
20b.	עֲבֹדַת י׳ (1)	Num 8:11
20c.	נְתֻנִים לי׳ (1)	Num 18:6
20d.	שאל...לפני י׳ (1)	Num 27:21
21.	אֱלֹהִים other (4)	See entries below
21a.	קִנֵּא לאלהים (1)	Num 25:13
21b.	נֵזֶר שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת אלהים (1)	Lev **21:12**
21c.	נֵזֶר אלהים (1)	Num 6:7
21d.	יְקַלֵּל אלהים (1)	Lev **24:15**

Note that the data in the above table is sometimes arbitrarily distributed (e.g. some items could have been listed under either 1 or 2 or 5).

Summary of Types of 3rd Person Reference:

Text Unit	לי׳	לפני י׳	Absolute	אלהים	Subject	בי׳
Genesis	(**0**)	(**0**)	(**0**)	(**1**)	(**0**)	(**0**)
Exodus	(**15**)	(**15**)	(**2**)	(**0**)	(**3**)	(**0**)
Leviticus 1-16	(**41**)	(**38**)	(**12**)	(**1**)	(**1**)	(**1**)
Leviticus 17-26	(**39**)	(**9**)	(**12**)	(**15**)	(**1**)	(**0**)
Numbers	(**22**)	(**11**)	(**12**)	(**4**)	(**1**)	(**1**)

Appendix 3.2b

Uses of the 1st Person Pronominal Suffix in Divine Speech in P (Genesis-Numbers)[1]

Entry	Use (total)	References
1.	Grammatical (35)	See entries below
1a.	Infinitive + subject pronoun (10)	Gen 9:14; Exod 7:5; 12:13; 14:18; 16:32; 29:46; Lev **23:43; 26:26**; Num 3:13; 8:17
1b.	Verb w/ prepositional object marker (14)	Lev **26:14, 18, 21 (2x), 23 (2x), 27 (2x), 40 (2x)**; Num 14:27 (2x), 29; 20:12
1c.	הִנְנִי + participle (6)	Gen 6:13, 17; 9:9; 48:4; Exod 14:17; Num 25:12
1d.	Prepositional indirect object (4)	Exod 14:15; Num 14:35; 17:20, 25
1e.	Direct object (1)	Num 20:12
2.	Covenant (31)	See entries below
2a.	בְּרִיתִי (21)	Gen 6:18; 9:9. 11, 15; 17:2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 21; Exod 6:4, 5; Lev **26:9, 15, 42 (x3), 44**
2b.	X בֵּינִי וּבֵין (10)	Gen 9:12, 13, 15, 17; 17:2, 7, 10, 11; Exod 31:13, 17
3.	Yhwh and Israel (11)	See entries below
3a.	Israelites לִי (4)	Exod 6:7; Lev **20:26 (x2); 26:12**
3b.	צִבְאֹתַי (1)	Exod 7:4
3c.	עַמִּי (1)	Exod 7:4
3d.	עֲבָדַי (2)	Lev **25:42, 55**
3e.	כִּי־לִי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבָדִים (1)	Lev **25:55**
3f.	כִּי־גֵרִים וְתוֹשָׁבִים אַתֶּם עִמָּדִי (1)	Lev **25:23**
3g.	כִּ־לִי הָאָרֶץ (1)	Lev **25:23**
4.	Levites (11)	See entries below
4a.	Levites לִי (6)	Num 3:12, 41, 45; 8:14, 16 (2x)
4b.	First-born לִי (5)	Num 3:13 (3x); 8:17 (2x)
5.	Yhwh's, personally (19)	See entries below
5a.	יָדִי (4)	Exod 6:8; 7:4, 5; Num 14:30
5b.	פָּנַי (5)	Lev **17:10; 20:3, 5, 6; 26:17**
5c.	נַפְשִׁי (2)	Lev **26:11, 30**
5d.	שְׁמִי (3)	Exod 6:3; Lev **19:12**; Num 6:27
5e.	שֵׁם קָדְשִׁי (3)	Lev **20:3; 22:2, 32**
5f.	בִּכְבֹדִי (1)	Exod 29:43
5g.	בְּאָזְנַי (1)	Num 14:28

[1] References to the Holiness Code are in **bold**.

Entry	Use (total)	References
6.	Yhwh's commands (27)	See entries below
6a.	חֻקֹּתַי (11)	Lev **18:4, 5, 26; 19:19, 37; 20:8, 22; 25:18; 26:3, 15, 43**
6b.	מִשְׁפָּטַי (8)	Lev **18:4, 5, 26; 19:37; 20:22; 25:18; 26:15, 43**
6c.	מִצְוֹתַי (4)	Lev **22:31; 26:3, 15**; Num 15:40
6d.	מִשְׁמַרְתִּי (2)	Lev **18:30; 22:9**
6e.	פִּי (2)	Num 20:24; 27:14
7.	Holy days (5)	See entries below
7a.	שַׁבְּתֹתַי (4)	Exod 31:13; Lev **19:3, 30; 26:2**
7b.	מוֹעֲדַי (1)	Lev 23:2
8.	Priests (11)	See entries below
8a.	*khn* D לִי (9)	Exod 28:1, 3, 4, 41; 29:1, 44; 30:30; 40:13, 15
8b.	בִּקְרֹבַי (1)	Lev 10:3
8c.	שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קׇדֶשׁ...לִי (1)	Exod 30:30
9.	Sanctuary (7)	See entries below
9a.	מִקְדָּשַׁי / מִקְדָּשִׁי (4)	Lev **19:30; 20:3; 21:23; 26:2**
9b.	מִשְׁכָּנִי (2)	Lev 15:31; **26:11**
9c.	וְעָשׂוּ לִי מִקְדָּשׁ (1)	Exod 25:8
10.	Offerings (6)	See entries below
10a.	תְּרוּמָתִי (2)	Exod 25:2; Num 18:8
10b.	וְיִקְחוּ לִי תְּרוּמָה (1)	Exod 25:2
10c.	מֵאִשַּׁי (1)	Lev 6:10
10d.	אֲשֶׁר הֵם מַקְדִּשִׁים לִי (1)	Lev **22:2**
10e.	אֲשֶׁר יָשִׁיבוּ לִי (1)	Num 18:9
11.	"Before me" (4)	See entries below
11a.	לְפָנַי (3)	Gen 6:13; 17:1; Exod 25:30
11b.	מִלְּפָנַי (1)	Lev **22:3**
12a.	בְּצַלְמֵנוּ (1)	Gen 1:26
12b.	כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ (1)	Gen 1:26
13.	קַשְׁתִּי (1)	Gen 9:13
14a.	אֹתֹתַי (1)	Exod 7:3
14b.	מוֹפְתַי (1)	Exod 7:3
15.	בִּרְכָתִי (1)	Lev **25:21**
16a.	קִנְאָתִי (2)	Num 25:11 (2x)
16b.	חֲמָתִי (1)	Num 25:11

Entry	Use (total)	References
16c.	תְּנוּאָתִי (1)	Num 14:34

Appendix 3.3
Divine Self Declaration in P[1]

Reference	Phrase	Usage/Notes
Gen 17:1	אני אל שדי	Initial declaration to Abraham
Gen 35:11	אני אל שדי	Initial declaration to Jacob (see also Gen 48:3)
Exod 6:2	אני יי	Initial declaration to Moses
Exod 6:6	אני יי והוצאתי	Announcement to Israel
Exod 6:7	וידעתם כי אני יי אלהיכם	"Knowing" motif/Exodus reference
Exod 6:8	אני יי	Speech closing formula
Exod 7:5	וידעו מצרים כי־אני יי	"Knowing" motif
Exod 12:12	אני יי	Passover reference
Exod 14:4	וידעו מצרים כי־אני יי	"Knowing" motif
Exod 14:18	וידעו מצרים כי־אני יי	"Knowing" motif
Exod 16:12	וידעתם כי אני יי אלהיכם	"Knowing" motif/Speech closing formula
Exod 29:46a	וידעו כי אני יי אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי	"Knowing" motif/Exodus reference
Exod 29:46b	אני יי אלהיהם	Speech closing formula
Exod 31:13	לדעת כי אני יי מקדשכם	Sabbath/sanctifying
Lev 11:44	כי אני יי אלהיכם	Explanatory/sanctifying
Lev 11:45	כי אני יי המעלה	Exodus reference/sanctifying
Lev 18:2	אני יי אלהיכם	Opening formula
Lev 18:4	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 18:5	אני יי	Speech transition
Lev 18:6	אני יי	
Lev 18:21	אני יי	
Lev 18:30	אני יי אלהיכם	Speech closing formula
Lev 19:2	כי קדוש אני יי אלהיכם	Explanatory/sanctifying
Lev 19:3	אני יי אלהיכם	Emphatic
Lev 19:4	אני יי אלהיכם	Emphatic
Lev 19:10	אני יי אלהיכם	Emphatic
Lev 19:12	אני יי	Emphatic

[1] Holiness Code references in bold. This phrase occurs 50 times in Leviticus 17-26 and 24 times elsewhere in P.

Reference	Phrase	Usage/Notes
Lev 19:14	אני ׳	Emphatic
Lev 19:16	אני ׳	Emphatic
Lev 19:18	אני ׳	Emphatic
Lev 19:25	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Emphatic
Lev 19:28	אני ׳	Emphatic
Lev 19:30	אני ׳	Emphatic
Lev 19:31	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Emphatic
Lev 19:32	אני ׳	Emphatic
Lev 19:34	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Emphatic
Lev 19:36	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Emphatic
Lev 19:37	אני ׳	Speech closing
Lev 20:7	אני ׳ אלהיכם	
Lev 20:8	אני ׳ מקדשכם	
Lev 20:24	אני ׳ אלהיכם אשר־הבדלתי	
Lev 20:26	כי קדוש אני ׳ ואבדיל	Speech closing formula/Explanatory
Lev 21:8	כי קדוש אני ׳ מקדשכם	Explanatory/sanctifying
Lev 21:12	אני ׳	Emphatic
Lev 21:15	כי אני ׳ מקדשו	Speech closing/explanatory/sanctifying
Lev 21:23	כי אני ׳ מקדשם	Speech closing/explanatory/sanctifying
Lev 22:2	אני ׳	
Lev 22:3	אני ׳	
Lev 22:8	אני ׳	
Lev 22:9	אני ׳ מקדשם	Sanctifying
Lev 22:16	כי אני ׳ מקדשם	Speech closing/sanctifying
Lev 22:30	אני ׳	
Lev 22:31	אני ׳	
Lev 22:32-3a	אני ׳ מקדשכם המוציא	Exodus reference/sanctifying
Lev 22:33b	אני ׳	Speech closing formula
Lev 23:22	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Speech closing formula
Lev 23:43	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Speech closing formula
Lev 24:22	כי אני ׳ אלהיכם	Speech closing formula/explanatory

Reference	Phrase	Usage/Notes
Lev 25:17	כי אני ׳ אלהיכם	Explanatory
Lev 25:38	אני ׳ אלהיכם אשר־הוצאתי	Exodus reference
Lev 25:55	אני ׳ אלהיכם	
Lev 26:1	כי אני ׳ אלהיכם	
Lev 26:2	אני ׳	
Lev 26:13	אני ׳ אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי	Exodus reference
Lev 26:44	כי אני ׳ אלהיהם	Explanatory
Lev 26:45	אני ׳	Speech closing formula
Num 3:13	אני ׳	Speech closing formula/Passover reference
Num 3:41	אני ׳	Passover reference
Num 3:45	אני ׳	Passover reference
Num 10:10	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Speech closing formula
Num 14:35	אני ׳ דברתי	Emphatic/affirmation
Num 15:41a	אני ׳ אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי	Exodus reference
Num 15:41b	אני ׳ אלהיכם	Speech closing formula
Num 35:34	כי אני ׳ שכן בתוך בני ישראל	Speech closing formula/Tabernacle (Exodus 29) reference

Appendix 3.4
Some Trends in Terminology

Term	P	H
טהר	Lev 11:32; 12:7, 8; 13:6, 13, 17, 23, 28, 34, 37, 58, 59; 14:4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 28, 29, 31, 48, 53; 15:13, 28; 16:19, 30; Num 8:6, 7, 15, 21; 19:12, 19; 31:23, 24	Lev 17:15; 22:4, 7
טָהוֹר	Gen 7:8 Exod 25:11, 17, 24, 29, 31, 36, 38, 39; 28:14, 11, 36; 30:3, 35; 31:8; 37:2, 6, 11, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29; 39:15, 25, 30, 37; Lev 1:12; 6:4; 7:19; 10:10, 14; 11:36, 37, 47; 13:13, 17, 37, 39, 40, 41; 14:4, 57; 15:8; Num 5:28; 9:13; 18:11, 13; 19:9, 18, 19	Lev 20:25; 24:4, 6
טֹהַר/טָהֳרָה	Lev 12:4, 5, 6; 13:7, 35; 14:2, 23, 32; 15:13; Num 6:9	
טמא	Lev 5:2, 3; 11:24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 44; 12:2, 5; 13:3, 8, 11, 14, 15, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30, 44, 46, 59; 14:36, 46; 15:4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 31, 32; Num 5:3, 13, 14, 20, 27, 28, 29; 6:7, 9; 19:7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22; 35:34	Lev 17:15; 18:20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30; 19:31; 20:3, 25; 21:1, 3, 4, 11; 22:5, 6, 8

Term	P	H
טָמֵא/טְמֵאָה	Lev 5:2; 7:19, 21; 10:10; 11:4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 38, 47; 13:11, 15, 36, 44, 45, 46, 51, 55; 14:40, 41, 44, 45, 57; 15:2, 25, 26, 33; Num 5:2; 6:12; 9:6, 7, 10; 18:15; 19:13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22	Lev 20:25; 22:4; (?27:11, 27)
טֻמְאָה	Lev 5:3; 7:20, 21; 14:19; 15:3, 25, 26, 30, 31; 16:16, 19; Num 5:19; 19:13	Lev 18:19; 22:3, 5
קדש	Gen 2:3; Exod 28:3, 38, 41; 29:1, 27, 33, 36, 37, 43, 44; 30:29, 30; 40:9, 10, 11, 13; Lev 6:11, 20; 8:10, 11, 12, 15, 30; 10:3; 11:44; 16:19; Num 3:13; 6:11; 7:1; 8:17; 17:3; 20:12, 13; 27:14	Lev 20:7, 8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:2, 3, 9, 16, 32; 25:10; (?27:14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 26)
קֹדֶשׁ	Exod 12:16; 16:23; 26:33, 34; 28:2, 4, 29, 35, 36, 38, 43; 29:6, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37; 30:10, 13, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37; 31:10, 11, 14, 15; 35:19, 21; 36:1, 3, 4, 6; 37:29; 38:24, 25, 26, 27; 39:1, 30, 41; 40:9, 10, 13; Lev 2:3, 10; 4:6; 5:15, 16; 6:10, 18, 22, 23; 7:1, 6; 8:9; 10:4, 10, 12, 17, 18; 12:4; 14:13; 16:2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27, 32, 33; Num 3:28, 31, 32, 47, 50; 4:4, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20; 5:9, 10; 6:20; 7:9, 13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 85, 86; 8:19; 18:3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 32; 31:6; 35:25	Lev 19:8, 24; 20:3; 21:6, 22; 22:2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 32; 23:2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 20, 21, 24, 27, 35, 36, 37; 24:9; 25:12; (?27:3, 9, 10, 14, 21, 23, 25, 28, 30, 32, 33)

Term	P	H
קָדוֹשׁ	Exod 29:31; Lev 6:9, 19, 20; 7:6; 10:13; 11:44, 45; 16:24 Num 6:5, 8; 15:40; 16:3, 5, 7	Lev 19:2; 20:7, 26; 21:6, 7, 8; 24:9
מִקְדָּשׁ	Exod 25:8; Lev 12:4; 16:22; Num 3:38; 5:17; 10:21; 15:40; 16:3; 18:1; 19:20	Lev 19:30; 20:3; 21:12, 23; 26:2, 31
אֹהֶל־מוֹעֵד		
מִשְׁכָּן[1]	Exod 25:9; 26:1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 18, 17, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30, 35; 27:9, 19; 35:11, 15, 18; 36:8, 13, 14, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 31, 32; 38:20, 21, 31; 39:32, 33, 40; 40:2, 5, 6, 9, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38; Lev 8:10; 15:31; Num 1:50, 51, 53; 3:7, 8, 23, 25, 26, 29, 35, 36, 38; 4:16, 25, 26, 31; 5:17; 7:1, 3; 9:15, 18, 19, 20, 22; 10:11, 17, 21; 16:9, 24, 27; 17:28; 19:13; 31:30, 47	Lev 17:4; 26:11
בְּרִית	Gen 6:18; 9:9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17; 17:2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19, 21; Exod 2:24; 6:4, 5; 31:16; Lev 2:13; Num 18:19; 25:12, 13	Lev 24:8; 26:9, 15, 25, 42, 44, 45

[1] It should be noted that this term has two meanings- it can refer to either the entire Tabernacle complex or to the inner curtain of the Tabernacle shrine (this meaning predominates in Exodus 26 & 36).

Term	P	H
עֵדוּת	Exod 16:34; 25:16, 21, 22; 26:33, 34; 27:21; 30:6, 26, 36; 31:7, 18; 34:29; 38:21; 39:35; 40:3, 5, 20, 21; Lev 16:13; Num 1:50, 53; 4:5; 7:89; 9:15; 10:11; 17:19, 22, 23, 25; 18:2	Lev 24:3

Appendix 3.5
The Division of PT and HS[1]

NOTE: "We assemble here a list of all the scriptural passages discussed so far, classifying them according to their school of origin. Several PT sections that were adapted and edited by HS are listed in the PT corpus column and **marked with an asterisk**. HS additions to the passage are marked on the same line in the parallel column. Chapters, passages, or individual verses of JE origin that were edited by HS are listed under the HS corpus and **marked with two asterisks**. Passages of the editorial stratum of HS based on a blending of PT material with JE are similarly marked. [emphasis added]"[2]

HS Corpus	*PT Corpus*
Genesis	
	1:1-2:4a
	6:9-22
	9:1-17
17:7-8, 14(?)	17:1-27*
23:1-20 (?)	
	35:9-13
36:1-43 (?)	
	48:3-6
Exodus	
	2:23aβ-25
4:21b	
6:2-7:6	6:13
	7:8-13
	8:12-15
	9:8-12
9:35	
10:1-2, 20-23, 27	
11:9-10	
12:1-20, 43-49	
16**	
20:11	
24:12-18**	
25:1-9	25:1-30:38*
27:20-21	
28:3-5	
29:38-46	
30:10	
31:1-17, 18**	
32:15**	
34:29-35**	

[1] Adapted from Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 104-6.
[2] Knohl, 104. Note that for Knohl, PT (Priestly Torah) = P and HS (Holiness School) = H.

HS Corpus	*PT Corpus*
35:1-40:38	
Leviticus	
1:1	1:1-16:34*[3]
3:17	
6:10-11	
7:19b[4]	
7:22-36	
9:16b	
10:6-11	
11:43-45	
14:34	
15:31	
16:29-34	
17:1-22:33	
23:2-3, 9-22, 28-32, 38-43	23*
24:1-26:46[5]	
Numbers	
1:48-5:10	1*[6]
5:21, 27b	5:11-31*
6:21b?	6:1-21*
6:22-10:28	
13:1-17a	
14:26-35	
15:1-41	
16:1-11, 16-24, 26-27a, 35	
17:1-18:32	
19:2a, 10b-13, 20-21a	19*
20:1-13**, 22-29	
25:6-18	
	26[7]
27:1-23	
28:2b, 6, 22-23, 30-31a	28:1-31*
29:5-6, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38	29:1-39*

[3] This asterisk is absent in Knohl's work, but its usage here seems to conform to the specifications quoted at the head of the table.

[4] Knohl, 105, n. ad loc., "The words והבשר כל טהור יאכל בשר are, in my opinion, an editorial addition to HS. See I.Knohl and S. Naeh, 'Studies in the Priestly Torah,' in *The Bible in Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin memorial Volum* (Jerusalem, 1994) 601-12."

[5] I don't know what Knohl thinks about Lev 27. According to the index, it is only mentioned in two footnotes (in passing), and otherwise doesn't receive a treatment that I can find.

[6] I have added this entry here, as it looks like there is a lapse in the chart. On page 100 he attributes most of Numbers 1 & 26 (the census lists) to PT. Once again, , my use of the asterisk here seems to conform to the specifications given at the head of the table.

[7] I have added this entry here, as it looks like there is a lapse in the chart. On page 100 he attributes most of Numbers 1 & 26 (the census lists) to PT.

HS Corpus	*PT Corpus*
31:1-54	
32:6-15	
33:52-53, 55-56[8]	33*[9]
	34[10]
35:1-36:13	
Deuteronomy	
32:48-52	

[8] Knohl, 106, n. ad loc., "As I mentioned above (p. 98), I doubt if Num 33:50, 51, 54 are of HS. Perhaps they contain an earlier command of PT, later expended [sic] by HS; thus, those verses were not included in the list."
[9] I have added this entry here, as it looks like there is a lapse in the chart. On page 100 he attributes most of Numbers 33 to PT. Once again, my use of the asterisk here seems to conform to the specifications given at the head of the table.
[10] I have added this entry here, as it looks like there is a lapse in the chart. On page 164, n. 157 he attributes Numbers 34:13 to PT, leading me to suspect that he regards all of it as PT.

Appendix 3.6
KRT Formulae[1]

Reference	Form	Closing Clause
Gen 9:11	לֹא־יִכָּרֵת	כָּל־בָּשָׂר עוֹד מִמֵּי הַמַּבּוּל
Gen 17:14	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Exod 12:15	נִכְרְתָה	מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל
Exod 12:19	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל
Exod 30:33	נִכְרַת	מֵעַמָּיו
Exod 30:38	נִכְרַת	מֵעַמָּיו
Exod 31:14	נִכְרְתָה	מִקֶּרֶב עַמֶּיהָ
Lev 7:20	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Lev 7:21	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Lev 7:25	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Lev 7:27	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Lev 17:4	נִכְרַת	מִקֶּרֶב עַמּוֹ
Lev 17:9	נִכְרַת	מֵעַמָּיו
Lev 17:10	הִכְרַתִּי	מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּהּ
Lev 17:14	יִכָּרֵת	כָּל־אֹכְלָיו
Lev 18:29	נִכְרְתוּ	מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּם
Lev 19:8	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Lev 20:3	הִכְרַתִּי	מִקֶּרֶב עַמּוֹ
Lev 20:5	הִכְרַתִּי	מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּם
Lev 20:6	הִכְרַתִּי	מִקֶּרֶב עַמּוֹ
Lev 20:17	נִכְרְתוּ	לְעֵינֵי בְּנֵי עַמָּם
Lev 20:18	נִכְרְתוּ	מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּם
Lev 22:3	נִכְרְתָה	מִלְּפָנַי
Lev 23:29	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Lev 23:30	הַאֲבַדְתִּי	מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּהּ
Num 4:18	אַל־תַּכְרִיתוּ	מִתּוֹךְ הַלְוִיִּם
Num 9:13	נִכְרְתָה	מֵעַמֶּיהָ
Num 15:30	נִכְרְתָה	מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּהּ
Num 15:31	הִכָּרֵת תִּכָּרֵת	עֲוֹנָהּ בָּהּ

[1] References to the Holiness Code are in **bold**.

Reference	Form	Closing Clause
Num 19:13	נִכְרְתָה	מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל
Num 19:20	נִכְרְתָה	מִתּוֹךְ הַקָּהָל

Appendix 5.1
Adaptations in Leviticus 1-5

Note: In what follows, speech frames are an assumed element of contextualization and will not be specifically mentioned.

Adaptations by speech

Speech One (Lev 1:1-3:17): The Tent of Meeting (1:3, 5; 3:2, 8, 13); Aaron as active priest (2:3, 10); anomalous 2nd person address (3:17)

Speech Two (Lev 4:1-5:13): The Camp (4:12, 21); The Tent of Meeting (4:4, 5, 7, 14, 16, 18)

Speech Three (Lev 5:14-19): None.

Speech Four (Lev 5:20-26): None.

Non-adaptations

-The altar: 1:7, 8, 9, 11 (x2), 12, 13, 15 (x3), 16, 17; 2:2, 8, 9, 12; 3:5, 11, 16; 4:10, 19, 25 (x2), 26, 30 (x2), 31, 34 (x2), 35; 5:9 (x2), 12. Note that this altar is nowhere further defined as "the bronze altar" or "the altar in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting." Compare with the first mention of the altar in Lev 1:5.

-The generic priest: Lev 1:9, 12, 13, 15, 17; 2:2, 8, 9, 16; 3:11, 16; 4:3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 20, 25, 26, 30, 31 (x2), 34, 35 (x2); 5:6, 8, 10, 12, 13 (x2), 16, 18 (x2), 25, 26.

-"Your dwellings": 3:17. Referring to life in the land of Canaan, this is functionally proleptic. Note, however, that this is not made explicit as in Lev 14:33-53; 19:23-25; 23:10ff; 25:2ff; Num 10:9; [15:1-16, 17-21].

-Yhwh referred to in the 3rd person (despite being the putative speaker): 1:2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17; 2:1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11 (x2), 12, 14, 16; 3:1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16; 4:2, 3, 4 (x2), 6, 7, 13, 15 (x2), 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 31, 35; 5:6, 7, 12, 15 (x2), 17, 19, 21, 25, 26.

Commentary: The phrase "the children of Aaron": Lev 1:5, 7,[1] 8, 11; 2:2; 3:2, 5, 8, 13 is tentatively not being considered an adaptation, because this could have been a guild name in the documents used by the Priestly author. This supposition is perhaps supported by the fact that while the term "the priest" appears without a preceding "Aaron" quite frequently (see list in Non-Adaptations), there is not a single occurrence of the generic "the priests" occurring without an accompanying "the sons of Aaron."

[1] The phrase *bny-ʾhrn hkhn* here could indicate that in some places where we read "the sons of Aaron, the priests" there originally just stood "the priest" without further definition. See Nihan 2007: 201-203 for discussion of this phrase in Lev 1:7.

Appendix 5.2
Adaptations in Leviticus 6-7

Note: In what follows, speech frames are an assumed element of contextualization and will not be specifically mentioned.

Adaptations by speech

Speech One (Lev 6:1-11): The Camp (6:4); Tent of Meeting (6:9); Aaron (6:9); anomalous 2nd person address (6:11); 1st person speech from Yhwh (6:10)

Speech Two (Lev 6:12-16): Aaron (6:13)

Speech Three (Lev 6:17-7:21): Tent of Meeting (6:19, 23)

Speech Four (Lev 7:22-27): None

Speech Five (Lev 7:28-34): Aaron (7:31, 34); 1st person speech from Yhwh (7:34)

Non-Adaptations

-The altar: Lev 6:2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8; 7:2, 5, 31. Note that this altar is nowhere further defined as "the bronze altar" or "the altar in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting." Compare with the first mention of the altar in Lev 1:5.

-The generic priest: 6:3, 5, 15, 16, 19; 7:5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 31, 32.

-"Your dwellings": 7:26. Referring to life in the land of Canaan, this is functionally proleptic. Note, however, that this is not made explicit as in Lev 14:33-53; 19:23-25; 23:10ff; 25:2ff; Num 10:9; [15:1-16, 17-21].

-Yhwh referred to in the 3rd person (despite being the putative speaker): Lev 6:7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18; 7:5, 11, 14, 20, 21, 25, 29 (x2), 30 (x2).

Commentary: Of interest is that the very long Speech Three nowhere mentions Aaron as an active priest. The phrase "the children of Aaron": Lev 6:7, 11; 7:10, 33 is tentatively not being considered an adaptation, because this could have been a guild name in the documents used by the Priestly author.[1] In places that read "Aaron and his sons," we might suppose an original that read "the sons of Aaron," again minimizing interference with the sources

[1] This supposition is perhaps supported by the fact that while the term "the priest" appears without a preceding "Aaron" quite frequently (see list in Non-Adaptations), there is not a single occurrence of the generic "the priests" occurring without an accompanying "the sons of Aaron" except when it is making a very general statement about accessibility of prebends (6:22; 7:6).

Appendix 5.3
Adaptations in Leviticus 11-16

Note: In what follows, speech frames are an assumed element of contextualization and will not be specifically mentioned.

Adaptations by speech:

Speech One (Leviticus 11): 1st person speech from Yhwh (11:44-45)

Speech Two (Leviticus 12): Tent of Meeting (12:6)

Speech Three (Leviticus 13): Aaron (13:2), the Camp (13:46)

Speech Four (Lev 14:1-32): Tent of Meeting (14:11, 23), the Camp (14:3, 8), tents instead of houses (14:8)

Speech Five (Lev 14:33-57): 1st person speech from Yhwh (14:34)

Speech Six (Leviticus 15): Tent of Meeting (15:14, 29, 31); 1st person speech from Yhwh (15:31)

Speech Seven (Leviticus 16): Tent of Meeting (16:7, 16, 17, 20, 23, 33); Aaron (16:3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 21, 23); The Camp (16:26, 27, 28); 1st person speech from Yhwh (16:2)

Non-adaptations

-The altar, otherwise unspecified: Lev 14:20; 16:12, 18 (x2), (20?), 25, 33. Compare with the first mention of the altar in Lev 1:5.

-The generic priest: Lev 12:6, 8; 13:3, 4, 5 (x2), 6 (x2), 7 (x2), 8 (x2), 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 (x2), 19, 20 (x2), 21 (x2), 22, 23, 25 (x2), 26, 27, 28, 30 (x2), 31 (x2), 32, 33, 34 (x2), 36 (x2), 37, 39, 43, 44, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56; 14:2, 3 (x2), 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 14 (x2), 15 (x2), 16, 17, 18 (x2), 19, 20 (x2), 23, 24 (x2), 25, 26 (x2), 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36 (x3), 38, 39, 40, 44, 48 (x2); 15:14, 15 (x2), 29, 30 (x2); 16:32, 33. Note that 14:2 does not repeat the "Aaronic introduction" from 13:2.

-Yhwh referred to in the 3rd person (despite being the putative speaker): Lev 12:7; 14:11, 12, 16, 18, 24, 27, 29, 31; 15:14, 15, 30; 16:7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 30.

-References to "the sanctuary" (*mqdš*): Lev 12:4.

-References to "the city" rather than "the camp": Lev 14:40, 41, 45, 53.

-References to "house" rather than "tent": Lev 14:34, 35 (x2), 36 (x3), 37, 38 (x3), 39, 41 (x2), 42, 43 (x2), 44 (x2), 45 (x2), 46, 47 (x2), 48 (x3), 49, 51, 52, 53.

Appendix 5.4
Adaptations in Leviticus 17-22

Adaptations by speech

Speech One (Leviticus 17): Tent of Meeting (17:4, 5, 6, 9); 1st person speech from Yhwh (17:10, 11, 12, 14)

Speech Two (Leviticus 18): 1st person speech from Yhwh (18:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 21*, 24, 25, 26, 30)

Speech Three (Leviticus 19): Tent of Meeting (19:21); 1st person speech from Yhwh (19:2, 3, 4, 10, 12*, 14*, 16, 18, 19, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32*, 34, 36, 37); anomalous 2nd person/when you come to the land (19:23)

Speech Four (Leviticus 20): 1st person speech from Yhwh (20:3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26); anomalous 2nd person (20:7-8)

Speech Five (Lev 21:1-15): 1st person speech from Yhwh (21:8, 12, 15)

Speech Six (Lev 21:16-23): 1st person speech from Yhwh (21:23)

Speech Seven (Lev 22:1-16): 1st person speech from Yhwh (22:2, 3, 8, 9, 16)

Speech Eight (Lev 22:17-25): None

Speech Nine (Lev 22:26-33): 1st person speech from Yhwh (22:30, 31, 32, 33)

* = an *ʾny yhwh* phrase that accompanies a neutral *ʾĕlōhîm*. May serve as explanatory comment.

Non-adaptations

-The altar, not otherwise specified: 17:11; 21:23; 22:22.

-The generic priest: 17:5, 6; 19:22; 21:9, 10; 22:10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

-"seed of Aaron": 21:21; 22:4.

-reference to "the sanctuary": 19:30; 20:3; 21:12 (x2), 23

-Yhwh referred to in the 3rd person (despite being the putative speaker): 17:4 (2x), 5 (2x), 6 (2x), 9; 18:21; 19:5, 8, 12, 21, 22, 24; 21:6 (4x), 7, 8, 12 (2x), 17, 21 (2x), 22; 22:3, 15, 18, 21, 22 (2x), 24, 25, 27, 29.

Commentary: Lev 21:9; 22:12-13 have *bt khn*. This is a marginal case—it is unclear whether this would have been rendered "daughter of Aaron, the priest" even had the Priestly author decided to adapt this text further.

Appendix 5.5
Adaptations in Leviticus 23-25

Adaptations

Speech One (Lev 23:1-8): 1st person speech from Yhwh (23:2)

Speech Two (Lev 23:9-25): 1st person speech from Yhwh (23:10, 22)

Speech Three (Lev 23:23-25): None

Speech Four (Lev 23:26-32): 1st person speech from Yhwh (23:30)

Speech Five (Lev 23:33-43): 1st person speech from Yhwh (23:43)

Speech Six (Lev 24:1-9): Tent of Meeting (24:3); Aaron (24:3, 9)

Speech Seven (Lev 24:13-22)*: 1st person speech from Yhwh (24:22)

Speech Eight (Lev 25:1-26:2)**: 1st person speech from Yhwh (25:2, 17, 18, 21, 23, 38, 42, 55; 26:1, 2)

*Note that this speech is embedded in narrative and may not reflect an underlying text.
**After Lev 26:2, the text shifts to a promises and threats segment that may or may not reflect an underlying text.

Non-adaptations

-The generic priest: Lev 23:10, 11, 20 (x2)

-Reference to "the sanctuary": 26:2

-Dwellings in the land: 23:3, 14, 17, 21, 31

-Yhwh referred to in the 3rd person (despite being the putative speaker): 23:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 (2x), 20 (2x), 25, 27, 28, 34, 36 (2x), 37 (2x), 38 (2x), 39, 40, 41; 24:3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16; 25:2, 4

Commentary: The use of the phrase *ʾny yhwh* in Lev 23:22, in a location not quite at the end of this speech is interesting. The fact that it accompanies a command with a parallel in Lev 19:9-10, which also ends with this phrase suggests that this may serve as a cross-reference. Alternatively, if the *ʾny yhwh* statements are native to Leviticus 19, the speech here may reflect a composite document that excerpted this line from Leviticus 19's underlying document. A looser example might be found in Lev 25:17, echoing 19:11-18.