“IT IS COMMONLY THOUGHT AND WIDELY ACCEPTED:”

A REEVALUATION OF THE HOLINESS CODE

by

TYLER EDWARD KELLEY

(Under the Direction of Richard Elliott Friedman)

ABSTRACT

In scholarship there occasionally arises an idea which grows to be unquestioningly accepted. One such idea within the study of the Priestly text of the Torah (P) is that Leviticus 17-26 is a work known as the Holiness Code (H). Recently this idea has grown in importance due to the work of Israel Knohl and Jacob Milgrom, who both have endeavored to reattribute an entire stratum of writings within P to the author(s) of H. Their work has such far reaching implications that it has become necessary to undertake a reevaluation of both their theory and their original premise: namely, whether Leviticus 17-26 does comprise a body of literature separate from P. Through an examination of the criteria used to identify the Holiness Code, it will be argued that Leviticus 17-26 constitutes an integrated and integral part of P as envisioned by the tradent responsible for its composition and compilation.

INDEX WORDS: Priestly Text, Holiness Code, Leviticus, Compositional Criticism, Torah, Pentateuch, Israel Knohl, Jacob Milgrom

“IT IS COMMONLY THOUGHT AND WIDELY ACCEPTED:”

A REEVALUATION OF THE HOLINESS CODE

by

TYLER EDWARD KELLEY

BA, University of Georgia, 2011

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

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2014

“IT IS COMMONLY THOUGHT AND WIDELY ACCEPTED:”

A REEVALUATION OF THE HOLINESS CODE

by

TYLER EDWARD KELLEY

Major Professor:	Richard Elliott Friedman
Committee:	Baruch Halpern Carolyn Jones Medine

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2014

DEDICATION

אוּלַי יֵשׁ תִּקְוָה

“Perhaps hope exists.”

-Lamentations 3:29b

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sine qua non: Dr. Richard Elliott Friedman, Dr. B Halpern, Dr. Carolyn Medine, and Amanda Smith. Without your time, support, infectious passion, and humor this would not exist.

Thanks to my family, especially my mother and my father, who have supported and encouraged me. Thanks as well to my children, Charlotte and James, who had to hear more about the Bible than they probably ever cared to and who had to exercise more patience than anyone else in the process.

And thanks to my friends who helped bear the stress, especially: Josh Patterson and Riley Kleckley, David Callaway, David Price, Umesh Patel, Jacob Dunn, Raleigh Heth, Caroline Piotrowski, and Jessica Scott. My warm thanks as well to the others who helped shape both this thesis and my time in the MA program: Dr. Jodie Lyon, Dr. Robert Foster, and Dr. Joel Hunt. My thanks as well to Dr. Russell Kirkland, who first pointed out to me the problems of protestant scholarship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

CHAPTER

1 "YOU WILL BE HOLY, FOR I, YHWH YOUR GOD, AM HOLY": THE CLASSICAL VIEW OF H 1

1.1 Traditional Criteria for the Separation of H 3

1.2 Other Grounds for the Separation of H 29

1.3 Arguments for the Unity of P and H 35

2 "I AM YHWH": THE KNOHL-MILGROM HYPOTHESIS 39

2.1 Some Presuppositions of Knohl's Analysis 40

2.2 Sample Issues in Knohl's Analysis 54

2.3 A Survey of P's Sabbath Passages 59

2.4 Examination of Knohl's Derived Criteria 66

2.5 Further Issues in Knohl's Analysis 87

REFERENCES 91

APPENDICES

1 List of terms and phrases in Leviticus 17-26 95

2 The Use of First and Third Persons by the Deity in P 97

3 Divine Self Declaration in P 100

4 Some Trends in Terminology 103

5 Knohl's Division of PT and HS 107

6 *KRT* Formulae 110

CHAPTER 1. "YOU WILL BE HOLY, FOR I, YHWH YOUR GOD, AM HOLY": THE CLASSICAL VIEW OF H

In scholarship an idea occasionally arises that grows to be unquestioningly accepted, almost unanimously agreed upon. When these ideas take hold, they are often employed with little reflection or defense, with arguments and theories being built around and upon them rather than to account for them. One such idea within the study of the Priestly text of the Torah (P), going back to the very beginning of critical biblical scholarship,[1] is that Leviticus 17-26[2] is a separate body of literature with its own theological viewpoint and ideological goals, called, since Klostermann,[3] the Holiness Code (H). In the last two decades, this idea has grown through the work of Israel Knohl[4] and Jacob Milgrom,[5] who both have identified an entire stratum of writings within P that they have identified as belonging to the same hand or school as that which produced the Holiness Code. Their work has such far reaching implications that it has become necessary to undertake a reevaluation of their original premise, a premise shared by the majority of biblical scholars since the beginning of the critical enterprise: namely, that Leviticus 17-26 comprises a separate body of literature distinct from the rest of P. Through an examination of the criteria used to identify the Holiness Code and a look at larger structural arguments it will be

---

[1] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Meridian Books, 1965), 376-84, and Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch,*(London: MacMillan & Co, 1886), 87-91, 272-88.

[2] With some variation, sometimes with chapters 16 or 18 as the beginning, and sometimes including chapter 27 rather than ending in 26.

[3] August Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch*, vol. 1 (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1893), 368-371.

[4] Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995).

[5] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1-63; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, AB 3a (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1319-1443. Milgrom, while concurring with a number of Knohl's views, also expresses caution concerning several of his criteria.

argued that Leviticus 17-26 constitutes an integrated and integral part of P as envisioned by the tradent[6] responsible for its composition and compilation. Knohl's and Milgrom's methods and views, involving dating H later than the rest of the P corpus, attributing a larger quantity of P to H, and viewing the final redaction of the Pentateuch as the work of H, can then be addressed.

The evaluation of whether the Holiness Code is indeed a separate body of literature or a fully integrated, inseparable, part of P is primarily a question of method. Issues of method are not secondary to an examination of this kind but central to it. Propositions must be carefully tested against objective standards in order to ascertain their veracity. Past scholarship has hypothesized the separate nature of Leviticus 17-26 by recourse to standard source-critical observations, including formal comparisons, all of which will be reviewed, evaluated and weighed against arguments for the unity of P and H. Ultimately, the issue of the separability of H from P is simply one part of a larger struggle within scholarship to understand the nature of P itself, an ongoing and contentious project.[7] While most of this debate falls outside the scope of this paper, an awareness of it has consistently informed the arguments made here. The question of the relationship between the Holiness Code and the larger Priestly text, while at heart a compositional issue, has larger implications, particularly in the areas of dating and ideology. The separation of the Holiness Code from the main body of Priestly literature has been used to justify the late dating of P by arguing that supposedly earlier ideas, such as the demand for

[6] The term tradent refers to one who hands over or delivers property from one person to another. Because the Priestly writer both transmits received material and composes his own, this author finds this term to be especially suited for describing his activity.

[7] Debates concern everything from the nature of P, as a redactional layer or independent document, to the arguments over where it ends, with options ranging from anywhere in the corpus from Leviticus to Joshua. For P as a redaction, see, e.g., Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973), 301-24; for P as an independent document see, e.g. Richard Elliott Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997), 188-92, 208-11 and Baruch Schwartz, "The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai," in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: a Tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. Michael V. Fox, et al. (Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 105-109, passim. For a summary of the debate over the ending of P see Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 20-30.

centralization, are part of this older stratum and does not reflect the view of the rest of the Priestly text which theoretically assumes rather than demands such centralization.[8] If H is really an organic and inseparable part of the Priestly text, this deals a serious blow to the idea that P must be late because it assumes centralization. In the realm of ideology, the separateness or not of H has a large impact on the character of the Priestly text as a whole. Whether one severs the Holiness Code from P or not, especially if the Holiness Code is later than P as contended by Knohl and Milgrom, affects how one understands the ideals and purpose of the single largest stratum of writings in the Torah. This has implication not just for studies in Priestly literature, but in the Torah as a whole. Furthermore, gaining an accurate understanding of the compositional makeup of the Priestly text is a major desideratum for undertaking any sort of analysis of the religious practices and ideas of ancient Israel and Judah and their development. The determination of the relationship between P and H, particularly the issue of whether H can be separated from P, is a first step in such a program, a move towards a compositional model of the Priestly source.

1.1 Traditional Criteria for the Separation of H

Roughly grouping the criteria usually put forward to separate the Holiness Code from P yields five categories:[9] (1) a distinctive vocabulary, (2) the use of the first person by the deity, (3) extensive use of motivational and parenetic clauses, (4) an ideology or theology that conflicts with P, and (5) a special relationship with the book of Ezekiel. The first is the identification of a cluster of distinctive terms and phrases that occur within H but not at all or rarely in the rest of

[8] See, e.g., Wellhausen, 376-378.

[9] For general discussions on the Holiness Code from which the following discussion has drawn, see S.R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 47-59; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 13-28, 35-42; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1319-67; Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: an Introduction* (Oxford: Harper and Row, 1965), 233-39; Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), 239-50; Alexander Rofé, *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 80-83. For the structural argument about the separateness of the Holiness Code, see below.

P.[10] While lists of this kind can be useful in identifying a separate body of literature, the distinctive phrases or terms must themselves be evaluated; the existence of a unique term or even a cluster of them can not suffice on its own. For instance, the appearance of a term or phrase can be attributed to the handling of a specific subject matter and may not necessarily indicate the need to posit a separate redactional layer. An excellent example of this is the term *peder* (פדר), suet, which occurs three times in Leviticus.[11] Despite this distribution, it would not be wise to identify Leviticus 1 as originating in a stratum separate from Leviticus 2-3, despite the fact that Leviticus 3 also deals with the disposition of fat pieces from an animal without using this term. A similar situation relevant to the discussion of the separability of H can be found in the distribution of the term *šᵊʾēr* (שְׁאֵר), close relative. This word appears almost exclusively in the corpus marked off as H,[12] but before this can be taken as indicative of its being a distinct corpus, one must ask where else in the Priestly text it would be appropriate to use this term. It has no place in the building of the Tabernacle, the legislation on sacrifice, or the purity laws. Perhaps most tellingly against using this term as marking off the distinctiveness of Leviticus 17-26 is the fact that P does in fact use this term when an appropriate context for its employment occurs: in the ruling about the daughters of Zelophehad.[13] A similar case can be made for the distribution of

[10] See Appendix 1 for a list adapted from Driver, 49-50.
[11] 1:8, 12; 8:20.
[12] Lev 18:6, 12, 13, 17; 20:19; 21:2; 25:49. Outside of H: Num 27:11.
[13] Num 27:11. Knohl, 100, attributes this passage to H on the basis of its connection with the Korah pericope (which he also assigns to H), the use of the term *šᵊʾēr* under discussion here, and a reference to the Jubilee in Num 36:4. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1343-1344, expresses caution about this attribution, citing the insufficiency of the evidence. Knohl's and Milgrom's views about this larger H stratum within P will be dealt with in detail in section II.

the term *zimmah* (זמה), conspiracy, which seems to occur exclusively in regard to specific and intentional familial sexual deviance.[14]

Similarly, the occurrence of a term in an arbitrarily marked off group of chapters must be viewed in terms of its distribution within those chapters. For example, while the phrase "food of [his/their] god" (לחם אלהים) occurs six times within Leviticus 17-26[15] and only once outside of this corpus,[16] an examination of its distribution within the H corpus shows that five of its occurrences are located in Leviticus 21, an extensive section dealing with the qualifications of priests in relationship with their ability to offer food to YHWH; the sixth occurrence[17] once again in a sacrificial context, summarizing the application of certain criteria to offerings from foreigners as well as Israelites. The overwhelming occurrence of the term in this setting is not a surprise; its concentration within the H corpus is not, then, due to this being a characteristic phrase of H, but simply a byproduct of the (arbitrary) inclusion of a chapter dealing with this subject within H. The distribution of a term such as this may indicate the independence of the section including it,[18] i.e. Leviticus 21 in this case, but in no way adds to the argument for the distinctiveness of the larger H corpus. Additionally, similar terms or phrases should also be examined; in keeping with the same case above, the use of the term "food" (לחם) in a sacrificial context twice in Leviticus 3[19] militates against viewing the phrase as being a distinctive of H

[14] Lev 18:17; 20:14 both refer to the same case- marriage between a man and a mother and daughter. Lev 19:29 refers to fathers prostituting their daughters.
[15] Lev 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25.
[16] Num 28:2 (R?), but cf. Lev 3:11, 16; Num 28:24.
[17] Lev 22:25.
[18] The discussion of the precise compositional makeup of P is outside the scope of the current paper. The issue revolves around whether the author of P is himself composing legal corpora or whether, more likely, he is incorporating discrete pieces of older material and, if so, where and what are the limits of these various older corpora.
[19] 3:11, 16.

against P's vocabulary.[20] The use of the first person hiphil with the *krt* formula presents a similar case.[21] While it is true that it is used nowhere outside of the Holiness Code, it is also true that H predominantly uses the more common third person niphal for this formulation.[22] Were H to truly be a distinctive corpus on this basis, one would expect to find the variant formula to be either leveled throughout or at least be predominant; in the absence of this evidence, another explanation, based on the particular situations of the first person hiphil usages, should be posited.

This is not to say that a case for the independence of H can not be made from a list of distinctive terms occurring in its chapters. For instance, the distribution of *ʿāmît* (עמית), which occurs nine times in Leviticus 17-26[23] and only twice in P outside of it[24] is certainly suggestive, and one could reasonably expect to find this term employed by P in a number of contexts. Equally suggestive is the distribution of *šabbātôn* (שבתון), which occurs six times in H[25] and only four times in the rest of P,[26] all of which are in disputed passages.[27] These phenomena must be weighed, though, against other arguments and evidence for the integrity of H with P and can not suffice on their own to demonstrate its independence.[28]

---

[20] Which is precisely the claim made by Knohl, 30, and Milgrom, *Leviticus 17*-22, 1804. Knohl, 106-10, and Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 35-38, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1327-8, present the argument, possibly related to this particular point, that H uses terminology in a less precise fashion than P does. This will be dealt with below.
[21] Lev 17:10; 20:3, 5, 6.
[22] Lev 17:4, 9, 14; 18:29; 19:8; 20:17, 18, 20; 23:3, 29.
[23] Lev 18:20; 19:11, 15, 17; 24:19; 25:14 (twice), 15, 17.
[24] Lev 5:21 (twice).
[25] Lev 23:3, 24, 32, 39 (twice); 25:4, 5.
[26] Exod 16:23; 31:15; 35:2; Lev 16:31. It should be noted that Exod 31:12-17 is often considered an addition in line with H, see, e.g., Driver, 59 and Knohl, 15-16. For arguments against assigning this entire section to H, see Saul Olyan, "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 2005), 201-209; Jeffrey Stackert, "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath: Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3," *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11 (2011), 2-21.
[27] Knohl, 14-19, assigns all of these passages to H, partially on the basis of this term's appearance. His method and theories will be dealt with in section II.
[28] For the terms on the list involving the first person "I" or "my," see the discussion below.

Another, related, criterion often adduced for the independence of H is the use of the first person by the deity and the direct, second person, address of many of the commands to the Israelite community rather than the third person address that seems to preponderate in the first part of Leviticus.[29] For Knohl, in particular, the use of the first person by YHWH, and especially the use of the possessive "my," become almost automatic criteria for attributing a passage to H.[30] Milgrom wisely cautions against the blanket application of this criterion, noting in particular the difficulty in explaining the use of the first person in Lev 6:10 by recourse to editorial tampering.[31] This phenomenon must be evaluated carefully, and examination of it can not be restricted to the book of Leviticus, an arbitrary unit marked off by much later tradition,[32] but must be viewed in light of the Priestly text as a whole. This particular criterion actually consists of a complex of phenomena that can be separated into three categories: the use of first person verbs with the deity as the subject, the use of the first person pronominal suffix indicating

[29] See, e.g., Driver, 49, note §.

[30] Knohl, 1 n. 3, 15("…in the PT stratum, God when speaking to the people, speaks in the third person, while God's direct address in HS is characterized by the use of the first person."), 17-18, 17 n. 24, 107-8, 169-172, passim.

[31] *Leviticus 1-16*, 16-17; he concludes, "…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 should be contrasted with his later view, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1326, that "As correctly noted by Knohl, a basic characteristic of H's style is that YHWH speaks in the first person to second-person Israel;" he also uses this criterion as part of an argument attributing Lev 17 to H, 1332, "There is overwhelming evidence for placing [Lev] 17 at the head of H. Its distinctive style (YHWH addressing Israel in the first person)…" For further discussion of Lev 17, see excursus on profane slaughter.

[32] Although Christopher R. Smith, "The Literary Structure of Leviticus," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 70 (1996), 17-20, makes a narrative argument for viewing Leviticus as a literary unit within P, the issue of the use of the first person by YHWH has such far-reaching implications for Knohl's view of P and for determining the distinctiveness of H that a view of the entire corpus is methodologically more sound. Additionally, forgetting to lay aside the separation of the Torah into books can sometimes lead to serious missteps in analysis (e.g. Knohl's, 101, statement that "the heterogeneous nature of this book [Numbers]… is evidence of its relatively late date."); although some scholars have defended readings of each book of the Torah as a complete work in themselves; see, e.g., Graeme Auld, "Leviticus: After Exodus and Before Numbers," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, SVT 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 41-54 and Nihan, 69-75.

YHWH's ownership, and the use of the phrase "I am YHWH" (**אני יי**) either alone or with various complements.[33]

A brief glance at the Priestly texts in Genesis and Exodus shows regular use of first person verbs and pronominal suffices with the deity beginning, albeit anomalously, with the creation of man.[34] The Priestly flood story contains thirteen first person verbs (counting as well the construction **אני** plus participle)[35] and fourteen uses of the first person pronominal suffix.[36]

The trend continues throughout the patriarchal narratives whenever YHWH, in the guise of El Shadday, appears to one of the patriarchs.[37] In the Exodus account, beginning with the revelation of the name YHWH to Moses,[38] YHWH continues to use the first person when speaking with Moses and describing his actions and intent.[39] This is not to discount that there are sections of divine speech in P in which YHWH also refers to himself in the third person, usually in relationship to festival regulations,[40] but these are perhaps explained by the supposition that older bits of legislation are being incorporated into the divine speech in the narrative composed by the Priestly author.[41] Regardless of how one accounts for these shifts between the first and third person, true stratification into separate sources, as opposed to smaller interpolations, seems

---

[33] Again, note Knohl's widespread use of this phrase for attributing passages to H, 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.

[34] Gen 1:26. See also 1:29 (נָתַתִּי).

[35] Gen 6:17, 18; 9:3, 5 (three times), 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17.

[36] Gen 6:13 (twice), 17, 18; 9:9 (twice), 11, 12, 13 (twice), 14 (with infinitive), 15 (twice), 17.

[37] Gen 17:1-21, 35:9-15.

[38] In which there are no less than thirteen first person verbs: Exod 6:3 (twice), 4, 5 (twice), 6 (three times), 7 (twice), 8 (three times) and five pronominal suffices: Exod 6:3, 4, 5, 7, 8 in seven verses (6:2-8).

[39] See Exod 7:1-13; 12:12-13; 14:1-4, 15-18; 16:11-12, 28.

[40] Note especially the Passover incipit in Exod 12:14, the instructions concerning who can participate in the Passover celebration in Exod 12:48, and the Sabbath instructions for the manna in Exod 16:29. Interestingly, Knohl, despite his zeal for using first person speech as an indicator of an H composition, attributes all three of these passages to his H. See Knohl, 17-23, 52.

[41] This seems especially convincing in the shift from Exod 16:28 to 29, where in the context of speaking about the manna, YHWH gives a short speech in the third person about the Sabbath.

unlikely and uncalled for.[42] Additionally, it should be noted that the same third person usage in relation to festivals is found in Leviticus 23, traditionally attributed to H.[43] P's account of the theophany at Sinai, which immediately precedes the law giving from the Tabernacle of which H is a part,[44] also includes the regular use of the first person[45] by the deity with occasional lapses into the third person.[46] Especially interesting in this regard is Exod 31:17 which switches between first and third person in the same sentence: "Between myself and the children of Israel it will be a sign forever; for six days YHWH made the heavens and the earth and on the seventh day he stopped and breathed."[47] Finally, an analysis of the distribution of first versus third person references to the deity within divine speeches in the Priestly text seems to suggest that the distribution in Leviticus 17-26 is completely in line with the rest of P.[48] A possible confirmation for this view is that the overwhelming use of the third rather than first person in the divine speech in Leviticus 1-10 can be attributed to its content: instructions for sacrifices. The third person is used as well in H whenever sacrificial contexts occur.[49] The conclusion seems to be that the Priestly tradent was perfectly willing to use either first or third person for YHWH's

---

[42] On the nature of P, and the possibility of recognizing the sources used by P, see discussion in section V.

[43] Lev 23:2-3, 4-5, 8, 11-13, 16-18, 20, 25, 27-28, 34, 36-38, 39-41. It should be noted that Knohl, 14-15, attributes Lev 23:2-3, which mixes first and third person, specifically to the H edition of Leviticus 23, as opposed to other parts of the chapter which he claims are based on a P calendar. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, AB 3b (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 2054-56 argues that this chapter, though stratified, is entirely the work of H; he dismisses Knohl's claim that H was a school, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1345.

[44] For a brilliant analysis of the Sinaitic theophany in P and its relationship with the JE account, see Schwartz, "The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai." For the relationship between the law giving and Sinai in P, see 114-7, 123-4.

[45] Examples from the instructions for building the Tabernacle: Exod 25:2, 8, 9, 16, 21, 22 (three times); 28:3, 4, 41; 29:1, 35, 42-46; 30:6, 36; 31:2, 3, 6, 11, 13, 17.

[46] Examples from the instructions for building the Tabernacle: Exod 27:21; 28:12, 29, 30, 35, 38; 29:11, 18, 23-26, 28, 41, 42; 30:8, 10, 12-16, 20, 37; 31:15, 17. Note that the phrase לפני יי in vss. 29:11, 24-26, 42 may be a stereotyped geographic referent to a specific place within the sacred precinct. Were it not for Lev 6:10, one could posit as well that the phrase אשה יי, used in vss. 29:18, 25, 41; 30:20, was a similarly stereotyped phrase, and may indeed still be when used in conjunction with the phrase ריח נחח.

[47] This phenomenon also appears in Gen 9:16, Exod 29:42, 31:3, Lev 23:2, Num 18:6.

[48] See Appendix 2 for distribution and statistics.

[49] Lev 19:5, 8, 21, 22, 24; 21:6, 8, 17, 21; 22:3, 15, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29; 23:8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, 27, 28, 36, 37. Of course, H refers to YHWH in the third person in other contexts as well, see Appendix 2.

divine speech, and that the use of the first person by YHWH as a criterion separating H from the rest of P is simply not useful once a larger view of P, rather than only Leviticus, is taken.[50]

The distribution of the phrase "I am YHWH" presents a slightly different case. The phrase appears, with or without various compliments, twenty-four times outside of H and fifty times within it.[51] That this phrase can be used as an argument for separating H from P, despite the skewed distribution, must be tested against other possible explanations. An examination of its usage in P and H must be undertaken to determine if there is any qualitative difference in the use of the phrase between the two theoretical sources to support the stratification that has been proposed on the basis of its quantitative difference.[52] In the Priestly text, its first occurrence in YHWH's initial revelation to Abraham, where he declares to him "I am El-Shadday,"[53] followed by its appearance in the revelation to Jacob,[54] suggests the recurrence of a motif. That this is indeed the case seems to be borne out by its use in the initial revelation to Moses, "I am YHWH, and I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El-Shadday, and [by] my name YHWH I was not made known to them."[55] This phrase is thus important to the narrative movement of the Priestly text from the patriarchal to the Mosaic periods. Its use in the remainder of the account of the exodus from Egypt seems to involve the idea of making the name known, as it occurs five times with some form of the word *yd*ʿ (**ידע**).[56] Its use in Exod 6:6, which immediately precedes the first occurrence of the phrase "And you will know that I am YHWH," appears to be part of

[50] For Knohl's, 124-28, 137-148, argument about the implication of the divine first person in the patriarchal narratives, which he willingly concedes to P, as opposed to the third person in use after the revelation of YHWH's name to Moses, which is the only usage he is willing to concede to P, see the discussion of the phrase **אני יי** and the fuller discussion of the Knohl-Milgrom hypothesis in section II.
[51] See Appendix 3 for a list of references.
[52] This is similar to the stance taken in the discussion of unique vocabulary above; there are often reasons other than stratification for a term to appear predominantly in some locations and not in others.
[53] Gen 17:1.
[54] Gen 35:11.
[55] Exod 6:2b-3.
[56] Exod 6:7; 7:5; 14:4, 18; 16:12. Exod 29:46a seems to recall this same idea, intentionally invoking the exodus event in its formulation.

this same complex, as it is embedded in the first command given to Moses and seems to serve as an announcement of the name to the Israelites.[57]

The remainder of the occurrences of this phrase in P[58] can be used in comparison with its usage in H. In the speech containing its first occurrence in P, the phrase "I am YHWH" is used to end the discourse,[59] a usage that can also be seen within H.[60] The connection between the exodus event and the self-declaration of YHWH is also something that is carried over into the Holiness Code.[61] What sets H apart from P in regard to this particular formula is its concentration among the prescriptions contained within it. That is, it is not simply used to begin or end long speeches by YHWH, although it performs this function as well;[62] it is also used seemingly to punctuate individual laws.[63] This function appears to be unparalleled in the sections of P outside of H, but this is perhaps a matter of appearance only. If the larger legal sections contained in Numbers are to be attributed to the redactor (R),[64] then there are no other legal sections with the same type of miscellany found in H. That is to say, the distribution of the phrase could be due to the genre with which it is associated. If the only qualitative difference between the usage in H and P is that H uses the phrase to punctuate individual laws in long lists,[65] then there seems to be no reason to

[57] On the basis of these occurrences, all working together, it seems reasonable to draw the conclusion that the phrase is native to P, an integral part of its presentation of Israel's history (contra Knohl, 17 n. 23, 61-63). For further discussion on the untenability of Knohl's attribution of the revelation of the divine name to H, see section II.
[58] Exod 29:46a, 46b; 31:13; Lev 11:44, 45; Num 3:13, 41, 45; Num 10:10; Num 14:35; Num 15:41a, 41b; Num 35:34.
[59] Exod 6:8.
[60] See note 62 below.
[61] Lev 22:32-3, 25:38, 26:13. For a discussion of this and other aspects of the formula "I am YHWH," see Jan Joosten, *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, 1996), 93-136.
[62] Lev 18:2, 30; 19:2, 37; 20:26; 22:33; 26:13, 45.
[63] See Appendix 3, especially the distribution within Leviticus 19 and 22, which contain 25 of the 50 occurrences in H.
[64] Num 15:1-31; 28:1- 29:39. See Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative* (California: Scholars Press, 1981), 108, 115. These chapters and their provenance will be discussed in detail in section II.
[65] A usage that also accounts for the quantitative differences between the distribution in H and P.

view that as a reason to separate H from P, as there are no other long lists of individual laws within P in which this usage could occur.[66]

Another criterion often brought forth to support the separation of the Holiness Code from the rest of P is its use of parenesis in the various law codes. The various legal sections that make up Leviticus 17-26 abound with explanatory and motivational asides, a characteristic that P lacks according to some.[67] Once again, however, the validity of this impression can not simply be taken at face value but must be determined by a larger view of the Priestly text and the positing of alternative explanations. It should first of all be noted that one of the first commands given by YHWH to men in P is accompanied by an explanatory clause grounded in the priestly creation account: "The spiller of a human's blood will have his blood spilled by a human; for in the image of god he made humans."[68] The entire passage contains hortatory elements, not at all dissimilar from what is found in H:[69] a command, explanatory statements,[70] and a promise of punishment.[71] The covenant of circumcision with Abraham includes the promises of land and relationship with god in a fashion similar to the frameworks found in Leviticus 17-26.[72] YHWH tells Abraham that "I will give to you and to your descendants after you the land of your wanderings, all the land of Canaan for a perpetual holding,"[73] and the issue of land and the possession of it is brought up repeatedly in H.[74] He tells Abraham that he is establishing his covenant "to be for you

[66] For the association of the phrase "I am YHWH" with the idea of holiness in H, see the discussion on ideology/theology below.
[67] See, e.g. Driver, 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." For others with similar views, see note 9 above.
[68] Gen 9:6.
[69] Compare Gen 9:4-6 with Lev 17:10-12.
[70] "only the flesh with its life, its blood" (Gen 9:4, cf. Lev 17:11), "for in the image of god he made humans" (Gen 9:6, cf. Lev 17:11 "and I have given it to you on the altar to atone for your lives").
[71] In the first person no less (Gen 9:5, cf. Lev 17:10).
[72] Compare Gen 17:5-8, 14 with Lev 18:24-30.
[73] Gen 17:8.
[74] 18:3, 24-25; 20:22-24; 23:10; 25:2, 23-24.

a god,"[75] a declaration both echoed in the Holiness Code directly[76] and adumbrated in its constant statement that "I am YHWH your god."[77] It could, in fact, be argued that this hortatory statement, long thought characteristic of H, is empty of content without this first agreement between YHWH in Abraham recorded in P. The covenant of circumcision also includes a punishment clause with an explanation: "that life will be cut off from its people; he broke my covenant."[78] This type of explanation with punishment is found throughout H.[79] In P's account of the Passover, an explanatory aside from YHWH is inserted into the description of the first Passover, "and the blood will be for you as a sign on your houses where you are, and I will see the blood and pass over you,"[80] directly paralleling such asides in the Holiness Code, such as the blood prohibitions statement that "and I said to the children of Israel, don't eat the blood of any flesh, for the life of all flesh is its blood."[81] The instructions for building the Tabernacle include an extended speech explaining the function of the Tabernacle and YHWH's relationship with Israel through it,[82] and the instructions for setting aside cities of refuge concludes in exhortation: "Don't defile the land which you are in, for the blood, it will defile the land, and for the land no atonement it made for blood which is spilled on it, except by the blood of its spiller. And don't make unclean the land which you are living in, where I am tenting in it midst."[83] In a context nearer to H, in the half of Leviticus with which it is often contrasted, Leviticus 15 ends with the

[75] Gen 17:7, 8.
[76] Lev 22:33; 26:12.
[77] See Appendix 3.
[78] Gen 17:14.
[79] Lev 17:10-12; 18:26-27; 20:3; 21:12; 22:16.
[80] Exod 12:13. There is some debate in scholarship over whether Exod 12:1-13 is intended to be a legal prescription for how future Passovers are carried out, or whether it is simply a descriptive account of the first Passover as it took place in Egypt. For the idea that this is a command, see, e.g. Yehezkel Kaufmann, *Religion of Israel* (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), 179. For the idea of it being a descriptive part of P's narrative, see Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, 95-96. For an analysis of whether sacrifice is involved in this passage, see William K. Gilders, "Sacrifice before Sinai and the Priestly Narratives," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, ed. Sara Schectman & Joel S. Baden (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009), 60-62.
[81] Lev 17:14. See also: 21:8, 15.
[82] Exod 29:42-46.
[83] Num 35:33-34.

statement: "And you will separate the children of Israel from their impurity; and they will not die in their impurity when they defile my Tabernacle which is in their midst."[84] Erhard Blum has argued, noting the exhortation that concludes the list of clean and unclean animals, often assigned to H,[85] that parenesis is required only in instances where there is a possibility for intentional violation, such as those found in Leviticus 11 or 18.[86] Once again, it seems that the supposed peculiarities of the Holiness Code seem less peculiar when set next to other sections of P; they are better explained by the idea posited above that the concentration of these features is due to this section containing a greater concentration of legal material than any other section of P.

Joel Baden also ignores such passages in an attempt to characterize a non-parenetic viewpoint as an identifying characteristic of P.[87] His argument is based on a lack of parenetic elements in P's formulation of ritual laws, contrasting this with the forward-looking elements of E, D, and H. He notes, for instance, that:

> "[t]he Covenant Code makes reference to houses, vineyards, fields… D is littered with framing devices like 'when you enter the land'… These elements of both content and framework clearly indicate that the laws ostensibly given to the Israelites at Horeb or in the plains of Moab are in fact relevant to and addressed to contemporary audiences."[88]

---

[84] Lev 15:31.
[85] Driver, 58-59; Eissfeldt, 234; Knohl, 69; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 13, 686-688.
[86] Erhard Blum, "Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, ed. Sara Schectman & Joel S. Baden (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009), 38-9. In favor of this, it should be noted that the warning about uncleanness contained in Leviticus 15 is not a warning against contracting impurity, but against approaching the sanctuary while impure, once again a preventable action.
[87] Joel Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Considerations," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, ed. Sara Schectman & Joel S. Baden (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009), 23-25. Baden's contributions to research on H will be dealt with in detail in section II as they are based on Knohl's and Milgrom's model.
[88] Baden, 23.

This seems to ignore the fact that in P's narrative there is no need to suspend the following of the ritual and sacrificial instructions until entry to the land; P's Tabernacle is the location where these things take place and it already exists and is present.[89] His further claim that "the promised land is hardly ever mentioned"[90] ignores such important Priestly passages as the covenant of circumcision[91] and the revelation of the Name.[92] His conclusion from these observations is 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" is not only marred by the observations offered above, but ignores the regular statement "for your/their generations" (לדרתיכ/ם) found repeatedly in P.[93] Baden's attempt to demonstrate that parenesis falls outside of P's presentation falls on all counts.

The preceding analysis of the criteria of the use of the first person by YHWH and the parenetic features of H reveals three serious methodological flaws in previous attempts to justify the independence of the Holiness Code. The first is the use of general impression rather than statistics, subjective rather than objective analysis. This is seen most clearly in the idea that the use of the first person by the deity is somehow more characteristic of Leviticus 17-26 than other sections of P, an idea thoroughly undermined by an actual count of the usage in divine speech.[94] The second, related to the first, is the use of only Leviticus for comparison rather than the entire Priestly text, an approach that needs to be justified rather than assumed. Once again a statistical analysis of first person speech by YHWH in the entirety of P reveals that Leviticus 17-26 falls within the range of usage elsewhere, while Leviticus 1-10 (or better, Leviticus 1-7) is anomalous

[89] Baden, 24, makes the puzzling comment "…[in P] the location of the cult is not addressed…"
[90] Baden, 24.
[91] Genesis 17.
[92] P sections of Exodus 6.
[93] 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. Many of these passages will be examined in detail in section II.
[94] See Appendix 2.

in its overwhelming use of the third person.[95] Parenesis is also a common aspect of P's divine address relating to legal prescriptions when the scope is widened to include material outside of Leviticus, appearing as early as the condemnation of murder in Genesis 9.[96] Once again it is Leviticus 1-7 that appears anomalous in this regard, rather than the body typically attributed to H.

The last flaw found in previous analyses, an issue of qualitative reasoning rather than quantitative oversight, is the imprecision with which the genres contained within P are distinguished. An inheritance of the older critical approach of dividing P into a P^g layer containing narrative and a P^s layer containing largely non-narrative, "legal" material,[97] the viewpoint that Exodus 25-31, Leviticus 1-7, 11-16, and 17-26 all contain the same type of material because of the largely non-narrative nature of these corpora is in need of nuancing. It is not exactly accurate to refer to the instructions for building the Tabernacle[98] or the instructions for how to perform the sacrifices[99] as "legal;" they are rather exemplars of distinct genres. The sacrificial instructions could be referred to as "ritual instruction," and the instructions for building the Tabernacle may be part of the "organizational" complex that is also present in the opening chapters of Numbers, although it also includes examples of "ritual instruction."[100] Some confirmation for distinguishing at least between "legal" and "ritual instruction" materials comes

[95] Although this may be attributed, as suggested above, to its subject matter, an idea possibly borne out by the preponderance of third person references to the deity in Leviticus 17-26 in sacrificial contexts similar to those that predominate in Leviticus 1-7. It is also possible that Leviticus 1-7 is a genuinely old and separate document that was incorporated into P wholesale. Note especially the use of the preposition בְּ in the sense of "from," 1:16; 5:9; 6:11, and the use of לחם to mean "food" rather than bread in 3:11, 16. Interestingly enough, and in keeping with the admonition offered above to take the Priestly texts as a whole, these same old usages reoccur in Leviticus 21-22 which also deal with sacrifices (for בְּ as "from" see 22:4; for לחם as "food" see Lev 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25), which may possibly mitigate against viewing Leviticus 1-7 as a separate document. It may simply be that sacrificial literature is conservative in its preservation of old, stereotyped usages.

[96] A text that neither Knohl nor Milgrom attribute to H despite their attribution of large sections of P to the Holiness School/Redactor.

[97] For a history of this idea in scholarship, see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 1-4, 11-14.

[98] Exod 25-31.

[99] Lev 1-7.

[100] E.g. Exod 27:20-21; 30:7-10.

from the vocabulary used in the text itself. It has long been noted that the term "instruction" (תורה) is used to describe the material contained in Leviticus 1-16,[101] while the terms "statutes" (חקה) and "judgments" (משפט) occur frequently in 17-26.[102] The distribution of these terms arises not because of different strata being combined but because of terminological precision in describing the contents of each section,[103] a conclusion confirmed by the closing of the so-called Holiness Code, containing the only reference to "instruction" in that corpus: "These are the statutes (חקים) and the judgments (משפטים) and the instructions (תורות) which YHWH gave between himself and the children of Israel on Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses."[104] The reference is to the different types of material contained in the prior chapters.[105] That pieces of "legal" material found within the ritual manuals of Leviticus 1-16 are referred to by the term "statute" (חקה) offers further support for this distinction.[106] And it is at least worth noting that those sections of H that stray farthest into the territory of "ritual instruction"[107] are not referred to by the terms "statute" or "judgment" in their frameworks; neither Leviticus 21-22, on the acceptable qualities of priests and sacrifices, nor Lev 24:1-9, about the service inside the Tabernacle, are labeled in this way. It is perhaps also not insignificant that the other law codes of the Torah, to which the Holiness Code is often compared, are titled as collections of statutes and

[101] Lev 6:2, 7, 18; 7:1, 7, 11, 37; 11:46; 12:7; 13:59; 14:2, 32, 54, 57; 15:32.
[102] 18:4, 5, 26; 19:37; 20:22; 25:18; 26:15, 43. Lev 26:15 appears to subsume both of these categories under the term "commandments" (מצות) (cf. Lev 22:31). Perhaps, then, YHWH's statement in Exod 16:28 is meant to imply total disobedience to every kind of decree from YHWH.
[103] Although this conclusion may be challenged by Lev 5:10; 7:36; 9:16.
[104] Lev 26:46.
[105] Wellhausen, 380, believes this to be a reference solely to the material contained in Leviticus 17-26 despite the lack of תורות in H. Driver, 58, attributes the verse to R^P, i.e. the person responsible for combining P and H, who he views, 54, as living subsequently to whoever produced the separate works. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2342-2343, views the verse as an editorial closure, presumably, in his system, the work of H.
[106] Lev 3:17, 16:29; see also 23:14, 31.
[107] Leviticus 21-22; 24:1-9.

judgments.[108] The point of distinguishing between these genres is not to argue that there are hard and fast boundaries between the two but to note that features of "legal" material, such as that found in Leviticus 17-26, do not necessarily have to appear in "ritual instruction" material and visa-versa; a difference in genre rather than strata would appear to account for the differences between these two sections.[109]

This brings us to the criterion of theology or ideology, that is, the supposition that H's worldview is in conflict with and different from that found in the rest of P.[110] However, in this case one must tread carefully. Ideology or ideological development can not be posited as a reason for stratification in absence of other compelling criteria. The proper methodological procedure is to reserve the determination of the ideology of a text for a descriptive stage of the process, after stratification has been determined on the basis of measurable and verifiable criteria. Which is to say that one must know the outline and content of a text, its beginning and ending, before one can begin to determine what that text means.[111] For instance, if one were to take only the Priestly texts of Genesis 1-Exodus 19, one might suppose that the Tabernacle instructions that occupy the second half of Exodus to be material foreign to the worldview of P,

---

[108] Exod 21:1; Deut 12:1. For a full discussion of the formal relationship between H and the Deuteronomic and Covenant codes, see below.

[109] For a more detailed discussion of the types of material contained in P, see section V. Related to this issue, and also dealt with in section V, is that the legal sections of P must also be viewed in light of the narrative logic of P, i.e. there are narrative and arrangement reasons for the placement of P's non-narrative corpora. Similar to the conclusions reached above is the argument of Blum, 38, that "[t]he validity of the H/P hypothesis should be tested by examining the alternative possibility that the undisputed peculiarities of "H" are in accordance with and even required by the internal logic of the priestly narrative as a whole;" similarly, Andreas Ruwe, "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*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, SVT 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 57 n 10, "There exists a widespread habit to [*sic*] differentiate between 'priestly narrative' and the 'legislative material' presented in the divine speeches. This trend, however, is problematic insofar as it fails to consider that the so-called 'legislative material' itself is substantially determined by the fictional elements of the frame of the surrounding story."

[110] It should be noted that a full discussion of the ideology of the various segments of the Holiness Code is not necessary here, but will be attempted in sections III and IV when the individual sections of H are more closely examined.

[111] This point should also be well taken in Samuel studies in regard to the separation of sources on the basis of a supposed "pro-" or "anti-" monarchic bias.

as such an institution had not been mentioned or intimated up to that point. However, once the Tabernacle instructions are recognized as part of P, certain elements such as the lack of sacrifice before its construction become meaningful. In the same way, new ideas introduced in the Holiness Code must not automatically be accounted as foreign to P's worldview but must be evaluated for their integrity with it. To posit a distinctive ideology for H requires an explicit contradiction of something found earlier in P.[112] The most commonly asserted difference between H and P is in the matter of centralization of worship, something about which Wellhausen argued that "[i]t is still a demand [in H], not a presupposition [as in P]."[113] Wellhausen's argument about centralization being an assumption rather than a demand of P, which seems to largely derive *ex hypothesi*, has since been effectively countered by Friedman, who argues that Leviticus 17 is integral to P and is its centralization command [114] and points to the repeated emphasis on the place to which sacrifices are brought in Leviticus 1-7,[115] and falls under the fallacy mentioned above of determining the intent of a text prior to determining its contents.[116]

After centralization, the most distinctive idea that scholars have pointed to in Leviticus 17-26 is the one after which this stretch of texts is named: the concept of holiness. It is argued that holiness, though a concern within the P corpus, takes on a distinctive character in the

---

[112] The specific contentions of Knohl and Milgrom in regard to certain concepts that differ between P and H will be examined in section II, as they attribute a much larger corpus of material to H.
[113] Wellhausen, 377.
[114] *Exile and the Biblical Narrative*, 102-3. It should be noted that Kaufmann, 180-184, also dismissed Wellhausen's argument by positing that P (which for him included H) assumed a multiplicity of sanctuaries, an argument revived by Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1503-1514, in regards to both P and H separately.
[115] *Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York: HarperCollins, 1987), 171.
[116] Related to this is the matter of profane slaughter. Milgrom has argued that the law in Lev 17:3-7 reflects a polemic against P's exposition of the sacrificial system in Leviticus 1-7, where the issue is seemingly passed over in silence (Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 28-29; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1353, 1452-1463, 1506-1508, 1513-1514), while Schwartz has argued that there is no difference of opinion on profane slaughter between P and H (Baruch Schwartz, "'Profane Slaughter' and the Integrity of the Priestly Code," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 67 (1996), 15-38). In section II, it will be demonstrated that the texts related to the ban on profane slaughter in P are native to their contexts.

Holiness Code.[117] So, while Milgrom grants that "the theme of the entire book of Leviticus is holiness,"[118] 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."[119] It should first of all be pointed out that the claim that the land is holy is never made in either the Holiness Code or P; although it can be defiled[120] and belongs to YHWH,[121] it is unclear if the implication of these concepts is that holiness inheres in the land in some way.[122] That P views the Israelites as having a special relationship with YHWH is something that appears fairly early on in P, although the adjective "holy" (קָדֹשׁ) is not used. In a seeming polemic of demythologization against earlier conceptions of the "hosts" (צְבָאוֹת) of YHWH, P speaks of Israel as being YHWH's host as well as his people.[123] The holiness of the people is implied as well in YHWH's explanation of the function of the Tabernacle, stating that "I have sanctified the Tent of Meeting and the altar; and Aaron and his sons I have sanctified to priest for me,"[124] culminating in the declaration that YHWH had brought the people out of Egypt "so I can tent in

[117] Robert A. Kugler, "Holiness, Purity, the Body, and Society: The Evidence for Theological Conflict in Leviticus," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 76 (December 1997), 3-27, argues for a differing view of holiness in Leviticus 1-16 and 17-26 but his study is undermined by the previously noted issue of treating Leviticus as a unit 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).
[118] Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1397.
[119] Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1397.
[120] Lev 18:24-30.
[121] Lev 25:23.
[122] See Joosten, 169-192; Kaufmann, 129-130; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1399; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2184-2187.
[123] Exod 7:4; 12:17, 41; Num 1:3. See Baruch Halpern, "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. JSOTSup 124 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1991), 78 n 1.
[124] Exod 29:44.

their midst."[125] The holiness of the Tabernacle in their midst suggests some reciprocal status for the Israelites themselves, a suggestion explicated in the Holiness Code.

Related to this declaration is the narrative logic behind which things are declared holy when. From the beginning of P, times can be sanctified by YHWH,[126] but it is only once the Israelites reach Mt. Sinai that the concept of holiness is applied to anything else. Beginning with the setting up of the "veil" (פרכת) to divide "between the holy (place) and the most holy (place)," the gradual unfolding of holiness appears to be part of P's overarching narrative whereby YHWH sets aside Israel as his people from the rest of the nations.[127] Time is sanctified by YHWH, then a sacred space is set aside in the form of the Tabernacle, which in its first appearance is called "place of holiness" or "sanctuary" (מִקְדָּשׁ)[128]and connected with the idea of YHWH tenting in the midst of Israel.[129] For the holy space to function the various accoutrements are also sanctified,[130] followed by the priests who are to serve within it.[131] Once the entire complex is prepared and ready for use,[132] the priests are assigned the task "to divide between the holy and the profane, and between the unclean and the pure, and to teach the children of Israel all the statutes which YHWH spoke to them by the hand of Moses."[133] The following sections of Leviticus follow the plan laid out here (in P!): the distinction between the unclean and the pure is found in Leviticus 11-15 and the instructions for distinguishing the holy from the profane make up a large part of the instructions found in Leviticus 17-25. The

---

[125] Exod 29:46.
[126] Gen 2:3 (Sabbath), Exod 12:16 (Passover), 16:23 (Sabbath). For a list of the occurrences of the root "holy" (קדש) in P, see Appendix 4.
[127] See, e.g., Exod 6:6-7, 29:43-46, Lev 20:26, Num 35:34. See also, Joosten, 93-122.
[128] The mem-hireq prefix is often locative.
[129] Exod 25:8.
[130] E.g. Exod 40:9-11.
[131] E.g. Exod 40:12-15.
[132] Exodus 40, Leviticus 8-9.
[133] Lev 10:10-11.

movement of the laws has a narrative logic, and the fact that the outline followed is laid out in P suggests caution should be taken before severing those laws from it, leaving a P that demands that people distinguish between holy and profane, unclean and pure, while only providing instructions for how to do one of those. To pick up the scheme of the progressive sanctification of time, space, personnel, and now people, the placement of the regulations for purity first makes narrative sense. While the people have now seen the "glory of YHWH,"[134] upping the ante on the declaration that YHWH tents in their midst and exposing them to the source of the Tabernacle's holiness,[135] they must first be instructed in how not to violate the already established sacredness of the sanctuary[136] before they can be instructed on what their positive responsibilities are in regards to their own sanctification.[137] This also makes sense of the near-unique address of Leviticus 19 "to all the congregation of the children of Israel."[138] It is indeed the announcement of the holiness of the entire people, but it is an idea for which P has prepared by declaring the people to be the host,[139] in announcing the responsibilities of the priests,[140] in the repeated assertion of YHWH's tenting in the midst of the people,[141] and in the revelation of the glory of YHWH to the people.[142]

A further supposed ideological difference between P and H, usually argued as an extension of the idea of the holiness of the people dealt with above, regards the general position of the laity in the legislation of H. Milgrom argues that H presents a much more egalitarian

---

[134] Lev 9:23-24.
[135] Exod 31:43.
[136] Lev 15:31.
[137] A scheme that seems to be, at least in part, stated explicitly in Lev 20:22-26.
[138] Lev 19:2. Found also in Exod 12:3; 16:9; 35:1; Num 1:2; 26:2. Once again the scheme proposed above is followed in these addresses to the entire congregation: from sacred time (Passover and Sabbath), to sacred space (the call to build the Tabernacle), to the sanctity of the people, to the numbering of the sanctified people as their now mobile sacred zone moves to the promised land.
[139] Exod 7:4; 12:17, 41.
[140] Lev 10:10-11.
[141] Exod 25:8; 29:45-46.
[142] Lev 9:23-24. Read especially with Exod 29:43 where the glory is what sanctifies the Taberbnacle.

worldview, attempting to integrate the laity more fully into the cultic world.[143] The integration of the laity in the cult is, however, a recurrent theme of the Priestly text. In addition to the texts adduced above in support of the idea of the holiness of the people for P, it should also be noted that P views the construction of the Tabernacle to have been a joint effort of the entire community, who both donate gifts[144] and provide labor for its construction.[145] The address of the sacrificial laws in Leviticus 1-7 to the "children of Israel" (בני ישראל),[146] despite the fact that it largely describes sacrificial procedure, is also a telling sign that the involvement of the laity in the cult was of paramount importance to P. 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[147] is simply a continuation of this idea. In the absence of a compelling difference in ideology or theology, there is once again no reason to suppose stratification on these grounds; many of the arguments for a divergent worldview between P and H rest on the *a priori* assumption that they are different, such as Milgrom's insistence that Lev 17:3-7 must be an innovation because it is H and not P ,[148] and are not arrived at on the basis of the text as it stands.[149]

The last criterion often used in arguments for the separability of H from P is the use of H by Ezekiel. The similarities between the two works was large enough for some scholars to

[143] Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1352, 1451, 1832-1834; Knohl's views, although similar, are more involved and require a thorough review of his entire model, undertaken in section II.
[144] Exod 25:2-7; 35:4-9, 21-29.
[145] Exod 35:10-19, 25-26; 36:2-4, 8; 39:32-42. This is possibly a polemic against the manner in which Solomon's Temple was built, cf. 1 Kings 5:20, 32; 6:1-38; 7:13-14, 51.
[146] Lev 1:2; 4:2.
[147] Lev 21:24.
[148] *Leviticus 17-22*, 1455.
[149] For the place of Joosten's engaging and mostly convincing analysis of H's worldview in this discussion, see the discussion on the unity of P and H below.

propose that Ezekiel was in fact the author of the Holiness Code.[150] Most discussions of the Holiness Code include some comments on its relationship with Ezekiel, and Knohl raises Ezekelian parallel to a criterion by which diverse sections of P can be attributed to H.[151] Granting, for the moment, the truth of the assertion that Ezekiel and H share a distinctive relationship that Ezekiel does not share with P, it is questionable whether or not this should indicate that Leviticus 17-26 is a separate body of literature incorporated into P rather than a native aspect of P itself. It is entirely within the realm of possibility that certain ideas contained in the Holiness Code were of more importance to the message Ezekiel was attempting to convey than ideas contained elsewhere in the Priestly text. This seems to be especially true in the absence of other criteria for separating H and P, many of the most important of which the prior analysis has demonstrated to be inadequate.

That Ezekiel's writing does have a relationship with the Holiness Code that differs from its relationship with P is an observation that is far from certain. First, it is unclear whether the extent of Ezekiel's parallels with the entirety of H can be maintained; of the usages that Ezekiel shares with H, the most extensive of them are with a single chapter, Leviticus 26.[152] In an appendix to his work on the relationship between H and Ezekiel, Lyons provides a listing of the passages that are paralleled between the two works.[153] Of the 148 parallels he lists, 91 of them, 61%, are with Leviticus 26. The remainder of the parallels between Ezekiel and H remain unconvincing, as they are based on the usage of terms or phrases shared between the two works,

---

[150] See, e.g., Graf, Horst.

[151] Knohl, 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."

[152] For an analysis of the sayings that Ezekiel shares with Leviticus 26, especially in regard to where they differ, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27,* 2348-2352.

[153] Michael A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, LHBOTS(JSOTSup) 507 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 162-165.

most of which can be accounted for by the context of the occurrences.[154] Which is to say, as with the explanation for most of the concentration or clustering of certain terms within H, the explanation for their use lies in the subject matter being addressed in any particular occurrence rather than on a distinctive vocabulary not shared with P. A further blow to the idea that Ezekiel has a peculiar relationship with H was Risa Levitt Kohn's study of Ezekiel's relationship with the Pentateuchal sources.[155] In a survey of the parallels between P (including H) and Ezekiel that concluded with an analysis of the way in which Ezekiel transformed and used these phrases and terms, Kohn concluded that:

> "Ezekiel's linguistic correspondence to PT [=P] is as pervasive as its correspondence to HS[=H], if not more… Ezekiel quotes, reverses, allegorizes and ignores HS language in the same manner he does PT language… If we can indeed subdivide P into two separate entities, Ezekiel utilizes both without particular differentiation."[156]

Kohn's work, the scope of which includes all of P, is especially in keeping with the argument levelled throughout this discussion that the Priestly work as a whole, not just the book of Leviticus, must be kept in view when determining whether Leviticus 17-26 represents a separate work. Indeed, Kaufmann concluded this in his own work, noting 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."[157] The work of Propp on the Priestly text provides a further argument that, even if Ezekiel had a particular liking for H, he was using it as part of a unified priestly composition. Propp argues that Ezekiel 20 preserves, at least in part, a

---

[154] Such as Ezekiel's use of זמה, see discussion above on this term's sexual connotations and Appendix 1 for references.
[155] *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah*, JSOTSup 358 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
[156] 85.
[157] Kaufmann, 433.

continuous portion of P separate from the JE interruption contained in its current form in Exodus 2-6.[158] The use of a relationship with Ezekiel as a criterion for viewing Leviticus 17-26 as separate is at least complicated by the factors described above; whether it was ever an adequate criterion, especially on its own, remains questionable as well.

It is appropriate at this point to turn to the larger structural/formal issue of the Holiness Code which led scholars to set its limits at Leviticus 17 and 26. Its limits superficially resemble the bookends of the Covenant Code (CC) and the Deuteronomic Code (Dtn), beginning with an altar law[159] and ending with a closing exhortation.[160] These formal criteria are used to define a "law book" genre,[161] of which the Holiness Code is an exemplar, clearly demonstrating that it was once a separate work prior to its incorporation into the Priestly text. Should these formal characteristics prove to be clearly exemplified by the Holiness Code, this would be a potent argument for its independence. There are, however, reasons to doubt whether the characteristics observed above are truly indicative of a "law book" genre and H's status as an exemplar thereof.

While the blessing and curse lists of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 clearly indicate the ending of something,[162] it is unclear if these can be compared in any meaningful way with the ending of the Covenant Code, which, while containing warnings against disobedience,[163] is largely a series of promises directly related to the narrative placement of the text; i.e., it is

---

[158] William H.C. Propp, "The Priestly Source Recovered Intact?" *Vetus Testamentum* 46, no. 4 (October 1996), 471-474.
[159] Lev 17:1-9 || Exod 20:24-26 || Deuteronomy 12.
[160] Leviticus 26 || Exod 23:20-33 || Deuteronomy 28. Driver, 48, uses the expression "parenetic exhortation" to maintain a connection with the Covenant Code (see also Kuenen, 88, n. 25), while Noth, *Leviticus*, 127-128 and Eissfeldt, 233-234, who are more concerned with the Deuteronomic parallel, simply refer to Leviticus 26 as a blessing and curse list. Noth, 127, provides the perhaps most basic version of the rationale behind this argument: "This blessing or cursing parenesis [Leviticus 26]… can only be understood as the concluding portion of a collection of divine 'laws,' to be sought in the preceding chapters… 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."
[161] Eissfeldt, 233; Noth, *Leviticus*, 127.
[162] Note as well the note in Lev 26:46. Blessings and curses lists logically seem to gravitate to the end of works; note as well the Sefire Treaty (KAI 222) A.21-41.
[163] Exod 23:21, 24, 32-33.

concerned with the coming conquest of the promised land.[164] In contrast, Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 both contain definite blessings concerning life in the land; the only promise of this nature in the comparable section of CC is the promise of adequate food, lack of war, children, and long life, all covered in just two verses.[165] The concomitant curses of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28, once again concerned with life in the land (and exile), have no parallel in CC.

There are issues as well with the idea that an "altar law" forms the beginning of a clearly defined "law book" genre. A comparison of the Covenant Code, the Holiness Code, and the Deuteronomic Code reveals some clear qualitative differences in the employment of their various altar laws. Once again it is CC that stands out most clearly in this regard. The beginning of CC is sometimes disputed,[166] but if Exod 21:1 is not taken as its opening, then there is no reason to view the beginning as 20:24 rather than 20:23. This means that the Covenant Code does not in fact begin with an altar law but with a prohibition of icons.[167] Even granting an "altar law" opening, it becomes apparent that CC and the Deuteronomic Code employ very different laws that can only be loosely categorized together as "altar laws." CC is concerned with the construction and use of altars, how they are to be made and how not to defile them; Dtn is concerned with centralization: not how you build and use an altar, but *which* altar one should use. If it is granted, despite these differences, that both Dtn and CC begin with an "altar law," and that this should be construed as a formal criterion indicating the opening of a law book, then

[164] Exod 23:20, 23, 27-31
[165] Exod 23:25-26.
[166] See William Propp's, *Exodus 19-40* (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 295, 304-305 for discussion. Eissfeldt, despite viewing CC (his B) as beginning at Exod 20:22 (212-213), still argues that the altar law in Leviticus 17 is a parallel characteristic.
[167] Exod 20:23. Whether this is intended to prohibit iconic representations of YHWH alone or of other gods is unclear.

it becomes unclear why the instructions for the Tabernacle[168] or the report of its construction[169] should not be taken as the opening "altar law" of P's law code, rather than viewing Leviticus 17 as such a beginning. If CC is dismissed as being a parallel, we are once again reduced to a similarity between Dtn and H,[170] a small pool from which to posit the presence of a genre based on shared formal characteristics. This parallel is not without weaknesses itself, though, for just as the altar laws of Dtn and CC are substantively different, so are the altar laws of Dtn and H. As noted above, the concern of Dtn lies largely in *which* altar one should use. H's altar law, while definitely noting the place at which legitimate slaughter should take place,[171] is more concerned with *to whom* sacrifices are offered; it is a ban on the profane slaughter of cattle, sheep and goats, an idea also found in P.[172] H's altar law draws a sharp contrast between "*šᵊlāmîm* to YHWH"[173] and "their sacrifices to the goats,"[174] a distinction that the writer of this chapter connects to location.[175] Again, the idea of an "altar law" which contains such diverse formulations and foci is too vague to be a useful formal criterion.

This brings us to the internal characteristics of these so-called "law books." Bookends are not sufficient formal criteria on which to base genre; one would expect other shared characteristics as well. It is on this point that the Covenant Code and the Deuteronomic code display a striking difference from H. Both CC and Dtn present themselves as a continuous speech with no interruption. The Holiness Code, in contrast, is riddled with introductions

[168] Exodus 25-31.
[169] Exodus 35-40.
[170] And it is not denied that Leviticus 17 and Deuteronomy 12 are similar, as both deal with centralization, profane slaughter, and blood consumption.
[171] Lev 17:5.
[172] Lev 7:23.
[173] Lev 17:5.
[174] Lev 17:7. The exact meaning of "goats" (שְׂאִירִם) in this context is unclear.
[175] Lev 17:4-5.

indicating the beginning of separate units,[176] even containing a narrative interlude.[177] This seems to indicate that the formal characteristics displayed by H in parallel to CC and Dtn are largely artificial constructions meant to parallel the form of a "law book." Nowhere is this more apparent than in the inclusion of Leviticus 20, which mirrors material found already Leviticus 18-19. This also converges with the observation made above that the content of Leviticus 17-26 represents the legal material of the Priestly text, as distinct from the Tabernacle instructions or the ritual manuals contained earlier in the corpus. It should come as no surprise, then, that P arranged its legal material in a way that mimics a format known from other legal codes.[178] Nevertheless, the fact that this is an artificial construction seems to be deliberately on display in the repeated headings that indicate the stitching together of originally discrete units. There seems to be no need to hypothesize anyone other than the priestly tradent as the one responsible for organizing the material in this fashion.[179]

1.2 Other Grounds for the Separation of H

If none of the traditional criteria used to separate H from P is adequate, it would be methodologically sound to suggest what would be an acceptable basis for separating the two documents before simply declaring the stratification to be untenable. The two that immediately spring to mind are the mainstays of the source-critical analysis of the Torah: the appearance of doublets and direct contradictions of earlier statements. Blum proposed this method for

[176] 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.

[177] Lev 24:10-23. Many scholars view this narrative, or at least 24:10-14, 23, as a Priestly insertion into the original H talion law, see, e.g., Driver, 56; Kuenen, 278; L.B. Paton, "The Original Form of Leviticus xvii-xix.," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 16, no 1 (1897), 53-57. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2101-2106, and Knohl, 119-121 , who view H as later than P, hold that this section is original to the Holiness Code. Even if one regards the narrative section of Leviticus 24 as a later addition (based on an *a priori* assumption in my opinion), the point about H consisting of discrete divine speeches still stands.

[178] Although whether or not this was an actually recognized form in Ancient Israel may be at least questioned on the basis of the analysis offered above.

[179] Baruch Schwartz, "Introduction: The Strata of the Priestly Writings," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings*, ed. Sara Schectman & Joel S. Baden (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009), 6-7, also criticizes this type of analysis, discounting the idea that H was ever a separate law-code; nevertheless, he insists on viewing H and P as different strata.

investigating H's independence, stating: "Such evidence [for the separation of H and P] might be, for instance:…Sufficient and clear evidence of contradictions in terms of content between alleged P and H strands."[180] So, for instance, the revelation of the Name YHWH occurs twice in the opening of Exodus,[181] leading scholars to separate the prior Elohistic strands of the Torah into the two strands now known as E and P. Again, and using the same passages, the revelation of the Name is directly contradicted by the statement in Gen 4:26 that "then it started- to call on the Name YHWH," leading to the supposition of a third source, J, in addition to the two previously noted. The next step in the evaluation of the separability of H will be an attempt to subject it to these criteria, evaluating the passages that seem to fall under these categories.

Doublets do indeed exist between H and P material. The two that immediately stand out are the regulations for disposing of *šᵊlāmîm* offerings[182] and instructions for lighting the *mᵊnōrāh*.[183] *Šᵊlāmîm* offerings are the only offerings from which meat is eaten by laypeople; they provide food for the table. The Priestly text distinguishes between three different types of *šᵊlāmîm* offerings: thanksgiving offerings (תודה), vow offerings (נדר), and freewill offerings (נדבה).[184] These different subtypes of offerings are provided with rules for when the meat from them can be eaten; thanksgiving offerings must be consumed on the same day as the offering is made, with any excess burned in the morning, while vow and freewill offerings can be eaten for

[180] Blum, 37. This is not to suggest that these two criteria are the best kinds of evidence for stratification, but they were among the first used to discern the multiple sources of the Torah at the beginning of the critical enterprise, see, e.g., Kuenen, 17-65.
[181] Exod 3:13-15; 6:2-3.
[182] Lev 7:15 || 22:29-30; 7:16-18|| 19:5-8.
[183] Exod 27:20-21 || Lev 24:2-4. I do not regard Exod 25:30 || Lev 24:5-9 to be a doublet, as the Leviticus passage adds substantial information to its Exodus counterpart. The inclusion of Passover regulations in Lev 23:5-8 that partially duplicate those in Exod 12:14-20 will also not be considered here; their use in both contexts makes sense. On the model of Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), 296 n., Numbers 28-29 is not assumed to be the work of P. This attribution will be defended in detail in section II, as the view that these chapters are P forms the basis of Knohl's work.
[184] Lev 7:15-16.

two days but must be burned on the third day (inclusive) after the offering is made. These disposal rules are grouped together in Leviticus 7[185] but are separated and repeated in H.[186] The repetition of the regulations can be accounted for by taking P seriously as a narrative document and understanding that its instructions are contained within discourses that are addressed to particular groups of people. The initial accounting of these regulations are in a divine speech directed at the priests,[187] nevertheless these regulations are of particular importance for the laity as this is one of the few sancta that they directly handle.[188] This is a possible explanation for their repetition in speeches directed at the Israelite people as a whole.[189] This seems to be confirmed by the addition of the phrase "for your acceptance" (לרצנכם) to the repetitions;[190] this is the actual instruction for how this meat is to be handled, whereas Leviticus 6-7 only incidentally reports this prescription among a record of the dues that each party of a sacrifice (YHWH, priest, offerer) receives. Lev 19:8 also includes an additional penalty; Lev 7:18 posits נשא עון, while 19:8 adds כרת to this. The addition of the penalty in 19 may also be a function of the fact that these are the instructions addressed to the laity; the priest, receiving the manual in Leviticus 6-7, would simply need to know that they are not responsible for punishing the offending part, not necessarily what the penalty would be. Tellingly, the only punishment recorded in Leviticus 6-7 is in a section addressed to the laity.[191]

---

[185] Lev 7:15-18.
[186] Vow and freewill offerings: Lev 19:5-8; thanksgiving offerings: 22:29-30.
[187] Lev 6:2, 29.
[188] It is also possible that the *šᵊlāmîm* was occasionally eaten without the supervision of priests, i.e. that the offerer could eat the meat in places other than the sanctuary grounds, raising the stakes on this particular injunction. For arguments, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 223-224.
[189] Lev 19:2; 22:18. This is also the most probably explanation for the repetition of the Yom Kippur instructions to the laity, contained in Lev 16:29-31 in an address to Aaron (Lev 16:2) and repeated in an address to the laity in Lev 23:27-32.
[190] Lev 19:5; 22:29.
[191] Lev 7:22-27.

The separation of the repeated command into two disparate locations can be explained on the basis of the implications of the violation of each command. The eating of a vow or freewill offering on the third day creates *pigûl*,[192] includes a punishment, and is described as a desecration.[193] The command to eat a thanksgiving offering on the same day that it is offered contains none of these elements. It follows from this that the vow and freewill offering rules were included in a chapter that is built around the ideal of holiness and its violation. In contrast to this, the command about the thanksgiving offering could be included in the list of various sacrificial ordinances that revolve around the idea of acceptability.[194] These explanations for the repetition and separation of these particular commands all rely on the logic of the Priestly text's presentation of commands, based both on the addressees of the various corpora and on the subject matter contained in each divine discourse; this suggests that stratification on the basis of this particular doublet is inadvisable. Even if these reasons are not accepted though, it is unclear that separation of the Priestly corpus into two distinct entities could (or should) be accomplished because of this doublet. At most it suggests that Leviticus 19 or Leviticus 22 may be separate works, but it can in no way carry the weight of supposing Leviticus 17-26 to be a separate, originally independent body of regulation.

The duplication of the menorah instructions is more difficult to account for.[195] Its placement in Leviticus, alongside the regulations for placing the *pānîm* bread,[196] has been

---

[192] Lev 7:18; 19:7. That this is not simply a description of the left-over meat is indicated by the fact that it is not פגול by virtue of simply being left over; in both instances of the command this term only comes on the heel of its consumption by the offerer. That some sort of transformation is implied also seems to be indicated by the phrase "it will not be acceptable," associated with the declaration of פגול in both instances. It is my opinion that the term פגול describes what the *sacrifice* has become; it is no longer accounted/accepted as a שלמים, but has become a פגול.

[193] Lev 19:8.

[194] Lev 22:18-30. Note as well that the aspects of the vow and freewill offering that don't involve desecration, but instead center on acceptability, are included in this section.

[195] Exod 27:20-21 || Lev 24:1-4

[196] Lev 24:5-9 does not appear to be a duplicate of Exod 25:30, but a much expanded discussion of the table and its use (note especially the absence of the verb נתן for the placement of the bread in the Leviticus passage).

convincingly explained on the premise that Leviticus 23-25 contains regulations for sacred times, under which the nightly lighting of the menorah and the weekly replacement of the *pānîm* bread have been included.[197] Despite the duplication, this particular section of the Holiness Code[198] has often been attributed by scholars to P rather than H;[199] nevertheless, in keeping with the use of doublets for stratification proposed above, some reason for its duplication should be explicable. The duplication is not explicable solely on the grounds that it fits the theme of this section of Leviticus; if this were the case, one could reasonably expect a repetition as well of the ordinances for the regular sacrificial offerings or of the regular incense burning given in Exodus.[200] Milgrom puts forth Rashi's suggestion[201] that the Exodus passage be read as "you will command [imperfect] the children of Israel…"[202] with the fulfillment of the prediction of this command being fulfilled in the Leviticus passage: "Command [imperative] the children of Israel…"[203] While this explanation leaves much to be desired in its apologetic thrust, the use of this doublet to separate Leviticus 17-26 from P is also questionable. Of particular note is Noth's observation that "It presupposes- as is nowhere else the case in the Law of Holiness-[204] the P-narrative and its picture of the holy place…"[205] Which is to say, this particular passage is so dependent on the P narrative, on the placement of the menorah in the Tent of Meeting, with its veil/canopy (פרכת) and testimony (עֵדֻת), that, even granting the duplication, one is hard

[197] The arrangement and compositional history of the Tabernacle instructions are outside the scope of this paper, and for the moment it will be assumed that Exod 27:20-21 was in the text in its current location when P was compiled.
[198] Lev 24:1-9.
[199] See, e.g., Driver, 56; Martin Noth, *Leviticus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 176-177; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2085-2086; Pfeiffer, 240. The presence of such a solid piece of P in the middle of H presents quite a problem for the idea that H was once a separate work. This is usually explained by recourse to the idea that H is an earlier code that the author of P reworked and included in his composition.
[200] Exod 29:38-42; 30:7-8.
[201] Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2084.
[202] Exod 27:20.
[203] Lev 24:2.
[204] A not quite accurate picture of H, as will be demonstrated below.
[205] Noth, *Leviticus*, 177.

pressed to explain this as originating in a once-independent code.[206] An alternative explanation is to view the passage in Leviticus 24 as original leaving the Exodus passage, notably out of place, as a later insertion, perhaps copied from this current passage to fill a perceived lack in the Tabernacle instructions.[207]

Contradictions between the Holiness Code and P are more difficult to detect.[208] The one that is most often pointed to is the seemingly variant treatment of sex with a menstruating woman.[209] P declares that the man who has sex with a menstruant is unclean for seven days, but specifies no further punishment;[210] H assigns the *krt* penalty for the same act.[211] Friedman and Dolansky argue that there is a difference in intention between the violation the two laws envision, one being an advertent act and one inadvertent.[212] Milgrom entertains this notion, but ultimately dismisses it in favor of reading them as in conflict.[213] Lev 15:24 itself can support both contentions: while the phrase "and her impurity is on him" seems to suggest a woman whose period starts during sex, especially when compared to the more forceful "he uncovers her

[206] Of particular note is the menorah's descripting in Lev 24:4 as the "pure menorah," cf. Exod 25:31. A counter argument to Noth's observation would be the supposition that H and P are based on the same historical reality which has a single menorah in a holy place known as a tent that had a veil/canopy and a testimony.
[207] For further discussion on this passage, see section II.
[208] Much of the list in Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1352-1355 will not be addressed here, as it assumes the assignment of several passages in Numbers to H, an issue that will be investigated in full in section II.
[209] See, e.g. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1353, 1755-1756; Saul Olyan, "'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 1994), 203-204.
[210] Lev 15:24.
[211] Lev 20:18. It is not clear whether 18:19 is actually in conflict with 15:24; while 18:19 does prohibit sex with a menstruating woman, it does not provide a penalty, something that either 15:24 or 20:18 could be used to fill in. It is of note that 18:19 much more closely parallels the language of 15:24, using the terms נדה and טמא to describe the woman's situation, whereas 20:18 uses the terms דוה, ערוה, and מקור to describe her menstruation. Nihan, 452, raises the possibility that the use of מקור דם in 20:18 is an intentional callback to Lev 12 and is meant to include not just sex with a menstruating woman, but also with a woman who has just given birth. It is also possible that the law in 20:18 is solely about sex with a woman who has just given birth, and that the reading of it as pertaining to menstruation is because of an overreliance on Leviticus 18 in understanding 20. If this is the case, there is no conflict between 20:18 and 15:24.
[212] Richard Elliott Friedman and Shawna Dolansky, *The Bible Now* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 185 n 30.
[213] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 940-941; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1756.

nakedness, her flow he laid bare,"[214] the fact that the woman is referred to with a pronoun indicates that her menstruation had started prior to the act as its antecedent lies in 15:19, "A woman who has a flow of blood." That there could be a differentiation in punishment between intentional and accidental sexual acts is supported by parallel adultery legislation found in other law codes.[215] Even assuming that the conflict is real, this once again does not give us a pervasive enough difference to separate Leviticus 17-26 from the main body of P; at most, it indicates that Leviticus 20 is possibly from a different hand or was inserted wholesale from somewhere else. This is an issue already suggested on the basis of the strong parallels between Leviticus 18 and 20, even were one to contend that the Holiness Code was originally separate, such a doublet would need to be explained. None of the doublets or contradictions posed so far has proven sufficient to posit stratification for the entire body of the Holiness Code, confirming Crüsemann's conclusion that, "Attempts to demonstrate a special position for Lev 17-26 within the great mass of priestly laws by means of contradictions with other portions must be regarded as failures."[216]

1.3 Arguments for the Unity of P and H

In the absence of any compelling reason to separate the Holiness Code from the rest of P, a positive argument can now be put forth in regard to their unity.[217] In several of the discussions offered above, it has been argued that many of the theoretical special features of H are in fact entirely consonant with P and are best explained by taking seriously their connection. In addition to these factors, there are other features of Leviticus 17-26 that suggest that they should be

[214] Lev 20:18.
[215] See, e.g., MAL A.13-14.
[216] *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law,* translated by Allan W. Mahnke (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 278.
[217] Crüsemann, 281, chastises scholars on this point, stating, "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."

understood as an integral part of P.[218] The first and most pervasive is that the Holiness Code everywhere presumes the narrative context of P up to this point.[219] Which is to say that H contains no narrative preparing for the situation in which the addressees of the various law codes are situated. Nevertheless, the people addressed in H are the Israelites who have been led out of Egypt but have not yet arrived in the promised land.[220] They are seen as living in a camp[221] and are addressed by Moses.[222] The Tent of Meeting and some of its specific appurtenances are assumed,[223] and the priests who serve there are Aaron and his sons.[224] Models that attempt to account for these features on the basis of a series of editorial additions[225] must also explain the fact that these references are not levelled throughout, e.g. the priests are not always referred to as Aaron and his sons, the altar is not always specified as the one at the Tent of Meeting; an editor who needed to change some instances to match his worldview but left others alone is neither a rational entity nor a useful supposition.

In addition to a narrative dependence on P, H also displays a dependence on ritual instructions given in P. H describes the separation of clean and unclean animals as an important indicator of holiness,[226] but the only passage containing instructions for their separation is found in P. Several types of sacrifices are mentioned without any description of the procedure that should accompany them.[227] Various types of impurities are listed in the regulations on when the

---

[218] An in-depth discussion of some of these are outside the scope of this paper. For in-depth analysis of these issues, such as the relationship of Leviticus 25 with the land and inheritance complex of P, see section III.
[219] See Joosten, 29-30, 93-101.
[220] Lev 18:3, 24; 19:34, 36; 20:22-24; 22:33; 23:10; 25:1-2, 42, 55; 26:13, 45-46.
[221] Lev 17:3; 24:10, 14, 23.
[222] Lev 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1, 16; 22:1, 17, 26; 23:1, 9, 23, 26, 33, 44; 24:1, 11, 13, 23; 25:1; 26:46.
[223] Lev 17:4, 5, 6, 9; 19:21, (30?); 21:(12?), 23; 24:2-4, 6; 26:11.
[224] Lev 21:1, 17, 21, 24; 22:2, 3, 4, 18; 24:9.
[225] See, e.g. Paton, "The Original Form of Leviticus xvii.-xix.," 34-35, passim; idem. "The Original Form of Leviticus xxi., xxii.," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 17, no 2 (1898), 150, 158-159, passim; idem. "The Original Form of Leviticus xxiii., xxv.," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 18, no ½ (1899), 38, 40, 45, passim. For a critique of this type of analysis of Leviticus 17-26, see Knohl, 111-123.
[226] Lev 20:25. See also Lev 17:13.
[227] 17:8; 19:5-8, 21-22; 22:18, 21, 23, 29; 23:12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 37-38.

priests may consume offerings, but their remedy is offhandedly referred to as "until he is pure,"[228] a phrase that has no substantive antecedent without the extensive instructions for the various types of impurities contained in Leviticus 11-15. The inverse of this assertion is true as well; without H, P lacks some seemingly necessary material, such as a festival calendar,[229] requirements for the priesthood,[230] or any generally legislative material.[231]

This degree of interdependence, together with an absence of any compelling conflicts, suggests that the most reasonable conclusion to draw is that the Holiness Code is simply a part of P. There are no compelling reasons, whether by doublet or contradiction, to separate H from P. Most of the distinctive features pointed to by past scholarship have been shown to be part of P's normal discourse once the entire work and its narrative character are taken into account. The distinctive features that remain are not levelled throughout Leviticus 17-26 in such a way as to allow the assertion that it once constituted a separate body of legislation. To be sure, parts of the legislation of Leviticus 17-26 may have stemmed from older sources, but this is just as true of Leviticus 1-7 and Exodus 25-31, both of which are considered as integral to P.[232] This does not, however, grant license for viewing Leviticus 17-26 as a coherent code or body of literature;[233] this can only be done within its total context: P. In the same way, the arguments offered here do not leave room for the assertion that if H presumes P in so much of its content then Leviticus 17-26 must be a later body of literature, as argued by Knohl and

---

[228] Lev 22:4.
[229] Leviticus 23. That Numbers 28-29 are not part of P will be argued in section II, see also note 139 above.
[230] Leviticus 21.
[231] Leviticus 17-20.
[232] For a discussion on the use and transformation of older works as a compositional feature of all of the Pentateuchal sources, see Joel Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Considerations," 14-18.
[233] For an evaluation of the internal coherence of the Holiness Code based on compositional analysis, see Henry T.C. Sun, *An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26)* (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1990). Sun, 564, concludes, "It therefore appears that Lev 17-26 had no originally independent existence as a legal corpus prior to its creation by those Priestly editors who inserted these legal materials into the Sinai pericope."

Milgrom;[234] the only reasons to assert that H is either earlier or later than P is on the *a priori* assumption, challenged throughout this paper, that H is a separate body of literature, an assertion that has been allowed to stand undefended for too long in scholarship. In order to hold the Holiness Code hypothesis, scholars must pursue a new, clearer methodological approach that takes the challenges above seriously. In the absence of that pursuit, to view H as simply an integral and integrated part of the Priestly text is methodologically more sound.

[234] Knohl, 8-45, 111-123, passim; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 13-15; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1349-1355, passim. The specific points of their arguments and their assignment of a wide array of material in P to H will be dealt with in section II.

CHAPTER 2. "I AM YHWH": THE KNOHL-MILGROM HYPOTHESIS

With the central corpus of the Holiness Code called into question, an evaluation of the theories of Knohl[235] and Milgrom can be addressed. Once again, these issues will be approached from a methodological angle. As part of this methodological approach, it will nowhere be assumed that the final conclusion of the arguments offered above for doubting the existence of H as classically defined is accepted; nevertheless, specific arguments offered in section I may be referred to in the course of examining Knohl's and Milgrom's views.[236] Knohl's and Milgrom's hypothesis consists of three propositions: that H is later than P,[237] that there is an extensive stratum of H texts that have been previously identified as P,[238] and that someone associated with H was the final redactor of the Pentateuch.[239] These will each be dealt with below, but occasionally, as Knohl interleaves his arguments for each of these features, they will be addressed out of turn.

Knohl's thesis that H is later than P is something to which he turns in many parts of his analysis. As a foundation to this view, he spends a great deal of effort demonstrating that the author of P did not edit H by examining places within the Holiness Code that scholars in the past have attributed to editorial insertion.[240] Knohl rightly critiques the older viewpoint for being

---

[235] Knohl uses the sigla PT for P and HS for H; these will be left unaltered in quotations from his book, while the traditional sigla of P and H will be retained when discussing his ideas in this paper.
[236] It should be noted at the outset, though, that their arguments rest on the assumption, challenged above, that a once independent document exists in Leviticus 17-26; for those who found the above conclusion that there is no reason to view H as anything other than an organic part of P convincing, the arguments of Knohl and Milgrom will already be lacking a crucial support.
[237] Knohl, 8-45, 111-123, passim; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 13-15; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1349-1355, passim.
[238] Knohl, 3, 59-110, passim; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1332-1344, passim.
[239] Knohl, 101-103; Jacob Milgrom, " H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, SVT 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 24-40.
[240] Knohl, 111-123.

based on *a priori* assumptions about the relationship between H and P. Having proven that H is in every way aware of P, an idea to which Milgrom has also contributed,[241] Knohl commits the same error; he assumes *a priori* that H is separate from P and that it is therefore later since it is cognizant of P. A reading not considered by him, but that was argued for above, is that H knows P because they are from the same hand and part of the same work. This provides an equally satisfying explanation for the phenomena that he has identified. Other arguments that Knohl urges for the relative dating of P and H will be noted as encountered below.

2.1 Some Presuppositions of Knohl's Analysis

The first major step of Knohl's argument is an analysis of Sabbath and festival regulations obtained by a comparison of Numbers 28-29 and Leviticus 23.[242] Knohl's goal for this exercise is to weed out P-dependent elements from Leviticus 23 by comparing its regulations with those found in Numbers 28-29, assuming that what will be left can be used as the basis for understanding and establishing the characteristics of H vis-à-vis P.[243] An approach such as this could be considered methodologically sound but only after the presuppositions on which it is based have been substantiated. Knohl's program, however, seems to rest on three presuppositions that he sets out in unsupported declarative statements: that Numbers 28-29 are the work of P, that the features traditionally associated with H are valid criteria for identifying H material,[244] and that anything that he does not recognize as H in Leviticus 23 is P. An evaluation of these assumptions must be undertaken before the results derived from their usage can be accepted.

---

[241] *Leviticus 17-22*, 1349-1352.
[242] Knohl, 8, "At the center of our discussion stands Leviticus 23, which, because of its unique layered character, can be highly instructive about the relationship between the Priestly schools."
[243] Knohl, 8-9.
[244] I.e., those criteria dealt with in section I.

Knohl's undocumented assertion that "[s]cholars generally agree that Numbers 28-29 is wholly PT…,"[245] while amenable to the thesis he is pursuing, masks a welter of scholarly disagreement on the proper attribution of these chapters. Kuenen, who divides the Priestly source into at least four layers,[246] attributes the festival calendar of Numbers 28-29 to the latest layer of Priestly composition, in no way related to the primary narrative and legal sections (his P) or its earliest supplement (his P^2).[247] Gray views the chapters as "post-Ezran."[248] Martin Noth considered these chapters to be among the latest in the Pentateuch, attributing them to a post-redactional phase,[249] and, at the least, dependent on Numbers 15 which he also viewed as late.[250] Eissfeldt states that these chapters are among those that "all critics [agree]… are to be denied to the basic content of P."[251] Friedman attributes these chapters to the redactor of the Pentateuch.[252] Jan A. Wagenaar, in a recent, exhaustive study of the festival calendars of the Hebrew Bible, concluded that certain features of Numbers 28-29 "represent the last stage in the development of the Old Testament festival calendar"[253] and are therefore "post-priestly."[254]

Adhering to the model used in section I, it is useful to view Numbers 28-29 alongside the totality of the Priestly text and to keep in mind the narrative nature of the Priestly text even in respect to its legal material.[255] By paying attention to the narrative progress of P in the latter part of Numbers and noting important narrative correlates that occur in the passages around Numbers

---

[245] Knohl, 9.
[246] Kuenen, 63-65, 87.
[247] Kuenen, 99 n. 40.
[248] G.B. Gray, *Numbers*, ICC 4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903), 403.
[249] Martin Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981), 9.
[250] Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 9; idem. *Numbers* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1968), 219-220.
[251] Eissfeldt 204-205.
[252] Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, 115. The P^2 of this dissertation is equivalent to the R of his later work.
[253] Jan A. Wagenaar, *Origin and Transformation of the Ancient Israelite Festival Calendar*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechsgeschichte v. 6. (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2005), 148-149.
[254] Wagenaar, 146-155.
[255] See above, pgs 12-13 and n. 94. A full analysis of the way that narrative and law function in tandem in the P source is, unfortunately, outside the scope of the current paper.

28-29, it can be demonstrated that these chapters are most likely not, in fact, a part of P, lacking details found in nearby Priestly passages. In particular, Numbers 28-29 nowhere mentions the priest Eleazar, the location of the Israelites at the plains of Moab, or the Tent of Meeting. Each of these correlates, and their place in P will be examined below.

Numbers 20, marking an important transition within P,[256] recounts the death of Aaron and his replacement by his son, Eleazar.[257] From this point forward in the narrative, Eleazar is an important figure, standing alongside Moses in a way similar to his father. The lineage of priests is confirmed through his family rather than Ithamar's,[258]and he is commanded by YHWH to undertake a second census.[259] He is addressed alongside Moses by the daughters of Zelophehad,[260] and his importance is emphasized in and he is present for the appointment of Joshua.[261] During the Midianite vendetta and its aftermath, his son Phineas goes out with the trumpets,[262] serving the same function Eleazar presumably would have under his father Aaron.[263] It is Eleazar and Moses to whom the victorious Israelites bring their spoils from the battle,[264] and it is Eleazar who gives *tôrāh* to the troops concerning the purification of their plunder.[265] When YHWH gives the regulations concerning how the booty is to be divided, he directs the command to Moses and Eleazar,[266] and the report of the fulfillment also mentions the two together.[267] When the Reubenites and Gadites make their request for land in Transjordan, they come to both

[256] For the purposes of this paper it will be assumed that P continues after Numbers 10, despite the trend in European scholarship, beginning with Noth, to deny any sort of conquest tradition to the Priestly text.
[257] Num 20:23-29.
[258] Num 25:11-13.
[259] Num 26:1.
[260] Num 27:2.
[261] Num 27:18, 21, 22.
[262] Num 31:6.
[263] Cf. Num 10:10; 17:2; 19:3.
[264] Num 31:12-13.
[265] Num 31:21.
[266] Num 31:26, 29.
[267] Num 31:31, 41, 51, 54.

Moses and Eleazar;[268] Eleazar is one of those whom Moses selects as guarantor on the Reubenites and Gadites promises.[269] In line with this, it is Eleazar and Joshua whom YHWH appoints as overseers of the division of Canaan.[270] It is conspicuous, then, that Eleazar is not mentioned in the framework of Numbers 28-29. Although this is not the only place in the latter part of Numbers where Eleazar is unmentioned in contexts where he could be reasonably expected,[271] this lack along with the other missing correlates discussed below indicates that these passages were not part of the original Priestly work.

Another such indicator in P is the matter of location. Shifts in the narrative are often marked by shifts in geography.[272] In the latter part of Numbers, the "fields of Jordan, by the Jordan of Jericho," (בערבת מואב על ירדן ירחו) is the prime geographic location, mentioned repeatedly. The Israelites arrive there shortly before the Baal-Peor incident,[273] and it is there that the census of the generation of the conquest is taken.[274] It is the location to which the Israelites return with their spoils after the Midianite war.[275] When YHWH commands Moses concerning the coming conquest, including the assignment of Levitic cities and cities of refuge, it is in the same location.[276] Finally, the book of Numbers closes this section with a notice paralleling that found at the end of Leviticus: "These are the commandments and the judgments

[268] Num 32:2.
[269] Num 32:28. It should be remembered that Moses already knows at this point that he will die soon and without entering the land (Num 20:12, 27:12-13).
[270] Num 36:16-17.
[271] Num 35:1ff; 36:1ff. It should be noted, though, that in 36:1 the complaint is brought לפני נשיאים, a group that does include Eleazar (Num 3:32).
[272] Exod 19:1; Lev 1:1; Num 1:1; 10:12
[273] Num 26:1. Friedman, *Bible with Sources Revealed*, 280, attributes this verse to R, but it does not match the form of the notice given in the list from which R drew (Num 33:48-49), and removing it means that the mention of the location in Num 26:3 occurs *ex nihilo*. It should also be noted that were Num 26:1 attributed to R it would mean that he went against the list in Numbers 33 which has them leaving the mountains of Abarim prior to their arrival at the fields of Moab (Num 33:47-49), a fact contradicted by Moses' ascent of those mountains in Num 27:12.
[274] Num 26:3, 63.
[275] Num 31:12.
[276] Num 33:50; 35:1.

which YHWH commanded by the hand of Moses to the children of Israel in the fields of Moab by the Jordan of Jericho."[277] As with Eleazar, the festival list in Numbers 28-29 is missing this geographic notation, suggesting that it is not an original part of P. The internal geography of Numbers 28-29 is also out of line with the Priestly text's; this is highlighted by a comparison with the festival calendar in Leviticus 23, which opens up its discussion of the harvest festivals with the statement "When you come to the land which I am giving to you…"[278] There is no parallel to this statement in Numbers 28-29, which throughout appears to assume the ability to keep all of the festivals. For *Bikkûrîm*, at least, this requires residency in the land, and there is no mention in P of the Israelites observing *Sukkôt* during the wilderness wanderings. That Numbers 28-29 ignores the geographic indicators, both internal and external, that are emphasized in surrounding sections is a second sign that this is a block of material that is unlike the Priestly text.

Finally, the Tent of Meeting, location of the cult in P, is nowhere mentioned in Numbers 28-29.[279] This is especially striking in a pericope that is so concerned with sacrifices,[280] and therefore one would expect mention of it at least in the opening content list.[281] This also contrasts with nearby narrative and legislation. The daughters of Zelophehad bring their complaint to the Tent of Meeting,[282] and both the commandments and fulfillment of the distribution of plunder

[277] Num 36:13, cf. Lev 26:46. Baruch Halpern, in private conversation, has suggested that this represents the Priestly version of a tradition of Moses' speech on the other side of the Jordan, a tradition leveraged extensively in the Deuteronomistic History see Deut 1:1, 4:46, 28:69.
[278] Lev 23:10a. Note that the Sabbath and Pesaḥ regulations appear prior to this announcement; this is part of P's perspective that these occasions were observed in the wilderness (Exod 16:23ff, Num 9:1-5).
[279] Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed*, 296-297 n.
[280] The only mention of any place where these rites are to be performed is in Num 28:7's unique reference to the pouring out of a שכר-libation in the "holy place." If this is meant to refer to the outer part of the sanctuary, as in P, then it appears to contradict Exod 30:9, unless the libation was poured directly onto the ground, which one images would soon render the floor quite filthy as this is part of the daily תמיד offering according to this passage.
[281] Num 28:2.
[282] Num 27:2.

from the Midianite war mention the Tabernacle.[283] While it is true that the Tent of Meeting is not mentioned in the list found in Leviticus 23 either, it should be recalled that Leviticus 23 is primarily a list of sacred occasions,[284] not sacrifices. Even were this not the case, Leviticus 23 is placed within the main corpus of revealed instructions from YHWH, a main point of which is the primacy of the Tabernacle.[285] The lack of any one of these three indicators common to P texts in the latter part of Numbers would be suspicious, but that all three are missing makes any undefended attribution of Numbers 28-29 to P impossible.

In addition to these missing correlates, there is another reason to regard Numbers 28-29 as an insertion into the Priestly text. As observed above, the author/compiler of P does not place legislation haphazardly but lays out laws in a narrative pattern.[286] This trend does not cease with the closing of the main body of laws revealed from the Tent of Meeting[287] but changes so that P everywhere attempts to connect new cultic regulations with narrative situations.[288] This trend can be seen throughout the book of Numbers and often provides the explanation for the placement of certain legislative blocs.[289] In addition to the legislation clearly couched as a response to a

---

[283] Num 31:47, 54.
[284] Lev 23:2, 4.
[285] E.g., Lev 1:1, 3; 4:4; 6:9, 17; 8:3; 9:5, 23; 10:9; 14:11, 23; 15:31; 16:2, 17; 17:1-7; 19:21, 30; 21:12, 23; 24:3; 26:2.
[286] A methodological consideration also employed by Stackert, 11, "Particularly pertinent to this study [of the Sabbath] is the extension of P's narrative character to its laws, which are presented within it as extended divine speeches, regularly introduced by the anonymous narrator as direct quotations... Moreover, P contains interdependent, internal cross references between its legal and non-legal material that cannot be disentangled neatly."
[287] Lev 1:1-26:46. Both the attribution and logic of placement for Leviticus 27 is unclear to this author, despite a plethora of suggestions (see Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2407-2409, for a summary of options).
[288] The intersection of these two trends can be clearly seen in Leviticus 16 which both culminates the purity-תורות with a cleansing ritual and makes explicit reference back to the death of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 16:1).
[289] The exceptions being Num 5:5-6:21. 5:5-10 would seem to be more at home with the rest of the אשם-law in Leviticus 5, although it also seems to share some concerns with Leviticus 27. Num 5:11-6:21 seem to belong logically to the rest of the Priestly תורות of Leviticus 11-15. The clue to the inclusion of these passages here probably lies in Num 5:1-4, which commands the expulsion of all טמא from the camp; the first two laws both deal with hidden sin (note the required confession of Num 5:7 and the explicit statement of hiddenness in Num 5:13). The placement of the Nazirite law probably results from a complex of reasons- it is a leftover תורה and so is linked to its closest law-type (Num 5:11-31), the defilement of a Nazirite vow by sudden death or consumption of alcohol

specific narrative case,[290] the larger legal sections of the Priestly text in Numbers are also linked to situations arising from the surrounding narrative. The Priestly tradent placed the account of the manufacture of the silver trumpets,[291] one of the functions of which is to signal the marching of the camp,[292] just prior to the departure from the wilderness of Sinai.[293] The responsibilities and perquisites of the Levites,[294] specifically the guarding of the Tabernacle, is placed after an incident that brought this issue markedly to the fore.[295] Likewise, the Priestly tradent's placement of the *tôrāh* of the corpse defiled[296] after the Korah disaster and its aftermath is explicable on the ground that this is the first time that large numbers of people have died in the camp in P. Executions have taken place prior to this,[297] but they occurred outside of the camp and necessitated no necessary contact with the dead.[298] The deaths of Nadab and Abihu took place

---

possibly constitutes a type of טמא that could be hidden, and finally the liminal status of the Nazir as neither priest nor Levite, but still consecrated to YHWH makes the placement of this law after the appointment of the Levites (Numbers 3-4) but before their consecration (Numbers 8) possibly ideal. This is, however, all speculation awaiting further study.

[290] Num 9:1-14 (second Passover), 15:32-36 (Sabbath violation), 27:1-11 (daughters of Zelophehad), 31:15-30 (disposition of plunder), 36:1-12 (daughters of Zelophehad redux). One wonders, if the suggestion argued here that Numbers 28-29 are an insertion into P is correct, whether Numbers 30 was meant to be a complement to the first daughters of Zelophehad case. It would address the question (by a kind of reverse-litotes) of the value of the oaths of women who are now explicitly allowed to hold land. In support of this view is the fact that the ruling of Numbers 30 is directed to "the heads of the tribes" (the anomalous ראשי המטות- for which, see Jacob Milgrom, "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of Pre-Monarchic Israel," *Jewish Quarterly Review* v. 69, no. 2 (1978): 76-79) a group involved as well with the rulings about Zelophehad's daughters (Num 27:2, 36:1). Alternatively, Numbers 30 could be viewed as just as disruptive to the Priestly text as Numbers 28-29; especially since even if one removes those texts, the case of Zelophehad's daughters is still separated from the vow laws by the appointment of Joshua in Num 27:12-23. Such interruptions are not, however, uncommon in P, see for instance the separation of the announcement of the Midianite vendetta (Num 25:16-18) with its fulfillment (Numbers 31).

[291] Num 10:1-10.

[292] Num 10:5-6.

[293] Num 10:11-12.

[294] Numbers 18.

[295] The plea of Num 17:27-28. It should be noted that this and several other passages in P give the lie to the oft encountered assertion that P's deity is more cosmic or transcendent. The issue in P is precisely that YHWH is not transcendent, but lives in close and immediate contact with the Israelites (Exod 29:42-46; Lev 9:23-24; 25:23; Num 5:1-4; 8:19; 17:6-14; 35:33-34).

[296] Numbers 19. Note that this class of contamination has already been foreshadowed in Lev 21:1-4; 22:4-5; Num 5:1-4.

[297] Lev 24:10-23; Num 15:32-36.

[298] Lev 24:14, 23; Num 15:35-36.

within the Tabernacle's court,[299] but its remedy is given in the Day of Atonement ritual;[300] the death of the faithless spies also occurs in the courtyard of the Tabernacle and so would seemingly be bound by the same regulations.[301] The deaths of the community of Korah[302] and the plague that followed[303] provide a narrative context to which the Priestly tradent has connected the law of the red heifer, appropriately placing it next to a narrative that involves the first corpses to which the community as a whole has been exposed. Finally, the commands regarding Levite cities and cities of refuge[304] has been placed in a block of texts dealing with the subject of "when you cross the Jordan to the land of Canaan,"[305] an appropriate place for these types of regulations. That this is all part of a planned scheme by the Priestly tradent can be demonstrated by the fact that he explicitly prepares for this phenomenon prior to the departure from the Sinai wilderness by stating: "and when Moses would come to the Tent of Meeting to speak with him and he would hear the voice speaking to him from upon the *kappōret* which is on the ark of the testimony from between the two cherubs; and he spoke to him."[306]

It is difficult to fit the festival calendar of Numbers 28-29 into this scheme, and its lack of connection to P's narrative context is another reason to regard it as an insertion into the Priestly work. This was observed, in a general way, as early as Gray, who writes: "…it [Numbers 28-29]

---

[299] Lev 10:1.
[300] Lev 16:1.
[301] Num 14:37 (וימֻתו האנשים...לפני יי).
[302] Num 16:24, 35.
[303] Num 17:12-14. It is scenes like this that makes one question the frequent characterization of the Priestly writer as a dry, style-less, mechanical author. The image of Aaron standing between the living and the dead and YHWH's proclamation to Noah that "the end of all flesh has come up before me" (Gen 6:13) remain, for this writer, among the most affecting passages of the Pentateuch.
[304] Numbers 35.
[305] Num 33:50-35:34.
[306] Num 7:89, *pace* Baden's claim, 22-23, that "one of the historical claims inherent in the framing narrative of the priestly author is that the divine laws were given by God to Moses exclusively while the Israelites were at Sinai." There is simply no support for this view in P itself, and it ignores P's assertion that revelation came from the Tent of Meeting (Lev 1:1) not from Sinai itself (a feature also noted by Schwartz, "The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai," 123-124). See the discussion on parenesis above for other weaknesses in Baden's analysis of P.

stands in no organic connection with the Priestly narrative."[307] One could reasonably expect such a festival calendar to have been contained in the closing legislation given for when the Israelites cross the Jordan, but this calendar occurs well in advance of that block of texts.[308] Additionally, as noted above, Numbers 28-29 itself contains no forward-looking language that would suggest that it was meant to apply after the Israelites had entered Canaan. Finally, the logic for the insertion of Numbers 28-29 that can be reconstructed seems to originate with the redactional stratum of the Pentateuch. The first reason for the insertion of these festival laws here is precisely that they are out of place; R wanted his legal material to stand out. While R seemed to have been comfortable with the task of combining the various sources narratively, his insertions of legal or ritual material, such as Lev 23:39-43[309] and Number 15,[310] seem designed to be out of place. For this reason it seems that the most logical place for these laws, somewhere in the instructions for entering the land beginning in Num 33:50-56, was eschewed. Additionally, there may be a chronological element for the placing of these chapters. The list of Israelite wanderings, the insertion of which Friedman attributes to R,[311] dates the death of Aaron to "the fifth month, on the first day of the month."[312] By the time of Moses' farewell speech in Deuteronomy, it is the eleventh month;[313] between these two dates lies the festival laden seventh month. While there is very little indication of chronology between these two dates, that the people mourned Aaron's death for thirty days[314] places any subsequent action in the sixth month.

---

[307] Gray, 403.
[308] And interrupts the connection between Numbers 30:2ff and the daughters of Zelophehad, as argued for in note 258 above.
[309] Placed after the conclusion to the festival calendar. For further discussion, see below.
[310] For an extensive analysis of Numbers 15, see below.
[311] Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, 106, 118. See also, Cross, 308-309, 314-317.
[312] Num 33:38.
[313] Deut 1:3.
[314] Num 20:29. Whether R envisioned the events, largely JE, that took place in Num 21-24 to be simultaneous with or after this mourning period is difficult to determine. This yields one of two timelines: a) 30 days to mourn Aaron's

R, having reconstructed a timeline that puts the events of Numbers 25-30 shortly before the seventh month and aware that the Israelites are about to come into a large amount of plunder through their war with Midian,[315] places the festival calendar prior to this. That the seventh month celebrations had particular meaning for R seems evident both from the extensive number of offerings to be brought on Sukkot[316] and from the addition of Sukkot regulations to the festival calendar in Leviticus 23.[317] Finally, these regulations had to be inserted in a place where the Israelites are gathered to hear Moses speak. Having eschewed the placement of these regulations after Num 33:50-56, Numbers 27 ends on an ideal note for insertion, with the community already assembled, [318] minimizing redactional interference in the narrative text. For all of these reasons, Knohl's simple assertion that Numbers 28-29 is P and therefore a sound basis from which to make comparisons to determine the characteristics of P in contrast to H can not be accepted. It is doubtful whether Numbers 28-29 are even part of P, and Knohl has mounted no defense of his attribution, *from which most of the rest of his argument hangs*.

The second presupposition inherent in Knohl's foundational analysis is that the language associated with H by past scholarship can be taken without further analysis as blanket identifiers of an H composition. This affects not only his analysis of the two festival calendars, under discussion here, but his entire hypothesis, particularly his identification of P passages as part of a larger H stratum.[319] In particular, his insistence that the use of first person by the deity is a

---

death, then the events of Numbers 21-24 or b) 30 days to mourn Aaron during the events of Numbers 21-24, closing with the Baal Peor incident (Num 25:6- "they were weeping at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting.").

[315] Numbers 31, esp. vv. 31-47.

[316] Num 29:12-38, cf. Lev 23:34-36.

[317] Lev 23:39-43. For a further example of the importance of Sukkot in the post-exilic period, see as well Zech 14:16-19.

[318] Num 27:22.

[319] See, e.g., Knohl, 17, n. 17 where he attributes the revelation of the divine Name in Exod 6:2-8 to H rather than P on the basis of the phrase "I am YHWH" (**אני יי**). This and his other attributions will be dealt with in detail below.

trademark of H[320] indicates both a misunderstanding of older scholarship and a misapplication of a criterion. The lists of characteristic H terminology from which he derives this principle are not intended to be used so uncritically. They are exactly what they claim to be, characteristics of Leviticus 17-26. To apply any of them, but especially the use of the first person by YHWH, as a blanket criterion for identifying H material within P skips an important step in the process: establishing that such usage is unique enough to serve as a source identifier. A survey of P's usage of the first person by YHWH[321] demonstrates that this is not the case.[322] Because Knohl's thesis is so radical and innovative, one could reasonably expect him to defend and argue for such terminological distinctions before applying them so broadly; that he never does so is a serious flaw in his methodology and seriously weakens any conclusions to which he may come on the basis of such terminological indicators. A further critique of this particular aspect of Knohl's method was leveled by Blum who: "plead[s] strongly 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."[323]

The last presupposition that underpins Knohl's analysis is his statement that "Leviticus 23…is composed of elements of PT interwoven with elements of HS."[324] Scholars have long recognized that Leviticus 23 has been edited or expanded,[325] but Knohl's attempt to separate

[320] A "fact" that he adduces in a single footnote (Knohl, 1, n. 2) based on the work of others to which he makes other references when the issue comes up (see, e.g., Knohl, 15, 51, n. 13).
[321] Undertaken in section I and tabulated in Appendix 2.
[322] This also brings up the mishandling of P in general- if P incorporates older material (such as, perhaps, Leviticus 1-3) into his work, is it wise to take the language of those sections and pretend that they are P's style? This issue will be dealt with in more detail below.
[323] Blum, 36.
[324] Knohl, 9. His reference, omitted in this quote, to "as mentioned above," is literally a mention on the previous page of Leviticus 23's "unique layered character" (Knohl, 8) with no backing or support.
[325] Note the repeated introduction in vss. 2, 4 with an intervening Sabbath regulation, as well as the additional regulations for the Feast of Booths given after the conclusion of the list in vss. 39-43.

other parts of the chapter into P and H strata seems to ignore other possibilities that should at least be addressed. Chief among these is the possibility, if one can demonstrate editing within the festival list itself rather than simply on its edges, that Leviticus 23 is a source document that has been adapted by the person responsible for placing it in its current setting. To attribute everything produced or preserved by the Jerusalemite priesthood to the siglum P is to misunderstand the documentary hypothesis at a very basic level. P is not simply anything "priestly" or "Aaronid," but is a specific document composed and compiled with its own narrative arc and ideological agenda. The source of Knohl's use of PT to stand for anything priestly seems to stem from a misunderstanding of a theory put forth by Menahem Haran.[326] Haran's claim is simply that large works, such as P or JE, were not written on a single (skin) scroll in the pre-exilic period[327] but were split across multiple (papyrus) scrolls.[328] This is not to say that P originated as simply a group of random scrolls dealing with various subjects that were kept in a bin. Haran is simply arguing that P, the narrative and legal work identified as non-JE in the Tetrateuch, was too large to be held on a single scroll and so was split into multiple "volumes."[329] With this understanding, it is difficult to understand why one must conceive of the structure of Leviticus 23, if it is indeed internally stratified, as being an example of P being edited by H. It could just as easily be an example of P editing a source document, or H editing a source document, or none of the above. That Knohl does not even entertain these alternatives is

[326] Menahem Haran, "Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 54 (1983), 111-122. Knohl refers to this work on p. 6, n. 22 and refers back to it on p. 11, n. 8. Once again Knohl uses an undefended assertion in a footnote as grounds for far reaching conclusions.

[327] The question of P's date is outside of the scope of the current argument; for now let it suffice that for both Haran and Knohl, as well as the current author, P is pre-exilic.

[328] Haran, 114-118.

[329] Curiously, Haran, 115, adduces the references to the *Tôlᵊdôt*-book in Genesis as proof of this theory. To this author, it seems easier to explain the reference as a source citation. For the argument that the *Tôlᵊdôt*-book is not an original part of P, but is a key feature of the Redactor's framework, see Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, 78-80.

another serious weakness in this analysis which serves as a foundation for much of his remaining argument. That each of the presuppositions on which his initial analysis depends has serious, unaddressed flaws should make one wary of any conclusions that he draws from his understanding of these two calendars and their relationship.

Before moving further into Knohl's analysis of the two festival calendars, it is worth examining a proposition put forth by Milgrom that Leviticus 23 actually includes explicit cross-references to Numbers 28-29.[330] Milgrom argues that the phrase "and you will bring-near offerings to YHWH" (והקרבתם אִשֶּׁה ליי) in Leviticus 23[331] is meant to indicate the specific offerings indicated in Numbers 28-29 and that passages lacking this phrase are meant to indicate disagreement between the two calendars. From this, Milgrom concludes that this is evidence for the lateness of H as it is, in his view, deliberately revising P's traditions.[332] Milgrom proposes that the only alternative is to assume that the calendar in Leviticus 23 leaves the specifics of offerings up to the "discretion (or whim) of the sanctuary" and that "the absurdity of this deduction suffices, in itself, to demonstrate that Lev 23 is wholly dependent on an antecedent source which can be only Num 28-29 (P)."[333] Determining literary dependence is much more difficult than this, though, and it is far from an absurdity to suppose that certain festival offerings were less regulated than others. In fact, the idea that the command to offer *ʾiššeh* is directed at the individual is entirely in keeping with the individual-centric sacrificial commands contained in Leviticus 1-5. A further problem with supposing the dependence of Leviticus 23 on Numbers 28-

[330] Milgrom also regards Numbers 28-29 as P, for which see discussion above.
[331] Lev 23:8, 25, 27, 36, 37.
[332] Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1350-1351; idem. *Leviticus 23-27*, 1979-1980, 2054.
[333] Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2054. Wagenaar, 149, n. 123, working from a different model offers Ezekiel 45:17-46:15 as the model from which Leviticus 23 was constructed.

29 arises from the "new grain-offering" (מנחה חדשה),[334] which Milgrom admits is so named to distinguish it from the barley offering given at the beginning of the harvest season.[335] However, this term also occurs in Numbers 28-29 which lacks the *ʿōmer*-offering from which the "new grain-offering" is so distinguished. This suggests that Numbers 28-29 has collapsed two originally separate festivals, as given in Leviticus 23, and not that Leviticus 23 has seen this term in its "antecedent" and expanded the festival regulations by five verses simply to explain a strange term in Numbers 28-29.[336]

There are problems as well with Milgrom's statement that festival sections lacking the simple phrase "and you will bring-near offerings" (והקרבתם אִשֶּׁה) are meant to indicate disagreements between his supposed later H school and the P antecedent from which it is quoting. The first festival which includes a detailed list of sacrifices to be offered is the *ʿōmer* offering. That the offering for this feast would have been explicitly listed out in opposition to other festival offerings seems to arise from the uniqueness of the offering; the worshipper is to bring an *ʿōmer*, but P has not defined what that is prior to this point. Additionally, this particular occasion is not simply a disagreement between the two calendars but represents a completely different conception of the agricultural and cultic year. As noted above, Numbers 28-29 lacks any mention of a barley harvest festival except for the contextually nonsensical offering named the "new grain-offering." The other difference between the two festival calendars, the different offerings to be brought on Shavuot, has been thought by many commentators to simply be the

[334] Lev 23:16; Num 28:26.
[335] Lev 23:10-14. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2002.
[336] This defect in Milgrom's argument was also noted by Wagenaar, 146-147, 147, n.10. Baruch Levine, *Numbers 21-36* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 384 argues that the phrase "new grain-offering" is used to indicate "the new crop from which the grain offering was taken." Knohl, 24-25, attempts to remedy the issue by positing that it should be understood as "not a command, but rather the description of accepted popular practices." This seems to me to be excessively subtle.

result of textual corruption arising in an insertion. While Leviticus 23 commands the offering of "one bull from the herd and two rams,"[337] Numbers 28 has "two bulls from the herd, one ram."[338] Because the long list of specific offering in Lev 23:18-19 is unique in the calendar, Kuenen has suggested that these particular offerings were inserted later in an attempt to bring Leviticus 23, which originally had only two lambs to complement the one lamb of the *ʿōmer*-offering, and Numbers 28 into harmony, in the course of which the numbers were accidentally switched.[339] If this proposition is correct, then the two calendars are in fact in agreement and Milgrom's citation scheme is rendered superfluous. Ultimately, there is no reason to suppose that Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28-29 are dependent on each other in any way; they may simply represent independent developments of similar traditions. Finally, a major weakness with Milgrom's analysis is his insistence that Numbers 28-29 are part of P, a proposition challenged above.[340]

2.2 Sample Issues in Knohl's Analysis

At this point, the foundation of Knohl's argument has been called into question. A survey of the conclusions Knohl reaches in his further analysis of Leviticus 23 shows that they are beset by issues similar to those already encountered, particularly the appeal to data "accepted by most scholars" without further comment or defense and the reliance on lists of terminological features of H as definite indicators of the presence of that author's/school's work. An early example of both of these flaws occurs in Knohl's first argument for the priority of P over H, involving the likely editing and insertion of Lev 23:9-22, 39-43.[341] Knohl begins with the statement that "most

[337] Lev 23:18.
[338] Num 28:27.
[339] Kuenen, 99, n. 40. This suggestion was also picked up by Wagenaar, 79, n. 11, who suggests that the extra offerings in Lev 23:13 should also be seen as interpolations.
[340] In addition to this, the stratification of Leviticus 23 that Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 1947-2056, seems, to this author, to be based on no discernible criteria other than Milgrom's own notions of how the ideology of the various regulations are associated with his historical reconstruction of Israel's religion and H's place in it. On the unsoundness of basing stratification on ideology, see section I.
[341] Knohl, 9-14.

scholars" accept the H-provenance of these passages.[342] The origin for this attribution in scholarship seems to rest on the assumption that such "popular" or agriculturally-dependent forms of worship must predate later "formalized" or "fixed" forms of worship,[343] and thus the parts of the calendar containing these types of injunctions and the parts containing fixed-date festivals were seen as originating from different strata. That the two forms could co-exist, with some festivals being dependent on harvest-times (such as Shavuot) and others being fixed dates (such as the Day of Atonement) seems to have been beyond most scholars' ken, although this position is strongly argued for by Kaufmann. [344] Knohl rightly points out the difficulties with the traditional scholarly view that Lev 23:9-22, 39-43 are fragments of an earlier calendar which have been woven into their current position by P, noting that the editorial process involved seems insensible.[345] What begins to stretch credulity, despite the historical stream of scholarship's agreement, is attributing the appendix on the Feast of Booths to the same hand as the one that made any other interventions in Leviticus 23. Even assuming that Lev 23:9-22 is an insertion, a position with which this author does not agree, it is difficult to envision a process that would be any more reasonable than scholarship's previous view, already rejected, whereby that passage and Lev 23:39-43 were inserted at the same stage by the same hand. Instead, it seems best to view Lev 23:39-43 as a later insertion, placed after the conclusion of the calendar[346] precisely because its insertion post-dates the fixation of that text. Nevertheless, Knohl attempts to rationalize the insertion of these two passages in their disparate locations by the same hand, one where it would be expected and the other after the conclusion, by arguing that "their [H's] innovations regarding Tabernacles did not contradict the PT laws and the description of that

[342] In addition to those cited ad loc., see also Driver, 55-56; Eissfeldt, 144, 207.
[343] See, e.g., Driver, 55; Eissfeldt, 207-208.
[344] Kaufmann, 305-309.
[345] Knohl, 10.
[346] Lev 23:37-38.

festival came last in the PT list, [so they] avoided tampering with the original PT list by simply appending [Lev 23:39-43].”[347] That a group who wanted to avoid tampering with a pre-existing calendar this badly would nevertheless “cut the original PT text regarding the firstfruits festival in order to splice in the sections reflecting their innovative practices…”[348] is no improvement over previous consensus and defies rationality.

A path that Knohl ignores on this issue is the possibility that Lev 23:39-43 is a late addition to the text of the Pentateuch. That he does not entertain this option is mystifying, as he envisions a centuries-persistent school subsumed under his HS siglum,[349] and although he never clearly defines to which stages certain additions or manipulations belong, he is clear that he thinks “the redaction of Leviticus 23…[occurred] at a much earlier stage in the activity of HS, when its own law code [i.e. Leviticus 17-26] was formed.”[350] Milgrom, working from a similar model, posits that Lev 23:39-43 was part of the final redaction of the Pentateuch,[351] a possibility put forth earlier by Friedman.[352] Knohl’s insistence that the appendix on Sukkot is part of H’s original revision to his supposed “original PT festival list”[353] seems to arise out of the occurrence of the phrase “I am YHWH your god” (**אני יי אלהיכם**) which occurs at its close. Knohl, here as elsewhere, takes any occurrence of this phrase as immediate proof that a passage stems from H, although he nowhere surveys its actual deployment and use.[354]

[347] Knohl, 11.
[348] Knohl, 11.
[349] Knohl, 204-220.
[350] Knohl, 11, n. 9.
[351] Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2036-2038, 2055-2056. This is, for Milgrom as for Knohl, still a function of the Holiness school. On the problems with positing that HS = R, see below.
[352] *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, 103-104.
[353] Knohl, 10-11.
[354] For which, see section I and Apppendix 3.

Without belaboring the point too much, a look at Knohl's attempt to salvage a part of a supposed P firstfruits passage that was replaced in favor of H's[355] is useful in illustrating certain weaknesses in his method. As elsewhere, he uses Numbers 28-29 as a baseline P text for comparison, the problems with which were detailed above. In this particular instance, he attempts to break down Lev 23:21 into three parts to recover its original kernel and to demonstrate again the priority of P over H:

וקראתם בעצם היום הזה

מקרא־קדש יהיה לכם כל־מלאכת עבדה לא תעשׂו

חקת עולם בכל־מושבתיכם לדרתיכם׃

He rightly notes that the passage is grammatically awkward, even with the Massoretic *rᵊbîaʿ* in place. The problem is that his attribution of the first part of the verse, "and you will announce on this very day," and the third, "an eternal statue in all your dwellings to your generations," to H, while leaving the middle, "a sacred convocation it will be to you, all work of labor you will not do," to P does not really solve the problem. Assuming the verse is a composite at all, it is difficult to imagine a reason behind adding such a content-empty phrase as that contained in his first section of the verse, which is the junction at which the stylistic awkwardness he is attempting to remedy is located. That a school that, in his view, would not even place their Sukkot regulations in the proper place would act in such a fashion is difficult to find credible. Furthermore, even should the awkwardness suggest the need for stratification, the only modification that needs to be made is the removal of the first part of the verse. He justifies his stratification of the rest of the verse into two sections by noting the similarity of the third part

[355] Knohl, 12-13.

with similar phrases in Lev 23:14, 41 his attribution of which to H has been questioned above. Additionally, his claim that the middle part of the verse has similarities with other sections of Leviticus 23 which he attributes to P[356] ignores the stylistic diversity contained within the calendar.

What Knohl's entire analysis of this verse brings to the fore is his willingness to atomize passages on little or no foundation, a trend he continues in his analysis of the Day of Atonement passage in Leviticus 23. By comparison with Numbers 28-29, again not a sufficient point of departure, Knohl argues that "vv. 28aβ-32 have no parallel in Numbers" and are therefore to be attributed to H.[357] In reading the passage as it is, though, there is not a seam by which one would be predisposed to dismember the passage. Knohl's insistence that the reference to "cutting off" in the first person in this passage[358] is another betrayal of the hand of H ignores the fact that first person speech by the deity is in no way indicative of H[359] and also ignores the uniqueness of the formulation present here, which states "I will make perish (**האבדתי**) that life from the midst of its people." His ability to conclude from this that "the Day of Atonement passage in Leviticus 23 is composed of materials originating in two different schools"[360] demonstrates nothing but his willingness to be led by his predetermined ideas of the composition of Leviticus 23. By separating the passage into two parts, he can claim that the "basic law presented in the beginning [which] specifies the date of the holiday and its special observances"[361] is the original text, which means that the sections he identifies as H are the additions which "leads to the conclusion that

[356] E.g. Lev 23:7, 8, 24, 25, 35.
[357] Knohl, 13.
[358] Lev 23:30.
[359] See section I and Appendix 2.
[360] Knohl, 13.
[361] Knohl, 13.

HS editors took PT materials and reworked them,"[362] i.e. H is later than P. It is difficult to escape the notion that he is arguing here *ex hypothesi*.

2.3 A Survey of P's Sabbath Passages

From here, it is difficult to decide the next point of departure for an analysis of Knohl's hypothesis, as the various sections of his arguments often assume conclusions defended in other parts of his work.[363] To avoid a page-by-page commentary of his book, it seems necessary to touch on major points in his argument. Before moving on, it is useful to note general trends in his thought, especially certain criteria by which he pursues his massive re-identification program, attributing large portions of P to H.[364] Already mentioned is his reliance on the use of the first person by the deity, the insufficiency of which was demonstrated extensively above.[365] That Knohl attributes so much to H from P on the basis of this criterion alone should sufficiently weaken his ultimate hypothesis, or at least make one wary of it. He frequently makes recourse to similarity with the book of Ezekiel as another indicator of H rather than P,[366] a trend once again argued against in section I. Another major weakness in Knohl's argument is his frequent failure to entertain alternatives outside of the scholarly consensus with which he is contending and his own idiosyncratic views, as noted above on the attribution of Lev 23:39-43. Finally, Knohl often employs circular arguments, "presupposing what is argued and arguing what is presupposed."[367] Instances of all of these will be pointed out as the various parts of Knohl's arguments undergo analysis below, focusing first on his attempts to reattribute large portions of P to H. In order to give his ideas a fair hearing, they will be carried to their conclusion, even as succeeding stages of

[362] Knohl, 13-14.
[363] Knohl certainly earns Propp's, *Exodus 19-40*, 730-731, observation that "[his] exposition is unsystematic and hard for me to follow."
[364] See Appendix 5 for a chart of Knohl's identifications, adapted from Knohl, 104-106.
[365] The peculiar ideological weight that Knohl puts on his view that YHWH only speaks in the third person in P will be dealt with below.
[366] See, e.g. Knohl, 15, n. 15, 46-47, 52, 91-92.
[367] Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 731.

his argument are critiqued. In other words, it is not only his final conclusions, but his process that is being reviewed.

The first major reattribution that Knohl attempts is related to the Sabbath passages found in P. After noting that the festival calendar of Leviticus 23 contains two introductory statements[368] he posits that the intervening Sabbath commandment found in 23:3 is an insertion.[369] He assigns this insertion to H on two grounds. The first is his conviction that Leviticus 23 represents a P calendar edited by H; since he believes that he has demonstrated this point, he finds it reasonable to suppose that "the Sabbath passage too was added by HS."[370] It was argued above that this view of the editorial history of Leviticus 23 is far from satisfactory and all of those arguments stand for this case as well. His second ground for attributing the insertion of 23:3 to H involves dividing 23:2 into two different strata:

דבר אל־בני ישראל ואמרת אלהם

מועדי יי אשר־תקראו אתם מקראי קֹדש אלה הם מועדַי׃

Knohl argues that the first part of the verse, "speak to the children of Israel and you will say to them," is part of the original title and flows directly into 23:4. He regards 23:2b to therefore be part of the insertion connected with the Sabbath command in 23:3. There are two problems with his analysis. The first is that given editorial trends in the Hebrew Bible, it is far more likely for 23:4 to be the insertion, a resumptive repetition (*Wiederaufnahme*) meant to pick up the original title of 23:2, in its entirety, after the insertion of the Sabbath command.[371] The second problem is that 23:2b exhibits the interesting feature of YHWH switching from third person to first person

[368] Lev 23:2, 4.
[369] Knohl, 14-15.
[370] Knohl, 15.
[371] For examples and further discussion, see Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Presentation of Synchroneity and Simultaneity in Biblical Narrative," in *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993), 112-133.

points of view within the same statement: "The appointed-times of YHWH which you will announce them (as) sacred convocations- these are my appointed-times."[372] Typically editors do not seek to introduce problems to the text in which they are intervening, and as such all of Lev 23:2 should most likely be regarded as part of the original heading of the calendar. Curiously, Milgrom also attempts to argue that 23:2b is an interpolation, on the very basis of the grammatical difficulties of the verse.[373] What both scholars hope to gain by attributing 23:2b to the same hand as the Sabbath command in 23:3 is the phrase "my appointed-times" (מועדי).

Knohl makes the claim: "in the PT stratum, God when speaking to the people, speaks in the third person, while God's direct address in HS is characterized by the use of the first person."[374] By connecting 23:2b to 23:3, Knohl and Milgrom think that they are adducing solid proof of the H origin of the Sabbath passage because of the use of first person;[375] the issues with this notion have been repeatedly noted, but beyond the arguments offered in section I is the fact that it is bad methodology to assume one's conclusion in such a manner.

Despite the number of flaws observed in everything from Knohl's presuppositions to his specific analysis of this Sabbath insertion, it is useful to follow his argument to the conclusion to which he chooses to carry it. Having identified to his satisfaction the H provenance of Lev 23:3, especially in connection with the phrase "my appointed-times," Knohl invokes the supposed

---

[372] For other instances of the deity switching persons in mid-statement in P, see Gen 9:16; Exod 29:42; 31:3, 17; Num 18:6.

[373] Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 1954-1955.

[374] Knohl, 15. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 1955, renders his similar judgment as "The use of the first person for the Deity is one of H's telltale signs." This represents a shift in opinion for Milgrom who at one point concluded, *Leviticus 1-16*, 16-17, "…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 should be contrasted with his later view, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1326, that "As correctly noted by Knohl, a basic characteristic of H's style is that YHWH speaks in the first person to second-person Israel."

[375] Curiously as well Knohl refers to this lapse into first person as a "deviation from the usual stylistic conventions in this chapter" before listing four other verses where the same thing occurs (10, 22, 30, 43). Five times in a list containing seven or eight holidays does not seem to be much of a deviation to this author.

similarity of this phrase to the "way in which the Sabbath is referred to in HS as שבתתי,"[376] although the only real similarity is the first person pronominal suffix. Nevertheless, Knohl follows this link to Exod 31:13-17 and attempts to attribute the passage in its entirety to H rather than P, beginning with noting that Exod 31:13 is "a verse that is shown to be of HS origins by the closing word אני ה' מקדשכם."[377] While it is true that this is the only occurrence of the phrase in the Pentateuch outside of H,[378] it is unclear whether the deployment of a single phrase can really be used to determine the authorship of an entire passage, especially when the ideology of the passage is in keeping with the general trend of P to indicate the sanctification of the Israelites.[379] In order to bolster his argument, Knohl notes the similarity of the descriptions of the Sabbath between Lev 23:3 and Exod 31:15, "Six days work will be done and on the seventh day, a Sabbath of cessation." Knohl poses the question; "Are these linguistic similarities coincidental, or do they indicate deeper substantive connections between these passages?"[380] He fails to entertain the far simpler explanation that there are only so many ways to formulate certain ideas; it is no surprise that Sabbath passages describe the Sabbath in similar ways. In addition to the weakness of his argument for assigning this passage to H, there are positive arguments that can be made for their relationship to P. The first of these is that his attribution of the description of the Sabbath to H fails to note that the formula in the Exodus passage explicitly links itself to the P account of creation.[381] Additionally, the idea that the Sabbath is a "sign" (אות)[382] seems to

[376] Knohl, 15. See Appendix 1 for the distribution of the term שבתת(י).
[377] Knohl, 15.
[378] Lev 20:8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32.
[379] See section I.
[380] Knohl, 16. I am uncertain that linguistic is the proper term to describe such a coincidence of formulation.
[381] Exod 31:17. Even Knohl, 104, attributes Gen 1:1-2:4a to P, although Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1344, attempts to reattribute at least Gen 2:2-3 as well to H, simply carrying Knohl's logic to its ultimate conclusion. A piece of evidence for this that Milgrom adduces is the use of קדש in the Piel, about which Milgrom asserts, "this root is

comport with a running theme of signs in the Priestly text that also begins in the creation account[383] and is noted at several important junctures in P: the Noahic covenant,[384] the covenant of circumcision,[385] and the first Passover.[386] Finally, as Propp notes, the entire Tabernacle account mirrors the creation account in P.[387] The culmination of the Tabernacle instructions in the Sabbath would then be a designed feature of P's narrative and attributing it to another hand destroys this parallel.[388] Knohl's analysis also ignores more complex understandings of the text here, such as that proposed by Saul Olyan, who sees the text as a composite H & P text.[389]

Nevertheless, Knohl carries his attempt forward, once again invoking the formulaic description of the Sabbath in Exod 35:2 as proof that H rather than P is responsible for the composition of Exod 35:1-3.[390] He furthermore invokes a reading from LXX which includes the plus ἐγὼ κύριος (**אנני יי**) at the end of 35:3 stating that "there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of this version." While omission by anablepsis is the most common reasons for absences in texts, neither of the common culprits leading to this type of error, homoioteleuton and homoiarchton, seem to be an issue in this particular text. Furthermore, at least one reason

---

totally absent in P." Stackert, 12, 13, n. 43, 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."

[382] Exod 31:13, 17.

[383] Gen 1:14.

[384] Gen 9:12-13.

[385] Gen 17:11.

[386] Exod 12:13.

[387] Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 659, 675-676. See also, Stackert, 11-14.

[388] The way that the Sabbath command in Exodus 31 begins with the particle אך also indicates its strong connection with what has gone before, although this could as easily have been written by someone inserting material as by the original author and so it does not provide solid evidence one way or the other. Knohl, 64-66, who attributes Exod 31:1-11 to H as well, would have no problem with the two passages being linked so strongly.

[389] Olyan, 202-205. For a reconstruction critical of both Olyan and Knohl/Milgrom, but still granting the composite nature of the text, see Stackert, 2-10. Olyan splits the passage into two parts: 31:12-15 (H) and 31:16-17 (P); Olyan bases much of this division on shifts in person, but it should be noted that the person begins to be blurred already in 31:15. Additionally, such inconsistencies of person are occasionally characteristic of divine speech, see notes 47 and 372 above.

[390] Knohl, 15-16.

presents itself for doubting the plus in this location: harmonization. Even granting the superiority of LXX, though, does not grant Knohl quite the coup that he thinks it does; he has yet to demonstrate that the use of this phrase is such a sure indicator of H, but still simply depends on the lists of characteristics of Leviticus 17-26 without examining its use throughout P first. Once again, the reason for his desire to include the phrase and this passage under the rubric of H presents itself in his wish to demonstrate that this passage and Exod 31:13-17 form a chiasmus, a feature which Milgrom often associates with H.[391] Again, even assuming that Knohl is correct in his attribution, there is no chiasmus present, for his statement that "the first Sabbath passage begins 'That I the Lord have consecrated you'"[392] is simply not true; it begins "only my Sabbaths you will keep for it is a sign between me and you for your generations to know that I am YHWH, sanctifying you."[393] Knohl places curious significance on this supposed chiasm, adducing from it his first argument that H was responsible for the final redaction of the Torah (R from here on). Theoretically, these Sabbath passages are the a and a' parts of a chiasm focused around the inserted JE material in Exodus 32-34.[394] It seems incredibly difficult to automatically attribute this pattern to the same hand or even school as those that are responsible for the Sabbath passages; surely an editor is capable of combining his sources in such artistic and attentive ways, and ruling against that scenario requires much more positive evidence than that adduced by Knohl. Finally, Knohl ignores the possibility that these Sabbath passages are part of a chiasm within the separate P document whereby the Sabbath command, which follows the call of Bezalel in Exodus 31, precedes it in Exodus 35. Alternatively, it simply forms a nice transition from YHWH's speech about the Tabernacle to Moses' conveying the instructions. In keeping

[391] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 39-42; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1319-1322. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 42, goes so far as to state that "such literary artistry [use of chiasmus] is patently beyond the capacity of P."
[392] Knohl, 16.
[393] Exod 31:13.
[394] Knohl, 16.

with the form of MT Exodus 35-40 in general, a more logical ordering is found than that in the instructions in Exodus 25-31; it makes sense that the Sabbath command, if it is intended to be kept during the construction of the Tabernacle,[395] would be conveyed first rather than after the people have already begun upon the project. Finally, Knohl's assertion that the equation of Sabbath and sanctuary in these passages is a characteristic of H rather than P on the basis of Lev 19:30 and 26:2[396] seems to be a function of which one is read first; it can not be proved that just because H regards the two as of equal importance that P does not hold the same viewpoint.[397]

Knohl continues his Sabbath overview by turning his attention to the P sections of Exodus 16, a passage beset by difficulties because of its anachronisms.[398] Knohl argues that the description of the Sabbath as a "Sabbath of cessation, holy to YHWH"[399] aligns these passages with Exod 31:15 and 35:2. Once again, it should not be surprising to see the Sabbath spoken of in such a similar fashion across passages. Nevertheless, Knohl, because he has assigned the two Sabbath passages associated with the Tabernacle to H, also attributes this passage to H. The weakness of this type of method should by now be self-apparent, and that Knohl builds on his conclusions, reaching higher and higher on less and less is a serious flaw in his work. A further issue arises from the assignment of all of these passages to H rather than P. As Knohl himself notes, this leaves the Priestly text with only two references to the Sabbath in the schema that he has established: creation and the list in Numbers 28-29. The absurdity of this is that is has P

---

[395] See note 352 above.
[396] Knohl, 16-17.
[397] That their viewpoints are actually identical was one of the arguments adduced above in section I for disregarding the existence of H as a separable stratum at all.
[398] Note Exod 16:33-34 for anachronism in the larger narrative; it is unclear how to take this, as the Tabernacle has not been constructed yet. That the author of the narrative understands this, and the command is meant to be proleptic (as suggested by William Propp, *Exodus 1-18* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 590) is suggested by the appearance of the glory of YHWH in the wilderness (Exod 16:10, cf. Num 17:7). For the suggestion that the Priestly manna story was originally located in Numbers 15, see Joel Baden, "The Structure and Substance of Numbers 15," *Vetus Testamentum* 63 (2013), 354-361. For anachronisms within the narrative, note 16:6-9, on which see Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 590-592.
[399] Exod 16:23.

mention the Sabbath by stating: "And god blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; for on it he ceased (שבת) from all his work, which god created to do"[400] only to never mention it again.[401]

Such disregard for the remnant of P after his reattributing it to H is something that characterizes Knohl's work as a whole, as will be highlighted by further analysis. Knohl has, to this point, yet to make a serious and persuasive case for any of his attributions related to the Sabbath, and even less so can any positive value be put on the conclusions he draws from his attributions.

2.4 Examination of Knohl's Derived Criteria

The methodology seen in the examination of his analysis of the Sabbath passages is continued throughout his review of Leviticus 23. That calendar is compared with Numbers 28-29, an H element is identified in the particular festival under examination, and every passage related to that festival is examined, many of which become attributed to H. Knohl soon begins to derive a larger set of criteria from his reattributions, creating a cycle whereby he identifies a passage as H instead of P and then takes a phrase or idea from that passage and finds it in another which he then also associates with H. Two of these that form a large basis for his reattribution scheme are the equation of the citizen and alien and the phrase "a perpetual statute for your generations" (חקת עולם לדרתיכם).

Knohl first introduces the idea of the equation of the citizen and alien as an indicator of the H author when surveying the various Passover passages while comparing Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28-29. Knohl, after surveying Exod 12:1-20,[402] points out that the two other Passover passages in P[403] both end with a statement of the equality of the citizen and alien. He goes on to

[400] Gen 2:3.
[401] A situation that Stackert, 11-12, refers to as "creating a blind motif."
[402] For discussion of this attribution, see below.
[403] Exod 12:43-49; Num 9:1-14.

state that "[t]he principle of the equality of the stranger and citizen is widespread throughout the Holiness Code, while in PT it appears only once, in Lev 16:29, a late editorial addition."[404] The issue is that Knohl has assumed his conclusion that Exod 12:43-49 and Num 9:1-14 are not P, largely on the basis of this very criterion,[405] and simply applied that conclusion here. Furthermore, while Knohl is correct that the equality of the alien and citizen commonly occurs in H,[406] this does not make it an exclusively H idea, as exemplified in its occurrence outside of that corpus as well.[407] It should further be noted that if, as argued above, the Holiness Code simply includes P's legal rather than ritual and purity regulations, it makes sense that declarations of equality would accompany precisely those types of rulings, including certain festival laws,[408] as they were apparently incumbent on both Israelites and non-Israelites in the Priestly author's view. Nevertheless, despite the circularity of his argument, Knohl concludes: "The presence of this idea may therefore serve as an indication of HS provenance."[409] In other words, Knohl's logic is that the idea of the equality of the alien and citizen occurs frequently in H, therefore it is an indicator of H, therefore Exod 12:43-49 and Num 9:1-14 are not P because P does not hold this ideology. This type of circular reasoning will be encountered again in the discussion below.

Knohl devotes a chapter to the distribution of the phrase "a perpetual statute for your generations",[410] noting that "an analysis of Leviticus 23 showed that [this] phrase… is a characteristic of the HS in that chapter. Let us therefore use it as a linguistic criterion for

---

[404] Knohl, 21.
[405] Knohl never addressed the provenance of Exod 12:43-49 again, and the only other points he makes about Num 9:1-14 include the idea of "bearing sin" rather than "guilt" and the form of the date, addressed in the discussion of Exod 12:1-20 below.
[406] Lev 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:33, 34; 20:2; 22:18; 24:22.
[407] Exod 12:49; Num 9:14.
[408] Note that both the Covenant Code (Exod 23:14-19) and the Deuteronomic Code (Deut 16:1-17) include festival regulations under the term משפטים (Exod 21:1, Deut 12:1).
[409] Knohl, 21.
[410] Knohl, 46-55.

detecting HS activity elsewhere in the Torah."[411] Knohl divides the priestly material into three parts for the sake of his analysis: a central corpus of P (Exodus 25-30; Leviticus 1-16), the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26), and miscellaneous priestly material (i.e. everything else). While his separation of the Holiness Code from the rest of P is understandable, as it has been part of the critical enterprise for quite some time and serves as the basis of Knohl's departure,[412] his strange grouping of the rest of P flies in the face of the narrative coherence of that text.[413] Furthermore, his denial of Exodus 35-40 to the "central" corpus assumes already his conclusion that these chapters originate in H, although the reasons for this come much later in his argument.[414] An issue with this approach makes itself clear from the outset as well in Knohl's observation that "the phrase… appears fifteen times in the Priestly material: six times in the Holiness Code,[415] four times in the central PT corpus,[416] and five times in the other[417] material."[418] This distribution, six times in H and nine times in P, hardly suggests that this phrase should be taken as indicative of H. Furthermore, at least one of the occurrences in H is part of the appendix on Sukkot in Leviticus 23, which was suggested above to be a later insertion rather than a part of H.

To his credit, Knohl lays out a set of corroborating criteria to accompany his evaluation of this phrase's occurrences in P. While some of the criteria he lays out are used with both sets of Priestly materials that he has identified, he distinguishes between methods for approaching his "central corpus" and the "miscellaneous" material, noting about the latter that the "criterion of

---

[411] Knohl, 46. It occurs in Lev 23:14, 21, 31, 41.
[412] This author, of course, does not think that this is the correct view, but Knohl's employment of it is understandable.
[413] His willingness to dismember P in such a way from the outset most likely gives some insight into his lack of recognition of the way his reattributions damage that text.
[414] Knohl, 66-68. The way that he deals with material in Exodus will be dealt with below.
[415] Lev 17:7; 23:14, 21, 31, 41; 24:3.
[416] Exod 27:21; Lev 3:17; 7:36; 10:9.
[417] Exod 12:14, 17; Num 10:18; 15:15; 18:23.
[418] Knohl, 46.

continuity is invalid, since we are dealing not with a simple literary unity, but with random literary units."[419] This statement, made without defense or documentation, flies in the face of a rather large sector of scholarship that views P as an independent, narrative document extending through (at least) Deuteronomy[420] and once again casts suspicion on his division of P into these two blocks of material. The criteria that he uses for both sets of texts are the presence of contradictions between any laws in the passage and those found in P and linguistic similarities between the passage in question and either the Holiness Code or Ezekiel. The first criterion seems sound and makes good sense. The second criterion begins to veer into methodologically murky waters. Similarity with Ezekiel as an indicator of the presence of H seems to assume the conclusion that Ezekiel knew only H; the unsoundness of this criterion was examined thoroughly in section I. Linguistic similarities with the Holiness Code is something with which Knohl should be more cautious and precise. Especially in Knohl's system, where H is viewed as later than P, there is the unentertained possibility that formulations that appear in H have been borrowed from P and their appearance in P passages would therefore be meaningless in terms of determining authorship. Furthermore, "linguistic similarities" include for Knohl such sweeping generalizations as the use of first person by YHWH, noted repeatedly above.

Problems with the unique criteria proposed for dealing with the two non-Holiness Code groups of texts also present themselves. When dealing with the "central" Priestly corpus, Knohl has proposed that passages containing the phrase "a perpetual statute for your generations" (חקת עולם לדרתיכם) should be identified as an addition if it "disturbs the sequence of the

[419] Knohl, 47.
[420] A view held by Wellhausen, Kuenen, Driver, Noth, Friedman, and many others. Despite the current debate over P's ending (for which, see the summary in Nihan, 20-30), one can not simply state such a conclusion without defense. Even Cross, 293-322, who did not view P as a separate document, still saw a unified Priestly redactional layer in Genesis-Numbers.

larger unit or… it is in a passage appended to a PT unit."[421] While the disturbance of a larger sequence may be a good criterion, although open to subjective interpretation as to what constitutes an interruption, there is no need to assume that every editorial insertion in P is from H. As for the second part of that statement, Knohl ignores the fact that the phrase he is evaluating *naturally* occurs at the ends of units; it is, by nature, a closing statement. Knohl's second unique criterion for dealing with the "central" corpus is "whether there is an apparent ideational motivation for HS's supposed addition to the passage, and whether the passage expresses the unique cultic conception of HS."[422] Knohl has, up to this point, not defined what constitutes such unique cultic conceptions and in fact does so only *after* identifying a large part of P as H.[423] This is the very definition of circular reasoning; he identifies these passages as part of H using his reconstructed cultic profile, then uses the passages to determine H's cultic profile. Additionally, the issues with using ideology to determine stratification have been addressed above. In brief, it has no place. Only after a text has been stratified on other, objective criteria can one determine what a text's ideological profile is. It is unsound to begin with a predetermined view of a text's ideology and then stratify it on that basis.

For dealing with his "miscellaneous" corpus, Knohl proposes that "use of language and terminology unlike that of the central PT corpus" will be indicators of a passage's H provenance. Again, that something is an insertion should not automatically qualify it as being from H. More importantly, though, his identification of the "central PT corpus" with which he is contrasting his "miscellaneous" material is an arbitrary set of texts;[424] different vocabularies may exist for different groups of texts without being anything more than an indication that a different topic is

[421] Knohl, 46.
[422] Knohl, 47.
[423] Knohl, 168-198.
[424] It should be noted as well that this arbitrary grouping is weighted in his favor by denying Exodus 35-40 to the "central" corpus despite his not having yet demonstrated that those chapters are H.

being addressed. As Blum has noted "it is not difficult to identify singular formulations, so-to-speak 'priestly hapax-legomena,' in any part of the priestly traditions."[425] This criterion seems designed to be self-fulfilling. Finally, Knohl proposes to use "[l]iterary structures absent from the central PT corpus, but present in the Holiness Code." Again, more definition as to what these types of structures are should be given. Even supposing the separateness of H, though, it is difficult to see how the deployment of a literary structure could be so distinctly the property of a single author over another.[426]

With these criticisms leveled, a survey of Knohl's application of this method is appropriate. The first passage containing the phrase "a perpetual statute to your generations" (חקת עולם לדרתיכם) is the instructions for bringing the menorah oil in Exod 27:20-21. Knohl offers a possible reason for its placement here, which, as he notes, has offered interpreters difficulty for quite some time. Knohl posits that the text, a near-copy of Lev 24:1-4, was inserted at a transition between the manufacture of the Tent of Meeting with its accoutrements and the manufacture of the priestly garments. He notes that the desire to include it would have arisen out of a desire to provide a section on its function as paralleled in the instructions for the ark[427] and the table,[428] which are placed within the Tabernacle alongside the menorah. Milgrom also argues that this passage has, at the very least, been edited with a view to its doublet in Lev 24:1-4.[429] Where Knohl errs is in assuming that this insertion into the text of Exodus 27 is the work of H. If H includes a passage on the menorah's oil, it is difficult to understand why that author felt the need to duplicate it by adding it to a P text as well. It is just as likely that a final redactor of the

[425] Blum, 36.
[426] And his denial of Exodus 35-40 to the "central" corpus should again be pointed out here as affecting his ultimate conclusions.
[427] Exod 25:22.
[428] Exod 25:30.
[429] Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2084-2085.

Pentateuch[430] felt the need to supply this passage and, rather than creating his own language, copied from an extant command in Leviticus 24. Alternatively, Rashi's reading[431] that this is a command to command, fulfilled in Leviticus 24, could be correct. Alternatively, as Milgrom notes, the focus of the passage is the oil, not the lampstand;[432] perhaps, with the completion of the instructions for constructing the Tabernacle, it was felt that this was an appropriate place to detail how it was to be lit. The point is, there is no necessary reason to associate this passage with H, although this is, admittedly, Knohl's strongest case for reattribution of those under consideration.

The next passage that Knohl considers is Lev 3:17, the prohibition of eating fat and blood at the end of the *šᵊlāmîm* instructions. While some scholars have viewed this verse as a secondary addition to the chapter,[433] the evidence does not necessitate this conclusion. In particular, Knohl's appeal to the endings of the two previous sub-sections[434] and his statement that "[s]tylistic convention would lead us to expect the third section to conclude in such a way as to combine the elements of the previous phrases"[435] as proof that the section originally concluded with v. 16 rings hollow. Knohl gives no examples from which he has derived this ideal of a "stylistic convention." Additionally, the diversity in the notices that close the two prior sub-sections are perfectly at home with the variant closing in the third section; each section has a unique ending and there is no need to attribute this to editorial intervention.[436] Finally, that the prohibition contained in Lev 3:17 is placed at the close of the entire chapter makes perfect sense; it is something that applies to every type of *šᵊlāmîm* discussed in the unit. His further comparison

[430] Of course, for Knohl, this would be H.
[431] On Lev 24:2.
[432] Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2085.
[433] See, e.g., Noth, *Leviticus*, 32.
[434] Lev 3:5, 11.
[435] Knohl, 49.
[436] For the possibility that כל־חלב in Lev 3:16 is the result of vertical dittography from 3:17, see Schwartz, "'Profane' Slaughter and the Integrity of the Priestly Code," 31-32.

to the endings of Leviticus 1-2 to argue that Lev 3:17 is an addition also misses the point; the *šᵊlāmîm* offering is unique in that it is consumed by the offerer, extra regulations concerning how the offering should be handled make as much sense as positing an ending identical to the prior chapters.

Knohl, on the basis of his understanding that Lev 3:17 is an editorial addition, moves to examine Lev 7:22-27 because of its ideational similarity. Despite the common view that this passage is an addition,[437] the need for more complete *šᵊlāmîm* offering regulations makes sense on the basis of the offerer's involvement in the disposition of the sacrifice. Because of this, Lev 7:11-34 is divided into three sections: what the offerer must do with the sacrifice,[438] what the offerer can't do in relation to the sacrifice,[439] and what parts of the offering belong to the priest.[440] That the second and third sections begin with new addresses make sense; the initial audience of Leviticus 6-7 was the Aaronid priests.[441] However, the second and third sections deal with the behavior of the offerer[442] and so are appropriately addressed. The need to switch addressees, uniquely, for the *šᵊlāmîm* instructions is the most likely reason for the oft-noted strange ordering of the regulations in Leviticus 6-7.[443] Knohl's insistence 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,"[444] simply assumes his 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,

[437] See, e.g., Driver, 44; Noth, *Leviticus*, 64.
[438] Lev 7:11-21.
[439] Lev 7:22-27.
[440] Lev 7:28-34.
[441] Lev 6:2.
[442] Note Lev 7:24, 30.
[443] Burnt-offering, grain-offering, sin-offering, guilt-offering, *ŝᵊlāmîm*. Cf. Lev 1-5: burnt-offering, grain-offering, *šelāmîm*, sin-offering, guilt-offering.
[444] Knohl, 50.

unsound. The weakness of his position is further telegraphed in his statement that H's supposed innovation banning profane slaughter was achieved by "adding to the margins of older Priestly scrolls;"[445] Lev 7:22-27 is not in the margin of anything! It is positioned, logically, in the middle of the *šᵊlāmîm* regulations.

The next passage containing "an eternal statute for their generations" that Knohl examines is Lev 7:36. Knohl claims that on the basis of his attribution of 7:22-27 to H "it is reasonable to consider the same possibility regarding the present passage (28-36)."[446] The evidence for his attribution of 7:22-27 has already been shown to rest on shaky grounds, but mere contiguousness is an even weaker criterion. As further evidence of this passage's non-P nature, Knohl points to the use of the term "perquisite" (משחה),[447] the variant procedure described for the offering of the right thigh,[448] and the use of the first person by YHWH.[449] Milgrom is also critical of Knohl's attribution in this case, arguing that the indicative phrase which Knohl has followed to this verse is in fact absent, preferring the Samaritan Pentateuch's reading of "a perpetual due for their generations" (חק עולם לדרתם). While Milgrom could be correct, it should at least be noted that the Samaritan reading could be by contamination of the identical phrase being employed two verses prior.[450] That MT is more diverse is an argument in its favor, so despite Milgrom's suggestion, its reading should probably be retained. The use of

[445] Knohl, 50.
[446] Knohl, 51. It is unclear whether Lev 7:28-36 should be considered a unit, there seems to be a break between 7:34 and 7:35. For the sake of this analysis, we will grant Knohl's understanding of these verses' coherence.
[447] Lev 7:35.
[448] Lev 7:30-32 indicates that the breast is waved while the thigh is not. This seems to contradict Lev 9:21, 10:15 which envision the breast and thigh being waved together. I am not certain that this is actually a contradiction, and their separation in Lev 7:30-32 may be due to that passage's concern to whom the respective parts belong rather than directly with procedure.
[449] Lev 7:34.
[450] Lev 7:34.

"perquisite" (משחה) is also an unclear chronological indicator, as acknowledged by Knohl.[451]

Knohl's case for this section's attribution to H rests, ultimately, solely on the occurrence of the phrase "a perpetual statute for their generations" the distribution of which has yet to prove a reliable indicator of H material.

The last passage in the "central" corpus Knohl examines containing this phrase is Lev 10:9, the prohibition against alcohol consumption by ministering priests. Knohl argues that the passage of which this verse is a part[452] "interrupts the story about the death of the two sons of Aaron,"[453] a strange statement considering that the story isn't precisely resumed in Lev 10:12, and in fact, some time is implied to have passed between Lev 10:7 and 10:12. He further notes the strangeness of YHWH directly addressing Aaron, a phenomenon that he claims "happens nowhere else in PT"[454] assuming his already reached, but not yet demonstrated, conclusion that Numbers 18, which is also addressed directly to Aaron is H. Even were the address to Aaron unique, this does not necessarily indicate that it does not come from the author of P. Everything about Leviticus 10 is strange and difficult to understand, and the circumstances surrounding the death of Aaron's sons and the fact that this passage contains the commissioning of the priesthood may have suggested themselves as reasons for having YHWH speak directly to Aaron. Knohl points as well to "linguistic similarities to Ezekiel (44:21, 23)"[455] a fact that, as pointed out above, has little to no bearing on whether a passage should be attributed to P or H. At this point in his analysis, Knohl has failed to convincingly demonstrate not only the H provenance but even

[451] Knohl, 51. See also Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 433-434; Avi Hurvitz, "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*, ed. David Krone (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983), 90-91.
[452] Lev 10:8-11.
[453] Knohl, 51.
[454] Knohl, 51.
[455] Knohl, 51-52.

the non-P provenance of any of the passages he has examined due to the presence of the phrase "a perpetual statute for your generations" with the possible exception of Exod 27:20-21.

Knohl next turns his attention to his "miscellaneous" corpus, pointing first to Exod 12:1-20. This is a passage that Knohl deals with both on the basis of the phrase "a perpetual statute for your generations"[456] and in his comparison of the festival calendars in Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28-29.[457] The reasoning he employs in both of those sections will be dealt with here. As evidence of the non-P provenance of this unit, Knohl points to the deviant *krt* formula employed in this chapter[458] which threatens excision from Israel (מישראל)[459] or the congregation of Israel (מעדת ישראל)[460] rather than the more typical "from its people"(מעמיה).[461] Perhaps this variation does point to a non-P provenance but, if understood this way, the same evidence points equally to a non-H provenance. This particular formulation does not occur in the Holiness Code, and Knohl's appeal to the only parallel, in Num 19:13, assumes his conclusion that that passage is H instead of P, something he attempts to establish largely through the dubious criterion of the remainder of the passage flowing smoothly after the removal of 19:10b-13.[462] Furthermore, the *krt* formula is anything but standardized,[463] and variation occurs rather frequently;[464] the variation here is simply not sufficient grounds for attribution, either away from P or to H. Knohl also points to the use of the phrase "I am YHWH" in the passage,[465] a phrase whose distribution

[456] Knohl, 52.
[457] Knohl, 19-21.
[458] Knohl, 52.
[459] Exod 12:15.
[460] Exod 12:19.
[461] See, e.g., Gen 17:14; Exod 31:14; Lev 7:20.
[462] Knohl, 93-94. For an understanding to this passage in relationship to the narrative material surrounding it, see discussion above.
[463] See Appendix 6.
[464] As can be seen in Appendix 6. Note, though, that within a given pericope the forms tend to be consistent. This perhaps has some bearing on the question of the sources that the author of P has incorporated into his work.
[465] Exod 12:12.

and importance to P have been discussed in section I.[466] Knohl argues as well from the similarity between Exod 12:14 and Lev 23:41, a passage he attributes to H but which was argued above to be a later insertion. Such similarities of phrasing when talking about the same topic, in this case a command to perform a חג, are often not indicative of anything other than a similar topic being discussed. Knohl also employs the intimation of the equality of the citizen and the alien[467] as an indicator that Exod 12:1-20 is H; the circularity with which he established this as a criterion for identifying H has been dealt with above. Again, Knohl has provided no convincing reasons for viewing this passage as an H insertion.

In his analysis of the festival calendar, Knohl makes the slightly more nuanced argument that the legal portion of Exod 12:1-20 could be split into two passages, 12:15-17 and 12:18-20. Knohl claims that these are doublets of each other and that 12:18-20 represents a later expansion.[468] His argument for this rests on two observations: the dating formula employed and the relationship between *maṣṣôt* and Passover. Knohl argues that the dating formula employed in 12:18, which simply states "on the first" (ברשאון) instead of "on the first month" (בחדש הרשאון) implies a late date for this passage;[469] this is important to Knohl because he views H as later than P. However, Knohl himself notes that this dating style occurs throughout P, and especially in Gen 8:5, 13 which he himself does not reckon as H.[470] Therefore, this dating style is utterly worthless for determining stratification within the Priestly text, especially since, as he

[466] The issues with Knohl's widespread use of this criterion will be dealt with in more detail below as well.
[467] Exod 12:19.
[468] Knohl, 19-20.
[469] Knohl, 19.
[470] His reference to Loewenstamm's, 19, n. 29, argument that those are the latest additions to the P flood account rings of *ad hoc* explanation that simply suits the point he is trying to make.

himself notes, both this later form and the earlier form can occur side by side in later works.[471] The second issue that Knohl points to is that Exod 12:18 seems to view the beginning of *maṣṣôt* to fall on the day of the Passover offering, the fourteenth day of the first month.[472] This is distinct from the view in Lev 23:5-8, which Knohl views as part of the PT layer of Leviticus 23; in that passage, *maṣṣôt* falls on the day after Passover, the fifteenth day. There are two possible solutions to this problem. The first, advocated by Propp, is that Israelites used both solar and lunar indicators to mark the beginning of the day, making any date ambiguous depending on which system is being used.[473] An alternative solution, complementary to Propp's, is that despite Exod 12:18 stating that *maṣṣôt* begins on the fourteenth, it actually means the fifteenth. This passage gives not just a start date, but an end date: the twenty-first day of the month, which it insists is seven days after the fourteenth. The only way this is possible, however, is if the fifteenth is considered the actual beginning of the festival. That the Israelites counted dates inclusively in this way is indicated by the common expression "yesterday and three days ago,"[474] (תמול ושלשׁם) commonly understood to mean "yesterday and the day before," the current day being counted as the first day. More importantly, Wagenaar has pointed out that the festival is stated in this passage to begin in the evening of the fourteenth day, [475] which could be dated in some systems to the fifteenth day[476] as attested by the Day of Atonement instructions which are dated to the tenth of the month,[477] despite the command stating that festival observance begins on

[471] Knohl, 22, n. 38. The example he himself points out is Num 9:1, 5 (which he doesn't separate into different strata precisely because that would damage the point he's trying to make), as well as examples in Zechariah and Haggai.
[472] Knohl, 19-20.
[473] Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 383-387, 390-392, 405-406.
[474] See, e.g., Exod 4:10; Ruth 2:11.
[475] Exod 12:18.
[476] Wagenaar, 104.
[477] Lev 23:27.

the evening of the ninth day of the month.[478] Additionally, Knohl's initial observation that this passage is a doublet fails to contend with an important point that suggests the unity of the passage. If Exod 12:18-20 are actually separate from 12:15-17 then there is no date given for the festival that is under discussion. It is simply sometime in the first month if the context from the Exod 12:1-14 is carried over. While the passage is somewhat redundant, Propp rightly notes that each repetition adds a layer of meaningful detail, most likely by design.[479] There is no need to view it as an expansion or an addition, and even if it were, no positive evidence drives one to attribute it H.

Joel Baden, a supporter of Knohl's hypothesis, has also offered an argument for the H provenance of Exod 12:14-20.[480] Baden, rightly, argues that the narrative nature of the P document is an important factor in determining stratification.[481] Baden goes on to note that the law-giving event is an important event in P and that it takes place at Sinai. Baden argues that P would not include legal materials that precede or follow this particular event, as that would violate a primary narrative aspect of P.[482] Therefore, Baden argues, Exod 12:14-20 can not be an original part of the Priestly text. While the beginning of Baden's argument is completely in agreement with the method used throughout this paper, and his observation that the Sinai event marks the bulk of the law-giving in P is correct, his assertion that P does not contain any legal material prior to the Sinai event is simply incorrect. Baden notes both Genesis 17 and the

---

[478] Lev 23:32.
[479] Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 406-407.
[480] Baden, 25-26, argues that Exod 12:1-13 are P.
[481] Baden, 17-19.
[482] Baden, 20. I believe that Baden is, off the bat, incorrect about there being no revelation after Sinai. Baden's claim, 22-23, that "one of the historical claims inherent in the framing narrative of the priestly author is that the divine laws were given by God to Moses exclusively while the Israelites were at Sinai," is directly contradicted by Num 7:89. Additionally, it ignores P's assertion that revelation came from the Tent of Meeting (Lev 1:1) not from Sinai itself (a feature also noted by Schwartz, "The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai," 123-124). His focus on Sinai most likely arises from the parallel JE accounts, as well as from his bizarre view, 24, that in P "the location of the cult is not addressed," completely ignoring P's focus on the משכן.

passage under discussion in Exodus but dismisses the legal nature of Genesis 17. He claims that the characterization of Genesis 17 as a "covenant" (ברית) is contradictory to P's presentation of the law-giving; Genesis 17 lists promises from god, while P views law-giving as something "given by divine fiat."[483] Baden's distinction here seems strange, to say the least. The threat of *krt*[484] and the language of the passage in general,[485] and the details given[486] indicate that circumcision is not intended as a suggestion but a command. To characterize this as a non-legal passage is to play semantics, despite Baden's appeal to the Rabbinic view of this passage as being non-legal in nature.[487] Both Gen 17:9-14 and Exod 12:14-20 contain the same type of language;[488] they are both legal passages that predate the major Sinaitic revelation. This does not, however, violate the logic of P; over and over it has been shown how the author of P intertwined law and narrative. So, the law of circumcision is placed in the narrative of the covenant-making with Abraham, and the main Passover regulations are contained alongside the narrative of the first Passover. It should further be noted that the covenant with Abraham, the stipulations of which Baden claims are different in some way from actual law, is the context within which YHWH acts to bring the Israelites out of Egypt,[489] including the striking of the firstborn.[490] If the passages in Genesis 17 and Exodus 12 seem out of place in P's general narrative scheme, it is because of the Priestly author's desire to intertwine law and narrative whenever possible,

[483] Baden, 20-21.
[484] Gen 17:14.
[485] Gen 17:9, "You will keep my covenant."
[486] Gen 17:12-13 detail both when circumcision should take place and who must be circumcised.
[487] Baden, 21.
[488] Gen 17:14 || Exod 12:15, 19; Gen 17:9 || Exod 12:17; Gen 17:12-13 || Exod 12:15-16, 18-19.
[489] Exod 6:4-8.
[490] Exod 6:6; 7:4 || 12:12. It could be argued that the Priestly עדות functions under the framework of the ברית made with Abraham. In other words, the relationship within which law is given is initiated with Abraham, with the majority of such regulations reserved until the construction of the Tent of Meeting.

especially when speaking of such important matters as circumcision and Passover.[491] It should be noted that Baden also fails to account for other legislation P places prior to Sinai, specifically the commands against murder and blood consumption.[492] His method, while sound, has been improperly applied in this case, and so there are no narrative grounds for viewing Exod 12:14-20 as an addition to the Priestly text.

Knohl next turns his attention to Num 10:1-10. He claims that this is an H passage on the grounds that it contains the phrase "an eternal statute for your generations," despite the fact that this has been something that he has set out to prove in this section of his argument,[493] something which was not initially borne out by the distribution of the phrase nor confirmed by his individual analyses of its occurrences. Knohl further adduces the presence of the phrase "I am YHWH," again something that has been demonstrated to not be an indicator of H. Particularly jarring is his argument that the passage here ends with these two phrases side-by-side, [494] but, as has been noted, these are naturally passage-final statements; finding them at the end of a regulation is neither a surprise nor an indicator of authorship.

Deviating slightly from Knohl's arrangement, his analysis of Numbers 18 will be examined before moving on to his view of Numbers 15. Knohl points to the occurrence of the term "perquisite" (משחה),[495] the direct address from YHWH to Aaron,[496] and Ezekielian parallel[497] as evidence that this chapter is H rather than P. The idea that a parallel with Ezekiel is evidence of H authorship is heavily questionable as discussed extensively in section I; that priestly traditions would have similar interests is not unexpected, and it is impossible to separate

[491] It should be noted as well that the Sabbath regulations in P are anchored in the narrative of Gen 2:1-3.
[492] Gen 9:4-6.
[493] Knohl, 52-53.
[494] Knohl, 53.
[495] Num 18:8.
[496] Num 18:1, 8, 20.
[497] Cf. Ezek 44:28-30.

common interest from actual literary influence. Knohl's use of the term "perquisite" as an indicator of H is dependent on his assignment of Lev 7:28-36 to H, an insight questioned above. Again, though, the use of a single term is not a wide enough basis on which to determine authorship. The direct address of Aaron by YHWH is a feature that occurred in Lev 10:8-11 which Knohl also attempted to attribute to H, largely on the basis of that feature. As argued above, it is not difficult to imagine that in certain places YHWH would directly address Aaron in certain situations. As in the Leviticus passage, this passage also sees YHWH speaking to Aaron about the responsibilities and related dues of the priesthood. Significantly, YHWH switches to speaking to Moses when he moves on to the subject of the Levites' share of Israelite offerings.[498] Furthermore, the connection between these regulations and the events of Numbers 16-17 is part of the pattern of fusing law and narrative noted above as a feature of the Priestly text.

Nevertheless, Knohl attempts to use this same connection alongside connections to other Levite passages to argue for the H provenance of this passage. Knohl attributes the majority of the texts related to the Levites to H, arguing that they are a unique concern of that stratum and that P has no interest in the Levites. It should first of all be noted that this attribution is based entirely on the application of his derived criteria, as Levites are mentioned only once in the Holiness Code as classically understood, [499] which is to say that one would not assume, on the basis of Leviticus 17-26, that the author of H was concerned with the Levites either. Knohl begins by noting the connection between the redemption of human firstborn by five shekels[500] and YHWH's statement that any who are not redeemed by the presence of a Levite must make a payment of five shekels.[501] He concludes that the passages related to the Levites serving as

[498] Num 18:25.
[499] Lev 25:32.
[500] Num 18:15-16.
[501] Num 3:45-48.

redemption for the firstborn should be attributed to H.[502] While his conclusion that these passages come from the same hand is sound, the idea that they should be attributed to H rather than P is rested only on the connection to Numbers 18 and the use of the phrase "I am YHWH," something that is in no way unique to the Holiness Code and which was shown to be in keeping as well with P's ideology.

Knohl eventually identifies a complex of passages in the book of Numbers as a "Levite Treatise," consisting of Numbers 3-4, 8, 16-18; he identifies these as H on their connection with Numbers 18, [503] a passage whose links with the story of Korah's rebellion and its aftermath is also seemingly sufficient grounds for Knohl's attribution of that passage to H as well.[504] At this point, Knohl seems to be well on his way to simply re-identifying everything as H simply based on their connection to each other, moving further and further away from criteria actually derived from the Holiness Code. While continuity is an important criterion for identifying sources, he has yet to provide a convincing reason to view this continuity as the result of an author distinct from the one responsible for the rest of the Priestly text. Having identified all of these passages as H, he then feels secure in identifying Exod 38:21, which describes Ithamar's oversight over the Levites, as H rather than P. Another explanation, once again anchored in P's narrative logic, presents itself. That passage is meant to note the place of the Levites in P's worldview, but as an issue to be discussed is put off until after all the laws in Leviticus are given. This is because the Levites have no cultic duty in P, their job is to transport and guard the tabernacle. Their transportation duties, then, are logically placed prior to the community's departure from Sinai, as this will be the first time that the Tabernacle is moved. The guard duties of the Levites are stated in this passage as well but reiterated after the incident with Korah along with their dues, a

[502] Knohl, 54.
[503] Knohl, 71-73.
[504] Knohl, 76-83.

placement explained by P's noted desire to link law to narrative wherever possible. A further issue with Knohl's attribution of the Levite passages to H rather than P is his idea that "the functional distinction between priests and Levites is one of the innovations of HS."[505] This leaves a gaping hole in P's entire system, as the appointment of Aaron and his descendants to the priesthood is a regular feature of P that seems to leave no room for any other priestly group.[506] That P was unaware of the existence of the Levites, or of the claim of other groups' pan-Levitic priesthood,[507] seems preposterous. That P was aware and yet chose to remain silent about them seems even more difficult to accept. The tenuousness of Knohl's analysis seems to grow with each connection he makes, simply stringing together passages that belong together in P and using their relationship with one another as a sign that they are from H instead. That he takes no account of what remains of P, as seen in his reattribution of the Levite passages to H, is a further weakness of his hypothesis.

Knohl then evaluates Numbers 15. Knohl notes the use of "from the midst" (מקרב) in the *krt* formula and the repetition and revision of the sin-offering legislation from Leviticus 4. He claims that the innovation of Numbers 15, which holds the view that "any sin performed willfully constitutes blasphemy,"[508] is derived from the ideology of Leviticus 19, a passage Knohl claims "sees all laws as being of equal importance as expressions of God's will."[509] Knohl is most likely correct that Numbers 15 is an insertion in the P text,[510] as it, like Numbers 28-29 neither mentions the Tabernacle nor has any organic connection to the surrounding narrative

[505] Knohl, 66.
[506] Exod 28:1-2; 40:12-15; Leviticus 8-9.
[507] See, e.g., Exod 32:29; Deut 18:1-8.
[508] Knohl, 53.
[509] Knohl, 53.
[510] An opinion long held by scholars, see, e.g., Noth, *Numbers*, 114; Eissfeldt, 204-205; Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed*, 266, n.

context[511] as well as containing doublets[512] and innovations[513] of legislation given in Leviticus 1-5. Knohl may even be correct that its ideological innovation is derived from ideas contained in Leviticus 19. However, there are serious issues with attributing this passage to the same hand, whether P or H, that produced Leviticus 17-26, although Knohl is not the first to suggest this connection.[514] In the first case, if H felt the need to make additions to or alter P's sacrificial regulations, it is difficult to understand why it grouped these together in a far separated corpus, while adding substantial additions to Leviticus 1-7, as claimed by Knohl. To posit, as Knohl does, that this inconsistency of method is an indicator of a long period of activity during which differing methods were employed but nevertheless displaying a continuity of "H ideology"[515] is not a hypothesis but an *ad hoc* explanation to preserve his predetermined understanding. Secondly, the lack of any mention of the Tabernacle in these passages is difficult to square with the Holiness Code's opening demand that all sacrifices be brought to that location. Third, the language used throughout Numbers 15 is at odds with the language used, not just in P but even just in Leviticus 17-26. More importantly, this unique language is not related to any of the specific topics under discussion, which could be expected to deploy unique vocabulary, but in phrases and notes found throughout both P and H. The statement that these laws are to be performed "when you come to the land of your settlements"[516] is unique and departs from the one used in H which simply states "when you come to the land."[517] The statement that introduces the innovation to the sin-offering notes that the duration of the commandments is "from the day

[511] At least, Num 15:1-31 do not.
[512] Num 15:22-28 recapitulates, with some difference, the sin-offering of Leviticus 4.
[513] Such as the specification of the grain-offerings (Num 15:3), libations (Num 15:4-12), and the introduction of a baked first-fruit offering (Num 15:18-21).
[514] E.g., Kuenen, 96, n. 38.
[515] Knohl, 200-202.
[516] Num 15:2.
[517] Lev 19:23; 23:10; 25:2.

when YHWH commanded and onwards (הלאה) to your generations," a phrase unique and unemployed anywhere else in H or P. The statement on the equality of the citizen and alien[518] is also unique in its syntax and displays a complete blurring of the line between instruction (תורה), judgment (משפט), and statute (חקה) noted in section I. Additionally, while H may view the citizen and alien as equally bound to the law, the concept found in Num 15:26 of a sacrifice functioning simultaneously for both citizen and alien is found nowhere in H. The way that blasphemy is spoken of is also unique, employing the term "revile" (גדף)[519] where H tends to employ the term "profane" (חלל).[520] Note as well the use of "despise" (בוז) and "break" (פרר) to describe disregard for YHWH's word.[521] While H does use the term "break" (פרר), it always uses it in regard to the covenant,[522] not with a commandment as in Numbers 15. For all of these reasons, it seems more likely that Numbers 15 should be regarded, like Numbers 28-29 and Lev 23:39-43, as a later addition to the Priestly text, possibly as part of the final redaction of the Pentateuch.[523] With this, Knohl's analysis of passages containing the phrase "an eternal statute for your generations" comes to an end, with very little in the way of useable results having been obtained. As his further analysis and assignment of passages is based largely on the fruits of his labor here and on his comparison of Numbers 28-29 and Leviticus 23, there is little need to go further in examining his attributions in detail. Nevertheless, larger issues with his reattribution program will be evaluated below.

---

[518] Num 15:15-16. Cf. Exod 12:49; Lev 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:33, 34; 20:2; 22:18; 24:22; Num 9:14.
[519] Num 15:30.
[520] Lev 18:21; 19:12; 20:3; 21:6; 22:2, 32.
[521] Num 15:31.
[522] 26:15, 44.
[523] Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, 108.

2.5 Further Issues in Knohl's Analysis

The first problem, already noted several times in the analysis offered above, is Knohl's overreliance on first person speech as a criterion for identifying H passages. Knohl carries the application of this criterion, which he never bothers to prove is unique to H, to such an extent that he attributes the revelation of the divine Name in Exodus 6 to H rather than P,[524] completely destroying its narrative arc, paralleled in E. Despite this, Knohl insists that P envisions a schematic view of history based on a period before and after the revelation of the name YHWH,[525] although how P accomplished this without an account of the revelation of the Name is never addressed. Furthermore, Knohl's overreliance on the first-person as a criterion for H leads him to the bizarre conclusion that after the revelation of the Name YHWH, god was envisioned by the Priestly author as more removed and hidden and obscure than he was before, something accomplished by the exclusive use of third-person referents for the deity.[526] Furthermore, the application of this criterion leads to nonsensical suppositions about the editing of texts. For instance, Knohl attributes Lev 6:10-11 to late H tampering on the basis of the phrase "from my gifts" (מֵאִשַּׁי) and the use of first person verbs.[527] Milgrom rightly points out the difficult with this supposition as it does not explain why the same editor or interpolator does not make the same changes to the very next verse, containing the same phrase.[528] More importantly, Milgrom also notes that the phrase itself "carries no ideological freight identifiable with H. To the contrary, it contains essential information… that is included in other P pericopes in chaps. 6-

[524] Knohl, 17, n. 24, 61.
[525] Knohl, 124-125. In 125, n. 3, Knohl makes the confusing observation that the patriarchal stories in Genesis both speak of אל שדי speaking even though "the name אלהים" is used in these chapters as well. This is not really an issue since אלהים is NOT a name, but a noun used to describe a class of being.
[526] Knohl, 125-128.
[527] Knohl, 126, n. 7.
[528] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 17.

7."[529] Having just a single P passage where the first person is employed weakens Knohl's entire attribution scheme and analysis, which depends on the complete lack of this feature in P after the revelation of the Name. Additionally, once the distribution of first versus third person references in divine speech are analyzed,[530] a much more likely explanation for its non-use in Leviticus 1-7, a large portion of Knohl's "central corpus," presents itself: this is most likely an indication that P has here incorporated a pre-existent source document into his work. That is to say, Leviticus 1-7 does not, overall, reflect the usage of the Priestly author himself,[531] which is best derived from the narrative passages in his work.

A second problem with Knohl's work is that he never attempts to make sense of the two strata that he separates out. Which is to say, he never evaluates them in terms of their literary forms or function. Knohl seems to be working within a largely documentarian framework, but he has eviscerated the Priestly text without providing a complementary work in his H strata. 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 narrative and ritual instructions without any accompanying legal material.[532] Knohl's P nonsensically jumps from the plague of boils[533] to the receiving of the Tabernacle instructions.[534] Furthermore, Knohl shows no sensitivity to narrative conventions, arguing that Exodus 25-30, with their direct address to Moses envisions him, rather than the community,[535] as the sole builder of the Tabernacle and going so far as to say that "PT believes that Moses sanctified the Tent, the altar, and the priests" as opposed to the H view "that

[529] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 17.
[530] See Appendix 2.
[531] In fact, Leviticus 1-7 stands out in comparison to the rest of P. See Appendix 2.
[532] See Appendix 5.
[533] Exod 9:8-12.
[534] Exodus 25-30.
[535] Knohl, 63-66.

it was God who sanctified [those things].”[536] That P believed that a human being could sanctify anything apart from YHWH and his presence seems difficult to believe. Knohl’s P ends, narratively, with the deaths of Aaron’s sons,[537] apparently followed by purity regulations,[538] the *śôṭāh*,[539] the red heifer law,[540] and coming to an end in a festival calendar.[541] That such a piecemeal and narratively incomprehensible document is left when Knohl is finished is a strong blow to his theory, and the contrapositive supposition, an examination of H as a narrative work, shows the same weaknesses. Indeed, the method of Knohl’s H is difficult to understand, as he envisions it making editorial additions here and there and inserting wholesale chapters in other places.

Finally, Knohl’s insistence that H be identified with R has little to no evidence. His argument rests largely on his assignment of the Exodus Sabbath passages to H and claiming that these form an intentional chiasmus with the JE material of Exodus 32-34 in the center.[542] This argument is weak from the outset, as even if the passages in question are H, it is just as possible for a redactor, unrelated to H, to frame the material in this way. Perhaps the strongest argument against Knohl’s argument is his admission of invasive H additions and editing in P legal material while there is a lack of such interference in JED legal material. Knohl attempts to explain this by stating that “the differing attitudes of the HS editors toward the two collections of texts [JE & P] apparently stem from HS’s consideration of PT as its guiding spiritual source.”[543] Once again, this type of editor makes little sense. If H as R was so concerned with fixing the Priestly

[536] Knohl, 49, n. 6.
[537] Knohl, 106.
[538] Leviticus 11-16.
[539] Num 5:11-31.
[540] Numbers 19.
[541] Numbers 28-29.
[542] Knohl, 66-68.
[543] Knohl, 102.

presentation and worldview, it stands to reason that the same type of meddling would be found in the other traditions.

Knohl's thesis, then, falls on all grounds. The basic framework from which he starts his argument was shown to be unacceptable and undefended. The criteria he employed were largely dependent on observations of characteristics of H that he never attempts to demonstrate are exclusive to H material, although he employs them as though that were the case. His logic is often circular, assuming his conclusion to make his point. His large scale reattribution of material often depends on a domino-like pattern, accepting one passage on the basis of thin evidence and then connecting as many passages as possible to that one. Finally, his conclusions are nonsensical. Neither his P nor H documents are coherent in any way, and the method of production he envisions for H's intervention and addition to P is difficult to comprehend. This is not to deny the presence of stratification in the Priestly text, but some other explanation should be sought. Knohl does not provide a sound method for identifying these strata and the idea that all additions to the Priestly text can be identified with a single ideological viewpoint seems farfetched. Nevertheless, some insight can be salvaged from Knohl's work, especially in examining ways in which the Priestly author combined preexisting materials into a coherent ideological framework and his arguments that the priestly elements in Leviticus 17-26 are native to that text rather than later editorial insertions. For the most part though, there is no viability for Knohl's method or model, and other ways of understanding the compositional history of the Priestly text should be sought.

REFERENCES

Auld, Graeme. "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, 2003.

Baden, Joel. "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, 2009.

Blum, Erhard. "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, 31-55. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009.

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic.* Massachusets: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Crüsemann, Frank. *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*. Translated by Allan W. Mahnke. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Driver, S.R. *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: an Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Harper and Row: 1965.

Friedman, Richard Elliott. *The Bible with Sources Revealed*. New York: HarperCollins, 2003.

---. "The Deuteronomistic School." In *Fortunate the Eyes that See*, edited by Astrid B. Beck, et al., 70-80. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1995.

---. "An Essay on Method." In *LeDavid Maskil*, edited by Richard Elliott Friedman and William H.C. Propp, 1-15. Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

---. *The Exile and Biblical Narrative.* California: Scholars Press, 1981.

---. *Who Wrote the Bible?* New York: HarperCollins, 1987.

Friedman, Richard Elliott and Shawna Dolansky. *The Bible Now*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Gilders, William K. "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, 2009.

Gray, G.B. *Numbers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903.

Halpern, Baruch. "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, 1991.

Haran, Menahem. "Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 54 (1983): 111-122.

Hurvitz, Avi."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, 1983.

Joosten, Jan. *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, 1996.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Religion of Israel.* Translated and Abridged by Moshe Greenberg from תולדות האמונה הישראלית. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

Klostermann, August. *Der Pentateuch*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1893.

Knohl, Israel. "The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 58 (1987): 65-117.

---. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995.

Kohn, Risa Levitt. *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah*. JSOTSup 358. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Kuenen, Abraham. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch.* Translated by Philip H. Wicksteed. London: MacMillan & Co, 1886.

Kugler, Robert A. "Holiness, Purity, the Body, and Society: The Evidence for Theological Conflict in Leviticus." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 76 (December 1997): 3-27.

Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 1-20.* Anchor Bible v. 4. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

---. *Numbers 21-36.* Anchor Bible v. 4A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Lyons, Michael A. *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*. LHBOTS (JSOTSup) 507. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

Milgrom, Jacob. "H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, 24-40. SVT 93. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

---. *Leviticus 1-16*. Anchor Bible v. 3. NewYork: Doubleday, 1991.

---. *Leviticus 17-22*. Anchor Bible v. 3A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

---. *Leviticus 23-27*. Anchor Bible v. 3B. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

---. *Numbers*. JPS Torah Commentary v. 4. New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.

---. "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of Pre-Monarchic Israel." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* v. 69 (1978): 65-81.

Nihan, Christophe. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated by Bernhard W. Anderson. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981.

---. *Leviticus*. Translated by J.E. Anderson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

---. *Numbers*. Translated by James D. Martin. London: SCM Press, Ltd, 1968.

Olyan, Saul. "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 2005): 201-209.

---. "'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 1994): 179-206.

Paton, L.B. "The Original Form of Leviticus xvii.-xix." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 16, no 1/2 (1897): 31-77.

---. "The Original Form of Leviticus xxi., xxii." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 17, no 2 (1898): 149-175.

---. "The Original Form of Leviticus xxiii., xxv." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 18, no 1/2 (1899): 35-60.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941.

Propp, William H.C. *Exodus 1-18*. Anchor Bible v. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

---. *Exodus 19-40*. Anchor Bible v. 2A. New York: Doubleday, 2006.

---. "The Priestly Source Recovered Intact?" *Vetus Testamentum* 46, no. 4 (October 1996): 471-474.

Rofé, Alexander. *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Ruwe, Andreas. "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, 2003.

Schwartz, Baruch. "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, 1996.

---. "'Profane' Slaughter and the Integrity of the Priestly Code." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 67 (1996): 15-42.

---. "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, 2009.

Smith, Christopher R. "The Literary Structure of Leviticus." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 70 (1996): 17-32.

Stackert, Jeffrey. "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath: Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11 (2011): 2-21.

Sun, Henry T.C. *An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26).* PhD diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1990.

Talmon, Shemaryahu."The Presentation of Synchroneity and Simultaneity in Biblical Narrative," in *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible*, 112-133. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993.

Wagenaar, Jan A. *Origin and Transformation of the Ancient Israelite Festival Calendar*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechsgeschichte v. 6. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2005.

Warning, Wilfried. *Literary Artistry in Leviticus*. Biblical Interpretation Series v. 35. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Translated by W. Robertson Smith. New York: Meridian Books, 1965.

APPENDIX 1. List of terms and phrases in Leviticus 17-26[544]

Phrase	Occurrences in H	Occurrences in P	Occurrences outside P
אני יי	See Appendix 3	See Appendix 3	
כי קדוש אני יי	19:2; 20:26; 21:8	(cf. Lev 11:44, 45)	
מקדשכם/הם	20:8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32	Exod 31:13	Ezek 20:12; 37:28
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)	
ונתתי/ושמתי פני בְּ	17:10; 20:3, 5, 6; 26:17		Jer 21:10; 44:11; Ezek 14:8; 15:7
והכרתי מקרב	17:10; 20:3, 5, 6		(cf. Ezek 14:8)
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
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
ושמרתם ... ועשיתם	18:4; 19:37; 20:8, 22; 22:31; 25:18; 26:3		
שְׁאֵר	18:6, 12, 13, 17; 20:19; 21:2; 25:49	Num 27:11	
זמה	18:17; 19:29; 20:14		Judg 20:16; 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;

[544] Adapted from S.R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 49-50.

			119:150; Prov 10:23; 21:27; 24:9; Job 17:11; 31:11
עמית	18:20; 19:11, 15, 17; 24:19; 25:14, 15, 17	Lev 5:21	Zech 13:7
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)
לחלל קודש/מקדש	19:8; 21:12, 23; 22:15	Num 18:32	Ezek 22:26; 12:39; 44:7
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
שבתון	23:3, 24, 32, 39; 25:4, 5	Exod 16:23; 31:15; 35:2; Lev 16:31	
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; 18:23 (cf. Gen 17:7)	Num 15:15
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
ויראת מאלהיך	19:14, 32; 25:17, 36, 43		
דמיו בו/דמיהם בם	20:9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 27		Ezek 18:13; 33:5
לחם אלהים	21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25	(cf. Lev 3:11, 16)	Num 28:2; Ezek 44:7 (cf. Num 28:24; Ezek 16:19)
נשא חטא	19:17; 20:20; 22:9; 24:15	Num 9:13; 18:22, 32	(cf. Isa 53:12; Ezek 23:49)
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 2. The Use of First and Third Persons by the Deity in P

Text Unit[545]	First Person Verbs[546]	First Person Pronominal Suffices[545]	Third Person Verbs[545]	Third Person References[547]
Gen 1-11	(**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	(**30**): 17:2 (2x), 4[548], 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	(**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	(**19**): 6:3, 4, 5, 6, 8; 7:3 (2x), 4 (3x), 5 (2x); 12:13; 14:15, 17, 18; 16:28 (2x), 32	(**2**): 16:29 (2x)	(**4**): 12:11, 14, 48; 16:23
Exod 24-31[549]	(**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	(**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)	(**29**): 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,

[545] Only the P portions of these sections are being included in the count. The source division is from Richard Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005).

[546] Format: (**Total**): References. Note that first and third person verb usage include the format personal pronoun/name + participle; 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.

[547] 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.

[548] "I am here" – אני הנה.

[549] The Decalogue is being intentionally skipped, as its assignment to any of the sources is debated.

Text Unit[545]	First Person Verbs[546]	First Person Pronominal Suffices[545]	Third Person Verbs[545]	Third Person References[547]
	(3x), 11, 13			16, 20, 37; 31:3(?), 15
Exod 34-40	(**0**)	(**2**): 40:13, 15	(**0**)	(**4**): 35:2, 5 (2x), 10
Lev 1-10	(**5**): 6:10; 7:34 (2x); 10:3 (2x)	(**2**): 6:10; 10:3	(**1**): 10:11	(**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, 12, 14, 15, 18; 7:5, 11, 14, 20, 21, 25, 29 (2x), 30 (2x);
Lev 11-16	(**5**): 11:44[550], 45[549]; 14:34 (2x); 16:2	(**1**): 15:31	(**0**)	(**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
Lev 17-27	(**87**): 17:10 (2x), 11, 12, 14; 18:3, 24, 25; 19:2[549], 36; 20:3 (2x), 5 (2x), 6 (2x), 8, 22, 23 (2x), 24 (3x), 25, 26[549] (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),	(**73**): 17:10; 18:4 (2x), 5 (2x), 26 (2x), 30; 19:3, 12, 19, 30 (2x), 36 (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	(**1?**): 17:2(?)	(**91**): 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[551], 16; 25:2, 4; 27:2, 9 (2x), 11, 14,

[550] "I am holy"- קדש אני.

[551] 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 Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 2115-6.

Text Unit[545]	First Person Verbs[546]	First Person Pronominal Suffices[545]	Third Person Verbs[545]	Third Person References[547]
	28 (2x), 30 (3x), 31 (3x), 32, 33 (2x), 36, 41 (2x), 42 (3x), 44 (2x), 45 (2x)	(2x), 44		16, 21, 22, 23, 26 (2x), 28 (2x), 30 (2x), 32
Num 1-10	(**8**): 3:12, 13; 5:3; 6:27; 8:16, 17, 18, 19	(**14**): 3:12, 13 (4x), 41, 44; 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
Num 11-20	(**27**): 13:2; 14:27, 28, 30, 31, 35 (2x); 15:41; 16:21; 17:10, 19, 20 (2x); 18:6, 7, 8 (2x), 11, 12, 19, 20[552], 21, 24 (2x), 26; 20:12, 24	(**16**): 14:27 (2x), 14:28 (2x), 29, 30, 34, 35; 15:40; 17:20, 25; 18:8, 9; 20:12 (2x), 24	(**0**)	(**19**): 14:28; 15:39, 40; 17:3; 18:6, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19 (2x), 24, 26, 28 (2x), 29; 19:2 (?), 13, 20
Num 25-36	(**6**): 25:11, 12; 27:12; 35:24 (2x)	(**5**): 25:11 (3x), 12; 27:14	(**0**)	(**5**): 25:13; 27:21; 31:28, 29, 30

*Note that the phrase **לפני יי** in these instances may be a stereotyped reference to a specific geographical location within the sacred precinct. Note especially the alternation between this phrase and **לפני אהל מועד** in Lev 3:7-8, 12-13.

[552] "I am your portion"- אני חלקך.

APPENDIX 3. Divine Self Declaration in P

Reference[553]	Context/Excerpt	Usage/Notes
Gen 17:1	אני אל שדי	Initial declaration to Abraham
Gen 35:11	אני אל שדי	Initial declaration to Jacob
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	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/closing formula
Exod 29:46a	וידעו כי אני יי אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי	"Knowing" motif/Exodus reference
Exod 29:46b	אני יי אלהיהם	Closing formula
Exod 31:13	כי אני יי מקדשכם	Sabbath/sanctifying
Lev 11:44	כי אני יי אלהיכם	Closing formula/sanctifying
Lev 11:45	כי אני יי המעלה	Closing formula/Exodus reference/sanctifying
Lev 18:2	אני יי אלהיכם	Opening formula
Lev 18:4	אני יי אלהיכם	?
Lev 18:5	אני יי	Closing formula?
Lev 18:6	אני יי	
Lev 18:21	אני יי	
Lev 18:30	אני יי אלהיכם	Closing formula
Lev 19:2	כי קדוש אני יי אלהיכם	Descriptive/Justificatory
Lev 19:3	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 19:4	אני יי אלהיכם	

[553] Holiness Code references in bold.

Lev 19:10	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 19:12	אני יי	
Lev 19:14	אני יי	
Lev 19:16	אני יי	
Lev 19:18	אני יי	
Lev 19:25	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 19:28	אני יי	
Lev 19:30	אני יי	
Lev 19:31	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 19:32	אני יי	
Lev 19:34	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 19:36	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 19:37	אני יי	
Lev 20:7	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 20:8	אני יי מקדשכם	
Lev 20:24	אני יי אלהיכם אשר־הבדלתי	
Lev 20:26	כי קדוש אני יי ואבדיל	Closing formula/descriptive
Lev 21:8	כי קדוש אני יי מקדשכם	Descriptive/sanctifying
Lev 21:12	אני יי	
Lev 21:15	כי אני יי מקדשו	Sanctifying
Lev 21:23	כי אני יי מקדשם	Sanctifying
Lev 22:2	אני יי	
Lev 22:3	אני יי	
Lev 22:8	אני יי	
Lev 22:9	אני יי מקדשם	Sanctifying
Lev 22:16	כי אני יי מקדשם	Sanctifying
Lev 22:30	אני יי	
Lev 22:31	אני יי	
Lev 22:32-3a	אני יי מקדשכם המוציא	Exodus reference/sanctifying
Lev 22:33b	אני יי	Closing formula
Lev 23:22	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 23:43	אני יי אלהיכם	

Lev 24:22	כי אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 25:17	כי אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 25:38	אני יי אלהיכם אשר־הוצאתי	Exodus reference
Lev 25:55	אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 26:1	כי אני יי אלהיכם	
Lev 26:2	אני יי	
Lev 26:13	אני יי אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי	Closing formula/Exodus reference
Lev 26:44	כי אני יי אלהיהם	
Lev 26:45	אני יי	Closing formula
Num 3:13	אני יי	Passover reference
Num 3:41	אני יי	Passover reference
Num 3:45	אני יי	Passover reference
Num 10:10	אני יי אלהיכם	Closing formula
Num 14:35	אני יי דברתי	Oath?
Num 15:41a	אני יי אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי	Exodus reference
Num 15:41b	אני יי אלהיכם	Closing formula
Num 35:34	כי אני יי שכן בתוך בני ישראל	Closing formula/Tabernacle (Exodus 29) reference

APPENDIX 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
טָמֵא/טְמֵאָה	Lev 5:2; 7:19, 21; 10:10; 11:4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31,	Lev 20:25; 22:4; (?27:11, 27)

	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	
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 1:3; 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)
קָדוֹשׁ	Exod 29:31; Lev 6:9, 19, 20; 7:6; 10:13;	Lev 19:2; 20:7, 26; 21:6, 7, 8; 24:9

	11:44, 45; 16:24 Num 6:5, 8; 16:5, 7	
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
מִשְׁכָּן[554]	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, 29; 25:12, 13	Lev 24:8; 26:9, 15, 25, 42, 44, 45
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

[554] 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).

APPENDIX 5. Knohl's Division of PT and HS[555]

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]"[556]

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	

[555] Adapted from Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 104-6.
[556] Knohl, 104. Note that for Knohl, PT (Priestly Torah) = P and HS (Holiness School) = H.

HS Corpus	*PT Corpus*
31:1-17, 18**	
32:15**	
34:29-35**	
35:1-40:38	
Leviticus	
1:1	1:1-16:34*[557]
3:17	
6:10-11	
7:19b[558]	
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[559]	
Numbers	
1:48-5:10	1*[560]
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[561]

[557] 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.

[558] 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."

[559] 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.

[560] 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.

[561] 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*
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*
31:1-54	
32:6-15	
33:52-53, 55-56[562]	33*[563]
	34[564]
35:1-36:13	
Deuteronomy	
32:48-52	

[562] 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."
[563] 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.
[564] 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 6. *KRT* Formulae[565]

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

[565] Holiness Code references in bold.

מֵעַמֶּיהָ	נִכְרְתָה	Num 9:13
מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּהּ	נִכְרְתָה	Num 15:30
עֲוֹנָהּ בָּהּ	הִכָּרֵת תִּכָּרֵת	Num 15:31
מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל	נִכְרְתָה	Num 19:13
מִתּוֹךְ הַקָּהָל	נִכְרְתָה	Num 19:20