

# THE VISION OF THE PRIESTLY NARRATIVE

# ANCIENT ISRAEL AND ITS LITERATURE

Thomas C. Römer, General Editor

*Editorial Board:*

Mark G. Brett

Marc Brettler

Corrine L. Carvalho

Cynthia Edenburg

Konrad Schmid

Gale A. Yee

Number 27



# THE VISION OF THE PRIESTLY NARRATIVE

Its Genre and Hermeneutics of Time

*by*

Suzanne Boorer



**SBL PRESS**

**Atlanta**

Copyright © 2016 by SBL Press

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, SBL Press, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Boorer, Suzanne, 1954– author.

Title: The vision of the priestly narrative : its genre and hermeneutics of time / by Suzanne Boorer.

Description: Atlanta : SBL Press, [2016] | Series: Ancient Israel and its literature ; number 27 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016021820 (print) | LCCN 2016022681 (ebook) | ISBN 9780884140627 (pbk.: alk. paper) | ISBN 9780884140641 (hardcover: alk. paper) | ISBN 9780884140634 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: P document (Biblical criticism) | Bible. Pentateuch—Criticism, interpretation, etc.

Classification: LCC BS1181.6 .B66 2016 (print) | LCC BS1181.6 (ebook) | DDC 222/.1066—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016021820>

Printed on acid-free paper.



Time present and time past  
Are both ... present in time future,  
And time future contained in time past

T. S. Eliot, "Burnt Norton," "The Four Quartets"



## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	xi
Abbreviations .....	xiii
 1. Introduction.....	 1
1.1. History of Interpretation	2
1.1.1. Preliminary Considerations	2
1.1.2. Survey of Views of the Interpretation of P as a Whole	10
1.2.3. Conclusions	33
1.2. Establishing the Parameters	34
1.2.1. An Originally Separate Source (Pg)	43
1.2.2. Definition and Extent of Pg	47
1.2.3. Did Pg Know Non-P?	90
1.2.4. Dating	100
1.2.5. Conclusions	104
1.3. Task and Approach	105
 2. The Structure of Pg.....	 109
2.1. Attempts at Structuring Pg	109
2.1.1. Survey of Views	109
2.1.2. Conclusions	129
2.2. Proposed Structure	131
2.2.1. Macrostructure	131
2.2.2. Linear Trajectory	140
2.2.3. Parallels	164
2.2.4. The Interrelation of Parallels and Trajectory	170
 3. The Genre and Hermeneutics of Pg.....	 175
3.1. A Survey of Interpretations in Relation to Genre	176
3.1.1. Lohfink, Blum, Janowski, Fritz, Blenkinsopp, and Carr on the Generic Nature of the Priestly Material	176

3.1.2. Genre Development in Ancient Near Eastern and Greek Texts: The Views of Damrosch and Van Seters	188
3.1.3. Van Seters, Damrosch, and Gorman on the Generic Nature of the Priestly Material	197
3.2. A Critique of Views regarding the Generic Nature of the Priestly Material	203
3.3. Conclusions regarding the Generic Nature of Pg, Its Hermeneutics of Time, and Function	210
4. The Paradigmatic Nature of the Scenarios within Pg's Story of the Nation and Their Hermeneutics of Time.....	217
4.1. Exodus 7–14*	218
4.1.1. The Paradigmatic Nature of Exodus 12*: The Liturgical/Ritual Centerpiece	220
4.1.2. The Paradigmatic Nature of the Narrative Frame: Exodus 7–11*; 14*	241
4.1.3. The Interaction of the Ritual Centerpiece and Narrative Frame	279
4.1.4. Conclusion: The Complex Paradigmatic Picture of Exodus 7–14* as a Whole	291
4.2. Exodus 16–Numbers 27*	294
4.2.1. The Paradigmatic Nature of Exodus 24*; 25–29*; 39–40*: The Sinai Pericope as Ritual Centerpiece	294
4.2.2. The Paradigmatic Nature of the Narrative Frame: Exodus 16*; Numbers 13–14*; 20*; 27*	375
4.2.3. The Interaction of the Centerpiece and Narrative Frame	408
4.2.4. Conclusion: The Complex Paradigmatic Picture of Exodus 16–Numbers 27* as a Whole	425
4.3. Exodus 1:13–7:7*	426
4.4. The Combination of Exodus 7–14* and Exodus 16–Numbers 27*	447
4.4.1. Numbers 13*–14*; 20*; 27* as Reversing Exodus 1–40*	447
4.4.2. The Consequent Picture	450
5. The Interpretation of the Story of the Nation within Pg as a Whole, Its Trajectory, and Parallels, in Light of Its Hermeneutics of Time.....	455



5.1. The Paradigmatic Nature of the Historiographical Trajectory of the Promises in the Story of the Nation and Its Ancestors in Genesis 11:27–Numbers 27:14*	457
5.1.1. Pg's Picture in Genesis 11:27–50:13*; Exodus 1:1–5, 7	458
5.1.2. Pg's Paradigmatic Trajectory in the Unfolding of the Ancestral Promises in Genesis 11:27–Numbers 27:14*	474
5.2. The Historiographic and Paradigmatic Nature of the Cosmic Backdrop in Genesis 1–9* and the Transition from the World to Abraham in Genesis 10:1–11:26*	488
5.2.1. Pg's Picture in Genesis 1:1–11:26*	488
5.2.2. The Historiographic and Paradigmatic Nature of Genesis 1:1–11:26*	496
5.3. Conclusion: The Historiographic and Paradigmatic Nature of Pg as a Whole	500
6. Conclusion: Embodying the World of the Text, Cognitively, Existentially, and through Ritual Praxis, or Not .....	503
6.1. Genesis 1:1–11:26*	505
6.2. Genesis 11:27–Exodus 1:7*	508
6.3. Exodus 1:13–7:7*	515
6.4. Exodus 7:8–14:29*	519
6.5. Exodus 15–Numbers 27*	531
Bibliography .....	563
Appendix: Texts Constituting the Priestly Narrative.....	583
Index of Biblical References .....	585
Index of Modern Authors.....	613



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project had its seminal roots in an extended essay on the theology of the Priestly narrative many years ago when I was an undergraduate; ever since then the use of time in this material has been an ongoing curiosity to me. I would like to thank, therefore, all those who have mentored me and/or inspired in me a fascination for the Old Testament texts and their theological perspectives over the years from then until now, including (but not limited to) Tony Campbell, Brevard Childs, Gene Tucker, and Carol Newsom.

My thanks also go to my colleagues for putting up with me during the time it has taken to write this book and in particular my Old Testament colleague, Jim Trotter.

I would like to express my appreciation for the generous amounts of study leave granted to me by Murdoch University and the Perth Theological Hall, without which I would never have completed this book.

Finally, my thanks go to SBL Press for publishing this book and in particular the editors of the *Ancient Israel and Its Literature* series, initially Steven McKenzie and then, especially, Thomas Römer, who heroically read my manuscript twice and offered helpful suggestions.



## ABBREVIATIONS

ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ADPV	Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BKAT	Biblische Kommentar, Altes Testament
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BRev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZABR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series
DBAT	<i>Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament</i>
Dtr	Deuteronomist/Deuteronomic
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary

FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	Forms of Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GDNE	Gorgias Dissertations: Near East Series
HAR	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
HBT	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HerBS	Herders biblische Studien
HS	Holiness School source
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
IBS	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
ITC	International Theological Commentary
J	Yahwist
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBTh	Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie
JNES	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JPSTC	Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KST	Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
NCB	New Century Bible
NIB	<i>New Interpreter's Bible</i> . Edited by Leander E. Keck. 12 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994–2004.
NIDB	<i>New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by Katherine Doob Sakenfeld. 5 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 2006–2009.
non-P	non-Priestly material
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis

ÖBS	Österreichische biblische Studien
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
P	Priestly material
Pg	Priestly <i>Grundschrift</i> , the independent P narrative
Ps	secondary P, supplement to Pg
PT	Priestly Torah
R	Redactor
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
Siphrut	Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures
StBib	Studia Biblica
SymS	Symposium Series
TB	Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert
<i>TDOT</i>	Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. <i>The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Translated by John T. Willis et al. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1974–2006.
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Supplementum
WAWSup	Writings from the Ancient World Supplement Series
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>ZABR</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>





## INTRODUCTION

It is generally agreed that it is relatively easy to distinguish Priestly material (P)<sup>1</sup> from non-Priestly material (non-P) in Genesis–Numbers (Joshua).<sup>2</sup> However, when it comes to identifying the overall theology of the Priestly material, or what it might be primarily about, there is much more contention. A range of views have been proposed, primarily in articles<sup>3</sup> and sections in books whose primary concern is mostly with one section of P<sup>4</sup> or with source/redactional issues or with defining the extent or possible levels within P.<sup>5</sup> Philip Jenson’s statement that “there have been surprisingly few full-scale theological studies of P in spite of the fact that it is the

---

1. When referring to Priestly material in general, I will use the siglum P.

2. E.g., the comment by Christophe Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study of the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT 2/25 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007], 20): “Still today, the distinction between ‘Priestly’ and ‘non-Priestly’ material ... on the basis of its distinctive language, syntax and theology, remain one of the few unquestioned results of Pentateuchal criticism.”

3. See, e.g., the classic articles of Karl Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 121–43; Norbert Lohfink, “The Priestly Narrative and History,” in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 136–72 (originally published as “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte,” *Congress Volume: Göttingen, 1977*, VTSup 29 [Leiden: Brill, 1977], 189–225).

4. See, e.g., Erich Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken: Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie der priesterschriftlichen Urgeschichte*, SBS 112 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983); David Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 43–140.

5. See, e.g., Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992); Ludwig Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, BZAW 214 (New York: de Gruyter, 1993); Thomas Pola, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von Pg*, WMANT 70 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995); Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*; Philippe

most clearly definable source”<sup>6</sup> is still more or less applicable today. It is this issue of the meaning of P as a whole, at least at some level that includes the P narrative material, that will form the focus of this study, in the hope that such an exploration will throw a little more light on the big picture of what might lie at its heart hermeneutically and theologically.

### 1.1. HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION

#### 1.1.1. Preliminary Considerations

Perceptions of the overall theology of P as a whole are inevitably affected, at least to some extent, by the complex debates surrounding the definition, nature, extent, and dating of the priestly material. The primary issues around which these debates have centered are as follows.

Does this Priestly material constitute, at least at some level, a once “independent” document; that is, a “source” that originally stood separately before later being combined with the non-P material by a later redactor(s)?<sup>7</sup> If so, did P know and draw on some of the non-P material

---

Guillaume, *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18*, LHBOTS 391 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009).

6. Philip Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*, JSOTSup 106 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 26. Jenson attributes this to the observation that “much of the challenge and difficulty of the Priestly material is how so many disparate concepts and institutions can be held together as a more or less coherent whole” (92). Of course, whether the Priestly material can be viewed as a coherent whole, and at what level, is an issue that is taken up in the following discussion.

7. See, e.g., Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. Bernard W. Anderson (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 8–19; Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung”; Sean McEvenue, *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*, AnBib 50 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971); Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 144–47; Suzanne Boorer, “The Kerygmatic Intention of the Priestly Document,” *ABR* 25 (1977): 12–20; Ralph Klein, “The Message of P,” in *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Jörg Jeremias and Lothar Perlitt (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 57–66; Walter Brueggemann, “The Kerygma of the Priestly Writers,” in *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, ed. Hans W. Wolff and Walter Brueggeman, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982), 101–13; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 32–36; Peter Weimar, “Struktur und Komposition der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung,” *BN* 23–24 (1983–1984): 81–162; Klaus Koch, “P-Kein Redaktor! Erinnerung an zwei Eckdaten der Quellenscheidung,” *VT* 37 (1987): 446–67; Volkmar Fritz, “Das Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift,” *ZTK* 84 (1987): 426–

to compose its own account or not?<sup>8</sup> Or does P represent a redaction of

---

39; J. A. Emerton, "The Priestly Writer in Genesis," *JTS* 39 (1988): 381–400; Ernest W. Nicholson, "P as an Originally Independent Source in the Pentateuch," *IBS* 10 (1988): 192–206; Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 221; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 78; Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*, LAI (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 108; Antony F. Campbell, "The Priestly Text: Redaction or Source?" in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: Für Norbert Lohfink*, ed. G. Braulik, Walter Gross, and Sean McEvenue (Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder, 1993), 32–47; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*; Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, esp. 46–47; Carr, "Scribal Processes of Coordination/Harmonization and the Formation of the First Hexateuch(s)," in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz, FAT 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 63–83; Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 292–96; Baruch J. 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. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 103–34; Graeme I. Davies, "The Composition of the Book of Exodus: Reflections on the Theses of Erhard Blum," in Fox, *Texts, Temples, and Traditions*, 71–85; Michaela Bauks, "La signification de l'espace et du temps dans l'historiographie sacerdotale," in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Thomas Römer, BETL 147 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 29–45; Christian Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung erinnern: Zum Ende der Priesterschrift*, HerBS 23 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2000); Jean-Louis Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, trans. P. Dominique (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 147 (note: in this later work he speaks of the "relative independence" of P, but in his earlier work he saw P as a redaction; see n. 8); Albert de Pury, "The Jacob Story and the Beginning of the Formation of the Pentateuch," in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, ed. Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, SymS 34 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 51–72, esp. 62, 68–69; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*; Guillaume, *Land and Calendar* (although he tends to incorporate some texts traditionally attributed to J into his Pg); Joel Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, FAT 68 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 197–207; Thomas Römer, "The Exodus Narrative according to the Priestly Document," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel Baden, ATANT 95 (Zurich: TVZ, 2009), 157–74, esp. 158; Konrad Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, trans. Linda Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 147–48.

8. The majority of scholars who hold the position that at some level there once existed an independent or separate Priestly narrative as listed in n. 7 also hold that P knew the non-P material; see especially McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 23–25; Lohfink,

the non-P material, whereby the non-P material was incorporated by the P redactor(s)?<sup>9</sup>

---

“Priestly Narrative,” 146–47 n. 31; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 147; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 47, 60–61, 90, 92, 117; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 292–96. The main exception is the position held by Schwartz (“Priestly Account”) and Baden (*J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 197–207), who maintain that the P source did not know the non-P material (J and E). Another exception is Guillaume (*Land and Calendar*, 7, 46, 145) who relegates the material he perceives as non-P, (which is not in places the same as the material traditionally attributed to non-P), “whether it is pre-Pg, post-Pg, or displaying Deuteronomistic traits” (7), to secondary P [Ps]. Moreover, there is some debate with regard to the delineation of the specific non-P texts that are earlier than P; this will be taken up in the later discussion in §1.2.3.

9. See, e.g., Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 293–325, esp. 306–7, 317–21; Sting Tengström, *Die Toledotformel und die literarische Struktur der priesterlichen Erweiterungsschicht im Pentateuch*, ConBOTS 17 (Lund: Gleerup, 1981); Jean Louis Ska, “La Place d’Ex 6:2–8 dans la narration de l’exode,” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 530–48; Ska, “Quelques remarques sur Pg et la dernière rédaction du Pentateuque,” in *Le Pentateuque en question: Les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes*, ed. Albert de Pury, MdB 19 (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989), 95–125 (but note that in his later work he speaks of the relative independence of P; see n. 7); Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, trans. J. Scullion, JSOTSup 89 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 156–70, esp. 169–70; Marc Vervenne, “The ‘P’ Tradition in the Pentateuch: Document and/or Redaction? The ‘Sea Narrative’ (Ex 13:17–14:31) as a Test Case,” in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989*, ed. C. Brekelmans and J. Lust, BETL 94 (Leuven: Peeters, 1990), 67–90; John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 322–42; Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 100–112; Van Seters, *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary*, Trajectories 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 164–77; Frank Crüsemann, *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*, trans. Allen Mahnke (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996); Thomas Dozeman, *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 89, 104–9, 135. However, Dozeman in a more recent article (“The Priestly Wilderness Itineraries and the Composition of the Pentateuch,” in Dozeman, *Pentateuch: International Perspectives*, 256–88, esp. 282–83, 287) admits that there are signs of an independent P source lying behind the P itineraries in Exodus and Numbers. Israel Knohl (*The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995]) presents a different model but one that lies close to this redactional one. Although he advocates a Priestly Torah (PT), this is fragmentary, and he attributes many of the Priestly narrative texts to his Holiness School (HS),

If there was once an independent, or more precisely, separate, document, what specific Priestly texts constituted it? Almost all who adhere to P as a separate document identify a basic coherent Priestly narrative, a Priestly *Grundschrift* (Pg), which is distinguished from later P-like material that supplemented Pg (Ps or H/HS) or the combination of Pg and non-P material (H/HS or post-P redaction).<sup>10</sup> Still, which particular texts make

---

which is made up of layers of redaction that both edited the PT texts and combined them with the non-P material. In this he is followed, albeit to a lesser extent, by Jacob Milgrom (*Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3B [New York: Doubleday, 2000], 1334, 1338, 1343–44); Milgrom, “HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, VTSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 24–40).

10. When speaking of the Priestly *Grundschrift*, the independent P narrative that many scholars have distinguished, I will use the siglum Pg. For the Priestly *Grundschrift*, see scholars listed in n. 7. An exception is Sigmund Mowinckel (*Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch: Die Berichte über die Landnahme in den drei altisraelitischen Geschichtswerken*, BZAW 90 [Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964], cited in A. Graeme Auld, *Joshua, Moses and the Land: Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980], 27–31), who simply takes P as a whole without worrying about possible levels and supplements.

Ps stands for secondary P and has been used traditionally for priestly material that supplemented Pg. More recently, with the recognition that the Holiness Code (Lev 17–26) is later than Pg, with texts similar to it found outside Lev 17–26 especially in Exodus and Numbers (labeled H or HS [for Holiness School]), some scholars see H as supplementing Priestly material only: e.g., Baruch Schwartz, “Introduction: The Strata of the Priestly Writings and the Revised Relative Dating of P and H,” in Shectman, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, 1–12; Jeffrey Stackert, “The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplementation, and Replacement,” in Shectman, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, 187–204; William Gilders, “Sacrifice before Sinai and the Priestly Narrative,” in Shectman, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, 57–72.

For H/HS as supplementing and combining P and non-P material, see, e.g., Eckart Otto, “The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch,” in Shectman, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, 135–56; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 545–71. For post-P redaction, see, e.g., Jan Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch*, FRLANT 186 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000); Reinhard Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*, BZABR 3 (Weisbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003); Thomas Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Construction of the Book of Numbers,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and Brian Aucker, VTSup 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 419–45; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*,

up this Pg?<sup>11</sup> If a redaction, does this Priestly material consist of fragmentary comments or a redactional layer with a specific perspective(s)?<sup>12</sup> Or is the nature of P neither a source nor redaction, but something in between; that is, a *Komposition* (KP) that incorporates non-P material (KD) but has traits of deliberate coherence between P texts at least in places and reveals a consistent theological rationale across the P texts that have been added to the non-P material?<sup>13</sup>

If perceived as an independent source or a deliberate redaction layer, where might this original document or intentional redaction layer or *Komposition* have ended? Do the texts in P-style in Joshua represent the conclusion of an originally independent narrative source (Pg) or intentional redactional layer?<sup>14</sup> Or does Pg or P as redactional layer or *Komposition* conclude rather with the death of the Mosaic generation, including at least Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*; or perhaps Deut 34\*?<sup>15</sup> Or does it conclude earlier than this, at some point in the Sinai pericope?<sup>16</sup>

---

25–30, 571–72. See also Christophe Nihan, “The Priestly Covenant: Its Reinterpretations and the Composition of P,” in Shectman, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, 87–134.

11. There is a range of views regarding the precise definition of Pg in terms of the particular texts to be included, especially with regard to its extent; see, e.g., the definitions of Pg by various scholars set out in the appendices in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 220–24, and Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 193–95; and see the later discussion in §1.2.2.

12. For fragmentary comments, see, e.g., Rendtorff, *Problem of the Process of Transmission*, 156–70. For a redactional layer, see, e.g., Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 293–325; and Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 322–42; Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 164–77.

13. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*.

14. For the former, see, e.g., Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 275–92, esp. 287–89; Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145; Ernst Axel Knauf, “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichten der Deuteronomisten,” in Römer, *Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, 101–18; Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 156, 161, 166; and most recently, Carr (*Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 295–97) suggests that Pg once concluded with the settlement in the land. For the latter, see, e.g., Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 322–42 (Van Seters sees the conclusion of his P redaction in Judg 1); Dozeman, *God at War*, 89, 104, 135.

15. For Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*, see, e.g., Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 151; Ska, “Le récit sacerdotal: Une ‘histoire sans fin’?” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, ed. Thomas Römer, BETL 215 (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 631–53; Ed Noort, “Bis zur Grenze des Landes? Num 27,12–23 und das Ende der Priesterschrift,” in Römer, *Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, 99–119; Joel Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Considerations,” in Shectman, *Strata of the*



When are these Priestly texts, whether perceived as a source constituting a basic narrative, Pg, or as a redaction, or *Komposition*, to be dated? In the preexilic period or the exilic/early postexilic period (pre-520 BCE) or later, that is, during the Second Temple period?<sup>17</sup>

---

*Priestly Writings*, 13–29, esp. 22–23; Suzanne Boorer, “The Place of Numbers 13–14\* and Numbers 20:2–12\* in the Priestly Narrative (Pg),” *JBL* 131 (2012): 45–63.

For Deut 34, see, e.g., Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 10; Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung,” 121, 128; Ronald E. Clements, *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 109; Terrence Fretheim, “The Priestly Document: Anti-Temple?” *VT* 18 (1968): 314; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 19; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 320; Brueggemann, “Kerygma of the Priestly Writers,” 102; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 36–43; Weimar, “Struktur und Komposition,” 85; E. Cortese, *Josua 13–21: Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, OBO 94 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990); Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 181–82; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 265, 271; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*.

16. See, e.g., Eckart Otto (“Forschungen zur Priesterschrift,” *TRu* 62 [1997]: 1–50, esp. 35; “Holiness Code,” 135), who concludes Pg in Exod 29\*; Pola (*Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 298, 364), Bauks (“Signification de l’espace,” 30–37), de Pury (“Jacob Story,” 63–65), and Reinhard Kratz (*The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, trans. J. Bowden [London: T&T Clark, 2005], 103, 111, 113), who end Pg in Exod 40\*; Erich Zenger (“Die Bücher der Tora/des Pentateuch,” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, ed. Erich Zenger, 5th ed., KST 1.1 [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004], 164), and Thomas Römer (*The So-called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction* [London: T&T Clark, 2005], 82, 178–80; “Exodus Narrative,” 160; “Israel’s Sojourn,” 424–27), who end Pg in Lev 9; and Matthias Köckert (“Leben in Gottes Gegenwart: Zum Verständnis des Gesetzes in der priesterschriftlichen Literatur,” in *Gesetz als Thema Biblischer Theologie*, ed. Ingo Baldermann and Dwight R Daniels, *JBTh* 4 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989], 29–61), Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*), who end Pg with Lev 16.

17. For the preexilic period, see, e.g., Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972); Weinfeld, *The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel*, *VTSup* 100 (Leiden: Brill, 2004); Avi Hurvitz, “The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology,” *RB* 81 (1974): 24–56, esp. 55; Menahem Haran, “Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 321–33; Ziony Zevit, “Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P,” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 481–511, esp. 510; Schwartz, “Priestly Account,” 103–34. Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*) dates his PT and much of his HS (though not all) to the preexilic period; and Milgrom (*Leviticus 17–22*, 1345) dates P and H to the preexilic period but HR to the exilic period.

For the exilic/early postexilic period, see, e.g., Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung,” 141–

It is to be expected that the particular conclusions drawn with regard to all these questions regarding the definition, nature, extent, and dating of P have some influence on the views that have been put forward regarding the interpretation of P (however conceived) as a whole; and indeed in some cases, the perception of what P is concerned with overall has influenced the answers given to these questions.

For example, Frank Cross's view that the central goal of the Priestly work is "the reconstruction of the covenant of Sinai and its associated institutions"<sup>18</sup> reflects his position that the Priestly stratum (of the Tetrateuch) is a redaction that incorporated JE since it is in the JE material only, and not in P texts, that there is a covenant at Sinai. Those who see P as an originally independent or separate document see no covenant at Sinai: it is the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17, preceded by the Noahic covenant in Gen 9\*) that is significant in P.<sup>19</sup> Another example, this time in relation to the issue of the definition and extent of P, is seen in the view of Sigmund

---

43; Clements, *God and Temple*, 111, 122; Peter Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.*, OTL (London: SCM, 1968), 86; Fretheim, "Priestly Document," 313; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 186; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 325; Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 147–48; Boorer, "Kerygmatic Intention"; Klein, "Message of P," 58; Brueggemann, "Kerygma of the Priestly Writers," 159; Weimar, "Struktur und Komposition," 86–87; Fritz, "Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift," 427; Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuch*, 238; Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*; Davies, "Composition of the Book of Exodus," 84; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 139; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 252–55, 292, 297–98, 303; Crüsemann, *Torah*, 283; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*; Bauks, "Signification de l'espace"; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 161; de Pury, "Jacob Story," 69–70; Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 436; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 158, 163, 169; Otto, "Holiness Code," 135; Saul Olyan, "An Eternal Covenant with Circumcision as Its Sign: How Useful a Criterion for Dating and Source Analysis?" in Dozeman, *Pentateuch: International Perspectives*, 347–58; and Schmid, (*Old Testament*, 148, 151) places P in the Persian period but prior to 525 BCE, admitting that at its earliest it was exilic.

For the Second Temple period, see, e.g., J. G. Vink, "The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament," in *The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies*, ed. J. G. Vink, OtSt 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 1–144; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 333–60; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 259–61; Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 180, 183; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 394, 614; Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 187.

18. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 325.

19. See Walter Zimmerli's classic article, "Sinaibund und Abrahambund: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift," in *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, TB 19 (Munich: Kaiser, 1963), 205–16.



Mowinckel, for whom the fulfillment of the promise of the land is the primary theme and climax of the Priestly material.<sup>20</sup> This reflects his view that his independent P document (within which he does not distinguish levels of text such as Pg and Ps) includes Num 32; 33:50–34:29; 35:9–15; Josh 4:19; 5:10–12; 9:15b–21; 12–19; 21, which are texts that look toward and then recount the coming into and distribution of the land; to some extent he has included these texts because he thinks that the emphasis on the promise of the land throughout P must reach its conclusion and fulfillment.<sup>21</sup> In stark contrast, for Martin Noth, whose Pg contains none of these texts from the second half of Numbers or Joshua, the land promise is of little or no significance for Pg as he perceives it; rather, it is the setting up of the cult at Sinai that is all important, and once the cult was set up anything after that was not significant.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, those who conclude Pg in the Sinai material obviously tend to emphasize that the goal and purpose of Pg is the setting up of the cult (or at least the tabernacle).<sup>23</sup> An example with regard to the issue of dating is the tendency that can be observed among those who date the P material (or more accurately Pg) in the exilic period as seeing the Sinai material within it as a program for the future.<sup>24</sup> In contrast, Ludwig Schmidt, who dates Pg in the fifth century BCE, after the construction of the Second Temple, sees Pg as justifying and legitimating the hierocracy of the Second Temple.<sup>25</sup>

It will be helpful to keep this interrelation between these complex issues and overall interpretations of P in mind in the following review of the various views of the interpretation of P as a whole that have been proposed, and the positions held with regard to these issues will be noted

---

20. Mowinckel, *Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch*, cited in Auld, *Joshua, Moses and the Land*, 27–31.

21. See Auld, *Joshua, Moses and the Land*, 30.

22. According to Noth the narrative unfolding of the land promise in Pg is merely following inherited (JE) tradition. Martin Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, trans. Hugh G. Williamson, JSOTSup 50 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 138; Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 240–42.

23. See the scholars listed in n. 16.

24. E.g., Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 325; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 140; and see Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 159 n. 117.

25. Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 259–61. The interplay of interpretation and dating is almost inevitably circular with regards to this material: often a perceived interpretation is surmised as fitting most appropriately in a certain era, and vice versa, i.e., a perceived era may inform interpretative conclusions.

where appropriate. However, it must also be said that this interrelation between perceptions of P's theology overall and positions regarding the definition, nature, extent, and dating of P is, in many cases, only partial. On the one hand, among those who follow similar positions with regard to these issues, there can be a range of hypotheses regarding the overall theological horizon of P.<sup>26</sup> For example, although Noth attributes little or no significance to the land promise in his interpretation of P as a whole, some others who have basically followed Noth's definition of Pg and in particular its conclusion with the Mosaic generation (Deut 34\*) before the book of Joshua, have highlighted the promise of the land as not only significant, but as the key point within Pg's theological horizon, albeit as a future hope.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, at times those with differing views, especially with regard to the nature of P as source, redaction, or *Komposition*, can come to not dissimilar conclusions with regard to P's overall theological intent.<sup>28</sup> For example, Erhard Blum's discussion of the theology of his P *Komposition* (KP) overall seems to be based on P texts almost entirely, with little reference to the non-P material (KD) incorporated, and could almost just as easily be a discussion of Pg as an independent document. This is supported by the fact that the interpretation of Pg by Christophe Nihan, who adheres to an originally independent Pg that he sees as concluding with Lev 16, unlike Blum's KP that concludes in Num 27\*, is nevertheless very close to that of Blum's interpretation of his KP and indeed could be perceived as a development of it. All this will be borne out in the following survey of views.

### 1.1.2. Survey of Views of the Interpretation of P as a Whole

The various positions regarding the interpretation of P as a whole fall into three main categories: those who see P's primary concern contained in the Sinai material, those who focus on the land, and those who seek to interpret P by integrating in some way the theme(s) of the Sinai material

---

26. This is largely due to which aspects of the text are weighted most heavily.

27. See, e.g., Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung"; Brueggemann, "Kerygma of the Priestly Writers."

28. This is perhaps a reflection of the fact that, because the style of P texts is so distinctive, those who see P as a redaction or *Komposition* incorporating the non-P material tend to focus on the P texts specifically in unfolding the theology overall.

with the theme of the land. Consequently, the following survey of views is arranged according to these categories.<sup>29</sup>

### 1.1.2.1. Sinai

The majority of scholars see P's primary concern as residing in the Sinai material.

Noth sees the goal of his originally independent Priestly narrative (Pg<sup>30</sup>) as the Sinai story; it is to this "'ideal' cultic order," the ideal sanctuary and God's relationship to it, embodying the proper worship of God, that P as a whole is oriented.<sup>31</sup> Its "purpose was ... to present a program for the future, or else to offer a corrective of prevalent views with the object of helping to bring about a reform or in the expectation that such a reform would one day take place."<sup>32</sup>

Although Cross perceives P as a redaction of the non-P (JE) material, his view of the theology of this exilic document as a whole (JEP), which

---

29. The various views within each category will be ordered chronologically. This survey is necessarily selective, aiming to include the most significant.

30. Although Noth does not specifically label the Priestly narrative (as distinct from secondary P supplementation), he outlines in *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17–19, as Pg, this is what scholars after Noth called such a P narrative. Noth sees his Pg as exilic concluding in Deut 34\* but maintains that, since Pg is only following inherited tradition outside Sinai, especially in the texts after Sinai, these are not significant for the theology of P; therefore the theme of the land is not important in P's theology as a whole. See 242 n. 634, and n. 22 above.

31. Ibid., 240; see further 240–46, esp. 243, 246.

32. Ibid., 243. Prior to Noth, Gerhard von Rad interpreted P as concerned with the *legitimation* of those ordinances that constitute Israel (*Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch: literarisch untersucht und theologisch gewertet*, BWANT 65 [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934], 187–88). Noth rejects this view in favor of seeing Pg as programmatic. Similar views to that of Noth are expressed by Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 92–93, 102; and Fretheim, "Priestly Document." Although Vink ("Date and Origin," 1–44), unlike Noth, includes Lev 1–16, texts from the second half of Numbers, and some texts in Joshua, in his P; he also perceives his Priestly Code in programmatic terms relating to the cult. However, in dating his P later than Noth, Ackroyd, and Fretheim, who see P as exilic, that is, in the late Persian period, he maintains that P was written to provide the framework for the renewal of the cult that would bring about the reconciliation between the ruling classes in Samaria and the Palestinian community between whom tension existed due to the activity of Nehemiah.

concludes with Deut 34\*, is not all that dissimilar from that of Noth.<sup>33</sup> He, too, focuses on the Sinai material as of primary concern and interprets this in programmatic terms: it outlines “a program written in preparation for and in hope of the restoration of Israel.”<sup>34</sup> His interpretation is slightly different, however, because although he focuses mainly on the cultic elements of the Sinai material, he links these with the Sinai covenant (found in the non-P material), which he sees as God’s ultimate covenant and self-disclosure. This covenant and the rest of the cultic material set at Sinai (which includes P laws in Leviticus) make possible YHWH’s “tabernacling” in Israel’s midst, and this alone could fully redeem Israel: “The entire cultic paraphernalia and cultus was designed to express and overcome the problem of the holy, transcendent God visiting his pervasively sinful people.”<sup>35</sup> In short, “The Priestly school desired to reconstruct the institutes of the normative Mosaic age as a model for the future cultic institutions and covenant theology of Israel.”<sup>36</sup>

Erik Zenger basically follows Noth in seeing Pg as an independent document that ends in Deut 34\*.<sup>37</sup> He focuses especially on the links between the story of the nation Israel and the primeval history, in particular the creation account (Gen 1:1–2:4a) and the Noahic covenant (Gen 9:1–17).<sup>38</sup> He sees the primary concern of Pg in terms of the sanctuary as the means of God dwelling in the midst of Israel, mediating communion of the people with the creator God and between one another.<sup>39</sup> This is the goal and completion of creation: “For P as a whole composition the erecting of the holy tent for the people freed from creation destroying slavery is the goal of creation.”<sup>40</sup> In relation to this, the motif of God’s glory, linked with the bow in the clouds of the Noahic covenant, is significant. Within the sanctuary the fullness of the glory of YHWH is revealed; indeed, “the

---

33. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 298–99, 307, 320–21, 325.

34. *Ibid.*, 325.

35. *Ibid.*, 299.

36. *Ibid.*, 320.

37. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*. However, it should be noted that in Zenger’s later work (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 94–96) he sees P concluding with Lev 9.

38. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 170–72.

39. *Ibid.*, 163, 172.

40. *Ibid.*, 181, and see 163–64 (unless otherwise stated, all translations of modern and ancient sources are my own). This parallels ancient Near Eastern texts where the building of a temple for the creator God completes, stabilizes, and renews and revives creation (173).

sanctuary is an instrument by which the creator God accepts and carries out his divine glory announced in the 'bow in the clouds' after the flood."<sup>41</sup> Zenger also acknowledges the elements of sin and death in the story of the nation (Num 13–Deut 34\*) but sees this as a metaphor for the "real" story of Israel that needs to be seen in the context of the foundation of Israel "in the arc of events 'creation–Sinai' ... set once and for all."<sup>42</sup> This foundation continues to stand and therefore means that there is ultimately life and not utter destruction: as he states "life in the face of the experience of death" dominates the horizon of Pg.<sup>43</sup> Ultimately, then, it is the sanctuary and the associated glory of the creator God in the midst of Israel that is for Zenger Pg's primary concern: "Israel's way can succeed in the 'life dwelling' of the creator God ... through an Israel which allows him 'to dwell' in its midst (Exod 29:45f) he wills to complete the creation."<sup>44</sup>

Peter Weimar adheres to an exilic Pg as an independent document that ends in Deut 34\*, and his position is very similar to that of Zenger.<sup>45</sup> For Weimar also Pg's primary concern is the sanctuary as the dwelling of YHWH, which he sees as the fulfillment of creation, and the associated glory of YHWH. Both humankind, created in the image of God, and the sanctuary as representing the heavenly prototype provide the manifestation or form of representation of the reality of God in the world: "the sanctuary ... is ... the place where the life producing freeing reality of YHWH ... is experienced in an exemplary way."<sup>46</sup> The dwelling of YHWH with the people through the sanctuary is the high point of the instructions (Exod 29:45–46), and this is the fulfillment of the essential goal of the covenant with Abraham, which is the promise to be their God (Gen 17:7–8; see also Exod 6:7a): in the expression of this promise lies "the inner point on which everything turns" within the whole Priestly construction.<sup>47</sup> The setting up of the sanctuary as the dwelling of YHWH completes the creation and at

---

41. Ibid., 175.

42. Ibid., 163.

43. Ibid., 138.

44. Ibid., 163.

45. Weimar's Pg, however, is much smaller than Noth's Pg; e.g., he includes within his original Pg in Exod 25–31 only 25:8–9; 26:1–29; 26:30; 29:45–46; see Peter Weimar, "Sinai und Schöpfung: Komposition und Theologie der Priesterschriftlichen Sinaigeschichte," *RB* 95 (1988): 340–46. See also Weimar, "Struktur und Komposition."

46. Weimar, "Sinai und Schöpfung," 353; see also 350–51.

47. Ibid., 356–57.

the same time, given the parallel with the Noahic covenant,<sup>48</sup> the “new creation.” At the same time, it introduces a process that aims at the transformation of the whole world, since it is the place from which the possibility of life-offering freedom radiates. The glory of YHWH plays an important role (Exod 16–Lev 9\*) within the function of the Sinai story in the framework of the whole of Pg: it is not static and perennial but a dynamic process in which the exodus God communicates and opens up new possibilities for life.<sup>49</sup> In short, it is “the symbol of the saving-guiding presence of God.”<sup>50</sup> Moreover, the creation of the people of YHWH is begun in the exodus and fulfilled with the erection of the sanctuary at Sinai, and this freed Israel becomes an example of the goal of the whole creation.<sup>51</sup>

Blum, although speaking in terms of a postexilic P *Komposition* (KP) that incorporates non-P material (KD) and concludes in Num 27\*, also sees the key to the interpretation of KP as a whole in terms of the presence of God.<sup>52</sup> Almost all the texts he cites as important in unfolding his interpretation of KP as a whole are traditionally Priestly (P) texts,<sup>53</sup> and therefore his reflections on the meaning of KP as a *Komposition* are not different in any significant way from reflecting on P per se without the non-P material. This is because, as Blum states, though KP integrates non-P (KD) traditions with its own, it is KP’s own (P) texts that guides the reception of the whole.<sup>54</sup> For Blum, then, the *Leitthema* of KP is the “closeness of God [*Gottesnähe*],” or “the longing of the creator for communion/community [*Gemeinschaft*].”<sup>55</sup> What holds together the whole of KP is the basic question of God’s communion with humankind. This is articulated in the Sinai material in relation to Israel in terms of the presence of God, holiness, and so on. But the significance of this Sinai material is seen only in the context of the creation and the subsequent narrative, with its various institu-

---

48. Weimar parallels the clouds of the Noahic covenant with the glory of YHWH in the cloud in the Sinai pericope; see *ibid.*, 371.

49. *Ibid.*, 380–81.

50. *Ibid.*, 372.

51. *Ibid.*, 385.

52. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 287–332.

53. Although Blum does include the whole of Leviticus, including the Holiness Code (Lev 17–26), in his KP. The texts that he puts most weight on in his interpretation of KP are almost all traditionally P texts: e.g., Gen 1:31a; 6:11–13; 9:1–6, 8–17; 17; Exod 14:4, 17, 18; 16; 24:15–18; 25–31; 35–40, esp. 29:42–46; Lev 1–10; 11–26; Num 1–10.

54. *Ibid.*, 287.

55. *Ibid.*

tions, leading up to it, which consists of a continuum of breakings and new beginnings in which God acts in response to the disturbances of the good creation by its creatures and especially humankind.<sup>56</sup> Thus, Blum argues, the relation between God and humanity in the “very good” creation (Gen 1:31a) before the flood is one where God’s longing for communion/community with humankind is expressed in God’s creating humankind in his image and where there is the possibility of an unbroken nearness to God (Enoch “walks with” God, Gen 5:22, 24). With the introduction of violence and the consequent new order after the flood, there is then a distance between God and humanity (e.g., Abraham “walks before” God, and God “goes up” after the theophany to Abraham, Gen 17).<sup>57</sup> With the narrative of Abraham’s line (within humanity), then, there is a progressive overcoming of this distancing and a drawing near of God, “a progressive constituting of the nearness of the God of Israel.”<sup>58</sup> The dynamic of this is seen in the progressive unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant and in particular the promise to be their God, marked by the periodization of the name (Elohim, El Shaddai, YHWH) and the progressive unfolding of the people’s encounter with the glory of YHWH—at the sea (Exod 14:4, 17, 18), in Exod 16 (where there is a distance in the cloud), at Sinai for Moses only (Exod 24:15–18), with the erection of the sanctuary where the glory of YHWH is known in the midst of the camp (Exod 40:33–38), and with the inauguration of the sacrifices (Lev 9:22–24). This nearness of God requires a protective space, and it is the sanctuary and its cult that provide this, as the means for YHWH to take up his dwelling among humankind in Israel and to meet his people (Exod 29:42–46) in fulfillment of the covenant promise to be God for Israel, that is, to be in communion with them. The holiness of God requires grades of holiness, in space (sanctuary), time (Sabbath), and personnel (priests). The section Exod 25–Num 10 presents the constitution of the people of God, as a people in the midst of whom the holy God dwells.<sup>59</sup> Noting the correspondences between the sanctuary and creation, Blum sees the sanctuary as the continuation of the work of

---

56. *Ibid.*, 330.

57. *Ibid.*, 289–93.

58. *Ibid.*, 294.

59. *Ibid.*, 295–305. Blum divides his discussion of the constitution of the people of God into four sections: constitution of the sanctuary (Exod 25–40); establishment of the service of God (Lev 1–10); the purity and holiness of the people of God (Lev 11–26); constitution of the pure camp (Num 1–10).

creation, or the fulfillment of creation but, unlike Zenger, not of the created world of Gen 1; it is in the postflood world that Israel is to build the sanctuary, and it is in this postflood world after the coming of violence that God and humanity are to draw near in the space protected by means of the sanctuary. It is in this sense that it is a type of “new creation,” where the constituting of Israel as the people of God, who in part participate in the “reality of God,” is in a sense a “creation within the creation.”<sup>60</sup> Moreover, essential for Israel’s relationship with God is its knowledge of God, and the material after Sinai shows the catastrophes Israel suffers as a consequence of forgetting God—albeit alongside the portrayal of the absolute loyalty of God.<sup>61</sup> However, the overall concern of KP is the way in which, with Israel, the creator creates for himself a “home” in his creation, within a community, whose fullness of life can counter and limit to some extent the violence but which still remains as part of Noahite humanity. In Israel, communion with God is made possible, but it requires the sanctuary and cultic institutions as protection. In this way, the postflood creation reaches its goal: the dwelling of God within Israel.<sup>62</sup>

For Frank Crüsemann, P, which includes the Levitical laws, including the Holiness code, is an exilic/early postexilic redaction.<sup>63</sup> He also maintains that “the heart and centre” of the Priestly writings is the establishment of the shrine and the forms of conduct associated with it that represent God’s indwelling within his creation and that P is essentially concerned with the presence or closeness of God.<sup>64</sup> However, he also believes that P is concerned to show that life before God and in accordance with God’s will is possible without the functioning cult described at Sinai, which allows life to be lived in the direct presence of God, and without possessing the land, as in the situation of the diaspora. Although a “second new world” or “second creation” came into being at Sinai, neither the world nor Israel can be reduced to this: “the world without a cult and without such a presence of the creator in it is not really Godless,” and “we cannot reduce the Priestly writings to the Sinai law.”<sup>65</sup> In the narrative leading up to Sinai, P unfolds a series of laws or institutions that do not presume the existence of

---

60. *Ibid.*, 311.

61. *Ibid.*, 329.

62. *Ibid.*, 331–32.

63. Crüsemann, *Torah*, 277–327.

64. *Ibid.*, 290, 303.

65. *Ibid.*, 290 and 291.



the Sinai cult, and these make it possible to live life completely before God (Gen 17:1). These are: capital punishment and corruption of blood (Gen 9:2–7); covenant and circumcision (Gen 17); endogamy (Gen 27:46–28:9); Passover (Exod 12); and the Sabbath.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, in observing the Sabbath, Israel is “as close to the actual form of God as it is possible to be without the shrine” and by participating in its rhythm, “Israel, which does not live in the presence of God, can catch sight of God himself.”<sup>67</sup> Moreover, P’s account of the exodus is concerned with Israel’s separation out from the other nations in terms of the establishment of God’s closeness to them, a relationship that is independent of the possession of land.<sup>68</sup> In all these ways, according to Crüsemann, P speaks to the Jewish diaspora.

Baruch Schwartz, who perceives P as an independent preexilic source that includes the laws, sees the aim and climax of the Priestly narrative in the arrival of the divine glory (כבוד) to dwell permanently among the Israelites, with everything in the Sinai pericope subordinated to this.<sup>69</sup> It is the immanence of the divine presence and “ever-present, indwelling deity” that is P’s primary concern, and this is contingent on the establishment and maintenance of the tabernacle cult and its permanent institutions.<sup>70</sup>

Ralph Klein sees P as an exilic independent document with its “central imperative ... to be the obligation to reestablish a cultic community consisting of three institutions: tabernacle, priesthood and sacrificial system.” Thereby Israel “would experience the living presence of God and go forth into God’s future.”<sup>71</sup> Klein, however, also puts some emphasis on the P motif of God’s remembering of the Noahic and Abrahamic covenantal promises, maintaining that hope lies in “God’s memory.”<sup>72</sup> Indeed, in an earlier article, Klein maintains that the memory of God plays a critical role in P’s theology and is central to its message: “The various and

---

66. Ibid., 290–301.

67. Ibid., 300.

68. Ibid., 301–10. Moreover, since the cult, and therefore the presence/nearness of God, is constituted at Sinai outside the land, before Israel is in the land, the loss of land does not affect Israel’s relationship with God (304). In addition, central to P’s cultic law is atonement and forgiveness, since only with this is it possible to have life in the presence of the holy God (310–22).

69. Schwartz, “Priestly Account,” 133.

70. Quote from *ibid.*, 133–34; see also 137.

71. Ralph Klein, “Back to the Future: The Tabernacle in the Book of Exodus,” *Int* 50 (1996): 274.

72. Ibid., 275; see also 273.

many-sided aspects of P's theology are triggered by the catalytic power of God's memory."<sup>73</sup> God's memory is a catalyst that makes real the salvation implicit in the everlasting (Noahic and Abrahamic) covenants, which includes deliverance, God's dwelling with his people, and the promised land. Therefore God's memory was exilic Israel's hope.

For David Carr, who also adheres to an exilic independent P source, "the constitution of Israel as a cultic community surrounding the tabernacle" is central to his Pg.<sup>74</sup> The link of the tabernacle and its cult to creation is important: P is dominated by the narrative span extending from creation to cult, with Gen 1, the building of the ark, and the covenants with Noah and Abraham foreshadowing and leading up to the Sinai material.<sup>75</sup> Carr, like Klein, also alludes to the memory of God, stating that "the world has certain created and covenantal structures. God has always remembered. Now Israel, standing at the brink of possible return to the land and reestablishment of its cult, must remember as well."<sup>76</sup>

Albert de Pury, whose Pg is an exilic independent document that concludes in Exod 40\*, perceives the ultimate purpose of the Priestly writer's contribution as a whole as residing "in establishing that true worship of YHWH has been revealed to Israel."<sup>77</sup> Israel is the nation chosen to worship God under the name YHWH and to keep the only sanctuary where God resides. But this is set within a universal perspective, that is, within "a history of God's universal project."<sup>78</sup> Thus, all humanity participates in the Noahic covenant and knows God as Elohim; the descendants of Abraham, including nations of Ishmaelite/Arabic and Edomite descent, participate in the Abrahamic covenant, including its promise of land and to be their God, and know God as El Shaddai; and finally, Israel is singled out as keeper of YHWH's sanctuary where YHWH dwells among humankind.<sup>79</sup> Therefore Israel has a priestly role in relation to the other nations:

---

73. Klein, "Message of P," 63.

74. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 137.

75. Ibid., 120–31.

76. Ibid., 140.

77. In seeing Pg as an independent exilic document ending in Exod 40, he follows Pola. See de Pury, "Jacob Story." For the quotation, see Albert de Pury, "Abraham: The Priestly Writer's 'Ecumenical' Ancestor," in *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Bible; Essays in Honor of John Van Seters*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Thomas Römer, BZAW 294 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 172.

78. De Pury, "Jacob Story," 69; and see de Pury, "Abraham," 172.

79. De Pury, "Abraham," 172–76.

“the only specific task of the sons of Israel will be to live before the face of YHWH, that is, to take care of the cult and to be the priests of humanity.”<sup>80</sup> In other words, Israel has a mission among the nations, which is fundamentally “to build and keep the sanctuary ... that will allow YHWH to reside among the sons of Israel and, through them, among humankind.”<sup>81</sup>

Christophe Nihan adheres to a postexilic independent P that concludes in Lev 16.<sup>82</sup> His interpretation of P represents a combination of the views of Blum and de Pury. Perceiving the Sinai material as the purpose of P’s account, he sees Exod 25–40\* as relating to Gen 1 and Exod 14\* according to the common ancient Near Eastern pattern where creation, victory over mythical enemies, and the building of a temple are closely intertwined.<sup>83</sup> Within this, the motif of YHWH’s glory is important: it is manifested at the sea in Exod 14\* and comes to a place of rest in Exod 40:34.<sup>84</sup> P’s particular interpretation of this pattern highlights Israel’s important role within God’s creation, namely, drawing from Blum, that “it is in Israel that the original proximity between God and man [*sic*] is partially restored,” and it is in these terms that the whole P account in Genesis–Exodus\* can be analyzed.<sup>85</sup> The postflood creation is inferior to the original creation: there is a distance between God and his creation, with the immediate relationship with the creator God that the preflood ancestors could experience no longer possible. However, it is to Israel, to whom the promise to be their God is given (Gen 17:7; Exod 6:7) and fulfilled (Exod 29:45–46; 40:34–35), by means of Israel’s sanctuary, that the divine presence symbolized in the glory returns and within whom it dwells; this is reported in Exod 40:34, which “corresponds to the restitution of the divine presence in Israel after

---

80. De Pury, “Jacob Story,” 68; and see de Pury, “Abraham,” 172.

81. De Pury, “Jacob Story,” 67–68. It should be noted that Michaela Bauks (“Signification de l’espace”; “Genesis 1 als Programmschrift der Priesterschrift (Pg),” in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*, ed. A. Wénin, BETL 155 [Leuven: Peeters, 2001], 333–45) also ends her exilic independent Pg in Exod 40\*, specifically Exod 40:34, with the glory of YHWH filling the tabernacle, which she sees as the climax of Pg. For her, Pg is definitely not land-centered but rather a working out of the divine program in Gen 1 and revolving around the themes of revelation and blessing/sanctification.

82. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*.

83. *Ibid.*, 30, 59–61.

84. *Ibid.*, 60.

85. *Ibid.*, 61.

the flood.”<sup>86</sup> In this way, “the order initially devised by God at the creation of the world can now be partly realized.”<sup>87</sup> This means, in line with de Pury, that Israel has become a priestly nation among the nations of the world: Israel, to whom the name YHWH is exclusively disclosed, is designated to serve him in his sanctuary, “thus making possible a more direct relationship between God and man [*sic*] in the postflood era.”<sup>88</sup> It is in Israel’s sanctuary that YHWH dwells and can be encountered as in the preflood creation. This means, then, that “it is Israel’s cult which guarantees the permanence of the divine presence, and hence the stability of the cosmic order”; Israel’s redefinition as “a cultic community or a priestly nation” accounts for the conclusion of P being within the Sinai material and not with the conquest of the land.<sup>89</sup>

According to Nihan, Lev 1–3; 8–9; 11–16 play an important role within this and indeed “function as the grand climax of the overall process running through the Priestly account of Israel’s origins.”<sup>90</sup> These chapters, with their ritual teachings, complete Israel’s transformation into the priestly nation in relation to the other nations of the world. They also complete the restitution of the divine presence in Israel’s sanctuary and therefore the process that redefines Israel such that there is “a cosmic order more in conformity with the original order existing before the flood.”<sup>91</sup> Leviticus 1–9\* relate to Israel as a priestly nation in that it is only Israel among the nations that is able to worship adequately the creator God who resides in its sanctuary (Exod 40:34–35) by presenting the appropriate sacrifices. Moreover, with the offering of the first sacrifices, not only is a new order instituted in which the relationship between Israel and YHWH is medi-

---

86. *Ibid.*, 65.

87. *Ibid.*

88. *Ibid.*

89. *Ibid.*, 65 and 66. Nihan, in line with Köckert and Bauks, goes on to argue, on the basis of a conception of the land as *’hzh* (rather than *nhlh*) whereby Israel is entitled to right of use (rather than possession), that the land given to the Israelites in Exod 6:2–8 is no different from that given to the patriarchs in P, and therefore entering the land is basically a return to the situation existing in the age of the patriarchs as resident aliens (rather than a conquest). Therefore the new thing introduced in the exodus in P is not related to the promise of the land but has to do with the constitution of Israel as a priestly nation, a cultic community devoted to YHWH’s service. Therefore, P ends in the Sinai material. See *ibid.*, 66–68.

90. *Ibid.*, 609.

91. *Ibid.*; see also 610

ated by the priesthood, but Moses and Aaron can now enter the tent of meeting (Lev 9:23), in contrast to Exod 40:35, where, because of the glory filling the tabernacle, they are not able to enter it. In addition, the glory of YHWH is manifested to all the people (Lev 9:23–24).<sup>92</sup> This represents a further stage in the partial restoration, in Israel's cult, of the original community between God and humankind in the original creation.<sup>93</sup> Moreover, Nihan argues, the sacrificial cult is an improvement for the animals of the situation after the flood where the killing of animals freely is allowed (Gen 9:2–3), since in this revelation of the legitimate way of sacrificing animals the violence involved in killing is partially compensated by offering these animals ritually. Thereby, in Israel there is “a relationship between God, men [*sic*] and animals superior to that characterizing post-diluvian mankind [*sic*],” and as such “Israel is closer (though not equivalent!) to the original creation.”<sup>94</sup> Leviticus 11–16 take this process further regarding the restoration of the original cosmic order in terms of the divine presence and Israel as a priestly nation. In particular, it is in Lev 16 that “the restitution in Israel's sanctuary of the divine presence in the original creation reaches its expected conclusion.”<sup>95</sup> The ritual of Lev 16 is one of re-creation, a reenactment of God's primeval victory in the creation of the world and therefore a reestablishment of the cosmic order, that “makes possible God's permanent presence in Israel” and therefore “his presence among his creation.”<sup>96</sup> This is given concrete expression in the revelation of the divine presence in the cloud to Aaron in the inner sanctum; this represents the culmination of the drawing near of the divine presence in that the cloud moves from Mount Sinai (Exod 24:15b–18a) to the tent of meeting (Exod 40:34–35) to the inner sanctum (Lev 16). This then “forms the structural opposite to his [God's] withdrawal from his own creation after the flood in Gen 9 (Gen 9:13–17<sup>97</sup>).”<sup>98</sup> Moreover, this ritual of the purification of the sanctuary and the community “guarantees that God will permanently stay among Israel” and among creation.<sup>99</sup> In short, for

---

92. Ibid., 233, 610.

93. Ibid., 610.

94. Ibid., 236–37, and see 611.

95. Ibid., 380.

96. Ibid., 631 and 381.

97. See the cloud imagery.

98. Ibid., 381, and see 613.

99. Ibid., 381.

Nihan, the revelation of the sacrificial cult (Lev 1–16\*) “comprised nothing less than the outcome of a process of reconciliation between God and his creation that started after the flood.”<sup>100</sup>

#### 1.1.2.2. Land

Although most scholars see P’s primary concern as residing in the Sinai material, there are a handful of scholars who see the promise of the land, whether as fulfilled or as future hope, as the key to the interpretation of P.

Karl Elliger, who adheres to an exilic independent Pg ending in Deut 34\*, although acknowledging that the dwelling of God with his people plays an important role in the theology of Pg, denies that it is of central significance within, or the central topic of, P as a whole.<sup>101</sup> Methodologically he states that, since the narrative of Pg contains many high points (exodus, Passover, sanctuary, etc.), it is not helpful to focus on any one of these since they are all important but to seek to discern the whole course or trend of Pg, or its goal, as a whole.<sup>102</sup> He sees this in terms of the promise of possession of the land of Canaan. He interprets the highest expression of the promise to be their God (Gen 17:7–8) as “the grant of the land of Canaan” and the promise of the land of Canaan as the essential core point of the covenant with the fathers (Exod 6:4, 8).<sup>103</sup> The content of this covenant is not fully realized at Sinai; from there God gives Moses instructions regarding bringing the people to Canaan.<sup>104</sup> The theme of Canaan dominates Pg’s presentation up to the end. It does

---

100. Ibid., 611. Nihan (391) sees his P as the founding account (*Ursprungslegende*) of the postmonarchical, poststate temple community in Jerusalem and as functioning as an ideal to which the Second Temple community could refer as a model, as well as in part legitimating the Second Temple cult. The view of Schmid (*Old Testament*, 147–52) is similar. The covenant with Noah guarantees the eternal existence of the world, and the covenant with Abraham guarantees that God will always remain close to Israel. There are three concentric circles, the world, the ecumenical Abraham circle, and Israel, where only Israel is given complete knowledge of God, and, through the gift of sacrificial worship, possesses the means for partial restoration of the very good order of creation in Gen 1.

101. Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung,” esp. 128, 130, 131. He also denies the view that P is primarily a legitimation of the Jerusalem cult (128, 130).

102. Ibid., 134–35.

103. Ibid., 134; see also 137.

104. Ibid., 138.

not conclude with possession of the land of Canaan because of the people's rebellion "against the goal of the divine plan itself" (Num 13–14\*) and Moses's and Aaron's doubt (Num 20\*), but the promise of the land remains unshakable.<sup>105</sup> God's will for Israel is "the possession of the land of Canaan according to its whole extent for all time," and the sin that leads to death is "the unfaithful doubt in God's power to carry through his will."<sup>106</sup> The Sinai revelation is important in so far as it shows what a fulfilled covenant in Canaan will entail: "a free people in its own land does not on its own constitute it, but requires God in the sanctuary in the midst of the people."<sup>107</sup> In short, the essential goal of the divine ordering of history (*Geschichte*) is "the possession of the land of Canaan as the material and ideal basis on which the life of the people and as a matter of course the cult as its most important function can properly unfold."<sup>108</sup>

Suzanne Boorer, seeing Pg as an exilic independent document ending in Deut 34\*, argues that Pg has schematized the history of Israel from exodus to exile as the journey of the Mosaic generation toward, and up to, the edge of the land of Canaan, with the Sinai material in particular corresponding to the period of the monarchy and the material after Sinai corresponding to the exilic period.<sup>109</sup> Each of the stages of Israel's history, especially the monarchy and the exile, are in this way presented as the unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promises, and in particular "as stages on the way to the fulfillment of the covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan."<sup>110</sup> In this way, each period of Israel's history and some of its traditions are validated. For example, the monarchical period, when Israel as a state lived in the land with its temple traditions and with Judah, at least toward the end, as the prominent state is reflected in the Sinai material, which is portrayed as a stage on the way toward the promised land. Therefore Israel's time in the land during the monarchy was only temporary; that time in the land was not the fulfillment of the

---

105. Ibid., 137; see also 140.

106. Ibid., 141.

107. Ibid., 140.

108. Ibid., 129. Elliger (143) sees Pg as a comforting and warning witness to the exiles of the powerful and grace-full God of the promise, the lord of world history and Israel's history, who remains steadfast to the goal of a great nation freed for the everlasting possession of the land of Canaan and to be God to this nation.

109. Boorer, "Kerygmatic Intention," 12–14.

110. Ibid., 16.

Abrahamic covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan but only a step in that direction. Moreover, its temple traditions reflected in the Sinai material are validated for that time as a stage on the journey forward to the ultimate goal of the land. Similarly, the situation of exile is yet another step forward toward the fulfillment of the everlasting possession of the land and not a negation of the land promise. All these stages were divinely ordained as God's unfolding of the everlasting Abrahamic covenant, and these covenant promises still stand, in particular the promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, which has not yet been fulfilled but will be in the future. This is the hope held out to the exiles; the exile is not a negation of the land promise but only a stage on the way to its ultimate everlasting fulfillment.<sup>111</sup>

Walter Brueggemann, who also adheres to an independent exilic P concluding before Joshua, finds in Gen 1:28, with its motifs of land and blessing, the formula that sums up P's intention.<sup>112</sup> This recurring formula (Gen 8:17; 9:1, 7) he associates with other P texts that concern land (e.g., Exod 6:2–4), and concludes that the "thread running through P ... concerns the promise of and gift of land as a blessing."<sup>113</sup> Spoken as a radical message to the exiles, "re-entry into the promised land" is P's central affirmation, with P's cultic material, that allows for the meeting of the holy God with a sinful people, functioning to ensure that the land to be reentered is not abused and so that expulsion from the land will not occur.<sup>114</sup> Since the promise of the land links back to Gen 1:28, he maintains that this land promise that is about to be actualized "is ordained in the very fabric of creation."<sup>115</sup> In short, Brueggemann sees "the kerygmatic key to the Priestly theology is that the promise of the land of blessing still endures and will be realized soon."<sup>116</sup>

Philippe Guillaume adheres to an independent Pg which concludes in Josh 19\* and is postexilic (ca. 485 BCE), but his Pg is defined largely on the

---

111. Ibid., 16–18.

112. Brueggemann, "Kerygma of the Priestly Writers," 103.

113. Ibid., 109.

114. Ibid., 112.

115. Ibid.

116. Ibid., 113. More recently, Frevel (*Mit Blick auf das Land*), adhering to an independent exilic P and arguing for the view that P ends in Deut 34\*, sees the conclusion of P as looking back to creation and forward to Israel's hoped for reentry into the land.



basis of arguments in relation to the sabbatical calendar rather than using the methodology of source criticism.<sup>117</sup> He maintains that the primary concern of Pg is with the land and, as “a charter for calendar reform,” with time.<sup>118</sup> He sees these concerns as stated from the outset in Gen 1:1, which begins with time (בראשית) and ends with land (ארץ), as does the entire narrative of Pg, which begins with time (Gen 1:1–2:4a, which he interprets not in cosmological terms but as the aetiology of the Sabbath with the aim of “setting up of a new rhythm serving as the basic unit of a different calendar”) and ends with land (Josh 18:1).<sup>119</sup> After creation, the divine activity is not completed until all aspects of the sabbatical calendar are delineated in the ongoing narrative of Pg and “until every human group is settled on a viable territory, which takes place in Josh 18.”<sup>120</sup> For Guillaume, in contrast to Elliger, Boorer, and Brueggemann, it is the fulfillment of the land promise that is central to Pg rather than the land promise as a future hope. He maintains that the “lack of land for the sons of Israel provides the only crisis, sustaining narrative tension from Genesis to Joshua” where finally Israel settles in the land. Interpreting the reference to the creating of the land (ארץ) in Gen 1:1 as referring to territory or agricultural land rather than the cosmic earth, he maintains that the commission in Gen 1:28 is gradually fulfilled in the course of Pg.<sup>121</sup> The generations (תולדת) of Adam concludes with filling the land with violence that corrupts the land, making the land unsuitable for multiplication on it.<sup>122</sup> The consequent flood

---

117. Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*. For an outline of the texts contained in Guillaume’s Pg, which in places contains some texts traditionally attributed to non-P (J), see *ibid.*, 193–95.

118. *Ibid.*, ix; see also 127–28.

119. Quote from *ibid.*, 42; see also 35–42. Guillaume (121) sees these themes of time and land announced in Gen 1:1 as “finding their most concrete explanation in the sabbatical year and the Jubilee” (Lev 25\*). Indeed, the “Jubilee is the nexus of the sabbatical calendar and the land” (121, and see 122).

120. Quote from *ibid.*, 45. Guillaume (*ibid.*, 62–68) even interprets the sanctuary material primarily in terms of what he sees as its calendrical function. He follows Pola in ascribing only the “residence” (משכן) to Pg (Exod 25:1–2; 35:22–23\*, 25; 36:8–13; 40:17, 34b). He sees this residence as having no cultic function and, although seeing its function in terms of enabling YHWH’s presence among his people, tends to see its primary role in supplying the last element of the description of the fully intercalated sabbatical calendar.

121. Quote from *ibid.*, 176; see also 126, 128, 133, 160.

122. *Ibid.*, 128, 133.

“purged antediluvian violence in order to sustain the creational order”; the very good nature of creation is not lost in the flood.<sup>123</sup> The תולדת of Noah’s sons lists the peoples and their various lands (Gen 10): “the various ethnic groups portion out the land of Gen 1:1 into their lands.”<sup>124</sup> Shem’s תולדת, however, ends with a lack of land (Gen 11:26). The concern of Pg in Gen 12–50\* is who gets land tenure, with Abraham buying burial tenure in Canaan (Gen 23), Ishmael associated with Canaan and North Arabia, and Esau moving to Seir.<sup>125</sup> “Every descendant of Terah is granted territory (Gen 13:12; 25:16–17; 36:6–8, 43) but Jacob’s seed fructifies and fills the wrong land (Gen 47:27; Exod 1:7).”<sup>126</sup> Therefore, Jacob’s sons remain the last landless group when enslaved in Egypt.<sup>127</sup> The exodus is more about land than liberation: “Land remains the aim of the entire Exodus, which only ends when the sons of Israel enter the land of Canaan.”<sup>128</sup> The wilderness is “no-land,” the absence of land. This absence of land is made bearable by YHWH filling the residence (משכן) (Exod 40:34). Thus the absence of land for Shem’s lineage in Jacob “is further developed through the wilderness theme which Pg uses constantly to keep the land in the sights of the entire narrative.”<sup>129</sup> Moreover, no festivals or rituals were celebrated in the wilderness; they are prescribed for performance in the land (see Lev 23\*; 25\*, where the land theme is important).<sup>130</sup> Israel’s time in the wilderness, that is, “outside space,” extends to forty years because of the congregation’s misinterpretation of the empty land as adversity rather than goodness (Num 13–14\*).<sup>131</sup> The census in Num 1, whose purpose is civil in that it identifies who is entitled to a share in their family’s land tenure, has occurred, and the land has been surveyed in order to “distribute the available population across the various areas according to their agricultural potential.”<sup>132</sup> Therefore, it can be said that the main theme of Pg in Numbers (and Deuteronomy) is land: “entry into Canaan is looming large on the agenda ... [but] the slander of the good land prevents immediate

---

123. Ibid., 169.

124. Ibid., 129.

125. Ibid., 130–32, 134.

126. Ibid., 160.

127. Ibid., 133.

128. Ibid., 136.

129. Ibid., 137.

130. Ibid., 137–41.

131. Ibid., 137; see also 147.

132. Ibid., 143, 147.

entry and requires adequate purgation.”<sup>133</sup> Finally in Joshua, in spite of the delay, Israel enters and settles in the empty land (Josh 4:19\*; 5:9–12; 14:1, 2\*; 18:1\*; 19:51\*). Thereby, “the last Semite branch is finally endowed with land tenure.”<sup>134</sup> Hence “humanity, in its entirety, finally fulfils the initial commission [in Gen 1:28] (Josh 18:1; 19:51).”<sup>135</sup>

### 1.1.2.3 Sinai and Land

Finally, a few scholars have sought to integrate in some way the themes of Sinai and the land.

Ronald Clements perceives exilic P as a program for the restoration of the community so that they could again become a nation and possess the land of Canaan, with YHWH's glory in their midst, all of which they have lost.<sup>136</sup> Maintaining that P cannot be reduced to one of these aspects, he states that “the aim of the Priestly writing is a threefold one, to show how Israel might yet again become a nation, possess its land, and receive the divine presence in its midst.”<sup>137</sup>

Joseph Blenkinsopp sees P as an independent exilic document extending into Joshua.<sup>138</sup> In reaction to scholars who emphasize either Sinai and the divine presence or the land, he states that, “what ... requires recognition is the intrinsic association between land and divine presence in P.”<sup>139</sup> He supports this in terms of his perception of the structure of P, identifying three key points where the finishing work formula (Gen 2:1, 2; Exod 39:32; 40:33; Josh 19:51) and the execution formula are found together, thus denoting the completion of successive stages; namely, the creation of the world (concluding in Gen 2:1–3), the construction of the sanctuary (concluding in Exod 40:33, and see Exod 39:32), and the establishment of the sanctuary in the land and the division of the land between the tribes

---

133. Ibid., 148.

134. Ibid., 165.

135. Ibid., 160.

136. Clements, *God and Temple*, 109, 111, 121.

137. Ibid., 113.

138. Blenkinsopp, “Structure of P” Blenkinsopp in his later work (*Pentateuch*, esp. 118–20, 185–86) maintains that P is an independent document; however, in this earlier article he does not commit himself either way on this issue (“Structure of P,” 280). The texts he sees as P in Joshua are: Josh 4:9, 19; 5:10–12; 9:15–21; 11:15, 20; 14:1–5; 18:1; 19:51; 21:1–8; 22:10–34; 24:33 (see “Structure of P,” 288–89).

139. Blenkinsopp, “Structure of P,” 278–79.

(concluding in Josh 18:1; 19:51). The strong parallels between the creation and the setting up of the sanctuary and the echoing of ancient Near Eastern myths of the cosmogonic victory of the deity that leads to the building of a sanctuary show that “P emphasizes the building of the sanctuary as the climax of creation.”<sup>140</sup> P then ends in Joshua with “the setting up of the same sanctuary in the occupied land of Canaan.”<sup>141</sup> The further intertwining of creation, sanctuary, and land is seen in parallels, not only between the formulas associated with the creation, the sanctuary, and the setting up of the sanctuary in the land, but also between the creation of the world and the allotment of the land.<sup>142</sup> Moreover, the “intrinsic association between sanctuary ... and land explains why P brings together possession of land and divine presence in the promissory covenant.”<sup>143</sup> This intrinsic link between sanctuary or presence of God and land is the key to P’s message concerning the occupation of the land and its distribution among the tribes; that is, that “the essential goal of securing the land is the reestablishment of the legitimate cult,” for “occupation of the land is a prerequisite for fulfilling the demands of the holy life.”<sup>144</sup> Thus, as Blenkinsopp comments in a later work, P “begins with the creation of the world as a cosmic sanctuary and ends with the setting up of the sanctuary in the promised land.”<sup>145</sup>

Norbert Lohfink adheres to an independent exilic Pg that extends into Joshua.<sup>146</sup> Although the main aim of this complex article is to explore the nature (or genre) of Pg as paradigmatic or turning history back into myth,<sup>147</sup> it contains within it an interpretation of Pg overall. Lohfink sees the role of promise and fulfillment in the whole sweep of Pg as all pervasive.<sup>148</sup> He sees Gen 1:28 as programmatic for the whole of Pg: “Here, in the blessing of humanity in Gen 1:28 God sketches a project for the whole chain of

---

140. Ibid., 286.

141. Ibid., 289.

142. Ibid., 290

143. Ibid., 290.

144. Ibid., 289 and 291.

145. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 104.

146. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative.” Lohfink includes Josh 4:19\*; 5:10–12; 14:1, 2\*; 18:1; 19:51 in his Pg (145 n. 29). Cf. Lohfink’s earlier article (“Original Sins and the Priestly Historical Narrative,” in *Theology of the Pentateuch*, 96–115), where he ends Pg with the death of Moses (Deut 34\*).

147. See §3.1.1 for a full discussion of Lohfink’s views regarding this.

148. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 165.

events that is subsequently described.”<sup>149</sup> This blessing is repeated (Gen 9:1, 7; 17:2, 6; 28:3; 25:9, 11; 48:3–4), revised in Gen 9:2, and fulfilled in Gen 47:27; Exod 1:7; and Josh 18:1. That is, Gen 1:28 is fulfilled with regard to the multiplying of humanity and its spreading over the earth in Gen 47:27 and Exod 1:7 with the multiplying of the sons of Jacob. Once this blessing of procreation is dealt with in Exod 1:7, the promise of the land determines the narrative (see Exod 6:2–8). This land promise for Israel, as an extension for what is said to all humanity, is fulfilled in Josh 18:1 where it states that the land lay subdued (כבוש, which according to Lohfink denotes possession) before them.<sup>150</sup> The remaining element of Gen 1:28 regarding human rule over the animals is revised in Gen 9:2 within a world that is second best to the original creation.<sup>151</sup> This element does not point to anything outside Pg. Neither is there any hint of a promise that has not been fulfilled in Pg. Not only are the promises of descendants (multiplying) and land fulfilled in Pg, but the promise that YHWH will be God for them “is fulfilled at Sinai when God takes up a cultic residence in the midst of Israel.”<sup>152</sup> Therefore all the promises in Pg are fulfilled within the narrative, and there is nothing beyond what is described within Pg.<sup>153</sup> Paralleling Pg to Atrahasis, Lohfink sees the Pg narrative as presenting two dynamic phases that move to their corresponding static phase: the first has to do with the whole world and all of humanity; the second is exemplified in Israel. The second dynamic phase has the same task as that proposed in Gen 1:28; that is, each nation, exemplified in Israel “must grow to its

---

149. Ibid., 165; and see 154, 166. Lohfink (165–66 n. 83) cites Brueggemann but criticizes him for reading into Gen 1:28 too immediate a statement concerning Israel and its hope to return from exile into its land.

150. Ibid., 167.

151. Ibid., 167, 169. In another article, Lohfink (“The Strata of the Pentateuch and the Question of War,” in *Theology of the Pentateuch*, 207) connects Gen 9:2, as a precondition for the sacrificial cult, to that which makes possible God’s presence among his people. See discussion below.

152. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 169 n. 169. Admittedly, Lohfink in this article plays down somewhat this promise to be their God and its fulfillment at Sinai, referring to it only in a footnote, but as we will see in the later discussion it figures more prominently in two of his other articles (“Strata of the Pentateuch,” and “God the Creator and the Stability of Heaven and Earth: The Old Testament on the Connection between Creation and Salvation,” in *Theology of the Pentateuch*, 116–35), where he sees it as equally important to the land promise and its fulfillment.

153. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 169.

proper number, and then each nation must take possession of the land assigned to it.”<sup>154</sup> All this is achieved within Pg’s narrative, as is the fulfillment of all three Abrahamic promises. Indeed,

The stability of the world, which God has brought to its perfected form in two stages, is guaranteed by the double covenant. The covenant with Noah guarantees the stability of the world itself, and the covenant with Abraham establishes the number of people, their possession of the land, and the presence of God in the sanctuary in the midst of Israel.<sup>155</sup>

Since these are eternal covenants made by God, their validity is not dependent on humanity. Therefore if a generation excludes itself and is punished, the next generation can “return to the stable final state of the world”; in other words, “the world can fall repeatedly from the perfect form into the imperfection of becoming and must tread the paths of the dynamic phase again.”<sup>156</sup> The exiles to whom Pg is addressed have fallen away, and therefore their hope lies in this “vision of a static world,” what “the world has already received from God,” rather than on a new and unknown eschaton.<sup>157</sup> “The ideal shape of the world is known, it already existed before. From the point of view of God it is always present, and all that is necessary is to return to it.”<sup>158</sup>

In two other articles, Lohfink also links together the themes of land and God’s cultic presence, in continuity with the article just outlined but in slightly different ways than the link made there between divine presence and land primarily through the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant promises. In “The Strata of the Pentateuch and the Question of War,”<sup>159</sup> Lohfink sees Josh 18:1 as important not only because it fulfils Gen 1:28, but also because in this verse “the themes of land and presence are brought to a conclusion.”<sup>160</sup> His exploration of the issue of war in relation to Pg then leads him to focus on the cult and the presence of YHWH in the glory (כבוד). He connects the postflood war between humans and animals in the context of blessing (Gen 9:2) with the cultic sacrifices and

---

154. Ibid.

155. Ibid., 171.

156. Ibid., 171 and 172

157. Ibid.

158. Ibid.

159. Lohfink, “Strata of the Pentateuch,” esp. 200–210.

160. Ibid., 200

therefore sees it as “the condition that makes possible for God to plan and create the congregation of Israel as shaped by cultic worship and hence by the presence of God among his people.”<sup>161</sup> Moreover, he argues that in Pg war is eliminated, envisioning a society that functions without violence (except presumably the violence between humans and animals ritualized in the cult, which itself solves the problem of human violence): “Pg thinks in terms of a society, and therefore a structure of the world that ... functions, or could function, without the use of violence. It is a world that has become peaceful through worship, and that can be kept peaceful through the power of ritual.”<sup>162</sup> In contexts where war is replaced, such as the event at the Reed Sea, and the story of Israel’s sin and punishment (Num 13–14\*), there is a connection with the presence of the glory (כבוד) of YHWH. At the Reed Sea, YHWH gets glory, the glory appears in Exod 16\* and remains permanently at the sanctuary where the sacrifices make possible the presence of the כבוד that Israel lives under, and from the כבוד proceeds destruction of all that is sinful (Num 13–14\*).<sup>163</sup> But even though the emphasis is on the presence of YHWH here, the land is still important. The problems of human violence are solved through the cult, and overall, “Israel will soon be able to resume life on its own land, and it is to exist as a society centered on the sanctuary and on the practice of the cult there.”<sup>164</sup> In “God the Creator and the Stability of Heaven and Earth: The Old Testament on the Connection between Creation and Salvation,” Lohfink sees the content of salvation in Pg as twofold: “the land of Canaan and the special relationship between God and Israel.”<sup>165</sup> The land promise is not just possession of the land but the people’s peaceful life in the land.<sup>166</sup> Genesis 1:26–28 sets the agenda: humanity as many peoples that spread over the earth, with each nation possessing their own territory. In Josh 18:1, this is achieved for Israel as an example, and this signifies creation reaching its successful outcome.<sup>167</sup> However, there is another aspect to this in Pg, namely, “the immanence of the transcendent God in a creation extended

---

161. *Ibid.*, 207.

162. *Ibid.*, 204

163. *Ibid.*, 207.

164. *Ibid.*, 210.

165. Lohfink, “God the Creator,” esp. 120–33, 126.

166. *Ibid.*

167. *Ibid.*, 128.

by human labor: the encounter with God in cultic worship.”<sup>168</sup> Not only land possession, but the cultic presence of God (Josh 18:1), made possible by human labor in setting up the tabernacle as “essentially a creative transformation of the world,” fulfills creation.<sup>169</sup>

For Schmidt, who dates his independent Pg document ending in Deut 34\* to the postexilic period, both the Sinai material and the land are important.<sup>170</sup> He maintains that P presents the epoch of Moses as the “canonical time (so to speak) in which YHWH created the basis for the existence of Israel as a community.”<sup>171</sup> However, it provides the basis not only for Israel as a cultic community, but also for their possession of the land of Canaan. The reason why the fulfillment of the land promise as originally intended (Exod 6:8) is not narrated in P is because Israel did not come into the land in this “canonical” time of Moses, because that generation rejected the gift of the land, and Moses and Aaron failed. Therefore, although P does not have a presentation of the taking of the land, this does not mean that the land is unimportant. Pg’s Second Temple audience is already a cultic community who have the land, and therefore Pg is effectively an etiology of Israel as a cultic community living in the land.<sup>172</sup>

Thomas Pola, whose exilic independent Pg ends in Exod 40\* with the erection of the tabernacle (משכן), attempts to combine the Sinai משכן and the associated divine presence with the land theme by the unusual move of equating Pg’s Sinai with (Ezekiel’s) Zion and therefore maintains that this Sinai account contains within it the fulfillment of the promise of the land.<sup>173</sup>

Finally, Jean Louis Ska, who sees P as exilic, relatively independent, and concluding in Num 27, thinks that a way around the dichotomy between those who focus on the Sinai cult as P’s primary concern and

---

168. Ibid.

169. Ibid., 132.

170. Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*.

171. Ibid., 265.

172. Ibid., 257, 259, 265.

173. Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*. Note that Pola does not see the tent of meeting material as part of his Pg. See the critique of Pola’s position by Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 66 n. 240). The perspective of Van Seters (*Pentateuch*, 164–67) should be mentioned at this point. Van Seters points out the strong emphasis in P on the theme of the promise of the land and its fulfillment (175, 186) and also the importance of the deity’s presence as represented in his “glory” (187). However, since he sees P as a redaction that comments on J (and Dtr) material, he does not attempt to integrate these themes in any way.



those who see P's real agenda in terms of the land is to be found in P's theology of "glory."<sup>174</sup> YHWH's glory has a "double nature ... as the concrete, effective presence of YHWH both in Israel's history and in Israel's cult."<sup>175</sup> Ska, therefore, wants to add a second aspect to Blum's concept of the nearness of God: it denotes not only God's residing in the midst of his people (Exod 6:7; 29:45–46) but also God's acting in history (Exod 14\*; 16\*; Num 13–14\*; 20\*).<sup>176</sup> For P, the cult is inseparable from history, and therefore the inauguration of the cult is not an end in itself, since with YHWH's glory guiding history the promise of the land (Exod 6:8) cannot fail. "Thus the 'glory' unites both dynamic and static aspects of P's theology—the tension with regard to the future (the possession of the land) and God's presence near his people in the sanctuary."<sup>177</sup>

### 1.1.3. Conclusions

The issue of the primary concern of P, or the meaning of P as a whole, is an area where the last word has not been uttered and therefore represents a potentially fruitful area of exploration. This is not least because, although the views outlined here offer many valuable insights, they tend to focus on a particular, albeit important, aspect of P, either the Sinai material or the narrative frame and particularly the land promise within this, and have some difficulty in accounting for the shape and details of P as a whole. Those that attempt to integrate the Sinai material with the land promise have advanced the discussion in a helpful direction. However, the explorations are somewhat sketchy, comprising only brief discussions in articles (e.g., Blenkinsopp, Lohfink) or as part of a different, albeit related, or larger, project (e.g., Clements, Schmidt, Pola, Ska). It is my intention to attempt to plumb the depths of this issue of the overall meaning or

---

174. Ska, *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, 157–58.

175. *Ibid.*, 158. YHWH's glory is referred to in Exod 14:4, 17–18, where YHWH glorifies himself; in Exod 16:10, where YHWH's glory appears in relation to providing manna; in Exod 24:16–17, where it covers Mount Sinai; in Exod 40:34–35 (cf. 29:43), where the glory takes possession of the tent of meeting; in Lev 9:23, where it is manifest with the inauguration of the cult; in Num 14:10, where it appears in relationship to the punishment on the generation that rejected the land; and in Num 20:6, where it is related to giving water to thirsty Israel; and the glory moves with the tabernacle to accompany and guide Israel on the way to the promised land. See *ibid.*, 157–58.

176. *Ibid.*, 158 n. 111.

177. *Ibid.*, 158.

theological horizon of P more, not only by revisiting the interrelation of elements within the structure and trajectory of P as a whole, but in particular through seeking to unfold the genre and hermeneutics of this material.<sup>178</sup> It is the latter that I believe has the most potential for shedding fresh light on what this material is primarily concerned with, what it might have sought to accomplish as a whole, and how it might have impacted, or functioned for, its original audience.

### 1.2. ESTABLISHING THE PARAMETERS

In order to explore in more depth the overall meaning of P, it is necessary to establish some parameters within which this investigation will take place, given that views regarding P's overall theology can be potentially influenced by perceptions of the definition, nature, extent, and (to a lesser extent) dating, and vice versa.<sup>179</sup>

#### 1.2.1. An Originally Separate Source (Pg)

I will maintain, with the majority of scholars, that there once existed a coherent Priestly narrative (Pg) that was originally an independent, that is, separate, document.<sup>180</sup>

The main arguments for seeing Pg as an independent or separate document, along with counterarguments to the objections that have been put forward to seeing Pg as an independent source by those who maintain that P is a redaction or *Komposition*, are as follows.<sup>181</sup>

---

178. Lohfink's classic article, "Priestly Narrative," of course, makes an important contribution in this area and will be taken up, and dialogued with, in §3.1.1.

179. This is the case sometimes, but not always, as seen in the survey of views discussed above.

180. See Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 46. See further n. 7 for a list of scholars who hold to this.

181. Those who have delineated detailed arguments in favor of seeing P as independent or separate, against the counterarguments of those who see P as a redaction or *Komposition*, include: Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 146–47 n. 31; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 35–36; Koch, "P-Kein Redaktor!"; Emerton, "Priestly Writer in Genesis."; Nicholson, "P as an Originally Independent Source"; Nicholson, *Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 205–18; Campbell, "Priestly Text"; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, esp. 1–34; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 46–140, esp. 45–46; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 292–97; Schwartz, "Priestly Account," 105–9; Davies, "Composi-

In favor of an independent or separate source, it can be seen that, when the P (narrative) material (Pg) is separated out from the non-P material, this Pg material is on the whole coherent; that is, “the bulk of the P material reads remarkably well.”<sup>182</sup> This coherence is supported by the many observable links and correlations between various elements within Pg, both at a microlevel in terms of details and at a macrolevel in terms of the structure of Pg.<sup>183</sup> For example, there are parallels between the creation (and flood) and the Sinai material.<sup>184</sup> Particularly telling is the way in which the revelation of the divine name is structured within Pg to portray three eras: God is known as Elohim in relation to humanity as a whole (Gen 1–10\*), as El Shaddai in relation to the ancestors (Gen 12–50\*), and then only with the emergence of the nation Israel and Moses is the divine name YHWH revealed (Exod 6:3). Moreover, this contradicts the non-P material, which does not contain such a scheme of progressive revelation, with YHWH being used throughout Genesis, and this suggests that Pg stood separately.<sup>185</sup> Indeed, the combination of Pg with non-P material blurs the distinction Pg wants to make here, as well as masking to a certain extent other structural patterns and linkages in Pg.<sup>186</sup> The blurring of link-

---

tion of the Book of Exodus.” For those who argue for P as a redaction or *Komposition* see n. 9, and the discussion by Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 20–21).

182. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 114; also 46, 79. See also Nicholson, *Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 208; de Pury, “Jacob Story,” 62; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 20; Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 19 n. 15. Minor unevennesses, such as the loose connection between Gen 1:1–2:3 and the תולדות formulas in Gen 5 can be accounted for by P’s taking up of different earlier traditions: see Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 295–96; Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 18. The objections to the coherence of P by those who see P as a redaction or *Komposition* because of certain gaps will be discussed shortly.

183. For the microlevel, see the detailed analysis of the P texts in Genesis in Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 48–99, and also the links between Genesis texts and Exodus texts outlined in *ibid.*, 118–20. See also, in relation to Genesis, Emerton, “Priestly Writer in Genesis.”

184. See, e.g., Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*; Weimar, “Sinai und Schöpfung,” 337–85.

185. See, e.g., Koch, “P-Kein Redaktor!”; Nicholson, *Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 208–9, 212; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 46, 114, 119; Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 158; Schmid, *Old Testament*, 147.

186. See, e.g., the parallels between the creation and the Sinai material or the pattern of the “signs” in Pg in Exod 7–11\*. See, e.g., Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 147 n. 31; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 119; Carr, “Scribal Processes,” 70; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 294; Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 108; Davies,

ages in Pg can be seen in places where the Pg account makes sense only on its own, that is, without the non-P material. For example, the reason given in Pg for Jacob's departure in Gen 27:46–28:9 does not presuppose that Gen 27:1–45 exists in the same narrative line; indeed the coherent and seemingly once continuous elements within Pg in Gen 26:34–35 that note Esau's marriages, leading directly on to Gen 27:46–28:9, are now interrupted in the present text by Gen 27:1–45 (non-P).<sup>187</sup>

Another cogent argument is that, given the coherence in details and in terms of structure of the bulk of Pg, the most straightforward interpretation that accounts for the many doublets and parallels between Pg and the non-P material, along with the discrepancies and tensions between details within these parallels, is that Pg is an independent source.<sup>188</sup> Pg has a parallel account of its own "at all the important junctures," and the ordering of episodes is practically the same in Pg as in the non-P material.<sup>189</sup> The close parallels in details, and yet discrepancies between the Pg and non-P stories of the flood and the Reed Sea episode, in particular, both of which are practically complete, speak for the independence of Pg in relation to the non-P material.<sup>190</sup> In addition, as Graeme Davies points out, such tensions as found between the Sinai material in Pg and the non-P Sinai material, for example, in the portrayal of Aaron (where for Pg Aaron is a positive figure, but a negative one in non-P [Exod 32]) speak for Pg as an independent

---

"Composition of the Book of Exodus," 80; and the comment by Schwartz ("Priestly Account," 120), "The continuous nature of the Priestly material when viewed alone, and the confusion created when it is viewed in the canonical version, lead to the conclusion that it was composed to stand independently, not as a redactional supplement to other accounts."

187. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 46, 114.

188. See, e.g., Campbell, "Priestly Text"; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 46, 117; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 293. Cf. Blum (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 229–85), who notes these things but explains them in terms of his KP as *Komposition*; see the later discussion.

189. Quotation from Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 108; see also Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 20. E.g., the creation, flood, covenant with Abraham, the call of Moses, the plagues/signs, the Reed Sea event, the spy story. For the similar ordering of episodes, see McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 92, 96; Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 147 n. 32. See also the chart of parallels between P and non-P in Genesis in Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 126–27.

190. See Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 147 n. 31. Cf. Blum (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 278–85), who explains this differently, as discussed below.

source since it is hard to believe that P would have included the non-P account in Exod 32 in the middle of P's tabernacle material.<sup>191</sup>

In short, as Nihan states,

The classical observations that ... the P texts represent a coherent story, with only a few lacunae; that they have preserved their own version of several central episodes in Israel's history of origins ...; and, above all, that in several places they stand in tension with the non-P material in the present form of the Pentateuch, all militate against the view that P was conceived initially as a supplement to the non-P traditions.<sup>192</sup>

The arguments against seeing P as an independent source are as follows.

First, it is objected that Pg is not coherent because of certain gaps. Those usually listed are: the birth of Jacob and Esau, Jacob's sojourn in Paddan-Aram and his marriages, Joseph's rise to power in Egypt, and in particular the lack of introduction for Moses, who seems to arrive suddenly on the scene.<sup>193</sup> With regard to these lacunae, Carr argues convincingly that, given what we know of redactors who conflated sources in the ancient world where source materials were drawn on selectively to form a new whole, it is not to be expected that the Priestly source would have been preserved completely when it was later combined with non-P material, but rather that there would be gaps in both the P and non-P material.<sup>194</sup> This explains the gaps in the Genesis ancestral material, that is, as places where non-P material was included instead of P material by the later redactor, especially given that the rest of the Pg ancestral material reads coherently.<sup>195</sup>

---

191. Davies, "Composition of the Book of Exodus," 83; see also, Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 293.

192. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 20.

193. These are listed by Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 45; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 146; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 21 n. 3. The lack of an introduction for Moses is important within Blum's arguments for P not being an independent source (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 230–31).

194. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 45.

195. That non-P material was included instead of P material was also the explanation given by Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 14. Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 78–99) presents convincing arguments for the coherence of Pg's ancestral materials apart from these three gaps; *pace* Blum (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 229–32), who sees P in the Genesis ancestral material as too fragmentary to form an independent narrative, especially in the Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph stories where he perceives P texts as only small additions.

This is also most likely the case with regard to the appearance of Moses in Pg (Exod 6:2–8); it is quite possible that the later redactor substituted non-P material concerning Moses's early life for a possible account in P.<sup>196</sup> Even if this were not the case, given the smooth connection between Exod 2:23ab–25 and Exod 6:2–8, it is reasonable to suppose that Moses by that time would not have needed an introduction since he was so well-known in the tradition.<sup>197</sup>

Cross also sees gaps in P with regard to “the primordial human rebellion” and is particularly incredulous with regard to there being no Sinai covenant in the P material and therefore argues that P must be a redaction that incorporated non-P material that contains the preflood sins and the covenant at Sinai.<sup>198</sup> The difficulty with this argument, however, is that Cross judges P in terms of the non-P (JE) material: it cannot be assumed that P must have narrated everything in the non-P material for it to be an independent source.<sup>199</sup> Moreover, these differences can be explained in terms of P's different interpretations and theological emphases: for example, P's brief statement of preflood sin in Gen 6:11 can be explained as due to P's lack of emphasis on this in favor of an emphasis, in Gen 1–9\*, on “God's reintegrative power of re-creation and blessing.”<sup>200</sup> Similarly, it seems to be a deliberate theological move on the part of Pg to reject the (conditional) covenant at Sinai and to emphasize the promissory covenant with Abraham (against the background of the Noahic covenant).<sup>201</sup>

One last seeming gap has been postulated by some who do not see P as an independent source: the P material does not seem to have an account of the departure from Egypt (or of the firstborn plague).<sup>202</sup> Again, this can be countered by the argument that when a later redactor combined P and non-P material, P's account may have been omitted in favor of the non-P

---

196. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 119.

197. Davies, “Composition of the Book of Exodus,” 80.

198. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 306; see also 318.

199. See the criticisms of Cross with regard to this in Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 146–47 n. 31; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 77, 119; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 146; Nicholson, *Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 207.

200. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 77. See also, Nicholson, *Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 207.

201. A view followed by many after Zimmerli's classic article, “Sinaibund und Abrahambund”; see Nicholson, *Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 210.

202. See Rendtorff, *Problem of the Process of Transmission*, 157; E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 255–56.

account. However, it seems more probable in this instance that this is to be explained in terms of taking seriously the style and genre of the P text in Exod 12, rather than imposing categories of narrative or storytelling as found in the non-P material at this point. The bulk of P's text here is liturgical, with the firstborn plague motif unfolded as part of the Passover rite (Exod 12:1–13) and the notice of their leaving Egypt (Exod 12:40–41) being stated after the execution of the Passover rite (Exod 12:28), and therefore as a consequence of carrying out the liturgy; that is, the performance of the rite brings about the reality of the exodus.<sup>203</sup> This is a theological move that is expressed appropriately in the genre of liturgy, rather than narrative storytelling, and this explains why the plague of the firstborn and the exodus from Egypt is not narrated in story form as in the non-P material.<sup>204</sup>

In summary, the argument against P as an independent source in terms of gaps is not convincing; the bulk of Pg reads coherently and this is especially so if assumptions regarding form and content, derived from non-P material, are not superimposed on the Pg material.

Similar counterarguments are valid in relation to Cross's comment that the P material in Genesis, as well as Exodus—Numbers cannot properly be called a narrative—is “a poor narrative indeed”<sup>205</sup> and therefore must depend on, or represent a supplement to, the colorful saga material of non-P.<sup>206</sup> Again, this is to prejudge the P material in terms of the genre of the non-P material, rather than taking seriously P's own style and genre.<sup>207</sup> More convincing is Carr's statement in relation to the ancestral material that P, which he sees as an independent source, “appears to have drawn

---

203. This will be taken up in more detail in ch. 4.

204. A similar comment could be made in relation to the argument of Van Seters (*Life of Moses*, 105–7, 112) that P is a redaction since, e.g., Exod 7:1–5 (P) must introduce both P and non-P plague material because no account of Moses and Aaron going to speak to Pharaoh is found in the ensuing account in the P material in Exod 7–11\*, as commissioned in Exod 7:2; it is found only in the non-P material in Exod 7–11\*. This neglects to consider the particular style of P (found also in Exod 12:28 and elsewhere), where P expresses the carrying out of the commission through the execution formula at the outset (Exod 7:7–8), rather than unfolding it in detail in narrative storytelling form. See Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 119 n. 9.

205. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 307.

206. Ibid.

207. See Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 146–47 n. 31; Nicholson, *Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 207.



selectively on Israel's ancestral traditions in the process of presenting a covenant-based expanded genealogy,"<sup>208</sup> since this takes seriously the possible genre of the P ancestral material and uses it to explain its shape comprising in places summary statements and more expansive texts such as Gen 17.

Another argument that has been advanced against seeing P as an independent source is that P texts serve as headings or frame older non-P material, and these P texts therefore represent a redaction.<sup>209</sup> However, these P texts could also have stood separately and their framing function in the present text can just as easily be explained in terms of a later redactor matching P and non-P material in the process of combining them.<sup>210</sup> This observation alone cannot be decisive in arguing either way for P as an independent source or redaction. A similar point can be made with regard to the observation that some P texts seem to be designed with their contexts in mind since they fit appropriately into these contexts.<sup>211</sup> This appropriate fit, as Davies comments, is not surprising given the similar subject matter, and could just as well be due to a later redactor combining P and non-P texts.<sup>212</sup> Moreover, the places where there is an appropriate fit between P texts and their present non-P contexts are countered or balanced by places where the Pg account makes more sense on its own, that is, without the non-P material that interrupts the coherence of Pg, as already noted above.<sup>213</sup> Such arguments, therefore, are not decisive either way regarding whether P is an independent source or redaction.

---

208. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 127.

209. This is argued particularly in relation to the תולדות texts and genealogical material in Genesis. See, e.g., Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 301–5; Tengström, *Toledotformel*; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 102–3; see also Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280–85.

210. See Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 146–47 n. 31. See also Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 97–99), who acknowledges that P's genealogical material is not as clearly separate from the non-P material but argues that a later redactor would have been more liberal in combining P and non-P genealogies and the material associated with them because it would not have been necessary to include redundant details, and it is therefore P's "theologically charged texts" (such as Gen 17), and their parallels with the non-P material, that more firmly support the view that Pg is an independent source.

211. See, e.g., Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 103; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 38–39, 230–31, 242–62.

212. Davies, "Composition of the Book of Exodus," 80.

213. E.g., with regard to the revelation of the divine name; and the P texts Gen 26:34–35; 27:46–28:9.



At this point, a note on Blum's view that P is neither a source nor a redaction, but a *Komposition* (KP) that incorporates the earlier non-P material (his KD), is in order.<sup>214</sup> Blum denies that P is an independent source because of the gaps (such as a lack of an introduction to Moses), the fragmentary nature of the P ancestral texts, especially in the Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph material (which he sees as insufficient to form an independent narrative), the fact that some P texts provide a framework for the older non-P material, and that in places P texts appear to be designed with their contexts in mind. The preceding discussion has offered reasonable counterarguments to these. However, Blum does not see P as a redaction either, but as a *Komposition*. He argues some groups of P texts show a coherence in relation to each other (e.g., P texts in Exod 1–7<sup>215</sup>), and therefore the author of KP composed these texts with such continuity in mind as well as seeking to produce coherence in terms of the revision of KD by means of these texts. Moreover, the concept of *Komposition* explains for him the features of P that are doublets or that stand in tension with the non-P material. Blum makes an interesting move here. Instead of seeing doublets and tensions between P and non-P texts as evidence of P as an independent source, he explains these as the author, who was revising KD by inserting P texts, wanting to preserve the inherited tradition (KD) but also to correct and reinterpret it, with the result that the narrative was then differently understood in light of the P texts that had been inserted. For example, he sees Exod 6:3 (P) (the revelation of the name YHWH first to Moses) as constituting the binding interpretation of the older material; that is, the reader/hearer was intended to make the necessary corrections to the older tradition, which did not contain such a concept of progressive revelation of the divine name, in the light of Exod 6:3. In addition, Blum acknowledges the continuity within the P accounts of the flood, the plague cycle with its recurring pattern, and the Reed Sea event, as coherent in themselves but gets around the traditional conclusion that this points to P as an independent source by attributing each of these accounts to a pre-P source, that is, already shaped Priestly tradition, that the author of KP took over and incorporated. In this way, he concludes that his KP is a well-crafted composition, which in addition to reworking KD also occasionally incorporated older already existing narrative material. All these explanations are pos-

---

214. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*.

215. Although for Blum, P cannot be an independent source since there is the gap here of a lack of introduction to Moses; see *ibid.*, 231, 240–42.

sible. However, it seems to be a complicated way to explain phenomena that can just as easily, and more simply, be accounted for in terms of seeing P as an independent source. Surely the P passages that parallel and stand in tension with KD passages are just as well, if not better, explained in terms of the P account being a counter narrative to his KD material; for example, it seems to be a complex process for a reader to make the necessary mental adjustments with regard to reinterpreting the KD material that has gone before in the light of Exod 6:3 when it comes after the material it is seeking to correct.<sup>216</sup> In short, Blum seems to complicate the issue unnecessarily, since his observations that cause him to conclude that P is not a redaction can be explained in terms of P as an independent source; and, given what I consider to be the demonstrable coherence of Pg within reasonable expectations of a source that has been combined with other (non-P) material by a later redactor, the view of Pg as a source, rather than KP as a *Komposition*, is more convincing. It seems to me no accident that, as already noted, when Blum examines the theology of KP overall, he bases this primarily on P texts; it seems there would be little, if any, difference regarding Blum's conception of the primary concern of P as a whole if Blum adhered to an independent P source rather than his KP composition.<sup>217</sup>

It has been argued here that there existed an originally independent or separate Priestly narrative, Pg, primarily in terms of its coherence. However, the existence of an originally separate *coherent* Priestly narrative, Pg, has been questioned from another direction, primarily by the work of Israel Knohl who advocates that originally there were fragmentary P scrolls (his Priestly Torah [PT]) that were supplemented, along with the non-P material, over a considerable period of time by the Holiness School (HS).<sup>218</sup> He dates PT to the eighth century BCE and his HS as extending from the eighth to the sixth century BCE. HS was responsible for blending PT and the non-P material, with the latest HS authors being responsible for the compilation of the Pentateuch as a whole.<sup>219</sup> Therefore, for Knohl,

---

216. Davies, "Composition of the Book of Exodus," 80–81.

217. See above, esp. n. 53.

218. Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*.

219. Ibid., esp. 6, 101–2; "Who Edited the Pentateuch?" in Dozeman, *Pentateuch: International Perspectives*, 367. Milgrom (*Leviticus* 17–22, 1325–30, 1334, 1338, 1343; "HR in Leviticus") basically follows Knohl's paradigm, albeit more cautiously; however, he rejects the concept of a holiness school in the sense of there having occurred continuous literary activity, advocating instead that almost all the H material was

there is no coherent Priestly narrative, Pg, only a fragmentary PT and later ongoing supplementation (HS).

It must be said that since the publication of Knohl's *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*, there has been an increasing consensus that the Holiness Code (Lev 17–26) is later than Priestly narrative texts, at least in Genesis and Exodus, and that H texts (that is texts stemming from the same hand or school as the composer of Lev 17–26), that supplement P texts or P and non-P texts, are to be found outside of Lev 17–26, particularly in Exodus.<sup>220</sup> However, although this has led Knohl to a position that discounts the existence of a coherent Priestly narrative, Pg, this is not the case with a number of other scholars, who, while acknowledging the existence of H texts within Exodus, for example, at the same time adhere to a coherent Priestly narrative, Pg, at least in Genesis and Exodus.<sup>221</sup> They see H or HS material as later than a coherent Priestly narrative, Pg, dating post-Pg H or HS in the exilic or postexilic period.<sup>222</sup> This is in large part because of the use of different

---

composed in the eighth century BCE with only 5 percent of H, which he labels HR (an H redaction), as occurring in the sixth century BCE. This HR is not to be equated with Pentateuchal redaction since H texts are basically to be found in Exodus–Numbers only (and Gen 1:1–2:4a).

220. There is some debate concerning whether H texts supplemented P only, before its combination with non-P material (so Schwartz ["Introduction"], Gilders ["Sacrifice before Sinai"], Stackert ["Holiness Legislation"], and Carr [*Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 298–303, esp. 301]), or whether H or HS texts were part of the process of combining P and non-P texts (so Knohl [*Sanctuary of Silence*], Milgrom [*Leviticus 17–22*, 1344; "HR in Leviticus"], Otto ["Holiness Code," 136–39, 141–42, 144, 150], Nihan [*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 616–19]), but this debate is not directly relevant to the concern here with regard to whether or not a coherent Priestly narrative can be identified. The essays contained in Sackett, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, address this issue.

221. See, e.g., Otto, "Holiness Code"; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*; Römer, "Exodus Narrative"; Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum."

222. Carr (*Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 303) dates H to the exilic period, whereas Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 562, 617) dates HS in the Persian period. There are differing views regarding the nature of H or HS; e.g., Otto ("Holiness Code") perceives H as a redaction layer, that includes Lev 17–26 as well as H texts in the rest of the Pentateuch, and is the work of a Pentateuchal redactor, whereas Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 554, 559, 561–62) sees HS as the work of a school, a specific group of scribes who participated in the editing of the Pentateuch in cooperation with other circles at the same time. This debate, however, is not directly relevant to our discussion.

criteria than Knohl uses in identifying H texts as distinct from P texts and therefore having different perceptions of which texts are to be assigned to H or HS.<sup>223</sup> So it is important now to evaluate Knohl's position, his criteria and the reasoning upon which it is based, if the view advocated here that there once existed a coherent Priestly narrative, Pg, is to be maintained.

Knohl argues for his views primarily in terms of linguistic considerations. He identifies specific words, phrases (such as "I am YHWH," **אני יהוה**), and grammatical traits (such as second-person plural address) that he sees as characteristic of H (in Lev 17–26) and then labels texts (outside of Lev 17–26) traditionally seen as Priestly that contain these words and traits as belonging to HS; in this way he comes up with a list of typical HS expressions differentiated from what he sees as typical PT expressions.<sup>224</sup> In addition, texts that seem to blend P and non-P elements he attributes to HS.<sup>225</sup> Moreover, texts that have similar motifs or affinities with ideas as found in Lev 17–26 or texts outside of this identified as HS on these linguistic grounds, he also attributes to HS even if they do not contain linguistic traits typical of HS.<sup>226</sup> For material outside of the cultic texts of Exod 25–30; Lev 1–16; 17–26, he explicitly sees the potential criterion for identifying HS in terms of interrupting the coherence of P material as not valid.<sup>227</sup> Indeed, approaching the Priestly texts outside Lev 17–26 with a view to identifying HS texts in these terms leads Knohl to label such texts as, for example, Exod 6:2–8 and Exod 29:43–46, traditionally seen as key texts within the sequence of a postulated Priestly narrative (Pg), as HS, thus splintering any coherent Priestly narrative that might be discerned and leading to the view that the Priestly material (his PT) is fragmentary.<sup>228</sup>

---

223. There is also an ongoing debate regarding the details among those who adhere to an underlying coherent Priestly narrative, Pg, as to which particular texts are to be assigned to H or HS and which are to be assigned to Pg; but in general those who adhere to a coherent Priestly narrative, Pg, assign a lot less of the texts, especially narrative texts, traditionally assigned to P, to H or HS than does Knohl. The question of which texts are to be assigned to Pg and which to H/HS (and other possible later material) will be addressed in §1.2.2, where the issue of the delineation of Pg, and in particular its extent, will be taken up.

224. See the lists set out in Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 1–2 n. 3; 108–10.

225. *Ibid.*, 68.

226. See, e.g., *ibid.*, 46.

227. *Ibid.*

228. Milgrom (*Leviticus* 17–22, 1325–30, 1334, 1338, 1343–44; "HR in Leviticus") basically follows Knohl methodologically except for (1) a few refinements with

Taking each of Knohl's criteria and their application in turn, the following arguments mitigate against Knohl's position and the reasons underlying it. First, Knohl's linguistic arguments have a number of flaws. Defining H terminology from Lev 17–26 and then using it to identify H texts in P involves circular reasoning: assuming terminology in Lev 17–26 is uniquely H and therefore any text outside of Lev 17–26 must be H does not allow for any other conclusion.<sup>229</sup> Expressions used consistently in Lev 17–26 (such as “I am YHWH,” אֲנִי יְהוָה) does not mean that they are exclusive to H and not used elsewhere, such as in the P material.<sup>230</sup> The use of the same language does not necessarily connote the same redaction layer or school, since different authors/redactors can copy formulations at later times.<sup>231</sup> Indeed, since H (in Lev 17–26) is later than P, it is quite possible that H (in Lev 17–26) took up the expression “I am YHWH” (אֲנִי יְהוָה), and other expressions, from P and developed them. Texts that blend P and non-P elements could in some cases connote HS or post-P supplementation, but this criterion needs to be used with caution for, as Blum points out, the Priestly writers were not robots in their use of language, there are plenty of Priestly *hapax legomena* to be found, and, as Carr cautions, given the circumscribed environment in which P and non-P would have been transmitted it would be expected that mutual contamination between P and non-P texts most likely would have occurred quite early on.<sup>232</sup> Furthermore, Knohl's application of his linguistic criteria in many places offers slim evidence of the

---

regard to some of the linguistic expressions that Knohl sees as typical of H (though not the ones listed above); (2) a much more cautious approach to the identification of H within Priestly narrative material since he perceives that in this, in contrast to the laws, there is a lack of terminological precision; and (3) in advocating the interruption to the flow of P as a criterion for identifying H. However, he still ends up with an incoherent P narrative since he also attributes such passages as Exod 6:2–8 and Exod 29:38–46, as well as Gen 17:7–8 to H/HR.

229. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 564; Erhard Blum, “Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings,” in Shectman, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, 37.

230. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 35 n. 72; Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum,” 25 n. 43.

231. See the arguments for different levels of texts with similar formulations regarding the oath of the land in Suzanne Boorer, *The Promise of the Land as Oath: A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch*, BZAW 205 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992).

232. For the point about *hapax legomena*, see Blum, “Issues and Problems,” 36. See Carr, “Scribal Processes,” 71–74; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 299.

existence of HS; in some passages there is only one term that is the same as those found in Lev 17–26, and this is not statistically significant.<sup>233</sup> Further, associating texts that have similar motifs to those texts identified as HS because of containing only one or two perceived H expressions is a further step removed and therefore provides even slimmer evidence.

Second, dismissing the criterion for identifying HS in terms of interrupting the coherence of the narrative Priestly connections and basing identification of HS instead almost exclusively on linguistic grounds, especially given the drawbacks listed here in the linguistic arguments, detracts further from the plausibility of Knohl's arguments for his designation of such a large number of texts as HS, especially within the Priestly narrative material, which leads to its fragmentation. I agree with the view of scholars such as Blum, Nihan, Thomas Römer, and Joel Baden that considerations of narrative coherence should take precedence over linguistic considerations alone.<sup>234</sup> Consideration of internal consistencies, continuity, and coherence in the Priestly narrative material lead, in contrast to Knohl's fragmentary PT, to maintaining the existence of a Priestly narrative, Pg, at least in Genesis and Exodus, that includes such key texts as Exod 6:2–8 and Exod 29:43–46.

This is not to say that there are no H or HS texts discernible within the Priestly narrative material. But there must be tighter controls than those exercised by Knohl. There is a solid case for designating a text as H or HS within P's narrative material only where there is an accumulation of several H/HS terms (as found in Lev 17–26), the text is not entirely coherent with the style of its P context, and without which the coherence of its P context is not disturbed.<sup>235</sup>

In conclusion, given the strong arguments in favor of an independent or separate Pg and the counterarguments against those who oppose it, the position that will be taken here is that there once existed a coherent Priestly narrative, Pg. It remains now to define which particular texts will

---

233. See the critique by Blum ("Issues and Problems," 34–36) regarding Knohl's linguistic evidence for HS.

234. Blum, "Issues and Problems," 38–39; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 35 n. 72, 64; Blum, "Priestly Covenant," 96 n. 39; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 158; Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum," 14, 18–19.

235. As is the case, e.g., with Exod 12:14–20. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 564. Which particular texts will be designated as H/HS will be taken up in §1.2.2, on the definition and extent of Pg.

be seen as constituting Pg, with a particular focus on the much-debated issue of its extent or where it might have ended.

### 1.2.2. Definition and Extent of Pg

#### 1.2.2.1. Pg in Genesis

With regard to the identification of Pg in Genesis, there is little debate. Noth's delineation of Pg in Genesis<sup>236</sup> has been basically followed by a number of scholars with only relatively minor variations.<sup>237</sup>

The most significant variation from Noth's delineation of Pg in Genesis is the questioning, particularly by Knohl, of the attribution of Gen 17:7–8 to P, by assigning these verses to H/HS.<sup>238</sup> Omission of these verses would significantly affect the coherence of a P narrative, since they are programmatic for, and instigate, the unfolding of the divine promises that constitute their content from Exodus onward (see especially Exod 6:2–8;

---

236. See Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17–18.

237. See, e.g., Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 121–22; Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 145 n. 29; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 19; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 339–40. See also the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 220–21. It should be noted that Carr excludes Gen 10\* (P) and Gen 23 as part of his Priestly narrative. This is not overly significant, since this does not affect the coherence of the P narrative, and our primary focus is on the story of the nation of Israel in Exodus–Numbers, with Genesis merely forming a backdrop to this. However, the issue of whether Gen 23 in particular was originally part of Pg or a later addition has some bearing on the interpretation of Pg that will be unfolded, esp. in chs. 2 and 5, and scholars appear to be divided over this. Indeed Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 111–12) follows Blum in seeing this chapter (and references back to it [e.g., Gen 25:9–10; 49:31; 50:13], as later additions, as do Rudolph Smend and Rolf Rendtorff (see Emerton, "Priestly Writer in Genesis," 388). However, a number of scholars over and above Noth maintain that Gen 23 is part of Pg, and it is this position that will be taken here: See, e.g., Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis*, OTL (London: SCM, 1972), 246–47; John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 293; Claus Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, trans. John J. Scullion (London: SPCK, 1986), 371–72; Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17; Emerton, "Priestly Writer," 381–400.

238. Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 60, 102 n. 145; see also Olyan, ("Eternal Covenant," 357), who sees the hand of H in the twice repeated formula "to be their God" and the description of the land as "a perpetual holding" (although he sees the land promise as such as P). Milgrom ("HR in Leviticus," 34–37, 40) argues that Gen 1:1–2:4a should be attributed to his HR, but this has not gained any support.



29:45–46<sup>239</sup>). Knohl argues on the grounds of linguistic expressions that he sees as typical of HS and the fact that 17:7–8 can be removed without affecting the syntax.<sup>240</sup> However, even Knohl is hesitant to attribute 17:7–8 entirely to HS since then there would be no land promise, as found echoed in PT texts in Gen 28:4; 35:12; 48:4.<sup>241</sup> Since, as noted above, I am preferencing the criterion of coherence over that of linguistic observations alone, given the pitfalls associated with the latter, I am in agreement with the majority of scholars who see Gen 17:7–8 as an integral part of Pg and particularly with those who argue for this over against Knohl in terms of the integral part these verses play for the core of Pg's narrative.<sup>242</sup>

With regard to the delineation of Pg in Genesis therefore, Noth's delineation, which includes Gen 17:7–8, will be used as our default position.<sup>243</sup> This is because it is basically, in its essentials, representative of the majority of scholarly opinion; the relatively minor variations that occur between scholars are not significant within our overall discussion since the focus of our analysis will be primarily on the story of the nation Israel and therefore on Pg texts within Exodus–Numbers. Pg in Genesis will only be briefly considered in its role as the backdrop to this.

---

239. Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 17 n. 24, 61, 65) also sees these texts as HS; this will be addressed shortly.

240. *Ibid.*, 102 n. 145.

241. *Ibid.*

242. For the inclusion of Gen 17:7–8, see, e.g., the scholars listed in n. 237. Those who argue against Knohl include Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 64; Nihan, "Priestly Covenant," 96 n. 39; Blum, "Issues and Problems," 34.

243. As outlined in Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17–18; and see the text as laid out in Antony Campbell and Mark O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 22–35. I.e., Gen 1:1–2:4a; 5:1–28, 30–32; 6:9–22; 7:6, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; 8:1, 2a, 3b–5, 7, 13a, 14–19; 9:1–17, 28–29; 10:1–7, 20, 22–23, 31–32; 11:10–27, 31–32; 12:4b, 5; 13:6, 11b, 12ab<sub>a</sub>; 19:29; 16:1a, 3, 15, 16; 17:1–27; 21:1b–5; 23:1–20; 25:7–11a, 12–17, 19–20 ... 26b; 26:34–35; 27:46–28:9...; 31:18aβb; 33:18a; 35:6, 9–13a, 15, 22b–29; 36:1–14; 37:1, 2aαb ... 41:46a...; 46:6, 7; 47:27b, 28; 48:3–6; 49:1a, 29–33; 50:12–13. However, I would add to this, as belonging to Pg, Gen 21:21 and 25:11b, settlement notices regarding Ishmael and Isaac respectively, given their conformity to the pattern of settlement notices within Pg for Esau and Jacob, and also Abraham and Lot, as argued by Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 108–9).



## 1.2.2.2. Pg in Exodus 1–14

The delineation of Pg in Exod 1–14 is also relatively straightforward, with many scholars for the most part in line with Noth's position.<sup>244</sup> Noth's delineation will be our starting point; however, there are some contentious areas, and certain texts listed by Noth as belonging to Pg need to be assessed in terms of their affiliation.

First, in Exod 1, Noth attributes verses 1–7, 13–14 to Pg.<sup>245</sup> Although it is generally agreed that verses 1–5, 7, and 13–14 belong to Pg, 1:6 is often attributed not to P but to non-P.<sup>246</sup> This is because verses 6 and 8 are usually seen as belonging together as formulaic of a change of generations.<sup>247</sup> In light of this convincing observation, I will attribute verses 1–5, 7, and 13–14 to Pg in Exod 1.

Second, both Knohl and Jacob Milgrom attribute Exod 6:2–8 to H/HS.<sup>248</sup> As with Gen 17:7–8, omission of these verses would significantly affect the coherence of a P narrative, since this text also is programmatic for what is unfolded within Pg in Exodus and beyond. Knohl again argues on linguistic grounds: the use in particular of the expression “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) and the use, alongside P expressions, of the non-P phrase “burdens of the Egyptians” (סבלת מצרים). However, given the pitfalls discussed above in relation to basing such conclusions on one expression that is not

---

244. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18; and see Campbell and O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch*, 35–41. See also Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung,” 121–22; Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29; and the charts in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 222; and in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194.

245. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18.

246. Of the scholars listed in the chart in Jenson (*Graded Holiness*, 222), only Noth attributes 1:6 to P. See also Brevard Childs, *Exodus: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM, 1974), 2.

247. Konrad Schmid (*Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*, trans. James Nogalski, Siphrut 3 [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010], 63–64) alternatively attributes Exod 1:1–8 to P, but contrary to this, Exod 1:1–5, 7 is coherent, and 1:8 would seem to introduce the speaker of the speech in 1:9–10. See the following discussion and critique (in §1.2.3) of Schmid's view that 1:9–22\* are later and dependent on 1:1–8, which is related to his view that 1:1–8 belong to P.

248. Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 17 n. 24, 61; Milgrom, “HR in Leviticus,” 32–33; *Leviticus 17–22*, 1343–44; Jacob Milgrom, “The Case for the Pre-exilic and Exilic Provenance of the Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers,” in *Reading the Law: Essays in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*, ed. J. Gordon McConville and Karl Möller, LHBOTS 461 (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 51–52.

necessarily exclusive to H/HS and in relation to one instance of the use of a non-P expression in a Priestly context,<sup>249</sup> the argument here lacks conviction. In addition, since I am preferencing the criterion of coherence over linguistic arguments alone, once again I am siding with the majority of scholars who see Exod 6:2–8 as an integral part of Pg and particularly with those who argue for this over against Knohl in terms of the integral part these verses play for the core of Pg’s narrative.<sup>250</sup> In this case, Exod 6:2–8 is coherent with the promises in Gen 17:7–8,<sup>251</sup> is an integral part of the process of divine revelation proceeding from Elohim (in Gen 1–10\* [P]) to El Shaddai (in Gen 17) to the disclosure of the name YHWH to Moses (Exod 6:3),<sup>252</sup> and indeed Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 as a whole forms a transition between Exod 2:23–25 and the signs in Exod 7:8–9:12 (P), which is otherwise incoherent.<sup>253</sup> I am therefore including, in line with Noth and the majority of scholars, Exod 6:2–8, indeed Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7, as an integral part of Pg.

Third, within Exod 7:8–11:10, it is quite generally agreed that, at the very least, Exod 7:8–13 (rod to snake) 7:19–20aa, 21b–22 (water to blood); 8:1–3 (Eng. 5–7), 11b (Eng. 15b) (frogs); 8:12–15 (Eng. 16–19) (gnats); and 9:8–12 (boils) belongs to Pg.<sup>254</sup> These texts contain similar motifs and

---

249. See the general critique of Knohl above under §1.2.1.

250. For scholars who include Exod 6:2–8, see, e.g., those listed in n. 237. Those who argue against Knohl include Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 34–35, 64; Nihan, “Priestly Covenant,” 96 n. 39; Blum, “Issues and Problems,” 34.

251. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 34–35 n. 72; Blum, “Issues and Problems,” 34; Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 161–65.

252. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 34–35 n. 72.

253. Ibid. Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 61) indeed excludes the whole of Exod 6:2–7:6, attributing it to HS, arguing, e.g., that Exod 7:1–6 has linguistic similarities with Exod 6:2–8 such as “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה). The same criticisms that can be applied to Knohl’s position with regard to Exod 6:2–8 can therefore also be applied to his argument for Exod 7:1–6 as belonging to HS.

254. See, e.g., Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18; Childs, *Exodus*, 131–32; Fujiko Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3–14*, BZAW 166 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986), 126; Ludwig Schmidt, *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung in Exodus VII 14–XI 10*, StBib 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1990); George W. Coats, *Exodus 1–18*, FOTL 2A (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 68, 69; Werner H. Schmidt, “Die Intention der beiden Plagenerzählungen (Ex 7–10) in ihrem Kontext,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation*, ed. Marc Vervenne, BETL 126 (Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 229; William H. Propp, *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 2A (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 286–89; Gertz,

display the same basic structure.<sup>255</sup> However, some scholars have included other verses over and above these: in particular Exod 9:22–23a, 35 (hail); 10:12–13a, 20 (locusts); 10:21–22, 27 (darkness) are controversial, as is Exod 11:9–10 to a certain extent.<sup>256</sup> Exodus 9:22–23a, 35; 10:12–13a, 20; 10:21–22, 27 display some similarities with the features of the agreed upon Pg texts listed above; however, they also show some differences.<sup>257</sup> Opinion is therefore divided, with some attributing these texts to P, others to an earlier non-P (E) level, and yet others to redaction later than P.<sup>258</sup> Given

---

*Tradition und Redaktion*, 395; and Thomas Römer, “Competing Magicians in Exodus 7–9: Interpreting Magic in the Priestly Theology,” in *Magic in the Biblical World: From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon*, ed. Todd E. Klutz, JSNTSup 245 (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 19 n. 33 (where he writes, “There is astonishing unanimity on this matter among exegetes.”).

255. Basically, a command of YHWH to do a sign (often involving Aaron and his staff), the carrying out of the sign, what the magicians do, the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart and his not listening as YHWH had said. It should be noted that in Exod 8:11 the note regarding Pharaoh’s hardened heart is replaced by the comment by non-P in Exod 8:11a as part of the redactional process; see Martin Noth, *Exodus: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM, 1962), 75.

256. The hail, locusts, and darkness plagues all occur in the context of non-P material that forms the bulk of the description of the plagues. Thomas Dozeman (*God at War*, 102–3; *Commentary on Exodus*, ECC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 190) includes in his P elements that are usually attributed to non-P such as references to the knowledge, or recognition, of YHWH in Exod 7:16b\*, 17a\*; 8:6b\*, 18b; 9:14b, 29b\*; 10:2b and references to Aaron in Exod 8:4a\*, 8a\*, 21a\*; 9:27a\*; 10:3a\*, 8a\*, 16a\*, but these are quite fragmentary and are related to his view that P material is supplementary. These will not be included in Pg.

257. These verses consist of a command of YHWH to Moses only involving stretching out his hand (there is no mention of Aaron nor the staff as in the agreed upon Pg texts), which Moses carries out, and Pharaoh’s heart is hardened (חזק), as in the recognized P texts [e.g., Exod 7:3; 9:12]), followed by a statement that Pharaoh would not let them go (cf. Pharaoh would not listen, as in the recognized Pg texts).

258. For attribution to P, see, e.g., the later work of Noth, *Exodus*, 70, 80, 82–83; Coats, *Exodus 1–18*, 68, 70. Van Seters (*Life of Moses*, 87, 103, 104, 108) also sees these verses as belonging to P, predictably so since he maintains that P is a supplement. Childs (*Exodus*, 131) attributes Exod 9:35b only to P, as does Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 190). For attribution to earlier non-P, see, e.g., the earlier work of Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 30); George Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus: Eine Analyse von Ex 1–15*, BZAW 91 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 60–79; Childs, *Exodus*, 131 (except for Exod 9:35b, which he sees as P); Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 286–92 (except for Exod 9:35; 10:20, 27, which he sees as R?); Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 190 (except for Exod 9:35b, which he sees as P). For redaction later than

the uncertainty with regard to the attribution of Exod 9:22–23a, 35; 10:12–13a, 20, 21–22, 27, I will exclude these texts from Pg<sup>259</sup> and include only the generally well-recognized P texts of Exod 7:8–13 (rod to snake) 7:19–20aa, 21b–22 (water to blood); 8:1–3 (Eng. 5–7), 11b (Eng. 15b) (frogs); 8:12–15 (Eng. 16–19) (gnats); 9:8–12 (boils). Although there is some contention regarding the inclusion or not of Exod 11:9–10, these verses will be included in Pg since they pick up on the vocabulary of Exod 7:3–4 that introduces this section concerning the signs and brings this phase to a conclusion.<sup>260</sup> The texts attributed to Pg within Exod 7:8–11:10 are, therefore, Exod 7:8–13, 19–20aa, 21b–22; 8:1–3 (Eng. 5–7), 11b (Eng. 15b), 12–15 (Eng. 16–19); 9:8–12; 11:9–10.

Fourth, there is debate surrounding the attribution of basically all or part of Exod 12:1–20 to Pg. On the one hand, Noth and Pola attribute Exod 12:1, 3–20 to Pg.<sup>261</sup> On the other hand, Lohfink does not include any of Exod 12:1–20 in Pg, and Knohl attributes the whole of Exod 12:1–20 to his HS.<sup>262</sup> A number of scholars include Exod 12:1, 3–13 in Pg but see 12:14–20 as later or belonging to HS.<sup>263</sup>

The exclusion of the whole of Exod 12:1–20 from Pg is not convincing, since this results in a lack of coherence in terms of P's story line.<sup>264</sup> In any case, Knohl's linguistic arguments for identifying the whole of Exod 12:1–20 as HS pertain primarily to 12:14–20, with only the expression in

---

P, see, e.g., Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 126; Schmidt *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzahlung*, 81, 83; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 395.

259. I will also leave open the issue as to whether these texts can be seen as earlier than P or constitute a later redaction influenced by P.

260. Noth, e.g., in his earlier work (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18) sees Exod 11:9–10 as later than P, as does Propp (*Exod 1–18*, 292), who attributes them to R? However, these verses are included within P by a number of scholars. See, e.g., Noth in his later work (*Exodus*, 92–94); Childs, *Exodus*, 132; Coats, *Exodus 1–18*, 68, 70; and see the comment by Campbell and O'Brien (*Sources of the Pentateuch*, 39 n. 45). In general, see Childs, *Exodus*, 161–62.

261. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18; and see the chart in in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194.

262. Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 145 n. 29; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 19–23, 52, 62.

263. See, e.g., Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 31–37; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 564–65, 618–19; Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum," 18, 21, 25–26; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 300. Milgrom ("HR in Leviticus," 32–33; *Leviticus 17–22*, 1343–44) identifies only 12:17–20 within Exod 12:1–20 as HS.

264. See Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum," 26.

12:12 of “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) within Exod 12:1–13 being cited, which on its own is not enough evidence to identify HS throughout the whole of 12:1–13.<sup>265</sup> There are, however, quite strong arguments for seeing Exod 12:14–20 as a later H/HS supplement to Pg in Exod 12:1, 3–13. Unlike their narrative context in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, within 12:14–20 a number of H expressions are concentrated, and they are paraenetic in style.<sup>266</sup> Moreover, 12:14–20 would seem to take up and develop Lev 23:5–8.<sup>267</sup> Therefore, within Exod 12:1–20, I am including only Exod 12:1, 3–13 within Pg.<sup>268</sup>

The delineation of Pg within the rest of Exod 1–14 is relatively uncontroversial, and so, apart from the exceptions discussed here—the exclusion of Exod 1:6 and 12:14–20 from Pg—for the remaining material we will basically take Noth’s delineation, agreed with in essentials by many, as the default position.<sup>269</sup> The Pg texts in Exod 1–14 therefore comprise: 1:1–5, 7, 13–14; 2:23aβb–25; 6:2–12; 7:1–13, 19, 20aα, 21b, 22; 8:1–3 (Hebrew)

---

265. The other argument of Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 19–23) is that, whereas in PT Passover and Unleavened Bread are distinct, HS tends to fuse the two, but this is only valid if Exod 12:1–20 is taken as a whole.

266. Expressions include, “a perpetual ordinance” (12:14, 17), “a festival [הג] to YHWH throughout your generations” (12:14) “will be cut off” (12:15, 19), the inclusions of the גר (12:19); see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 564–65; Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum,” 21. On the paraenetic style, see Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum,” 25–26.

267. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 564–65; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 300.

268. Exod 12:2 is generally seen as a secondary addition since it interrupts the link between 12:1 and 3, and is quite possibly H.

269. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18; and see Campbell and O’Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch*, 35–41. See also Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung,” 121–22; Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29; and the charts in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 222, and in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194. I will diverge from Noth’s delineation of P in Exod 14\* in omitting Exod 14:10aβb (esp. with regard to the Israelites crying out to YHWH), in line with Childs (*Exodus*, 220) and George W. Coats (*Rebellion in the Wilderness: The Murmuring Motif in the Wilderness Traditions of the Old Testament* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1968], 128; Coats, *Exodus 1–18*, 111; and in omitting Exod 14:15aβ (“Why do you cry out to me?”) in line with Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 314) and Thomas Römer (“From the Call of Moses to the Parting of the Sea: Reflections on the Priestly Version of the Exodus Narrative,” in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, VTSup 164 [Leiden: Brill, 2014], 145).

... 11b–15 (Hebrew); 9:8–12; 11:9–10;<sup>270</sup> 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41; 14:1–4, 8, 9aβb, 15aαb, 16–18, 21aαb, 22–23, 26, 27aα, 28–29.

### 1.2.2.3. Pg in Exodus 15–16

The itinerary in Exod 15:22\*, 27; 16:1 which links the sea episode (Exod 14\*) to the manna episode (Exod 16\*) will be attributed here to Pg.<sup>271</sup>

However, the delineation of Pg within Exod 16:2–36 is not as straightforward as in Exod 1–14\* and requires some discussion. First, within Exod 16:2–15, verses 4–5 are in tension with their context, repeating and anticipating what is unfolded later in the story in 16:11–12, 16, 22–23 and is generally seen as not belonging to the P narrative, Pg.<sup>272</sup> In addition, 16:8, which basically repeats the content of 16:7 is clearly a gloss.<sup>273</sup>

Many scholars attribute the remaining verses within Exod 16:2–15 to Pg, that is, 16:2–3, 6–7, 9–15.<sup>274</sup> There are, however, two contentious areas:

---

270. Exod 11:9–10 are listed as secondary in Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18, but as part of P in Noth, *Exodus*, 94.

271. In agreement with Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18) and Lohfink (“Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29). Pace Graeme I. Davies (“The Wilderness Itineraries,” VT 33 [1983]: 1–13), who, building on an article by George Coats (“The Wilderness Itinerary,” CBQ 34 [1972]: 135–52) points out the difficulties in allocating the itineraries to the sources. He attributes only Exod 19:1; Num 20:1aα; 22:1 to P. However, his argument for excluding the “itinerary chain” of Exod 15:27; 16:1; 17:1; 19:2a on the basis of repetition in Exod 19:1, 2a is not convincing. More recently, Thomas Dozeman (“Priestly Wilderness Itineraries,” esp. 279–80, 282–83, 287) has argued, over against Coats and Davies, that the itineraries are not a late structuring device but are intimately interwoven with the narratives, providing the settings for distinctive ideological interpretations of the episodes in the wilderness. He suggests that signs of a P document underlying the present text can be seen in the P itineraries which include Exod 16:1b, as well as Exod 19:1 and Num 10:12; 20:1.

272. See, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 132, 134; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 182.

273. See, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 134.

274. Noth, *Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18; *Exodus*, 129–37; Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 83–87; *Exodus* 1–18, 128; E. Ruprecht, “Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Mannawunder (Ex 16) im Aufbau der Priesterschrift,” ZAW 86 (1974): 269–307; P. Maiberger, *Das Manna: Eine literarische, etymologische und naturkundliche Untersuchung*, ÄAT 6 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983); Aaron Scharf, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüstenerzählungen*, OBO 98 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Presses Universitaires, 1990), 134; Joel Baden, “The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16,” ZAW 122 (2010): 492, 494. Pace Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 17, 62), who attributes all of the



whether or not 16:6–7 should be included within Pg and whether or not all or part of 16:13b–15 should be excluded from Pg.

Those who see Exod 16:2–3, 9–15 as belonging to Pg but exclude Exod 16:6–7 do so on the grounds that they anticipate 16:12 and their content shows some unevenness with verse 12 (such as different referents in relation to the motifs of evening/twilight/morning).<sup>275</sup> There is some unevenness and repetition with regard to 16:6–7 in relation to 16:12, but other arguments in favor of including 16:6–7 within Pg override this. As Brevard Childs has argued, the sequence found in 16:1–3, 6–7, 9–12 parallels that in Num 14\* (P), where 16:6–7 parallel the dispute with the people, after their murmuring, in a speech by Joshua and Caleb in Num 14:6–9\*.<sup>276</sup> Further, as argued by George Coats, 16:6–7 and 12 have different functions within the narrative: 16:6–7 form an appropriate response to 16:2–3, which represent a rebellion against the exodus, with 16:6b countering 16:3, while 16:12 is concerned, also in response to 16:2–3, with the knowledge of YHWH through the provision of bread and meat.<sup>277</sup> Therefore Exod 16:6–7 will be included here as part of Pg.

There are some scholars who include Exod 16:2–3, 6–7, 9–13a within Pg but exclude all or part of Exod 16:13b–15.<sup>278</sup> This seems to be part of

---

Priestly material in Exod 16 to HS primarily because of 16:12 (“You shall know that I am YHWH your God”) and 16:32 (“a day of rest, a holy Sabbath to YHWH”). However, although 16:32 is probably later than Pg, as argued below, to maintain that all the Priestly material belongs to HS on these grounds goes beyond the evidence, and, as argued above, the use of the expression “I am YHWH” is not sufficient grounds for attributing material to HS, and, given that Exod 16:12 is coherent with Exod 6:2, 7, 8; 12:12; 14:4, 18, which are here attributed to Pg, 16:12 is to be attributed to Pg on the grounds of narrative coherence.

275. See, e.g., Ludwig Schmidt, “Die Priesterschrift in Exodus 16,” *ZAW* 119 (2007): 487. See also David Frankel (*The Murmuring Stories of the Priestly School: A Retrieval of Ancient Sacerdotal Lore*, VTSup 89 [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 66–67), although he by no means attributes all of 16:2–3, 9–15 to his Priestly story.

276. Childs, *Exodus*, 279. See the discussion below in §1.2.2.5.1 for arguments supporting the view that Priestly material in Num 13–14\*, including Num 14:6–9, belong to Pg; see also Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*.”

277. Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 90–92.

278. See, e.g., Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29, Childs, *Exodus*, 275; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 583–84; Baruch Schwartz, “The Sabbath in the Torah Texts” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, CA, 19 November, 2007, <http://tinyurl.com/SBL2627a>); Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 379.

an attempt to discern an underlying or semiparallel non-P account where all or part of 16:13b–15 is linked with 16:4, which does not belong to Pg. However, the explanation of the bread as given by YHWH in Exod 16:15b picks up on, and is coherent with, the motif of the knowledge of YHWH by means of the food given in 16:12 which belongs to Pg (see Exod 6:2, 7, 8; 12:12; 14:4, 18, all of which belong to Pg and have to do with the knowledge of YHWH) and therefore should be included in Pg. Exodus 16:15b answers the question in 16:15a, and I see no reason to separate 16:13–14 from verse 15 in terms of the coherence of the narrative.<sup>279</sup> Exodus 6:13b–15 will therefore be included within Pg.

Within Exod 16:2–15, therefore, the verses that will be taken as belonging to Pg are Exod 16:2–3, 6–7, 9–15.

The question of which verses should be attributed to Pg within Exod 16:16–36 is quite complex. It is generally agreed that at least Exod 16:28–30 are not Priestly,<sup>280</sup> that Exod 16:36 is a gloss, and that all or at least part of Exod 16:35 does belong to Pg.<sup>281</sup> However, in relation to the other verses within Exod 16:16–36, that is, verses 16–27, 30–34, there is a diversity of views. Some scholars include almost all of the remaining verses, including the collection of the manna (16:16–21), the motif of the Sabbath (16:22–27, 30), and the keeping of an omer into the future (16:32–34).<sup>282</sup> Others include verses from only one or two of these motifs—either the collecting of the manna and the Sabbath, or the Sabbath only, or the keeping of

---

279. In addition, it is by no means clear that a non-P account that parallels all or even part of Pg can be constructed within Exod 16. See, e.g., Schmidt (“Priesterschrift in Exodus 16”), Maiburger (*Manna*), Ruprecht (“Stellung und Bedeutung”), and Scharf (*Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 134), who see the verses that do not belong to P as later supplements and therefore do not adhere to an underlying non-P narrative, however fragmentary.

280. The language is not Priestly and it forms a doublet with 16:23, 26.

281. There is obvious repetition in 16:35, with either 16:35a of 16:35b, or even 16:35 a2bβ to be attributed to Pg. I will refer therefore to 16:35\* as belonging to Pg.

282. See, e.g., Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18 (P = 16:16–27, 32–34); Childs, *Exodus*, 275 (P = 16:16–26, 32–34); Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 83–87 (P = 16:16–26, 33–34); Coats, *Exodus 1–18*, 128 (P = 16:16–21, 23–24, 27, 33–34); Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 583–84 (P = 16:16–21a, 22–27, 31, 32–34); Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 379 (P = 16:16–21a, 22–26, 32–34); Baden, “Original Place” (P = 16:16–25, 31–34).



an omer only—or effectively none of these motifs.<sup>283</sup> We will take each of these motifs and the verses relating to them in turn.

Exodus 16:16 begins a new topic concerning the gathering of the manna that extends through 16:16–21. The command in 16:16a to collect what they can eat is a little repetitive in relation to 16:12, where it states that they shall be filled with bread, and suggests that it, along with 16:16b–18 and the related 16:19–20, developed as a later expansion out of 16:12.<sup>284</sup> Moreover, and most importantly, the introduction to this section on gathering the manna as a speech of Moses (“This is what YHWH has commanded,” 16:16a) with no preceding YHWH speech to Moses comprising these instructions is uncharacteristic of the rest of Pg to this point and in what follows where it is YHWH’s speech that is reported and then carried out.<sup>285</sup> Therefore, 16:16–20 are probably a later expansion and not to be attributed to Pg. Exodus 16:21 possibly belongs to Pg since it makes clear that the manna was given over an extended period and not just on one day as 16:12, 15 on their own might imply.<sup>286</sup> As such it is in continuity with 16:35\*, which is generally acknowledged as belonging to the P narrative, and details the extended time over which Israel ate the manna.

The material within Exod 16:22–27 concerning the Sabbath is in my opinion unlikely to have originally been a part of Pg since, rather than being in the form of a command by YHWH directly (to Moses) as is typical throughout Pg, it is introduced by way of a discovery by the people (16:22, and see 16:27) and once more through a Moses speech reporting “This is what YHWH has commanded” (16:23) with no antecedent YHWH speech which is uncharacteristic of Pg. I am inclined, therefore to agree with P. Maiberger, Schwartz, and Nihan that 16:22–27 concerning the Sabbath is not to be attributed to Pg.<sup>287</sup>

---

283. For collecting of the manna and the Sabbath, see, e.g., Ruprecht, “Stellung und Bedeutung” (P = 16:16–27, 30); Schart, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 134 (P = 16:16–27, 30–31). For Sabbath only, see, e.g., Schmidt, “Priesterschrift in Exodus 16,” 491–92, 497–98 (P = 16:21, 22aab, 23, 24\*, 25–26). For keeping of an omer only, see, e.g., Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Texts” (P = 16:31–34). For none of these motifs, see Maiberger, *Manna* (P = 16:21, 31).

284. Schmidt, “Priesterschrift in Exodus 16,” 490–91.

285. See Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 184. Baden (“Original Place,” 494 n. 17) thinks that this is not unheard of in P, but the texts he cites with the same phraseology, in Num 16:5; 30:2 are usually not seen as part of Pg but as later Priestly material.

286. Baden, “Original Place,” 490.

287. Maiberger, *Manna*; Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Texts”; Nihan, *From*

It is unlikely that Exod 16:31 belongs to Pg since, in noting the naming of the manna and describing it in some detail, it repeats motifs found in 16:14–15, which belong to Pg, where the manna is described (16:14) and its naming is intrinsic to the question of the people (מִן הַיּוֹאֵל, 16:15).<sup>288</sup>

Exodus 16:32–34 is also unlikely to have been part of Pg. It is introduced by a speech of Moses, with the formula “This is what YHWH has commanded,” with no antecedent YHWH speech, and it presupposes the erection of the tabernacle that has not yet occurred within the narrative.<sup>289</sup>

Within Exod 16:16–36, therefore, the verses that will be taken as belonging to Pg are Exod 16:21, 35\*. The Pg texts in Exod 15\* and 16 therefore comprise: 15:22\*, 27; 16:1, 2–3, 6–7, 9–15, 21, 35\*.

#### 1.2.2.4. Pg in the Sinai Material

The itinerary notices in Exod 17:1ab $\alpha$  and Exod 19:1, 2a, linking the manna episode (Exod 16\*) to Sinai will here be attributed to Pg.<sup>290</sup>

Although Exod 24:15b–18a is relatively uncontentious as belonging to Pg,<sup>291</sup> the delineation of the Pg material within the rest of the material set at Sinai, between Exod 25:1 and the itinerary noting the departure from Sinai in Num 10:11–12 (in Exod 25–31, 35–40; Leviticus; and Num 1:1–10:10) is quite contentious and requires some discussion.

---

*Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 568 n. 606; Nihan sees Exod 16:22–28 as a later addition that has been influenced by H expressions in 16:23, 28. See also Milgrom (“HR in Leviticus,” 37) who sees 16:22–30 along with 16:4–5 as possibly belonging to H or HR.

288. In addition, the expression “the house of Israel” is not a Priestly expression; Schmidt, “Priesterschrift in Exodus 16,” 495.

289. Ibid. If the mention of the omer here is later than Pg, this gives further support to the view that Exod 16:16–20 is also later than Pg, since an omer is mentioned in 16:16b, 18a.

290. In agreement with Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18, and Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29. See n. 271.

291. Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18) and Lohfink (“Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29). Frevel (as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194) and Weimar (as cited in the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 222) exclude 16:17, but this is not overly significant for our exploration of the theology and hermeneutics of Pg overall.

## 1.2.2.4.1. The Tabernacle and Its Personnel

**Exodus 25–31.** It is generally agreed that Exod 30–31 is secondary material and not part of Pg.<sup>292</sup> The only verse within these chapters that is subject to debate is Exod 31:18.<sup>293</sup> Exodus 31:18b is related to non-P material (Exod 24:12; 32:15–16), and it is hard to decide whether 31:18a might have been part of Pg or, as argued by Nihan, the whole verse is a later Pentateuchal redaction connecting Exod 25–31 (P) with Exod 24:12–15a; 32–34.<sup>294</sup> Given, that the verse is something of an anomaly within the context of Priestly material, interrupting the pattern of divine command and execution, the latter view seems more credible and Exod 31:18 will be excluded from Pg.

Scholars differ significantly with regard to how much of Exod 25–29 should be attributed to Pg.

Pola's position represents the most limited view of Pg within Exod 25–29, identifying only Exod 25:1a, 8a, 9; 29:45–46 (along with 40:16, 17a, 33b within Exod 35–40) as belonging to Pg. He maintains that within Exod 25–29 all the material related to the “tent of meeting” (אהל מועד) is secondary, with the original layer of Pg comprising only material concerned with the “residence” (משכן).<sup>295</sup> Pola's view has, however, been convincingly countered by Nihan, whose critique includes the observation that the omission of any “tent of meeting” material means that Exod 40:34, which fulfils Exod 29:45–46 and forms an *inclusio* with Exod 24:15b–16a, is omitted; and, besides, the opposition drawn by Pola between the mystery of the sanctuary and prosaic details is not in line with ancient Near

---

292. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18; Noth, *Exodus*, 234; Blum, “Issues and Problems,” 33, 39; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 31–33. This is primarily because the instructions regarding the incense altar in Exod 30:1–10 are out of place, and these chapters occur after the programmatic summary in Exod 29:43–36 that links with Exod 6:2, 7, 8.

293. Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18) and Lohfink (“Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29) include it in Pg, but Frevel (*Mit Blick auf das Land*, 144), Susanne Owczarek (*Die Vorstellung vom “Wohnen Gottes inmitten seines Volkes” in der Priesterschrift: Zur Heiligtumstheologie der priesterlichen Grundschrift* [Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1998], 42), and Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 49) omit it.

294. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 49.

295. Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 224–98. Pola is followed by, e.g., de Pury (“Jacob Story,” 70), and Guillaume (*Land and Calendar*, 62–68).

Eastern parallels.<sup>296</sup> Moreover, Nihan argues convincingly for the coherence of Exod 26 and in particular 26:1–6 that refer to the “tabernacle” (משכן) and 26:7–14 that refer to the “tent” (אהל) whereby the “tent” (אהל) is the outer cover of the “tabernacle” (משכן), with the symbolic system of metals (with gold in relation to the משכן and bronze in relation to the אהל) corresponding to the schema in Exod 25:10–40 (gold inside the sanctuary) and Exod 27 (bronze for the outer elements such as the altar and the court).<sup>297</sup> Most importantly it can be argued, in line with Nihan, that within Pg there is a symbiosis of traditions with independent origins, such as the tabernacle (משכן) and the tent of meeting (אהל מועד), with the earlier traditions reshaped into a new paradigm; this seems to me to be a more credible way to go than splitting different elements derived from different earlier traditions into different literary levels.<sup>298</sup>

Some scholars, such as Lohfink and Christian Frevel, include more of Exod 25–29 than Pola but still see quite a limited number of texts as belonging to Pg, that is, only those concerning YHWH’s instructions to Moses in relation to the tabernacle and its purpose in Exod 25:1, 2\*, 8–9; 26:1–30; and 29:43–46.<sup>299</sup>

Exodus 25:2aβb–7, or at least 25:6–7, are probably secondary.<sup>300</sup> It must be admitted that Exod 26:30 links well with Exod 29:43, but Exod 26:30 seems to be one of a series of notices regarding the pattern shown on the mountain in Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30 and 27:8, and, as Nihan points out, Exod 26:31–37 which marks the separation of the inner and outer sanctum and the court, corresponding to the traditional plan of ancient Near Eastern temples, surely forms an integral part of the instructions

---

296. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 35–38, for these and further arguments.

297. *Ibid.*, 39–41.

298. *Ibid.*, 40. See further chs. 3 and 4 below. See also Blum’s criticism of Pola’s position as problematic in terms of coherence and narrative plausibility (“Issues and Problems,” 40 n. 34).

299. E.g., Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29; Frevel (*Mit Blick auf das Land*) as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194 (although he does not include all of Exod 26:1–30\*). See also Weimar (as cited in the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 222), although he includes only part of Exod 26:1–30\* and only Exod 29:45–46.

300. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 44. The incense in 25:6, e.g., presupposes the incense altar in Exod 30:1–10.

concerning the tabernacle.<sup>301</sup> Exodus 26:33–35 refer to the ark, the *kapporet*, the table, and the lampstand, the instructions for which are found in Exod 25:10–40. Moreover, the instructions for the court in Exod 27:9–19 and the altar implicitly positioned in the court in Exod 27:1–8 form a coherent sequel to the areas demarcated by the curtains in Exod 26:31–37. Given the traditionally expected pattern of the tabernacle with its inner and outer sanctum and the court and the fact that there is no compelling reason to exclude the furnishings in Exod 25:10–40; 27:1–8, especially since there are references to the tabernacle's furniture in Exod 25:9 and 26:33–35, it seems more credible to attribute effectively the whole of Exod 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19 to Pg.<sup>302</sup> Such an account, allowing for minor additions and glosses, moreover, forms a coherent account moving from the inside to the outside or from the perspective of YHWH outward.<sup>303</sup> Exodus 27:20–21, however, does not fit well in the context and is a later addition.<sup>304</sup>

Over against Lohfink and Frevel, then, the instructions regarding the furnishings (the ark, *kapporet*, table, and lampstand) in Exod 25:10–40, the instructions concerning the curtains dividing the most holy place and the holy place and these from the court in Exod 26:31–37, and the instructions concerning the altar and the court in Exod 27:1–19 will be included in Pg. Therefore within Exod 25–27, Pg comprises basically 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19.

But what about Exod 28:1–29:42 which are also excluded by Lohfink and Frevel? There seems to be no clear reason to exclude the bulk of Exod 28 concerning the instructions for the robes of Aaron and his sons who will serve as priests in relation to the tabernacle. As Nihan points out, in the ancient Near East, temples and cultic servants go hand in hand, and the instructions regarding Aaron and his sons in terms of serving YHWH as priests is in continuity with the prominent role given to the figure of Aaron alongside Moses in Exod 7–16\* (Pg).<sup>305</sup> The Pg account in Exod 28 prob-

---

301. Ibid., 42.

302. On the furniture, see *ibid.*, 44. In addition, as Nihan points out here, an empty sanctuary is unsatisfactory in light of ancient Near Eastern temple parallels. The attribution to Pg is in line with Nihan, *ibid.*

303. See Mark K. George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space*, AIL 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 133.

304. See Noth, *Exodus*, 217; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 42 n. 115.

305. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 51. See especially Exod 12:1,

ably began and ended with the *inclusio* concerning the role of Aaron and his sons as serving YHWH as priests in 28:1 and 28:41. Exodus 28:42–43 referring to linen undergarments is obviously a later addition, coming as it does after the concluding summary in Exod 28:41.<sup>306</sup> In addition Exod 28:3–5 is also a later supplement, with its reference to the wise of heart which seems to presuppose Exod 31:1–11 and the repetitive nature of Exod 28:4–5 in relation to Exod 28:1, 2, 6–40.<sup>307</sup> Therefore, contra Lohfink and Frevel, and in line with Noth and Nihan, Exod 28:1–2, 6–41 which forms a coherent account of the instructions for the clothing of the priests who are to be consecrated as servants to YHWH, will be included in Pg.

Whether or not the bulk of Exod 29, that is, Exod 29:1–35 which concerns the instructions for the consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests was originally part of Pg is more difficult to decide. Noth, who basically includes Exod 25:1–27:19 in Pg as well as Exod 28:1–2, 6–41 sees Exod 29 as a supplement to P, since there are minor variations in the priests' attire in relation to Exod 28, and Exod 29 deals no longer with instructions regarding the sanctuary and its furnishings and cultic dress but with the cultic celebration.<sup>308</sup> This is slim evidence for excluding Exod 29; however, the summary statement in Exod 28:41 concerning the anointing, ordaining, and consecrating of Aaron and his sons as priests could stand as a conclusion to the instructions concerning the priesthood per se, with Exod 29:1–35 reading rather like an expansion of Exod 28:41. On the other hand, that detailed instructions for priestly garments should be unfolded at length but no instructions for the consecration of these priests, or simply a summary statement in Exod 28:41, seems unbalanced.<sup>309</sup> Still, there seems to be no detailed divine instructions within Pg

---

where Aaron is addressed by YHWH alongside Moses in giving the instructions for the ritual of the Passover, and in the prominent role of Aaron alongside Moses in the post-Sinai material in Num 14:26 and 20:2–12\*, passages, which, it will be argued below, belong to Pg.

306. Noth, *Exodus*, 220, 227; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 53.

307. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 52. Nihan comments that the plural verb in Exod 28:6 is probably a modification that occurred when 28:3–5 were inserted.

308. Noth, *Exodus*, 229. Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 52 n. 172) also points to some unevenness between Exod 28:41 and Exod 29:7 with regard to who exactly is anointed, Aaron and his sons (Exod 28:41) or Aaron only as high priest (Exod 29:7).

309. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 52.

for the consecration of the sanctuary and its furnishings,<sup>310</sup> corresponding to the divine instructions in Exod 29:1–35 concerning the consecration of priests, and YHWH's promise to consecrate the tent of meeting, the altar, and Aaron and his sons as priests is given in summary form in Exod 29:44, which, as will be addressed shortly, belongs to Pg. This suggests that Exod 28:41, along with 29:44,<sup>311</sup> would have been sufficient within the formatting of Pg's account, without the detailed instructions contained in Exod 29:1–35. However, given that Pg arises from Priestly circles, it might be expected that detailed instructions would have been included for the consecration of priests. In addition, the instructions in Exod 29:1–35 are still in the form of a divine speech and could be seen simply as an unfolding of 28:41; there are no literary indications for exclusion of these instructions. Therefore, it is quite possible that Exod 29:1–35, or at least the bulk of it, was originally part of Pg, and will be taken as such.

Within Exod 29:1–35, there are some obvious expansions and additions. Nihan has argued persuasively that Exod 29:21 is a later addition, since the ritual use of blood after it is poured around the altar (see Exod 29:20) is unique within Priestly texts and 29:21 implies that Aaron is anointed and consecrated twice (see 29:7).<sup>312</sup> Exodus 29:27–30 are also an addition: these verses interrupt the connection between 29:26 and 31, the content of 29:27–28 is in tension with 29:22–25, and 29:29–30 are concerned with issues of succession whereas the context is concerned with the consecration of the first priests.<sup>313</sup> Exodus 29:33–34 are also probably secondary.<sup>314</sup> This leaves Exod 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35 as belonging to Pg, contra Lohfink and Frevel and in line with Nihan.<sup>315</sup>

Exodus 29:36–37 with its references to atonement and the anointing of the altar (see 30:28–29) is secondary, as is 29:38–42 concerning the daily

---

310. The instructions concerning the first sacrifices at the sanctuary in Lev 9 are not in the form of a divine speech, and, as will be argued shortly, Lev 9 will not be taken here as belonging to Pg.

311. Although there seems to be some unevenness between Exod 28:41 and Exod 29:44 in that in the former Moses is instructed by YHWH to consecrate Aaron and his sons as priests, whereas in the latter YHWH will consecrate them, this is one and the same thing in Pg since YHWH's actions are repeatedly carried out by Moses according to YHWH's instructions: see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 51 n. 168.

312. *Ibid.*, 128–30.

313. See *ibid.*, 131–32; Noth, *Exodus*, 233.

314. Noth (*Exodus*, 233), e.g., alludes to the reference to atonement.

315. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 51–52.



sacrifices, which is out of place after the instructions for the consecration of Aaron and his sons.<sup>316</sup>

Exodus 29:43–46, however, does belong to Pg. Many scholars attribute these verses (or at least 29:45–46) to Pg.<sup>317</sup> Knohl and Milgrom are exceptions, assigning Exod 29:43–46 to HS/H primarily on the grounds of the expression “I am YHWH their God” (אני יהוה אלהיהם) in 29:46.<sup>318</sup> However, given the limitations of basing the identification of HS/H on this linguistic expression, which is not exclusive to HS/H, and the fact that there is a clear narrative coherence between Gen 17:8; Exod 6:2–8; and Exod 29:45–46,<sup>319</sup> with Exod 6:2–8 (which repeatedly uses the expression אני יהוה) already identified above as a key text within the coherent narrative of Pg, Exod 29:45–46 is clearly to be attributed to Pg, contra Knohl and Milgrom. Exodus 29:45–46, moreover, forms a fitting *inclusio* with 25:8 in terms of the function of the sanctuary as the means of YHWH dwelling in the midst of the Israelites. With regard to Exod 29:43–44, a convincing case can be made for the inclusion of these verses, along with 29:45–46, as a fitting conclusion to Exod 25–29.<sup>320</sup> The first-person is used throughout 29:43–46 as part of YHWH’s speech,

---

316. On 29:36–37, see Noth, *Exodus*, 233; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 132–33. On 29:38–42, see Noth, *Exodus*, 233; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 36.

317. E.g., Lohfink (“Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29) attributes 29:43–46 to Pg; Frevel (*Mit Blick auf das Land*, as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194) 19:43–44\*, 45–46; Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 35–38) 29:43–46; Blum (“Issues and Problems,” 34) 29:44–46; Römer (“Exodus Narrative,” 163) 29:45–46.

318. Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 46, 49, 63, 65; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1338, 1353; Milgrom, “HR in Leviticus,” 30–31. They also argue for the presence of HS/H here on the grounds that YHWH is meeting with all Israel, whereas, in their view, in P God’s word is transmitted through Moses, but this is not convincing especially since the glory of YHWH appears to the Israelites in Exod 16:10 (Pg) and in Num 14:10, which, as will be argued shortly, also belongs to Pg. Noth (*Exodus*, 233) sees Exod 29:42b–46 as secondary additions but gives no substantial reasons for this, merely stating that these verses “are rather unskillfully composed of familiar expressions of P language” and YHWH speaks in the first-person, a manner of speaking that has fallen into the background in the previous instructions. With regard to the latter point, Exod 29:45–46 forms a fitting *inclusio* with Exod 25:8 which also represents YHWH speaking in the first-person.

319. See Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 163; Blum, “Issues and Problems,” 34; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 34–35 n. 72; Nihan, “Priestly Covenant,” 96 n. 39.

320. Exod 29:42b is best explained as an addition that functions to link the sec-



including the appropriate reference to “my glory” (כְּבוֹדִי),<sup>321</sup> suggesting that these verses belong together. Exodus 29:43–44 together represent an etiology for the “tent of meeting” (אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד) as the place where YHWH will “meet” (יָעַד, *niphal*) with the Israelites.<sup>322</sup> This, along with the reference to YHWH “dwelling” (שָׁכַן) among the Israelites in 29:45–46 is best explained by the synthesis of different earlier traditions relating to the tent of meeting (אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד) and the tabernacle (מִשְׁכָּן) that, as observed above, should not be teased apart into different literary levels. Exodus 29:44, which, as the second part of the etiology for the tent of meeting cannot be separated from 29:43, lists the consecration of the tent of meeting, the altar, and Aaron and his sons which reflects the ordering of the instructions within Exod 25–29\* (Pg) from tent (Exod 26) to altar (Exod 27:1–8) to priests (Exod 28–29\*).<sup>323</sup> Thus 29:43–44, which along with 29:45–46 form an *inclusio* with Exod 25:8, therefore form a fitting conclusion to Exod 25–29\* (Pg) as identified here.

In conclusion, the Pg material within Exod 25–31 comprises 25:1–2aa, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46.

**Exodus 35–40.** Opinion is divided as to whether within Exod 35–40 there was a compliance report of some detail belonging to Pg or whether Pg simply consisted of some brief statements stating that the instructions were carried out correctly.<sup>324</sup>

---

ondary material in Exod 29:38–42a with Exod 29:43–46; see the arguments for this put forward by Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 37.

321. The first-person suffix is appropriate within the first-person address of the YHWH speech throughout 29:43–46; see *ibid.*, 37–38.

322. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 38, drawing on Bernd Janowski, “Tempel und Schöpfung: Schöpfungstheologischer Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtums Konzeption,” in *Schöpfung und Neuschöpfung*, ed. L. Alonso Schökel and Ingo Baldermann, *JBTh* 5 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 37–69.

323. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 51.

324. Those who advocate that Pg contained a detailed compliance report include: Victor Hurowitz, “The Priestly Account of Building the Tabernacle,” *JAOS* 105 (1985), 21–30; Victor Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exulted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*, JSOTSup 115 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 110; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3A (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 36–37; and tentatively Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 58. Those who advocate that Pg

Victor Horowitz has argued that the description of the building of the structure is an inherent part of the genre of ancient Near Eastern temple building inscriptions. In particular, he sees in the Samsuiluna B inscription a close parallel to the P tabernacle account since it contains both prescriptive and descriptive accounts that mirror each other in their details.<sup>325</sup> These observations have been used to support the inclusion of Exod 35–40 within Pg.<sup>326</sup> However, against this, Samsuiluna B would seem to be the exception rather than the rule, since, as Horowitz himself acknowledges, most ancient Near Eastern temple building inscriptions do not describe the building within the context of divine command nor describe the structure and its furnishings twice, and Samsuiluna B is much briefer, containing very little detail, in comparison with the extensive and repetitive detail of Exod 25–29\*; 35–40.<sup>327</sup> The comparison is too remote to be of convincing support for the inclusion of Exod 35–40 as a whole within Pg. More convincing is the view that Pg originally contained only brief statements concerning the carrying out of the instructions since this is coherent with Pg's style elsewhere, particularly with regard to the carrying out of the ritual prescriptions for the Passover in Exod 12:1–13 where this is stated in the brief statement in Exod 12:28.<sup>328</sup> Given this, it seems likely that these brief compliance statements would have comprised Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b. Exodus 39:32, 43; 40:33b form a parallel with Gen 1:31; 2:1–3; and Exod 40:17, with its chronological notice, forms an *inclusio* with Exod 19:1.<sup>329</sup>

Finally, Exod 40:34 will be included in Pg. It follows on from, and fulfills, the promise in Exod 29:43 concerning YHWH's glory in relation to the tent of meeting.<sup>330</sup> It also forms an *inclusio* with Exod 24:15b–18: the

---

consisted of brief statements only include: Noth (*Exodus*, 274–75, 280, 282), who sees only Exod 39:32, 42–43; 40:17 as belonging to Pg; Pola, (*Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, cited in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194), who sees only Exod 40:16, 17a, 33b as belonging to Pg; and Frevel (*Mit Blick auf das Land*, as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194), who sees only Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34–35 as belonging to Pg.

325. Hurowitz, "Priestly Account."

326. See, e.g., Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 36–37.

327. Hurowitz, "Priestly Account," 26. An exception is Cylinder A of the Gudea inscription, but the two descriptions of the temple are not alike.

328. See also Exod 7:6.

329. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 58. Exodus 40:17 also forms a parallel to Gen 8:13a.

330. Pace Nihan (*ibid.*, 53) who maintains that Lev 9:23–24 fulfills the promise in

cloud that covers the glory of YHWH on Mount Sinai (24:15b–18) now becomes the cloud that covers the tabernacle that is filled with the glory of YHWH.<sup>331</sup> Exodus 40:35, however, does not belong to Pg but is a secondary addition, given the repetition of the cloud and glory motifs in 40:35b.<sup>332</sup>

In summary, the verses within Exod 35–40 that are seen here as belonging to Pg are 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34.

**Leviticus.** Much of the discussion regarding the delineation of Pg in Leviticus centers on the narrative material in Lev 8 and 9. The weight of opinion with regard to Lev 8 is that it is probably a later addition and should not be included in Pg.<sup>333</sup> Leviticus 8 consists of a detailed compliance report corresponding, with some variation, to Exod 29 and as such functions much like the detailed compliance descriptions in Exod 35–40.<sup>334</sup> Since we have already excluded the detailed compliance descriptions in Exod 35–40, therefore Lev 8 should also be excluded from Pg.<sup>335</sup>

---

Exod 29:43–44 rather than Exod 40:34. However, the promise that the tent of meeting will be sanctified/consecrated by YHWH's glory is surely implied in the glory of YHWH filling the tent of meeting, and there are significant grounds for seeing Lev 9 including 9:23–24 as not originally belonging to Pg.

331. Ibid., 36; *pace* Noth (*Exodus*, 283), who sees Exod 40:34 as secondary.

332. This is in line with, e.g., Noth *ibid.*, and Pola, *Ursprungliche Priesterschrift*, cited in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194. Exodus 40:35 adds another motif not alluded to up to this point, concerning Moses's access to the tent of meeting, and this is picked up in Lev 9:23, which does not belong to Pg but is a later supplement; *pace* Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 53–54), who correctly links Exod 40:35 and Lev 9:23 but sees both as belonging to Pg.

333. Those scholars who do not include Lev 8 in Pg include, e.g., Martin Noth, *Leviticus: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 68; Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 145 n. 29; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194.

334. Noth, *Leviticus*, 68. *Pace* Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 126), who sees the relationship between Exod 29 and Lev 8 as different from the relationship of Exod 35–40 to Exod 25–28 and maintains that the notices in Exod 39:32, 43 relate only to Exod 25–28 and not Exod 29. However, contra Nihan, the notice in Exod 40:33b could refer to Moses's carrying out of the instructions in Exod 29\* (Pg), and it would seem strange that a detailed compliance report should be given in relation to the consecration of the priests but not in relation to the instructions concerning the sanctuary and its setting up, and the priests' garments.

335. This is especially so, given that the instructions for the consecration and ordination of the priests in Exod 29\* have only tentatively been included here in Pg; *pace* Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 122), who includes Lev 8 within Pg,

Many scholars, however, include some at least of Lev 9, which describes the inauguration of the sacrificial cult, within Pg.<sup>336</sup> However, there are some strong arguments for not including any of Lev 9 within Pg. First, there is no preceding divine speech giving the instructions that are carried out in Lev 9 as is the consistent pattern throughout Pg. Second, the use of the expression in Lev 9:6 “This is the thing that YHWH commanded” (זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה) in a Moses speech is the same as that found in Exod 16:16, 23, 32, where there, as here, the content of these sections are not preceded by divine instructions, and these were seen as an indication of later supplements to Pg. On these grounds, then, Lev 9 will not be included as belonging to Pg.

It is true that Lev 9:23b picks up on the imagery of the glory of YHWH in seeming continuity with Exod 29:43 and Exod 40:34 that do belong to Pg,<sup>337</sup> but Lev 9:23 is not necessary for the coherence of Pg. Exodus 40:34 is sufficient to fulfill the divine promise in Exod 29:43,<sup>338</sup> with the glory of YHWH now intrinsically associated with the tent of meeting. The glory of YHWH that has already appeared to the people in the wilderness in Exod 16\* will appear to them after this at the tent of meeting in Num 14:10, which belongs to Pg. All the divine promises in Exod 29:43–46 will inevitably unfold given the brief compliance notices in Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b<sup>339</sup> in line with Pg’s style elsewhere—as seen especially in Exod 12:1–13, 28, 40–41. It seems likely that when Lev 9 was added to Pg, with the function of elaborating on the appearance of the glory of YHWH associated now with the first sacrifices at the tent of meeting, the motif of Moses (and Aaron) entering the tent in Lev 9:23a was the reason for the addition of Exod 40:35, where Moses cannot enter the tent of meeting. Exodus 40:35 functions, then, to foreshadow and anticipate Lev 9:23a, and

---

not only because he sees it as the compliance report in relation to Exod 29 (see n. 370), but also because he sees it as inseparable from Lev 9, and indeed as part of Lev 1–3, 8–9 (ibid., 150–59), nearly all of which he attributes to Pg. However, as will be argued shortly, Lev 9 should also be excluded from Pg.

336. See, e.g., Noth, *Leviticus*, 76; Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29; Elliger and Weimar as cited in the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 223; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 157–60; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 111–24, 150–59; Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 161.

337. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 157–60; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 158–59.

338. See n. 330.

339. With regard to Exod 40:33b see n. 334.

to link the glory of YHWH in Exod 40:34 (Pg), repeated in Exod 40:35b, with the appearance of the glory of YHWH to the people in Lev 9:23b. Therefore both Lev 8 and Lev 9 will be excluded from Pg.<sup>340</sup>

Some scholars recently have included some legal passages from Leviticus within Pg. For example, Nihan includes Lev 1–3, 11–16 within his P, Römer includes the first chapters of Leviticus, Blum includes Lev 1–16, and Guillaume includes Lev 16\* within his Pg.<sup>341</sup> With regard to Nihan's position, it is interesting to note that the inclusion of Lev 1–3, 11–16 does not have a very significant bearing on his conclusions regarding the meaning of P overall as outlined above; these chapters merely refine it slightly by adding a slightly different dimension, but his basic position would still stand without the inclusion of Lev 1–3, 11–16.<sup>342</sup> The laws in Leviticus will not be included in Pg here. Our exploration of the meaning of Pg overall will focus on accounting for its shape primarily in terms of its narrative and the Sinai material concerning the sanctuary and its personnel; that being said, however, although the inclusion of Levitical laws would color, or add a dimension to, any conclusions drawn regarding the meaning of Pg as a whole, I do not believe, as is the case with Nihan and Blum, that it would result in a radically different view. Indeed, as will become clear when we explore the hermeneutics of Pg,<sup>343</sup> the legal material could be seen as not at all at cross purposes with Pg's hermeneutics of time but perhaps as an extension of it.

In conclusion, no material within Leviticus will be included as belonging to Pg within this study.

---

340. So also Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194.

341. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 150–236. Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 160–61, with Pg extending either to Lev 9 or Lev 16. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 312–29; Blum, “Issues and Problems.” Blum also includes the Holiness Code within his KP, but in this he is very much in the minority, with Lev 17–26 now seen by most as later than Pg; see the essays in Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden, eds., *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*, ATANT 95 (Zurich: TVZ, 2009); and Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 152–53. Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 84–122; as well as part of the Holiness Code (Lev 23\*, 25\*).

342. This is also the case with regard to Blum's view of the overall theology of KP that includes the Holiness Code and the rest of Leviticus (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 312–29).

343. See ch. 3.

## 1.2.2.4.2. Numbers 1:1–10:10

Although some scholars include Num 1–2\*, 4\* within Pg,<sup>344</sup> more recently there has emerged an increasing consensus that none of Num 1:1–10:10 is to be attributed to Pg but consists of later material. Knohl, for example, sees most of Num 1–10, including Num 1, 2, and 4, in particular the “Levite treatise,” as belonging to HS.<sup>345</sup> Along a similar line, Jeffrey Stackert sees the distinction between the priests and Levites within Num 1–10\* as formulated by H as a mediating position between P that does not mention Levites, and D where all the priests are Levites; this seems likely.<sup>346</sup> Pola has argued that the language and theology of Num 1–10 (and Num 26–36) is different from P in Genesis–Leviticus, especially with regard to Israel as an *ecclesia militans* grouped around the sanctuary and the introduction of the Levites that have not been previously mentioned.<sup>347</sup> Reinhard Achenbach has also argued in detail for the late origin of Num 1–10.<sup>348</sup> Römer argues for the post-P nature of Num 1–10 on the grounds that many of the prescriptions within these chapters represent supplements to P material found in Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus.<sup>349</sup> Nihan also points to the supplementary nature of many of the prescriptions within Num 1–10 especially in relation to Exod 19–40\* (P) as evidence for the late, post-P origin of Num 1–10.<sup>350</sup> In particular, the census of Num 1 is prepared for by Exod 30:11–16 (which is later than Pg) and the connection between them is found in Exod 38:25–26 (also later than Pg) where the monetary figures correspond with the census number in Num 1:46a. All this suggests the material within Num 1:1–10:10 is later than Pg and will not be included within Pg here.<sup>351</sup>

---

344. E.g., Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18; Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145 n. 29.

345. Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 85, 184–85. According to Knohl, the only servants of the sanctuary in PT are the priests, Aaron and his sons, and the distinction between the priests and Levites and their tasks is an innovation of HS.

346. Stackert, “Holiness Legislation,” 194.

347. Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 56–99.

348. Achenbach, *Vollendung der Tora*.

349. Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” 428–30. E.g., the prescriptions for the Passover in Num 9:1–14 supplement the instructions given in Exod 12\*.

350. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 73, 572, 618–19.

351. Frevel (*Mit Blick auf das Land*, as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194) also excludes Num 1:1–10:10 from his Pg.

Again, it must be said, however, that, like the legal material, the material in Num 1–2\* concerning the census and arrangement of the twelve tribes, though probably later than Pg, is not at cross purposes with the hermeneutics of Pg but can be seen as an extension of it—as will become clear when we explore in detail the interpretation of Pg in light of its genre and hermeneutics.<sup>352</sup>

#### 1.2.2.4.3. Conclusion

In summary, the material delineated here as belonging to Pg within the Sinai pericope after the Pg itinerary in Exod 17:1abα and 19:1, 2a comprises 24:15b–18a; 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34.

#### 1.2.2.5. Pg Material Post-Sinai

Opinion is divided over whether or not Pg extends beyond Sinai. There are a number of scholars who maintain that Pg is to be found within Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\* at least.<sup>353</sup> However, there is currently a strong school of thought that holds that Pg concludes within the Sinai material, with no Pg material to be found in Numbers or beyond; the Priestly material within Numbers is seen as very late, comprising post-P redactions or successive supplementation.<sup>354</sup> Contrary to this position, it will be maintained here that Pg continues beyond Sinai and is to be found within Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*.<sup>355</sup> This needs some justification, and this will be primarily in

352. See chs. 3 and 4.

353. See the scholars listed in n. 15.

354. See the scholars listed in n. 16, and esp. Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumsrahmens*, FAT 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); Otto, “Holiness Code,” 135–39; Achenbach, *Vollendung der Tora*; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 572, 608, 618–19; Römer, “Israel’s Sojourn,” esp. 427, 430, 435–36. See also Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 90–92, 94–96) who attributes Num 13:1–17a; 14:26–38; 20:1–13, 22–29; 27:12–23 to his HS.

355. As held recently by, e.g., Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 151; Ska, “Le récit sacerdotal,” 631–53; Noort, “Bis zur Grenze des Landes,” 99–119; Ludwig Schmidt, “Die Priesterschrift—kein Ende im Sinai!” *ZAW* 120 (2008): 481–500; and see the detailed arguments for this position in Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 45–63.



terms of the identification of a Priestly narrative within Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\* that is coherent with Pg in Genesis and Exodus.

#### 1.2.2.5.1. Pg in Numbers 10:11–27:14

**Pg in Numbers 10:11–20:13.** With regard to the itinerary contained within Num 10:11–12: verse 11a is coherent with the itinerary in Exod 16:1b and 19:1 with regard to its chronology and will be included in Pg; and 10:12a is coherent with Exod 17:1a in referring to stages and will be included in Pg.<sup>356</sup> However, the reference to the cloud lifting and settling, as a guide in the journey in the wilderness is most likely a later redaction of the itinerary, given that this motif occurs elsewhere only in Priestly material that is most likely later than Pg, namely, in Exod 40:36–37; Num 9:15–23.<sup>357</sup> It is also quite likely that the expression “by the word of God through Moses” in Num 10:13 is part of Pg since this coheres with the similar motif in Exod 17:1.<sup>358</sup> Therefore, within Num 10:11–12, Num 10:11a, 12a, along with the expression “by the word of God through Moses” in Num 10:13 (and presumably an original reference to Paran [Num 10:12bβ]) will be included in Pg here.

But what about the Priestly texts beyond this in Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*? Before making a positive case for the identification of the continuation of Pg in Num 13–14\*; 20:1–12\*, it is necessary to present some counterarguments to those used in support of the view that Pg does not extend beyond Sinai into Numbers and such texts as Num 13–14\*; 20:1–12\*.

First, those who exclude all of the Priestly material in Numbers from Pg tend to see the goal and purpose of Pg within the Sinai material, but, although some circularity between conceptions of the purpose of P and its

---

356. This is in line with Frevel as cited in the chart in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 194. In a recent study of the itineraries, Thomas Dozeman (“Priestly Wilderness Itineraries,” esp 282–84, 287) suggests that, given the related motifs within P itineraries (which include Exod 16:1b; 19:1 and Num 10:12), such as dating, P itineraries formed an independent version of the wilderness journey prior to the present text, and is indicative of a P document. See n. 271. *Pace* Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 73), who sees the chronology here as at the level of the canonical Pentateuch.

357. David Frankel (“Two Priestly Conceptions of the Guidance in the Wilderness,” *JSOT* 81 [1998]: 31–33) has argued convincingly that the cloud imagery here is secondary; *pace* Noth, Elliger, and Lohfink, as listed in the chart in Jenson (*Graded Holiness*, 223), who include the whole of Num 10:11–12 within their Pg.

358. See Frankel, “Two Priestly Conceptions,” 33.



extent are almost inevitable, this is not a solid enough argument for concluding P in the Sinai material per se.<sup>359</sup>

Second, it has been argued by some that the motif of the land is not important for Israel's identity within Pg as part of their justification for concluding Pg within the Sinai material and by implication not including within Pg such passages as Num 13–14\* (P); 20:1–12\* (P), which are concerned with the land.<sup>360</sup> They argue that the land as אֶרֶץ (Gen 17:8; 48:4) is YHWH's possession, with Israel having the right to use it but not own it, and therefore Israel's relation to the land is the same as that of the patriarchs with their גֵּר status. Therefore, Pg has no interest in Israel's entry into the land after the exodus since YHWH's gift of the land to Israel is identical with that to the ancestors and therefore simply represents a return to the state of things before Jacob and his sons went to Egypt.<sup>361</sup> There are a number of arguments that can be brought to bear over against this. The land is also described in terms of possession (יִרְשָׁה) in Gen 28:4; Exod 6:8, which belong to Pg. Never is the explicit status of גֵּר referred to in relation to the promise of the land for Israel in Pg, as is the case repeatedly in relation to the ancestors (Gen 17:8; 28:4; Exod 6:4). Most importantly, the promise of the land (whether as אֶרֶץ or יִרְשָׁה) to the ancestors and their descendants, Israel, which is forward looking, is a significant motif in Pg, running through Genesis (see Gen 17:8; 48:4 [described as עוֹלָם]; and 28:4) and in Exodus (see Exod 6:4, 8), and cannot be so easily dismissed. It begins to unfold, not only in relation to the ancestors but in Pg's itineraries

---

359. On the goal of Pg, see Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 148. See also the comment by Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 30) that "it has long been recognised that the report of Israel's sojourn at Mount Sinai represents the very purpose of P's account. Therefore, it is logical to assume that P, initially, could have ended here." On the inevitable circularity, see Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 148.

360. Mattias Köckert, "Das Land in der priesterlichen Komposition des Pentateuch," in *Von Gott reden: Beiträge zur Theologie und Exegese des Alten Testaments; Festschrift für Siegfried Wagner zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Dieter Vieweger and Ernst-Joachim Waschke (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995), 147–62, esp. 152–53, 155; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 66–68; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 164, 169.

361. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 67; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 164, 169.

(see, e.g., Exod 16:1; 19:1; and see Num 10:11–13\*), and it is precisely Num 13–14\* (P); 20:1–12\* (P) that focus on this important promise.<sup>362</sup>

Third, the main proponents of the view that all the Priestly material in Numbers is post-P assume, and work within, a redactional model in relation to Numbers, which tends to rely on criteria such as linguistic/stylistic features and/or thematic or ideological *Tendenz* to ascertain which texts might be seen as building on other texts and which texts are later than others.<sup>363</sup> Used with caution, the approach of this model is helpful in illuminating many texts, including texts in Numbers.<sup>364</sup> However, in

---

362. See Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung,” 137–38, 140–41; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 148–50.

363. See esp. Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 90–92, 94–96) who speaks in terms of HS that redacts both P and non-P; Otto (*Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*; “Holiness Code”), who speaks in terms of Hexateuch redaction and Pentateuch redaction; Reinhard Achenbach (“Die Erzählung von der gescheiterten Landnahme von Kadesh Barnea [Numeri 13–14] als Schlussetext der Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuchs,” *ZABR* 9 [2003]: 56–123; *Vollendung der Tora*), who speaks in terms of Hexateuch redaction, Pentateuch redaction, and theocratic revision; Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 572, 608, 618–19), who, at least in essentials, tends to follow Achenbach; Römer (“Israel’s Sojourn”), who speaks of successive supplements of a rolling corpus. E.g., Achenbach (“Erzählung von der gescheiterten Landnahme”) divides Num 13–14 into a pre-Dtr spy narrative (found within Num 13:17b–20, 22a, 23–24, 27, 28a, 30–31; 14:23–24\*, 25b) that was redacted by the Hexateuch redactor (to give Num 13:17b–20, 22–24, 26a, 27a, 28, 30–31; 14:1b, 5b, 23–24, 25b, 40–45) that was redacted by the Pentateuch redactor (who added Num 13:1–2a, 3a, 21, 25–26, 32–33; 14:1a, 2–5a, 10b–22, 25a, 26–30a\*, 31–35, 36–37, 39) which was redacted by the theocratic revision (who added Num 13:2b, 3b–17a, 29aβγ; 14:6–10a, 30b, 38).

364. Carr (*Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 69–74, 138–39) points to some possible pitfalls in the application of this approach that need to be taken into consideration in weighing up arguments based on its criteria. He points out that, with regard to the use of the criterion of seeing the mixture of P and non-P language in a text as a sign of post-P redaction, consideration must be given to the tendency of scribes to assimilate and harmonize documents while still being transmitted separately and the fact that P and non-P were transmitted within a fairly circumscribed environment, and therefore it is to be expected that there would be some non-P language within a P document and vice versa while they were still separate. One cannot, therefore, expect to reconstruct P and non-P strands that are linguistically pristine and, where there is a mix of P and non-P language, this is not necessarily the compositional work of a post-P redactor but could be due to scribal assimilation and harmonization. He also points out that in discerning dependence of texts on one another, a criterion used to argue for the relative lateness of texts, not only is it difficult to judge the direction of dependence, but also as the chain of dependence grows the cumulative effect is to reduce the probabil-

relation to Num 13–14 and 20:1–13 specifically, traditional source-critical considerations, such as repetitions, discrepancies, differences in style and theology, and issues of coherence, all working together, seem to me to be just as helpful, if not more so, in shedding light on the features of those texts. Therefore, rather than using a redactional model, my arguments for discerning Pg within Num 13–14 and 20:1–13 are based on the source-critical model with its specific criteria and observations made by scholars working within this framework.

Turning now to presenting some positive arguments in support of identifying the continuation of Pg in Num 13–14\*; 20:1–12\*, it is necessary first to delineate what can be taken as a basic P narrative within these texts.

Traditional source criticism has identified in Num 13–14 two parallel and relatively coherent intertwined accounts (P and non-P), in a way that is similar to the accounts of the flood and the Reed Sea, where the presence of Pg is not disputed by those who hold to an originally independent document. The verses that will be taken here as constituting the P narrative are: Num 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38.<sup>365</sup>

The verses included in Num 13 are relatively uncontentious. Opinion is divided with regard to the reference to the fruit in Num 13:26b, with some excluding it because it is seen to contradict the reference to the unfavorable report of the land in Num 13:32.<sup>366</sup> However, the reference to the land devouring its inhabitants in Num 13:32 probably refers to loss

---

ity of the argument. Judgments must be made with regard to these things, of course, in relation to each specific text.

365. This is in close agreement with the delineation of Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18–19; *Numbers*, 107–11) and that of Schmidt (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 483 n. 12), with only minor variation. This delineation and the following arguments in support of it are found in Boorer, “The Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 41–42.

366. Those who exclude 13:26b include Elliger and Lohfink (see the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 223); McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 118 n. 34; Philip Budd, *Numbers*, WBC 5 (Waco, TX: Word, 1984), 141, 143. Those who include 13:26b include Martin Noth, *Numbers: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 106; Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 138–39; Schart, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 88; Olivier Artus, *Études sur le livre des Nombres: Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1–20,13*, OBO 157 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Presses Universitaires, 1997), 156; Horst Seebass, *Numeri: 2 Teilband Numeri 10,11–22,1*, BKAT (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003), 88.

of inhabitants due to military battles (see Ezek 36:13–14) rather than the infertility of the land and is therefore not in conflict with Num 13:26b.<sup>367</sup> Therefore, Num 13:26b, which forms a parallel with non-P in Num 13:27 (and see Num 13:23–24) will be included.

Within Num 14:1–10\*, the inclusion of 14:3, 9aβb in Pg are contentious.<sup>368</sup> A reason for excluding 14:3 is that in 14:2 the people complain against Moses and Aaron, but in 14:3 the complaint is against YHWH.<sup>369</sup> However, there are strong arguments for attributing 14:3 to a basic P narrative including: verse 35 (P) assumes the complaint is against YHWH; 14:3b forms a doublet with verse 4 (non-P); 14:3 is coherent with 13:32b, 33aαb that refers to the large inhabitants; 14:3 picks up on the wording of Exod 6:8 (P), and 14:2–3 follow a similar pattern to that found in Exod 16:2 (Pg)<sup>370</sup> of a death wish followed by an accusation. Numbers 14:9aβb does contain unusual language for P, but over against this, 14:9aβb, as part of a speech by Joshua and Caleb, forms a parallel with a speech of Caleb with similar motifs in non-P (Num 13:30); it is coherent with 13:32b, 33aα; 14:3 regarding the large inhabitants of the land and the fear of death and defeat at their hands; and its motif of lack of protection (לֹא) for the people of the land from their gods fits well with Exod 12:12 (Pg) and the Pg material leading up to this in Exod 7–11\*.<sup>371</sup>

---

367. See Noth, *Numbers*, 107; Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers*, JPSTC (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 106–7; Eryl W. Davies, *Numbers*, NBC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 140; Rolf P. Knierim and George W. Coats, *Numbers*, FOTL 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 186.

368. E.g., as well as Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 18–19) and Schmidt (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 483 n. 12), these verses are included by Coats (*Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 139), Scharf (*Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 88), and Baden (*J, E and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 116–17). Cf. Elliger and Lohfink (cited in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 223), McEvenue (*Narrative Style*, 90–91), and Seebass (*Numeri*), who exclude these verses; and Artus (*Études sur le livre des Nombres*), who includes 14:3 but excludes 14:9, indeed 14:6–10a. The inclusion of 14:6–10a\*, however, is supported by the fact that these verses form a parallel to the speech of Caleb in the non-P material (Num 13:30) and, as Schmidt points out, 14:6–10a explain why the people are punished as well as the surveyors (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 486).

369. See Katherine Sakenfeld, “The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14,” *CBQ* 37 (1975): 318–19.

370. On 14:3, see Schmidt, “Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 483–84. See also Num 20:3b–4, which, as will be argued shortly, belongs to the basic P narrative.

371. On the lack-of-protection motif, see Davies, *Numbers*, 141; Budd, *Number*, 156; Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Com-*

Within Num 14:26–38, verses 29b and 30–34 are contentious.<sup>372</sup> I am excluding Num 14:29b, since the Hebrew is uneven and refers back to Num 1, which has not been included in Pg here but is seen as later priestly material.<sup>373</sup> Opinion is divided regarding the inclusion or exclusion of Num 14:30–34. I am inclined to side with those who exclude these verses, except, tentatively, for 14:31, since it refers back to 14:3, which has been included in Pg here.<sup>374</sup> In conclusion, the verses delineated here as constituting a P narrative within Num 13–14\* form a coherent account.

In Num 20:1–13, the application of source-critical criteria leads not to the differentiation of two intertwined relatively coherent narratives as in Num 13–14 but to a basic P narrative that has been supplemented with statements from Exod 17:1–7 (non-P). Over and above the itinerary in Num 20:1a, the verses that will be taken here as constituting the P narrative are Num 20:2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8aα\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12.<sup>375</sup>

---

mentary, AB 4A (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 364. Note that I am excluding Num 14:8 with Schmidt (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 483), and Num 14:9aα with Noth (*Numbers*, 108).

372. I am excluding Num 14:26b from Pg with Noth (*Numbers*, 110).

373. Elliger and Lohfink also exclude Num 14:29b (see the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 223), as do McEvenue (*Narrative Style*, 90–91 and n. 2) and Schmidt (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 483 n. 12). Pace, e.g., Coats (*Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 138–39; Budd (*Numbers*, 151, 153) and Fritz (cited in Davies, *Numbers*, 128), who include Num 14:29b.

374. On excluding 14:30–34, see, e.g., Elliger and Lohfink (see the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 223); Noth, *Numbers*, 110–11; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 90–91 n. 5. Pace, e.g., Budd (*Numbers*, 151, 153); Knierim and Coats (*Numbers*, 188); Scharf (*Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 88); Artus (*Études sur le livre des Nombres*, 156), who include these verses. Including 14:31 is in line with Schmidt (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 483), who excludes Num 14:30, 32–34 but includes Num 14:31.

375. This is in line with Schmidt (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 487), and it follows closely Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 19; *Numbers*, 144–47), except that Noth excludes 20:3b and 20:8aα\* and includes 20:8bβ, and Elliger and Lohfink, except they include 20:5 (see Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 224), and Artus (*Études sur le livre des Nombres*, 240–41). Numbers 20:3b is included here since, with 20:4, it forms a parallel with Exod 16:2 (P); Num 14:2–3 (P), where the people express a death wish followed by an accusation. Seebass (*Numeri*, 278) identifies a similar P narrative except that he includes 20:8aα, 9, 11a concerning the staff. Pace Coats (*Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 73–78), Katherine Sakenfeld (“Theological and Redactional Problems in Numbers 20:2–13,” in *Understanding the Word: Essays in Honor of Bernhard W. Anderson*, ed. Edgar W. Conrad and Ben C. Ollenburger, JSOTSup 37 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985],

The arguments in support of this delineation are as follows:<sup>376</sup> Num 20:3a is excluded because it forms a doublet with 20:2 except that in 20:3 only Moses is mentioned whereas in 20:2 Moses and Aaron are referred to; it interrupts the coherence between 20:2 and 20:3b–4, where Moses and Aaron are addressed (see the second-person masculine plural in 20:4); and it corresponds word for word with Exod 17:3aα.<sup>377</sup> Numbers 20:5 looks like an addition since it refers to Egypt out of sequence after the reference to the wilderness in 20:4, brings in the extraneous element of food alongside water, and 20:5aα corresponds linguistically with Exod 17:3bα. The motif of the staff in 20:8aα\*, 9, 11a appears to be secondary: 20:8aα\* corresponds with Exod 17:5\* and is fragmentary since it is not clear why Moses is to take the staff; 20:9 seems to refer to Aaron's staff in Num 17:25–26, which is part of a later supplementary text; and 20:11a now refers to Moses's staff, in contrast to 20:9 that refers to Aaron's staff, and corresponds with Exod 17:6\*. Numbers 20:8bα is excluded since it forms a doublet and discrepancy with verse 8aβ, with 20:8aβ referring to the rock giving its water, whereas 20:8bα refers to Moses bringing water out of the rock. Numbers 20:8bβ is also secondary since it has a second-person masculine singular address like 20:8bα, which is secondary, and its motif of Moses providing drink represents an unevenness with the rock giving its water in 20:8aβ. Numbers 20:11bβ uses similar words to those in 20:8bβ in terms of the congregation and their livestock drinking but is careful not to mention Moses causing them to drink as in 20:8bβ, and it follows directly on the water coming out of the rock in 20:11bα and is therefore included in the basic P narrative. Finally, 20:13 represents a later addition to the basic P narrative since it stands in tension with 20:12 which states that YHWH's

---

133–54), and Schart (*Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 117–18), who for the most part see Num 20:2–13 as P with P drawing on, and rewriting, the earlier tradition of Exod 17:1–7. However, the doublets and their discrepancies with their context especially between 20:3a and 20:2, 4, and 20:8aβ and 20:8bα, along with the lack of evidence elsewhere within P of taking up and quoting literally clauses from the tradition as in 20:3 speak against taking such a position. Again, this delineation and the following arguments in support of it are found in Boorer, “The Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 50–52.

376. See esp. the discussion of Schmidt (“Priesterschrift–kein Ende,” 487–90); and the succinct summary of the tensions and difficulties within Num 20:1–13 by Frankel (*Murmuring Stories*, 263).

377. There is little evidence outside of Num 20:1–13 that P takes up and includes statements literally from non-P.

holiness was not shown and refers back to 20:3a, which has been excluded from the basic P narrative.

The verses delineated as forming the basic P narrative in Num 20:1–13\* form a coherent account. This account concerns Moses and Aaron throughout: they are referred to in 20:2, 6, 10a, 12; the second masculine plural is used in 20:4, 8aβ, and the first common plural in 20:10b. That YHWH speaks to Moses only in 20:7 is in line with the pattern found in Pg material in Exod 16:10–11 of a divine speech to Moses after the appearance of the glory of YHWH. The singular reference to the speaker of 20:10b (“he,” Moses?) can be interpreted as having to do with the content of the disobedience to the command in 20:8aβ: instead of both Moses and Aaron speaking to the rock, only one of them, probably Moses, speaks, and the other, probably Aaron, is silent. It could perhaps be argued that the water from the rock (20:11b) that comes after the question in 20:10b lacks coherence, but this is part of the plot: the rock produces its water with no reference to YHWH prior to this, and since the people did not witness the glory of YHWH and ensuing command to Moses (20:6, 7, 8aα\*β), from their point of view the miracle of the water has no reference point in YHWH, thus leading to the accusation of Moses and Aaron in 20:12 of not showing YHWH’s holiness before the eyes of the people.

The later addition in 20:13 contradicts the plot of this basic narrative by maintaining that YHWH did show his holiness by means of the water. The other later interpolations in 20:3a, 5, 8aα\*, 9, 11a focus on Moses only, and in places echo literally Exod 17:1–7 (non-P) suggesting that they have been inserted to accentuate the role of Moses and harmonize the P narrative in Num 20:2–12\* with the non-P account in Exod 17:1–7.<sup>378</sup>

A coherent P narrative has been identified in Num 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38, and in Num 20:2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8aα\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12. Moreover, the P narratives in Num 13–14\* and Num 20:2–12\* are coherent with each other. In terms of plot, Num 13–14\* (P) focuses on why that generation of the nation will not gain entry into the land but die in the wilderness, and Num 20:2–12\* (P) follows on from this explaining why the leaders of that generation, Moses and Aaron, will not enter the land. Moreover, Num 13–14\* (P) and Num 20:2–12\* (P) have a

---

378. See Artus, *Études sur le livre des Nombres*, 242; Schmidt, “Priesterschrift—kein Ende,” 492.



similar structure: the congregation speaks against Moses and Aaron (Num 14:2–3; Num 20:2, 3b, 4), the glory of YHWH appears (Num 14:10b; Num 20:6), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (Num 14:26–35\*; Num 20:7, 8αα\*β), and consequently what happens is unfolded (Num 14:36–38; Num 20:10, 11b, 12).<sup>379</sup> But does this Priestly narrative identified in Num 13–14\* and 20:2–12\* belong to Pg, as an extension of it?

Arguments in terms of the coherence of the P narrative in Num 13–14\* and 20:2–12\* with Pg as identified in Genesis and especially Exodus support the view that it belongs to, and is a part of, Pg.<sup>380</sup>

379. In Num 20:2–12\*, there is no disputation speech before the appearance of the glory of YHWH as in Num 14:6–9\*. However there is a speech of Moses and Aaron to the people, with the tone of a disputation, occurring after the appearance of the glory of YHWH and YHWH's speech to Moses.

380. Pace Nihan, e.g., who argues that Num 20:1–13 as a whole is a post-P Pentateuchal redaction (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 25–30). He bases this to a large extent on language that is uncharacteristic of P in 20:12–13, such as the use of אָמַן in 20:12 and the use of קִדַּשׁ (*niphil*) in 20:13, which he sees as a reference to Lev 22:32 (post-P). He argues that these two verses therefore cannot be attributed to P and so the whole episode should be attributed to a later redaction. He then goes into more detail, arguing for 20:1–13 being a literary unity and maintaining that the whole of 20:1–13 is post-P since there is language uncharacteristic of P and/or late in 20:3b (עֹגֵג), 20:4 (קָהַל יְהוּה), 20:5 (עֲלֶה, in relation to the exodus), 20:9 (Aaron's staff before YHWH), 20:10 (הַמֵּרִים), 20:11a (רוּם, *hiphil*), as well as אָמַן in 20:12 and קִדַּשׁ (*niphil*) in 20:13. Nihan's arguments are unconvincing. His attempts to harmonize the unevennesses and discrepancies as outlined above cannot be sustained; e.g., his argument that 20:13 is not in tension with 20:12 since 20:13 resolves the issue regarding YHWH's holiness left open by the defiling of YHWH by Moses and Aaron does not take seriously the plot of the P narrative as argued here where in this story YHWH's holiness is clearly not demonstrated to the people; and his attempt to harmonize 20:3a with 20:2 in terms of 20:3a specifying that after gathering against Moses and Aaron (20:2b) the community accused Moses in particular, does not account for the second-person masculine plural in 20:4. With regard to language, the language uncharacteristic of P and/or late identified in 20:5, 9, 11a, 13 support our arguments on other grounds that these verses are not part of the basic P narrative. The verb גִּוַע (20:3b) is used elsewhere in Pg (see Gen 6:17; 7:21; 25:8; 35:29). The reference to קָהַל יְהוּה in 20:4, though unusual, could be to accentuate that the people are gathered against Moses and Aaron only and not YHWH, in line with the plot of the basic narrative, where the focus is squarely on Moses and Aaron. It is true that some language that is uncharacteristic of P occurs in the basic P narrative that we have identified, such as הַמֵּרִים in 20:10, and אָמַן in 20:12, but since the majority of the language in the basic P narrative identified here is Priestly, and 20:10 and 12 are integral to the narrative, considerations of language alone are not enough to disqualify the basic narrative as a whole from belonging to



Numbers 13–14\*; 20:1–12\* (P) is coherent with the promise of the land emphasized in Pg, especially in Gen 17:8; Exod 6:4, 8. This land promise does not find its realization at Sinai. However, the promised land motif is central to Num 13–14\* (P) (see Num 13:2a); indeed it explains why this land promise did not unfold for the Mosaic generation, that is, in terms of the uniquely P motif of the slandering of the land (Num 13:32),<sup>381</sup> which represents a rejection of the promised land itself.<sup>382</sup> Numbers 20:1–12\* (P), in turn, explains why Moses and Aaron, the leaders of the Mosaic generation, did not enter the land in fulfillment of the promise.<sup>383</sup>

In addition, motifs and themes in Num 13–14\* (P) and Num 20:1–12\* (P) correspond to and reverse major conceptual elements in Pg in Exod 6–16\*. Over and above negating of the land promise for that generation, Num 13–14\* (P) contains the people's rejection of the exodus (14:2ba, 3b) and their rejection of YHWH's control and defeat of other nations as symbolized in Egypt in Exod 7–14\*, when they assume military defeat in Num 14:3aβ and reject the assurance of Joshua and Caleb that YHWH is with them and therefore they need not fear the people of the land (Num 14:9aβb). The people also reject what has occurred in the wilderness (Num 14:2bβ), in particular YHWH's nurturing of them in Exod 16\* (Pg). Indeed, the coherence of Num 13–14\* (P) with Pg identified in Exodus is particularly clear in relation to Exod 16\* (Pg). They have a very similar structure,<sup>384</sup> the common elements of which are: the congregation complain against Moses and Aaron with a speech comprising a death wish and an accusation (Num 14:1a, 2–3; Exod 16:2–3); there is a disputation speech in response to the complaint (Num 14:6–9\*; Exod

---

P. Since Moses and Aaron behave in a unique way in this episode compared to their behavior in the rest of Pg, it is perhaps not surprising that terminology uncharacteristic of P but used in non-P texts in relation to the rebellion of the people (such as אָמַן, see Num 14:11) occur here. Finally, the use of קָדַשׁ (*hiphil*) in 20:12, though unique in P, is appropriate after Sinai (see Exod 29:43) and could be an allusion to Kadesh within the older tradition (see Lohfink, "Original Sin," 114).

381. Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 159–60.

382. The spies bring an "evil report" (דְּבַר) of the land as a land that "devours its inhabitants" (אֹכֶלֶת יוֹשְׁבֵיהָ), Num 13:32, and see Num 14:36–37), and the people collude with this (Num 14:1a, 3) and then reject the view put forward by Joshua and Caleb that the land is exceedingly good and fertile (Num 14:7b, 8, 10a).

383. See Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 137–38, 140–41; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 148–50.

384. See Childs, *Exodus*, 279–80.

16:6–7); the glory of YHWH appears (Num 14:10b; Exod 16:10), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (and Aaron) that includes an instruction to speak to the people (Num 14:26–29, 31, 35; Exod 16:11–12); the delivery of the oracle is simply assumed, with the ensuing events reported straight after the YHWH speech (Num 14:36–38; Exod 16:13–15). These similarities in structure and motif, along with differences in detail between them, suggest they are intentionally being played off against each other. They begin similarly but the subtle differences in Num 14\* (P) put the people in a more radically negative light, and this leads to opposite outcomes, with Exod 16\* (Pg) unfolding with sustenance and life, and Num 14\* (P) issuing in death.<sup>385</sup> In all these ways, Num 13–14\* (P) interacts with, and negates or reverses, Pg in Exod 6–16\*.

The situation is similar in relation to Num 20:1–12\* (P). We have already seen how Num 20:1–12\* (P) has a similar structure to that of Num 13–14\* (P). Therefore Num 20:1–12\* (P) also displays a similar structural pattern to Exod 16\* (Pg): the congregation speaks against Moses and Aaron, and this includes a death wish and an accusation (Num 20:2, 3b, 4; see Exod 16:2–5), the glory of YHWH appears (Num 20:6; see Exod 16:10) followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (Num 20:7, 8\*; see Exod 16:11–12), and consequently what happens is unfolded (Num 20:10b, 11b, 12; see Exod 16:13–15). Again, as with Num 13–14\* (P), the similarities in structure and motifs, alongside the differences, suggest an intentional mirroring, yet playing off of Num 20:1–12\* (P) over against Exod 16\* (Pg) by way of negations and reversal; but in a different way from the interplay between Num 13–14\* (P) and Exod 16\* (Pg), which focuses on the people, in Num 20:1–12\* (P) the focus is on the leadership of Moses and Aaron. Whereas in both Num 20:1–12\* and Exod 16\* (P) the outcome for the people is similar (they are provided with meat/manna, water), the way in which Moses and Aaron are portrayed is in sharp contrast. In Exod 16\* (Pg), Moses (and Aaron) point away from themselves to YHWH who brought the people out of Egypt (16:6–7, 9) and who provides them with manna (16:15), in this way allowing the people to come to the knowledge of YHWH (16:15). In Num 20:10, 11b, 12, quite the opposite is the case. Moses (and Aaron) do not carry out YHWH's command to speak to the rock (20:8a $\alpha^*\beta$ ) but address the people, accusing them of being

---

385. For a more detailed discussion, see Boorer, "Place of Numbers 13–14\*," 55–58. This will be taken up again in more detail in ch. 2.

rebels when, in this context, YHWH has not, and most significantly Moses points to himself and Aaron as the source of the water instead of YHWH, thus blocking the knowledge of YHWH from the people (20:10). Therefore they are condemned for not showing YHWH's holiness. Numbers 20:2–12\* (P) therefore reverses the portrayal of the leadership in Exod 16\* (Pg) where Moses and Aaron mediate YHWH's commands and witness to what YHWH is doing for them, with Moses (and Aaron) disobeying YHWH's command and therefore not witnessing at all to YHWH's deeds. Indeed, the disobedience of Moses and Aaron to the command of YHWH in Num 20:2–12\* reverses the portrayal of them within the whole of Exod 1–Exod 40\* (Pg), for throughout this material the obedience of Moses and Aaron to YHWH's commands is impeccable (see, e.g., Exod 7:6, 10, 20; 8:6, 17; 9:10; 14:21, 27; 39:32; 40:33b).<sup>386</sup> In all these ways, Num 20:2–12\* (P) interacts with, and negates or reverses, Pg in Exod 6–16\*.

In short, the coherence of Num 13–14\* (P) and Num 20:1–12\*, albeit by way of reversal, with the preceding Pg material (and with each other), speaks for their place within Pg.<sup>387</sup>

In summary, then, Num 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38, and Num 20:1a, 2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8aα\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12 will be taken as belonging to Pg.

**Pg in Numbers 20:22b–27:14.** Numbers 20:22b, 23aα, 25–29 concerning the death of Aaron and his succession at Mount Hor presupposes, and continues on from, Num 20:2–12\* (Pg) and in particular 20:12, which states that Moses and Aaron will not lead the people into the land.<sup>388</sup> The same is the case with Num 27:12–14, which refers to Moses's death outside the land for not showing YHWH's holiness before the eyes of the Israelites in line with 20:12. Therefore, since Num 20:2–12\* belongs to Pg, 20:22b, 23aα, 25–29 and 27:12–14 must also be seen as belonging to Pg. Between Num 20:22b, 23aα, 25–29 and 27:12–14, there was probably an itinerary within Pg linking these two scenarios, such as found in 22:1 (and perhaps

---

386. For a more detailed discussion, see Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 58–62. This will be taken up again in more detail in ch. 2.

387. For some additional arguments in support of the inclusion of these texts within Pg, see Schmidt, “Priesterschrift–kein Ende.”

388. See Noth, *Numbers*, 152–53, for arguments for excluding 20:23aβb–24 as a secondary addition.

21:4\*).<sup>389</sup> Therefore Num 20:22b, 23aα, 25–29; 22:1; and 27:12–14 will be included in Pg.

**Conclusion.** By way of summary, the material delineated here as belonging to Pg in the post-Sinai material thus far comprises Num 10:11–13\*; 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38; 20:1a, 2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8aα\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12, 22b, 23aα, 25–29; 22:1 and 27:12–14. However, the question now needs to be asked as to whether Pg can be discerned beyond this, that is, beyond Num 27:12–14.

#### 1.2.2.5.2. Where Does Pg End?

Some scholars have discerned Pg even beyond Num 27:12–14, in Deut 34\*, for example, or even within Joshua.<sup>390</sup> It will be argued here that Pg cannot be discerned beyond Num 27:12–14, starting with a consideration of P texts in Joshua and working backwards.

In my opinion, it is clear that Pg does not extend into Joshua. Arguments against discerning any Pg texts in Joshua are as follows: P texts in Joshua appear to represent supplements to the underlying material.<sup>391</sup> The primary P texts identified by Lohfink as belonging to Pg, which are also included within P by Blenkinsopp, that is, Josh 4:19; 5:10–12; 18:1; 19:51,<sup>392</sup> represent a minimalist position that can therefore provide the basis for testing whether or not Pg extends into Joshua. An examination of these texts does not support the view that these texts are an extension, and therefore part, of Pg. Although containing some Priestly terminology and motifs, these texts are not coherent with the narrative movement of Pg but rather take it in a different direction through telescoping and conflation of elements found in Pg particularly in Genesis and Exodus.<sup>393</sup>

---

389. See Noth, Elliger, and Lohfink as outlined in the chart in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 224; and Dozeman, “Priestly Wilderness Itineraries,” 282–83.

390. For the former, see the scholars listed in n. 15. For the latter, the scholars listed in n. 14.

391. See Noth, *Chronicler's History*, 111–19.

392. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 145, n. 29; Blenkinsopp, “Structure of P,” 288–89.

393. Priestly terminology and motifs include, e.g., an interest in dating (Josh 4:19; 5:10), reference to the Passover (Josh 5:10–12), the reference to the manna ceasing in their coming into “the land of Canaan” (Josh 5:12; see 14:1), reference to “Eleazar” as

It is likely that P traits in Josh 5:10–12 (e.g., reference to the fourteenth day [5:10], the lack of manna linked with eating crops of the land [5:12aβb], and “the land of Canaan” [5:12c]) represent P editing of an underlying non-P text, given the repetitions and the traits, mixed with P expressions, that are not typical of P (e.g., the reference to “in the evening” instead of the typical P expression of “between the evenings” [see Exod 12:6], the Passover as a national festival, and the reference to “produce” [עֲבוֹר], which is a *hapax legomena*). However, even if this were not the case, Josh 4:19; 5:10–12 conflates elements found in Pg in Exod 12\* (Pg) and Exod 16\* (Pg) into a different pattern and combines them with non-P elements; for example, the selecting of the lamb on the tenth day and its slaughtering on the fourteen day found in Exod 12:3, 6 has become in Josh 4:19; 5:10–12 the time of the coming up out of the Jordon and camping at Gilgal and the keeping of the Passover respectively; and the narrative sequence of Passover in Exod 12:1, 3–13 (Pg) and the eating of manna until coming to the land in Exod 16:35\* (Pg) has become conflated and telescoped in Josh 5:10–12 into the eating of the Passover followed by the eating of unleavened bread<sup>394</sup> along with parched grain as coinciding with the ceasing of the manna.

Joshua 14:1–2; 18:1; 19:51 are interrelated. The use of כָּבַשׁ in Josh 18:1b, seen as signifying the fulfillment of the land promise, is not a strong argument for seeing this verse as part of Pg. Although used in Gen 1:28, כָּבַשׁ is not part of the postflood order of creation (Gen 9:1, 7) within

---

priest (Josh 14:1), and the “tent of meeting” (Josh 18:1; 19:51), and the “congregation” (Josh 18:1), and the use of the word כָּבַשׁ (Gen 1:28; Josh 18:1).

For arguments that Pg does not extend into Joshua, see Suzanne Boorer, “The Envisioning of the Land in the Priestly Material: Fulfilled Promise or Future Hope?” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*, ed. Thomas Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid, AIL 8 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 99–125. In this essay I argued on both literary and theological/hermeneutical grounds against seeing the end of Pg in Joshua, dialoguing particularly with the views of Blenkinsopp and Lohfink. The literary arguments are summed up in what follows. The theological/hermeneutical arguments that see the whole of Pg as forward-looking with regard to the fulfillment of all the promises including that of the land (with Pg not extending into Joshua, since Joshua is focused on the fulfillment of the land promise), found in seminal form in this article, will be unfolded in detail in later chapters; see chs. 3, 4 and esp. ch. 5.

394. Since Exod 12:14–20 is later than Pg (that is H/Hs), this suggests that the reference to unleavened bread in Josh 5:11 is quite late.

which the Abrahamic promise of the land unfolds, and, with the usual meaning of military conquest or enslavement,<sup>395</sup> it does not cohere well with the rest of Pg postflood where, since the surveyors are punished for slandering the land (Num 14:36–37), the land is clearly valued. Moreover, the closest formulation to the use of כבש in Josh 18:1 is in 1 Chr 22:18. All this suggests Josh 18:1 is later and not part of Pg. This is confirmed by the anomalies that can be observed between the reference to the tent of meeting in Josh 18:1; 19:51 and the tent of meeting in Exod 25–40\* (Pg): the fleeting reference to it in Josh 18:1; 19:51 contrasts with its central role in Pg in Exodus,<sup>396</sup> and there is no mention of YHWH's associated glory as might be expected;<sup>397</sup> and the localization of the portable tent at Shiloh would seem to point forward to the Shiloh traditions in 1 Sam 1–3 rather than back to any anticipation of this particular location of which there is no mention in Pg in Genesis–Numbers.<sup>398</sup> Moreover, Josh 18:1; 19:51 conflate elements found in Pg in different places in Genesis and Exodus, such as the “subduing” (כבש) of the earth (Gen 1:28), the “tent of meeting” (Exod 25–40\*), and the notice of “finishing” (Gen 2:2; Exod 39:32, 43; 40:33), and combined these with the localization at Shiloh.

All this suggests that Josh 18:1; 19:51 (and the interrelated text of Josh 14:1–2) are, like Josh 4:19; 5:10–12, a later redaction that takes the narrative direction of Pg in Genesis–Numbers in a slightly different direction, in part through telescoping and conflating some of its narrative elements. Joshua 4:19; 5:10–12; 14:1–2; 18:1; 19:51 therefore do not form a coherent extension of Pg in Genesis–Numbers and therefore cannot be seen as part of Pg. Pg concludes before the book of Joshua.

With regard to Deut 34:1\*, 7–9 there are some strong arguments against attributing these to Pg. The account is not coherent, although this could be accounted for as a result of the hand of a later redactor who combined these verses with the Dtr text. However, the language of Deut 34:7–9 seems to be a mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language. Deuteronomy 34:8b is not Priestly, and the combination of “weeping”

---

395. See Norman Habel, “Geophany: The Earth Story in Genesis 1,” in *The Earth Story in Genesis*, ed. Norman Habel and Shirley Wurst (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 34–48, esp. 46–47.

396. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 227–28.

397. Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 150.

398. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 227–28.

and “mourning” in this verse has no parallel in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>399</sup> The language of Deut 34:9b $\alpha$  is close to Dtr language, although the language of Deut 34:9b $\beta$  is Priestly,<sup>400</sup> as is 34:9a (“[he] was full of the spirit of wisdom,” see Exod 28:3; 31:3; 35:31 [although not part of Pg as identified here]). Römer and Marc Brettler, for example, noting that Deut 34:7–9 “betrays knowledge of both Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions” argue for Deut 34:7–9 as part of a late redactional process, a stratum that builds on the earlier DtrH text within this chapter, attributing them to a Hexateuch redactor, that was earlier in turn than the next layer in this chapter in Deut 34:1–3\*, 4\*, 10–12.<sup>401</sup> This argument holds some weight, especially given the position of these verses at the end of the book of Deuteronomy as concluding the Mosaic generation and looking beyond this to Joshua. Without going into the complexities of the debates surrounding Deut 34 and its diachronic dimensions, it can at least be said that it is far from clear that Deut 34:1\*, 7–9 should be attributed to Pg, and may in fact be part of a later redaction layer.<sup>402</sup> Given this, Deut 34:1\*, 7–9 will be excluded from Pg.<sup>403</sup>

This leaves us with the ending of Pg within Num 27\*. Although Num 27:15–23 has sometimes been included within Pg,<sup>404</sup> there are some telling arguments against its inclusion. Noth in his commentary on Numbers argues that Num 27:15–23 is secondary, and was added when the Pentateuch was linked with the deuteronomistic historical work because in the deuteronomistic/deuteronomistic literature reference to the death of Moses is linked with reference to Joshua as his successor (Deut 3:23–29; 31:1–8; Josh 1:1–2).<sup>405</sup> These verses contain quite a few non-P expressions as well as some very late expressions; for example, “the God of the spirits of all

---

399. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 23.

400. *Ibid.*, 22.

401. Thomas Römer and Marc Brettler, “Deut 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 408; see further 416.

402. See the comment by Ska (*Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 150) that “there are good reasons to believe that this [Deut 34:1, 7–9] is a late, postdeuteronomistic or postpriestly, text.”

403. For further arguments against the inclusion of Deut 34:1\*, 7–9, see the influential article by Lothar Perlitt, “Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?” in *Deuteronomium-Studien*, FAT 8 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 123–43; and Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 22–24.

404. See, e.g., Elliger and Lohfink as cited in Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 224.

405. Noth, *Numbers*, 213.



flesh” occurs elsewhere only in Num 16:22, which is later than Pg; “the congregation of YHWH” (עדת יהוה) is found elsewhere only in the late texts of Num 31:16 and Josh 22:16–17; the rite of laying on of hands with the verb סמך is unique, with the verb usually used in the context of animal sacrifice (see Lev 1; 3); the expression in 27:17, “like sheep without a shepherd” is not found elsewhere in P but is found in 1 Kgs 22:17 and the late texts 2 Chr 18:16; Zech 10:2; הוֹד (27:20) is not used elsewhere in P; and 16:21b is paralleled in 2 Sam 5:2; 1 Chr 11:2.<sup>406</sup> Moreover, it is unusual, to say the least, given the rest of Pg to this point with its repeated commands of YHWH to Moses, for Moses to be portrayed as effectively instigating the appointment of his successor (Num 27:15).<sup>407</sup> Also, this passage in Num 27:15–23, along with Deut 34:9, which is by no means clearly part of Pg, forms a transition to Joshua, and since the P texts in the book of Joshua are not to be attributed to Pg, an ending of Pg in Num 27:15–23 that denotes Moses’s successor as Joshua is not to be expected.<sup>408</sup> Josh 27:15–23, therefore, does not belong to Pg.

Numbers 27:12–14, which does belong to Pg, then, is where Pg ends. Although at first glance it may appear a little abrupt, Num 27:12–14 forms an appropriate conclusion to Pg. That Moses is allowed to see the land but not to go into it completes the reversals found in Pg in Num 13–14\*; 20\* and concludes Pg with the Mosaic generation, which is paradigmatic for the constitution of the nation Israel.<sup>409</sup> It is not necessary for there to be a death notice in relation to Moses; just as in Num 14:28–35\* where in a YHWH speech the demise of the Mosaic generation is predicted but with no notice of this having occurred, so also in Num 27:12–14 in a YHWH speech Moses’s death is predicted but not actually related. As will be discussed later, the open-ended nature of Num 27:12–14 where the promised

---

406. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 24–25 n. 19.

407. Noth, *Numbers*, 214.

408. The succession after the death of Aaron, however, as narrated in Num 20:23–29\*, is important because it is the Aaronite priesthood that constitutes the future leadership of the community. The figure of Moses functions in Pg as the founding figure through whom the nation of Israel is created and constituted as the cultic community, and so in a sense Moses is unique and has no successor with the same function once the community is constituted under its Aaronide leadership.

409. Contra Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 24. The significance of the reversals in Pg Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\* (Pg) will become clear when we look at the structure of Pg in ch. 2 and unfold the significance of Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\* (Pg) within Pg as a whole in chs. 4 and 5.



land is glimpsed but its possession yet unrealized is part of Pg's hermeneutics where forward-looking vision is constitutive of its trajectory at every point.<sup>410</sup> In conclusion, Pg ends in Num 27:12–14.

#### 1.2.2.6. Conclusion

In conclusion, Pg is defined here as comprising:

- ♦ In Genesis, the texts basically defined as P by Noth in *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*.<sup>411</sup>
- ♦ In Exodus: 1:1–5, 7, 13–14; 2:23aβb–25; 6:2–12; 7:1–13, 19, 20aα, 21b, 22; 8:1–3 (Hebrew) ... 11b–15 (Hebrew); 9:8–12; 11:9–10; 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41; 14:1–4, 8, 9aβb, 15aαb, 16–18, 21aαb, 22–23, 26, 27aα, 28–29; 15:22\*, 27; 16:1, 2–3, 6–7, 9–15, 21, 35\*; 17:1abα; 19:1, 2a; 24:15b–18a; 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34.
- In Numbers: 10:11a, 12a, 13\*; 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38; 20:1a, 2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8aα\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12, 22b, 23aα, 25–29; 22:1; 27:12–14.

It is this that will form the basis of our discussion. However, ultimately the credibility of such a Pg document will be solidified only if a theological horizon can be found that accounts for, or makes sense of, the shape, content, and interrelation of its elements as a whole as these are expressed according to its own particular style and within its own particular genre.

---

410. See chs. 3, 4 and 5; and Boorer, “Envisioning of the Land,” 121–25. Perlitt (“Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium”) also sees P concluding in Num 27:12–14.

411. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17–18. I.e., Gen 1:1–2:4a; 5:1–28, 30–32; 6:9–22; 7:6, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; 8:1, 2a, 3b–5, 7, 13a, 14–19; 9:1–17, 28–29; 10:1–7, 20, 22–23, 31–32; 11:10–27, 31–32; 12:4b, 5; 13:6, 11b, 12abα; 19:29; 16:1a, 3, 15, 16; 17:1–27; 21:1b–5; 23:1–20; 25:7–11a, 12–17, 19–20 ... 26b; 26:34–35; 27:46–28:9 ... ; 31:18aβb; 33:18a; 35:6, 9–13a, 15, 22b–29; 36:1–14; 37:1, 2aαb ... 41:46a ... ; 46:6, 7; 47:27b, 28; 48:3–6; 49:1a, 29–33; 50:12–13. I am also including Gen 21:21 and 25:11b: see above n. 243.

This is what we will seek to do in the following chapters. However, before this a discussion concerning whether or not Pg was familiar with parallel non-P material, as well as the dating of Pg, is in order.

### 1.2.3. Did Pg Know Non-P?

Traditionally, it has been assumed that Pg knew and drew on (but without incorporating) the non-P material, which is earlier, to compose a separate and alternative document, and this is still the dominant view.<sup>412</sup> The reasons for presupposing this are: the similar overall design of Pg and the non-P material, with a very similar sequence of episodes; within some of these episodes specific detailed parallels and resonances; and the existence of blind motifs within Pg in relation to the parallel account in non-P that suggests that Pg is presupposing and depending on non-P.<sup>413</sup> These are strong and convincing reasons.

However, Schwartz and Baden have questioned this view, maintaining that P did not know or depend on non-P (JE), but rather P and non-P drew on a common tradition separately.<sup>414</sup> By way of rebutting the view

---

412. See, e.g., McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 23–25; Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 146–47 n. 31; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 47, 60–61, 90, 92, 117; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 294; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 147; Reinhard Kratz, “The Pentateuch in Current Research; Consensus and Debate,” in Dozeman, *Pentateuch: International Perspectives*, 38, 52; and see Kratz, *Composition of the Narrative*, 244, 279, 281, 307. They also assume that the writer of Pg presupposed that its audience was familiar with the earlier non-P material. Cf. the idiosyncratic view of Guillaume (*Land and Calendar*, 7, 46, 145), who relegates the material he perceives as non-P (which is not in places the same as the material traditionally attributed to non-P), “whether it is pre-Pg, post-Pg, or displaying Deuteronomistic traits” (7), to Ps.

413. On the sequence of episodes, see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 234; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 294. See the parallels, e.g., between Exod 3:1–4:17 (non-P) and Exod 6:2–12; 7:1 (Pg). See Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 140. Blind motifs include the prophetic motifs in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1 (Pg) that seem to be blind motifs presupposing the fuller prophetic representation of Moses and Aaron in Exod 3:1–4:17 (non-P); Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 140, and see also esp. 292–94. Possibly also Pg seems to presuppose that its audience knew elements in non-P, e.g., in Gen 6:11, 13 with its very abbreviated description of violence, and in the lack of introduction to Moses in Exod 6:2 (*ibid.*, 293).

414. Schwartz, “Priestly Account,” 110, 120–30; Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 197–207.

that Pg knew non-P (JE, or J or E separately), Baden argues primarily on linguistic grounds, in terms of the lack of verbal correspondences between non-P and P (e.g., on the analogy of Chronicles in relation to Samuel–Kings).<sup>415</sup> He also argues that, in terms of overall design, the parallels between P and non-P are only in terms of broad contours and stresses the differences in details within parts of the sequence, as well as within specific episodes, all of which suggest to him that P was simply working with a similar broad outline of Israelite traditions, set in the same rough order, as non-P.<sup>416</sup> However, Baden brushes over far too lightly the similarities between Pg and the non-P material, especially the uncanny similarity of the sequence of summary and more extensive episodes of the story outline and detailed parallels in resonances and features (whether in terms of similarity or in presenting an alternative view on a particular motif<sup>417</sup>) within episodes. He has a point with regard to the lack of specific verbal or verbatim parallels, but this is addressed in a credible way by Carr, who argues that this can be explained in terms of non-P (unlike Samuel–Kings) not yet having achieved a fixed authority.<sup>418</sup> Moreover, the likelihood that Pg knew non-P is enhanced by taking into consideration the small and limited scribal environment that most likely existed when Pg was being composed.<sup>419</sup>

I agree with the vast majority that Pg knew the non-P material. In any case, even if non-P and Pg were drawing on a common stock of tradition, the only evidence we have of a similar sequence of traditions outside of Pg is in the non-P material, and it is only this that can give us clues as to how Pg has picked up on such earlier traditions to compose its particular account.

However, questions have been raised from a different direction in relation to the view, as traditionally stated, that Pg formed a separate, alternative account to the earlier non-P, conceived of as an earlier parallel account

---

415. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, esp. 198–99.

416. Ibid., 199–206. Schwartz (“Priestly Account,” 120–30, esp. 122) had earlier argued in a similar way in relation to the Sinai material specifically, i.e., on the grounds that P uses elements it has in common with the non-P material in ways that are irreconcilable with the non-P material, and it either lacks other elements found in the non-P Sinai material or connects them with other Pentateuchal traditions.

417. See Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 293.

418. Ibid., 294.

419. Ibid.

to Pg in its outline and many of its episodes.<sup>420</sup> These dissenting voices hold to the existence of a Pg, but their views question the specific assumption that the earlier non-P material consisted of a *parallel* account as a template for Pg's separate account. There are two somewhat overlapping positions that question the parallelism of the non-P account throughout: there are significant texts within non-P, particularly in Genesis and/or Exodus, that are later than Pg, that is post-P; and/or the Genesis ancestral material was quite separate from the Moses material prior to Pg.<sup>421</sup> Each will be addressed in turn.

First, the non-P texts identified by a few as later than, and presupposing, Pg include primarily the non-P texts within Gen 2–11\*; 15; Exod 1:9–22; and 3:1–4:17.<sup>422</sup> With regard to Gen 2–11\* (non-P), Carr has put

---

420. See, e.g., the majority of scholars listed in nn. 7 and 8.

421. On the first position, see, e.g., Joseph Blenkinsopp, "A Post-exilic Lay Source in Genesis 1–11," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion*, ed. Jan Gertz, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte, BZAW 315 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 49–61; Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuch*, 93; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 158–224; Schmid, *Old Testament*, 155–59, 80, 82, 161; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*; and (the later) Erhard Blum, "The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua," in Dozeman, *Farewell to the Yahwist*, 89–106. On the second position, see, e.g., Eckart Otto *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*; Schmid, "The So-called Yahwist and the Literary Gap between Genesis and Exodus," in Dozeman, *Farewell to the Yahwist*, 29–50; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*; Gertz, "The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus," in Dozeman, *Farewell to the Yahwist*, 73–87; de Pury, "Jacob Story," 67; Blum, "Literary Connection" (although it should be noted that in Blum's earlier work [*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*], he argued that his KD extended from Genesis through Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers).

422. For Gen 2–11\* (non-P), see, e.g., Blenkinsopp, "Post-exilic Lay Source"; Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuch*, 93; Schmid, *Old Testament*, 155–59; and for Gen 15, see Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 158–71; Schmid, *Old Testament*, 161 (in this he is in line with, e.g., Thomas Römer ["Gen 15 und Gen 17: Beobachtungen und Anfragen zu einem Dogma der 'neueren' und 'neuesten' Pentateuchkritik," *DBAT* 26 (1989–90): 32–47], and John Ha [*Genesis 15: A Theological Compendium of Pentateuchal History*, BZAW 181 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989)]). For Exod 1:9–12, 15–22, see esp. Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 138–44; Schmid, *Old Testament*, 80. For Exod 3:1–4:17, see esp. Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 183–93; Schmid, *Old Testament*, 82. It is Schmid's arguments with regard to Exod 1:9–22\* and Exod 3:1–4:18 that will be engaged with here. De Pury ("Jacob Story") also sees the non-P material in Gen 12–25\* as later than, and presupposing P; but see Schmid (*Old Testament*, 85–86).

forward convincing counterarguments for reasons given for seeing Gen 2–11\* (non-P) as late, such as the perceived influence of wisdom, dependence conceptually on late texts, and the reference to parts of it only in exilic texts and later. Carr argues that wisdom traditions may go back quite early; given the genre of the Gen 2–11\* (non-P) texts as primeval, etiological myth-like narratives, they are quite different from the rest of the Bible and therefore not dependent conceptually (or linguistically) on other biblical texts, but rather probably quite early and, because of their cosmic perspective and the limited circles in which they were likely handed down, unlikely to be cited by preexilic texts.<sup>423</sup> Moreover, Carr's extended analysis of the P texts in Genesis in relation to the non-P texts, showing that P is dependent on the earlier non-P material that in places it sought to replace, is convincing.<sup>424</sup> An exception is perhaps the enigmatic text of Gen 15, which may or may not be post-P. Leaving any conclusions regarding Gen 15 open, then, I will basically assume that the rest of the non-P texts in Genesis are earlier than Pg in Genesis. However, even if parts of the non-P Genesis material were to be seen as later than Pg, this would not affect the following investigation of Pg significantly, since its primary focus is on Pg's story of the nation Israel, including how Pg in Exodus and Numbers drew on, or interacted with, the non-P material to present its own vision, with the Pg material in Genesis forming only a backdrop to this. It is important, however, given this, to address arguments put forward for Exod 1\* (non-P) being later than P, and especially for Exod 3:1–4:18 as being post-P, since the call of Moses in Pg (Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–2) is a pivotal text within Pg's story of the nation.

Konrad Schmid, for example, argues that Exod 1:9–11, 15–22 is later than and presupposes P, which he finds in Exod 1:1–8, in language and substance in terms of Israel becoming numerous and strong.<sup>425</sup> True, the

---

who sees this material as earlier than Pg. With regard to texts in Numbers, specifically Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\* as part of Pg see above, §1.2.2.5.1; even those who maintain that the “P” material in these chapters in Numbers is a very late post-P redaction, see this material as later than their corresponding non-P material in Num 13–14 and Exod 17:1–7 upon which they build (even though not necessarily earlier than their Pg in Genesis and Exodus) (See, e.g., Römer, “Israel's Sojourn”).

423. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 465–69.

424. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 48–99.

425. Exod 1:8 is commonly attributed to non-P; see, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 19–20; Childs, *Exodus*, 7. Exodus 1:6 is also often attributed to non-P; see Childs, *Exodus*, 2, and the discussion above in §1.2.2.2. For Schmid's argument, see his *Genesis and the*

non-P material here (whether beginning in 1:8 or 1:9) lacks an introduction; but this is adequately accounted for by Carr in terms of either a non-P note regarding the growth and strength of the Israelites having been eliminated when P and non-P were combined or Exod 1:7 as a conflation of parallel P and non-P reports (since it contains P language of being fruitful and multiplying [see Gen 1:8; 9:6] and non-P language of becoming mighty). Therefore, I see no pressing reason to suppose that non-P in Exod 1 is later than P.<sup>426</sup>

With regard to Exod 3:1–4:18, arguments based on common motifs between this passage and P material, such as the transformation of the staff into a snake (Exod 4:2–4; see Exod 7:8–13 [P]) and changing of water into blood (Exod 4:9; see Exod 7:14–24\* [P]), do not per se provide solid evidence either for the dependence of non-P on P or vice versa.<sup>427</sup> The situation is similar in relation to the contrast between non-P and P where Exod 3:1–4:18 situates Moses's call at Horeb and Exod 6:2–12 in Egypt, which Schmid uses to argue that P here is therefore earlier than non-P.<sup>428</sup> Such details very likely simply reflect different theological nuances within

---

*Moses Story*, 139–44, and *Old Testament*, 80. See esp. Exod 1:7 (P) with its motifs of Israel becoming numerous and strong.

426. Schmid (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 140–43; *Old Testament*, 80–81) also argues that the genocide motif of Exod 1\* was not known to Exod 2:1–10, with the reason for placing Moses in a basket on the river being because Moses was illegitimate; however, this is not convincing, with the genocide motif forming the most obvious reason for hiding Moses.

427. Schmid (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 188–89; *Old Testament*, 82) argues that Exod 4:2–4, 9 presupposes P's plague cycle, but it could be just as easily argued that Pg has picked up these motifs from non-P in Exod 4 and reinterpreted them within Pg's own schema. Indeed, Thomas Dozeman ("The Commission of Moses and the Book of Genesis," in Dozeman, *Farewell to the Yahwist*, 118–22) has made a case for Exod 4:1–9 being earlier than P in Exod 7:8–13, 14–24\* based on observations regarding the differences between non-P in Exod 4:1–9 and the P parallels, and the way in which these differences from P in Exod 4:1–9 are an appropriate fit with non-P's exodus and wilderness accounts which are commonly seen as pre-P. Nor is the use of one word such as "cry out," found in P in Exod 2:23 and used in Exod 3:7, 9 (non-P), linked with themes in non-P material in Exod 1–2\*, an adequate reason for seeing Exod 3:7, 9 as presupposing Exod 2:23 as Schmid (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 187; *Old Testament*, 82) argues; one word is not sufficient evidence, and it could just as easily be argued that P took up this word from non-P in Exod 3:7, 9 and summarized the references to taskmasters and oppression in Exod 3:7, 9 by using the word slavery.

428. Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 186; Schmid, *Old Testament*, 82.

each of the wider contexts, with Exod 3:1–4:18 foreshadowing Exod 19–24\* (non-P) and 6:2–12 situating Moses's call more closely within its immediate context of the situation of slavery in Egypt and its foreshadowing of the exodus,<sup>429</sup> and as such it is hard to know on the basis of such an observation alone which is earlier and which is later.<sup>430</sup> Moreover, in relation to Schmid's argument that Exod 3–4\* is later than P in 6:2–12, given that in 3:18 YHWH states that the Israelites will listen to Moses's voice and then in Exod 4:1 Moses expresses his fear that they will not listen to him even before he has delivered the message, Exod 3–4\* has integrated problems that only arose in 6:9, 11 (P) where the Israelites refused to listen, the opposite could be argued. The unevenness perceived here between Exod 3:18; 4:1 could either be the result of different levels in the text where a number of objections on Moses's part are found, or it could be explained in terms of the intention of stressing the radical and unreasonable nature of Moses's objection in Exod 4:1 precisely because he has already been told that the Israelites will listen. Either way, it is quite reasonable to imagine that P in Exod 6:2–12 has tidied this up to present a more coherent account that puts Moses in a better light since Moses's objection in Exod 6:12 is reasonable, given that the Israelites actually have not listened. Both perspectives are possible, so this also is not helpful in trying to decide relative chronology or direction of dependence.

However, a solid case can be made for the P account in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–2 being later than, and dependent on, 3:1–4:18 (non-P), which centers on the theme of the prophetic roles of Moses and Aaron. This is based on form critical observations and the existence of blind motifs. Thomas Dozeman presents a convincing argument for seeing Exod 3–4\* (non-P) as earlier than 6:2–7:2 (P) based primarily on considerations of form, comparing the structures of each of the passages and interpreting them in the light of form critical research on the genre of the prophetic commis-

---

429. Note also the different schema between P and non-P in relation to the sea episode; as Childs (*Exodus*, 222–23) argues, in non-P the sea episode clearly belongs to the wilderness tradition, whereas in P the sea episode is connected closely with the exodus from Egypt (see Exod 14:1 where they are commanded to turn back), with Israel entering into the wilderness only after they have crossed the sea and the wilderness wanderings occurring after this.

430. Although, given that Exod 19–34\* (non-P) is commonly seen as pre-P, as admitted also by Schmid (*Old Testament*, 125–26), this perhaps tips the balance in favor of non-P's situating of the call of Moses at Horeb as earlier than P.



sion.<sup>431</sup> Of vital importance within the complex structure of Exod 3:1–4:18 are the form critical elements of a prophetic call narrative (commission, objection, reassurance, sign), which function in this text to express the commission and authority of Moses as rooted in the prophetic office. The prophetic imagery is carried through in relation to Aaron who also functions in a prophetic role (Exod 4:13–16). In the P account in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–2, there are also commission elements (6:6–8, 10) and an objection on Moses's part (6:12), but no sign, and the interplay between objection and reassurance so prominent in Exod 3–4\* (non-P) is much fainter, with the reassurance comprising the prophetic role of Aaron (6:12; 7:1–2) and no reassurance, as is typical, of God's presence (see Exod 3:12a; 4:12; and see Jer 1:8). Moses's objection that the pharaoh will not listen no longer functions, as in the typical prophetic call narrative genre as found in Exod 3–4\* (non-P), to show Moses's authority but is simply a logical extension from the fact that the Israelites did not listen to him. This indicates, so Dozeman concludes, that Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–2 (P) is later than Exod 3–4\* (non-P), with the Priestly author using the genre of prophetic call so central to Exod 3–4\* (non-P) in a "lexically reorganized and topically rethematized way."<sup>432</sup> Carr makes similar observations in support of seeing Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–2 (P) as later than, and dependent upon, Exod 3–4\* (non-P). Whereas the theme of Moses and Aaron as prophetic figures is integral in Exod 3–4\* (non-P) as seen through the elaboration of the prophetic call pattern in YHWH's commissioning of Moses, with echoes of Jeremiah's call narrative in describing Aaron's commissioning, in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–2 (P), apart from Aaron being commissioned in a similar way as Moses's prophet, prophetic elements so central in Exod 3–4\* are marginal.<sup>433</sup> Moses's objection in terms of being a poor speaker (Exod 6:12) and Aaron's prophetic status as an answer to this (7:1) are unmotivated in this context and therefore represent blind motifs, or faint echoes, of the fuller prophetic presentation of Moses and Aaron in Exod 3–4\*.<sup>434</sup> In light of the convincing arguments

---

431. Dozeman, "Commission of Moses," 111–17.

432. Ibid., 117, citing Michael Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [Oxford; Clarendon, 1985], 285).

433. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 142–43.

434. Ibid., 141, 143. Carr (141–42) also argues against the view that Exod 3–4\* (non-P) is a supplement to P on the grounds that doubling the introduction of Aaron and disagreements such as introducing Aaron after the signs (Exod 4\* [non-P]), whereas in P Aaron is involved in the signs, are not typical of later scribal supplementation.



of Dozeman and Carr, the non-P material in Exod 3–4\* will be taken here as pre-Priestly that is earlier than 6:2–12; 7:1–2.

A brief note is required regarding the material within Exod 7:8–11:10 that lies outside of the texts designated as Pg in 7:8–13, 19–20a, 21b–22; 8:1–3 (Eng. 5–7), 11b (Eng. 15b), 12–15 (Eng. 16–19); 9:8–12; 11:9–10. It will be assumed that the bulk of this non-P material is earlier than these Pg texts, in line with the majority of scholars.<sup>435</sup> The controversial texts, Exod 9:22–23a, 35; 10:12–13a, 20, 21–22, 27 may be earlier or later than Pg as noted above,<sup>436</sup> but their relative level is insignificant for our purposes since they do not form a direct parallel with the Pg texts as delineated here.<sup>437</sup> What is important is that the non-P texts that form a direct parallel to Pg, Exod 7:14–18, 20aβb–21a, 23–24 (Hebrew) (water to blood); 7:26–29; 8:4–11a (Hebrew) (frogs); 8:16–28 (Hebrew) (flies), can be taken as earlier than Pg.

Another brief note is in order with regard to one more text in this context, Exod 16\* (Pg) and its possible relation to parallel non-P material. Although traditionally remnants of an earlier non-P manna account have been identified, especially, for example, in 16:4–5 and in all or part of 16:27–31,<sup>438</sup> there is not enough evidence to clearly support this. I am inclined, therefore, to side with the view, held, for example, by E. Ruprecht, Maiberger, Aaron Scharf, Blum, and Schmidt, that P is the earliest layer

---

435. See, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 69–70; Childs, *Exodus*, 131; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 77–100, 104; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 286–92; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 190; Schmidt, *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung*, 80.

436. See esp. nn. 258.

437. This is also the case, e.g., in relation to the much debated text of Exod 10:21–27 (the plague of darkness) as a whole, which does not conform to the pattern of the other plagues in the non-P material nor to the pattern of the signs/plagues in the P material; for the contentious text of Exod 10:1b–2, attributed by some to a level earlier than P (see, e.g., Childs, *Exodus*, 173; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 87) but by others to a redactional level later than P (see, e.g., Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 126; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 395); and for various other verses within the non-P material that have been identified as later redaction by, e.g., Kohata (*Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 126) and Gertz (*Tradition und Redaktion*, 395). Since these texts do not form any direct parallels with the Pg material as delineated here, this is not of any significance for our purposes of exploring how Pg might have drawn on and reshaped earlier tradition and can remain an open question.

438. See Noth, *Exodus*, 132, 136; Childs, *Exodus*, 275; Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 87, 95; Coats, *Exodus 1–18*, 128; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 583–84; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 379; Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Texts.”

in this chapter that has later been supplemented (including with 16:4–5, 28–29).<sup>439</sup> Therefore, it will be taken here that there is no non-P parallel to Exod 16\* (Pg) within its present context. There is, however, another potential non-P parallel to Exod 16\* (Pg): Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34. Many scholars see this non-P material as earlier than P,<sup>440</sup> and this will be the position taken here. Although situated in a different context, it is quite possible that Pg took over motifs from this story in Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34, or it might be said even perhaps an earlier version of it in Num 11:4b, 10a, 13, 18–20aa, 21–24a, 31–32 and placed its own version pre-Sinai to make the point that Israel was nourished with the manna for the whole of the wilderness wandering.<sup>441</sup>

Since there is little debate regarding the rest of the non-P texts as earlier than their P counterparts in Genesis and Exodus and Num 13–14,<sup>442</sup> the position taken here is that these non-P texts, including those in Gen 2–11\*, Exod 1\*, and Exod 3–4\* are pre-Priestly.

Second, the view that the Genesis ancestral material was quite separate from the Moses material prior to Pg, who was the first to link patriarchal and exodus traditions,<sup>443</sup> needs to be addressed briefly since the implication is that the earlier non-P material did not consist of a sequential parallel account as a template for Pg's separate account. Since, Exod 3–4\* (non-P) is pre-P and this text contains links with the ancestral material (see Exod 3:6, 15), I am inclined to agree with Dozeman and Carr who maintain that Genesis and Exodus non-P material were linked prior to P.<sup>444</sup> I am

---

439. Ruprecht, "Stellung und Bedeutung"; Maiburger, *Manna*; Schart, *Moses und Israel im Konflikt*, 134; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 146–48; and Schmidt, "Priesterschrift in Exodus 16."

440. E.g., Noth, *Numbers*, 83; Budd, *Numbers*, 124; Levine, *Numbers 1–20*, 328; Davies, *Numbers*, 101–3; Thomas Dozeman, "Numbers," *NIB* 2:104–5; Knierim and Coats, *Numbers*, 177. Pace, e.g., Römer ("Israel's Sojourn," 434, 436) who sees Num 11 as post-P; i.e., he sees Num 11:4–35 as presupposing Exod 16 and Exod 18 and rereads these chapters from the perspective of postexilic prophecy.

441. Davies (*Numbers*, 102) follows Volkmar Fritz in dividing the narrative concerning the quail into two strands, an earlier positive tradition in Num 11:4b, 10a, 13, 18–20aa, 21–24a, 31–32, which was subsequently connected to another tradition concerned with the aetiology of *kibroth-hattaavah* in Num 11:4a, 10b, 20b, 33–34. On the general point, see Schmidt, "Priesterschrift–kein Ende," 496–97.

442. See n. 422.

443. For scholars who hold this position, see n. 421.

444. Dozeman, "Commission of Moses"; David Carr, "What Is Required to Iden-

therefore also inclined to agree with the view that sees non-P as an earlier sequential parallel account to Pg.<sup>445</sup> However, even if it were the case that Genesis and Exodus were not joined until Pg, this would not affect the following study of Pg significantly, since I intend to focus primarily on the story of the nation Israel in Pg, and the way in which the Pg material in Exodus and Numbers drew on the non-P material to present its own vision for the nation, with the Pg material in Genesis forming a backdrop to this.<sup>446</sup> Moreover, in seeking later to unfold the hermeneutics of Pg which will involve the way in which Pg might have reshaped non-P traditions,<sup>447</sup> it is not necessary to adhere precisely to the traditional view of the corresponding *sequential* non-P parallel account to Pg where non-P and P mirror each other with regard to an uninterrupted link between the Genesis and Exodus material. It is sufficient for our purposes to conclude that P knew and drew on earlier traditions as reflected in the non-P material at so many parallel points throughout, without making assumptions about the overall coherence of the corresponding non-P material *per se*.

---

tify Pre-Priestly Narrative Connections between Genesis and Exodus?" in Dozeman, *Farewell to the Yahwist*, 159–80; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 275–77. Much of the debate in relation to this issue revolves around the non-P material in Gen 50 (esp. 50:24–26) and Exod 1, as well as Exod 3–4\*, as to whether these texts are post-P or pre-P. Carr in his earlier article criticizes the methodology of using as evidence explicit forward and back references only, warning that "we should be wary of using connections in the Priestly material as our norm for evaluating connections in the non-P biblical traditions" ("What Is Required," 301). He argues for more subtle connections between non-P texts in Genesis and Exodus in terms of a network of similar motifs (167). However, in his later work (*Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 271, 278, 275–76), he identifies explicit connections between Gen 50:24–26 and Exod 1:8–9, seeing these texts as post-D additions and part of his non-Priestly post-D Hexateuchal composition, which he maintains is earlier than P and forms a parallel account to it: indeed "one of the major achievements of the post-D Hexateuchal composition was the establishment of a compositional connection between non-P materials in the ancestral history ... and the Moses story materials" (276).

445. See Carr (*Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 294), who states that P "created a counter-composition covering the same narrative scope and many (though not all) of the same events as the non-P Hexateuch."

446. I will be looking at the way in which Pg might have drawn on non-P material in Genesis only briefly, not in any detail, as this has been covered adequately, e.g., by Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 48–99).

447. See chs. 4 and 5.

In conclusion, the position taken here with regard to the relationship between Pg and non-P is that the corresponding non-P material is earlier than P and that Pg knew and was dependent, or drew, on, the earlier traditions reflected in non-P that parallels the Pg material at so many points throughout, to compose its own separate account.

#### 1.2.4. Dating

The difficulty of dating texts with no direct references to historical events, such as Pg, must be acknowledged from the outset. Attempts to date such texts, and Pg is no exception, are often based on suppositions as to what situation is best reflected, or is most suitable, with regard to perceptions of what this material is concerned to convey. Conclusions reached in this way are intrinsically tentative for two reasons. First, as Benjamin Sommer points out, the ideas within a text might be relevant or meaningful within a period of time other than when the text originated; and the ideas may be equally appropriate for some other time.<sup>448</sup> Second, this approach is necessarily circular at least to some extent in that how the text is interpreted can influence perceptions regarding dating and perceptions of dating can color how the text is interpreted. Thus the dating of Pg is colored to some extent by the particular interpretation of the overall meaning of Pg, and of particular elements within this, and the dating of Pg can influence how Pg as a whole and elements within it are interpreted.<sup>449</sup> Evidence such as

---

448. Benjamin Sommer, "Dating Pentateuchal Texts and the Perils of Pseudo-Historicism," in Dozeman, *Pentateuch: International Perspectives*, 86–108.

449. See Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 159. E.g., on the one hand, those who see the sanctuary and its cult in programmatic terms or as a vision for the future, date Pg in the exilic period, or those who date Pg in the exilic period and for whom the Sinai material is important in the interpretation of Pg tend to see the Sinai material as a plan for the future; see, e.g., Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 243; Clements, *God and Temple*, 109, 111, 121–22; Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 87, 92–93, 102; Fretheim, "Priestly Document," 313–29; Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuch*, 238; Klein, "Back to the Future," 274; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 137, 140; de Pury, "Jacob Story," 67–68. On the other hand, those who see the material in the Sinai pericope in terms of legitimation of something that is already existing, date Pg in the postexilic, i.e., Second Temple period, or those who date Pg in the postexilic period tend to interpret the Sinai material as a legitimation of the Second Temple; see, e.g., Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 259–61; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 614.

parallels in motifs to other biblical texts that are more easily dated is perhaps a little more solid, but ultimately any conclusions with regard to the dating of Pg are necessarily tentative.

In the debate regarding the dating of P, the primary divide is between Jewish/Israeli scholars who for the most part date P (and much of H/HS) in the preexilic period and North American and European scholars who date Pg to the exilic/early postexilic or postexilic, Second Temple, period.<sup>450</sup>

Those who argue for a preexilic date do so primarily on the basis of the legal and cultic material.<sup>451</sup> Moshe Weinfeld, for example, argues that ritual laws and the tabernacle material within P are early, that is, preexilic (with some traditions even premonarchical), by drawing constantly on early ancient Near Eastern parallels (such as Hittite and Ugaritic texts) as evidence for the antiquity of these texts.<sup>452</sup> This legal and cultic material, he maintains, reflects the reality of the First Temple, not the exile when there was no temple.<sup>453</sup> It is true that many of the laws are probably early, as are the tent/temple motifs; however, when the Priestly narrative, Pg, as a whole might have been put together is a different question. Weinfeld does not offer any arguments for dating in relation to the narrative material or P as a whole, so it is fallacious to suppose, as he does, that because some parts of P such as the laws and tent/tabernacle material reflect early traditions that the whole of Pg is also early. It is generally acknowledged that Pg incorporated earlier (preexilic) traditions in composing its account,<sup>454</sup> and because it is drawing on First Temple traditions it does not necessarily or logically follow that Pg as a whole was composed while the temple was still standing during preexilic times. As Carr comments, “any effort at dating their [the author(s) of P] work should be focused not on the material they

---

450. For a list of scholars pertaining to each of these periods, see n. 17.

451. Also linguistic arguments are used; see Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 159. For arguments against a preexilic dating on linguistic grounds see Joseph Blenkinsopp, “An Assessment of the Alleged Preexilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch,” *ZAW* 108 (1996): 495–518.

452. Weinfeld, *Place of the Law*.

453. *Ibid.*, 82. He also argues, against Wellhausen, that P is not later than D, but rather that their differences are due to them originating in different sociological circles in the First Temple period rather than because of different chronological settings; if one is older than the other, it is more likely that P is older than D, since it is more likely that there was a development from sacred to secular rather than vice versa; see *ibid.*, 80–82, 94, 121.

454. See, e.g., Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 294–96.

likely appropriated ... but on the connecting narrative and broader narrative frame that more likely originated with them.”<sup>455</sup> When Pg as a whole, and in particular its narrative frame, is considered, it seems more likely, as advocated by North American and European scholars,<sup>456</sup> that Pg was put together later, in the exilic/postexilic period, in the process of which various earlier traditions (such as temple and tent traditions) were drawn on and combined to present an overarching document. To this position we will now turn.

There is some point of contention between those who advocate a date in the vicinity of the exilic/postexilic period as to whether P (or Pg) should be dated to the exilic/early postexilic period (pre-520 BCE) or later in the postexilic, Second Temple, period.<sup>457</sup> However, the majority of North American and European scholars advocate an exilic/early postexilic (pre-520 BCE) date or at least admit P may date in that period at its earliest.<sup>458</sup> The main arguments that in my judgement tip the balance in favor of an exilic/early postexilic (pre-520 BCE) date are as follows.

First, there are significant parallels between Pg and Second Isaiah (Isa 40–55), which is exilic, and between Pg and Ezekiel, which is dated to the exilic/early postexilic period. The main parallel with Second Isaiah comprises an image of YHWH as an all-powerful cosmic creator who controls the nations (see esp. Pg in Exod 7–14\*). The parallels between Pg and Ezekiel include: the motif of “glory” (כבוד) to describe the divine manifestation, and the motif of the recognition of YHWH linked to the formula “I

---

455. Ibid., 296. See also Blum, “Issues and Problems,” 32.

456. See n. 17.

457. See n. 17. It should be noted that Vink (“Date and Origin”) does not differentiate levels in P and therefore does not adhere to an earlier level within P, i.e., Pg as such, and that Blum’s KP incorporates the non-P material (his KD) (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 333–60), and both these factors affect the dating of P/KP as late, i.e., in the Second Temple period. Van Seters (*Pentateuch*, 180, 183) also does not differentiate levels within his P redaction, and his late dating of this material depends on his model for the formation of the Pentateuch of an exilic J written as an introduction to an exilic DtrH, with J/DtrH then later being supplemented by the P material. Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 614) prefers a date in the first decade of the fifth century BCE, but leaves the door open for a slightly earlier date in stating that P is no earlier than the beginning of the Persian period.

458. See n. 17.

am YHWH” (אֲנִי יְהוָה).<sup>459</sup> Second, the motifs of Passover as celebrated within the family/clan (Exod 12:1–13) and the sanctuary as portable and related to the community rather than to a fixed place in the land appear to reflect most appropriately the exilic situation, or at least the diaspora.<sup>460</sup> Third, the emphasis in Pg’s account in Exod 7–14\* on the cosmic power of YHWH against whom the nations and their gods, symbolized by Egypt, are powerless, such that YHWH can (re)create the nation Israel by bringing them out of a foreign land to set them on a journey toward the promised land,<sup>461</sup> meshes most appropriately with the exilic situation. Finally, the Pg text in Num 13–14\* with its particular emphasis on the slandering of the land (by the surveyors, and colluded with by the people) as the reason for the death of that generation outside the land, but with the nation still under the promise, seems to reflect the situation of the late exilic or early postexilic period, when it was possible for the people to return to the land but there was resistance to it; this is supported by the parallel motif of slandering the land found in the exilic text Ezek 36:1–15.<sup>462</sup>

The tentative nature of this conclusion and the inherent circularity of some of the arguments still needs to be acknowledged, but overall an exilic/early postexilic (pre-520 BCE) dating seems the most credible view, as the majority of scholars maintain.<sup>463</sup>

---

459. See Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 138; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 160.

460. Pace Weinfeld (*Place of the Law*, 29) who argues that the Passover as a home sacrifice is earlier than the centralized offering in D (Deut 16).

461. For a fuller discussion of this, see ch. 4.

462. See Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 159–60. See also Elliger (“Sinn und Ursprung,” 141–43) who refers to the transparency of Num 13–14; 20\* (P) to the exilic situation, where the old generation has died in the wilderness and the new generation is yet to come into the promised land. Clearly, perceptions of the extent of Pg also have a bearing on views of dating, since this argument is not valid if these texts from Numbers are not included in Pg. And the open-ended nature of Pg if it concludes in Num 27\* with the people still outside the land but the land promise still there for future generations reflects well the exilic situation; this is not so much the case if Pg is seen to extend into Joshua. Since I have included Numbers 13–27\* (P) and perceive the end of Pg in Num 27\*, this tends to support the view of an exilic date.

463. See n. 17. See Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 160–61 for further arguments for an early postexilic date. Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 137 n. 46) points to the difficulty of distinguishing between exilic/early postexilic and the Second Temple period texts since, “the postexilic period is characterized by successive waves of exiles returning to Judah and an effort culminating in Nehemiah and Ezra



## 1.2.5. Conclusions

In summary, the parameters within which our discussion will take place are as follows. It is maintained that there once existed a coherent Priestly narrative (Pg), that was originally an independent, that is separate, document, and this will be the focus of the following analysis. Pg comprises the texts in Genesis delineated by Noth in *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*<sup>464</sup> and the following texts in Exodus and Numbers: Exod 1:1–5, 7, 13–14; 2:23aβb–25; 6:2–12; 7:1–13, 19, 20aα, 21b, 22; 8:1–3 (Hebrew) ... 11aβb–15 (Hebrew); 9:8–12; 11:9–10; 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41; 14:1–4, 8, 9aβb, 15aαb, 16–18, 21aαb, 22–23, 26, 27aα, 28–29; 15:22\*, 27; 16:1, 2–3, 6–7, 9–15, 21, 35\*; 17:1abα; 19:1, 2a; 24:15b–18a; 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34; Num 10:11–13\*; 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38; 20:1a, 2, 3b, 4, 6, 7,

---

to reorganize life in postexilic Judah in accordance with the insights ... stemming from the exile. This means that there is a substantial continuity between exile and the importation of exilic perspectives into postexilic Judah.” What is important here, then, is that an exilic perspective lies behind Pg. Klein (“Message of P,” 58) makes a similar point when he states that “what we call post-exilic would still be exilic, as far as many of the theological, social, political, and other problems are concerned.” See also the comment, along a slightly different line, by Lohfink (“Priestly Narrative,” 148 n. 33) that “since in essence the address is to a diaspora that is already in a position to return home, but hesitates to do so, even later situations for the writing are conceivable.” An exilic/early postexilic (pre-520 BCE) dating and mentality will be assumed in applying Pg’s perceived hermeneutics especially to the story of the nation of Israel in chs. 4 and 5, and it will be speculated as to how Pg might have functioned for an exilic audience in ch. 6; however, given this blurring between exile and postexile in terms of perspective, further questions could be raised as to whether and how, given the genre and hermeneutics of Pg (see ch. 3), Pg might have functioned for later generations, including Second Temple Yehud. It should also be noted, however, that, although the sociopolitical situation of the early Persian period may be reflected in Pg (see, e.g., Gen 10\* [P]), an examination of this sociopolitical situation in concrete and specific terms, and how Pg might potentially reflect and interact with it, lies outside the scope of this study; this is partly because of the nature, that is genre and hermeneutics, of this material (see ch. 3); see the comment by Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 129).

464. I.e., Gen 1:1–2:4a; 5:1–28, 30–32; 6:9–22; 7:6, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; 8:1, 2a, 3b–5, 7, 13a, 14–19; 9:1–17, 28–29; 10:1–7, 20, 22–23, 31–32; 11:10–27, 31–32; 12:4b, 5; 13:6, 11b, 12aβa; 19:29; 16:1a, 3, 15, 16; 17:1–27; 21:1b–5; 23:1–20; 25:7–11a, 12–17, 19–20 ... 26b; 26:34–35; 27:46–28:9 ... ; 31:18aβb; 33:18a; 35:6, 9–13a, 15, 22b–29; 36:1–14; 37:1, 2aαb ... 41:46a ... ; 46:6, 7; 47:27b, 28; 48:3–6; 49:1a, 29–33; 50:12–13.



8αα\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12, 22b, 23αα, 25–29; 22:1; 27:12–14. Pg knew and was dependent, or drew on, the corresponding non-P material, that is, the earlier traditions reflected in non-P material that parallels the P material at so many points throughout, to compose its own separate account. Pg incorporated other earlier material and traditions into its account. Pg most likely dates to the exilic/early postexilic (pre-520 BCE) period.

### 1.3. TASK AND APPROACH

The aim of this study is to explore in depth the issue of the overall meaning of Pg as defined here, as an originally separate exilic/early postexilic (pre-520 BCE) document extending from Gen 1 to Num 27\*, that knew and drew on the earlier parallel traditions reflected in the non-P material to compose its own account, as well as incorporating other earlier traditions within itself.<sup>465</sup>

This will involve building on past insights regarding the structure, shape, and interrelation of key elements within Pg and attempts to interpret its theological horizon as a whole. In particular, it will involve seeking to move in the direction of those who have sought to integrate the Sinai material and the narrative frame with its land promise,<sup>466</sup> but to go beyond their brief discussions to explore in more depth what it might be that makes sense of the material of which Pg is constituted as a whole. The means of doing this, and of opening up a fresh perspective, in a way that integrates all of Pg’s dimensions within a coherent theological and hermeneutical horizon, seems to me to lie in investigating in detail the nature of Pg in terms of its

---

465. In restricting the investigation of the meaning of Pg as a whole to this particular model with regard to the definition, nature, extent, and dating of Pg, I am not claiming to be able to reach any absolute conclusions regarding P’s overall meaning and function *per se*; it is of course quite possible to explore P’s theological horizon based on different conclusions with regard to the texts to be included, particularly in relation to its extent, whether or not P is, as a whole or in part, redactional, and the context of the original audience. However, as argued here, there are solid reasons in favor of the parameters set up here. Moreover, although somewhat circular, if some overall sense of Pg as defined here can be unfolded, i.e., all of its dimensions can be accounted for within a coherent horizon of meaning that functions meaningfully for its supposed original audience, this would go some way in supporting this particular model of Pg.

466. See above §1.1.2.3.

genre and hermeneutics, particularly its hermeneutics of (liturgical) time, and to seek to interpret the key features and shape of Pg in light of this.

The genre and hermeneutics of P as a key to the overall interpretation of P (Pg) has not as yet received enough attention. There has been some discussion of the generic nature of P, but on the whole there has been little attempt, beyond tantalizing allusions, to use observations regarding the nature of the Pg material, its genre and hermeneutics, in order to try to make sense of the meaning of the shape and interrelation of the elements within Pg as a whole.<sup>467</sup> This is what I propose to do. Using Pg's generic and hermeneutical nature as a key to the interpretation of Pg as a whole, I will seek to open up how this material overall, with its distinctive shape and interrelation of key features, of Sinai material and narrative frame, functions hermeneutically within an overall theological horizon, and how it might therefore have impacted its readers.

The discussion will proceed in the following manner. Chapter 2 will outline the shape and structure of Pg in terms of its content and how its key elements interrelate and function within the structure and trajectory of Pg as a whole, sequentially and in terms of its parallel pattern. Chapter 3 will explore the genre and hermeneutics of the material making up Pg and in particular its "historiographical" and "paradigmatic" nature, central to

---

467. On the genre of P, see, e.g., Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative"; David Damrosch, *The Narrative Covenant: Transformations of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Traditions* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 261–97; Frank Gorman, *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology*, JSOTSup 91 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990); Gorman, "Priestly Rituals of Founding: Time, Space, and Status," in *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honor of John H. Hayes*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, William P. Brown, and Jeffrey K. Kuan, JSOTSup 173 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 47–64. See ch. 3 for a discussion of the attempts that have been made in exploring the genre and hermeneutics of P.

For examples of these tantalizing allusions, see, e.g., Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 284, 286; Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 68, 104–9; Fritz, "Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift"; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 330–31; Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung"; John Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 5; Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 161–62, 163–64, 171, 174, 183; Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 129, 132, 139–40. See ch. 3 for a discussion of these views.

The primary exception to this general statement is Norbert Lohfink's seminal article, "The Priestly Narrative and History," where this is the central focus. This article will form a helpful starting point, but, as will be seen in ch. 3, the discussion will move beyond it to different conclusions.

which is its hermeneutics of time as akin to liturgical time. This will open up a way of approaching the content of Pg as outlined in chapter 2 in such a way as to take seriously its generic and hermeneutical nature as a key to interpreting its main elements and details as they interact within the structure and trajectory of Pg.

The application of this approach, which takes seriously both the structure and the interrelation of Pg's key elements (ch. 2) and the way in which these are expressed through its genre and hermeneutics (ch. 3), will be the focus of the rest of the monograph (chs. 4–6). In interpreting the details of the text of Pg in light of its genre and hermeneutics, the focus will be primarily on the Pg material regarding the story of the nation, Exod 1–Num 27\*. Within the limits of this study, the Pg material in Genesis will be discussed only briefly, primarily in its capacity in forming the backdrop to the story of the nation in Exod 1–Num 27\*, in setting up the trajectory for the whole story of the nation, and in terms of its parallels to the story of the nation (see ch. 2). This is because the way in which consideration of the genre and hermeneutics of Pg affects its interpretation is seen most clearly in Exod 1–Num 27\*, and it is this section, albeit interpreted against the backdrop of Pg in Gen 1–9; 10–11\* and Gen 11–50\*, that would appear to have the greatest impact on Pg's audience. Moreover, enough can be gleaned from the detailed exploration of Exod 1–Num 27\* (Pg), against the backdrop of Gen 1–9; 10–11\* and Gen 11–50\* (Pg), to be able to draw some solid conclusions regarding the interpretation of Pg overall and how it might have functioned for its readers.<sup>468</sup>

Chapter 4 will interpret the main scenarios within Exod 1–Num 27\* in light of its generic and hermeneutical nature and in particular its “paradigmatic” nature. The first section will focus on Exod 7–14\*, the centerpiece of which is the Passover ritual in Exod 12:1, 3–13, which is framed by narrative in Exod 7–11\* and Exod 14\*. The second section will focus on Exod 16–Num 27\*, the centerpiece of which is the Sinai material comprising the ritual material of the tabernacle and its cult (Exod 19–40\*), which is framed by narrative in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*. Exodus 1–7\* as the programmatic introduction to the whole of Exod 7–Num 27\* will then be considered, before looking at

---

468. In addition, the way in which the Pg material parallels and has drawn on and reshaped, the non-P material in Genesis, which will form part of our approach (see the discussion in ch. 3) has already received a good deal of attention; see in particular Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 48–99.

the combination of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* as a whole. In each of these sections, the details of the texts, including the way in which they parallel and interact with each other, as they are interpreted in light of Pg's hermeneutics, will be unfolded. This will illustrate clearly how approaching the interpretation of Pg by taking seriously its genre and hermeneutics makes sense of, and throws light on, the key elements of this material. Interpreting these scenarios in this way is the first step toward understanding what Pg as a whole might have been concerned to portray and how it might have functioned for its readers.

Chapter 5 will then set the scenarios analyzed in terms of our hermeneutical approach, and in particular their paradigmatic nature, in chapter 4 within the structure and trajectory of Pg as a whole (as outlined in ch. 2), thus taking seriously not only Pg's paradigmatic nature but also its historiographical nature. The context of these scenarios in terms of their sequence along the trajectory set up in in Gen 12–50\* (Pg) and as paralleling their backdrop in Gen 1–9, 10–11\* (Pg) will illuminate their interpretation further. In addition, our hermeneutical approach will be here applied, beyond the scenarios (as analyzed in ch. 4), to Pg's trajectory as a whole, and its parallels, such that the whole of Pg's historiographic trajectory will be shown to be paradigmatic.

Chapter 6 will address the impact Pg might have had, or how it might have been intended to functioned for, its original exilic/early postexilic audience, cognitively, existentially, and in terms of praxis, and will also raise the question as to whether and how, given its genre and hermeneutics, Pg might function for later generations. In so doing, this chapter will draw together in an integrated way what has been discovered in the preceding chapters concerning the interpretation and meaning of Pg as a whole in light of its genre and hermeneutics of time.

It is hoped that in this way some fresh light will be thrown not only on the hermeneutics of Pg and its theological horizon overall but also its function for its readers.

## THE STRUCTURE OF PG

Various views regarding the structure of P as a whole have been proposed. All have a certain merit, not least because the P narrative material seems to contain a number of structural markers or characteristics that do not necessarily all point in the same direction or indicate the same structure.<sup>1</sup> These will become clear in the following selective survey of attempts at structuring P, as will the way in which each view gives importance to selective characteristic(s). In exploring these various views, it must be kept in mind that the delineation of Pg by the various scholars may not coincide exactly with Pg as delineated in chapter 1. Nevertheless, this survey will bring to light some valuable insights that will be taken up in the formulation of a proposed structure for Pg as defined in chapter 1; and this will form a working hypothesis on which our investigation of Pg's overall theological and hermeneutical meaning will be based.

### 2.1. ATTEMPTS AT STRUCTURING PG

#### 2.1.1. Survey of Views

Blenkinsopp, who sees P as extending into Joshua,<sup>2</sup> proposes a three-part structure for his P, marked by the completion of three successive stages: the creation of the world (concluding in Gen 2:1–3); the construction of the sanctuary (concluding in Exod 40:33, and see Exod 39:32); and the establishment of the sanctuary in the land and the division of the

---

1. E.g., the genealogies, the two covenants (with Noah and Abraham respectively), the use and revelation of the different divine names (Elohim, El Shaddai, YHWH), the parallels between the creation (Gen 1:1–2:3) and the Sinai sanctuary.

2. Including Josh 4:9, 19; 5:10–12; 9:15–21; 11:15, 20; 14:1–5; 18:1; 19:51; 21:1–8; 22:10–34; 24:33.

land between the tribes (concluding in Josh 18:1; 19:51).<sup>3</sup> He bases this view primarily on the formula regarding the finishing of work (Gen 1:1, 2; Exod 39:32; 40:33; Josh 19:51), and the structural correspondences he sees between these successive stages.<sup>4</sup> The correspondences between the creation and the construction of the sanctuary comprise the linguistic parallels between Gen 1:31; 2:1–3; and Exod 39:32,43; 40:33 in terms of God/Moses “seeing,” “finishing,” and “blessing”; and the reference to “spirit” in Gen 1:2 and Exod 35:31. In addition, the flood shows parallels with the construction of the sanctuary in that, both in relation to Noah building the ark and the construction of the sanctuary, the execution formula is used (Gen 6:22; Exod 39:42), and in both the emergence of the new world after the flood and the setting up and dedication of the sanctuary occurs on the first day of the liturgical year (Gen 8:13; Exod 40:2). Moreover, the flood to the construction of the sanctuary arc in P represents the equivalent to the cosmogonic victory of the deity resulting in the building of a temple in ancient Near Eastern myths (e.g., Enuma Elish). The correspondences between the creation and the establishment of the sanctuary in the land comprise the command to **כבש** the land (Gen 1:28) and its fulfillment (Josh 18:1, **כבש**) and the finishing of work formula (Gen 2:2; Josh 19:51; see Exod 39:32; 40:33). Blenkinsopp relies primarily, therefore, on parallels in language, but also motifs, as well as the ancient Near East mythological pattern, to support his structure of three successive stages.

Lohfink, who also sees Pg extending into Joshua, sees the “most comprehensive division, defining the structure of the whole work” in terms of ten major sections, each one defined in terms of being introduced by the *toledoth* formula.<sup>5</sup> The sections therefore are marked by Gen 2:4 (functioning as a concluding formula to Gen 1:1–2:3); 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1; 37:2.<sup>6</sup> The ten sections are of differing length, with the last one that begins with Gen 37:2 (the Jacob *toledoth*) introducing the rest of the text of Pg until (since his Pg extends into Joshua) the entry into Canaan.

---

3. Blenkinsopp, “Structure of P” esp. 278.

4. Ibid., 280–86, 289–90, 299.

5. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative.” Lohfink sees Pg as including Josh 4:9\*; 5:10–12; 14:1, 2\*; 18:1; 19:51 (ibid., 145 n. 29). Quotation from ibid., 151.

6. Ibid., 151 n. 38. Lohfink cites the article by Peter Weimar (“Die Toledot-Formel in der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung,” *BZ* 18 [1974]: 65–93) in this connection.

He sees this tenth part as subdivided into sections by the (eight) notices of wandering (or itineraries), with each of these notices concluding a section and leading to the next, which occurs in a different place.<sup>7</sup> Therefore Lohfink sees the overall structure of his Pg as defined by the occurrences of the *toledoth* formula as the primary structural signal and indeed states that he explicitly rejects, as signals for the division of the narrative, the covenants in Gen 9 and 17, as well as the differences in the name of God within Pg (and therefore a threefold structure for Pg).<sup>8</sup>

However, in exploring the genre and meaning of Pg overall in the rest of the article, Lohfink's observations would seem to imply a different structure, and within this the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants have an important role. True, his observations that Gen 1:28 constitutes "a kind of program for history whose realization or non-realization is then confirmed from time to time in the course of the narrative" and that "the history described in Pg is shaped into a sequence by which one can locate every point clearly in time and space" can be linked to the unfolding of the *toledoth* sections and the itineraries according to his perceived overarching structure.<sup>9</sup> The command to be fruitful and multiply reaches its fulfillment in Israel in Exod 1:7,<sup>10</sup> and although Lohfink does not make the explicit link here, this point is reached by way of the *toledoth* formulas and the genealogies some of them introduce. The command to fill the earth is first approached in the table of nations (Gen 10\*) and then further unfolded by way of the wandering notices.<sup>11</sup> However, when, in the context of exploring the genre of Pg, he parallels it with the Atrahasis myth, a different structure for Pg seems to emerge or is at least implied. For Lohfink, the movement from the dynamic/restless phase to the stable phase in the Atrahasis myth is paralleled in Pg twofold: first in the creation–flood to the first stabilization phase after the flood; then in another dynamic period in which humanity (exemplified in Israel) must grow to its proper number and take possession of the land, with the achievement of which stability is reached.<sup>12</sup> In particular, within the second dynamic phase, he sees in the sin of the people and Moses and Aaron in Num

---

7. Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 151, 153

8. Ibid., 154 n. 42.

9. Ibid., 154.

10. Ibid., 166–67.

11. Ibid., 154 n. 43, and see 167.

12. Ibid., 170.

13–14\* and 20\* respectively a catastrophe that echoes or parallels the flood of the first dynamic phase.<sup>13</sup> The Noahic covenant is linked with the stability of the world itself—the first (postflood) stable phase—and the covenant with Abraham is seen as that which ensures the reaching of the second stable phase: “The stability of the world, which God has brought to its perfected form in two stages, is guaranteed by the double covenant.”<sup>14</sup> These remarks would seem to strongly imply a two part structure: part 1 comprises creation–flood and postflood, with the flood as the dynamic phase and the postflood world as the stable phase with the Noahic covenant as guaranteeing the stability of that world; and part 2 comprises a dynamic phase consisting of the story of humanity, exemplified in Israel, as they multiply and move toward the land, which reaches its stable phase, guaranteed by the Abrahamic covenant, when these goals are finally achieved. Although Lohfink does not define precisely where the first part ends and the second part begins, his comments in this article seem to imply that the first part ends with Gen 9\* and the second part begins with Gen 10\*.<sup>15</sup>

---

13. Ibid., 171. He also notes that the plagues and Sea of Reeds could also be linked with this, i.e., as paralleling the flood. Lohfink explored these narratives of sin and punishment, i.e., the flood narrative and the sin of the people and their leaders in an earlier article (“Original Sin in the Priestly Historical Narrative”), and then again in a later article (“The Strata of the Pentateuch and the Question of War,” esp. 202–4), where he includes also the sin and punishment of the Egyptians in Exod 1–14. He sees these sin and punishment narratives as related, and the observations in these articles can be used to support the echoing or paralleling of the sin and punishment of the Egyptians, the Israelite people, and their leaders, Moses and Aaron, in the second dynamic phase with the sin and punishment of humanity and all flesh in the first dynamic phase. Lohfink’s student, McEvenue (*Narrative Style*, 123) also compares the P account in Num 13–14 with the flood: in both no attempt is made to explain the sin; death is the result in both cases; they both end an era, the flood ends the era of creation and Num 13–14\* ends an era of promise and blessing; and, in relation to the flood where Noah and his family and animals remain alive, in Num 13–14\* Joshua and Caleb (and eventually Eleazar, Num 20:25–28) remain alive.

14. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 171.

15. Lohfink unfolds this two-part structure also in a later article, “God the Creator and the Stability of Heaven and Earth: The Old Testament on the Connection between Creation and Salvation,” esp. 120–25. In a similar way, he notes that alongside the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants that “guarantee the world’s stability” there is a forward-thrusting dynamic (121), which has to do with human and animal deviation from the God-given order of things (123) but is also within “a narrative scheme



In sum, although Lohfink explicitly adheres to a ten-part structure based on the occurrences of the *toledoth* formula, with the last section subdivided in terms of the itineraries, other comments in terms of a two-fold movement from a dynamic to a stable phase, first in relation to the world and second in relation to humanity exemplified in Israel, suggest a different, that is, two-part, structure. Moreover, in formulating this two-fold movement, the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants are important in relation to the first and second parts respectively, as are parallels noted between the sin and punishment of the flood and the sins and punishments found in the dynamic phase of the second section (in Exod 1–14\* [the Egyptians] but especially Num 13–14\*; 20\*). These two different, or even competing, structures that are contained within Lohfink's thought in a rather unintegrated way, would seem to arise out of, and point toward, the fact that in Pg there is both: a linear trajectory, indicated, for example, by the series of *toledoth* formula notices and the itineraries; and significant parallels, especially between the cosmic material and the portrayal of the people of Israel. How these might interact with each other will be an important issue in our seeking to fathom Pg's structure.

Zenger, who at least in this earlier work sees Pg as extending to Deut 34\* and includes part of Leviticus, especially Lev 9\*, proposes a two-part

---

according to which by way of a series of critical and dynamic situations a kind of final compromise is achieved that leads to stable relationships" (123). Moreover, "This structure is even repeated two successive times in the priestly writing, once for the fabric of the world itself, and again for the world's population" (123). Lohfink goes on to describe the content of each part more precisely. In the first part, violence causes the good world to be in a decaying condition and this is brought to its conclusion by the flood (123–24). After the flood, there is a compromise, "a second-best world order" (124), but one made stable by the giving of the Noahic covenant. In the second dynamic phase, humanity, now at a new beginning, "must multiply, expand, and enter, nation by nation, into the places planned for them by God," according to God's plan for creation in Gen 1:28 (124). This is then described as it applies in the people of Israel as an example. And so, the blessing of fruitfulness is concluded in Exod 1:7, but since the people of Israel are slaves in Egypt "a new dynamic and a new instability arises," which leads to their deliverance and journey through the wilderness to the edge of the land, with complications along the way because of the sin of the people (124). Stability is reached with their life in the land under a revised (priestly) leadership structure (125). This confirms that, although Lohfink does not define exactly in terms of chapter and verse the division between the first and second parts, it would seem to occur, in accordance with his description here, between Gen 9\* and Gen 10\*.

macrostructure for Pg.<sup>16</sup> The first part, Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\*, is held together by the ten *toledoth* notices, the last one being that of Jacob in Gen 37:2. These *toledoth* formulas, which form the narrative connection throughout this section, are related to the blessing of multiplying in Gen 1:28 and the promise of the multiplying of the descendants of Abraham and Jacob (Gen 17:1–6; 35:11), and denote the passing on of God-given life. This first part provides the foundation for the second part. The second part, Exod 1:13–Deut 34:9\*, Israel's national story, is held together by the series of topographical and chronological notices that unfold the land promise. This journey of Israel is further subdivided into three stages: Israel under the power of the Egyptians (Exod 1:13–14:29\*; see the chronological notice in Exod 12:40, 41); Israel under the lordship of YHWH at Sinai (Exod 16:1–Lev 9:24\*; see the chronological and itinerary notices in Exod 16:1; 19:1; 40:17); and Israel in the wilderness moving toward the promised land (Num 10:11–Deut 34:9\*; see the chronological and itinerary notices in Num 10:11–12; 20:1, 22). The division of Pg into two major sections (Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\* and Exod 1:13–Deut 34:9\*) is further supported by the designation of God and by the use of certain key words. In the first section, God is called Elohim and El Shaddai, and in the second section God is known by the name YHWH. In the first section, Elohim blesses the creation and the new creation (Gen 1:28; 9:1,7) and gives the Noahic covenant, and El Shaddai gives the Abrahamic covenant and blesses both, Abraham and his descendants, and Jacob and his descendants. In the second section, the key expression is YHWH's glory: in the first stage of the exodus, YHWH creates glory over the gods of Egypt; in the second stage at Sinai, YHWH's glory appears and is present in the midst of the people; and in the third stage in the wilderness, moving toward the promised land, YHWH's glory guides them and is active in their midst. Zenger justifies beginning the second major section with Exod 1:13 by arguing that Exod 1:13–14; 2:24–25; 6:2–8 signals a new introduction in a three-part exposition: in Exod 1:13–14 the slavery and in particular the bitter life stands in contrast with, and represents a disintegration of, the blessing of the first part (Gen 1:28–30; 17:6; 35:11), and the Egyptian situation is introduced; Exod 2:24 signals a new phase of relationship between God and Israel as a consequence of the Abrahamic covenant of the first part; and in Exod 6:2–8 there is the revelation of the name YHWH and the

---

16. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, esp. 137–42.

promises still left open from the Abrahamic covenant are restated and the outline of the story horizon of what is to follow is outlined.

Zenger also outlines parallels between the second part (Exod 1:13–Deut 34:9\*) and the first part (Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\*).<sup>17</sup> Exodus 1–14\* has parallels with the flood and Noahic covenant in that the Egyptian acts of violence are implicitly paralleled with the violence of all flesh that led to the flood; God steps in to deliver Israel, as he delivered Noah, in order to preserve the Noahic covenant; and the Egyptians' demise is through being covered with water, which parallels the flood. The deliverance of Israel through walking on dry land in the midst of the sea parallels the creation account in Gen 1:9. The Sinai account has the following parallels with Gen 1–11\*: the Sabbath motif in Exod 16\* (which he includes) parallels the seven-day creation account. The instructions given for the sanctuary on the seventh day (Exod 24:16–18) parallels the seventh day in Gen 2:2–3, and there are linguistic parallels of “seeing” and “blessing” between the construction of the sanctuary and the creation account (Exod 39:43; Gen 1:31; 2:3a). Given this, and since the sanctuary constructed by Israel is that of the model shown to Moses by God, the building of the sanctuary represents the completion of creation, and humankind made in the image of God (Gen 1:26) becomes the medium of the divine power of reality. The seven-day structure of Lev 9:1–24 (which he includes) also parallels the creation account. Exodus 40:17, the setting up of the tabernacle on New Year's Day, parallels the end of the flood that occurs on New Year's Day (Gen 8:13a), and this reflects the connection in ancient Near Eastern myths of the creator God overcoming the waters of chaos (in this case symbolized in the flood and the defeat of the Egyptians) with the erection of a sanctuary. The execution formula in Exod 39:32 in relation to the sanctuary parallels that in Gen 6:22 in relation to the ark. The motif of YHWH's “glory” (כבוד) in both the Sinai material and the wilderness material after Sinai (Exod 40:34; Lev 9:23; Num 14:10; 20:6) parallels the “bow” in relation to the Noahic covenant (Gen 9:13–14). The allusion by Joshua and Caleb to the very good land in Num 14:7 is a citation of Gen 1:31; and the surveyors' description of the land as devouring its inhabitants radically calls into question Gen 1:1–2:3, where the earth/land is the place where humankind can live. Finally, the judgment on sin (death) in Num 13–14\*; 20\* recalls the judgment of the flood.

---

17. Ibid., 167–76.

In sum, Zenger bases his view of the structure of Pg as comprising two major parts (Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\* and Exod 1:13–Deut 34:9\*) on the series of *toledoth* formula notices in the first part and itinerary and chronological notices in the second part, the different designations of God and key words or motifs characterizing the two sections, and the parallels between them. It should be noted, however, that these parallels are between Exod 1–Deut 34\* and Gen 1–11\* specifically, rather than with the whole of the first section (Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\*).

Weimar proposes a similar structure to that of Zenger.<sup>18</sup> The first part of Pg comprises Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\* and is structured by the series of *toledoth* formulas that function to show the fulfillment of the blessing in Gen 1:28, which reaches its conclusion in Exod 1:7. The second part (after Exod 1:7 and thus Exod 1:13–Deut 34:9\*) has as its subject the sons of Israel and is structured by means of a system of wandering notices. Three wandering notices occur before the appearance of YHWH's glory at Sinai (Exod 12:41; 16:1; 19:1) and three occur after (Num 10:11, 12b; 20:1; 20:22b). The former three all refer to the exodus and trace the way from Egypt up to Sinai; the latter three trace the way from Sinai to the edge of the land. In this way, they trace a narrative movement that coincides with three parts, Exodus–Sinai–gift of the land, which highlights Sinai as the turning point. Chronological notices constitute another, though less significant, structuring device; these complement the wandering notices in the second main section, and in the first section in a different form are subordinated to the *toledoth* structure.

In a later article, Weimar focuses on what he sees as a narrative arc within Pg in terms of the promise to be their God, and on the parallels between the second part, in particular the Sinai material, and the creation

---

18. Weimar, "Struktur und Komposition." This article builds on an earlier one by Weimar ("Toledot-Formel") in which he argues that the *toledoth* formula is the leitmotif or principal system of the first part of Pg that ends in Exod 1:7. He argues that these *toledoth* formulas introduce new topics within the first part and that those associated with the creation and Jacob stories are linked with the theme of blessing (being fruitful and multiplying), but the *toledoth* of Terah marks the introduction of Abraham in relation to whom the leitmotif is the covenant. With the end of the Jacob story the promise of multiplying, unfolded by the *toledoth* formulas, has been fulfilled and Israel is a people (Exod 1:7). After this, the *toledoth* formula loses its function so that what ensues is something different, but what that is he does not address. This article was influential on Lohfink (see n. 6), and since it is earlier than Zenger's book (*Gottes Bogen*) forms a precursor to it.

and flood.<sup>19</sup> The narrative arc begins in Gen 17:7–8, where the promise to be their God is the essential goal of the Abrahamic covenant, and ends with Exod 29:45–46, where God's dwelling in their midst is the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant, with the promise repeated in between in Exod 6:7a.<sup>20</sup> He claims that in the promise to be their God "lies the inner point on which everything turns of the whole Priestly construction."<sup>21</sup> The parallels he notes between the Sinai material and the creation and flood are similar to those noted by Zenger: the parallel of the six days plus the seventh in Exod 24:16 and Gen 1:1–2:3; the linguistic parallels of "seeing" and "blessing" between Exod 39:43 and Gen 1:31a; 2:3; the parallel of New Year's Day for the erection of the sanctuary (Exod 40:17) and the drying of the waters as the beginning of the "new creation" (Gen 8:13); the parallel of the execution of the task of constructing the sanctuary in Exod 39:32b (and see Exod 39:43; 40:17) and the ark in Gen 6:22; and the "glory of YHWH," which links together the Sinai material (Exod 16:10; Exod 24:15–16; 40:34; Lev 9:23 [which he includes]), as a parallel to the bow or glory of YHWH in the clouds in relation to the Noahic covenant (Gen 9:13–14).<sup>22</sup> Moreover, the motif of "glory" is linked also with the exodus (Exod 16:6–7; and see Exod 14\*) and is therefore related to the creation of the people, which is completed at Sinai, all of which therefore link back to Gen 9:13–14. In short, "deliberate paralleling of the creation of the world (creation and flood) and the creation of 'the people of YHWH' (Exodus and Sinai) give P its inner sense."<sup>23</sup>

Therefore, for Weimar, like Zenger, the *toledoth* formula notices and the wandering notices are the key structural markers, and the parallels between the creation/flood material and the exodus/Sinai material are also significant. However, Weimar stresses over and above Zenger the arc in terms of the promise to be their God extending from the Abrahamic covenant, Gen 17:7–8, through Exod 6:7a to Exod 29:45–46. The question still remains, however, as to how the structural elements related to the linear trajectory (in this case the *toledoth* and itinerary notices and the arc in terms of the promise to be their God) interrelate with the observed parallels, here between Gen 1–9\* and Exod 1–40\*.

---

19. Weimar, "Sinai und Schöpfung."

20. Ibid., 356–57.

21. Ibid., 357.

22. Ibid., 365–72, and see 380–83.

23. Ibid., 385.

Odil Steck is critical of the structure proposed by Zenger and Weimar, where the primary division is between Exod 1:7 and Exod 1:13–14, and proposes a different two-part structure.<sup>24</sup> He maintains that the first section cannot end in Exod 1:7 since the Abrahamic covenant contains not only the multiplying aspect in Gen 1:28 in the promise of descendants (Gen 17:2, 4, 6), but also its aspect of filling the land in the promise of land possession (Gen 17:8), with both reiterated in the patriarchal material (Gen 35:11, 12; 48:4), and Exod 1:7 only fulfills the promise of multiplying/descendants. The land promise of the Abrahamic covenant is not fulfilled in Exod 1:7, which only refers to the land of Egypt, but is taken up in the material that follows from Exod 6:2–8 onward. Therefore, if the section is concluded with Exod 1:7, there is a surplus not accounted for in terms of the promise of the possession of the land in Gen 17:8 (prefigured by Gen 1:28 concerning filling the earth); 35:12; 48:4.<sup>25</sup> A more satisfactory structure is a different two-part structure: the first part comprises Gen 1–10\* concerning the world and humanity; the second part focuses on the story of Israel inaugurated by the Abrahamic covenant in Gen 17.<sup>26</sup> Genesis 1:28 is important within the first section of Gen 1–10\*; in this section the two aspects of Gen 1:28 of multiplying and filling the earth are fulfilled with regard to humanity (Gen 5\* and 10\*).<sup>27</sup> This first section, then, prefigures the second section. The Abrahamic covenant in Gen 17 and the patriarchal material take up both the multiplying aspect (Gen 17:2, 4, 6; 28:3; 35:11; 48:4) and the filling of the earth aspect (Gen 17:8; 35:12; 48:4). These aspects of multiplying, or the promise of descendants, and filling the earth, or the promise of possession of the land, are then unfolded in the rest of the material in two stages. The former is fulfilled in Exod 1:7, where the multiplying formula occurs. The latter is the focus of the second stage, beginning with its restatement with reference to the Abrahamic covenant in Exod 6:4, 8, and then unfolded (though with no fulfillment) in the

---

24. Odil Steck, "Aufbauprobleme in der Priesterschrift," in *Ernten was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. D. R. Daniels, Uwe Glessmer, and Martin Rösel (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 287–308, esp. 305–8.

25. *Ibid.*, 307.

26. *Ibid.*, 306, 307. Steck does not actually state the precise place that this section starts.

27. *Ibid.*, 306.

remaining Mosaic material through the wandering notices.<sup>28</sup> Such a division is supported by the numerous correspondences or parallels between Gen 1–10\* and the remaining material.<sup>29</sup>

For Steck, therefore, the primary indicator of structure is not the *toledoth* formula but the thematic unfolding of the motifs of multiplying and filling the land, depending on whether this refers to humanity in general or to Israel in particular. Therefore the division is between Gen 10\* and what follows, initiated by the Abrahamic covenant, with Exod 1:7 as the conclusion of the first stage (or subdivision) within the second main part. This view has the potential to align itself more coherently with the parallels observed between the story of Israel and the creation–flood accounts but underplays somewhat the continuity between Gen 1–10\* and the patriarchal material in terms of the repetition of the *toledoth* formula and the genealogies.<sup>30</sup>

Blum, in dividing his discussion of the overall meaning of his KP<sup>31</sup>, which includes much of the book of Leviticus as well as non-P material (his KD), into two parts, implies a two-part structure.<sup>32</sup> The first section is called, “The creation of the world and its decline.”<sup>33</sup> Although he does not define the parameters of this section precisely in terms of chapter and verse, it includes Gen 9, that is, the new order that is a diminution of the original created order, and so could be supposed to comprise Gen 1–9\*. The second section is called, “The partial restoration in Israel.”<sup>34</sup> Again, although he does not define exactly where this section starts, he states that with Abraham, God creates a line under humanity in which the distance with God has declined at least partially, and in relation to whom a progressive constitution of the nearness of God then unfolds; and this new beginning is marked by the covenant (Gen 15; 17).<sup>35</sup> The Abrahamic covenant takes up the blessing of multiplying and filling the earth of Gen 1:28; 9:1, 7 in the form of promises of descendants and the possession of a particular

---

28. Ibid., 307.

29. Ibid., 308. Steck, however, does not spell out these correspondences.

30. See the discussion below of Carr’s position; see also Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 120–25.

31. For what KP refers to, see §1.2.1, above.

32. Blum, *Studien sur Komposition*, 287–332.

33. Ibid., 289–93.

34. Ibid., 293–332.

35. Ibid., 294.



land (e.g., Gen 17:2, 6, 8; 28:3; 35:11, 12; 48:4; Exod 6:4) and also the promise to be their God (Gen 17:8); this is unfolded in the story of the origins of Israel. Within this, there is a periodization of the revelation of the divine name, with YHWH used only by the nation, the cultic community, and not by the ancestors. Within the story of Israel, there is also a progressive unfolding of encounter with the glory of YHWH, in line with the promise to be their God and the primary theme of a progressive restoration of the closeness of God (see Exod 14\*; 16\* [where the glory is at a distance in the cloud]; Exod 24:15–18 [where only Moses goes near it]; Exod 40:33–34 [where with the erection of the sanctuary the glory is in the midst of the camp]; Lev 9:23 [where the glory appears before all the people]).<sup>36</sup> Blum also notes the parallels between the Sinai sanctuary and the creation in terms of the seven day structure (Exod 24:16–18 and Gen 1:1–2:3); the linguistic parallels of “seeing,” “blessing,” and “finishing” (Exod 39:32a, 43; 40:33b; and Gen 1:31a; 2:1, 2a, 3a); the reference to “spirit” (Exod 31:3 and Gen 1:2); the heavenly pattern (תבנית) shown to Moses according to which the tabernacle is to be built (Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8) and the creation of humankind in the image (צלם) of God (Gen 1:26–27).<sup>37</sup> He refers to the link in ancient Near Eastern myths between creation and the building of a sanctuary.<sup>38</sup> Important for Blum within his structure is that the progressive constitution of the people of God as a cultic community granted communion with YHWH by means of the sanctuary occurs in the postflood world; there is not a direct connection between Israel’s institutions and Gen 1.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, he takes very seriously the impact of the first section in Gen 1–9\*, where the postflood world that emerges is a diminution of the original creation (Gen 9\*), on the second section of the story of Israel begun with the Abrahamic covenant; the first section forms the backdrop, and sets up the context, within which the second section unfolds its theme of a progressive closeness between God and humanity in Israel within the postflood world.

Blum’s structure is close to that of Steck in making a separation between the story of the world and humanity in general and the story of Israel inaugurated by the Abrahamic covenant. Similarly also, he focuses on thematic indications, but there is an added emphasis on motifs relat-

---

36. Ibid., 295–301.

37. Ibid., 306–7.

38. Ibid., 309.

39. Ibid., 311, 330–31.



ing to the distance or progressive closeness of God (e.g., the promise to be their God, the divine name YHWH, the “glory” of YHWH). Blum also spells out the parallels, many of which have been noted by Zenger and Weimar, between the Sinai material contained in the second section of the story of Israel and the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:3, but in particular, he emphasizes as significant that such parallels occur in the postflood world. In this way, Blum begins to integrate something of the linear trajectory of P (although he is referring to his KP), in terms of creation to the postflood world to the story of Israel, with some of the parallels between the story of Israel, notably, in the Sinai section, and the creation account.

Carr divides Pg into three major sections: Gen 1:1–2:3 (cosmology); Gen 5:1–50:26\* (expanded genealogy); and Exod 1:1–Deut 34\* (life work story of Moses).<sup>40</sup> He does this on the following grounds. He identifies two major breaks within Pg. The first major break is between the cosmology of Gen 1:1–2:3 and the genealogically focused material introduced by the superscription of Gen 5:1, which he sees as introducing not just Gen 5 but all the Pg genealogically focused material from Gen 5–50\*. The second major break is between the end of Genesis, that is, the genealogically focused material, and Exod 1:1, which he sees as beginning the national history of Israel.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore between these three sections, that is, marking the beginning of these major breaks, are two transitional texts that link the three sections together: Gen 5:1b–2 makes the transition from cosmology to genealogy by reviewing the creation of *ʾādām* and introducing the descendants of Adam; Exod 1:1–5, 7 reviews the essential aspect needed to introduce what follows, namely, the multiplication of the descendants of Jacob in Egypt, which then forms the prologue to the oppression in Egypt, God’s response and call of Moses (Exod 1:13–14; 2:23–25; 6:2–8), and the subsequent formation of Israel into God’s people.<sup>42</sup> He also differentiates these three major sections in terms of genre:

---

40. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 120–25.

41. Ibid., 120–21. Carr is critical of Zenger’s and Wiemar’s division after Exod 1:1–7, maintaining that Exod 1:13–14 can hardly be the beginning of Israel’s national history, that the Exod 1:1 superscription marks a structural break, that Exod 1:1–7 does not report the completion of narrative threads in Genesis but rather reviews the completion of these threads as a presupposition in preparation for the following national history, and that the paralleling of Exod 1:7 with Gen 1:28 represents “an echoing of that blessing in the process of pointing forward to God’s formation of the nation through the exodus from Egypt” (121 n. 15).

42. Ibid., 121–22.

the first section is a cosmology; the second section is an “expanded genealogy”; and the third section is a “life work story” of Moses.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, the second section (Gen 5:1–50:26\*), the expanded genealogy, is distinguished from the third section in that it is focused on the transmission of blessing and the making of covenants, the life cycle of the producing of children, and the sojourns, deaths, and burials of the ancestors.<sup>44</sup> The third section (Exod 1:1–Deut 34\*), in contrast, as well as being concerned with the national history of Israel or the Moses story, is structured and defined not by genealogies and the lifetimes of progenitors but by the itinerary to and from Sinai, “the movement of Israel from Egypt into Canaan, with Sinai as orientation point for this journey.”<sup>45</sup>

Because Carr’s primary focus is on Genesis, he further subdivides the second section (Gen 5:1–50:26\*) into two main parts (A = Gen 5:1–9:28\*; and C = Gen 11:27–50:26\*) that are joined by a bridging passage (B = Gen 11:10–26).<sup>46</sup> Part A comprises the internationally focused genealogical sections culminating in the covenant with Noah (Gen 5:1–9:28\*). Part C comprises the Israel-focused genealogical sections that unfold God’s covenant with Abraham, ending with Jacob’s move to Egypt and his and Joseph’s deaths (Gen 11:27–50:26\*).<sup>47</sup> Genesis 11:10–26 (B), the genealogy of Shem, links the international and Israel-focused parts (A and C) because it links Abraham with the descendants after the flood. This subdivision of the second section highlights the place of the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants and the backdrop to this of the cosmic creation of Gen 1:1–2:3: “Thus in P we have the cosmic creation as the setting for the Noahic covenant, which in turn is the setting for God’s covenant with Israel.”<sup>48</sup>

In summary, for the primary divisions of Carr’s structure of Pg, genre is important, but also of significance are the genealogies (section two) and itineraries (section three) and differentiation in terms of primary content or theme. Additional structural markers are transition passages that review partially what has gone before and introduce what is to come. It is within

---

43. *Ibid.*, 123–24.

44. *Ibid.*, 121, 123.

45. *Ibid.*, 121.

46. Carr (*ibid.*) further subdivides the material within these sections primarily in terms of genealogical markers. See his outline of Pg on pp. 124–25. It should be noted that Carr does not include Gen 10\* in his Pg (99–101).

47. *Ibid.*, 122.

48. *Ibid.*, 123.

the subdivision of his second section that issues such as international focus versus focus on Israel (or their ancestors) and the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants are important. Carr has advanced the discussion, especially in terms of Pg's linear trajectory, even though only Genesis is considered in detail. However, when the Pg material of Exodus and Numbers in all its detail is taken into account, and in particular when the parallels between this material and Gen 1–9\* are considered, a complexity is added that does not necessarily support such a neat arrangement as outlined here.

Ska divides the story of Pg into two main periods or sections: Gen 1–9\* (universal history) and all that follows (Israelite history).<sup>49</sup> The first section, the history of the world, can be subdivided into two parts: creation (Gen 1–5\*) and the renewal of the creation by means of the flood (Gen 6–9\*). Likewise, the second section, the history of Israel, is subdivided into two parts: the history of the ancestors and the history of the people of Israel. The most important texts in the first period are Gen 1:1–2:4a and Gen 9:1–17 (the creation and the renewal of creation); and the most important text in the second period is Exod 6:2–8. To these divisions correspond the different designations of God: in the first section, Elohim is the God of the universe; and in the second section, God reveals himself explicitly as El Shaddai as the God of Israel's ancestors in the first part and as YHWH as the God of the people of Israel in the second part. These two major sections (with their respective subdivisions) are supported by the many correspondences or parallels between them. The Noahic covenant (Gen 9\*), with its sign of the rainbow, corresponds to the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17) with its sign of circumcision. The violent generation that disappeared in the flood is paralleled by the Egyptians who oppressed Israel and disappear in the sea; and in both, God as creator commands the waters and dry land appears (Gen 1:9–10; 8:14; Exod 14:16, 22, 29). The blessing of humanity in Gen 1:28, repeated in Gen 9:1, is echoed in the blessing to Abraham and Jacob (Gen 17:2, 16; 28:3; 35:11; 48:4), which is fulfilled in Gen 47:27 and Exod 1:7. The God who feeds the creatures (Gen 1:29–30) nourishes Israel in the wilderness with manna (Exod 16:15). The seventh day of Gen 2:1–3 is discovered as a day of rest by the Israelites (Exod 16\*<sup>50</sup>). Finally, there are the parallels between the creation and the

---

49. Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 155–59, esp. 155. Ska does not define precisely where his second period or section begins except to refer to the history of the ancestors.

50. Ska includes those verses within Exod 16 that relate to the Sabbath in his P.

Sinai sanctuary: Moses receiving the instructions on the seventh day (Exod 24:16), reflecting the seventh day in the creation account; and the linguistic parallels between Gen 1:31; 2:1–3; and Exod 39:32, 43 of “finishing,” “seeing,” and “blessing.”<sup>51</sup> Ska sees these correspondences as “sufficient to prove that P wanted to construct a history in the form of a diptych to stress the continuity between, and progression of, the history of the world and the history of Israel.”<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, he points out that the two parts within the first section have much in common: the world created from primeval chaos is partially returned to this primeval chaos in the flood, but the dry land reappears; Noah and his family leave the ark to repopulate the world; the blessing is renewed (Gen 9:1) but the food regulations have been changed (Gen 9:2–3; cf. Gen 1:29–30). Though the two parts of the second section concerning Israel’s history have less in common, there is continuity between the first section regarding the history of the ancestors and the second part regarding the history of Israel in terms of promise and fulfillment. God “remembers” his covenant with Abraham in Exod 2:24; 6:5. The Abrahamic covenant promises of descendants and to be their God are fulfilled in the second part in Exod 1:7 (and Gen 47:27) and Exod 40:34–35 (and see Exod 29:45–46) respectively. The Abrahamic covenant promise of land is not fulfilled due to Israel’s sin (Num 13–14\*) but awaits fulfillment in the next generation (Num 14:26–38\*).<sup>53</sup> Moreover, the existence of the postflood world depends on the unilateral covenant with Noah, and Israel’s existence depends on the unilateral covenant of El Shaddai with Abraham.

Ska’s proposal is closest to that of Steck and Blum, but he goes beyond them in supporting his division of P into the two sections of Gen 1–9\* and the rest of P with parallels noted between them from throughout each of the sections and not just between the Sinai sanctuary and the creation. Also important for Ska is the pattern of the designations for God, the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants (Gen 9\*; Gen 17; Exod 6:2–8), and the linear development between the two parts of the second section in terms of the promises of the Abrahamic covenant and their fulfillment. However, his emphasis is on the parallels between the first part and the second part, and the genealogical trajectory throughout Genesis plays little if any part in his description.

---

51. *Ibid.*, 156, 154.

52. *Ibid.*, 156.

53. *Ibid.*, 156–57.

In an article that focused on the land and saw the extent of Pg reaching into Deut 34\*, I attempted to structure Pg in terms of two main sections linked together by a programmatic transition.<sup>54</sup> The first main section comprises Gen 1–10\* and has to do with the cosmos. The second main section comprises Exod 1:7–Deut 34:9\* and has to do with the nation. Genesis 11:10–Exodus 1:7\* forms the programmatic transition to the nation of Israel, from Shem to Abraham through the descendants of Jacob, and including the Abrahamic covenant.<sup>55</sup> These divisions are aligned with the designations for God: the first main section refers to Elohim; the programmatic transition (at least from Gen 17 onward) uses El Shaddai; and YHWH is the designation for God in the second main section. The subsections within each of the main sections for the most part parallel each other in terms of motif. The creation of the world (Gen 1:1–2:3) is paralleled by the creation of the nation (Exod 1:7–Num 9\*), as seen in the parallels between the Sinai sanctuary and the creation account, and also between Exod 14\* and the creation account. The destruction of the world (Gen 6:9–7:24\*) is paralleled by the destruction of the Mosaic generation of the nation (Num 13–14; 20–Deut 34\*); and within each of these sections the sin of all flesh is paralleled with the sin of the tribal representatives and the people in that both are connected with the land, and in both this leads to the death of the whole generation, of all flesh and the nation of Israel, except for individuals, in the case of the former, Noah and his company and in the case of the latter, Joshua and Caleb. The appearance of the land after the flood (Gen 8:1–2a, 3b–5, 7, 13a, 14), along with attendant conditions, is paralleled by the sighting of the land of Canaan by representatives of the Mosaic generation (within Num 13–Deut 34\*), with the entry into the land and living on it also linked with certain conditions. However there is no parallel with the continuation of life on the land in the post-flood world (Gen 10\*) in the second main section since there is no account of entering and settling in the land.<sup>56</sup> Within the programmatic transition (Gen 11:10–Exod 1:7\*), the promises of the Abrahamic covenant, and in

---

54. Suzanne Boorer, “The Earth/Land (אֶרֶץ) in the Priestly Material: The Preservation of the ‘Good’ Earth and the Promised Land of Canaan Throughout the Generations,” *ABR* 49 (2001): 19–33.

55. *Ibid.*, 20–21.

56. See *ibid.*, 20–23.

particular the land promise, are important and are unfolded in the story of the nation in the second main section.<sup>57</sup>

Although this proposed structure takes seriously parallels between Gen 1–9\* and the story of the nation in Exod 1–Deut 34\*, especially in relation to the creation and destruction of the cosmos/Israel, the parallels in terms of the appearance of the land are more tenuous. It also takes into account to some extent the designations of God. It does not, however, really account adequately for the place of the Noahic covenant and in particular the changed conditions in the postflood world; nor does it address the issue of the continuity of the genealogies throughout Genesis.

De Pury, whose Pg extends only to Exod 40\*, proposes a three-part division that tends to highlight Abraham more than the foregoing structures.<sup>58</sup> Part 1 comprises Gen 1–10\* and is called the “History of Humankind.” In this part, the world order is founded (Gen 1 and 9). Part 2 comprises Gen 11–50\* and is called the “History of the Abrahamides.” The Abrahamic covenant and its promises include not just Israel but also the nations of Ishmaelite/Arabic and Edomite descent, and the story of Jacob is embedded within the story of the Abrahamides with the function of linking this Abrahamic community of nations and the sons of Israel, who finally emerge to their proper destiny in the next part (part 3). Part 3, then, comprises Exod 1–40\* and is called the “History of the Vocation of the Sons of Israel.” This vocation is to build and keep YHWH’s sanctuary where YHWH dwells among humankind and therefore to perform a priestly role in relation to the other nations. In this “history of God’s universal project”<sup>59</sup> unfolded by these three parts, both the designation of God and the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants have an important place. Thus, in part 1, all humanity participates in the Noahic covenant and knows God as Elohim; in part 2, the nations that descend from Abraham and participate in the Abrahamic covenant know God as El Shaddai; and finally in part 3, Israel is singled out for its vocation as keeper of YHWH’s sanctuary where YHWH dwells among humankind.<sup>60</sup>

Nihan, who incorporates material in Lev 1–16\* as part of his P (which he concludes in Lev 16\*) sees the key to the structure and movement of P as the classic pattern of ancient Near Eastern myths in which

---

57. *Ibid.*, 23.

58. De Pury, “Jacob Story,” 63–65; see also, de Pury, “Abraham.”

59. De Pury, “Jacob Story,” 69; see also de Pury, “Abraham,” 172.

60. See de Pury, “Abraham,” 172–76.

the victory of the deity over chaos is followed by the building of a temple and the offering of a great banquet.<sup>61</sup> Thus within P, Gen 1 relates God's victory over the primeval abyss, but the building of a sanctuary is delayed and replaced by the Sabbath. There is another conflict with the primeval waters in Exod 14\*, where the separation of waters and the appearance of dry land here parallels Gen 1:6–10. Only after this second conflict in Exod 14\* is YHWH's sanctuary built (Exod 25–40\*).<sup>62</sup> Therefore the links between Gen 1:1–2:3, Exod 14\*, and Exod 25–40\* are important structural components. Indeed, the parallels between Gen 1:1–2:3 and Exod 39–40, such as the terminology of “finishing,” “seeing,” and “blessing,” form an *inclusio* around the whole P story.<sup>63</sup> In between the creation account involving the victory over the primeval waters in Gen 1:1–2:3 and the delayed building of the sanctuary in Exod 25–40\*, P has inserted a long history of humankind divided into three eras: Gen 1–11\*;<sup>64</sup> Gen 12–50\*; and Exod 1–Lev 16\*.<sup>65</sup> The three eras culminate with Israel's emergence as a distinct nation in the postdiluvian age in which the original creation is partly resumed but in a clearly inferior form. Nihan also refers to Gen 10\* as the beginning of the fulfillment of Gen 1:28; 9:1, 7 and states that after this the focus is on the emergence of Israel through the gradual narrowing of the *toledoth* notices (Shem to Jacob), with this development finding its conclusion in Exod 1:7.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, the main thread of P's narrative after Gen 10\* is formed by three central passages that have to do with the same promise to be their God, namely, Gen 17:7; Exod 6:7; and Exod 29:45–46. Indeed, he calls Gen 17 and its reception in Exod 6 and 29 a “major structuring device.”<sup>67</sup> The restitution of the divine presence in the postflood world by means of the sanctuary is described in stages: in Exod 40:34, which takes up the previous promises of Gen 17:7;

---

61. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 59–64, and in relation to the discussion that follows see also 233–36, 380–81, 609–11.

62. *Ibid.*, 60.

63. Nihan also mentions the motif of New Year's Day (Gen 1; Exod 40:17) and the seventh day motif within Gen 1:1–2:3 and Exod 24:16.

64. In view of Nihan's other comments outlined in the following discussion, this should perhaps read Gen 1–10\*.

65. *Ibid.*, 61.

66. *Ibid.*, 63.

67. *Ibid.*, 64.

Exod 6:7; and Exod 29:45–46,<sup>68</sup> followed by Lev 9:23–24.<sup>69</sup> The institution of the sacrificial cult in Lev 1–9\* corresponds to the great banquet in honor of the god after the building of the temple in ancient Near Eastern mythology.<sup>70</sup> Moreover Lev 1–9\*, which reveals the legitimate way of sacrificing animals and therefore is a significant improvement on Gen 9:2–3, reenacts the initial harmony between God and humankind devised in creation and therefore completes Gen 1:1–2:3.<sup>71</sup> Leviticus 11–16\* also displays parallels with Gen 1–11\*,<sup>72</sup> and the appearance of YHWH to Aaron in the inner sanctum in the cloud (Lev 16:2b, 12–13) is the culmination of the movement of the divine presence symbolized in the cloud, from Mount Sinai (Exod 24:15b–18a) to the tent of meeting (Exod 40:34–35).<sup>73</sup> YHWH's return to his sanctuary, then, “forms the structural opposite to his previous withdrawal from his own creation after the flood in Gen 9 (vv. 13–17).”<sup>74</sup> Therefore, in Israel the gradual definition of the cosmic order closer to that of the original creation is unfolded, with its climax achieved in the ritual of Lev 16, which not only makes possible God's permanent presence, but can be seen as a “re-enactment of God's primeval victory over chaos at the creation of the world”<sup>75</sup> and therefore “corresponds to the re-establishment of the cosmic order.”<sup>76</sup>

Nihan does not set out a specific structure for his P but makes rather unintegrated comments regarding structural indications within P. The closest he gets to an overall structure is the ancient Near Eastern mythological pattern of the victory of the god over chaos, the building of a temple for him, and the throwing of banquet for him, as the arc that encompasses the whole movement of P, albeit in modified form. His observations regarding the parallels between the sanctuary (Exod 25–40\*) and the creation (Gen 1:1–2:3) support this, as do the structural links between Gen 1:1–2:3, Exod 14\*, and Exod 25–40\*. How the three eras of humankind he identifies mesh with this encompassing pattern he does not explain. Neither does he

---

68. *Ibid.*, 610.

69. *Ibid.*, 233.

70. *Ibid.*, 234.

71. *Ibid.*, 234, 236.

72. See *ibid.*, 380.

73. *Ibid.*, 378–81.

74. *Ibid.*, 381.

75. *Ibid.*, 613.

76. *Ibid.*



try to integrate observed structural indicators within sections of Pg with these two larger patterns or with each other; for example, the unfolding of Gen 1:28 initially in Gen 10\* followed by the notices up to Exod 1:7; the unfolding of the promise to be their God in Gen 17:7; Exod 6:7; 29:45–46; 40:34; Lev 9:23–24; and the sequence of the progressive presence of YHWH in Exod 24:15b–18; 40:34–35 and Lev 16:2b, 12–13. Therefore, although Nihan makes some good observations with regard to structure, primarily in relation to the trajectory of Pg, his comments are not all that helpful in trying to arrive at an integrated structure of the whole.<sup>77</sup>

### 2.1.2. Conclusions

This survey shows how complex the task of trying to structure Pg as a whole is. Clearly there are a number of structural elements or markers within Pg, but these do not necessarily complement one another in such a way as to point toward a single structure. Therefore, the way in which each of these structural markers is weighted leads to different views and varying ways of structuring Pg overall. Lohfink aptly states that in Pg there

---

77. Guillaume (*Land and Calendar*, esp. 83, 164) presents yet another structure, but the material he includes within his P document is so idiosyncratic (see §1.1.2.2 and esp. n. 117, above) that his comments in this area do not add in any significant way to the discussion. He structures his P document into seven periods based on the sabbatical calendar and its intercalation. These are: creation (1 week); antediluvian period (6,000,000 days + 6 years + 6 months + 6 weeks + 59 days); flood (36 weeks); drying out (7 months); postdiluvian period (three cycles of seven 365-day mean years); period of wanderings (Gen 12–Exod 40\*, 14 jubilees minus 40 years); wilderness era (concluding in Joshua, from 400 days to 40 years). He argues against the Sinai “residence” having parallels with Gen 1 and any paralleling of the mythic pattern of creation to the building of a temple within his P document (65–68). Although he dismisses a bi- or tripart division in favor of his seven-part division (80–83), he makes the contradictory statement elsewhere that the first section of P’s narrative (Genesis) is structured by the list of *toledoth* notices (125). He also makes some comments with regard to some parallels that are potentially more helpful. The violence that causes the flood is paralleled by the Egyptian brutality that causes the exodus (135). The flood is paralleled by the wilderness in that P treats the flood as a chronological gap and the wilderness as no-land, and in both the land is rendered invisible (136, 174); the reference to the “mountains,” their “tops” and “seeing” in Deut 34\* recall the end of the flood and parallel Moses with Noah, whose mission is accomplished when the mountains appear again (Gen 8:5) (55).

is an “order through a variety of structural systems within the whole that sometimes contain one another and sometimes overlap.”<sup>78</sup>

The structural markers identified in this survey of views that are relevant to Pg as delineated in chapter 1 can be summarized as follows.

First there are structural markers that are related to Pg’s trajectory. These are:

- ♦ the genealogies and in particular the *toledoth* formula notices and the itineraries;
- ♦ the designation of God, as Elohim, El Shaddai, and YHWH;
- ♦ the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants;
- ♦ the unfolding of Gen 1:28 regarding multiplying and filling the land (see Gen 10\*; 17; 28:3; 35:11; 47:27; 48:4; Exod 1:7; 6:4); and/or the unfolding (and fulfillment) of the Abrahamic covenant promises of descendants and land, and the promise to be their God (see Gen 17:7–8; Exod 6:7; 29:45–46; 40:34<sup>79</sup>);
- ♦ international focus on all humanity versus focus on Israel;
- ♦ the difference between the original creation (Gen 1:1–2:3) and the postflood world (Gen 9\*)
- ♦ key words and themes, for example, blessing, glory, and the progressive closeness of the presence of God (linked with the promise to be their God)
- ♦ transition passages that review what has gone before and introduce what is to come (e.g., Gen 5:1b–2; Exod 1:1–5, 7);
- ♦ the paralleling of the ancient Near Eastern mythological pattern of creation linked with the overcoming of chaos that leads to the building of a temple/sanctuary.

Second, there are the parallels in language and motif between the creation-flood material and the material concerned with Israel as a nation in Pg, that is, the parallels between:

---

78. Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 151. See also the comments by Ska (*Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 154–55): “It is not possible to fit all these elements into one structure. Furthermore, P undoubtedly never intended to give his readers a clear account that was composed in accord with the canons of modern structuralism.”

79. See also, Lev 9:23–24; Lev 16\*, but these texts are not included in Pg as I have delineated it in ch. 1.

- ♦ the creation and new creation after the flood and the Sinai sanctuary (e.g., the motif of the seventh day, the language of finishing, seeing, blessing, and New Year's Day);
- ♦ the creation and flood and the Reed Sea episode in Exod 14\* (e.g., the division of the waters and dry land, and the coming together of the waters over the Egyptians who have exercised violence against Israel);
- ♦ the flood and the episode of spying out the land in Num 13–14\*<sup>80</sup> (sin in relation to the land and punishment of death except for Noah and company and Joshua and Caleb).<sup>81</sup>

The main difficulty in structuring Pg as a whole lies in the issue of how the structural elements related to Pg's trajectory can be seen to relate to, or interplay with, the many parallels in motif and theme observed between the creation-flood material and the story of the nation.

## 2.2. PROPOSED STRUCTURE

### 2.2.1. Macrostructure

The structure proposed here attempts to integrate the structural elements found in Pg in relation to its trajectory with the clear parallels in theme and motif also found within Pg. This structure is most similar to that of Steck, Blum, and Ska and, like all the proposed structures, inevitably weights some features more than others and does not pretend to be the definitive solution or the last word on this topic. However, it is necessary to provide here a working hypothesis with regard to the structure of Pg on which can be based our investigation of its overall theological and hermeneutical meaning; it is hoped that the rationale for this structure outlined in the following discussion will support its credibility. The structure is as shown on pages 132–35. On a macrolevel, the structure gives weight to the following features of Pg.

Importance is placed on the contrast between concern with the world and humanity in general (I Gen 1–9\*) and Israel in particular (II Gen 12–

---

80. See also Num 20\*.

81. The motif of the seventh day in the creation account and in Exod 16\* is not included here since the Sabbath motif in Exod 16\* has not been included in Pg as delineated in ch. 1.

I. COSMIC backdrop		Gen 1–9*	ELOHIM
A. CREATION of the world (including blessing, 1:28)		Gen 1:1–2:3	
REVERSAL			
B. DESTRUCTION of creation and new creation		Gen 6–9*	genealogy (Gen 5)
1. Destruction: Flood		Gen 6–7*	
a. Sin: violence in relation to the land		6:11 (13)	
b. Death of all flesh except Noah and company		6:13–7:24*	
2. New creation		Gen 8–9*	
a. Reappearance of land: (God <i>remembers</i> Noah, 8:1)		Gen 8*	
b. New world order:		Gen 9*	
i. Renewal of blessing and structured violence		9:1–7	genealogies (Gen 10–11*)
ii. NOAHIC COVENANT (that God <i>remembers</i> )		9:8–17	
<i>transition from world to Abraham</i>			
		Gen 11–Num 27*	
II. ISRAEL in the postflood world			
A. Israel's ancestors		Gen 11:27–32*; 12–50* 11:27–16:16*a	EL SHADDAI unfolding of promise of descendants
1. Backdrop		Gen 17	
2. ABRAHAMIC COVENANT		Gen 21–50*	
3. Unfolding of covenant promises, esp. descendants			structured by genealogies

<i>Transition from ancestors to nation</i>	genealogy (Exod 1:1–7*)	descendants promise: fulfilled regarding first generation of the nation
B. The nation of Israel		
1. CREATION of the nation	Exod 1:13–Num 27:14*	
a. Programmatic backdrop to the exodus and the whole of the story of the nation (God <i>remembers</i> Abrahamic covenant and restates promises, not yet fulfilled, of land and to be God)	Exod 1–40*	
i. Introduction	Exod 1:13–7:7*	
ii. Call of Moses		
(a) Divine speech to Moses (including a commission)	Exod 1:13–2:25*	
and execution	Exod 6:2–7:7*b	
(programmatic basis for the whole story of the nation)	6:2–8	YHWH
(b) Commission, objection, reassurance, and obedience	6:10–7:7*	
(programmatic basis for the exodus)		
(i) Commission	6:10–11	
(i) Objection	6:12	
(iii) Reassurance (including introductory summary of Exod 7:8–14:29*) <sup>b</sup>	7:1–5	
(iv) Obedience	7:6–7	

unfolding of remain-  
ing Abrahamic covenant  
promises  
to be God

b. Exodus	Exod 7:8–14:29*		
i. Signs	Exod 7:8–11:10		
ii. Exodus: Passover	Exod 12*		
iii. Reed sea:	Exod 14*	<i>glory</i>	to be God
CREATION imagery regarding Israel; Flood imagery regarding destruction of Egyptians <i>Transition</i>		itinerary (Exod 15:22*, 27; 16:1)	land
c. Wilderness: Manna <i>Transition</i>	Exod 16*	<i>glory</i>	to be God
		itinerary (Exod 17:1*; 19:1, 2a)	land
d. Sinai	Exod 24–40*		to be God
i. Backdrop: Moses ascends mountain CREATION parallel (seventh day)	Exod 24:15b–18a	<i>glory</i>	
ii. The sanctuary	Exod 25–29; 39–40*	<i>glory</i>	
CREATION parallels (finishing, seeing, blessing)			
Creation/new order of creation parallel (New Year's Day)			
(a) Backdrop: Moses ascends mountain	Exod 24:15b–18a	<i>glory</i>	
(b) Instructions	Exod 25–29*	<i>glory</i>	

(c) Execution <i>Transition</i>		Exod 39–40*	<i>glory</i> itinerary (Num 10:11–13*)	land
<i>REVERSAL</i>				
2. DESTRUCTION of Mosaic generation of the nation		Num 13–27*	<i>glory</i>	land and to be God (negative)
a. Destruction of the people		Num 13–14*	<i>glory</i>	
i. Sin: in relation to the land		Num 13:1–14:10a*		land (and to be God): rejection
ii. Death of spies except Joshua and Caleb, and death of people predicted		Num 14:10b–38*		
<i>Transition</i>			itinerary (Num 20:1a)	land
b. Death of Moses and Aaron predicted		Num 20:2–12*	<i>glory</i>	to be God: rejection
i. Sin: in relation to YHWH		Num 20: (2–12*)10		
ii. Death outside the land		Num 20:12		
<i>Transition</i>			itinerary (Num 20:22b)	land
c. Death of Aaron and succession		Num 20:23–29*		
<i>Transition</i>			itinerary (Num 22:1)	land
d. Death of Moses predicted after seeing the land from the mountain		Num 27:12–14		

#### Notes

a. Including Gen 19:29.

b. Exodus 7:3–5 does double duty: as part of the call of Moses, where it functions as part of the reassurance, and as providing a programmatic backdrop or summary introduction to what is to follow in Exod 7:8–14:29\*.

Num 27\*). Within the second main section, Israel in the postflood world, the two subsections are divided on the grounds of material concerned with Israel's ancestors (II A Gen 12–50\*) and the account concerning Israel as a nation (II B Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*).

The designation of the divine name is privileged within this structure. The use of Elohim coincides with the first main section (I Gen 1–9\*). The revelation, and use, of El Shaddai and YHWH coincide with the two subsections of the second main part respectively (II A Gen 12–50\*, El Shaddai; and II B Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*).<sup>82</sup>

Another aspect that is given due weight within this structure is the differentiation of the Noahic covenant and the Abrahamic covenant as two successive stages. The Noahic covenant is the culmination of the first main section, the cosmic backdrop, since it, along with the renewal of the blessing (Gen 9:1, 7 forming a chiasm with Gen 1:28), ensures the stability of the postflood world and its order (I B 2. b. Gen 9\*). The Abrahamic covenant, allowing for the backdrop in Gen 11:27–16:16\*, inaugurates and sets the program for the first subdivision concerning Israel's ancestors (II A, esp. Gen 21–50\*) and regarding the nation of Israel (II B Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*) in terms of the unfolding of its promises. These covenants are also interconnected. The Noahic covenant, occurring as it does within the postflood world that is created when God “remembers” Noah (Gen 8:1), is to be “remembered” by God (Gen 9:15,16). God's “remembering” of the Abrahamic covenant, then, is what initiates and forms the basis for the unfolding of the story of the nation (Exod 2:24; 6:5). This interconnection between the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants, along with the distinctive roles each plays within the respective stages, highlight the fact that the second main section, regarding Israel and its ancestors (II Gen 11–Num 27\*) takes place in the postflood world, that is, the new world order (see I B 2. b Gen 9\*) that is different from the original creation in Gen 1:1–2:3.

This structure therefore also emphasizes the unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promises, which occurs throughout the second main section, and across its two subdivisions, of Israel's ancestors and the nation of

---

82. The revelation of El Shaddai and YHWH occur at the beginning of the respective subsections, providing allowance is made for the introductory passages to Gen 17 and Exod 6:2–8 in Gen 11:27–16:16\* (II A 1) and Exod 1:13–2:25\* (II B 1 a i) respectively.



Israel (II A Gen 11–50\*, and II B Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*).<sup>83</sup> The promise of descendants dominates the subsection concerned with Israel's ancestors (II A Gen 11–50\*), and the promises of land and to be their God dominate the second subsection (II B Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*). The itineraries, which begin after the exodus (II B 1 b), are significant in the rest of this subsection (II B) not only with regard to their function in relation to the land promise, but also to mark transitions between episodes.<sup>84</sup>

In addition, within this structure, parallels between the first main section, the cosmic backdrop (I Gen 1–9\*), and the second subsection of the second section, concerning the nation of Israel (II B Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*), are seen as significant and given importance. The creation of the world (I A Gen 1:1–2:3) is paralleled by the creation of the nation (II B 1 Exod 1:13–40:34\*). Several of the subdivisions of the latter contain clear parallels in language and motifs with Gen 1:1–2:3 (see II B 1 b [Exodus, especially Exod 14\*] and II B 1 d [Sinai, especially the sanctuary, Exod 25–40\*]). The destruction of the world in the flood (I B 1 Gen 6–7\*) is paralleled by the destruction of the Mosaic generation of the nation in the wilderness (II B 2 Num 13–27\*), where the sin of the flood generation and that of the Mosaic generation is paralleled in terms of having to do with the land (I B 1 a Gen 6:11, 13 and II B 2 a i Num 13:1–14:10a\*), and in both the punishment is death, with individual exceptions (I B 1 b Gen 6:13–7:24\*, where the exception is Noah and company, and II B 2 a ii Num 14:10b–38\*, where the exception is Joshua and Caleb).<sup>85</sup> There may be an echo of the reappearance of the land in Gen 8\* (I B 2 a) in the command to Moses to see the land from the mountain in Num 27:12–14 (II B 2 d). Most significantly then, the cosmic backdrop, the first main section, and Israel in the postflood world, in particular its second subsection (II B), parallel each other in reversing in some way what has been created. There is no parallel to Gen 9\* (I B 2 b) in

---

83. Again, if allowance is made with regard to the introductory backdrop to Gen 17 in Gen 11:27–16:16\* (II A 1)

84. Exod 15:22\*, 27; 16:1, between 1 b (Exodus) and c (Wilderness: Manna); Exod 17:1\*; 19:1, 2a, between 1 c and d (Sinai); Num 10:11–12, between 1 d and 2 a (Destruction of the people); Num 20:1a between 2 a and b (Death of Moses and Aaron predicted); Num 20:22b between 2 b and c (Death of Aaron); Num 22:1 between 2 c and d (Death of Moses predicted).

85. See also the parallels with the flood in the destruction of the Egyptians in the Reed Sea in Exod 14\* (II B 1 b), which occurs within the narrative arc as a result of their violence toward Israel (Exod 1:13–14, and see the violence that causes the flood, Gen 6:11, 13).

the material concerning the nation (II B), but, as will be discussed later, this has something to do with the interaction between the structural elements and features that are part of Pg's trajectory with the parallels observed here, and more precisely with the fact that the story of Israel that occurs in the postflood world, which is under the Noahic covenant, centers around the unfolding of the everlasting Abrahamic covenant promises.

It can be seen, moreover, that the parallels between the Sinai sanctuary material and the creation support the view that in Pg can be found the ancient Near Eastern mythological pattern of creation linked with the overcoming of chaos that leads to the building of a temple/sanctuary. More precisely, this pattern is seen in the parallels between the creation in Gen 1:1–2:3 (I A), the creation of the nation in Exod 14\* through the walking on dry land resulting from the divided waters at the same time as the Egyptians are uncreated by the divided waters coming together in a parallel to the flood (II B 1 b), and the Sinai sanctuary, whose finishing not only parallels Gen 1:1–2:3 (see Exod 39:32, 43; 40:33; and Gen 1:31; 2:1–3), but also its erection on New Year's Day (Exod 40:17) parallels the creation as well as the reappearance of the land in the postflood world (Gen 8:13a). Pg, therefore, mirrors the ancient Near Eastern mythological pattern but reshapes it to describe the building and erection of the sanctuary after three allusions to creation associated with chaos, representing three stages: the original creation (Gen 1:1–2:3), the flood and postflood creation (Gen 6–9\*), and the Reed Sea episode (Exod 14\*).<sup>86</sup> The ancient Near Eastern mythological pattern is also reshaped in Pg in that Pg does not end with the Sinai sanctuary but continues on with a reversal of this very pattern within the Mosaic generation in Num 13–20\* (II B 2 a and b), therefore hinting, metaphorically speaking, at the appearance again of chaos.<sup>87</sup>

This structure at the macrolevel, however, gives a subordinate place to the genealogies and the *toledoth* formula within these. Within this structure the genealogies, which admittedly have much in common with each other,<sup>88</sup> span the first main section (I Gen 1–9\*) and the first subdivision of the second section (II A Gen 12–50\*), and the last occurrence (Exod 1:1–7\*) forms the bridge between this first subdivision and the second

---

86. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 55–56, 60–61.

87. This will be addressed in more detail in the following discussion, which examines in greater depth the trajectory of Pg, the parallels contained within it, and their interaction.

88. See the discussion of Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 68–73, 93–101.

subdivision concerning the nation Israel (II B Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*).<sup>89</sup> However, although Pg has not been structured in terms of its main divisions according to the genealogical elements, they do have a role, or more precisely a number of roles, within the structure proposed here. The first genealogy in Gen 5 (the genealogy of Adam) stands between the creation of the world (I A) and its reversal in the destruction of the world in the flood (I B), forming a bridge between the creation and Noah (see especially Gen 5:1–2a).<sup>90</sup> The next genealogies, Gen 10\* (the table of nations) and Gen 11\* (the genealogy of Shem), form a bridge or transition between the two main sections of this structure, the cosmic background that has to do with the world and humanity in general (I) and Israel in the postflood world (II) and in particular to Israel's ancestors and specifically to Abraham. The genealogies throughout Gen 11–50\*, which indeed structure and hold together this material, represent the unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promise of descendants. Finally, Exod 1:1–7\* forms the transition from the first subdivision of the second section concerning the ancestors (II A) and the second subdivision concerning the nation of Israel (II B). Moreover, all these genealogies represent the unfolding of the blessing in Gen 1:28 with regard to multiplying, prior to, and after, the Abrahamic covenant, which picks up this motif in terms of the promise of descendants, and reaches its initial conclusion in the emergence of the first generation of the nation of Israel in Exod 1:7.<sup>91</sup>

Given all this with regard to the genealogies, it would have been possible to propose a structure that sees the whole of the Pg material in Genesis (Gen 1–50\*) as the backdrop to the story of the nation of Israel, with the transition between these in Exod 1:1–7\*. The designation of God would have cohered just as well with such a structure since in this case ELOHIM and EL SHADDAI would correspond with the first section (Gen

---

89. Since Exod 1:1–7\* functions as a transition or bridge between the ancestral material and the story of the nation of Israel, it does not form the beginning of the story of the nation (II B). Beginning II B with Exod 1:13 is reasonable since Exod 1:13–2:25\* forms the backdrop to Exod 6:2–8, which is the key text that introduces and sets the program for the rest of the material that follows regarding the nation of Israel; *pace Carr, Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 120–21.

90. See *ibid.*, 68, 71, 73–74.

91. Genesis 10\* picks up the aspect of the blessing of 1:28 regarding filling the earth, but it is only in the second division of the second main section (II B), in particular the unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promise of the land in terms of the itineraries, that this aspect is further developed.

1–50\*) and YHWH with the second (Exod 1:13–Num 27\*). However, I have chosen to divide the Genesis Pg material in terms of its cosmic focus versus material concerned with the nation of Israel and its ancestry because, not only is this difference in focus important, but it also separates the Noahic covenant as the culmination of the cosmic backdrop (I B 2 b ii Gen 9\*) from a different stage in which the Abrahamic covenant (II A, esp. II A 2 Gen 17) has an inaugurating function that makes clear that the whole of Israel's story, including its ancestors, takes place in the postflood order of creation. In addition, the structure proposed here more clearly highlights the parallels between the material concerned with the nation of Israel (II B) and the cosmic material (I) in terms of creation and reversal of creation in destruction.

Having discussed the main points with regard to the macrostructure of Pg overall as proposed here and having offered some justification for it, it is necessary to examine the trajectory of Pg and the parallels within it in more detail.

### 2.2.2. Linear Trajectory

The cosmic backdrop (Gen 1–9\*) begins with creation (Gen 1:1–2:3) and, after ten generations (Gen 5\*), moves through the reversal or destruction of this creation in the flood to a new creation with a new world order (Gen 8–9\*).

Little needs to be said with regard to Gen 1:1–2:3 in relation to Pg's trajectory except to note the seven-day structure, with God's resting on the seventh day and sanctifying it (Gen 2:2–3), and God's blessing of humankind with the command to be fruitful (פֶּרָה), “multiply” (רִבְיָה) and “fill the earth” (מִלֵּא אֶת הָאָרֶץ), subdue it, and have dominion over all creatures in Gen 1:28.

The genealogy in Gen 5\* links the creation with Noah and therefore with the reversal of the creation in the flood and what ensues thereafter. Genesis 5:1–3 links the creation with the genealogy of Adam. Genesis 5:1b–2 refers back to God's creating of humankind (אָדָם, *'ādām*), in the likeness (בְּדַמּוּת) of God, male and female (see Gen 1:26, 27), and God's blessing of them (see Gen 1:28). Genesis 5:1a and 3, which frame verses 1b–2, equate Adam (אָדָם) as a person with אָדָם (*'ādām*), humanity, and 5:3 refers to Adam's son as made in his likeness (בְּדַמּוּתוֹ) and image (כְּצִלְמוֹ) and thereby “links God's blessing of humanity with Adam's more specific

manifestation of this blessing in having a long line of children.”<sup>92</sup> There are ten generations from Adam to Noah inclusively.

The reversal of creation in the flood story and the new creation with its new order are bracketed between genealogical notices in Gen 6:9–10 and 9:28–29. Genesis 6:9–10 and 9:28–29 together follow a pattern similar to the genealogical notices in Gen 5\*.<sup>93</sup> Genesis 6:9–10 links back to the genealogy of Gen 5\* in referring to “descendants” (see Gen 5:1), in listing the three sons of Noah (see Gen 5:32), and in including the expression regarding “walking with God” (see Gen 5:22, 24); and it forms the introduction to the flood story and its aftermath.

The destruction of creation in the flood (Gen 6–7\*) represents a reversal of creation in Gen 1:1–2:3 as signified in the following ways: in Gen 6:12 God “sees” (רָאָה) that the earth is corrupt, in contrast to 1:31, where God “sees” (רָאָה) that everything that he has made, including the earth, is very good (see also Gen 1:10). The flood itself, which is the coming together of the waters above and below the heavens (Gen 7:11), represents a reversal of the creation of the earth through the division of the waters above and below the heavens and the gathering of the latter so that the earth could appear (Gen 1:6–9).<sup>94</sup> The sin that is the reason for the flood is that all flesh has filled the earth with violence and therefore corrupted the earth (Gen 6:11, 12, 13), and the result is the death of all flesh in the flood, except for the righteous and blameless Noah (see Gen 6:9), his family, and the pairs of each kind of creature.

The turning point occurs when God “remembers” (זָכַר) Noah and all the animals in Gen 8:1. This initiates the new creation, symbolized in the wind (רוּחַ) that God makes blow over the earth in Gen 8:1b, paralleling the wind (רוּחַ) from God that hovered over the face of the waters in Gen 1:2, and the dividing of the waters once more (see Gen 1:6–8) in Gen 8:2a with the fountains of the deep and the windows of the heavens being closed (see Gen 7:11). Still following the ordering of the original creation account of divine wind, the division of waters, and then appearance of dry land, in the new creation the tops of the mountains appear (Gen 8:5) and the waters dry up from the earth on New Year’s Day (Gen 8:13a, 14). This is followed by an allusion to the blessing in Gen 1:28 with God’s command to Noah to

92. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 71.

93. *Ibid.*, 73.

94. For other correspondences between Gen 1:1–2:3 and Gen 6–7\* (P), such as the terminology for the creatures, and provision of food, see *ibid.*, 64–65.

go out of the ark with his family and all the creatures so that they might “be fruitful” (פֶּרֶה) and “multiply” (רָבָה) on the earth (Gen 8:15–17).

Continuing a sequence similar to that within the original creation account, the description of the new world order within this new creation begins in Gen 9:1 with a repetition of the original blessing of God in 1:28a in the command to “be fruitful” (פֶּרֶה), and “multiply” (רָבָה), and “fill the earth” (מִלֵּא אֶת הָאָרֶץ), a command that is repeated in similar terms in 9:7. Genesis 9:1, 7 do not contain the command found in 1:28 to rule over (רָדָה) the animals and subdue (כִּבֵּשׁ) the earth. However, the relationship between humans and animals in the new order takes a turn for the worse; not only can animals be eaten now (9:3), in contrast to 1:29–30, where only plants are to be eaten, but the holy war language of “fear and dread” and “into your hand they are delivered” (9:2) is used to express human-kind’s oppressive rule over the creatures of the earth.<sup>95</sup> There is a limitation on violence expressed in Gen 9:4–6, with the retribution for shedding the blood of humans (9:5–6) based on the creation of humankind in God’s image (see 1:26, 27). It can be said that within this postflood order the authorization of human violence in killing and eating animals provides the necessary precondition for the ritual slaughtering of animals in the sacrificial cult and therefore can be seen to foreshadow the Sinai sanctuary.<sup>96</sup> This is supported by the reference to blood in Gen 9:4, the manipulation of which is so important within Priestly rites.<sup>97</sup> However, although there is a structuring of violence within certain bounds, this new world order in 9:1–7 is inferior to the original creation.<sup>98</sup> The blessing of multiplying and filling the earth (9:1, 7) has now to unfold in this postflood world, which is second best to the original creation.

95. See Lohfink, “Strata of the Pentateuch,” 205–6, esp. n. 9; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 68; Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, trans. John J. Scullion (London: SPCK, 1984), 462.

96. Lohfink, “Strata of the Pentateuch,” 207.

97. See within Pg as delineated in ch. 1, Exod 29\*; and see Boorer, “Earth/Land (אֶרֶץ) in the Priestly Material,” 28–29. Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 236–37, 611) also makes this connection, but also argues that the sacrificial cult is an improvement for the animals in relation to Gen 9:2–4, since in the revelation of the legitimate way of sacrificing animals the violence involved in killing is partially compensated by offering these animals ritually.

98. See Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 167, 169; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 289–93.

The account of this new creation, the postflood world, and its order culminates in the Noahic covenant in Gen 9:8–17, and it is this that ensures the stability of the postflood world. God’s “everlasting covenant” (9:16) is established with Noah, his descendants, and all creatures, never again to destroy the earth and all flesh in a flood. The sign of this covenant is the bow in the clouds (9:16–17), which is perhaps a foreshadowing of the glory of YHWH within the story of the nation (II B, in Exod 16–Num 20\*).<sup>99</sup> The function of the bow in this pericope, however, is to jolt God’s memory; when God sees the bow, God will “remember” (זָכַר) this everlasting covenant (Gen 9:16). This reference to remembering at the end of the account of the Noahic covenant, which concludes the description of the new order of creation, forms an *inclusio* with the beginning of the account of the new creation in Gen 8:1, where God “remembers” (זָכַר) Noah and the animals.

The transition from the first main section, the cosmic backdrop, which encompasses the creation and new creation and refers to humanity in general along with all creatures (I), to the next major section concerning Israel and its ancestors in particular (II) is accomplished through two genealogies. The first genealogy, the table of nations (Gen 10\*), focuses on the spread of humanity in general postflood by outlining the descendants of Noah’s sons, Japheth, Ham, and Shem, with indications of their lands. This is an outgrowth of the new creation postflood and represents the unfolding of the blessing of Gen 1:28, which has been restated in the postflood order in Gen 9:1, 7, in both aspects of multiplying and filling the earth. The second genealogy in Gen 11\* is linear and in its context represents an outgrowth of Gen 10\*. It traces the descendants of Shem through to Abraham. It has a form similar to the genealogy of Gen 5\*, and as in Gen 5\*, there are ten generations, counting from Shem to Abraham inclusively. Therefore, Gen 11\* represents a bridge between humanity in general and Abraham, the ancestor of Israel, in particular; and, given its similarity with Gen 5\*, it makes clear the continuity between the cosmic backdrop and the story of the nation beginning with the family of Abraham in Gen 11:27. It makes clear that the story beginning with Abraham (and his family), and therefore that of the nation, takes place in the new order of creation; unlike Gen 5\*, which unfolds the blessing set within the original creation (Gen 1:28), Gen 11\* is placed as one line arising out of the spread of nations in the

---

99. See Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 175.



postflood world and as the unfolding of the restated blessing of multiplying in Gen 9:1.<sup>100</sup>

The material within the subsection concerning Israel's ancestors (II A) is made up of genealogies and material related to these, such as marriages, birth, death, and burial accounts, travel notices (in and out of the land), and promise texts. The genealogies provide the primary means of structuring this material (see in particular Gen 11:27; 25:12–16, 19–20, 26b; 36:1–5, 9–14; 37:2).<sup>101</sup> However, it is the promise texts, in particular the covenant with Abraham, and its initial unfolding, indeed in part through the genealogies, that form the central theme. The section begins with the genealogy of Terah in Gen 11:27, which picks up from the end of the genealogy in Gen 11\* (11:26), and ends with the death of Jacob (Gen 50:12–13). The transition to the story of the nation (II B) is accomplished by the genealogical list in Exod 1:1–7\*, which bridges the story of Israel/Jacob, to which it looks back (Exod 1:1–5), with Israel as a nation, which comes to fruition in Exod 1:7.

The backdrop to the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17) in Gen 11:27–16:16\* (including Gen 19:29) follows in summary fashion the non-P material, including what is necessary as background to Gen 17. The coming of Abram and his relatives to the land of Canaan, the settling of Abram there, the notice that Sarai bore Abram no children, and that Hagar bore Abram a son, Ishmael, are all motifs picked up in Gen 17 (see 17:8, 15–22). So also is the separation of Abram, who settles in the land of Canaan, from Lot who goes outside the land of Canaan because the land could not support them both. This motif also foreshadows the leaving of Esau from the land because the land could not support the livestock of both Jacob and Esau (Gen 36:6–8). Both of these show which particular line is heir to the land.

The Abrahamic covenant in Gen 17, like the Noahic covenant, is an “everlasting” covenant (ברית עולם) (Gen 17:7; see 9:16). Indeed it is set within the framework of the Noahic covenant, since it occurs within the postflood world, the stability of which the Noahic covenant ensures. It also

---

100. Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 99–101) argues that Gen 10\* (P) is not part of Pg, mainly on the grounds that the juxtaposition of Gen 10:31–32 and Gen 11:10–11 produces a “jarring doublet” (100) and that the P material in Gen 10\* appears to be a redaction of the non-P material. However, even if Gen 10\* were not part of Pg, the transitional nature of Gen 11\* would still stand.

101. See the structure of Gen 11:27–Gen 50\*, based on the genealogies, as set out by Carr (*ibid.*, 124–25).



alludes back to Noah and therefore the Noahic covenant, in that Noah is described as “blameless” and as one who “walked with God” (Gen 6:9), and Abram is commanded by God to “walk before me and be blameless” (17:1). The difference between Noah and Abraham, in walking *with* and walking *before* God respectively, is perhaps because the Abrahamic covenant is set in the postflood world where God is more distant.<sup>102</sup>

However, the primary role of the Abrahamic covenant is forward-looking. The self-revelation of God as El Shaddai at the beginning of the divine speech in Gen 17:1 marks the beginning of a new stage in which God is known as El Shaddai by the ancestors (see Gen 28:3 where Isaac refers to El Shaddai; Gen 35:11 where there is another self-revelation of God as El Shaddai, this time to Jacob; and the reference to this in the Jacob speech in Gen 48:3; see also Exod 6:3). The covenant with Abraham and his descendants then sets the agenda for the rest of the material in Pg, which unfolds the story of Israel and its ancestors in the postflood world (II A and B). There is no Sinai covenant in Pg, and so the foundation for the story of the nation is the Abrahamic covenant; the story of the nation and its ancestors is the unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promises. Moreover, the Abrahamic covenant defines the nation of Israel, not only in that its promises are programmatic for the story of the nation, but also in that it is the keeping of this covenant by circumcision, the sign and acknowledgement of the covenant, that determines who belongs to Israel, the community of God’s people (Gen 17:9–14, esp. 14).

The covenant promises, which are consequently unfolded in the story of the nation and its ancestors, are given equal weight, but in different ways. The bulk of Gen 17:1–8, which spells out the promises, is devoted to the promise of descendants to Abram/Abraham (Gen 17:2, 4–6). This promise is also emphasized through repetition and the changing of Abram’s name, and therefore his identity, to Abraham. Such emphasis is appropriate in this context (within II A) since the unfolding of the promise of descendants forms the primary focus of the ancestral material through its genealogies, its marriages, and birth and death/burial notices. The use of the terminology of being “fruitful” (פֶּרָה) and “multiplying” (רָבָה) from Gen 1:28; 9:1, 7 within the promise of descendants (רָבָה Gen 17:2; פֶּרָה 17:6) shows that this promise and its subsequent unfolding is a

102. See Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 293.

continuation of the blessing of Gen 1:28 or more precisely the blessing of 9:1, 7 in the postflood world.

The promises of land and to be their God (Gen 17:7b–8), though stated more briefly, are equally significant. This is evidenced by the fact that these two promises are introduced emphatically and solemnly in Gen 17:7a as the content of the “everlasting covenant” (ברית עולם) that God is establishing not only with Abraham but also with his descendants. That these promises are given to Abraham’s descendants as well as Abraham looks forward to the unfolding of these promises not only in the ancestral material but especially in the story of the nation of Israel (II B; see Exod 6:2–8). The significance of these two promises is further emphasized in that the promise to be their God is repeated twice (Gen 17:7b, 8b) and forms a frame around the promise of the land (Gen 17:8a), which in turn is focused and highlighted by this frame of the promise to be their God.<sup>103</sup> Moreover, it is these two promises in particular that are restated at the beginning of the section concerned with the story of the nation Israel (II B) in Exod 6:2–8, which forms the basis for its narrative arc.<sup>104</sup> In addition, the promise to be their God has no parallel in the non-P material; it is unique to Pg. And the land promise is formulated in a unique way: it names the land explicitly as the “land of Canaan,” as the land where Abraham is now a resident alien (גר) and, most importantly, it promises this land as “a perpetual holding” (אחזת עולם).<sup>105</sup>

These promises of descendants and land are repeated three more times in the ancestral material (Gen 28:3–4; 35:10–12; 48:4).<sup>106</sup> In Isaac’s bless-

---

103. Pace Westermann (*Genesis 12–36*, 255, 259–60, 262), who argues that the promise of descendants takes precedence in Gen 17, while the promise of the land is very much in the background, overshadowed not only by the promise of descendants but also the promise of divine presence that encloses it (Gen 17:7b, 8b). However, the argument here in terms of framing and Westermann’s own admission of the centrality of Gen 17:7 (262), which introduces Gen 17:8, outweigh his concern that the land promise, unlike the repetition of the other promises, is only mentioned once.

104. This will be unfolded in more detail shortly.

105. None of these features are found with regard to the land promise in any of the non-P references to the land promise in Genesis–Deuteronomy. For an explanation of Pg’s description of the land, see Suzanne Boorer, “The Priestly Promise of the Land: Genesis 17:8 in the Context of P as a Whole,” in Habel, *Earth Story in Genesis*, 177.

106. The promise to be their God is not repeated until Exod 6:7, in the call of Moses, where it occurs along with the promise of the land (Exod 6:2–8).

ing of Jacob in Gen 28:3–4, the promise of descendants is formulated in terms of being “fruitful” (פרה) and “numerous” (רבה) (see Gen 1:28; 9:1, 7; 17:2, 6a) and the land promise is put in terms of “possession” (ירש) of “the land where you live as an alien” (גר; see Gen 17:8). This foreshadows God’s blessing of Jacob at Luz in the land of Canaan in Gen 35:10–12. In Gen 35:10–12, in parallel to Abraham, God reveals himself as El Shaddai and Jacob’s name is changed to Israel in association with the promise of descendants, which again is phrased in terms of “being fruitful” and “multiplying” (פרה, רבה; see Gen 1:28; 9:1, 7; 17:2, 6a), and Jacob and his descendants are promised the land. In Jacob’s speech to Joseph, then, in Gen 48:3–4, he refers back to the revelation at Luz and the promises made to him and his descendants in terms of “being fruitful” (פרה) and “multiplying” (רבה) and with regard to the land, described as “a perpetual holding” (אחזת עולם; see Gen 17:8).<sup>107</sup> The repetition of the terminology of “being fruitful” (פרה) and “multiplying” (רבה) in all these texts clearly shows that the blessing of Gen 9:1, with its backdrop in Gen 1:28, is being unfolded. The repetition of these covenant promises occurs each time with reference to Jacob who, next to Abraham, has a relatively prominent part in the ancestral material. Jacob is the one to whom the Abrahamic covenant promises of descendants and land are reiterated and through whom the promise of descendants to become the nation of Israel unfolds; it is the sons of Jacob that multiply to become the Israelites and from whom the nation gets its name.<sup>108</sup>

The rest of the ancestral material is related to the initial unfolding of the promise of descendants and the land of Canaan. The bulk of this material centers around the outworking of the promise of descendants. This is seen primarily in the genealogies, in terms of which the ancestral material can be said to be structured,<sup>109</sup> along with the closely related birth, marriage, death, and burial accounts. Immediately after Gen 17,<sup>110</sup> there is the

107. See the chart in Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 81) outlining the connections between Gen 17:1–8; 28:3–4; 35:9–12; 48:3–4.

108. Isaac and Joseph are mentioned in a more summary fashion. As we shall see, Isaac functions as an important link in the genealogy of the ancestors of Israel. The skeletal Joseph account functions to bring Jacob and his sons from Canaan into Egypt so that Israel becomes a nation outside the land.

109. See discussion above and n. 101.

110. Prior to Gen 17, as already mentioned, there is the genealogy of Terah (Gen 11:27, 32), along with the birth notice of Ishmael (Gen 16:15–16).

account of the birth of Isaac (21:1–5\*) in fulfillment of the promise of a son in 17:15–22. The death and burial of Sarah follows in 23:1–2, 19. The death and burial of Abraham is then recounted in 25:7–10. This is followed by the genealogy of Ishmael (25:12–16), signifying the extended family of Isaac within Abraham’s descendants. The genealogy of Isaac, whom God blessed after Abraham’s death (25:11a) follows in 25:19–20, 26b, including his marriage to Rebecca (25:20) and the age of Isaac when Jacob and Esau were born (25:26b<sup>111</sup>). Genesis 26:34–35 relates Esau’s marriages as the backdrop to Gen 27:46–28:9 in which Jacob is sent away with Isaac’s blessing to ensure he marries within Rebecca’s family to keep the purity of the line, which in turn leads Esau, in reaction, to marry the daughter of Ishmael. Genesis 35:22b–26 lists the sons of Jacob. The death and burial of Isaac (Gen 35:27–29) ensues, and this is followed by the genealogy of Esau in Gen 36:1–5, 9–14, again signifying an interest in the extended family, this time of Jacob, within the descendants of Abraham and Isaac. Finally, there is the genealogy of Jacob (Gen 37:2\*; 47:28), and his death and burial (Gen 49:1a, 29–33; 50:12–13), after he adopts the two sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen 48:5–6), ensuring their place in the twelve-tribe system.<sup>112</sup> The notice concerning the family of Jacob “being fruitful” (פרה) and “multiplying” (רבה) in the land of Egypt (Gen 47:27b) signifies the unfolding of the promise of descendants (Gen 17:2, 4–6), which represents the unfolding of the blessing in Gen 1:28, or more precisely Gen 9:1, 7, and foreshadows Exod 1:7.

The remaining material relates to the promise of the land of Canaan. An important text in this regard is Gen 23, Abraham’s purchase of the cave of Machpelah to bury Sarah. This can be seen from its position after the Abrahamic covenant and the initial unfolding of the promise of descendants in the birth of Isaac (Gen 21:1–5) as well as its relative amount of detail. In purchasing this plot of land in the land of Canaan (see Gen 23:19), Abraham changes his status from resident alien in the land to landowner and therefore possesses a part of the land of Canaan. The purchasing of this field links back to the promise of the land in Gen 17:8,

111. Pg is fragmentary at this point, presumably because in the process of redaction non-P material replaced P material; see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 14.

112. See the chart in Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 94) that outlines the correspondences in the genealogical frameworks between Terah’s descendants (under which Abraham is subsumed), Isaac’s descendants, and Jacob’s descendants.

where it is described in terms of a “perpetual holding” (אחזת עולם) in that it is repeatedly described in terms of a “possession [אחזת] for burial” in Gen 23:4, 9, 20 (and see also Gen 49:30; 50:13).<sup>113</sup> Subsequently, Abraham and the other patriarchs and matriarchs are also buried there (25:9–10; 49:31; 50:13).<sup>114</sup> Therefore it can be argued that “the granting of the land of Canaan, promised in Gen 17:8, is initially focused symbolically in this small area of land in which Sarah and then the other ancestors are buried.”<sup>115</sup> The burial of the ancestors in the cave of Machpelah represents the initial unfolding of the promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, for in death they possess the small plot of their grave; but it is also proleptic with regard to the future unfolding of this promise of everlasting possession of the whole land of Canaan for their descendants, the nation Israel.

In life, the ancestors come and go to and from the land in which they are resident aliens (גֵּר; see Gen 17:8; 28:4). This is represented in a series of travel reports that display similarities in structure and wording (Gen 12:5; 13:6, 11–12\*; Gen 31:18\*; 36:6–7; 46:6–7).<sup>116</sup> As already mentioned, Abram, Sarai, and Lot come to the land of Canaan (Gen 12:5); Abram settles in the land of Canaan, but Lot separates from Abram and leaves the land of Canaan (13:6, 11b, 12\*). Jacob is sent away to Paddan-Aram

---

113. See §1.2.2.5.1, above, regarding אֶחְזָה and whether the use of the term here is significant.

114. With the exception of Rachel.

115. Boorer, “Priestly Promise,” 178–79; and see McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 142 n. 77a. Various commentators nuance this in different ways. E.g., McEvenue (*Narrative Style*, 119, 142–43) speaks of Gen 23 as a “symbolic fulfillment” of Gen 17:8, or, taking up Elliger’s term, as fulfilling it “in nuce.” Wenham (*Genesis 16–50*, 130) speaks of “partial fulfillment.” Walter Brueggemann (*Genesis*, IBC [Atlanta: John Knox, 1982], 196) sees the securing of this property for the grave as “a symbolic but concrete guarantee of possession of the land”; he states further (196), “This little piece of land signifies the whole land, certainly promised and undoubtedly to be possessed.” Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 122) states, “this description of the burial of multiple generations of ancestors in the land is at the same time a claim of the Israelites’ right to possess it.” Pace Van Seters (*Abraham in History and Tradition*, 294–95) who favors Gunkel’s view that Gen 23 represents a polemic against the cult of the dead or hero worship (see also Jason S. Bray, “Genesis 23: A Priestly Paradigm for Burial,” *JSOT* 60 (1993), 69–73, for a similar view); and Westermann (*Genesis 12–36*, 376), who argues that the primary focus is the family rite of burial.

116. See the chart of correspondences between these passages in Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 104–5.

(28:1–5), and he comes back to the land of Canaan (31:18<sup>\*117</sup>). Esau separates from Jacob and leaves the land of Canaan<sup>118</sup> for the same reason that Lot separates from Abram and leaves the land: because the land could not support both of them (36:6–8).<sup>119</sup> Finally, though Jacob initially settles in the land of Canaan (37:1), he and all his family leave the land of Canaan and go to Egypt (46:6–7), where they multiply (47:27b), and where Jacob dies (Gen 47:28, 49:33).<sup>120</sup> This forms the backdrop to the transition in Exod 1:1–5, 7 where Jacob's descendants become the nation Israel in the land of Egypt.

Exodus 1:1–5, 7 is a transitional passage. It looks back to the ancestral material in terms of alluding to its genealogical form<sup>121</sup> and in listing the sons of Jacob (see Gen 35:22b–26), who came to Egypt along with Jacob, and Joseph. It also looks forward to the story of the nation of Israel by equating Israel as Jacob in 1:1 with Israel as a nation in 1:7, where the emergence of Israel as a people is described. Moreover, in equating Jacob and

---

117. There is a gap in the text of Pg here, which Noth thinks is due to the omission of Pg material in favor of non-P material in the process of redaction; see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 14.

118. Reading with the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch rather than the MT.

119. See the discussion of Carr (*Fractures of Genesis*, 108–9) concerning the pattern here of the death of a patriarch and the subsequent splitting of the household where the recipient of the land promise stays in the land of Canaan and the excluded relative moves outside the land, except for Jacob's sons who all move outside the land to Egypt.

120. Gen 46:6–7 is preceded by a skeletal allusion to the Joseph story; however, this is another place where it seems that Pg material has been omitted in favor of non-P material in the process of redaction; see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 14. Note that Jacob is buried, however, in the cave of Machpelah in the land of Canaan (Gen 50:12–13).

121. Except that instead of the *toledoth* formula (see, e.g., Gen 11:27; 25:12, 19; 36:1, 9; 37:2; and see also within the cosmic material of section I Gen 5:1; 10:1; 11:10), it refers to “the names of the sons of Israel.” Contrary to Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 121 n. 16), who argues that the superscription of Exod 1:1 marks a structural break, this is not the case, even though it has been maintained here that Gen 11:27, the *toledoth* of Terah does mark a structural break. That the *toledoth* of Terah should begin the section regarding the ancestors is appropriate since that whole section is structured by genealogies, whereas after Exod 1:1–5, 7 the genealogies disappear. Exodus 1:1, however, links back to the ancestral section in a transitional way, more akin to how Carr describes Exod 1:1–5, 7 later (122) as helping to “accomplish the shift from the genealogically focused family history giving an account of Israel's ancestors (Gen 5:1–50:26\*) to a national history.”

Israel in this way, the listing of Jacob's twelve sons in Exod 1:1–5 implies that the nation of Israel comprises the twelve tribes named accordingly.<sup>122</sup> The description of the nation in Exod 1:7, then, refers back to Gen 47:27b, the multiplying of Jacob and his sons in Egypt, and picks up the language of being fruitful (פֶּרָה), multiplying (רָבָה), and the land being filled (מָלֵא הָאָרֶץ) used in Gen 1:28 and its repetition in Gen 9:1 (and see Gen 9:7). It therefore presents the emergence of the nation, at least its first generation, as the unfolding of the blessing given at creation or more precisely the unfolding of the blessing given within the new creation of the postflood world. It is also, in effect, as the first generation of the nation, the initial fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant promise of descendants (Gen 17:2, 4–6; and see 35:11; 28:3; 48:4). However, the land that Israel fills is the land of Egypt, and this forms the backdrop for the narrative of the exodus that is to follow.

Exodus 1:13–7:7\* forms a programmatic backdrop both to the story of the nation as a whole and to the exodus and the events leading up to it (Exod 7:8–14:29\*) in particular.

Exodus 1:13–2:25\* introduces the situation of Israel, which has multiplied in the land of Egypt, as slavery under the brutality of the Egyptians (Exod 1:13–14), and God's response to this (Exod 2:23b–25). God "remembers" (זָכַר) this covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 2:24) when God hears their groaning and "sees" (רָאָה) the Israelites and their plight (Exod 2:25; see Gen 1:31; 6:12). As in the flood story where God's "remembering" (זָכַר) Noah and the animals is the turning point from destruction to new creation (Gen 8:1), God's "remembering" (זָכַר) his covenant is the turning point for the Israelites from the destructive violence of the Egyptian oppression to liberation. These verses (Exod 1:13–2:25\*) form the introductory backdrop to the divine speech in Exod 6:2–8 where the motif of God's "remembering" (זָכַר) his covenant is reiterated (Exod 6:5).<sup>123</sup>

The divine speech in Exod 6:2–8 is very important within Pg's trajectory, not only in that it is part of the turning point signified by God remembering his covenant (6:5) but most significantly in that it represents the programmatic basis for all that is to follow. It refers back to the

122. Something that is spelled out more explicitly by a later hand in Num 1–2\*.

123. This is in response to the cries of the Israelites in both Exod 2:23b and 6:5.



ancestors, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at several points (6:3, [5], 8) but also forward to the rest of the story of Israel, including the exodus.

The whole story of the nation here is introduced in Exod 6:2–8 by two means. First, it begins with the self-revelation of God by the name YHWH (Exod 6:2–3), reinforced by the expression “I am YHWH” (אֲנִי יְהוָה) at the beginning and end of the speech (Exod 6:2, 8, and see 6:6, 7). The designation of God as YHWH, which begins here, characterizes the story of the nation as distinct from the cosmic backdrop, where God is called Elohim, and the ancestral material, where God is known as El Shaddai. Second, it reiterates the Abrahamic covenant promises of the land of Canaan (Exod 6:4, 8) and to be their God (Exod 6:7). As in the Abrahamic covenant, where these two promises are closely associated by means of one framing the other (Gen 17:7–8), here also the repetition of one of the promises, this time that of the land (Exod 6:4, 8), surrounds the other promise to be their God (Exod 6:7a). Not surprisingly, since the promise of descendants has effectively been fulfilled in the existence of the nation, at least its first generation (Exod 1:7), it is these two promises that come into prominence in the whole story of the Mosaic generation of the nation, and indeed they form the agenda around which it unfolds. The outworking of the promise to be their God is emphasized throughout the pre-Sinai material in the exodus account (Exod 7–14\*) and the episode in the wilderness of Sin (Exod 16\*), is particularly prominent in the Sinai material (Exod 19–40\*), and unfolds in the post-Sinai material—albeit in a negative way that entails judgment. The material from the exodus onward moves in stages by means of itineraries from Egypt east to the plains of Moab at the very edge of the land of Canaan, in this way portraying the unfolding of the promise of the land of Canaan. That the account stops short of narrating any entrance into the land and thus the fulfillment of the promise of its everlasting possession has to do with the story of the failure of that generation, the Mosaic generation, post-Sinai (Num 13–27\*); this post-Sinai material therefore also has to do with the land promise, albeit in a negative way. In places, it is the promise to be their God that forms the primary focus of attention, and at other points it is the land promise, but it is these two promises and their interplay that form the primary subject matter of the story of the first generation of the nation.

More narrowly, Exod 6:2–8 introduces the exodus account (Exod 6–14\*) in linking the identification of the name YHWH and the promise to be their God with the promise to free the Israelites from the burdens



of the Egyptians (Exod 6:6–7): they will know that YHWH, their God, is the one who frees them. In addition, structurally it is inseparable from 6:10–12; 7:1–5: Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 contains the elements of commission (indeed two commissions), objection, and reassurance with a focus on the exodus. With Exod 6:2–8 included generically within the call of Moses, there is in a sense a double commission: to tell the Israelites that YHWH will free them from the Egyptians and will be their God (6:6–8) and to go and tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of the land (6:10). The refusal of the Israelites to listen when Moses carries out the former (6:9) forms the reason for his objection in 6:12, which leads then to the divine response in 7:1–5 that acts as an assurance. Within Exod 7:1–5, verses 1–2 reaffirm the second commission but incorporate within it the role of Aaron, and 7:3–5 are a summarizing statement of the exodus and the events surrounding it in 7:8–14:29\*. As such, Exod 7:3–5 have a double function: as part of the divine response in Moses's call narrative, which offers reassurance in outlining what will occur, and as a programmatic backdrop to 7:8–14:29\*.

The whole subsection of Exod 6:2–7:7\*, therefore, acts as an introduction, and (with its backdrop in 1:13–2:25\*) performs a double function: to introduce the story of Israel as a whole and to introduce that part of it concerning the exodus from Egypt.

The account of the exodus (Exod 7:8–14:29\*) occurs in three stages, which are reflected in the introductory summary of this material in 7:3–5. The first stage is the series of signs (7:8–11:10\*), introduced by Exod 7:3, which are designed to demonstrate the cosmic power of YHWH that renders powerless any opposition whether divine or human (Pharaoh/the gods of Egypt and the magicians). These signs begin the destruction of the land of Egypt and its people. The second stage (12:1, 2–13, 28, 40–41), introduced by Exod 7:4, is the exodus from Egypt that is linked with the rite of the Passover. The Passover celebrates YHWH's execution of judgment on the gods of Egypt by striking down the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both human and animals, and the land of Egypt itself (12:12–13); and as a consequence of performing the Passover rite, the Israelites go out of the land of Egypt (12:28, 40–41). Again the expression "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה) is associated with this in Exod 12:12. The third stage in Exod 14\*, with its introduction in 7:5, has close links to the first stage in 7:8–11:10\* (see, e.g., the motif of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart) and can be interpreted as the climax of the signs, and the ultimate demonstration of YHWH's superior cosmic power over Pharaoh and the Egyptians. The point of this ultimate destruction and defeat of Egypt, the opposing power,

is so that YHWH can “gain glory [כבוד] for himself” and so that the Egyptians will know, in their demise, that “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) (Exod 14:4, 17; and see 7:5), an assertion made repeatedly in relation to Israel in Exod 6:2–8 (6:2, 7, 8).

Overall, the account of the exodus in Exod 7–14\* represents the unfolding of the promise to be their God (Gen 17:7, 8; Exod 6:7), for here YHWH is revealed as the one who frees his people from oppression through his great power by which he gains glory over the Egyptians, with the repetition of “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) in Exod 12:12; 14:4, 18 reinforcing this. It is this YHWH who is to be celebrated in the rite of Passover. It also represents the beginnings of the unfolding of the promise of the land, for in leaving Egypt (Exod 12:40–41) and moving through the Reed Sea (Exod 14\*), Israel is set on her journey by the powerful acts of YHWH, east toward the land of Canaan. This is taken up subsequently in the itinerary in Exod 15:22\*, 27; 16:1, where they move from the Reed Sea to Elim to the wilderness of Sin.

The next stage of the journey toward the land of Canaan pre-Sinai is the account concerning the manna in the wilderness of Sin in Exod 16\*. Again, this is not only a further unfolding of the land promise in that it is set between the itineraries proceeding toward the land in Exod 16:1 and 17:1abα; 19:1, 2a but represents a further unfolding of the covenant promise to be their God. In response to the complaint of the people who wish they had died in Egypt rather than die of hunger in the wilderness (16:3), YHWH feeds Israel with manna. Whereas in Exod 14\* YHWH gets glory (כבוד) for himself over the Egyptians, here the “glory” (כבוד) of YHWH appears at a distance (toward the wilderness). The consequent speech of YHWH makes clear that the purpose of the sustenance he will give is so that the people will know that YHWH is their God, “I am YHWH [אני יהוה], your God” (Exod 16:12; see 6:7). The speech of Moses and Aaron prior to this in Exod 16:6–7 explains that part of knowing “I am YHWH” is recognizing that it was YHWH and not Moses and Aaron who brought them out of the land of Egypt (see 6:7). This manifestation of the unfolding of the promise to be their God, therefore, reveals YHWH not only as the one who freed them from the Egyptians, but also the one who feeds and sustains them, something that occurs throughout the wilderness period (Exod 16:21, 35\*).

Indeed, Exod 16\* forms a bridge to the stage of the journey situated at Sinai, since precisely through its motifs of the knowledge of YHWH and YHWH’s glory it looks both backward and forward: the knowledge of the

Israelites that “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) in Exod 16:12 looks back to 6:7; 12:12 and forward to 29:46; and the “glory” (כבוד) of YHWH in Exod 16:10 looks back to 14:4, 17, 18 and forward to Exod 24:17; 29:43; 40:34.

The itineraries that follow in Exod 17:1ab, from the wilderness of Sin to Rephidim, and 19:1, 2a, from Rephidim to the wilderness of Sinai,<sup>124</sup> represent a further unfolding of the land promise. This introduces the Sinai material, which, in being bracketed by itineraries in Exod 19:1, 2a and Num 10:11–13\* is represented as a further stage on the journey toward the land of Canaan.

The Sinai material (Exod 25–29; 39–40\*) is concerned with the tabernacle/tent of meeting as the means of YHWH’s presence. Its primary focus, therefore, is the unfolding of the promise to be their God.

The unfolding of the promise to be their God is seen in the references to the “glory” (כבוד) of YHWH, associated with the cloud, that form an *inclusio* around the material concerned with the sanctuary and its personnel (Exod 24–40\*) in Exod 24:16–17 and 40:34. In Exod 24:15b–18a, the glory of YHWH settles (שכן) on cloud-covered Mount Sinai and is witnessed by the people; Moses goes up the mountain into the cloud on the seventh day. After the completion of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, the glory of YHWH fills the cloud-covered tabernacle/tent of meeting (40:34) as predicted in Exod 29:43. Thereby, the glory of YHWH, and the associated cloud, signifies that YHWH’s presence is no longer at a distance, on the top of Mount Sinai where it is only accessible to Moses (24:15b–18a) (or prior to this in the wilderness at a distance from the people, 16:10), but is centered in the tabernacle/tent of meeting (40:34).

Indeed, the whole of the extensive material devoted to the instructions for the sanctuary and its priesthood in Exod 25–29\*, given to Moses on the mountain according to the heavenly pattern (25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8b), and the carrying out of these in Exod 39–40\* makes it abundantly clear that the purpose of the sanctuary with its personnel is so that YHWH may be present with Israel in fulfillment of the promise to be their God. This is spelled out clearly in Exod 29:43–46, which effectively concludes the instructions for the sanctuary (Exod 25–29\*) with a statement regarding its purpose: “I will meet with Israel there ... I will dwell among the Israelites, and I will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord [אני יהוה] their

124. Exod 19:1 would seem to interrupt the two itinerary notices in Exod 17:1\* and 19:2a. However, 19:1 provides an opening introduction to the Sinai material that emphasizes its importance. See Noth, *Exodus*, 155.

God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them. I am the Lord [אני יהוה] their God.”<sup>125</sup> This links the unfolding of the promise to be their God in the exodus with the further unfolding of this promise in the divine presence in their midst; indeed, the purpose of the exodus, the freeing of Israel from Egypt, is so that YHWH can be present among them. This is what it means for YHWH to be their God. The presence of God as the purpose of the sanctuary is variously expressed: sometimes as YHWH’s “meeting with” (יעד ל) them (29:43; see also 25:22, though this is in relation to Moses rather than Israel); at other times as YHWH’s “dwelling among” (שבן בתוך) them (25:8; 29:45–46). Be that as it may,<sup>126</sup> what is important here is that the establishment of the sanctuary as the means of YHWH’s presence with his people is the fulfillment par excellence of YHWH’s promise to be their God, as reinforced by the formula, “I am YHWH [אני יהוה] their God” (29:46) whom the Israelites thereby come to know.

There is yet a further purpose for the sanctuary: it is also the place where YHWH meets with Moses to give commands in relation to the Israelites (Exod 25:22; see also Num 14:10b, 26–35\*; 20:6–8\*). In sum, YHWH fulfills his promise to be their God in freeing and sustaining them, in being present in their midst, and in giving commands with regard to the Israelites through Moses.

Moreover, this sanctuary, as the means of YHWH dwelling in the midst of Israel and from which YHWH issues commands through Moses, is portable. YHWH’s presence which is now in their midst, therefore is no longer associated with a fixed place (Mount Sinai; see Exod 24:15b–18a) but moves with the Israelites as they continue on their journey away from Sinai (Num 10:11–13\*; and see Exod 29:43; 40:34).<sup>127</sup>

---

125. See Weimar, “Sinai und Schöpfung,” 356–57; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 64.

126. The different terminology used here for the presence of YHWH and its significance will be discussed in ch. 4 when we look at the possible combination of traditions that compose this material.

127. Although Num 1–2\*, presented as the first instructions to Moses in the tent of meeting after it has been set up (Num 1:1), is being taken here as having been added to Pg at a later time, it is interesting to note that it provides a picture that further unfolds the Abrahamic covenant promises of descendants, to be their God, and the land. The fulfillment of the promise of descendants, based as it is in Pg on the sons of Jacob (Exod 1:1–5, 7) is more closely elaborated and defined in the (military) census of the tribes in Num 1. The unfolding of the promise to be their God is further

The chronological notice in Num 10:11a refers to the twentieth day of the second month of the second year. This is coherent with Exod 19:1, which dates Israel's arrival at Sinai on the first day of the third month after the exodus, and also with Exod 40:17, where the erection of the tabernacle takes place on the first day of the first month of the second year.<sup>128</sup> Numbers 10:11a, therefore, designates the stay at Sinai as just short of one year and with the itinerary in Num 10:12–13\* forms the transition to the next stage in the unfolding of the land promise in the wilderness of Paran.

The rest of the material in Pg's account of the story of the Mosaic generation of Israel, set post-Sinai, centers around the nation's and its leaders' rejection of the unfolding of both the promise of the land and/or the promise to be their God and their consequent demise.

The rejection of both the promise of the land and the way in which the promise to be their God has unfolded thus far, leading to the demise of the nation, is clearly portrayed in the episode of the surveying of the land in Num 13–14\*, which is set in the wilderness of Paran (see Num 13:3).

The tribal leaders (with the exception of Joshua and Caleb) bring an "evil report" (דְּבָרָה) of the land of Canaan, describing it as a killer "that devours its inhabitants" (Num 13:32).<sup>129</sup> This results in their death by plague (14:36–37).<sup>130</sup> The reason for their deaths in terms of bringing a

---

defined in the portrayal of the arrangement of the tribes in their military camping and marching order around the sanctuary, as the means of God's presence at the very center of the people, and in YHWH's preparedness to engage in holy war on behalf of the nation of Israel; see Rolf Knierim ("The Book of Numbers," in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Stegemann [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990], 159) who describes this as "Israel's militia ... in the service of cultic warfare" (162) or as "the campaign of the sanctuary with the tribes in attendance" (161). The actual marching arrangement of the tribes, with Judah the largest tribe (Num 1:27) set on the east and setting out first as leader of the march (Num 2:3–9), pictures the subsequent journey as in an eastward direction away from Egypt and toward the land, and therefore as preparation for the further unfolding of the promise of the land.

128. See Mark Smith, *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus*, JSOTSup 239 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 290–93. Smith sees the third month of the year as the setting for Sinai as significant since this timing coincides with the Festival of Weeks (291–92).

129. Lohfink ("Priestly Narrative," 159) refers to their slandering of the land.

130. Like the nations who are judged by God in the exilic oracle in Ezek 36:1–15 for slandering the mountains of Israel by saying they "devour people" (36:13), the

bad report about the land is repeated twice, showing that this is an important motif within this pericope. That this is an explicit rejection of the Abrahamic covenant promise of the land of Canaan is seen from the description of the land, evaluated (תור) by the tribal leaders, as the gift of YHWH (13:2) and the extent of the land surveyed as described in Num 13:21.<sup>131</sup> The people as a whole collude with this in their complaint in Num 14:1a, 2–3, where, beginning with the exodus, they wish that they had never set out on the journey toward the promised land and wish to go back to Egypt. Moreover they actively reject the alternative view put forward by Joshua and Caleb that the land is exceedingly good (טובה הארץ; מֵאֵד מְאֵד; 14:7b).<sup>132</sup> In this way, it portrays the complete rejection of the land of Canaan, and their journey so far, the land promised to them in the Abrahamic covenant in Gen 17:8, restated with emphasis in Exod 6:4, 8, and its unfolding in the stages of the story of the nation so far by means of itineraries.

In the complaint of the people in Num 14:2–3, there is not only a rejection of the promised land but also a rejection of the unfolding of the promise to be their God that has occurred so far. In their wishing to have died in Egypt (14:2b) and in their preference to return to Egypt (14:3c), the people reject the exodus. This is where YHWH has revealed himself as their God, in delivering them from oppression through his cosmic power that renders powerless opposing powers, both human and divine, and by which he gains glory over the Egyptians (Exod 7–14\*; see the repetition of “I am YHWH” in Exod 6:6–7, and the connection of this expression with YHWH’s destruction of the Egyptians and their coming to the knowledge of YHWH thereby in 12:12; 14:8, 18). In line with their rejection of who YHWH is as their God revealed to them in the exodus as the one who defeats other nations (Exod 7–14\*), they assume that they will be killed and captured in the killer land with its giant inhabitants in Num 14:3. This is further escalated in Num 14:10a where the people reject in a dramatic way the counter assurances of Joshua and Caleb in holy war language that they need not fear the people of the land for YHWH is with Israel, and the

---

leaders of Israel here are judged by YHWH. See McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 134–36; Lohfink, “Original Sin,” 110–12; Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 159.

131. Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 55.

132. A description that echoes that of the cosmic earth (Gen 1:10, 30), which suggests also that the people’s rejection of this (Num 14:10a) is also a negation of the fulfillment of the geographic goal inherent in God’s good creation; see *ibid.*, 55.

protection (לְצַל) of the people of the land, that is, the support of their gods,<sup>133</sup> is removed so that, instead of the land eating the Israelites, its inhabitants will, like bread, be consumed by the Israelites (Num 14:9aβb). Their rejection of YHWH's promise to be their God in terms of the exodus could not be clearer.

However, there is also a rejection of the promise to be their God as unfolded within Exod 16\* and the Sinai pericope. In Num 14:2b, the people state their wish that they had died in the wilderness, therefore negating their knowledge of YHWH as the one who nurtures them in the wilderness (see Exod 16:12, "I am YHWH") and also the whole of what unfolds in the Sinai pericope and its purpose (see Exod 29:45–46, "I am YHWH") that is set in the wilderness.

As alluded to earlier (§1.2.2.5.1), Num 13–14\* mirrors and reverses Exod 16\* by means of a similar structure, which accentuates their differences.<sup>134</sup> In Num 13–14\*, the people are put in a more negative light than in Exod 16\* in that, for example, in Num 14:3 they explicitly bring an accusation against YHWH, whereas in Exod 16:3b the people understand their accusation as being against Moses and Aaron only;<sup>135</sup> and whereas in Exod 16\* the people are instructed, in Num 14:10a the people show that they are not open to instruction, which is all the more jarring coming after what they should have learned about YHWH in Exod 16\* and at Sinai.<sup>136</sup> Consequently, there are opposite outcomes: in Exod 16\* sustenance and life for the people, who are instructed in the knowledge of God ("I am YHWH") in partial fulfillment of the unfolding of the promise to be their God; and in Num 13–14\* judgment from the very God whose nurturing action in the past they have rejected.

In relation to the Sinai pericope, the people, in rejecting the assurance that "YHWH is with us" (Num 14:9), reject the presence of YHWH who

133. See Davies, *Numbers*, 141; Budd, *Numbers*, 156; Levine, *Numbers 1–20*, 364.

134. The congregation complains against Moses and Aaron with a speech comprising a death wish and an accusation (Num 14:1a, 2–3; Exod 16:2–3); there is a disputation speech in response to the complaint (Num 14:6–9\*; Exod 16:6–7); the glory of YHWH appears (Num 14:10b; Exod 16:10), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (and Aaron) that includes an instruction to speak to the people (Num 14:26–29, 31, 35; Exod 16:11–12); the delivery of the oracle is simply assumed, with the ensuing events reported straight after the YHWH speech (Num 14:36–38; Exod 16:13–15\*).

135. They have to be instructed subsequently by Moses and Aaron that it is really a complaint against YHWH (Exod 16:6–7).

136. See Boorer, "Place of Numbers 13–14\*," 56–57.



is dwelling in their midst by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and who YHWH has shown himself to be by delivering them from Egypt in order to dwell among them as summed up in “I am YHWH” (Exod 29:45–46). They are described tellingly by YHWH in Num 14:35 as this wicked congregation “meeting against [יעד על] me,” which is surely an ironic play on, and reversal of, YHWH’s promise to “meet with [יעד ל] the Israelites” at the tent of meeting in Exod 29:43 (and see Exod 25:22).

The link between Num 13–14\* and what precedes it in Exod 16\* and the Sinai pericope is portrayed emphatically in the motif of the presence of YHWH as symbolized by the “glory” (כבוד) of YHWH (Num 14:10b; see Exod 16:10; 29:43; 40:34). It appears at the tent of meeting to all the Israelites (Num 14:10b). However, in the reverse of its positive roles in Exod 16\* and the Sinai pericope, in Num 14:10b it forms the backdrop for YHWH’s speech of judgment announcing that this generation of the nation will die outside the land in the wilderness, just as they wished in Num 14:2c (Num 14:26–28, 29\*, 35), as a consequence of their rejection of the promises of the land (14:36) and that YHWH would be their God (14:35). The promise of the land will not be fulfilled for that generation. The surveyors die immediately (14:36–37), and this is proleptic of the death of that whole generation in the wilderness.<sup>137</sup> Only Joshua and Caleb survive because they did not reject, but embraced, the promised land and the promise that YHWH would be their God, by naming the land as exceedingly good and advocating that YHWH is with them (14:7, 9aβb).

Despite the rejection of the promised land and the predicted demise of that generation outside it, the itinerary to the wilderness of Zin in Num 20:1a moves the journey inexorably forward. The pericope in Num 20:2–12\* not only represents the next stage of the unfolding of the land promise, but the promise to be their God is further unfolded in that YHWH sustains the people in the wilderness with water (Num 20:7, 8\*, 11b; see Exod 16\*) after the “glory” (כבוד) of YHWH once more appears at the entrance of the tent of meeting (Num 20:6). However, this time it is Moses (and Aaron) who reject YHWH’s promise to be their God, by blocking the manifestation of YHWH as Israel’s God right at the point of YHWH’s demonstrating this in sustaining them (Num 12:10, 11b, 12). This does not prevent the promise that YHWH would be their God from unfolding for

---

137. See McEvenue (*Narrative Style*, 36), who refers to a symbolic fulfillment “in nuce.”



the people at this point by sustaining them with water in an analogous way to the manna in Exod 16\*. But the consequence for Moses and Aaron is that they also are to die outside the land.

The focus of Num 20:2–12\* is primarily on Moses and Aaron, rather than the people as in Num 13–14\*. This is seen from the fact that the people voice their complaint against Moses and Aaron only, whom they have “gathered against” (עַד עַל; 20:2,4<sup>138</sup>), in contrast to Num 14:2–3, where the complaint of the people is also against YHWH (14:3), whom they are described as “meeting against” (עַד עַל; 14:35). When, in Num 20:6 the “glory” (כְּבוֹד) of YHWH appears (in continuity with Exod 16:10; 29:43; 40:34; Num 14:10b) at the tent of meeting, it appears not to the people but to Moses and Aaron alone. Moreover, in Num 20:2–12\*, there is no judgment in the YHWH speeches against the people, who are not at fault here, as in Num 14:26–35\*; judgment is reserved in the YHWH speech in Num 20:12 for Moses and Aaron alone. The YHWH speech in Num 20:7, 8α\*β comprises instructions for Moses and Aaron to carry out (cf. 14:26–35\*, where YHWH’s speech is directed against the people through Moses and Aaron); and the emphasis lies in the disobedience of Moses and Aaron to YHWH’s command. The precise nature of the sin of Moses (and Aaron) has been much debated.<sup>139</sup> However, in Pg as delineated here, it is clear that Moses does not obey the command of YHWH to speak to the rock before the eyes of the people to yield its water (Num 20:8α\*β); rather, he<sup>140</sup> speaks to *the people*, calling them rebels, which in this context they clearly are not, and therefore taking the place of YHWH in judging them when YHWH does not. He says, “Listen you rebels, shall *we* bring forth water from this rock?” (Num 20:10, emphasis added). Moses’s speech to the people here draws attention to himself and Aaron as potentially the ones who will bring forth water from the rock, rather than YHWH whose cosmic power has been revealed in Exod 7–16\*. The people are provided

---

138. The people refer to themselves as the assembly of YHWH, thus reinforcing that their complaint is not against YHWH but against Moses and Aaron.

139. The lack of clarity, or ambiguity and vagueness, in this area is commented on by most scholars, e.g., Dennis Olson, *Numbers*, IBC (Louisville: John Knox, 1996), 128; Davies, *Numbers*, 204; Budd, *Numbers*, 219. The debate is extensive and has occurred primarily in relation to the present text; for a helpful summary of the most common views, see Olson, *Numbers*, 126–29.

140. Although the text does not name Moses explicitly here, making it ambiguous as to whether the speaker is Moses or Aaron, it is generally assumed that it is Moses.

with water. However, from the people's perspective, there is no indication that YHWH is behind this miracle, especially since the people have not witnessed the appearance of the glory of YHWH in Num 20:6 or heard its accompanying YHWH speech of instructions to Moses. Moses's disobedience to YHWH's command leads to his and Aaron's demise. The disobedience of Moses (and Aaron) here is even more dramatic when Num 20:2–12\* is compared with Exod 16\* with which it corresponds, not only in terms of the motif of sustenance for the people, but also, like Num 13–14\*, in terms of its basic structure.<sup>141</sup> Again, the similarities highlight the major differences. Indeed, Num 20:2–12\* reverses the portrayal of Moses and Aaron as found in Exod 16\*. In Exod 16\*, Moses and Aaron repeatedly point away from themselves to what YHWH has done and is doing for Israel in bringing them out of Egypt and providing them with manna (Exod 16:6–7, 9, 15). In obedience to YHWH's speech consequent upon the appearance of the glory in Exod 16:11–12, where the provision of food has the purpose of Moses, Aaron, and the people coming to the knowledge of YHWH ("I am YHWH your God"), Moses explains that the bread is a gift of YHWH. The people come to the knowledge of YHWH mediated by the speech of Moses. This lies in stark contrast to Moses's disobedience in his speech in Num 20:10 in which he (and Aaron) clearly usurp the place and role of YHWH,<sup>142</sup> giving the people to believe that it is they, and not YHWH, who provides them with water, thus preventing the people from coming to further knowledge of YHWH. In not obeying the command of YHWH through which YHWH's actions and presence in relation to the people are mediated and in usurping YHWH's place, it is not surprising that Moses and Aaron are therefore accused by YHWH of "not having trusted in YHWH to show my holiness before the eyes of the Israelites" (Num 20:12). In this way, Moses (and Aaron) have in this instance worked against the revelation of YHWH as "the Holy One who is present and active in their midst"<sup>143</sup> and therefore YHWH's promise to

---

141. The congregation speaks against Moses and Aaron, and this includes a death wish and an accusation (Num 20:2, 3b, 4; see Exod 16:2–5), the glory of YHWH appears (Num 20:6; see Exod 16:10) followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (Num 20:7, 8\*; see Exod 16:11–12), and consequently what happens is unfolded (Num 20:10b, 11b, 12; see Exod 16:13–15\*).

142. This explanation is favored by, e.g., Olson, *Numbers*, 127; Budd, *Numbers*, 218–19, 220; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 69, 72.

143. Lohfink, "Original Sin," 115.

Israel to be their God. The disobedience of Moses (and Aaron) in this way is even more significant when it is considered that throughout the story of the nation to this point Moses and Aaron, without fail, have carried out the commands of YHWH impeccably (see Exod 7:6, 10, 20; 8:6, 17; 9:10; 14:21, 27; 39:32; 40:33b), thus mediating YHWH's action and presence in relation to Israel and revealing who YHWH is in relation to Israel and the nations (Egypt). This is in fact the only place where Moses and Aaron are disobedient to YHWH, and this anomaly highlights its significance.<sup>144</sup> The consequence is that they cannot bring the people into the promised land (Num 20:12); YHWH's gift of the land can only come about through leadership that mediates YHWH's actions in relation to the people, thus witnessing to YHWH as their God in fulfillment of the promise.<sup>145</sup>

Accordingly, after yet another itinerary that inches Israel still closer to the land in Num 20:22b, Aaron dies on Mount Hor (20:23aα, 25–29). Eleazar, as successor to Aaron, is clothed with the vestments of Aaron. This is Moses's last act, this time in obedience to YHWH's command (20:23aα, 25–28), and it is a significant one in that it establishes the leadership into the future.

After yet another itinerary that unfolds the land promise as they reach just outside the land in the plains of Moab across the Jordan (Num 22:1), YHWH, in a speech, allows Moses to see the land from the mountain (27:12); but that is all, for Moses's death is predicted immediately after he has seen the land from afar because of what he did in Num 20:2–12\* in not showing YHWH's holiness before the people (27:13–14).

Here Pg ends. The promise of descendants has unfolded in the emergence of the first generation of the nation (Exod 1:7), with its twelve tribes hinted at in Exod 1:1–5 (and see Gen 35:22b–26). The promise to be their God has unfolded in YHWH's freeing of the nation from oppression by

---

144. The only exception perhaps is Moses's "objection" to his commission to go and tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of his land (Exod 6:10) in Exod 6:12 that the people will not listen to him as he is a poor speaker. This, however, reflects the earlier tradition contained in the non-P material in Exod 3:1–4:17 that emphasizes Moses's many objections much more. Pg has played down Moses's resistance here by including only one objection and making it much more reasonable than its parallel in Exod 4:10, where it is one of a number of objections, by placing it after the note that the Israelites have not listened to him (6:9). Moreover Exod 6:12 functions in Pg, as in the earlier tradition, to introduce the role of Aaron, so important in Pg, as Moses's spokesman and offsider.

145. See Boorer, "Place of Numbers 13–14\*," 58–62.

destroying opposing powers (Exod 1–14\*), sustaining them on their journey (Exod 16\*; Num 20:2–12\*), and, most importantly, in establishing his presence in their midst, a presence that moves with them by means of the portable tabernacle/tent of meeting (Exod 19–40\*), and issues commands and brings judgments as they journey on (Num 14:10b, 26–28, 29\*, 35; 20:8aα\*β; and see Exod 16:10–12). The promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan has unfolded to the extent that the first generation of the nation has moved from Egypt by stages toward the land and is at its very edge on the plains of Moab. The surveyors have seen it, and Moses has glimpsed it from afar. But that generation and its leadership (except Joshua and Caleb), and Moses and Aaron in particular, do not enter it but (will) die outside it because of their rejection of YHWH's promises of the land and/or to be their God. But the promises of the everlasting covenant with Abraham have not been negated and still stand. The promise of descendants will continue to be fulfilled in the next generations. YHWH will continue to fulfill his promise to be their God by sustaining them, being present in their midst (and commanding and judging them) into the future by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel of the high priest Eleazar and the Aaronic priesthood, who, with Moses demise, will function as their leaders. Finally, the promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan is assured and at the point of being fulfilled; they stand at the edge of the land ready for the land promise to be fulfilled for a future generation.

### 2.2.3. Parallels

The parallels within Pg are well recognized.<sup>146</sup> These are between the cosmic backdrop in Gen 1–9\* (I) and the story of the nation of Israel in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\* (II B) and can be summarized as follows.

---

146. See the survey of views above, and in particular, Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 280–83; Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 171; Lohfink, "Strata of the Pentateuch," 202–4; Lohfink, "God the Creator," 130–31; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 44–45, 123; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 167–76; Weimar, "Sinai und Schöpfung," 365–72, 380–83, 385; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 306–7; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 154, 156; Boorer, "The Earth/Land (אֶרֶץ) in the Priestly Material," 20–23; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 60–61; Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 136, 174. See also, Jon D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 84; Fishbane, *Text and Texture*, 12; Eric E. Elnes, "Creation and Tabernacle: The Priestly Writer's Environmentalism,"

The imagery in Exod 14\*, of the divided waters between which Israel walks on dry land (Exod 14:21–22, 29), parallels the division of the waters in the creation account in Gen 1:6–10. This symbolizes the creation of the nation Israel.

Most important, the account of the sanctuary and its cult (Exod 24–29\*; 39–40\*) has strong parallels with Gen 1:1–2:3. Moses is called on the seventh day to receive the instructions for the tabernacle after the cloud had covered the mountain for six days (Exod 24:16), echoing the seven-day structure of the creation account. There is also the seven days of the priestly ordination ceremony (Exod 29:35). There are significant linguistic parallels between the conclusion of Gen 1:31–2:3 and the conclusion of the construction of the sanctuary in Exod 39:32, 43; 40:33. In Gen 1:31a, God “saw” all that he had made and behold it was very good; and in Exod 39:43a, Moses “saw” all the work and behold they had done it as YHWH had commanded. In Gen 2:1, it states that the heavens and the earth and all their host “were finished”; and in Exod 39:32a, it says that all the work of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting “was finished.” In Gen 2:2a, it states that on the seventh day God “finished” all his work which he had done; and in Exod 40:33b, Moses “finished” the work. In Gen 2:3a, God “blesses” the seventh day; and in Exod 39:43b, Moses “blesses” them (the Israelites). In addition, the erection of the tabernacle takes place on New Year’s Day (Exod 40:17), thus mirroring the creation account. Clearly, therefore, there is a significant interrelation between the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:3 and the construction of the sanctuary.<sup>147</sup>

The parallels observed here between Exod 14\*, Exod 24–40\*, and Gen 1:1–2:3 are significant, particularly because the texts concerned with the story of the nation in Exodus follow the same sequence as that found in the creation account, moving from creation through the division of the waters (Gen 1:6–10; Exod 14\*) through a focus on the seventh day to the completion of the creative work (Gen 1:31–2:3; Exod 39–40\*). This shows that the story of the nation unfolded in Pg in Exod 14\*; 25–29; 39–40\*

---

HBT 16 (1994): 148; Susan Niditch, *Chaos and Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 23; S. W. Hollaway, “What Ship Goes There: The Flood Narratives in the Gilgamesh Epic and Genesis Considered in Light of Ancient Near East Temple Ideology,” ZAW 103 (1991): 328–55, esp. 329, 348, 350; Janowski, “Tempel und Schöpfung,” 46–47, 60–63.

147. What exactly this might symbolize is discussed in the following section (2.2.4) concerning the interrelation between the parallels and trajectory.

(and by extension the whole of the material, as coherent with this, up to and including the Sinai section) represents the creation of the nation in correspondence to the cosmic creation.

There are, however, some parallels between this material concerning the creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*) and the flood and appearance of the new creation in Gen 6–9\*. In Exod 14\*, the imagery of the divided water coming back on the Egyptians (Exod 14:26–28), which occurs in tandem with the creation of the nation of Israel who walk on dry land through the divided waters, portrays the destruction of the Egyptians in terms of the flood imagery (Gen 6–7\*) that reverses creation. This is the ultimate result of the Egyptians' violent oppression exercised against Israel (Exod 1:13–14) that parallels the violence of all flesh, which is the reason for the flood (Gen 6:11–13). The sanctuary (Exod 25–29; 39–40\*) in some ways echoes the ark of the flood story (Gen 6–8\*): both are built by humankind, according to divine specifications, and in obedience to the divine command (see the execution formula in Exod 39:32; Gen 6:22). Moreover, the sanctuary is set up on New Year's Day (Exod 40:17), which is also the day of the emergence of the new creation after the flood with the drying up of the waters from the earth (Gen 8:13a).<sup>148</sup>

There are some significant parallels between the post-Sinai material in Num 13–27\* and the flood story in Gen 6–8\*. The sin committed in both Num 13–14\* and Gen 6\* is in relation to the earth. The sin of the tribal representatives and also of the people in colluding with them is slandering the land as a land that devours its inhabitants (Num 13:32; 14:1a, 36–37), in direct opposition to the very good earth in Gen 1:31.<sup>149</sup> In the flood story, it is the corrupting (שחת) of the whole earth and the filling of it with violence (חמס) by all flesh (Gen 6:11–13), this corrupted earth being the reverse of the very good earth in Gen 1:31 (see Gen 6:12). The consequence of this in both is God's judgment of death; the death of all

---

148. These parallels will become significant when we look at the interrelation between the parallels and the trajectory. There is perhaps also an echo of the bow in the clouds (Gen 9:13,16) and the "glory" (כבוד) of YHWH in Exod 16–40\* (see also Num 14:10b; 20:6), but the function is different.

149. Zenger (*Gottes Bogen*, 176), in drawing parallels between the flood story and Num 13–14, concludes that the rejection of the land here, as a place that "devours" life (Num 13:32), is a questioning of the earth as created by God as a place of life (Gen 1:29–30; 9:2–3), which is then set in contrast to Joshua and Caleb who see the land as "good" (Num 14:7) and therefore recognize the creator God.

flesh in the flood (Gen 7\*) as predicted in a speech of God (Gen 6:13, 17), and of the surveyors (Num 14:37), with the death of that generation of the nation in the wilderness outside the land predicted in a YHWH speech (Num 14:28, 29\*, 35). In both, however, there are individual exceptions who survive by the command of God: the righteous Noah, his family, and animals (Gen 6:9, 18–20; 8:1, 15–18); and Joshua and Caleb, who declare the land as very good and have faith in the power of YHWH to give it to them (Num 14:38; see 14:7b, 9aβb). Aaron also dies (Num 20:23–29\*), and Moses will die outside the land, but this is because of their failure in relation to mediating the manifestation of YHWH to the people rather than having anything to do with the land.

The story of the nation of Israel in the post-Sinai material, in paralleling the flood in these ways, is also paralleled by the destruction of the Egyptians in Exod 14\*, since this scenario also parallels the flood. Numbers 13–14\* has links with the destruction of the Egyptians in Exod 14\* in that the people express a wish that they were just like the Egyptians who have died in Egypt<sup>150</sup> (Num 14:2a); both the Egyptians and Israel stand in opposition to YHWH's plan for Israel; and the demise of each is foreshadowed by the death of a subgroup—the smiting of the firstborn Egyptians (Exod 12:12) and the death of the surveyors (Num 14:37). In sum, all three scenarios, the destruction of all flesh, of the Egyptians, and of the Mosaic generation of the nation Israel, represent a reversal of creation.

In particular, the demise of the Mosaic generation in the wilderness (Num 13–27\*) represents a reversal of the creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*). This occurs because in Num 13–14\*; 20\* there is a rejection of the promise of the land and/or who YHWH has revealed himself to be and whom they have come to know (see “I am YHWH,” Exod 6:7; 16:12; 29:46), in the unfolding of the promise to be their God throughout Exod 1–40\* as deliverer from oppression and as the one who controls the cosmos and the nations (Exod 7–14\*), as nurturer (Exod 16\*), and as present in their midst (Exod 25–40\*). In rejecting these things, the Mosaic generation excludes itself from the identity of the nation created in these terms throughout Exod 1–40\*, and this is a reversal of sorts. More specifically, this is borne out in the way in which the details of the accounts in Num 13–14\* and Num 20:2–12\* reverse details within the

---

150. Many commentators perceive the setting of Exod 14\* in Pg as in Egypt; see, e.g., J. Philip Hyatt, *Exodus*, NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 150–51; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 490–91.



creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*, and in particular Exod 16\*). This is analogous to the flood (Gen 6–7\*), which reverses the cosmic creation in Gen 1 with the coming together again of the divided waters.<sup>151</sup> Numbers 13–14\* and 20:2–12\* both have a structure similar to Exod 16\*: the congregation speaks against Moses and Aaron (Num 14:2–3; 20:2, 3\*, 4; see Exod 16:2–5), the glory of YHWH appears (Num 14:10b; 20:6; see Exod 16:10) followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (Num 14:26–35\*; 20:7, 8\*; see Exod 16:11–12), and consequently what happens is unfolded (Num 14:36–38; 20:10b, 11b, 12; see Exod 16:13–15). However, whereas the YHWH speech that occurs with the appearance of the glory in Exod 16\* is positive, having to do with sustaining the people with food (Exod 16:12), the YHWH speech with the appearance of the glory in Num 14:26–35\* is negative, pronouncing the judgment of death in the wilderness for that generation. The YHWH speech with the appearance of the glory in Num 20:7–8\* is positive for the people, but the subsequent YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron in Num 20:12 is negative, pronouncing the judgment on Moses and Aaron that they will not bring the people into the land. The outcome for the Mosaic generation in Num 13–14\*, and for Moses and Aaron in Num 20:2–12\*, is negative, the direct opposite of the outcome in Exod 16\* where the people are nurtured and Moses and Aaron exercise positive leadership in line with YHWH's commands. The portrayal of Moses and Aaron in Num 20:2–12\* represents a reversal of their portrayal in Exod 16\*. In Num 20:2–12\*, Moses disobeys the command of YHWH and usurps the place of YHWH (Num 20:10), thus blocking the people from knowledge of YHWH as their God. This is the opposite of his portrayal in Exod 16\*, where Moses (and Aaron) point away from themselves to YHWH who brought the people out of Egypt (Exod 16:6–7, 9) and who provides them with manna (Exod 16:15), thus mediating knowledge of YHWH to the people. Indeed, Moses's disobedience to the command in Num 20:10 reverses the portrayal of Moses and Aaron within the whole of Exod 1–40\*, for throughout this material Moses and Aaron are obedient to YHWH's commands without exception (see, e.g., Exod 7:6, 10, 20; 8:6, 17; 9:10; 14:21, 27; 39:32; 40:33b). The reversing of such details between Exod 1–40\* and especially Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20\* is analogous to the reversal of the cosmic creation in the details of the flood account (e.g., Gen 7:11; cf. 1:6–10), thereby

---

151. See earlier discussion in §2.2.2.



supporting the view that the post-Sinai material in Num 13–20\* parallels the flood in reversing creation, in this case the creation of the nation Israel in Exod 1–40\*.

Pg's conclusion in Num 27:12–14, where Moses is allowed to see the promised land from the mountain, perhaps alludes to the reemergence of the dry land after the flood in Gen 8\* (see especially 8:5, 13–14). In both cases, after the reversal of creation, the cosmic creation in the flood, and the creation of the nation with regard to the Mosaic generation in Num 13–20\*, the land appears, the cosmic earth of the new creation and the land of Canaan glimpsed from afar.

In conclusion, the story of the Mosaic generation mirrors the story of the cosmos in that both are created (Gen 1:1–2:3; Exod 1–40\*) and both are destroyed in a reversal of their creation (Gen 6–7\*; Num 13–20\*), with the exception of individuals (Noah and company; Joshua and Caleb). However, apart from the allusion to the appearance or sighting of the land (Gen 8:5, 13–14; Num 27:12–14), there is no parallel in the story of the nation to Gen 8:15–19, where Noah and company are commanded to go out of the ark and abound on the earth, subsequently unfolded in what is to follow (see esp. Gen 10\*). There is no account in Pg of the nation of Israel subsequently (in a future generation) entering the land and flourishing in it, even though it is hinted at: Joshua and Caleb are alive, and Eleazar inherits the leadership of the Aaronic priesthood (Num 20:25–29). The potential parallel of creation/flood (destruction) to humanity living on the earth and the Mosaic generation's creation/destruction to living in the promised land is incomplete. This provides a hint for the future of the nation, for the parallel pattern between the cosmic backdrop and the story of the nation looks for completion. An examination of the interrelation of Pg's parallels with its trajectory will highlight further this open-endedness of the story of the nation,<sup>152</sup> as well as account for the lack of any parallel in the story of the nation to Gen 9\* that completes the cosmic account of creation, destruction, and new creation.

---

152. However, the full explanation for this will only come to light when the parallels in Pg as they interrelate with Pg's trajectory are explored further in the light of Pg's hermeneutics in ch. 5.

2.2.4. The Interrelation of Parallels and Trajectory<sup>153</sup>

The story of the nation (II B Exod 1–Num 27\*) comprises two main parts that mirror the cosmic backdrop: the creation of the first generation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*) and the destruction of that generation (Num 13–27\*).

The creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*), after the initial fulfillment of the promise of descendants with its allusion to the twelve tribes (Exod 1:1–5, 7), in various ways unfolds the Abrahamic covenant promise to be their God and begins the unfolding of the land promise. At the same time, it unfolds in two stages the creation of the nation that parallels (in sequence) the original creation account in Gen 1:1–2:3: Exod 7–14\*, where the creation of the nation in Exod 14\* has parallels with Gen 1:6–10, and the Sinai material, where the instructions for, and the building of, the sanctuary have strong parallels with Gen 1:31a; 2:1a, 2a, 3a. However, although there are significant parallels between the original creation of the cosmos in Gen 1:1–2:3 and the creation of the nation, the trajectory as a whole makes quite clear that the creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*) takes place in the new creation of the postflood world (Gen 8–9\*) whose order (Gen 9:2–6) is inferior to the original creation.

The sanctuary, the erection of which takes place in the postflood world (see the reference to New Year's Day in Exod 40:17 which refers back to the new creation in Gen 8:13a) can be interpreted as the high point of the creation of the nation. The unfolding of the promise to be their God, so prominent throughout the section on the creation of the nation, reaches its climax with the sanctuary as the means of YHWH's presence in their midst and as the place from which YHWH issues commands on their journey. It is the last, and therefore culmination, of the stages of the creation of the nation. The sanctuary is also the end point of a trajectory that, following the pattern of ancient Near Eastern myths (e.g., *Enuma Elish*), comprises allusions to creation associated with the overcoming of chaos by God that leads to the construction of his sanctuary. In Pg, the account of the sanctuary occurs after allusions to creation through the overcoming of chaos in three stages: in the original creation where the waters are ordered (Gen 1:1–2:3), in the new creation after the flood (Gen 8\*), and

---

153. The focus here will be on the story of the nation (II B) as it unfolds the Abrahamic covenant promises (II A) that are grounded in the cosmic account (I Gen 1:28; 9:1) and as it parallels the cosmic backdrop (I).

in the creation of the nation linked with the destruction of the Egyptians imaged in terms of the flood (Exod 14\*).

These intersecting linear and parallel patterns in relation to the sanctuary can provide some insight into its interpretation and place within Pg's framework. Because of the significant parallels between the account of the sanctuary and the original creation in Gen 1:1–2:3, the sanctuary has been interpreted as the extension, and completion, of creation.<sup>154</sup> In that case, the identity of Israel, with the sanctuary in its midst and brought into reality by human obedience to divine instruction (Exod 25:1–9\*; 39:32, 43), is perceived as adding another dimension to the portrait of creation in Gen 1:1–2:3. This added dimension, which completes creation, is the coming together of divine and created spheres by means of the sanctuary that allows God to dwell in, or be present within, God's creation through the sanctuary in Israel's midst: the sanctuary allows the creator to have communion with his creation. However, account also needs to be taken of the emphasis within Pg on the place of the sanctuary within the post-flood world with its new order. The broader context of the sanctuary as the means of YHWH's presence is the creation of Israel in the postflood world; that is, after the allusions to the defeat of chaos in the new creation of the postflood world in Gen 8\* and in Exod 14\*. It is within the order of the violent postflood world (Gen 9:2–4) that the sanctuary is erected (Exod 40:17; see Gen 8:13a). Given this, the sanctuary as portrayed within Pg's framework and trajectory cannot be simply the extension and completion of the original creation.<sup>155</sup> Rather, the identity of Israel, centered on the sanctuary, represents the climax of God's creation of Israel in the postflood world. In this inferior world, the sanctuary, built in accordance

---

154. See, e.g., Fishbane, *Text and Texture*, 12 (following the view of Martin Buber); Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 171–72; Weimar, “Sinai und Schöpfung,” 369. Zenger (*Gottes Bogen*, 172) argues specifically that Gen 2:3 looks forward to the continuation of the acts of creation, given in the instructions for the sanctuary to Moses on the seventh day on the mountain (Exod 24:16) and completed by Israel in obeying these instructions of YHWH. Weimar (“Sinai und Schöpfung,” 369) states that “with the erection of the dwelling of YHWH not only is the creation, not finished up to now, definitively concluded, but also at the same time a process is introduced that aims at the transformation of the whole world.” He does however acknowledge also that the “erecting of the dwelling of YHWH not only completes the creation but at the same time the ‘new creation.’” (371).

155. Blum (*Studien zur Komposition*, 311) emphasizes this and its implications for the perception of the sanctuary in his KP.

with the instructions of YHWH and according to the heavenly pattern, allows God to dwell with his people and to guide them, that is, for Israel (as well as the whole creation through Israel) to “in part participate in the reality of God.”<sup>156</sup> By extension, therefore, it can be said that the sanctuary allows for God to be present within the new creation with its new order that incorporates violence (Gen 9:2–6), for in this postflood world God and humanity can only draw near to each other in such a protected space,<sup>157</sup> with its grades of holiness.<sup>158</sup> It remains a matter of speculation whether in relation to the original creation some such means of mediating God’s presence to his creation would have been necessary; Gen 1:1–2:3 does not address this issue, and within Pg’s framework there is only the postflood world with its new order as the backdrop for the trajectory of the creation of the nation Israel, the culmination of which is the identity of Israel as the nation with YHWH’s sanctuary in its midst.<sup>159</sup>

The destruction of the Mosaic generation in Num 13–27\* embodies the rejection of the promises to be their God and of the land as they have unfolded thus far in the creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*) and represents the reversal of the creation of that generation of the nation, which parallels the reversal of the original creation in the flood. However, this occurs within Pg’s trajectory, that is, in the postflood world, whose stability is guaranteed by the Noahic covenant; and within the trajectory of the nation, which is founded on the Abrahamic covenant and its promises. This has a significant bearing on how the destruction of the Mosaic generation is portrayed.

---

156. Ibid.

157. Ibid.

158. And perhaps where violence is contained through ritual; see Lohfink, “Strata of the Pentateuch,” 207–9; Boorer, “The Earth/Land (אֶרֶץ) in the Priestly Material,” 27–30.

159. Cf. Blum (*Studien zur Komposition*, 311), who argues that the very good creation of Gen 1:1–2:3 is not deficient and does not need any such supplementation. The closeness between God and humankind preflood is evidenced in Gen 5:22; 6:9, which carries some weight but seems to be slim evidence on which to base the view that before the flood there was a direct closeness with God, in contrast to after the flood where God and humanity are at a distance from each other (291). It may be that for the divine to dwell in the midst of humanity preflood a sanctuary as protective space would still have been necessary, but this sort of speculation is just that, given Pg’s framework.

There is no parallel in Num 13–27\* to Gen 9\* in the cosmic backdrop; rather, Gen 9\* spells out the new order of the postflood world, with the basis for its continued existence in the Noahic covenant, within which Num 13–27\* is set. Since according to the Noahic covenant, the earth will not again be destroyed (by flood) (Gen 9:11), there is no destruction of the land of Canaan in relation to which the Mosaic generation sins, as there was a flood to destroy the earth in response to the sin of all flesh in relation to the earth. The land of Canaan that parallels the cosmic earth remains as the promised land. So also the promises of the Abrahamic covenant, which is everlasting (Gen 17:7), still stand. The Mosaic generation, in rejecting these promises, especially of the land and to be their God, do not abrogate these promises as such. That generation merely excludes itself from the continuing unfolding of the promises. In particular, the promise of the everlasting possession of the land of Canaan awaits fulfillment in the future, hinted at by the figures of Joshua and Caleb (Num 14:38) and the passing on of the priesthood from Aaron to Eleazar (Num 20:23–29\*), which is Moses's last act. The glimpse of the land from afar granted to Moses, in a possible allusion to the continuance of life on the land after the flood (Gen 8:5, 13a, 14), but as yet not unfolded as in its cosmic parallel (Gen 8:15–19; and see Gen 10\*), also hints at the future fulfillment of the promise of the land for the nation but for another generation.<sup>160</sup> At the conclusion of Pg, its linear trajectory and parallel pattern intersect in their incompleteness to point to the same future hope for the nation: life in the land, as their everlasting possession, as a nation with the sanctuary in their midst, as the means of God's presence and guidance in fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant promises, and as a mirror, albeit more clearly defined, of humanity abounding on the earth. They stand at the edge of

---

160. It might be also that, given the parallels between the ark and the sanctuary, that the ark and sanctuary have a parallel function, that is, as the bridge, or means of continuity, between the flood generation and the Mosaic generation of Israel respectively that are destroyed, and the following generations. As the ark, a microcosm or remnant of the initial creation (Gen 1:1–2:3), came to rest on the mountains of Ararat (Gen 8:4) in the postflood world, and Noah and his company go out from it onto the land and multiply and spread through the earth, so the sanctuary, which represents the completion of the creation of the nation Israel, will come to rest in the land post-wilderness, where the next generation of Israel, with the sanctuary in its midst, will live and thrive, a situation that is not yet, but will be. This, however, is only a suggestion and remains tentative.

this fulfillment, which is assured, but not yet. In this open-ended way, Pg as a whole ends.

In conclusion, although this exploration of the structure of Pg has gone some way toward the interpretation of Pg, in order to understand the meaning of Pg as a whole more fully and in greater depth, it is necessary to delve into the genre of this material and its hermeneutics. The question of Pg's genre and hermeneutics will, accordingly, be explored in the next chapter.

## THE GENRE AND HERMENEUTICS OF PG

A vital factor in any attempt to interpret Pg as a whole is the question of its nature or genre.<sup>1</sup> However, how exactly to describe the nature of the Priestly material (Pg) has proven to be an elusive task. The Priestly material has been described in various ways; it has been described as “*Geschichte*,” and specific nuances of this such as “*Geschichtserzählung*” or “*Ursprungsgeschichte*,” as “historiography,” and as “history viewed in ritual categories.”<sup>2</sup> It has also been described in terms of “paradigm,” whether as comprising “fundamental paradigmatic constellations” or being described as “paradigmatic” narrative, “paradigmatic history,” or “myth.”<sup>3</sup>

These terms that have been used in the various attempts to grapple with this issue of the genre of the Priestly material—history (*Geschichte*), historiography, paradigm, myth—are notoriously slippery and elude precise and all-encompassing definitions.<sup>4</sup> Rather than embarking on a general

---

1. See Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 101.

2. For “*Ursprungsgeschichte*,” see, e.g., Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung”; and Blum (*Studien zur Komposition*, 330–31), who describes P (or more accurately his KP) as “*Geschichte*” and “*Ursprungsgeschichte*.” For “historiography,” see, e.g., Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 5; and Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 188. It should be noted that Van Seters sees P as a supplement to J rather than an independent source (see ch. 1) and thus of the same genre as J but a later stage of the historiography of the Pentateuch. Cf. Bauks, “Signification de l’espace,” who argues against Pg being seen as historiography. For “history viewed in ritual categories,” see Gorman, “Priestly Rituals,” 51.

3. For “fundamental paradigmatic constellations,” see Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 143. For “paradigmatic” narrative, see Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 109. For “paradigmatic history,” see Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 140. For “myth,” see Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 162; and see Blenkinsopp (“Structure of P,” 286), who refers to Pg as “a foundation or charter myth.”

4. See, e.g., Robert Oden, “Myth and Mythology,” *ABD* 4:946–56; and Oden, “Myth in the Old Testament,” *ADB* 4:956–960, for a discussion of the difficulty and

philosophical discussion of such terms, our starting point for approaching this issue of how to describe the generic nature of Pg will be to explore the views of the major recent contributors to the discussion of the genre of the Priestly material: in the German context, Lohfink, Blum, followed by Bernd Janowski, and, finally, Volkmar Fritz; and in the American context, Blenkinsopp and Carr, with consideration also of the comments on P by Van Seters, Damrosh, and Gorman.<sup>5</sup> From this will emerge, not only what each might mean at least implicitly by the terminology used, but also areas of agreement and disagreement, and the nuances involved in relation to this issue. The perceived interaction between, as well as a critique of, these views then will open the way for some conclusions to be drawn regarding the nature of Pg. This, and some hermeneutical considerations that are consistent with it, will form the basis for, and be illustrated in, the rest of this study regarding the meaning of Pg as a whole and how it might have functioned, at least for its original exilic/early postexilic audience.

### 3.1. A SURVEY OF INTERPRETATIONS IN RELATION TO GENRE

#### 3.1.1. Lohfink, Blum, Janowski, Fritz, Blenkinsopp, and Carr on the Generic Nature of the Priestly Material

The debate about the generic nature of P in the German context has taken the following form. Lohfink, in his seminal study on the nature of Pg, "The Priestly Narrative and History," argues that this material is not "history" (*Geschichte*) in the sense of a causal ordering of events on a sequential time line.<sup>6</sup> How he does perceive it he describes in a number of ways.

In the first instance, he speaks of this material as comprising "something like fundamental, paradigmatic constellations that had appeared in the past and might have importance for the present."<sup>7</sup> What he means

---

complexity of attempting to define myth and the various meanings and functions of myths that have been proposed; and see the comments of Van Seters (*Prologue to History*, 2) concerning the lack of consensus with regard to how to define historiography.

5. It should be noted that the views of scholars that follow are not all based on Pg as we have defined it but on various definitions of the Priestly material as outlined in ch. 1.

6. Lohfink uses the word *Geschichte* throughout this article, which was originally published as "Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte."

7. Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative and History," 143.



by such “paradigmatic constellations” seems to be spelled out further in his discussion, for example, of the Jacob material with its concern for the purity of the line.<sup>8</sup> There he speaks of there being no reference to history as such, that is, in the sense of what happened, but rather reference to “the constellation of events and the problems they express.”<sup>9</sup> Such constellations are “the vehicle for some very precisely conceived theological statements.”<sup>10</sup> Though in the guise of past events what is really being presented in these paradigmatic constellations is not what happened but theological concepts and advice.

Extending this idea further, Lohfink, drawing on Elliger,<sup>11</sup> speaks of the Pg material in terms of the “transparency” of presentation: although narrated in the guise of the past, what is narrated addresses the situations, experiences, and problems of the readers (the exiles) providing help and possible solutions to them.<sup>12</sup> Although in the form of past events (regarding the ancestors and the Mosaic generation), this material is presenting theological concepts and guidance that reflect and address the exilic situation of the readers. In this sense, the material is transparent and paradigmatic. Implicit within this is a view of the collapsing of time, between past and present; the content of the material is the narration of past events but as such it speaks about and to the present of the readers.

Lohfink goes on to tease out how he sees this relationship between past and present embodied in the way the Pg material functions. Events or situations presented are paradigmatic in the sense of repeatedly recurring in the past, present, and future. He says,

Every event is transparently narrated. What once was can also return. The structural congruence illuminates the readers’ present—and perhaps every possible present.... This is an understanding of history for which there is, in a certain sense, a storehouse of paradigmatic world situations, all of which existed at one time and can recur again.<sup>13</sup>

---

8. *Ibid.*, 155–56.

9. *Ibid.*, 156.

10. *Ibid.*

11. *Ibid.*, 159.

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Ibid.*, 161.

Another way in which Lohfink describes this past/present transparency or recurring repetition of paradigmatic situations of Pg is in the terminology of “myth” (*Mythus*). He uses myth in the sense of that which “tells of things that happened in the timelessness of primeval time, that are true always and everywhere and therefore can also explain the Now.”<sup>14</sup> In other words, “in Pg the primeval era did not end with the Flood; instead it extends throughout the entire narrated history [*Geschichte*].”<sup>15</sup> In this sense, then, Pg

narrates everything as if it were recounting *myths*. In a sense it converts history [*Geschichte*] back into *myth*. Therefore we get the impression that, in spite of the temporal sequence, we are ... looking at a great *picture collection* assembled on artistic principles. It derives from history and yet its tendency is towards *paradigm*.<sup>16</sup>

Lohfink’s perception of Pg in terms of paradigm or paradigmatic constellations or transparency or myth relates to the interplay of past and present and/or future, whether it be nuanced as past narrative form reflecting and addressing the present or the past being repeated in the present and future. There are two important corollaries for Lohfink in perceiving Pg in this way.

The first corollary is that Pg is not concerned at all with when something might have happened or with any interplay of cause and effect between events; what relationship an event might bear to what went before or how it might have influenced what came later is not relevant.<sup>17</sup> True, Lohfink is polemicizing against seeing Pg as “history” in the sense of providing information about the past in terms of what actually might have happened in a cause and effect temporal sequence, and elsewhere he does recognize Pg as remaining true to a broad historical substratum, for

---

14. Ibid., 162.

15. Ibid., 163. See also Odil Hannes Steck (*World and Environment* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1980], 91), who in similar vein states, “P offers a sequence of institutions, decrees, premises and gifts bestowed in the world’s initial situation, with the aim of determining—for his own time and indeed for all time—what has always existed and has always been valid.... P places these fundamental, always valid enactments, given to Israel as guardians of its identity, in the period between Abraham and Moses, which is really also viewed as part of the primeval history.”

16. Ibid., 162, emphasis added.

17. Ibid., 161.

example, in the sequence of principal events as presented.<sup>18</sup> But implicit within his perception of the generic nature of Pg is a downplaying of the importance of the detailed contingent sequential context as presented in Pg (however schematically) for the interpretation of the events described. What is primarily important is the theological concept or the transparency of each event or constellation of events as paradigm, in reflecting and addressing the present situation, in illuminating the now, albeit as assembled into “a great picture collection along artistic lines.”<sup>19</sup>

Although the detailed contingent sequence of events as presented is downplayed, the broad repeated pattern within Pg as a whole is, however, significant for Lohfink. This is seen in the second corollary, which has to do with the way in which Pg is perceived as functioning for its exilic audience with regard to the issue of hope for the future. According to Lohfink, the nature of Pg as paradigmatic or transparent or myth sets it apart from the prophetic view of history. Pg’s notion of history (*Geschichte*), unlike the prophetic view, is not eschatological in the sense that it leads to an expectation of new events or new actions of YHWH in the future that surpass the past and are as yet unknown.<sup>20</sup> Rather, what is offered in Pg is a vision of a static world that is already known and to which one can repeatedly return. For Lohfink, Pg operates much like its parallel, the Atrahasis myth. Both describe a restless phase that moves to a stable world; only in Pg this path from a dynamic to a static state is pursued twice over—not only from preflood to postflood, but also, as exemplified by Israel, from wilderness to possession of the land.<sup>21</sup> This vision of a stable or static world of settlement in the land, already known in the past,<sup>22</sup> however, does not simply legitimate things as they are. The (exilic) readers did not live in the “land,” within the stable, peaceful order planned for them by God. So, they must repeat the pattern and tread the paths of the dynamic phase again in order to embody the stable final state of the world already brought about by God.<sup>23</sup> In short, “The ideal shape of the world is known, it has already

---

18. Ibid., 162.

19. Ibid., 162; see also 161.

20. See *ibid.*, 164, 172.

21. Ibid., 170–71.

22. See *ibid.*, 172: “[Hope] is founded on what our world already received from God since the crossing of the Jordan and, as far as God is concerned can never lose.”

23. Ibid. It should be noted that Lohfink (145 n. 29) sees Pg as concluding in Joshua (4:19\*; 5:10–12; 14:1, 2\*; 18:1 ... 19:51) with the settlement in the land accomplished.

existed before. From the point of view of God it is always present, and all that is necessary is to return to it.”<sup>24</sup>

Blum, in contrast, describes the nature of the Priestly material primarily as “*Geschichte*” (history) or as “*Ursprungsgeschichte*” (history of origins).<sup>25</sup> Blum does not use *Geschichte* in the way that Lohfink sets it up as the narration of what happened in a cause-and-effect temporal sequence.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, Blum is critical of Lohfink for setting up a questionable alternative between history as recounting facts and the tendency toward paradigm in relation to P, since no biblical texts have to do with history in this sense, and surely, he says, all biblical presentations of history (*Geschichte*) tend toward paradigm.<sup>27</sup> For Blum, it is important that the nature of the Priestly material be described as *Geschichte* since it presents the creation of the world and the constitution of Israel’s institutions within a continuum or course of history; what is described is a series of particular disturbances within God’s good creation by its creatures and especially humanity and God’s response to these, comprising, in part at least, the setting up of Israel’s institutions. Blum stresses the particularity of the human actions described and God’s specific responses; he speaks of “a history [*Geschichte*] which fastens the creation and the institutions in a continuum of particular breakings and new beginnings.”<sup>28</sup> For example, the violence of all creatures leads to the flood and a postflood world where the closeness of God preflood has been lost. In this postflood world, then, YHWH is presented as acting to set up the institutions of Israel, in particular the sanctuary and its cult, as a means by which YHWH may be in communion with his people and the closeness of the divine presence with creation be restored. This, however, is not a reconstitution of the original preflood state but something new; the institutions of Israel are the means of communion with God in the situation of the postflood world that incorporates violence. In this sense, then, the Priestly material is a “history of origins” (*Ursprungsgeschichte*), of the origins of Israel, comprising a continuum from creation through God’s progressive constitution of the

---

24. Ibid.

25. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 330–31. It should be noted that Blum denotes his Priestly material as KP and perceives it as a “compositional” layer that incorporates non-P material (his KD), expanding it and often correcting it. See §1.2.1, above.

26. See Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 149.

27. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 330–31 n. 159.

28. Ibid., 330

particular institutions of Israel for the purpose of enabling the nearness of God, as God's specific response to contingent human acts. In short, it is a "contingent, irreversible history [*Geschichte*]." <sup>29</sup>

Given his emphasis on *Geschichte* or *Ursprungsgeschichte* in this sense, Blum is critical of Lohfink's description of the nature of the Priestly material as "myth" or "the transformation back of history (*Geschichte*) into myth" in two areas.<sup>30</sup> First, he criticizes Lohfink for seeing as unimportant the specific contingent sequence as narrated (e.g., Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, etc.), leading him to be free to take episodes (such as the story of the spies) out of their compositional or sequential context and to interpret them in isolation as transparent or paradigmatic for the present exilic audience. Second, Blum rejects Lohfink's view of the Priestly material as presenting a static, recurring vision of the world, which is already known and needs only to be returned to. Rather, against Lohfink's rejection of Pg as presenting a dynamic, eschatological view of history, Blum maintains that the Priestly material (like other Old Testament narrative traditions) looks forward to the future, to YHWH's future with Israel, beyond that of the present situation of the addressees. The Priestly material is eschatological and looks toward a future goal.<sup>31</sup>

Bernd Janowski takes up Blum's perspective on the nature of the Priestly material and similarly criticizes Lohfink's position that P turns history (*Geschichte*) back into myth and rejects a dynamic eschatological view of history.<sup>32</sup> Janowski admits that P's *Geschichte* of Israel, introduced in Exod 1:13, has a "primeval dimension"; its major components refer back in a multilayered reference system to the primeval history (Gen 1–11\*).<sup>33</sup> However, he questions Lohfink's statement that P turns history

---

29. Ibid. In this Blum builds on the position of Gerhard von Rad, who saw the theme of P as the "development of particular cultic institutions out of history" and "the goal of the origin and development of the world ... [as] the cult becoming historical in the people of Israel" (cited in *ibid.*). However, he is critical of von Rad for suppressing in this "development" the marked breaks and new beginnings, the unfolding of something new by God in response to humanity (330).

30. Ibid., 331 n. 159.

31. It should be noted that Blum, unlike Lohfink (see n. 30), does not see KP as continuing into Joshua but as ending in Num 27\*; see §1.1.2.1.

32. Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 37–70, esp. 63–66, 67.

33. Ibid., 64. This comment is preceded by a detailed discussion of the links between the Sinai material and the creation story (Gen 1:1–2:3) and their relationship (*ibid.*, 46–63).

back into myth; he interprets Lohfink to mean by myth a “festive-ritual revival and representation of ‘*Urevents*,’” which does not reflect the nature of P.<sup>34</sup> Against Lohfink, he states that the kerygma of P is not that the ideal form of the world is there already, and one must return to it. Neither is P a “collection of pictures” as Lohfink maintains but, says Janowski citing Blum, “a continuum of specific breakings and new beginnings.”<sup>35</sup> Like Blum, Janowski criticizes Lohfink for denying a dynamic historical perspective in P since it fails to recognize that the *Geschichte* between the creation and Sinai unfolds through YHWH’s interventions to create something new in response to the failure of his creatures, of humankind.<sup>36</sup> This history (*Geschichte*) is dynamic, and contrary to Lohfink’s view, it is eschatological. In its unfolding, it allows for new acts of YHWH that surpass earlier ones, and its full goal is yet outstanding. The exemplary reality of the dwelling of the creator God in the midst of Israel, unfolded in the Sinai material, is part of a process of “the transformation of the world as a space for the concrete acceptance of God,” which is yet to be completed; it is the hope for the postexilic YHWH community.<sup>37</sup>

Finally, in the German context, mention should be made of Volkmar Fritz’s discussion of the nature of the Priestly material as *Geschichte*.<sup>38</sup> His discussion is prior to those of Blum and Janowski and is somewhat different in emphasis, while also being critical of Lohfink’s position.

In Fritz’s view, Lohfink has made the mistake of replacing *Geschichte* with myth, which is what Fritz understands Lohfink to be saying when Lohfink states that P has changed history back into myth. Fritz maintains that P has mythologized history (*Geschichte*). However, by this he does not mean Lohfink’s collection of pictures, or mythical individual elements, but a certain understanding of *Geschichte* whereby the events described are not determined by human acts but by divine ordinances (*Setzungen*).<sup>39</sup> P’s *Geschichte* is a composition of God and comprises a sequence of divine acts or *Setzungen* (ordinances), with time itself being one of these ordinances.<sup>40</sup> In particular, God’s institution of the cult in P represents the

---

34. Ibid., 65.

35. Ibid., 66.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid., 67.

38. Fritz, “Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift,” 426–39, esp. 434.

39. Ibid., 434.

40. Ibid., 429.

creation of a new understanding of history (*Geschichte*) from that found in J and Dtr. In the latter, act/consequence is the criterion for the direction of history all the way through, that is, human acts and YHWH's responding intervention determine the course of these histories. In contrast, in P there is a decisive turning point in the flood, where God does intervene in reaction to human action, but this preflood *Urzeit* (primeval time) is separate, and qualitatively different, from the *Geschichte* postflood where no longer does God simply respond to human acts but creates and determines the course of this history. With the divinely constituted cult, the gift of God, *Geschichte* is no longer shaped by human acts leading to acts of punishment by God, for inbuilt into the cult is God's pregiven absolution, making life in God's presence possible even in the face of human failure.<sup>41</sup> P's *Geschichte* postflood (in contrast to the *Urzeit* preflood) is the unfolding of the divine reality,<sup>42</sup> where human conflicts are not decisive for the course of events. It comprises a series of salvation ordinances (*Setzungen*, such as circumcision, Sabbath, Passover, and above all the cult) that enable humankind to remain in the presence of God. It is this understanding of *Geschichte* in P that Fritz sees as the answer to the exiles. As in J, the constitution of the people is based on their common *Geschichte*, but as a *Geschichte* that God composes and determines, rather than being dictated by human actors (in contrast to J and Dtr), it opens up a future for them.<sup>43</sup>

Therefore, unlike Lohfink for whom Pg as myth means that the primeval era did not end with the flood but extends throughout the entire narrated history,<sup>44</sup> Fritz differentiates clearly primeval time from *Geschichte* postflood. Although Blum and Janowski also see the flood and the difference between pre- and postflood worlds as decisive, the nuance is different. For Blum and Janowski, the whole of the Priestly material, as *Geschichte*, is characterized as "a continuum of particular breaks and new beginnings,"<sup>45</sup> where God's specific responses correspond to human actions; whereas for Fritz, precisely what characterizes the understanding of *Geschichte* in P is that this dynamic of divine response to human action no longer pertains, at least in P's postflood *Geschichte*; human acts are of

---

41. Ibid., 433–34.

42. Ibid., 429.

43. Ibid., 427.

44. See Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 163.

45. See Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 330; and Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 66.

little consequence, for the course of this history is divinely determined, that is composed by God.<sup>46</sup>

On the North American continent, Blenkinsopp, in his discussions of the Priestly material, has alluded to the nature of P in a fashion similar in many ways to Lohfink's position.<sup>47</sup> Blenkinsopp refers to the Priestly narrative as "paradigmatic" and "not so much a historical work as the working out of a conceptual schema along a temporal axis."<sup>48</sup> What Blenkinsopp means by this is very similar to what Lohfink means when he speaks of paradigmatic constellations, which express theological statements, and when he describes the Priestly material as transparent;<sup>49</sup> that is, the Priestly material encodes themes and reflects and addresses concerns to do with the contemporary situation (which for Blenkinsopp is the early postexilic period).<sup>50</sup> Blenkinsopp uses as an example of P's paradigmatic interpretation in this sense the sequence in P's primeval history of the flood and fresh start, that takes up "the ancient Mesopotamian mythic-historiographic models most clearly perceived in the ... Atrahasis myth."<sup>51</sup> He argues that P's retelling of the flood may be read as "a kind of parable of the inundation of Israel by the nations resulting in exile from the land

---

46. The position of Bauks ("Signification de l'espace"), although seeing the genre of Pg as very distant from being historiography, the use of which leads to misunderstandings (esp. 29, 45), is not all that dissimilar to that of Fritz. Although acknowledging ruptures and recommencements throughout Pg's narrative (45) that hint at the position of Blum and Janowski, Bauks basically perceives Pg as outlining a history of God's revelation throughout its extent, which for Bauks comprises Gen 1–Exod 40:34\* (see esp. 40–45).

47. See Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P"; Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, esp. 68, 104–9.

48. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 109 and 104; see also 107.

49. See Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 143, 156, 159.

50. See, e.g., Blenkinsopp's statement (*Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 106) that "the narrative cycles about the ancestors in Gen 12–36 encode themes and concerns related to the establishment of a new commonwealth after the return to Zion," which is followed by examples of this, concluding with the statement that "a close reading of the ancestral histories brings to light other paradigmatic aspects that can be related to the newly founded commonwealth of the Persian period." This is followed by further examples from the Mosaic period (106–9), concluding with the observation (109) that the nature of the P narrative as paradigmatic is seen in the designation of Israel—in the terminology for Israel (*qahal*) and its leaders (*nes'im*, *zeqenim*) as corresponding to that used for the Jewish communities in the Achaemenid Empire.

51. Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 284.



(earth)”; however, now this “judgement lies essentially in the past,” and “God is ... offering to his people a new dispensation of grace.”<sup>52</sup>

Clearly for Blenkinsopp, as for Lohfink, the parallels between P and the Atrahasis myth are significant. However, Blenkinsopp takes the implications of such ancient Near Eastern parallels in a different direction from Lohfink’s conclusions regarding the repeated returning to a stable static ideal and final state of the world already known by retreading the dynamic phase. Blenkinsopp argues that the mythic pattern underlying P’s structure as a whole is the deluge myth as it functioned as a creation myth as seen, for example, in Enuma Elish; as in these myths, the flood in P functions as “the cosmogonic victory of the deity resulting in the building of a sanctuary for him.”<sup>53</sup> P’s version provides for Israel “a *foundation or charter myth* for the rebuilt sanctuary and the cult which was to be carried out in it.”<sup>54</sup>

Blenkinsopp links this specifically to the political and social situation of the early postexilic period and the rebuilding of the temple: “The actual political and social reality to which the paradigm [i.e., the account of the wanderings] was meant to apply was the new commonwealth in the process of formation during the first century of Persian rule [ca. 538–445 BCE].”<sup>55</sup> It is ambiguous, both in this statement and others, as to whether he conceives P’s relationship to the sociopolitical situation in programmatic or etiological terms.<sup>56</sup> But it is clear that for Blenkinsopp the function of P is one of legitimation; and in the context of explicating this, he speaks of P in historiographical terms. Again alluding to ancient Near Eastern background, Blenkinsopp maintains that for P,

---

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid., 285; and see also the Greek parallels mentioned.

54. Ibid., 286 (emphasis added).

55. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 109.

56. Apart from the statement just quoted, which is ambiguous in itself, see Blenkinsopp’s statements: “what is envisaged in P is the ideal situation of the future commonwealth” (“Structure of P,” 291), and “the intent is to create a paradigm or model of the ideal polity for Israel” (*Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 108), which suggest a programmatic nuance; and the rather vague statement (*Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 68) that much in P “reflects the situation obtaining in the early period of the second commonwealth, either shortly before or shortly after the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple and the reestablishment of worship.”

everything necessary for the life of the community was laid down in the period before the rise of the state. In this respect, P is faithful to a dominant *historiographical* tradition in the Near East and the Levant that sought for identity, self-understanding, and *legitimacy* in the distant past.<sup>57</sup>

Again, he refers to P as “a well-thought-out conceptual system that required *historiographical* expression ... to *legitimate* the system with its institutional embodiments.”<sup>58</sup> As historiography, it portrays this as a sequence of divine actions; for example, the ritual acts revealed requiring no sanctuary or priests (such as circumcision and Passover) precede the revelation at Sinai of the sanctuary cult and its priesthood.<sup>59</sup> Thus, “for P the choice of the historiographical genre was largely dictated by the need to ground the religious institutions in a well-thought-out series of divine revelations that punctuate history.”<sup>60</sup>

It can be seen, then, that Blenkinsopp’s position lies very close to that of Lohfink in seeing P as paradigmatic in the sense of its scenarios reflecting and addressing directly the situation of its early postexilic audience. However, he diverges from Lohfink in emphasizing the importance of the portrayed sequential ordering of the divine actions in setting up the institutions and in this respect tends towards the views of Blum, Janowski, and Fritz with their focus on P as *Geschichte*.<sup>61</sup> Correspondingly, he does not shy away from describing the genre of P as historiographical.

Carr, in line with Lohfink, refers to Israel’s “paradigmatic history” as conceived by P and as P lending “a primeval tinge to all of Israel’s formative history.”<sup>62</sup> Carr does acknowledge the qualification by Blum and Janowski of Lohfink’s position that tends to characterize P as nonhistorical.<sup>63</sup> Accordingly, he recognizes that the cult and other potentialities portrayed in P are “outgrowths of God’s ... covenantal responses to human

---

57. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 105, emphasis added.

58. *Ibid.*, 109, emphasis added.

59. *Ibid.*, 109, 69.

60. *Ibid.*, 68.

61. Even though, as is clear from the earlier discussion, *Geschichte* is differently nuanced in Fritz’s position from that of Blum and Janowski.

62. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 140 and 132, respectively. The latter statement is followed by a footnote (n. 33) referring to Lohfink, among others.

63. *Ibid.*, 132 n. 33.

history.”<sup>64</sup> However, he leans closer to Lohfink in insisting that the Priestly material “reformulates history with a primeval accent” and in referring to the intention of the P work as arguing for “the timeless unconditional truth of their representation of Israel’s prehistory.”<sup>65</sup> Like Lohfink and Blenkinsopp, Carr, in grappling with the nature of P, draws on ancient Near Eastern parallels. Like ancient Near Eastern cultural founding myths, P describes the establishment of the cult and other aspects of human life in a formative time long ago; but whereas for ancient Near Eastern myths this is portrayed at the time of creation or in the span of creation to flood, P “describes the cult and other human potentialities as being established over a stretch of cosmic history extending up through Moses” and therefore, in line with Blum, as responses to human history.<sup>66</sup> But everything, all the basic possibilities of human life, is established by the time Moses dies, in the formative time at the dawn of Israel’s history, and all Israel can hope for is to actualize these potentialities already established.

Carr’s emphasis on Israel’s hope as the actualization of the potentialities outlined in this primeval-like formative time spanning creation to the death of Moses represents a different nuance from Lohfink’s formulation in terms of repeated recurrence of the paradigmatic situations portrayed.<sup>67</sup> Indeed, Carr conceives of time in relation to P, and thus the way P functions, in a different way from Lohfink’s recurring, cyclical view. Carr’s position lies close to Lohfink’s and Blenkinsopp’s view of P as paradigmatic in the sense of being transparent,<sup>68</sup> but unlike Lohfink and Blenkinsopp, he sees this working differently in different parts of the document since pre-Sinai and Sinai onwards represent a division in relation to time. For Carr, P presents a narrative of Israel pre-Sinai that reflects the experience the audience already knows, namely, the diaspora practices of circumcision, Sabbath, and Passover.<sup>69</sup> But from Sinai onward, the final step in this history, what is presented is P’s utopia: the constitution of the nation as

---

64. Ibid., 132.

65. Ibid., 132 n. 33 and 129. Carr thinks it goes against the grain of P to analyze the sociopolitical context out of which P arose, but that at the same time it is helpful to reconstruct it in order to see how P responded to the questions of the time, while not reducing P to this context. Cf. Blenkinsopp, who interprets P much more closely in relation to its sociopolitical context (see nn. 55 and 56).

66. Ibid., 132.

67. See above, p. 177.

68. See above, pp. 177, 184–85.

69. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 139–40.

a cultic community and their procession into the land.<sup>70</sup> Carr speaks of “the resulting story ... [as] half narrative and half vision;”<sup>71</sup> he likens this division of time he sees in P as in some ways similar to apocalyptic literature, which presents eschatological visions by describing history up to the present time as if it were being predicted and then presenting the author’s utopia as the decisive final step in the history.<sup>72</sup> They differ, though, in that “P is not displacing into the past a prediction of present and future events (so apocalypses), but instead retrojecting legislation shaping the present and the future cultic community of Israel.”<sup>73</sup>

P functions, then, by reminding Israel of its paradigmatic history—or its prehistory—in which all the possibilities and potentialities, including the cult, have already been established eternally. Although this cannot be limited to the specific exilic/early postexilic context, it functions in this particular sociopolitical context both etiologically and programmatically. Israel’s present observance of the pre-Sinai rites is explained in terms of P’s paradigmatic history; and as they stand at the brink of possible return to the land and the reestablishment of the cult, they must remember and actualize all the eternal structures established in P’s paradigmatic history as a whole, including those portrayed at Sinai onwards.<sup>74</sup>

### 3.1.2. Genre Development in Ancient Near Eastern and Greek Texts: The Views of Damrosch and Van Seters

It is clear from the discussion so far that ancient Near Eastern parallels have played a significant role in the conceptions of the generic nature of P. This is particularly the case regarding Lohfink’s and Blenkinsopp’s positions;<sup>75</sup> however, they come to different conclusions about the generic nature and hermeneutics of P, in part because of different assumptions regarding the nature of these ancient Near Eastern texts. Thus, discussions of the development of ancient Near Eastern genres, as seen, for example,

---

70. Ibid., 139.

71. Ibid.

72. Ibid.

73. Ibid., 140.

74. See *ibid.*

75. Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 132) also draws on ancient Near Eastern parallels in grappling with the nature of P.

in the work of Van Seters and Damrosch,<sup>76</sup> have the potential to inform the exploration of the generic nature of P. It will be helpful at this stage to critique the conceptions underlying the uses of ancient Near Eastern parallels by Lohfink and Blenkinsopp in light of recent discussions of the development of ancient Near Eastern genres<sup>77</sup> and to explore the views of Van Seters and Damrosch in particular, regarding the developing genres of ancient Near Eastern and Greek texts as a means of bringing us a step closer toward an understanding of the genre and hermeneutics of Pg.

Lohfink's conclusions, drawn largely from his paralleling Pg with the Atrahasis myth, that Pg comprises a static, repeatedly recurring vision of the world, a timeless pattern already known that only needs to be returned to, seems to assume a cyclical view of myth where time is circular, as distinct from the ongoing linear time of unrepeated, contingent cause and effect events often associated with history. Indeed, Lohfink's dichotomy between myth and history (*Geschichte*), summed up in his perception that Pg "converts history [*Geschichte*] back into myth,"<sup>78</sup> would seem to suggest this. It is in reaction to this view of Pg as myth in such cyclical terms that calls forth Blum's criticism of Lohfink, leading him to stress that Pg presents a dynamic, eschatological history (*Geschichte*), comprising a contingent sequence related by act and response. In contrast, such a sharp dichotomy between myth and history or historiography does not pertain in Blenkinsopp's position. In his earlier article, Blenkinsopp refers to "ancient Mesopotamian *mythic-historiographic* models" such as the Atrahasis myth and P's version of such ancient Near Eastern deluge myths (as a creation myth as seen in Enuma Elish) as a "foundation or charter myth."<sup>79</sup> In his later work, he refers to P's genre as "historiographical," in that P is "faithful to a ... historiographical tradition in the Near East ... that sought for identity, self-understanding, and legitimacy in the distant past."<sup>80</sup> It could be argued in part that this shift from the use of myth to historiography

---

76. Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*; Van Seters, *In Search of History*; Van Seters, *Prologue to History*; Van Seters, *Pentateuch*.

77. A full critique of the position of Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 132–40), who also draws on ancient Near Eastern parallels in his observations regarding the generic nature of P, will be given later. Here the positions of Lohfink and Blenkinsopp and the difference between them on this issue are given by way of initial illustration.

78. Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 162.

79. Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 284 (emphasis added) and 286.

80. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 105.

reflects the shift in scholarship with regard to the interpretation of ancient Near Eastern genres to be discussed shortly. However, there is throughout Blenkinsopp's work no dichotomy between myth and historiography as assumed in Lohfink's view. This is suggested from the fact that both his description of P as myth in his earlier article and as historiography in his later book are linked with his assertion of P as paradigmatic.<sup>81</sup> In addition, in his earlier article, in the same context as describing P as a version of the Mesopotamian deluge myth with its temple building motif, he refers to the Greek historiographical tradition as also throwing light on P.<sup>82</sup>

Blenkinsopp's position, particularly as found in his *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, reflects more recent scholarship on the genres of ancient Near Eastern texts, especially regarding the categories of myth and history or historiography; whereas Lohfink's assumptions regarding the nature of myth versus history reflect an older, and no longer generally held, conception of myth as it relates to the comparison of ancient Near Eastern texts with biblical texts. To the discussion of this shift in the perception of the nature and genre of ancient Near Eastern texts we will now turn, since it will provide helpful background to explore further the generic nature of Pg.

The older view that categorized ancient Near Eastern texts and thinking as mythical and cyclical over against the historical and linear thinking of Israel as reflected in Old Testament texts is no longer held. It has been shown to be a false dichotomy since it is clear that, at least to a certain extent, historiographical thinking was alive and well in the ancient Near East and that myths or mythical elements are part and parcel of many Old Testament texts; moreover, in many ancient Near Eastern texts and Old Testament texts both myth and history or historiography are combined and interrelated in various ways.<sup>83</sup>

Given the difficulty of defining myth and history or historiography and the slipperiness of their use already noted, we will focus here on the

---

81. See Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 284; Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 109.

82. Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 285 n. 43.

83. See, e.g., Brevard Childs, *Myth and Reality on the Old Testament*, SBT 27 (London: SCM, 1960); Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*; J. J. M. Roberts, "Myth versus History: Relaying the Comparative Foundations," *CBQ* (1976): 1-13; Thomas L. Thompson, "Historiography," *ADB* 4:206-12; Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and the Bible*, CBQMS (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1994); Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*; Van Seters, *In Search of History*; Van Seters, *Prologue to History*.

specific discussions, and the use of terms, by Damrosch and especially Van Seters, both of whom have intentionally explored the issue of the development of genre in ancient Near Eastern texts as the context for the development of historiographical Old Testament texts.<sup>84</sup> Although they are primarily interested in the Yahwist (J) text (and in the case of Damrosch in 1–2 Samuel) in relation to ancient Near Eastern (and, in the case of Van Seters, Greek) genre development, their particular discussions of the latter have the potential to illuminate the nature of the Priestly material.<sup>85</sup>

Damrosch, in exploring the development of genre in the Mesopotamian literature, focuses on what he sees as the two major narrative forms in the second millennium, namely, “poetic epic” and “prose chronicles,” and the way in which they were transformed over time toward assimilating with each other.

He defines poetic epic as “narrative poems concerning *mythic* stories of the interactions of gods or god with mortals usually in early times”; “they develop large existential issues, of the sort addressed timelessly in rituals, within narrative sequences concerning the history of early times.”<sup>86</sup> Prose chronicles record “*historical* events,” which were usually the exploits of kings.<sup>87</sup> Poetic epic thus falls on the mythic side; the chronicles on the historiographic side. However, he argues, in the course of time and before the early first millennium, there occurred the “occasional epic expansion of historiography and ... a greatly increased historical dimension within poetic epic.”<sup>88</sup> On the one hand, in the case of the historiographical texts, the interaction of gods and mortals in the historic process is described,<sup>89</sup> and the exploration of existential issues, traditionally the realm of epic,

---

84. Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*; Van Seters, *In Search of History*; Van Seters, *Prologue to History*.

85. Damrosch (*Narrative Covenant*, 261–97) does have a discussion of the development of the genre of P but this is one step removed, or further on, from the development of J and the story of David from ancient Near Eastern developments. Van Seters (*Pentateuch*, 160–89) also discusses P, but again this is not directly related to his discussion of ancient Near Eastern and Greek genres. Both the view of Damrosch and of Van Seters regarding P will be taken up later, in §3.1.3.

86. Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*, 39 (emphasis added) and 65.

87. *Ibid.*, 39 (emphasis added).

88. *Ibid.*, 50.

89. Damrosch (*ibid.*, 58) admits that, although divine action in relation to historical events often has to do with a single event in these texts, larger scale historical ordering was not unknown.

begins to appear in the prose chronicles. On the other hand, an illustration of the historicization of the epic is seen in the development of the Gilgamesh epic over time.<sup>90</sup> This is seen, for example, in the addition of the Enkidu story as a response to Gilgamesh's irresponsible behavior as a ruler. Moreover, the addition of the Atrahasis myth into the plot of the rest of the Gilgamesh epic historicizes the former,<sup>91</sup> and the Gilgamesh epic as a whole becomes concerned with historical cultural experience. For Damrosch, it is not all that surprising that the distinction between the epic and chronicles, the mythic and the historiographical, begins to collapse, since he perceives the distinction as generic rather than ideological: "for Near Eastern historiography constantly asserts the unbroken continuity of *Urzeit* and present time, of the world of the gods and the world of daily life."<sup>92</sup>

This assimilation, then, of historiography and epic seen in Mesopotamian texts is, Damrosch argues, organically developed and redirected in Hebrew texts, specifically J and the story of David in 1–2 Samuel.

Van Seters, in his earlier work, discounts the development of the Pentateuchal text out of the ancient Near Eastern epic tradition because the latter is poetry rather than prose, and he prefers to see J as closer to Greek historiography.<sup>93</sup> However, he does see a similar process to that described by Damrosch in the development of ancient Near Eastern genre lying behind the genre of J, especially in his later work, albeit expressed in different terminology.<sup>94</sup> Steering away from the terminology of epic, Van Seters describes this development of ancient Near Eastern and Greek genres in terms of "the historicization of myth" and/or "the mythologization of history."<sup>95</sup>

---

90. *Ibid.*, 88–118.

91. See *ibid.*, 114, "When Gilgamesh visits Utnapishtim, history visits myth."

92. *Ibid.*, 59–60. Thus, Damrosch maintains, since there was no secular world of human historical activity, Cross's distinction between epic narrative and historic narrative, with the latter having no divine agency (*Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, viii), does not hold.

93. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 30–31. This is contrary to Cross. Van Seters's book is prior to Damrosch's work, so Damrosch is in disagreement with Van Seters in seeing J as translating the older epic poetry, already historicized to a certain extent, into historical prose.

94. Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, esp. 24–44.

95. *Ibid.*, 25.



Van Seters defines myth as “a traditional story about events in which the god or gods are the primary actors, and the action takes place outside of historical time” and “contains some structure of meaning that is concerned with the deep problems of life and offers explanations for the way things are.”<sup>96</sup> He defines history as “written records of past events that celebrate the deeds of public figures and important events of communal interest within a chronological framework” and that “reflect the problem of historical change and seek to account for it in political terms within ‘historical’ time.”<sup>97</sup> However, in many ancient Near Eastern and Greek texts there is an interrelation of myth and history, reflecting the “historicization of myth or the mythologization of history” that “may be two sides of the one coin, depending on whether the myth or historical tradition is the primary focus of attention.”<sup>98</sup>

By historicization of myth, Van Seters means “a process of rationalization of myths or mythical elements by the use of historical categories of arrangement and explanation, such as the imposition of genealogical or chronological succession on myths,” which often “transforms the individual myth from a traditional story into part of a continuous ordered narration with a larger view of the past.”<sup>99</sup> An example of this can be seen in the Sumerian King List in which a series of antediluvian kings were added to the king list series, thus placing the flood in the middle of a succession of kings and historicizing the flood myth as an event in the sequence.<sup>100</sup>

By mythologization of history, Van Seters means “the imposition of mythical motifs and elements on to historical materials and traditions,” which “gives to the particular historiographic form a more universal and paradigmatic character.”<sup>101</sup> Examples of this, Van Seters maintains, can be found in ancient Near Eastern literature as well as Greek literature.<sup>102</sup> However, it is interesting to note that Van Seters also uses an example from the Priestly material where he maintains that P has mythologized a histori-

---

96. Ibid.

97. Ibid.

98. Ibid., 26.

99. Ibid., 25.

100. Ibid., 62–64. See Roberts (“Myth versus History,” 8), who also sees in the Sumerian King List a “historicization of myth.”

101. Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 25. He also notes (25–26) that the way in which this may be done is “by the use of absolute references: in time—the beginning; in scope—the world; in ultimate cause—the gods.”

102. See, e.g., ibid., 26–27.

cal precedent in deriving the Sabbath from the structure of creation which is mythical, in contrast to Deut 5:15 where the keeping of the Sabbath is linked with historical precedent in the exodus tradition.<sup>103</sup>

An important focus for Van Seters is also the Greek historiography of the mid-first millennium BCE, where myths of the distant past are linked with more recent events by means of genealogies.<sup>104</sup> Although more concerned with the beginnings of political, social, and cultural life (in contrast to many of the ancient Near Eastern texts that focus on the universal and the origin of humankind in general), this Greek historiography also represents the historicization of myth in that myths of the beginning and political history are narrated in a continuous work. An example used by Van Seters is Hellenicus's *Athis*, which traces the earliest beginnings of Athens in the mythical age through successive periods to his own day, linking the age of myth and the historical period with etiologies.<sup>105</sup> Thus, "in the Greek understanding of the past there is no decisive break between the mythical mentality of an absolute and timeless beginning and the historical past" and "between the two is a large grey area occupied by etiology."<sup>106</sup>

According to Van Seters, in both the ancient Near Eastern texts and Greek historiography "the interaction between myth ... and history," found in them in various ways, "has its clearest ... focus in the problem of origins or etiology."<sup>107</sup> The view of origins in myth is that "the beginning is essentially timeless and the cause is paradigmatic," and "what happens at the beginning ... constitutes the basis for the later corresponding reality."<sup>108</sup> The view of origins in history is that "the beginning is the chronological starting point, and the cause is an event at a point that is in continuous relation to a series of events in an unbroken chain down to the reported effect."<sup>109</sup> In these texts, which reflect the historicization of myth or the mythologization of history, the views of origins in myth and in history respectively come together and are assimilated, and the function of these texts is primarily explanatory and etiological in both these senses.

---

103. Ibid., 29–30.

104. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 23, 29, 31, 51; Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 30–31.

105. Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 38.

106. Ibid., 30.

107. Ibid., 27.

108. Ibid., 28.

109. Ibid.

Although using different terminology, both Damrosch and Van Seters see a similar process reflected in the ancient Near Eastern genres, that is, to use Van Seters's terminology, the historicization of myth and/or the mythologization of history; and both see this as significant in attempting to come to grips with the genre of Old Testament texts such as J. This is not only because these ancient Near Eastern genres form the context and backdrop for the Old Testament texts but also because in these Old Testament texts a similar process of mythic and historical characteristics seem to be reflected, albeit in their own particular form. In addition, the historicization of myth seen in the Greek historiography of the mid-first millennium in its own particular form has the potential to throw significant light on Old Testament genres. A corollary of these discussions is that the old dichotomy perceived between ancient Near Eastern religion as reflecting a mythical mode of thinking and Israelite religion as reflecting a historical mode of thinking and being responsible for the historicization of ancient Near Eastern myth,<sup>110</sup> cannot be supported. From the evidence of ancient Near Eastern, Greek, and Old Testament, texts, myth, and history cannot be set over against each other in this way.

In terms of function in relation to these developing genres that reflect the historicization of myth, Damrosch and Van Seters only make brief allusions.<sup>111</sup> Again, though using slightly different terminology, they both perceive function in terms of explaining, constituting, and justifying or

---

110. See *ibid.*, 28.

111. It is not possible here to enter into a discussion of the function of ancient Near Eastern and Greek texts in general. Oden ("Myth and Mythology"), e.g., describes a number of views with regard to the function of myths *per se*; these include: an etiological function; the counterpart of ritual; and the forming and supporting of group identity. With regard to *Enuma Elish* alone suggestions regarding its function include: scripture for the Akitu festival (see reference to this view in Wilfred G. Lambert, "Enuma Elish," *ABD* 2:528); political propaganda in terms of the place of the king and his subjects (see Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989], 232); to exalt Marduk and to establish Babylon as the center of the world empire (Lambert, "Enuma Elish," 528); as "validating or explaining present reality" in a theological sense as well as a political sense (Clifford, *Creation Accounts*, 98). See also Clifford's comment (*ibid.*) concerning Atrahasis as explaining existential human issues such as mortality, and theological issues such as the nature of the gods and humankind's relationship with them. The complexity of the issue simply multiplies when issues regarding the function of historiography are included.

legitimizing, the present. Damrosch sees the function of Mesopotamian poetic epic (including as historicized) as being:

to explain, justify and celebrate the establishment of culture. A people's god(s) are shown establishing the modern world order either in a mythological *Urgeschichte* or creation, or in a later account of the realizing of relations among existing divine and human societies.<sup>112</sup>

Van Seters's unfolding of historicized myth in its relationship to origins as explanatory or etiological has already been alluded to; it explains the present by describing its constitution and cause at its beginning.<sup>113</sup> He sees the genre of Greek historiography (which combines myth and history) as functioning to give legitimation and identity to the society, to present "a people's essential character or constitution," or "its special nature and destiny."<sup>114</sup>

As we shall see shortly, the discussions of Damrosch and Van Seters regarding P are not directly informed by their conclusions regarding the development of non-Israelite genres, partly because they see P as a supplement to J rather than an independent document in its own right. However, given Pg's (ancient Near Eastern) mythic pattern of creation/deluge moving to the building of the temple/sanctuary for the deity,<sup>115</sup> and its contingent sequence of events reflecting Israelite historical traditions within this framework,<sup>116</sup> surely Pg's genre, albeit in its own form, is not so unusual given the historicization of myth and mythologization of history, or the combination of mythic and historiographical elements, seen in the ancient Near Eastern and Greek texts. Therefore, the discussion of genre development of these texts by Damrosch and Van Seters can be seen to pave the way toward throwing light on Pg's genre.<sup>117</sup> However, although

---

112. Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*, 47.

113. Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 28, 30–32.

114. On legitimation and identity, see *ibid.*, 35. Quotations from Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 2, and Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 332.

115. See Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 285; and §2.2.4, above.

116. See Blum, *Studien zur Komposition*, 330.

117. Van Seters himself (*Life of Moses*, 101) acknowledges that P shares with other major historical narratives such as J and DtrH a number of historiographical features. However, although interpreting the genre of J and DtrH in light of his exploration of the development of ancient Near Eastern and Greek genres and historiography, he does not extend this investigation in a direct, complete, and integrated way to P per

providing a starting point, it is less certain that Damrosch's and Van Seters's allusions to the function of ancient Near Eastern genres as historicized myth is helpful in exploring the particular way in which Pg might be seen to function. This is partly because the issue of function is just as speculative and open to debate in relation to the non-Israelite texts as for the Old Testament texts such as Pg.<sup>118</sup> In addition, it is risky to generalize regarding function from one particular ancient Near Eastern text or Greek text to another or to a biblical text displaying similarities of genre. The way each text might function, including Pg, should be considered primarily in its own right, taking into account its own unique features.

### 3.1.3. The Views of Van Seters, Damrosch, and Gorman on the Generic Nature of the Priestly Material

Turning to the discussions of the Priestly material by Van Seters and Damrosch, both discuss P as one step removed from their discussion of genre development in ancient Near Eastern (and Greek) texts; they relate this primarily to J (and DtrH or 1–2 Samuel), perceiving P to be a later supplement of J.<sup>119</sup>

Van Seters basically sees P as historiography. This is primarily because he sees P as a supplement to, and revision of, J which is historiography: "the Priestly corpus does not represent a different genre from that of J, but merely a later stage in the development of the Pentateuch's historiography."<sup>120</sup> Noting that in P the narrative and laws or institutions are more closely

---

se, because of his position that P is a supplement to J, a view based in part on what he perceives as "large gaps in the narration of that history" (*Life of Moses*, 101). However, given our stance that the gaps in Pg are not insuperable and that Pg can be seen as originally independent or separate (§1.2.1, above) and the coherence and structure of Pg (ch. 2) that supports this view, it seems to me that extending Van Seters's discussion of ancient Near Eastern (and Greek) historiography and genre development to throw light on Pg is a constructive direction to pursue.

118. It often depends on the approach taken; see Oden, "Myth and Mythology."

119. Or more precisely in Van Seters's case as a supplement to Genesis–2 Kings; see Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 82–83, 182; Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*, 261.

120. Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 5; and see also his description of P (*Pentateuch*, 182) as "a revision of the historiographic tradition from Genesis–Kings." It is interesting to note that Van Seters (*Prologue to History*, 332) argues against reading J as historiography "allegorically"—by which he means effectively what Lohfink means by transparently (see also Blenkinsopp and above discussion)—that is, as primarily

integrated than in other sources, with the latter introduced as a consequence of major events, Van Seters perceives P's historiography primarily in etiological terms: P's history "has become almost totally etiological."<sup>121</sup> He maintains that "P represents a series of etiologies that explain and legitimate priestly thought and practice and sets out a program for cultic reform."<sup>122</sup> For Van Seters, P as historiography has an explanatory and legitimating function but also seeks the programmatic restructuring of the cultic institutions in Jerusalem in the late Persian period as portrayed in the presentation of the tabernacle cultus and priesthood.<sup>123</sup> As historiography, P has to do with the identity of the community, its ethnic and cultic-religious identity.<sup>124</sup>

However, although Van Seters sees P primarily in historiographic terms as a revision of J (and DtrH), there are places in his discussion where he moves away from this toward myth and paradigm, particularly when considering the P material per se. In one place he refers to P itself as a whole as:

Very *static*, with the various episodes treated as a series of *paradigmatic* events in the time of the beginnings. For this reason one can speak of the P narrative as *myth* and its combination with J as the *mythologization* of the earlier historiography.<sup>125</sup>

In the case of the P Passover account (Exod 12:1–28<sup>126</sup>), after noting that it stands in tension with the story in the context (11:1–8; 12:29–36, J), Van

---

reflecting and addressing contemporary concerns, even though such reflections are present. Presumably, this could be extrapolated to P as a revision of J's historiography.

121. Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 164; see further 163–64.

122. *Ibid.*, 183; see also 162, where he cites the view of Mowinckel and Vink; however, Van Seters differs slightly from them in that he sees a future programmatic dimension in P, whereas for Mowinckel and Vink the etiological character of P is linked with maintenance of the legitimate customs and institutions.

123. *Ibid.*, 188. Prior to this (179), Van Seters asks the question whether "P should be understood as a historiographic work that legitimates the origins of certain customs, institutions and practices in the distant past, or a programmatic work that prescribes and reforms practices for the future," and comes out in favor of both.

124. *Ibid.*, 183.

125. *Ibid.*, 161–62, emphasis added. Van Seters here refers to part of Lohfink's essay, "Priestly Narrative," 149–63.

126. Van Seters includes Exod 12:14–27 in his P material, in contrast to the delineation of Pg here as outlined in §1.2.2.2, above.

Seters states that “this is a clear instance where the paradigmatic myth completely overrides all historical considerations.”<sup>127</sup> In relation to the Sinai portrayal with its costly elaborate tabernacle and cult in the middle of the desert, Van Seters goes so far as saying that “P’s portrayal of the sojourn at Sinai and of the wilderness period in general is the creation of a great mythic fantasy.”<sup>128</sup>

Therefore, although for Van Seters P as a supplement and revision of J (or more precisely Genesis–2 Kings) is primarily historiography, functioning to explain, legitimate, and provide programmatic guidance for cultic reform, and so shape identity, he cannot help but refer in places to P as paradigmatic, or indeed as myth, albeit in a rather unintegrated way.

Damrosch perceives in P (which he also maintains expanded J) the evolution of a genre, or rather a revolution in genre, beyond the “epic historiography” of J and Dtr.<sup>129</sup> J merged prose chronicle and poetic epic.<sup>130</sup> The story of David in 1–2 Samuel applied poetic epic perspectives to historiography proper.<sup>131</sup> P was influenced by these but represents a transition beyond them, comprising the interaction of, and reciprocal influence between, ritual or law and history or narrative.<sup>132</sup> Although basing much of his discussion on the book of Leviticus and the analysis of its ritual laws (in contrast to my delineation of Pg in §1.2.2.4.1), his analysis of the genre of P points in tantalizing directions that can be applied to my Pg, since it does contain some ritual laws and institutions.<sup>133</sup>

In analyzing the interaction of narrative and ritual law in P, Damrosch maintains that, although the Priestly writers have “a deep interest in history,” as seen in the presentation of a historical sequence and particular details,<sup>134</sup> this narrative history is transformed by the ritual laws and vice versa. In particular, time is overcome or collapsed: both narrative and law

---

127. Ibid., 171.

128. Ibid., 174.

129. Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*, 263. On P as an expansion of J, see 261.

130. Ibid., 263.

131. Ibid., 3.

132. Ibid., 4, 262–63.

133. E.g., Exod 12:1, 3–13; 29\*. In addition, although we have excluded the ritual laws in Leviticus from Pg, it is implicit, and to be assumed, that the tabernacle/tent of meeting with its personnel, as the means of YHWH’s presence, is the place where priestly ritual is centered.

134. Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*, 272; for details such as Moses’s lineage, see 272–73.

reflect ritual time, which has a dimension of timelessness and can incorporate all time. Damrosch observes that in P “past and present merge in the iterative present of ritual” and refers to the Priestly writers taking up past and future “into a narrative grounded in the ritual present.”<sup>135</sup> Or again, he says that the text “mixes together past, present and future,” referring to this as the “interanimation of temporal orders”; he also states that “four distinct layers of history are folded into the ritual order of the story.”<sup>136</sup>

In grappling with the way in which time operates in P, Damrosch also uses the analogy of the perfective and imperfective temporalities of Semitic languages.<sup>137</sup> The imperfective ritual law and the perfective narrative events mingle such that “the Priestly writers give the presentation of the law a strongly perfective aspect and the presentation of history an equally pronounced imperfective aspect.”<sup>138</sup> The Priestly account of the establishment of the Passover can be seen as an example of this; here time is reordered “as the unique but infinitely repeatable beginning of time in the ritual calendar.”<sup>139</sup>

Because time in P cannot be neatly contained in the distinct categories of past, present, and future, Damrosch can equate the wilderness with the contemporary situation of exile<sup>140</sup> and see it as both narrating the past and looking forward to the future. For, “in the presentation of the law within their vision of the redemptive power of the exile, the Priestly writers have

---

135. *Ibid.*, 281 and 282.

136. First quotation, *ibid.*, 280, in the context of discussing Lev 11–25. Second, including contemporary history; *ibid.*, 278, in the context of discussing Lev 10.

137. That is, perfective forms are used for singular and one-time actions, imperfective forms for ongoing or habitual activities whether past, present, or future (*ibid.*, 282).

138. *Ibid.*, 283, where he also states: “If the presentation of the law is given a perfective specificity, the historical narrative around the blocks of law is conversely characterized by a high degree of imperfective iteration.” But see also *ibid.*, 284, where he states that although perfective historical narrative is brought into close relationship with imperfective ritual order they do not entirely merge—history and law are still distinct.

139. *Ibid.*, 281.

140. See *ibid.*, 295, “The Priestly writers see the wilderness as exemplifying the fullest potential of a life of exile: that the place where everything is lost can be the place where everything is found.”



combined historical narrative and ritual ordinance into a mode of discourse at once perfective and imperfective.”<sup>141</sup>

Before turning to a critique of all these views with regard to the genre of P, it will be helpful to discuss one more recent view regarding the nature of P: that of Gorman; for like Damrosch, although spelled out in slightly different terms, Gorman links history with ritual categories in relation to the Priestly material.<sup>142</sup> Although Gorman also includes priestly ritual law (e.g., Leviticus) in his Priestly material, his comments on the nature of the Priestly material with regard to “rituals of founding” are pertinent to Pg as we have defined it.

According to Gorman, “Priestly traditions ... reflect a ritual way of thinking about the world, *history*, and human existence”; indeed, “history itself is viewed in ritual categories—rituals of founding, rituals of maintenance and rituals of restoration.”<sup>143</sup> It is Gorman’s comments on the general nature of founding rituals in particular that are of relevance in relation to Pg as we have defined it.<sup>144</sup> Founding rituals are set in a time in the

---

141. Ibid., 296–97.

142. Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*; Gorman, “Priestly Rituals.”

143. Both quotations from “Priestly Rituals,” 51, emphasis added. Bauks also refers to “the ritual conception of history” in Pg (“Signification de l’espace,” 40).

144. Rituals of maintenance and rituals of restoration that are found primarily in Leviticus have not been included in our delineation of Pg (see §1.2.2.4.1, above). For Gorman’s analysis of founding rituals, see Gorman, “Priestly Rituals,” passim; Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 58, 106. The text referred to by Gorman in relation to the founding of sacred time is Gen 1:1–2:4a, and this is part of Pg as delineated in §1.2.2.1, above. However, the specific texts nominated by Gorman as describing the founding rituals of sacred space and sacred persons, that is Exod 40:16–33 and Lev 8–9 respectively have not, for the most part been included in our delineation of Pg (see §1.2.2.4.1, above), at least not in their entirety. This does not negate the relevance of Gorman’s comments for exploring the genre and hermeneutics of Pg as defined here. It can be argued that the founding ritual of sacred space is present in Pg as we have defined it in the instructions for the tabernacle and its furnishings and the court in Exod 25–27\* along with the notices, however brief, of the execution of these instructions in Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b (which cover intrinsically the more extended [and in my view later] account of the carrying out of these instructions as described in Exod 40:16–33) along with YHWH’s promise in Exod 29:43–44 to sanctify the tent of meeting and the altar by his glory, which accordingly occurs in Exod 40:34 when the glory of YHWH fills the tabernacle. (For Gorman the founding of sacred space is completed in Lev 8:10–11, where Moses anoints the tabernacle and altar to consecrate them, maintaining that what is required for a space to be sacred/holy is both the manifestation of God’s presence and enactment of the proper ritual as in Lev 8:10. However, in

distant past, such as the time of the wilderness, at Sinai, but effect or constitute something permanent or ongoing both in sociohistorical terms, the Israelite cult, and cosmic terms relating to the divinely created order. That is, the time of a founding ritual is the past, “a moment of origins,”<sup>145</sup> but it structures the order of reality now: “It [a founding ritual] functions ... not only as a description of a past event, but also as a *paradigm* of what is to be.”<sup>146</sup>

Gorman also speaks of the way in which ritual texts and ritual relate to worldview. Worldview, he maintains, has both a “cognitive aspect and a performative aspect.”<sup>147</sup> Ritual relates to both aspects: with regard to the former, ritual texts function as “theological statements” concerning the “world of meaning”;<sup>148</sup> with regard to the latter, the rituals themselves as performed are the means of enacting, actualizing, and realizing this worldview (which includes both societal and cosmic order); that is, they are “a means of enacting one’s theology.”<sup>149</sup> In short, what is found in P is

---

relation to the founding of sacred time in Gen 1:1–2:4a, it is God alone that sanctifies time—see Gen 2:3 where God sanctifies the seventh day—and therefore it is more consistent and coherent to see the founding of sacred space within Pg as occurring fully when YHWH sanctifies the sacred space through the manifestation of his glory, once Moses and the people have executed the divine instructions [note that there are no divine instructions in relation to Lev 8:10–11]—it is the carrying out of the divine instructions that is required on the human side in Pg, not the ritual of anointing.) In terms of the founding of sacred persons, although the pertinent text for Gorman of Lev 8–9 is not included in our Pg, again it can be argued that such a founding ritual is described in the instructions in Exod 28–29\* and their execution in Exod 40:33b along with YHWH’s promise in Exod 29:44 to sanctify/consecrate Aaron and his sons.

145. *Ideology of Ritual*, 138.

146. *Ibid.*, 106, emphasis added. It is interesting to note that Gorman cites Lohfink in relation to the nature of P as paradigmatic in this context (106 n. 1). Gorman (*Ideology of Ritual*, 226–27) has an interesting discussion of time in relation to the Priestly material arising out of his discussion of the P ritual laws in Num 28–29; he argues that there is no dichotomy between cyclical and linear time in the Priestly ritual material—they are not opposed, but rather, instead of understanding this time graphically as a “straight line or circle” it should be understood in terms of “qualitative tone or texture.”

147. Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 18.

148. *Ibid.*, 229.

149. *Ibid.*, 232, and see 17, 22, 38, 225, 229. See also his discussion in Frank Gorman, *Divine Presence and Community: A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus*, ITC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 5–6. Although the rituals contained in Leviticus have not been included in our delineation of Pg, the tabernacle/tent of meeting as sacred space together with its priesthood or sacred personnel is intrinsically, or by

“a vision of the world held in conjunction with a means of situating oneself in that world [i.e., ritual].”<sup>150</sup>

### 3.2. A CRITIQUE OF VIEWS REGARDING THE GENERIC NATURE OF THE PRIESTLY MATERIAL

It is now time to offer a critique of these views of the generic nature of P in so far as this leads to the unfolding of the position to be taken here with regard to the nature of Pg and how it might be perceived to function.

Lohfink has captured a significant perspective regarding the nature of Pg in describing it in paradigmatic terms, in the sense that, though being expressed in the narration of past events, it reflects and addresses the contemporary situation.<sup>151</sup> This collapsing, or perhaps overcoming, of time, of moving beyond the categories of past, present, and/or perhaps future implied in this view points in a helpful direction in attempting to fathom the nature of Pg and how it can be seen to function. This is confirmed in that the description of Pg as paradigmatic in this way has been taken up by most of the subsequent scholars who attempt to grapple with this issue, namely, Blenkinsopp in particular, but also Blum,<sup>152</sup> Carr, Van Seters, Gorman, and we might add Damrosch since, although he uses different terminology, his discussion of the nature of P in terms of ritual time lies very close to this perspective.<sup>153</sup>

What is not helpful is when Lohfink takes his important insight regarding P as paradigmatic in the direction of equating this with myth over against history, leading him to downplay the interaction between events described in the narrative sequence and to perceive P in terms of a repeatedly recurring pattern that needs only to be returned to. As already

---

implication, the place of ritual (see the statement by Gorman [“Priestly Rituals,” 58] that “the need for a priesthood clearly reflects the priestly view of the tabernacle as a cultic site.”). The ritual texts in Leviticus, although perceived here as incorporated into Pg at a later time, fill out the detail of, or elaborate on, what is intrinsic to the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood as described in Pg, and are in continuity with, indeed they enhance, Pg’s generic character with its hermeneutics of time and the way this might function for those to whom it is addressed.

150. Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 232.

151. Also referred to by Lohfink in terms of transparency; see p. 177 above.

152. Although Blum only touches on it in the context that all biblical presentations tend toward paradigm.

153. See §§3.1.1. and 3.1.3.

noted, this seems to assume a cyclical view of myth where time is circular, as set over against the linear time of unrepeated, contingent cause and effect events associated with history. This dichotomy is no longer held and cannot be maintained in light of more recent discussions of the development and nature of ancient Near Eastern, Greek, and Old Testament genres, especially by Damrosch and Van Seters as outlined above; in many of these texts mythic and historiographical elements and qualities are interrelated, or the historicization of myth or mythologization of history, to use Van Seters's terminology, can be perceived.<sup>154</sup> In reaction, therefore, to Lohfink's somewhat dated mythic view here, Blum, while alluding in passing to the paradigmatic nature of the biblical text, is quite right in emphasizing the historical nature of Pg in the sense that a central characteristic of the Priestly material is its portrayal of a continuum of specific cause and effect contingent sequence of events, portrayed (at least in part) as responding to particular human actions. This also is central to the nature of the Pg material. It means, on the one hand, as Blum maintains, that individual scenarios cannot be taken out of their sequential context and simply applied paradigmatically or transparently to the contemporary situation in isolation as Lohfink has a tendency to do but must be interpreted within their narrated sequence. On the other hand, it means that a cyclical, recurring model of time as related to the way P might function in the contemporary situation, as Lohfink maintains, is inappropriate. It means that, as Blum maintains, the nature of P as eschatological in the sense of looking forward to a future goal, YHWH's future, beyond that of the contemporary situation, must also be taken into account.<sup>155</sup>

It should be noted here that in relation to the characteristics of P that lead, quite rightly, to its description as history (*Geschichte*), Blum's position (followed by Janowski) of the sequence of events as narrated comprising human action and divine response is borne out in Pg in, for example, the significant episodes in Exod 2\*; 16\*; Num 13–14\*; 20\*, where YHWH repeatedly responds to Israel's actions. However, there is truth also in Fritz's view that it is YHWH who composes and determines the direction of this history after the flood—as seen particularly in the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17) and its unfolding at Sinai. His perspective is helpful in stressing and bringing to the fore that Israel's institutions (such as circumcision and

---

154. See §3.1.2.

155. Since Janowski basically follows Blum in these respects, the same comments could be made in relation to his position over against this aspect of Lohfink's position.

the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel) are constituted by God. In line with this, an important characteristic of Pg's unfolding of the contingent sequence of events throughout most of the narrative is the pattern of command by God and the carrying out of this command by the leader and/or the people.

So far we are maintaining that central to Pg's nature is that it is paradigmatic in the sense that although in the form of a narrative of past events it collapses time, or circumvents the time categories of past, present, and future, in reflecting and addressing the contemporary situation; and also historiographical in the sense of portraying a contingent sequence of events interrelated through cause and effect, both in terms of YHWH's initiative that is brought about and human actions to which there is a divine response, and pointing toward a future goal.<sup>156</sup> Can these perspectives regarding Pg's nature be held together, and if so, how do they interrelate? That is, what does it really mean to describe the generic nature and function of Pg as both paradigmatic and historical or historiographical in the senses outlined above?

I believe that the discussions of Damrosch and Van Seters with regard to ancient Near Eastern (and Greek) genre are helpful in relation to this. Using Van Seters's terminology, the historicization of myth and/or the mythologization of history (as he defines these and the elements myth and history), seen in the various ways ancient Near Eastern and Greek texts interrelate myth and history,<sup>157</sup> is surely also evident in its own peculiar way in Pg. In Pg, myths or mythical elements such as creation and flood stories have been placed in a chronological sequence as part of a continuum of narrative.<sup>158</sup> Indeed, as is clear from the parallels within the structure of Pg outlined in chapter 2 (§2.2.3), this pattern of creation and flood stories established on a cosmic scale is then mirrored in the unfolding

---

156. There is no sense of course that this is history in the sense of narrating what happened, for, as Blum rightly maintains, Lohfink's setting up of a dichotomy between history in this sense and paradigm is questionable and cannot be maintained because all biblical *Geschichte* tends toward paradigm (see p. 180 above); and none of the scholars discussed here who describe P as history or in historiographical terms use it in the sense of describing what actually happened.

157. See examples such as the Sumerian King List and *Athis* as summarized on pp. 193, 194 above.

158. See Van Seters's definition of the historicization of myth, and the example of this in the flood story as being set as an event in a sequence within the Sumerian King List, as discussed above.

sequence of contingent events in the portrait of the nation that shows the creation of the Mosaic generation and the reversal of this in its destruction (see §2.2.3, above). In addition, an underlying broad framework for the unfolding of the contingent sequence of historical traditions is provided by the mythic pattern of the deity's defeat of chaos associated with creation and the consequent building of a sanctuary for him.<sup>159</sup> Surely this can be seen as the historicization of myth and/or the mythologization of history (depending on the perspective from which one views this) as Van Seters defines them.<sup>160</sup> Therefore, Pg would seem to reflect in its own way this process of interrelating myth and history, seen in developing ancient Near Eastern and Greek genres.

But what does this interrelation of myth and history really mean with regard to the nature of such genres and their possible functions? Again, Van Seters provides us with a helpful direction in his observations regarding the fact that many of the texts in which myth and history interact focus on, and have to do with, origins.<sup>161</sup> In historicizing myth or mythologizing history in relation to the problem of origins, they assimilate the mythic and historical views of origin, such that, in line with the former they see the portrayal of the beginning as timeless, as paradigmatic, and as constituting the basis for later corresponding reality; and in line with the latter they portray the beginning as the chronological starting point in a continuous cause and effect series of events.<sup>162</sup> Surely Pg can be described similarly as a text that historicizes myth and/or mythologizes history to give a portrayal of the origins of the world and the nation. As such, then, it is both timeless and paradigmatic, constituting the basis for later corresponding reality;<sup>163</sup> and, in portraying a continuum of contingent events in narrative

---

159. Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 285; and see also Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*, 90–91; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 55–56, 60–61; and the discussion in §2.2.4, above.

160. See pp. 193–94 above and in particular his example of the mythologization of history taken from the P material (pp. 198–99 above). See also Damrosch's discussion of the Gilgamesh Epic (*Narrative Covenant*, 88–188) as outlined on p. 192 above.

161. See p. 194 above.

162. See p. 194 above; and Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 28.

163. Therefore, it would seem that Lohfink's description of myth ("Priestly Narrative," 162) in terms of telling things "that happened in the timelessness of primeval time, that are true always and everywhere and therefore can also explain the Now" holds true, even though his view of myth in terms of a cyclical view of time does not hold.

sequence, it points in the direction of explaining and clarifying present effects and perhaps future goals. Van Seters describes such texts (at least as pertaining to Greek historiography) as presenting the nation's constitution and self-identity and giving it legitimation.<sup>164</sup> Whether or not this is precisely the function of Pg remains to be clarified, but these observations provide a solid basis for gaining insight into the nature of the genre of Pg, and in particular how it is possible to hold to Pg as both paradigmatic—collapsing categories of time past, present, and future to reflect and address the contemporary audience—and historical or historiographical in the sense of portraying a contingent cause and effect sequence of traditions heading toward a future goal.

Reflecting something of this newer discussion, Blenkinsopp speaks of P both as paradigmatic, and at the same time, especially in his later work, in historiographical terms.<sup>165</sup> He uses paradigmatic in the same sense as Lohfink in reflecting and addressing concerns of the contemporary situation,<sup>166</sup> and this is closely related to Van Seters's view of mythic origins; indeed, Blenkinsopp refers to P as a foundation myth in his earlier article.<sup>167</sup> His description of P in historiographical terms means taking the sequential ordering of the setting up of the institutions seriously and in interpreting P in the tradition of the Near East and the Levant as presenting the identity, self-understanding, and legitimation of the community and its institutions as grounded in the distant past.<sup>168</sup> More, however, could be said regarding the way in which Pg can be said to be both paradigmatic and historiographical in a more integrated and detailed manner than Blenkinsopp provides in his brief comments and allusions.

Carr's rather brief comments with regard to the nature of P are also in line with this more recent perception of the coming together of mythic and historiographic elements, or paradigm and history, rather than being polarized against each other as with Lohfink. Carr refers to P as para-

---

164. See p. 196 above.

165. See pp. 184–86 above and Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 104, 106, 107, 109.

166. See, e.g., *ibid.*, 106.

167. See Blenkinsopp, "Structure of P," 286.

168. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 105. Blum (*Studien zur Komposition*, 330–31) in a similar way refers to KP as a "history of origins" (*Ursprungsgeschichte*) that progressively constitutes the particular institutions of Israel; see p. 180 above, and see also Fritz, "Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift," 427.



digmatic history, as being like ancient Near Eastern founding myths in establishing the cult and all other aspects of human life in a formative time, which in the case of P extends over a stretch of history from creation through the death of Moses, and therefore as responses to human history. Moreover what is established are potentialities to be actualized. In these comments, he hints at combining both paradigm and historiography in the sense of Blum's *Ursprungsgeschichte* comprising a continuum of God's progressive constitution of institutions in response to human actions or, in Van Seters's framework, of combining mythic and historical views of origins. However, again this stays on the level of brief hints and allusions.

In addition, the direction Carr takes with regard to exploring the way time operates in relation to P as paradigmatic history leads him to make a distinct split between how time operates pre-Sinai and from Sinai onwards. Instead of seeing P as a whole as collapsing time categories of past, present, and future, he ties down the narrative in P pre-Sinai as reflecting what the audience already knows and as thus functioning etiologically and from Sinai onward as presenting what they have never experienced and therefore as a utopian vision of the future. It will be argued shortly that the Priestly material cannot be divided in this way in terms of its hermeneutics of time. Rather, it will be maintained that the whole of P, its various elements or scenarios and trajectory, reflects at least potentially a collapsing of time, or integration of past, present, and future elements, such that in each and every part, and throughout P as a whole, the audience would perceive partial fulfillment and future vision. That is, the potentialities described in the paradigmatic history that have already been fulfilled should not be relegated to part of the document and those yet to be realized, or the future vision, to another part.

Van Seters, when he comes to specifically focusing on the nature of P, does not fully and consistently apply the helpful directions in the development of genre in the ancient Near Eastern and Greek literature he has proposed.<sup>169</sup> Rather, he refers, in an unintegrated way, to P (as a supplement to J) as historiography that has to do with the nation's identity; and yet also in static paradigmatic and mythic terms such as the mythologization of the earlier historiography (that is, J), even citing Lohfink ("The Priestly Narrative and History") in this regard.<sup>170</sup> Also, like Carr, he tends to make

---

169. This is primarily because he does not see P as an independent document but as a supplement to J; see above n. 117 and pp. 197–99 above.

170. Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 182–83, 161–62, 171, 174.



a distinction regarding time between parts of the material, referring (in the context of speaking of P as historiography) to P as primarily etiological, but also, in its presentation of the tabernacle cultus and priesthood (at Sinai) as setting out a program for reform. Such a distinction in terms of sections of the material where some of it is etiological and other parts programmatic cannot be made.

A more helpful direction in terms of how time might be seen to operate, given the nature of the Priestly material, is provided by Damrosch. His exploration of time in relation to P indeed helps to unfold more precisely, I believe, what Lohfink, and others such as Blenkinsopp, are pointing to in describing P as paradigmatic. In perceiving both the narrative and law/ordinances in P as reflecting *ritual* time, Damrosch can in a sense see the whole of P as reflecting all time, since as such the distinctions of past, present, and future do not apply. Each part of the text, as the narrative takes on the imperfective time of the ritual law and the ritual law takes on the perfective time of historical narrative, can be seen as mixing past, present, and future, as incorporating all time in a kind of timelessness. Therefore, rather than speaking of the wilderness/Sinai material as programmatic in contrast to the pre-Sinai material as etiological as Carr and Van Seters do, Damrosch can speak of the wilderness material as a combination of historical narrative and ritual ordinance reflecting at once a perfective and imperfective mode of discourse—as equating with the *present* situation of exile, narrating the *past*, and looking forward to the *future* all at once. This is a helpful drawing out of what Lohfink seems to mean by Pg as paradigmatic when he speaks of Pg narrating in the guise of the past that which reflects and addresses the present readers but differs from Lohfink in that it holds together with past and present a future dimension. The position that will be taken here and presented shortly is that this view of time is applicable to the whole of Pg, to each of the scenarios depicted of the nation Israel and to its trajectory as a whole.

Finally, Gorman in also perceiving history in P in ritual categories speaks explicitly about founding rituals in paradigmatic terms; founding rituals are set in the time of the distant past—they describe a past event, a moment of origins—but constitute the present order of reality, indeed function as a paradigm of what is to be.<sup>171</sup> Thus in these founding ritu-

---

171. Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 106; Gorman, *Divine Presence and Community*, 58, 61, 62; and see pp. 201–3 above.

als past, present, and future are combined and mirrored at once, a position similar to Damrosch, although using terminology more akin to Van Seters's mythic view of origins, albeit applied to institutions ordered in history. This view will be taken up in the position to be taken here regarding the nature of Pg. In addition, I will take up Gorman's other insight regarding the function of ritual, where ritual texts, or we might say more precisely P's history viewed in ritual terms, have a cognitive aspect that embodies a world of meaning, and the ritual itself is the means of enacting, actualizing, and realizing this world of meaning.

### 3.3. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE GENERIC NATURE OF PG, ITS HERMENEUTICS OF TIME, AND FUNCTION

The position that will be taken here, and unfolded in the following chapters, with regard to the generic nature of Pg and how it might be seen to function, is as follows. It is clear that Pg's genre coheres with the development of ancient Near Eastern and Greek genres where the process of the historicization of myth and/or the mythologization of history, to use Van Seters's terminology, can be seen in that it comprises, albeit in its own way, an interrelationship of paradigmatic<sup>172</sup> and historiographical features. Its historiographical quality is seen in its trajectory of contingent historical traditions moving sequentially toward a goal. Yet its nature is also paradigmatic, and not only in that it reflects a mythic pattern of the deity's defeat of chaos linked with creation moving to the building of the deity's temple and a repeating pattern on a cosmic and national level of creation and destruction or the undoing of creation. More importantly, the material itself seems to have a paradigmatic quality more akin to ritual time that incorporates all time, describing the past, reflecting and addressing the present, and looking to the future all at once. For example, the founding rituals have this quality and yet they are set in a contingent historiographical sequence. What is more, while being paradigmatic, the material incorporates national historical traditions.

So how exactly do these paradigmatic and historiographical qualities interrelate, and how can Pg be seen to function? True, in a sense it has to do with presenting origins—of the world and the nation Israel in a way

---

172. As defined in the above critique of views and standing close to a certain sense of "myth" emergent in the above discussion.

that combines a mythical and historiographical view of such origins—and thus has a constituting and identity shaping function. But does this get to the heart of the nature of Pg, which involves in particular the *way* in which paradigmatic and historiographical qualities interrelate and combine and thus function for the reader?

The specific genius of the Priestly material is that it presents along a contingent traditional historiographical trajectory scenarios that are composed (at least in part) of historical traditions, and these scenarios, and also the trajectory that forms their context, are also paradigmatic in the sense unfolded above where time—past, present, and future—is collapsed or incorporated all at once in a way seen most clearly in the way in which the timelessness of ritual time operates. As such, the historical features of both the scenarios and the trajectory as a whole function paradigmatically; and the paradigmatic scenarios in their paradigmatic trajectory at every point have a historiographical aspect, especially by virtue of the contingent sequence of which they are composed.

Thus, each component scenario in the presentation of the trajectory of the nation comprises a synthesis of past, present, and/or future traditions, experiences, and hopes into a paradigm, such that each section of Pg can be said to be paradigmatic and to function paradigmatically. But as arranged in a contingent sequential narrative, their paradigmatic meaning must be considered in this context, each in its place in the sequence and in relation to the direction or goal to which this trajectory as a whole is heading. This not only gives a historiographical dimension to these paradigmatic scenarios, but also gives a paradigmatic dimension to the trajectory. Another paradigmatic dimension of the trajectory of the nation is also seen in its repetition or paralleling of the trajectory of creation (of world/nation) and destruction (flood as paralleling the death of the Mosaic generation at the edge of the land); and therefore both the trajectory of the nation and each of its paradigmatic scenarios comprising it must be interpreted in relation to the corresponding cosmic parallel.

How might Pg as a whole as at once paradigmatic and historiographical function for the reader, in particular for its original exilic audience? As the reader—and I am thinking here in particular of the original audience in the early exilic/early postexilic period<sup>173</sup>—moves through the sense of

---

173. Although perhaps it need not be restricted to this. However, how Pg with its hermeneutics of time might be seen to function for later, and even contemporary, readers, lies outside the scope of this study.

the text of Pg with its particular structure, he/she will *throughout*—in the various scenarios that make up the trajectory and with regard to the trajectory itself as they interact—at each point constantly and continuously recognize and relate to what is known from past tradition and/or present experience and tradition. But this will be only a partial recognition since these past traditions and/or present aspects are combined, synthesized, and reshaped in each element or scenario encountered along the trajectory in a paradigmatic way with future elements and goals (God's future); and the trajectory itself in interaction with the scenarios of which it is composed, though rooted in and reflecting past tradition, also heads toward an as yet unrealized future goal (that God is yet to bring about). The reference of the text, or the world of the text, opened up for the reader in moving through its sense in this way will comprise the accumulation of these constant partial recognitions of reshaped traditions and present experience integrated with future elements—visions of goals formulated through the combination of reshaped past and future aspects in the paradigmatic scenarios and the direction of the trajectory as a whole.<sup>174</sup> This world of the text represents the full vision of the complex paradigm as a whole that at each stage and in its pattern and trajectory as a whole combines inseparably past/present and future.<sup>175</sup>

The embodiment of this world of the text or complex paradigm would involve the reader (or reading community) allowing it to inform his/her/their self-understanding or identity.<sup>176</sup> But not only this, for, given that central to the paradigmatic scenarios and trajectory of the nation as a whole are the institution of rituals/ordinances (or in Gorman's terminol-

---

174. This dynamic of continual recognition of past, present, and future elements throughout is different from the division of the material by Carr and Van Seters into pre-Sinai as reflecting what is known and therefore etiological, and Sinai as a future program.

175. In using the terminology of the sense and reference or world of the text and the reaching of the world of the text by moving through the sense of the text, I am influenced by the discussion on hermeneutics by Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976), 71–88.

176. Again, in using this terminology I am influenced by Ricoeur (ibid., 89–95). This approximates to Gorman's reference to worldview as having a cognitive aspect and ritual texts or P's history viewed in ritual terms, having a cognitive aspect that embodies a world of meaning; see Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 18, 229.

ogy founding rituals) as commanded by YHWH,<sup>177</sup> the reader will know in moving through the sense of the text as a whole to the world of the text, that part of entering into the fulfillment of this complex paradigm involves not only appropriating the world of the text cognitively and existentially, but also carrying out the divinely constituted ordinances/rituals that enable the embodying of that world. For, in Gorman's words, the performing of the rituals is "the means of enacting, actualizing, and realizing ... world view."<sup>178</sup>

The reader, then, in moving through Pg may constantly experience "the now ... but not yet," glimpses of the known combined with visions of the future not yet experienced, both at each point and as a consequence of reading the whole. At the same time, the reader is provided with the means of entering into, and embodying, the world of the text, the fulfillment of this complex eschatological paradigm with its future ultimately brought about by God.<sup>179</sup>

---

177. See the emphasis of Fritz in the above discussion, pp. 182–84.

178. Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 232; and see pp. 201–3 above.

179. Hanna Liss ("The Imaginary Sanctuary: The Priestly Code as an Example of Fictional Literature in the Hebrew Bible," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006], 663–69), although focusing on the material relating to the sanctuary rather than the whole of P, argues, in part, in a not dissimilar fashion to our conclusions regarding the generic nature of Pg, albeit using different terminology. Drawing on Wolfgang Iser, Liss argues that the sanctuary material in Pg is fictional literature in the sense that it draws on past or known traditions and brings them together into a new reference system, with these traditional elements then having a twofold point of reference: backward toward their former context and forward toward the new reference system (esp. 671–72). The result is a fictional text that is theological in that it portrays the relationship between God and humans and that is imaginary in that what it refers to does not exist, except in the text, but is made imaginable. This is in some ways close to our description of Pg's hermeneutic in terms of the reshaping of earlier traditions so that they are transformed into timeless scenarios. However, whereas Liss emphasizes that this meeting between God and humans in the new fictional reference system of the P sanctuary text exists purely in the text, creating "the realm of a theological future, having Yahweh 'dwell' in Israel's literature," it seems important to me to go beyond this to delve into the way in which the reference or world of the text impacts upon its readers beyond its imaginary function; i.e., such a text, it seems to me, has practical implications for the life of the community to which it is addressed in terms of how life is to be lived.

This position concerning the nature of Pg and the way it can be seen to function will be explored in the following chapters. In this discussion, however, our focus of attention in terms of detailed analysis will be on the portrayal of the nation of Israel (Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*).

In chapter 4, we will seek to apply the generic insights unfolded here regarding Pg's historiographical and paradigmatic nature, but especially in terms of its paradigmatic nature with its hermeneutics of time, to an analysis of the scenarios comprising the story of the nation in Exod 1–40\*; Num 13–27\*. The collapsing of time, past/present/future, into a timeless vision is most clearly apparent in the ritual, or founding ritual or ordinance texts, in Exod 12:1, 3–13 (concerning the Passover) and Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\* (concerning the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel or the founding of sacred space and sacred persons<sup>180</sup>). These passages, therefore, will form our central focus, and we will explore how within these texts, past and present traditions and experiences are reshaped with future vision into a timeless paradigm akin to ritual time (or, to use Gorman's terminology, as founding rituals/ordinances that incorporate, or are relevant for, all time). It will be seen that the narratives surrounding, or framing, these ritual/ordinance texts (Exod 7–11\*; 14\* and Exod 16\*; Num 13–27\* respectively) are themselves paradigmatic in the sense that they reshape past traditions into timeless patterns. It will be shown that the paradigmatic nature of these narrative frames is influenced, and further enhanced, by the hermeneutics of time of the ritual/ordinance texts at their respective centers; and that the paradigmatic patterns of the narratives interact with the ritual/ordinance texts that they frame to unfold further the significance, and implications, of these ritual/ordinance texts. (Or, to use Damrosh's terminology, we will explore the way in which the narrative frames take on the imperfective time of the ritual/ordinance texts, and the ritual/ordinance texts take on the perfective time of the narrative.) Proceeding in this fashion, we will explore not only each of the two major paradigmatic scenarios—of Exod 7–14\* with its center in Exod 12:1, 3–13, and Exod 16–Num 27\* with its center in Exod 25–40\*—separately, but also the larger paradigmatic pattern that emerges from their combination (that is Exod 7–Num 27\*), against the programmatic backdrop in Exod 1–6\*, which is itself paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping older traditions into timeless patterns.

---

180. See n. 144.

In chapter 5, we will situate the story of the nation as interpreted in chapter 4 within the context of Pg as a whole, including its backdrop in Gen 1:1–11:26\* and Gen 11:27–Exod 1:7\*, that are also paradigmatic in the sense of drawing on and shaping older traditions into timeless patterns. Accordingly, we will interpret the paradigmatic scenarios of the story of the nation and their complex paradigmatic pattern as a whole, as situated within, and an intrinsic part of, the trajectory of the unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promises interpreted paradigmatically in terms of its hermeneutics of time, as well as in relation to the paradigmatic cosmic parallels. This chapter will demonstrate how the historiographical nature of Pg seen especially in its trajectory is also and inseparably paradigmatic. In this way, the interpretation of Pg will reach a different level from that presented in chapter 2 in terms of its structure and content only, that is, as a complex historiographical and paradigmatic text intrinsic to which is its hermeneutics of time.

Finally, in chapter 6, we will explore the potential impact that Pg as a whole, interpreted in this way, might have had or the way it might have functioned, for its original exilic/early postexilic audience. In so doing, this chapter will draw together the conclusions arrived at throughout this monograph concerning the meaning of Pg in light of its genre and hermeneutics of time, as this is an integral part of unfolding how Pg might have functioned for its readers in moving through the sense of its text into its world.





## THE PARADIGMATIC NATURE OF THE SCENARIOS WITHIN PG'S STORY OF THE NATION AND THEIR HERMENEUTICS OF TIME

In analyzing the paradigmatic nature of Pg's story of the nation in Exod 1–Num 27\*, the core trait of this material that defines it as paradigmatic, as unfolded in chapter 3, is the way in which earlier traditions are reshaped and synthesized with unique and visionary elements into a picture, or pictures, that are in a sense timeless, or transcend time, or are relevant for all time. How this hermeneutics of time or sense of timelessness is nuanced over and above this varies between components: whether through repetition of details or stereotypical patterns that suspend or mark time; or in the use specifically of mythological language or imagery that gives the nuance of the universal; or through describing prescriptive ritual ordinances and their performative effects whereby such texts have the quality of ritual or liturgical time that incorporates or transcends all time. What particularly stands out is the paradigmatic nature of these last texts whose hermeneutics of time is explicitly liturgical or ritual time that, as in ritual, collapse or incorporate all time, past, present, and future and whose performance at any time and through time effects the reality that they incorporate. These texts are the Passover rite in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and the text concerning the tabernacle and its personnel in Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\*, both of which are surrounded by paradigmatic narratives, in Exod 7–11\*; 14\*; and Exod 16\*; Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*, respectively. These ritual or ritualized texts, along with their framing narratives, will therefore form the two main foci of the discussion of the paradigmatic nature of Pg's material concerned with the story of the nation Israel. Accordingly, the two main sections in this chapter comprise Exod 12\* and its surrounding narrative in Exod 7–11\* and 14\*; and Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\* and its surrounding narrative in Exod 16\*; and Num 13–14\*; 20\*, 27\*. With each of

these sections, we will begin with the central focus or centerpiece within each, that is, Exod 12\* and Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\*, respectively, and explore its hermeneutics of time, before examining how each interacts with its paradigmatic framing narratives to present two complex paradigmatic pictures, one set in Egypt (Exod 7–14\*) and the other in the wilderness (Exod 16–Num 27\*). However, since both these sections are introduced by Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 against its backdrop of Exod 1:13–14; 2:23aβb–25 (with Exod 6:2–8 introducing both Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* inseparably within its structure, and Exod 6:10–12; 7:1–7 introducing Exod 7–11\* specifically), we will then go on to explore how the Pg material in Exod 1:13–7:7\* reshapes earlier traditions into structured patterns. As such it introduces the combined paradigmatic picture of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* as a complex paradigmatic picture extending from Exod 7–Num 27\* as a whole, a discussion of which will form the completion of this chapter on the paradigmatic nature of Pg's story of the nation (Exod 1–Num 27\*).

We begin with a discussion of the paradigmatic nature of Exod 7–14\*.

#### 4.1. EXODUS 7–14\*

As alluded to in chapter 2, Pg's account of the exodus in Exod 7:8–14:29\* occurs in three interlinked stages that are distilled in the introductory summary of this material in Exod 7:3–5.<sup>1</sup> Exodus 7:3, with its reference to YHWH hardening Pharaoh's heart and multiplying his signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, introduces the first stage in Exod 7:8–11:10\* that unfolds the signs and wonders and concludes with a summary that refers to the signs and wonders and to YHWH's hardening of Pharaoh's heart (11:9–10). Exodus 7:4 introduces the second stage in 12:1–41\*: Exod 7:4 interlinks with the first stage introduced by 7:3 in 7:8–10:11\* in referring back to Pharaoh not listening (see 7:13, 22; 8:11b [Eng. 8:15b]; 8:15 [Eng. 8:19]; 9:12 and 11:9);<sup>2</sup> and introduces the second stage in Exod

---

1. See §2.2.2; Childs, *Exodus*, 139–40.

2. Indeed, that Pharaoh does not listen as stated in Exod 7:4 is the result of YHWH hardening Pharaoh's heart as stated in Exod 7:3 and that Pharaoh does not listen leads on to the next phases of YHWH bringing the Israelites out of Egypt with his judgments as stated in Exod 7:4 and unfolded in Exod 12:1–41\*. Exodus 11:9–10 has a similar bridging function in that the fact that Pharaoh does not listen is so that YHWH can multiply his signs and wonders; but because YHWH has hardened Pha-

12:1–41\* by referring to YHWH's judgments (שפטים; see 12:12<sup>3</sup>) and to the Israelites going out of the land of Egypt as YHWH's "hosts" (עבדות; see 12:41<sup>4</sup>).<sup>5</sup> Finally, Exod 7:5 introduces the third stage in 14:1–29\*: Exod 7:5 interlinks with the second stage in referring to YHWH's hand upon/against Egypt (see 7:4) and to YHWH bringing the Israelites out (see 7:4) and in the use of the expression "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה; see 12:12); and it introduces the third stage in Exod 14:1–29\* by referring to the fact that "the Egyptians shall know that 'I am YHWH'" (וידעו מצרים אני יהוה; see 14:4, 18).

However, when we look at Pg's material in Exod 7–14\*<sup>6</sup> in terms of its paradigmatic nature, it comprises a paradigmatic centerpiece of the Pass-over ritual and its performative effect in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, which is surrounded by a narrative frame in Exod 7–11\* and Exod 14:1–29\*.<sup>7</sup> The paradigmatic nature of Exod 12\* in terms of the way in which it collapses time—past, present and future—into a kind of timelessness stands out most clearly in that it reshapes earlier traditions and synthesizes these with seemingly contemporary and unique elements to create a timeless ritual that reflects liturgical time and, as such, transcends time. The narrative frame that surrounds it is also paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping earlier tradition and synthesizing this with unique elements into repeated patterns and in using mythological language and imagery that take on a kind of timelessness. Moreover, the narrative frame, as surrounding the ritual in

---

raoh's heart he did not let the people go out of his land, thus forshadowing the second phase in Exod 12:1–41\*.

3. The term שפטים occurs in Priestly material only in Exod 7:4; 12:41 (Pg); see Childs, *Exodus*, 140; Dozeman, *God at War*, 141 n. 79.

4. The term עבדות is limited in Priestly material to Exod 7:4; 12:41 (Pg) and Exod 12:17 (=H) and Exod 12:51 (= secondary P material).

5. In a way, the summary statement at the end of this phase in Exod 12:40–41, which refers back to the introduction to this phase in Exod 7:4, corresponds to the summing up of the first phase in Exod 11:9–10, which refers back to the introduction of that phase in Exod 7:3; see Childs (*Exodus*, 140) who in commenting on this states, "They [Exod 11:9–10 and Exod 12:40–42] summarize the tradition [of the plagues and Passover respectively] and confirm the initial framework of P given in 7:3ff."

6. I.e., Exod 7:8–13, 19, 20aa, 21b, 22; 8:1–3 (Hebrew) ... 11b–15 (Hebrew); 9:8–12; 11:9–10; 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41; 14:1–4, 8, 9aβb, 15aαb, 16–18, 21aαb, 22–23, 26, 27aα, 28–29.

7. For Exod 7–11\*, see 7:8–13, 19, 20aa, 21b, 22; 8:1–3 (Hebrew) ... 11b–15 (Hebrew); 9:8–12; 11:9–10. For Exod 14:1–29\*, see 14:1–4, 8, 9aβb, 15aαb, 16–18, 21aαb, 22–23, 26, 27aα, 28–29.

Exod 12\*, takes on its ritual/liturgical timelessness, further unfolding the significance of this paradigmatic ritual/liturgy and its performative effect. Accordingly, the paradigmatic nature of the centerpiece in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 will first be explored, before turning to a discussion of its narrative frame and the way in which they can be seen to interact.

#### 4.1.1. The Paradigmatic Nature of Exodus 12\*: The Liturgical/Ritual Centerpiece

##### 4.1.1.1. Pg's Portrayal as the Synthesis of Reshaped Tradition, Contemporary Praxis/Experience and Unique Elements

The traditions Pg may have drawn on, and the way in which such earlier traditions have been reshaped in, Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 is a complex issue.

The whole area of how the Passover ritual is seen to have evolved, and how exactly Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 fits within this, has been the subject of much debate. Much of the scholarship pertaining to the evolution of the Passover rite involves various hypotheses regarding its relationship to eating unleavened bread and/or the festival of unleavened bread over time, with the diversity of views displaying various permutations regarding at what point Passover and (eating or the Festival of) Unleavened Bread were separate and at what point united<sup>8</sup> and when either of these or both were linked with the exodus motif. The reason for the complexity of the debate surrounding the evolution of the Passover and/or eating/Feast of Unleavened Bread is that the various views draw on, to a greater or lesser extent, and therefore weigh differently, evidence drawn from literary critical analysis of biblical texts, from ancient Near Eastern parallels, and observations from comparative religion.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, literary critical analyses of the relevant biblical texts, and how much they are

---

8. Views with regard to this range from seeing originally independent Passover and Unleavened Bread traditions coming together in the late monarchy (see Deut 16:1–8) through seeing the Passover-Unleavened Bread as one rite or festival from early Israelite times that was split up with the move to centralization in the late monarchy (see Deut 16:1–8). For the former view, see, e.g., the scholars listed in Jan Wagenaar, “Passover and the First Day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread in the Priestly Festival Calendar,” *VT* 54 (2004): 251 n. 1; and for the latter view see, e.g., Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 428; Tamara Prosic, *The Development and Symbolism of the Passover until 70 C.E.*, JSOTSup 414 (New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

9. See Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 190–202.

seen to encompass early or later tradition, vary substantially. The relevant biblical texts are: Exod 23:14–18; 34:18, 25; Deut 16:1–8; Josh 5:10–12; 2 Kgs 23:21–23; Lev 23:5–8; Num 18:15–25; as well as Exod 12:1–13:15. With regard to Exod 23:14–18 and Exod 34:18, 25, it is not clear whether the Passover is being referred to at all in Exod 23:18 and Exod 34:25, at least at an early pre-Priestly level.<sup>10</sup> Deuteronomy 16:1–8 is a composite text displaying a number of levels.<sup>11</sup> There is disagreement as to whether Josh 5:10–12 reflects very early tradition or not. Second Kings 23:21–23, if authentic, may be Josianic, but if not, it reflects the exilic time of the Deuteronomist. Exodus 12:1–13:15 is a complex text comprising a number of levels, where the relationship between texts concerned with the Passover rite in Exod 12:1–13 and 12:21–27 is disputed, as is the relationship of the Passover rite in Exod 12:1–13 to the texts concerned with unleavened bread in 12:14–20<sup>12</sup> and 13:3–10. All this has led to a variety of hypotheses with little consensus regarding the tradition history of the Passover and/or the eating of, or Festival of, Unleavened Bread.<sup>13</sup>

As delineated in chapter 1, I have attributed Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 only to Pg; that is, only the rite of Passover (along with the effects of its performance) is attributed to Pg, not the Festival of Unleavened Bread as unfolded in Exod 12:14–20, which would appear to belong to a later stratum (H/HS).<sup>14</sup> As such, the evolution of the Festival of Unleavened Bread and its relationship to the Passover rite is not directly relevant to our discussion. Focusing, then, on texts concerned with the Passover rite specifically, those that have the most potential for informing the issue of what traditions Pg may have drawn on and reshaped to formulate its picture of the Passover ritual in Exod 12:1, 3–13 in particular are Deut 16:1–8 (or at least those aspects of it that refer to the Passover) and the non-P material

---

10. Exod 34:25b may be a late addition.

11. See my discussion in Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 177–85; and more recently, Timo Veijola, “The History of the Passover in the Light of Deuteronomy 16,1–8,” *ZABR* 2 (1996): 53–75.

12. E.g., Childs (*Exodus*, 197) argues that Exod 12:1–20 forms a coherent unity, whereas increasingly Exod 12:14–20 are being seen as later than Exod 12:1, 3–13, and belonging to H/HS, which is the position taken here; see §1.2.2.2, above, and the scholars listed in n. 263.

13. For a sample of the various views and some of the arguments in more detail, see Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 190–202; Prosic, *Development and Symbolism*, 20–32, and passim for her position; Wagenaar, “Passover and the First Day of the Festival.”

14. See §1.2.2.2, above.

within the immediate context of Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, in 12:21–27, 29–39.<sup>15</sup>

It is reasonably safe to assume that the elements in Deut 16:1–8 that pertain to the Passover (16:1, 2, 3aα, 4b, 5–7) are pre-Pg.<sup>16</sup> The reference to Passover here and the details that it gives may reflect something of the way in which the Passover was celebrated, or at least how it should be celebrated, at a time just prior to Pg (in the late monarchy). That Exod 12:9 explicitly rules against boiling (בשל) the lamb may be an explicit reference to, and departure from, the command to boil it (בשל) in Deut 16:7, suggesting that Pg's account is later and represents a deliberate modification of how the animal is to be cooked as reflected in Deut 16:1–8\*. Although Pg's account in Exod 12:1, 3–13 is more detailed, what Deut 16:1–8\* has in common with Exod 12:1, 3–13 is reference to the identity of the animal (Deut 16:2; see Exod 12:3, 5), possibly that nothing leavened will be eaten with it (Deut 16:3aα; see Exod 12:8),<sup>17</sup> the rule that none of it shall remain until the morning (Deut 16:4b; see Exod 12:10), prescription of the time of day/night it is to be offered/slaughtered (Deut 16:6; see Exod 12:6), and how it is to be cooked. However, in terms of specific details, Pg departs from Deut 16:1–8\* in that: the animal in Pg is a lamb (Exod 12:3, 4, 5, 8) whereas in Deut 16:2 it is from the flock and the herd; in Deut 16:1–8\*, it is a sacrifice (16:2) whereas in Pg it is not;<sup>18</sup> the timing in Pg is “between the evenings” (בין הערבים, Exod 12:6) whereas in Deut 16:6 it is “in the

---

15. Other potentially pre-Pg texts such as Exod 23:18; 34:25 are not particularly helpful since it is not altogether certain that these laws refer to the Passover rite at an early stage and in any case give little information as to what this rite involved. The laws in Lev 23:5–8 and Num 28:16–28, though possibly reflecting earlier tradition, on a literary level are probably later than Pg. Although there may be early tradition behind the Priestly redaction in Josh 5:10–12, this is far from certain, and it seems to me that the Priestly redaction, including the reference to the Passover here, is late, i.e., post-Pg; see Boorer, “Envisioning of the Land,” 113–15.

16. As commented above, Deut 16:1–8 is clearly a composite text in which either the Passover rite has been added to a text concerning the eating of unleavened bread or vice-versa and may reflect a number of different levels; see n. 11. For the pre-Pg status of the Passover elements in Deut 16:1–8, see Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 177–85; Veijola, “History of the Passover”; Wagenaar, “Passover and the First Day of the Festival,” 250–51.

17. I say possibly because the syntax of וּמִצֹּת in Exod 12:8 is difficult and may be an addition, as Wagenaar (“Passover and the First Day of the Festival,” 259, 262) maintains.

18. See Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 266.

evening, at sunset" (בערב כבוא השמש); in Pg it is to be roasted (Exod 12:8) whereas in Deut 16:7 it is to be boiled; and finally, in Pg it is a rite centered in the households (Exod 12:3–4) whereas in Deut 16:1–8\* the whole thrust, stated repeatedly, is that it is to take place at the centralized place where YHWH chooses to dwell. Although it cannot necessarily be concluded that Pg in Exod 12:1, 3–13 is drawing directly on Deut 16:1, 2, 3aa, 4b, 5–7 in a literary sense, the similarities but differences in details between the two at least suggests that Pg's account of the rite of the Passover represents a later stage of the evolution of this rite and possibly also some fresh reshaping of the ongoing Passover tradition, although it is difficult, if not impossible, to pinpoint precisely which of these alternatives is operating within the specific details regarding the Passover rite in Pg's picture of it.<sup>19</sup>

The closest parallel to Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, however, is found in its immediate context in 12:21–27, 29–39. I would maintain that 12:21–27 (or more accurately 12:21–23, 27b), 29–39 is earlier non-P material and that in this case there is evidence that Pg has drawn directly on this material and reshaped it into its own paradigmatic picture.

Before turning to the evidence for Pg's reshaping of Exod 12:21–27 (or at least 12:21–23, 27b), 29–39, it is necessary to make a brief comment on the issue of the relative level of Exod 12:21–27, since there is some debate as to whether or not this is earlier than Pg<sup>20</sup> or on the same level and there-

---

19. E.g., it would be too simplistic to suppose that Pg is responsible for reshaping the Passover into a household rite from a temple rite, as this may have occurred as part of its evolution during the exile after the temple was destroyed; i.e., Pg may simply be reflecting present practice. This is also the case with regard to the requirement to roast the lamb in Pg, although the explicit reference to not eating it boiled in Exod 12:9 could suggest a deliberate reshaping on the part of Pg. That the Passover rite came into prominence in the late monarchic period and/or the exilic period is evidenced not only by Deut 16:1–8, especially if in this text the Passover rite was added to the unleavened bread references (see Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 181) or, as Veijola alternatively maintains ("History of the Passover"), a centralized feast of Passover was substituted for the older feast of Massot, but by 2 Kgs 23:21–23, which refers to the Passover rite only, which, if authentic, reflects the Josianic era, and if not, at least reflects the hand of the Deuteronomist and therefore the exilic era.

20. See, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 93; Childs, *Exodus*, 184–85; Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 153–60; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 356 (with the exception of Exod 12:24); Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 278–79.



fore part of Pg.<sup>21</sup> Previously, I have argued that the literary level of Exod 12:21–27 is earlier than Pg in Exod 12\*, lying in between the earlier non-P text in Exod 12:29–39; 13:3–16 and 12:1, 3–13 (Pg).<sup>22</sup> Arguments for this consisted in the mixture of P and Deuteronomistic language and features; the rationale for such an addition of Exod 12:21–27 to 12:29–39; 13:3–16 in terms of a resulting symmetrical structure of a Moses speech (12:21–27), narrative (12:29–39), a Moses speech (13:3–16); and that the later Pg builds on the effect of the addition of Exod 12:21–27 to 12:29–39; 13:3–16.<sup>23</sup> In light of ongoing scholarship, it is quite possible that the argument of the mixture of Priestly and Deuteronomistic language and features could point to this text as being post-P, rather than at a level somewhere in between Deuteronomistic and Priestly literature, since such a mixture has been used more recently as an important criterion for identifying post-P redaction.<sup>24</sup> However, this mixture of Priestly and Deuteronomistic language and features is concentrated specifically in Exod 12:24–27a<sup>25</sup> but not in 12:21–23, 27b. Exodus 12:24–27a could well be, therefore, a post-P addition,<sup>26</sup> with the language of “perpetual ordinance” in Exod 12:24 adding support to this, and it will be taken as such here. However, this is not the case for Exod 12:21–23, 27b, for here the language and features have affinities with Priestly texts, including 12:1–13. Can it be concluded, then, that these verses at least should be attributed to P on the same level as Pg in 12:1, 3–13?<sup>27</sup> What speaks against this is that Exod 12:27b forms a doublet with

---

21. See, e.g., John Van Seters, “The Place of the Yahwist in the History of Passover and Massot,” *ZAW* 95 (1983): 167–82; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 115–19; Shimon Bar-On, “Zur literarkritischen Analyse von Exod 21,21–27,” *ZAW* 107 (1995): 18–30.

22. Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 153–60.

23. See *ibid.*, 161–67.

24. See, e.g., Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*.

25. See Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 154–56.

26. Gertz (*Tradition und Redaktion*, 396) maintains that Exod 12:24–27a belongs to the post-P *Endredaktion*; F. Ahuis (*Exodus 11,1–13,16 und die Bedeutung der Trägergruppen für das Verständnis des Passa*, *FRLANT* 168 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996]) also sees Exod 12:24–27a as post-P; and see Peter Weimar, “Exodus 12,24–27a: Ein Zusatz nachdeuteronomischer Provenienz aus der Hand der Pentateuchredaktion,” in *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic Literature: Festschrift for C. H. W. Brekelmans*, ed. Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust, *BETL* 133 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 421–48.

27. As Van Seters (“Place of the Yahwist”; *Life of Moses*, 115–18) argues, though he sees Exod 12:21–27 as a unity and as of one piece with Exod 12:1–20 (P).



12:28; Exod 12:28 (Pg) presupposes a YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron and not a Moses speech to the elders of the people directly, as in Exod 12:21–23, and nowhere else in Pg is a speech of YHWH followed by a speech of Moses that parallels the content of the YHWH speech.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, there are discrepancies between the content of Exod 12:21–23 and 12:1, 3–13 that suggest a different literary level: in 12:23 YHWH will strike down the Egyptians in general, whereas in 12:12 YHWH will strike down the firstborn of the land of Egypt, and in 12:23 the blood on the door of the house protects against the destroyer, whereas in 12:13 it protects against YHWH himself. That Exod 12:21–23, 27b represents an earlier level than 12:1, 3–13 is supported by my other two previous arguments, albeit in modified form. That is, the rationale for the addition of Exod 12:21–23, 27b to 12:29–39; 13:3–16 in terms of a resulting symmetrical structure of a Moses speech (12:21–27), narrative (12:29–39), a Moses speech (13:3–16) in general terms still holds.<sup>29</sup> The later Pg represents a progression from the effect of the addition of Exod 12:21–23, 27b to Exod 12:29–39; 13:3–16, as seen in the way in which Pg in Exod 12:1, 3–13 smoothes over and renders coherent details that are uneven and contradictory as a result of the addition of Exod 12:21–23, 27b to 12:29–39.<sup>30</sup> The details of this will be unfolded shortly. It can be concluded, therefore, that Exod 12:21–23, 27b was added to 12:29–39 prior to Pg's composition of its paradigmatic

---

28. See Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 160–61 n. 52.

29. Although my argument in terms of the trend in form (*ibid.*, 159–60) does not, since I am now excluding Exod 12:24–27a from this pre-Pg level. It should be noted that Gertz (*Tradition und Redaktion*, 396), sees Exod 13:3–16 as post-Priestly *Endredaktion*, in contrast to my position that it is pre-Pg (and pre-Exod 21:21–27). However, see my arguments for the relative level of Exod 13:3–16 in Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 150–52, and the counterarguments to Gertz's view by Graeme Davies in his review of *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, by Jan Gertz, *JTS* 53 (2002): 573–74. The relative level of Exod 13:3–16 only affects this particular argument but has no bearing on the other argument for Pg being later than Exod 12:21–23, 27b in terms of Pg smoothing over the unevennesses and discrepancies resulting from the addition of Exod 12:21–23, 27b to Exod 12:29–39; 13:3–16 since these observations pertain to Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 only.

30. See Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 163. My argument there in terms of the trend from the combination of unleavened bread and firstborn as commemorating the exodus (Exod 12:29–39; 13:3–16) to the Passover loosely added in Exod 12:21–27 to the integrated rite of Passover and Unleavened Bread as commemorating the exodus in Pg in Exod 12:1–20 (*ibid.*, 160), however, no longer holds since I have now excluded Exod 12:14–20 from Pg.

picture of the rite of Passover and its performative effects in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41.

Indications that Pg has drawn directly on this material in Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 and reshaped elements of it as part of the process of formulating its paradigmatic picture in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, are as follows.

Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 have a common structure comprising a speech with instructions for a Passover rite and the meaning of, or the reasons for carrying out, these ritual instructions (12:21–23 [speech of Moses]; 12:1, 3–13 [speech of YHWH]); followed by a narrative that begins with the response of the people to these instructions as one of submission and obedience (12:27b [non-P]; 12:28 [Pg]) and then proceeds to describe the exodus of the people from Egypt (12:29–39 [non-P]; 12:40–41 [Pg]). This suggests that Pg in Exod 12:1–13, 28, 40–41 is drawing on the non-P account in 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39.

The details in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 that are similar to those in 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 are as follows. In terms of the instructions for the Passover rite, in both the rite is centered in the household with lambs selected according to families/households (12:21 [non-P]; 12:3–4 [Pg]). In both the Passover rite is a blood rite,<sup>31</sup> where the verb used for killing the lamb is שחט (“slaughter,” 12:21 [non-P]; 12:6 [Pg]), and where the blood is put on the doorposts and the lintel (12:22 [non-P]; 12:7 [Pg]), with the word משקוף (“lintel”) occurring only here, that is, in Exod 12:22, 23 and 12:7.<sup>32</sup> These observations may be an indication that Pg is drawing on the non-P account in 12:21–22, or both accounts may be reflecting evolving or contemporary Passover practice, since 12:21–22 is probably not much earlier than Pg. However, in relation to the explanation of these ritual instructions the similarities are striking and suggest that Pg in Exod 12:12–13 is drawing on 12:23. In both it is stated that YHWH will pass through (12:23 [non-P]; 12:12 [Pg]), but when YHWH sees the blood he will “pass over” (פסח) (12:23 [non-P]; 12:13 [Pg]). Moreover, the closest parallel to the unique use in relation to the Passover of המשחית (“the destroyer”) in Exod 12:23 (non-P) is the use of the verb למשחות (“to destroy”) in 12:13 (Pg); and the root נגף, used in verbal form with the meaning to strike down in Exod 12:23 (non-P) is found in 12:13 (Pg) as a noun (“plague”).<sup>33</sup>

31. Cf. Deut 16:1–8, where no blood rites are associated with the Passover.

32. See Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 156–57.

33. See *ibid.*, 157.

Other indications that Pg has drawn on the non-P account are that in both accounts there is an element of haste (though in different contexts: Exod 12:33, 39 [non-P]; 12:11); both incorporate the motif of the killing of the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both humans and animals (though in different ways: 12:29–30 [and see 11:4–6] [non-P]; 12:12 [Pg]); in both there is a reference to the people's submission/obedience to the Passover instructions (12:27b [non-P]; 12:28 [Pg]), and in both there is a narrative describing the exodus of the people from the land of Egypt (12:31–38 [non-P]; 12:40–41 [Pg]).

The cumulative evidence of the similarity of Pg's account in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 to the earlier non-P account in 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 supports the conclusion that the former is drawing on the latter.

There is, however, even more evidence that this is the case. The non-P text in Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 contains a number of inconsistencies or tensions that are the result of the addition of 12:21–23, 27b to the earlier level of 12:29–39. It would appear that Pg has intentionally smoothed out these inconsistencies to present a more coherent picture, particularly with regard to the instructions for the Passover rite and its explanation in Exod 12:1, 3–13. Emerging from an exploration of how Pg has done this will not only be further evidence that Pg is drawing on 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39, but it will also show ways in which Pg has reshaped the earlier non-P account in formulating its unique paradigmatic picture.<sup>34</sup>

First, there is a tension within the non-P text of Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 with regard to the motif of the death of the firstborn: in the narrative in 12:29 (and see 11:4–6) YHWH strikes down (נכה) the firstborn in the land of Egypt, humans and animals, but the meaning of the Passover rite in 12:23 concerns YHWH striking the Egyptians in general. Pg in Exod 12:12 reconciles these elements, dispelling the tension, by portraying the meaning of the Passover in terms of the striking down (נכה) of the firstborn in the land of Egypt, human and animals.

Second, there is an inconsistency regarding who is the agent of destruction in the non-P text of Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39: in the narrative in 12:23a, 29 it is YHWH, but in 12:23b the blood on the door protects those inside from the destroyer as the one who will strike. Pg smooths

---

34. For a discussion of how Pg has integrated and made coherent the tensions within the non-P text, see Childs, *Exodus*, 192; Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 163.

over this discrepancy by simply referring in 12:13 to YHWH himself as the avenger.<sup>35</sup>

Third, there is a discrepancy in the non-P text of Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 with regard to the timing of the exodus: in the narrative in 12:30–34, the people leave Egypt at night, but in the Passover instructions in 12:22, they are forbidden to go outside the house until the morning. Pg renders this more coherent by not having the people leave Egypt until the morning/day as signified by “on that very day” in 12:41.

Fourth, within the non-P account in Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 the motif of haste in the narrative of 12:33–34, 39 does not cohere with the Passover instructions in 12:21–23 entirely satisfactorily. Pg addresses this by assimilating the motif of haste into the Passover rite itself as part of the liturgy in 12:11, where they are to dress for a journey and eat hurriedly.

In all these ways, Pg in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 has smoothed over areas of unevenness and tensions in the non-P material in 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39, integrating elements in such a way that a harmonious and coherent account is created.<sup>36</sup> This indicates that Pg has drawn on this non-P material directly and deliberately reshaped aspects of it in formulating its paradigmatic picture of the Passover rite and its performative effects.

In turning specifically to the way in which Pg may have reshaped and synthesized earlier tradition and combined these with its own unique elements and the specific picture resulting from this, account needs to be taken that most likely Pg is not only drawing literarily on Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 but also on the evolving and contemporary practice of the Passover ritual. Beginning with the broad structure, each section within Pg’s portrayal will be discussed in order.

---

35. There is an interesting play on wording here: the non-P material in Exod 12:23 uses the verb נָגַף and the noun הַמַּשְׁחִית; and Pg in Exod 12:13 uses the noun נָגַף and the verb מַשְׁחִית.

36. There is one other area in which Pg may have integrated more coherently elements within the non-P material. Whereas in the non-P material the Passover rite in Exod 12:21–23 has been loosely juxtaposed with the motif of the eating of unleavened bread in Exod 12:34, 39, in Pg the eating of unleavened bread is integrated into the Passover rite in Exod 12:8. However, whether this is the result of deliberate reshaping on the part of Pg is by no means as clear-cut as the other instances because this may well simply reflect ongoing Passover practice, since this is also referred to in Deut 16:3aα. Moreover, it is possible, because of the difficult syntax of מִצּוֹת in Exod 12:8 that the reference to unleavened bread has been added later; see n. 17.

## Structure

In terms of the structure, Pg would appear to have deliberately reformulated the Moses speech that instructs the elders of Israel regarding the Passover rite and its meaning in Exod 12:21–23 (non-P) as a YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron regarding the Passover rite and its meaning (12:1, 3–13). Accordingly, Pg, in paralleling the people's response of submission in Exod 12:27b (non-P), notes the obedience of the people with the emphasis on the obedience of the people to what YHWH himself had commanded Moses and Aaron. In this way, Pg, in line with this tendency throughout, underpins the authority of the Passover rite as ordained by YHWH. Moreover, the unfolding of the exodus that occurs in both accounts is very differently expressed. In the earlier non-P material in the narrative of Exod 12:29–39 the people leave Egypt at the command of Pharaoh (and the urging of the people) in response to the plague of the firstborn, whereas Pg simply notes briefly their departure from Egypt (12:40–41) as the result of the performance of the Passover rite in obedience to YHWH instructions,<sup>37</sup> thus putting the focus on YHWH's commands (12:1, 3–13) rather than on human commands (12:31, 33 [non-P]) as that which allows the exodus to occur.

## Exodus 12:1, 3–13: YHWH Speech Concerning the Passover Rite

**Exodus 12:3–11: Instructions for the Passover Rite.** The instructions for the Passover rite in Pg's YHWH speech in Exod 12:3–11 are quite detailed, and it is with regard to these that it is most difficult to discern which details simply reflect the evolving and contemporary practice of the Passover rite<sup>38</sup> and which details represent Pg's specific reshaping of the tradition or are unique to Pg. Clues regarding what reflects ongoing

---

37. This will be discussed in more detail later.

38. See Childs, *Exodus*, 193; Terence E. Fretheim, *Exodus*, IBC (Louisville: John Knox, 1991), 133. See also the statement in Diana Edelman ("Exodus and Pesach-Massot as Evolving Social Memory," in *Remembering and Forgetting in Early Second Temple Judah*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, FAT 85 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012], 161–62, citing Kertzen): "While there tends to be a conservative bias in rites, they do change their form, symbolic meaning, and social effects according to the needs of the people using them in order to link the past to the present and the present to the future."

contemporary practice can, however, be gained from the earlier non-P texts of Deut 16:1, 2, 3a $\alpha$ , 4b, 5–7 and Exod 12:21–22 that also constitute instructions regarding the details of the Passover rite. Indeed, since Exod 12:21–22 is probably only slightly earlier than Pg; it may represent the almost contemporary practice of the rite, although given the evidence already outlined that Pg drew on Exod 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39, Pg may also have drawn directly in a literary sense on Exod 12:21–22.

With this in mind, the following details within Pg's account in Exod 12:3–13 likely reflect primarily evolving and ongoing contemporary practice of the Passover rite.

First, the selection of a lamb in relation to households (Exod 12:3 [Pg]) probably reflects contemporary liturgical practice of exilic/early postexilic times, since Exod 12:3 (Pg) has this in common with 12:21 and makes sense, in contrast to the earlier practice reflected in Deut 16:1, 2, 3a $\alpha$ , 4b, 5–7 where the animal sacrifice from the flock and herd is to be offered at the central place (temple), at a time when the temple no longer existed. In contrast to Exod 12:21, however, Pg in 12:4–5 provides additional detail concerning the size of the group for each lamb (presumably so that little or none is left over [see 12:10]) and the age and state of the lamb as without blemish. Although there is no way of knowing if this reflects evolving and contemporary practice or an embellishment by Pg, the former is more probable, given that such ritual instruction tends to be conservative,<sup>39</sup> and it adds little to the specific interpretation of the rite, especially given that already in Deut 16:4b no meat of the passover animal is to be left until the morning.

Second, the taking of the lamb on the tenth of the month and its slaughter on the fourteenth at twilight (between the evenings) is suggestive of contemporary practice that has further evolved with regard to more precise timing from the practice reflected in Deut 16:6 of slaughtering the Passover animal in the evening. In support of this is the observation that these acts that are involved in the Passover rite as spanning several days do not cohere very well with the motif of haste in this context, incorporated in Pg in Exod 12:11, which reflects the earlier tradition that the exodus occurred in haste (see 12:31, 33, 39).

Third, the placing of the blood on the two doorposts and the lintel of the house in Exod 12:7 probably reflects evolving contemporary practice of the Passover rite, since this same blood rite is described in Exod 12:22.

---

39. See previous note.

Pg could well be drawing literarily on 12:22, especially since the word **משקוף** (“lintel”) occurs only in 12:22, 23 and 12:7, but even if this is the case, 12:22, as just prior to Pg, is most probably describing what the Passover rite had become at least by that time: a blood rite (cf. Deut 16:1–8\*).

Fourth, when the lamb is to be eaten and with what, as well as how it is to be prepared as detailed in Exod 12:8–10, may reflect ongoing contemporary celebration of the Passover rite. The eating of the lamb at night, with none remaining until the morning or what does remain being burned in Exod 12:8, 10, represents a slight elaboration of the instruction in Deut 16:4b that none of the meat of the animal slaughtered in the evening shall remain until the morning. That it is to be eaten with unleavened bread<sup>40</sup> and bitter herbs could reflect contemporary practice, given that in Deut 16:3aα the Passover animal is not to be eaten with anything leavened, although the mention of unleavened bread here could also be the result of Pg drawing on Exod 12:34, 39. It is likely, however, that the tradition reflected in 12:34, 39 had already been assimilated into the Passover rite prior to Pg (or even that the narrative in 12:34, 39 was composed to explain why nothing leavened was eaten in association with the Passover rite), given the reference in Deut 16:3aα.<sup>41</sup> It is difficult to determine whether the description of how the lamb is to be cooked, that is, roasted with its head, legs, and inner organs, simply reflects contemporary practice or is a prescription that has been reformulated by Pg. The chiasmic structure of Exod 12:8–10, with the reference to time forming the outer bracket (12:8a, 10) and the inner bracket comprising instructions that include roasting (12:8b, 9b), surrounding the center in 12:9a, and the prohibition regarding not boiling or eating it raw,<sup>42</sup> suggests perhaps that Pg is intentionally reshaping the rite away from boiling the animal as found in Deut 16:7 to roasting. However, if the point of roasting it, and moreover roasting it with its head, legs, and inner organs (Exod 12:9), is to distinguish it as a household rite from the sacrifices at the sanctuary as cooked by boiling (see Deut 16:7),<sup>43</sup> the roasting of the Passover lamb in this way could simply be a reflection of the change in how the Passover lamb was prepared and cooked in the

40. If **ומצות** is not a later addition in Exod 12:8; see n. 17.

41. See also Exod 23:18; 34:25, although the relative levels of these texts are not certain.

42. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 267.

43. *Ibid.*, 268.



exilic period after the destruction of the temple. It is difficult, if not impossible, to know.

It is possible that the description of the way in which the lamb is to be eaten in Exod 12:11, that is, as dressed for a journey or in anticipation of a hasty exit<sup>44</sup> and eaten hurriedly, may have already been built into the rite and therefore reflect contemporary practice. However, since the assimilation of the motif of haste as an aspect of the Passover rite in Pg would appear to be a deliberate reshaping of the earlier tradition, which unevenly juxtaposes Passover rite with its preparation (Exod 12:21–23, 27b) with the motif of hasty flight (Exod 12:31–34, 39), in order to smooth over the tension thus created, this is quite likely an innovation of Pg.

In sum, although the instructions for the Passover rite in Pg are more detailed than any other account that has come down to us, it is likely that the bulk of the details—such as its definition as a household rite; the size of the household groups per lamb (Exod 12:3); the criteria for choosing the animal (12:5); the exact times for taking, slaughtering, and eating the lamb (12:3, 6, 8, 10); the eating of it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs (12:8); the roasting of it whole (12:8b, 9)—reflect ongoing contemporary practice. However, it is possible that the assimilation of the motif of haste into the Passover rite itself, in the description of the clothing and eating hurriedly in 12:11, is the result of Pg's deliberate literary reshaping of the tension within 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 (see esp. 12:21–22, 31–34, 39).

**Exodus 12:12–13: Meaning of the Passover Rite.** The meaning of the Passover rite as spelled out in Pg's YHWH speech in Exod 12:12–13 is, unlike most of the detailed instructions for the ritual, an intentional literary reshaping of the meaning of the Passover rite in Exod 12:23 (non-P) and the narrative in Exod 12:29 (non-P) in synthesis with its own unique elements.

This is clear from the way in which Pg in Exod 12:12–13 has drawn on Exod 12:23 and 12:29, in places almost word for word, conflating their motifs in such a way as to surround or bracket Pg's distinctive interpretation that forms the focal point. This is shown in the following chart where the wording in Exod 12:12–13, in common with Exod 12:23 is in bold type, in common with Exod 12:29 is in bold italics, and Pg's unique elements are in capital letters.

---

44. Ibid., 269.



12:12 I will **pass through** [עבר] the land of Egypt on this night and **I will smite** [נכה] *all the firstborn in the land of Egypt*, both humans and *animals*

UPON THE GODS OF EGYPT I WILL MAKE JUDGMENTS  
[שפטים]. I AM YHWH [אני יהוה].

12:13 The blood will be to you as a sign upon the houses where you are and I will **see the blood and I will pass over** [פסח] you and plague [נגף] will not destroy [משחית] you when I **smite** [נכה] *the land of Egypt*.

Pg in Exod 12:12a has taken the motif of YHWH passing through (עבר) in 12:23 and combined it with the motif of YHWH smiting (נכה) the firstborn in the land of Egypt in 12:29, though not word for word, and also the description of the firstborn in 12:29 in terms of humans and animals. In Exod 12:13, Pg has taken the motif that when seeing the blood YHWH will pass over (פסח) from 12:23 and combined it with the motif of YHWH smiting (נכה) the land of Egypt (though this time minus the firstborn reference) in 12:29. The motif of the land of Egypt associated with YHWH's smiting, taken over from 12:29, is repeated twice and thereby emphasized. This conflation of motifs from Exod 12:23 and 12:29 in both 12:12a and 13 in Pg surrounds the elements that are unique to Pg in 12:12b: YHWH's executing of judgments against the gods of Egypt linked with the formula "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה).<sup>45</sup> As the center of the conflated elements from Exod 12:23 and 29, these elements unique to Pg are emphasized and highlighted.

Pg therefore reflects the tradition contained in Exod 12:23 that the meaning of the Passover rite has to do with YHWH's passing through and destroying Egyptian people but, upon seeing the blood on the houses, passing over these and therefore preventing destruction of those inside.<sup>46</sup> However, Pg has reshaped this tradition by assimilating into this the plague of the death of the firstborn (from 12:29; and see 11:4–8),<sup>47</sup> smoothing out

45. The formula "I am YHWH" itself occurs in other earlier texts such as in Gen 28:13; Exod 7:17; 15:26; 20:2; Hos 12:9; 13:4, and it is quite probable that this formula has its roots in ancient liturgical tradition; see Walter Zimmerli, *I Am YHWH*, trans. Douglas W. Stott (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982), 1–28.

46. The blood on the doorposts is apotroaic; Jorunn Buckley, "A Matter of Urgency: A Response to the Passover Supper in Exodus 12:1–20," *Semeia* 67 (1994): 68; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 267, 268. Dozeman (ibid., 269) maintains that YHWH's actions in passing through and striking down signify warfare.

47. For arguments in support of Exod 11:4–8 as the backdrop to Exod 12:29–39

the tension within non-P (Exod 12:23, 29) regarding the identity of the agent of destruction, interpreting the blood as a “sign to you,” the Israelites, as well as adding its own unique elements of interpretation. We will take each of these in turn.

First, Pg incorporates the plague of the killing of the firstborn into the meaning of the Passover rite by changing non-P’s reference to YHWH’s passing through to strike down “the Egyptians” in general (Exod 12:23) to YHWH’s passing through the land of Egypt and smiting “all the first-born of the land of Egypt, both humans and animals” derived from 12:29.<sup>48</sup> In the earlier non-P material, the killing of the firstborn represents the last plague, and it is the motivating factor for the exodus, which occurs as the result of Pharaoh (and the Egyptians) giving active permission, even urging, the Israelites to leave Egypt as a consequence of YHWH’s killing of the firstborn (11:4–8; 12:29–39). For Pg, in contrast, the killing of the firstborn is not the last plague or sign/wonder; Pg’s signs/wonders section in Exod 7–11\* concludes with 11:9–10 (and see 7:3), nor is it part of Pg’s narration of the exodus (see 12:40–41 [Pg]); rather, the killing of the firstborn as incorporated into the etiology of the Passover rite in 12:12–13 is given a prominent place within the meaning and whole point of the Passover rite.<sup>49</sup> The implication is that the performance of the Passover rite celebrates, or, given the narrative context, even effects, the killing of the firstborn, and given the intimate link between the killing of the firstborn and the exodus, therefore implicitly also brings about the exodus.<sup>50</sup>

Second, with regard to the identity of the agent of destruction, Pg reshapes the earlier non-P account in Exod 12:23, 29 in the following way: Pg’s reference to plague (נגף), not destroying (משחית), in 12:13 plays on the reference to the destroyer (משחית) who strikes down (נגף) in 12:23. In so doing, Pg cleverly smoothes over the tension regarding the agent of destruction within 12:23, 29 as YHWH who strikes down, on the one hand (12:23a [נגף], 29 [נכה]), and the destroyer (משחית), on the other (12:23b [נגף]), making quite clear that YHWH is the one who smites (12:12, 13 [נכה]) and the plague (נגף) that accompanies this does not destroy (משחית) the Israelites (12:13).

---

forming a relatively coherent narrative, see Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 148–49. See further, in general, Childs, *Exodus*, 194.

48. See also the reference to “plague” (נגף) in Exod 12:13 (Pg).

49. See Childs, *Exodus*, 135, 192–93.

50. This will be taken up and explored in more depth shortly.

Third, Pg adds its own interpretation of the symbolism of the blood on the houses as a sign (אֶות) to Israel (not YHWH), therefore placing the emphasis, not on marking for YHWH in which houses the Israelites are to be found, but rather on YHWH's commitment to Israel,<sup>51</sup> whom he protects from destruction in Egypt.

Finally, the unique elements of interpretation that Pg has introduced are telling. As already noted, the significance of these is emphasized by their central position surrounded by reshaped tradition. Pg, in adding the words "and upon all the gods of Egypt I will make judgments,"<sup>52</sup> I am YHWH" to the reshaped tradition of YHWH smiting the firstborn of the land of Egypt, interprets the death of the firstborn in the land of Egypt as YHWH executing judgments on the gods of Egypt and therefore showing who YHWH is as signified by the self-revelation formula of "I am YHWH" (אֲנִי יְהוָה). YHWH here portrays himself as a cosmic God who judges and defeats other gods, that is, the gods of Egypt, including Pharaoh. YHWH's act in killing the firstborn in the land of Egypt interpreted in this way is an act of destruction that shows the superior power of YHWH over against other divine powers, who are rendered powerless. However, as such, and in light of Pg's picture in Gen 1:1–2:3, it can perhaps also be construed as a cultic act in which YHWH as the cosmic creator god claims what is his, the firstborn in the land of Egypt.<sup>53</sup> The content of YHWH's self revelation in the formula "I am YHWH" is that YHWH is the cosmic creator, who in killing the firstborn of the land of Egypt, judges and defeats the divine powers of Egypt and claims what is his own.

#### Exodus 12:28, 40–41 Narrative

As already noted, in Exod 12:28, Pg reshapes the people's response of submission and worship in 12:27b (non-P), into a note concerning the obedience of the people to what YHWH himself had commanded Moses

51. Fretheim, *Exodus*, 138.

52. See also Exod 7:4.

53. See, in this connection, Edward L. Greenstein, "The Firstborn Plague and the Reading Process," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honour of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 555–68. Although arguing at the level of the final text, Greenstein reaches this conclusion.

and Aaron, underpinning the authority of the Passover rite as divinely ordained and stating that it has been performed by the people. Within the narrative context, the performance of the Passover rite in conformity to YHWH's commands (12:1, 3–11) means YHWH's killing of the firstborn of the land of Egypt as YHWH's judgment on the gods of Egypt is effected (12:12), and so the Israelites, protected from this plague (12:13), are free to go out from the land of Egypt.

The departure of the Israelites from the land of Egypt is accordingly recorded in Exod 12:40–41. There is a chronological notice regarding the time of their exodus. The tension found in the earlier non-P account, where according to the Passover instructions in 12:22 they are not to go outside the house until the morning and yet in the narrative in 12:29–39 they leave at night, is expelled by Pg explicitly stating that “on this very day” (בַּעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה) the hosts of YHWH (צְבָאוֹת יְהוָה)<sup>54</sup> went forth (צָא) from the land of Egypt.

This brief notice in Exod 40:40–41 is all that is necessary within Pg, in contrast to the extended narrative describing the exodus in the earlier account in Exod 12:29–39. This is because in Pg YHWH's killing of the firstborn as an intrinsic part of the etiology of the Passover rite, and thus effected by its performance, represents YHWH's judgments against the gods of Egypt, and with the decimation of the firstborn whereby the Egyptian gods, including Pharaoh, are defeated and rendered powerless, there is nothing to stand in the way of the Israelites leaving; it is a foregone conclusion. There is, therefore, no place in Pg for narrating Pharaoh's response to the plague of the killing of the firstborn in commanding that the Israelites leave with their hasty exit urged on by the Egyptians as in the earlier tradition (12:29–39). Rather, in this short narrative in 12:28, 40–41, Pg has reshaped the non-P tradition to portray the exodus occurring when the divinely ordained ritual of the Passover is carried out, that is, YHWH's commands are obediently performed, in contrast to 12:29–39, where the exodus occurs as an act of obedience to the command of Pharaoh (and the Egyptians). In Pg, the exodus results from a ritual act ordained by YHWH,<sup>55</sup> not by the permission of human or foreign gods symbolized by the Pharaoh.

54. This is military metaphor, in line with the military overtones of YHWH passing through and striking down; see n. 46 and Dozeman, *God at War*, 130.

55. See George Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God*, JSOTSup 57 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 103, and his statement that for P “the Passover event ... estab-

The exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, as the consequence of YHWH's judgments against the gods of Egypt effected in the Passover ritual (Exod 12:12), duly noted in 12:40–41, is reinforced as an act of YHWH in Pg's introduction to this section in 7:4 which refers to YHWH as bringing out (יצא) "my hosts" (צבאותי), my people Israel, from the land of Egypt (see similar wording in 12:41) by great judgments (משפטים<sup>56</sup>).

In all these ways, Pg's account in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 reflects details of the evolving and contemporary practice of the Passover synthesized with intentional literary reshaping of the tradition in 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 and Pg's own unique interpretative elements. Pg's picture formulated in this way is one in which the obedient performance of the Passover rite commanded by YHWH brings about or effects the protection of the Israelites from destruction in Egypt and their liberation in the exodus through defeating the divine powers of Egypt by the killing of the first-born in the land of Egypt. It can be said, therefore, that the exodus in Pg's picture is a ritual or cultic event since it occurs inseparably from the performance of the Passover rite. This brings us to the next step of addressing how Pg's picture in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 is paradigmatic in terms of its hermeneutics of time.

#### 4.1.1.2. The Paradigmatic Nature of Pg's Portrayal and Its Hermeneutics of Time

The paradigmatic nature of Pg's picture in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 is seen in the way in which Pg has formulated it. Pg's reshaping of tradition, with its own fresh perspective in such a way that contemporary praxis of the Passover rite in the form of prescriptions for carrying out the rite has been incorporated seamlessly into a narrative set in the remote past, points to the inherently timeless nature of the description where the categories of past/present/future are collapsed in such a way as to incorporate all time and therefore transcend it.<sup>57</sup> This collapsing of any distinction

---

lishes the exodus from Egypt totally in terms of cultic event. To keep the ritual is to leave Egypt."

56. At least according to the Samaritan Pentateuch.

57. As Childs (*Exodus*, 198) observes, "For this biblical narrator the historical distinction between earlier and later Passovers was lost." See also the statement of Dianne Bergant ("An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Interpretation: The Passover Supper in Exodus 12:1–20 as a Case Study," *Semeia* 67 [1994]: 49) that "the mes-

between past, present, and future by fusing past event and contemporary celebration into liturgical prescription and action so that the exodus itself is a ritual event is something of what makes Pg paradigmatic.<sup>58</sup>

Indeed, the ritual nature of Pg's picture in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, in the sense that the bulk of it is divine prescriptions for the Passover rite and its significance (12:1, 3–13) and the rest of it relates to the performative effects (12:28, 40–41), is the essence of its paradigmatic nature. For it is, drawing on Damrosch's discussion, a narrative that reflects ritual time, which has a dimension of timelessness and can incorporate all time.<sup>59</sup> As liturgical or ritual focused text it transcends time, and in this sense it is paradigmatic. Moreover, the ritual instructions of this rite can be carried out at any time,<sup>60</sup> through time, and its performative effects realized, or in Gorman's terms, its worldview enacted, actualized, and realized.<sup>61</sup>

The hermeneutics of time in Pg's picture here, which reflects ritual or liturgical time as transcending or incorporating all time, has been touched on by a number of scholars who have offered helpful descriptions. Terence Fretheim, for example, refers to a "liturgical hermeneutic" where the "event is liturgy.... Act of God is also liturgical event."<sup>62</sup> He sees the effect

---

sage contains directives for ritual reenactment of their proleptic deliverance. This bifocal temporality suggests that their deliverance by God is not a single occurrence but an on-going reality."

58. This would seem to be a deliberate hermeneutical move on the part of Pg, since in the earlier non-P account, particularly in Exod 12:29–39; 13:3–16, there is a clear distinction in time between the event of the exodus from Egypt as narrated (Exod 29:29–39) and the later celebration of it in the land (Exod 13:3–16, esp. 13:5, 8, 11, 14). For arguments regarding Exod 13:3–16 as earlier than Pg, see Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 150–52, and see above n. 29.

59. Damrosch, *Narrative Covenant*, esp. 272–73, 278, 280–84, 295, 296–97; and see §3.1.3, above.

60. Bergant, "Anthropological Approach," 49.

61. Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 17–18, 22, 38, 225, 229, 232; and see §3.1.3, above. As such, the land of Egypt and the gods of Egypt are paradigmatic of the land and gods of foreign nations in general. Therefore in carrying out this Passover rite as prescribed at any time, YHWH's judgment and defeat of the divine powers or gods of any foreign country in which the Israelites find themselves is celebrated as a reality, and their liberation and exodus from that country effected. This is pertinent particularly to the exiled Judahites in Babylon as Pg's original audience; the message for them is that the praxis of the Passover rite celebrates the reality of YHWH's judgment on the Babylonian gods and effects their exodus from Babylon.

62. Fretheim, *Exodus*, 136 and 137.

of this in terms of giving these events “a character ... beyond normal time and space,” and the Passover as act of God is a “sacramental vehicle for making the exodus redemption real and effective for both present and subsequent generations.”<sup>63</sup> According to Dianne Bergant:

Ritual both lifts the participants out of and above mundane time and sacralizes the temporal movement of its performance. In the Passover, certain events of historical time, through ritualization, have become sacred events of sacred time.... We witness here a simultaneity or a convergence of the mythologization of history and the historicization of myth receiving expression in a classical ritual which mediates ... slavery/freedom; life/death.<sup>64</sup>

Finally, Thomas W. Mann states that “the Passover narrative elicits a communion between past and present, and joins past and present together in anticipation of the future.”<sup>65</sup>

---

63. Ibid., 136 and 139, where he also further states, “It is a question of how the salvific effect of a past event can be appropriated or realized in every new present. Liturgy, by being structured into the very story of the past redemptive event, provides the answer.”

64. Bergant, “Anthropological Approach,” 49.

65. Thomas W. Mann, “Passover: The Time of Our Lives,” *Int* 50 (1996): 242. In contrast to what I have argued here in terms of the paradigmatic nature of Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 with its hermeneutics of time spelled out in terms of the transcendence of time or the incorporation of all time, Propp (*Exodus 1–18*, 445, 448, 451–52), followed by William Gilders (“Sacrifice before Sinai and the Priestly Narrative,” in Shectman, *Strata of the Priestly Writings*, 62–63), argues that many aspects of Exod 12:1–13 are historicized ritual rather than prescriptive ritual, i.e., it is specific to its context of historical narrative and therefore a one-time only event, not to be repeated, i.e., with no intention for it to be performed in the future. In my opinion, making a distinction between historicized and prescriptive ritual is a false dichotomy. Dividing up elements within Exod 12:1, 3–13 between these categories does not make sense; why would some of the elements for the rite refer only to the past with no further relevance and others, intended to be carried out on an ongoing basis, be mixed together in a description of what is involved in carrying out the rite? Why present such detailed prescriptions if most of them are irrelevant for Pg’s contemporary audience? Such a position seems to lack an appreciation of the hermeneutics of time of ritual or liturgical description. Baden (“Identifying the Original Stratum,” 24–26), although emphasizing Exod 12:1–13 is part of P’s narrative plot, and distinguishing it from paraenetic texts such as found in Exod 12:14–20, which in an explicit way breaks out of the narrative context to speak explicitly to P’s present addressees, still acknowledges



Pg's picture in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 is paradigmatic by virtue of its hermeneutics of time, which is related to its ritual or liturgical nature. Set within the remote past, but reflecting ongoing contemporary practice and comprising prescriptive ritual instructions whose performance effects the exodus, time is collapsed: its time is ritual or liturgical time, where past/present/ future is one, where time as incorporating all time is transcended. As such, this text invites its audience to enact and actualize its worldview by practicing this rite so described as a way of realizing that worldview and the reality it effects, wherever it finds itself through time.

This paradigmatic picture in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 forms a centerpiece that is framed by narrative on either side, in Exod 7–11\* and 14\*, respectively. This narrative frame is itself paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping past traditions and synthesizing these with unique elements into repeated patterns that, along with the use of cosmic mythological language and imagery, all designed to make a theological statement, gives it a typical, universal, and timeless dimension. Moreover, this narrative frame has elements in common with 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, such as YHWH's acts of destruction in relation to "the land of Egypt" (Exod 7–11\*; 12:12–13<sup>66</sup>), the motif of the defeat of, or judgment on, the divine powers of Egypt (Exod 7–11\*; 12:12b),<sup>67</sup> and the self-revelation formula "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה, 14:4, 18; 12:12b), and the protection and liberation of the Israelites (14:21bβ, 22, 29; 12:13, 40–41). These common motifs bind the central picture and its narrative frame even more closely together over and above their proximity to each other. Moreover, like the colors in the frame of a painting that pick up significant colors in the picture itself and interact with it in such a way that these colors illuminate each other, so these motifs common to the central picture and the framing narrative interact with each other to shed light on both. As such, in exploring the narratives in Exod 7–11\* and Exod 14\*, it will be seen that, on the one hand, the paradigmatic nature of these narratives is highlighted and enhanced further by virtue of their forming a narrative frame around the central paradigmatic picture of 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and its hermeneutics of time, the

---

that Exod 12:1–13 implicitly addresses the contemporary audience and that we are to understand it as an implicit model for future observance.

66. See the repetition of "the land of Egypt" in Exod 7:19, 21b; 8:1 (Eng. 8:5); 8:2 (Eng. 8:6) 8:12 (Eng. 8:16); 8:13 (Eng. 8:17); as well as twice in 12:12–13.

67. How this is unfolded in Exod 7–11\* (and 14\*) will become clear in the ensuing discussion.



timelessness of ritual or liturgical time; and, on the other hand, the framing narratives add interpretative dimensions and spell out further the significance and implications of the central picture, in particular the meaning of the Passover rite described in 12:12–13 and its effect in 12:40–41, where the motifs common to both are concentrated. In this way, the narrative frame and central picture together form a complex paradigmatic picture whose hermeneutics of time is one of timelessness or the transcending of time, and therefore relevant for all time. To the discussion of this we will now turn.

#### 4.1.2. The Paradigmatic Nature of the Narrative Frame: Exodus 7–11<sup>\*</sup>; 14<sup>\*</sup>

The way in which Exod 7–11<sup>\*</sup>; 14<sup>\*</sup> has reshaped earlier tradition and synthesized this with its own unique elements into a paradigmatic narrative will be discussed in two stages: first with regard to the signs and wonders of Exod 7–11<sup>\*</sup> and second with regard to the sea episode in Exod 14<sup>\*</sup>.

##### 4.1.2.1. Exodus 7–11<sup>\*</sup><sup>68</sup>

The earlier traditions or texts that Pg seems to have drawn on in formulating its picture of the signs and wonders is apparent from the clear parallels found in the earlier non-P material. These are:

- ♦ The transformation of the staff into a snake in Exod 4:2–4 (see Pg 7:8–13);<sup>69</sup>
- ♦ Water transformed into blood in Exod 4:9 and the plague in Exod 7:14–18, 20b–21a, 23–24 (see Pg 7:19–20aα, 21b–22);
- ♦ The plague of frogs in Exod 7:26–29; 8:4–11a [Eng. 8:1–4, 8–15a] (see Pg 8:1–3, 11b [Eng. 5–7, 15b]);

---

68. Pg's narrative comprises Exod 7:8–13, 19, 20aα, 21b, 22; 8:1–3 (Hebrew) (8:5–7 English); 11b–15 (Hebrew) (8:15b–19 English); 9:8–12; 11:9–10, with an introduction in Exod 7:3 as noted above.

69. Although in Exod 7:8–13, the staff transformed into a snake is clearly not a “plague” as such (in the sense of the earlier tradition), this does not exclude it from being the first of Pg's “signs and wonders” (7:3), which is the distinct terminology of Pg, for that is what it is; and it is not only placed as the first in a series of signs/wonders, but displays a similar structure and elements to the other Pg signs/wonders that follow it.

- ♦ The plague of insects (flies) in Exod 8:16–28 [Eng. 8:20–32]) (see Pg [gnats] 8:12–15 [Eng. 16–19]).<sup>70</sup>

Pg would seem therefore to have drawn quite extensively on earlier tradition in formulating the signs/wonders of the rod transformed into a snake, water transformed into blood, the frogs, and the gnats. Of these, the frogs and the gnats are drawn from the non-P plague tradition, the water turned into blood also from the non-P plague tradition but also likely the tradition of this as a sign (Exod 4:9), and the transformation of the rod into a snake from the earlier tradition where it functions as a sign (4:2–4).<sup>71</sup> Pg, however, has reshaped these traditions and added its own distinctive elements, an example of which is the inclusion of the sign/wonder of boils (9:8–12), which has no close equivalent in the non-P texts.<sup>72</sup>

In order to see how these earlier traditions have been reshaped and synthesized with unique elements into Pg's distinctive picture of the signs/wonders, it will be helpful first to compare the broad structure of Pg's signs/wonders with that of the earlier non-P plagues.<sup>73</sup> I will then turn to an exploration of the similarities and especially the differences in detail.

---

70. This parallel is not as close but both refer to the whole land of Egypt being inundated with insects; see Noth, *Exodus*, 76.

71. Pg has therefore been quite selective with regard to what has been drawn from the earlier plague tradition. Pg also, as we have seen, drew on the earlier non-P tradition of the plague of the firstborn in Exod 12:29–39 (and see 11:4–8) but instead of incorporating it as a sign/wonder has transformed it into an inherent element of the Passover rite (12:12).

72. It has been argued that there is a parallel between this and the non-P material in either the sign regarding leprosy in Exod 4:6–7 (see Fretheim, *Exodus*, 122–23; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 350), or the plague of pestilence in Exod 9:1–7 (see Schmidt, *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung*, 79). These parallels however are more remote, and it would seem that, even if drawing on these, P has shaped this sign in quite a unique way.

73. I.e., in particular the plagues upon which Pg has drawn: water transformed into blood in Exod 7:14–18, 20, 21a, 23–24; frogs in Exod 7:26–29 (Eng. 8:1–4); 8:4–11a (Eng. 8:8–15a); flies in Exod 8:16–19, 21, 24b, 25–28 (Eng. 8:20–23, 25, 28b, 29–32); and possibly also pestilence on livestock in Exod 9:1–7. As discussed in ch. 1, the question of whether Exod 9:22–23a, 35 (hail); 10:12–13a, 20 (locusts), 21–22, 27 (darkness) are earlier or later than Pg has been left open and therefore, along with their immediate contexts, will not be considered here with regard to earlier non-P material; see §§1.2.2.2 and 1.2.3, above.

Pg material concerning the signs/wonders displays quite a rigid pattern that is repeated for each. It comprises:

1. A speech of YHWH commanding Moses (and sometimes Aaron) concerning the execution of the sign/wonder (most often involving commissioning Aaron to stretch out his staff to bring about the sign/wonder) (Exod 7:8–9, 19; 8:1 [Eng. 8:5]; 8:12 [Eng. 8:16]; 9:8–9);
2. The execution of the command and the realization of the sign/wonder (Exod 7:10, 20aα, 21b; 8:2 [Eng. 8:6]; 8:13 [Eng. 8:17]; 9:10);
3. The actions of the magicians who attempt to match the sign and either succeed or fail (Exod 7:11–12, 22a; 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]; 8:14–15a [Eng. 8:18–19a]; 9:11);
4. The hardening (חזק) of Pharaoh's heart, and the formulaic consequence—"and he did not listen to them as YHWH had said" (ולא־שמע אלהם כאשר דבר יהוה) (Exod 7:13, 22b; 8:11b (Eng. 8:15b);<sup>74</sup> 8:15b (Eng. 8:19b); 9:12).<sup>75</sup>

The pattern displayed in the non-P material concerning the plagues of water transformed into blood, frogs, flies, and pestilence on livestock,<sup>76</sup> though much less rigid and stereotyped, comprises the basic elements of:

1. A speech of YHWH commanding Moses to relay to Pharaoh a message of YHWH, which includes the expression "Thus says YHWH" and comprises a request or demand for Pharaoh to release the Israelites and the threat of a plague if this is denied;<sup>77</sup>
2. The occurrence of the plague;<sup>78</sup>

---

74. Note that the hardening of Pharaoh's heart is missing here, but it is thought that it has been omitted in favor of the expression of this in non-P in 8:11a (Eng. 8:15a) in the redaction process; see Noth, *Exodus*, 75.

75. For similar views of this pattern in the P material, see Childs, *Exodus*, 138; Robert R. Wilson, "The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," *CBQ* (1979): 29–30; Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 210–20; Coats, *Moses*, 101–2; Dozeman, *God at War*, 113; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 195; Römer, "From the Call of Moses," 140.

76. See n. 73.

77. See, e.g., Exod 7:14–18; 7:26–29 (Eng. 8:1–4); 8:16–19 (Eng. 8:20–23); 9:1–4.

78. See, e.g., Exod 7:20aβ–21a; 8:20 (Eng. 8:24); 9:5–6. According to Noth

3. Pharaoh's consequent behavior (often involving a conversation between Pharaoh and Moses, which leads to the removal of the plague through Moses's intercession), with a notice concerning Pharaoh's heart, almost always the hardening (כבד) of his heart.<sup>79</sup>

As evidenced by the commonality between the broad structure of Pg and that of the earlier non-P material, Pg would appear to have drawn on this earlier tradition in presenting the signs/wonders as initiated by YHWH in a speech to Moses;<sup>80</sup> in the description of the sign/wonder as actually occurring; and in the notice regarding Pharaoh's hardened heart at or toward the end of each sign/wonder. However, the differences between Pg's structural elements and those of non-P are telling and show something of the way in which Pg has reshaped the earlier plague tradition, using some elements differently and adding its own unique elements.

With regard to Pg's section (1), although drawing on the earlier tradition in presenting the initiation of each scenario with a speech of YHWH to Moses (at least), Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition in a number of respects. This is seen particularly in the way in which the reference to the sign functions within the YHWH speech and the roles of Moses and Aaron.

---

(*Exodus*, 75) this element in the non-P material regarding frogs has been suppressed in favor of P in the redaction process.

79. On כבד, see Wilson ("The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," 22), who argues that J always uses כבד to describe Pharaoh's heart (Exod 7:14; 8:11 [Eng. 15], 28 [Eng. 32]; 9:7, 34). On the element in general, see, e.g., Exod 7:23–24; 8:4–11a (Eng. 8:8–15a); 8:21, 24b, 25–28 (Eng. 8:25, 28b, 29–32); 9:7. Exodus 7:23 does not use the verb כבד, as is the case in Exod 8:11a (Eng. 8:15a); 8:28 (Eng. 8:32); 9:7b, but instead the expression לא שת לבו. For similar views of this basic pattern, see Noth, *Exodus*, 69; Childs, *Exodus*, 133; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 78; Wilson, "Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," 24; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 191–92. Within this basic pattern there is, as Childs notes (*Exodus*, 135) "a high degree of creativity." There are also some other motifs that recur quite often within different parts of this basic pattern, such as the recognition or knowledge of YHWH by Pharaoh motif in various guises (Exod 7:17; 8:6 [Eng. 10], 18 [Eng. 22]).

80. P uses the specific terminology of signs (אֲתוֹת) and wonders (מוֹפְתִים) rather than plagues. See the insightful comment of Childs (*Exodus*, 139): "in P's schema, Moses and the magicians compete in the performing of miraculous signs, yet the signs soon take on the characteristics of plagues, whereas the J source speaks initially of plagues, but these shortly function as signs."

Whereas in the non-P material, the plague referred to in YHWH's initial speech functions as a threat conditional upon whether Pharaoh obeys YHWH's command through Moses to release the Israelites, in Pg, the sign is the content of YHWH's direct and unconditional command; YHWH's speech consists simply of instructions, the execution of which will result in the sign occurring.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, in Pg, there is a greater emphasis on the sign/plague as the sole content of the YHWH speech<sup>82</sup> and on its occurrence in a more inevitable fashion. Most importantly, in Pg's portrayal, YHWH is in complete control of the events with the occurrence of the sign in no way dependent on Pharaoh's decisions and actions with regard to releasing the Israelites as in the non-P tradition.<sup>83</sup>

Significantly also, Pg would appear to have reshaped the roles of Moses and Aaron in comparison with the earlier tradition as evidenced in non-P. First, Pg has given more prominence to Aaron than has the non-P material. Whereas in non-P's section (1) the YHWH speech is consistently addressed to Moses only, in Pg the speech of YHWH is addressed in the first and fifth signs to both Moses and Aaron (Exod 7:8; 9:8). Aaron's increased prominence in Pg is also seen in the fact that in the first four signs, YHWH's instructions for bringing about the sign involves Aaron's use of his staff (7:8–9, 19; 8:1 [Eng. 8:5]; 8:12 [Eng. 16]). In the earlier non-P tradition, however, only Moses's staff is mentioned (4:2–4; 7:15, 17), and within the plague material only in relation to the transformation of the water into blood (7:15, 17, 20b). However, although Pg has brought Aaron into greater prominence, Moses still has prior place over Aaron, since in signs two, three, and four it is only to Moses that YHWH speaks directly (7:19; 8:1 [Eng. 8:5]; 8:12 [Eng. 8:16]), with Aaron receiving the

---

81. The element of the request for Pharaoh to let the Israelites go, so prominent in the non-P material in the initial speech for each of the plagues (Exod 7:16, 26 [Eng. 8:1]; 8:16 [Eng. 8:20]; 9:1), is found in Pg as part of the introduction to Pg's signs/wonders section in Exod 7:2, 6–7 (and see Exod 11:10). YHWH's command to Moses to make this request to Pharaoh in Exod 7:1–2 and Moses's fulfillment of this in Exod 7:6–7 is given by way of summary at the beginning, and thus it is not necessary for P to repeat it in relation to each of the signs, allowing Pg to portray the signs differently in terms of their nature and emphasis in the repeated pattern, with Exod 7:6 taken as given.

82. See Wilson, "Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," 30.

83. Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 194–95) comments that one of the most distinctive characteristics of P's portrayal of the signs/wonders is the structure of divine command and fulfillment as in the rest of P.

divine instructions only through Moses, and in the fifth sign of the boils it is Moses who is the prime actor (Exod 9:10).<sup>84</sup>

Second, and importantly, Pg has emphasized more the role of Moses and Aaron as mediators of divine action, as wonder-workers through whom YHWH's signs are performed, whereas in the non-P material the emphasis lies more on Moses as the speaker of God's word to Pharaoh ("Thus says YHWH").<sup>85</sup>

Accordingly, in Pg's section (2) the emphasis is on the occurrence of the sign/wonder as the result of Moses and Aaron obediently carrying out YHWH's command (Exod 7:10, 20aα, 21b; 8:2 [Eng. 8:6]; 8:13 [Eng. 8:17]; 9:10), which is a reshaping of the earlier non-P element of the occurrence of the plague according to the word of YHWH through Moses ("Thus says YHWH") (and expressed on occasion as directly carried out by YHWH [8:20 (Eng. 8:24); 9:6]) when implicitly Pharaoh does not accede to the request to let the Israelites go.

The most striking innovation of Pg is the structural element of section (3), the competition between Moses and Aaron and the Egyptian magicians who attempt to match the sign and either succeed or fail (Exod 7:11–12, 22a; 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]; 8:14–15a [Eng. 8:18–19a]; 9:11).<sup>86</sup> This has no equivalent in the non-P plague tradition, and is unique to Pg.<sup>87</sup> These

---

84. Moses's prominence over Aaron has already been signaled in the definition of their roles in Exod 7:1.

85. As pointed out by Childs (*Exodus*, 145–46) both these roles are part of the prophetic tradition, with P's portrayal of Moses and Aaron coming closer to the prophetic tradition of Elijah and Elisha; see also Schmidt, "Intention der beiden Plagenzählungen," 234. It should be noted however, that implicit in these instructions is that Moses transmit the words of YHWH, the instructions for the sign, to Aaron.

86. Römer ("From the Call of Moses," 143) argues convincingly that strictly speaking, since according to Exod 7:1 Moses as "*elohim*" is set in contradistinction to the "divine" Pharaoh and Aaron is Moses's prophet, Aaron specifically is the figure who is set in contradistinction to the Egyptian magicians.

87. The suggestion of Römer ("Competing Magicians," 21–22; "Exodus Narrative," 167) that possibly P drew on tradition from the Egyptian diaspora is interesting and may have some merit. He argues for this on the basis that חרטמים only occurs outside Exod 7–9 in Gen 41:8, 24 and Dan 1:20; 2:2, which he sees as part of two diaspora novels; and Gen 41 and Dan 1–2 are comparable in theme to the P material in Exodus 7–9 in that they seek to show that the magical skill of Jews is superior to that of specialists in the great culture. See the comment of Childs (*Exodus*, 151) on the importance of this element: "The theme of conflict with the magicians and their defeat provides the major framework of the P source."

Egyptian magicians, called wise men (חכמים) and sorcerers (מכשפים) (7:11), but subsumed primarily under the name חרטמים (7:11, 22; 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]; 14–15 [Eng. 8:18–19]; 9:11), which is quite probably an Egyptian loan word, are thought to be the chief ritualists or high ranking priests in charge of ritual, that is, both priests and magicians who by their “secret arts” (7:11, 22; 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]; 14–15 [Eng. 8:18]) or enchantments protected Egyptian society.<sup>88</sup> In Pg’s portrayal, their actions in the first four signs are set over against those that Aaron executes in an attempt to match them (7:10b, 11, 20aa, 21b 22a; 8:2–3 [Eng. 8:6–7]; 13–14 [Eng. 8:17–18]); but whereas the Egyptian magicians base their actions on “secret arts” or traditional rituals and enchantments, Aaron’s actions are an execution of YHWH’s commands through Moses.<sup>89</sup> This competition between Moses/Aaron and the Egyptian magicians portrayed by Pg is primarily a contest to show who is really in control of all that occurs: YHWH, whose commands Moses and Aaron carry out, or the so-called divine powers of Egypt, that is, the Egyptian gods and Pharaoh whom they invest with divine power.<sup>90</sup> Although the Egyptian gods are not specifically mentioned, this is implicit since the magicians who perform or attempt to perform the signs by their secret arts are, as priests, religious functionaries in a culture, as throughout the ancient world, where the divine realm was taken as given.<sup>91</sup> The sig-

88. See Römer, “Competing Magicians,” 19–20; Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 166; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 212–13, and especially Dozeman’s comment (212) that in Egypt “Magic sustained the order of creation by warding off elements of chaos.”

89. For secret arts, see Exod 7:11, 22; 8:3 (Eng. 8:7); 8:14 (Eng. 8:18). See also Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 166.

90. As Michaela Bauks (“Das Dämonische im Menschen: Einige Anmerkungen zur priesterschriftlichen Theologie [Exod 7–14],” in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*, ed. Herman Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003], 251) comments, Aaron and the magicians depend in a similar way on their god and his representative (Moses and Pharaoh). Inherent in this competition is also a struggle over the legitimacy of the figures involved; i.e., the conflict with the magicians and their eventual defeat with regard to the signs legitimates the divine authority of Moses and Aaron in their dealings with Pharaoh and the Egyptians. See, e.g., Schmidt, *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung*, 78; Childs, *Exodus*, 152. This motif is present especially in the first sign (see Exod 7:8–13), but it seems to me that this is not the primary emphasis here. *Pace* Schmidt (*Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung*, 78), who maintains that P has made the legitimization of Moses into the leitmotif of his presentation of the plagues.

91. See Dennis J. McCarthy, “Moses’ Dealings with Pharaoh: Exod 7,8–10,27,”



nificance of this structural element of section (3) will be explored further after looking at the details of Pg's reshaping of the earlier tradition and its unique contribution. It suffices at the moment to highlight Pg's innovative addition regarding the competition with Egyptian magicians that has no precedent in the earlier non-P tradition.

Pg's final structural element, section (4), clearly takes over the motif of Pharaoh's hardened heart from the earlier non-P plague tradition where it also appears in a similar position at the end of each sign/plague. However, Pg has reshaped this tradition by using a different verb for hardening (חזק cf. כבד [non-P]); giving it a different function within the repeated structure of the signs and bringing in the agency of YHWH as the one hardening Pharaoh's heart; and, importantly, following it uniquely with Pg's distinctive formulation, "and he did not listen as YHWH had said" (Exod 7:13, 22b; 8:11b [Eng. 8:15b]; 8:15b [Eng. 8:19b]; 9:12).

Pg uses the verb חזק for the "hardening" of Pharaoh's heart consistently within Exod 7:8–11:10\* (see 7:13, 22; 8:15 [Eng. 19]; 9:12; 11:10<sup>92</sup>), although in Pg's introduction to this section in 7:3 the verb קשה is used. This is in contrast to the earlier non-P plague tradition that uses the verb כבד.<sup>93</sup> As Robert Wilson points out, חזק has the connotation "to be firm or strong," which, if interpreted negatively, can mean "to be stubborn"; קשה has a similar meaning, but is almost always negative, in the sense of stubbornness, and this, argues Wilson, encourages the reader to interpret חזק as negative throughout.<sup>94</sup> כבד has a slightly different connotation,

---

CBQ 27 (1965): 344 n. 20. Pace Schmidt ("Intention der beiden Plagenerzählungen," 231), who argues that the "secret arts" do not clearly go back to a divine power. However, in support of seeing the divine powers of Egypt as implicitly behind the actions of the Egyptian magicians is the symbolism of the תנין in the first sign (Exod 7:8–13), which recalls the cobra crested diadem of Pharaoh signifying the divine power invested in him by the god(esses), the contemporary references to the Pharaoh as תנין, and the recognition by the Egyptian magicians in the fourth sign that the sign carried out by Aaron as commanded by YHWH through Moses is "the finger of God" (8:15 [Eng. 8:19]), all of which will be discussed shortly.

92. On the omission of this element in the third sign of frogs, see n. 74.

93. Exod 7:14; 8:11a (Eng. 8:15a); 8:28 (Eng. 8:32); 9:7b. Van Seters (*Life of Moses*, 91 n. 41) suggests that perhaps P uses חזק instead of כבד because P uses כבד in a different sense ("get glory") in Exod 14:4, 17, 18.

94. Wilson, "Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," 23.



according to Wilson, suggesting that a heart that is **כבד** is an organ of perception that is not open to outside stimulation.<sup>95</sup>

Although the notice regarding the hardening of Pharaoh's heart occurs near the conclusion of each of the plagues/signs in the earlier non-P material and in Pg, this motif functions in a different way in Pg's structure from its function in the non-P plagues. In the earlier non-P plagues, the hardening motif occurring at the conclusion of each plague does not function as the cause of the next plague but represents the response to the cessation of the plague.<sup>96</sup> It functions to show the lack of effect that the plague has had on Pharaoh; it shows the failure of the plague to effect its purpose of persuading Pharaoh to let the Israelites go.<sup>97</sup> In contrast, Pg portrays the hardening of Pharaoh's heart as the explicit cause of each ensuing plague. This is stated from the outset in Exod 7:3, which forms the introduction to Pg's signs section in Exod 7–11\*: 7:3, in juxtaposing the hardening of Pharaoh's heart and YHWH multiplying his signs and wonders, interprets the latter as the purpose of the former. This is reinforced in Pg's concluding summary of the signs section in 11:9, stating that Pharaoh's not listening, which throughout the signs is linked closely with, indeed is the consequence of, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (7:13, 22b; 8:11b [Eng. 8:15b]; 8:15b [Eng. 8:19b]; 9:12), is in order that YHWH's wonders might be multiplied in the land of Egypt. It can be concluded, therefore, that in Pg's schema, the notice of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, which means he does not listen at the end of each sign, is the cause of the next sign, the divine command concerning which immediately follows. As Childs states,

---

95. *Ibid.*, 22.

96. See Childs, *Exodus*, 171–72; Wilson, “Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart,” 26.

97. See Wilson (“Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart,” 26–27), who interprets the hardening of Pharaoh's heart in J as meaning that he does not receive the outside stimulation of the command of YHWH to let the Israelites go: he does not obey it, his position remains the same at the end of the story of each plague as at the beginning; the plague has no effect on him. Cf. Childs (*Exodus*, 171–72), who sees the purpose of the plagues in J as a means of coming to the knowledge of YHWH, and therefore the hardening of Pharaoh's heart in J serves to show that the plagues have failed to produce knowledge of YHWH for Pharaoh. This motif is present especially in the plague of water transformed into blood (Exod 7:14–18, 20aβ–21a, 23–24; see 7:17; and see also 8:6 [Eng. 8:10]; 8:19 [Eng. 8:23]), but it seems to me the overarching function of the non-P plagues, and the motif of Pharaoh's hardened heart within this, is related to the central motif of the release of the Israelites from Egypt, since the hardening motif is repeatedly linked with Pharaoh's refusal to let the people go (see 7:14; 8:28 [Eng. 8:32]; 9:7b).

in P “Pharaoh is hardened in order to effect plagues. His refusal to hear results in the multiplying of signs.”<sup>98</sup>

Pg has also reshaped the motif of Pharaoh’s hardened heart to emphasize the agency of YHWH in this. In the earlier non-P plagues identified here, which parallel most closely Pg’s plagues, there is no explicit reference to YHWH hardening Pharaoh’s heart: the emphasis is on Pharaoh as the one who “does not set his heart even to this” (לֹא־שָׁת לְבוֹ גַם־לִזְאוֹת, Exod 7:23) or who “hardens his heart” (וְהִכְבֵּד אֶת־לְבוֹ, 8:11 [Eng. 8:15]; וַיִּכְבֵּד פַּרְעֹה אֶת־לְבוֹ, 8:28 [Eng. 8:32]).<sup>99</sup> Although Pg follows the earlier tradition in the first four signs in not stating the agency of YHWH in relation to Pharaoh’s hardened heart (וַיִּחְזַק לֵב פַּרְעֹה, 7:13, 22; 8:15 [Eng. 8:19]<sup>100</sup>), Pg concludes the fifth sign of the boils, which stands out not only because it is the last of the signs but also because it is unique to Pg, with the notice that “YHWH hardened Pharaoh’s heart” (וַיִּחְזַק יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה, 9:12). This conclusion to the last sign is reinforced by Pg’s introduction and conclusion to the signs in Exod 7:3 and 11:10, where it is also stated that YHWH is the one hardening Pharaoh’s heart (וַאֲנִי אֶקְשֶׁה וְאִנִּי אֶחֱזַק יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה, 7:3 [in a YHWH speech]; וַיִּחְזַק יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה, 11:10). Thus, Pg reshapes the earlier tradition to introduce and emphasize that it was YHWH who hardened Pharaoh’s heart—this hardening was part of YHWH’s plan, in order that the signs might be multiplied. This highlights the fact that YHWH, and not Pharaoh, is in control of everything.<sup>101</sup> It also provides a theological explanation for the seeming ineffectiveness of the plagues/signs inherited from the earlier tradition: Pharaoh was stubborn in relation to the signs and did not listen because YHWH hardened his heart as part of his plan, so that YHWH’s power, his many signs and wonders, might be displayed.

Finally, as already noted, the notice of the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart is consistently followed by the formulation, “and he did not listen to them as YHWH had said” (לֹא־שָׁמַע אֱלֹהִים כְּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה) (Exod 7:13, 22b; 8:11b [Eng. 8:15b];<sup>102</sup> 8:15b [Eng. 8:19b]; 9:12). This close linking of Pharaoh’s not listening with the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart is also evi-

98. Childs, *Exodus*, 173 (and see 174, 139).

99. See Exod 9:7, where the *niphal* of כָּבַד is used.

100. See n. 74 in relation to the omission of any notice of Pharaoh’s hardened heart in the frogs sign.

101. See Wilson, “Hardening of Pharaoh’s Heart,” 35.

102. See n. 74.

dent in Exod 7:3–4 and 11:9–10, which provide interpretative brackets to Pg's signs section.<sup>103</sup> This repeated linking of Pharaoh's not listening to the hardening motif is unique to Pg.<sup>104</sup> By way of contrast, the non-P material connects the hardening motif repeatedly with Pharaoh's refusal to let the people go (7:14 ; 8:28 [Eng. 8:32]; 9:7b), corresponding to the command of YHWH through Moses to let the people go, in the structure of non-P. Pg, drawing on this earlier tradition, does not link Pharaoh's refusal to release the people with Pharaoh's hardened heart until Exod 11:10 by way of conclusion to the whole signs section, with 11:10 referring back to 7:3–4 to form a bracket, and as a way of foreshadowing Pg's next phase in Exod 12\*. What is stressed then by Pg in the signs section is that YHWH's hardening of Pharaoh's heart means that he did not listen<sup>105</sup> in order for YHWH's signs/wonders, the demonstration of YHWH's power, to be multiplied. Most significantly, Pg adds the unique element of Pharaoh's not listening as being divinely predicted ("as YHWH had said," כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה).<sup>106</sup> This refers back to Exod 7:4a and reinforces the emphasis that has already emerged that this was all part of the divine plan, that YHWH is in complete control of everything.

In sum, the primary emphasis that has emerged through a consideration of Pg's structure in comparison with that of the earlier non-P plagues is that YHWH is in complete control of all that occurs. The sign events are in no way dependent on Pharaoh's decision to let the Israelites go or not,

---

103. See the discussion by Childs (*Exodus*, 172), where he points out that since Exod 7:3b is the same as Exod 11:9b, then 7:3a concerning YHWH hardening Pharaoh's heart parallels 11:9a concerning Pharaoh not listening.

104. The motif of Pharaoh's not listening is found in the earlier non-P material in Exod 7:16b, at the beginning of the plagues narrative, but it is not linked directly with the hardening motif.

105. Dozeman (*God at War*, 116) interprets this as Pharaoh not perceiving the divine power behind the signs. Wilson ("Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," 31, 35) links this motif of Pharaoh not listening to the P text in Exod 6:9, where the people do not listen, and sees in Pharaoh's not listening a message of warning to the Israelite audience that to refuse to listen to YHWH's representatives ultimately results in destruction. Perhaps there are some overtones of this here; however, this is not the primary message, since the hardening of Pharaoh's heart and therefore his not listening serves the purpose of YHWH multiplying his signs and therefore displaying his power. Dozeman's interpretation therefore is to be preferred.

106. The only text that is similar to Pg here is Exod 9:35b, which is one of the texts that we have left open since it is unclear whether it is earlier or later than Pg.

but occur inevitably as a result of YHWH's initiating and unconditional command executed obediently by Moses and Aaron (who, though still subordinate to Moses, now has a higher profile), thereby portraying them as wonderworkers, the mediators of divine action. The power of YHWH who executes the signs through Moses and Aaron is pitted over against the divine powers of Egypt upon which the Egyptian priest magicians draw in a competition for control and domination. YHWH's hardening of Pharaoh's heart, resulting in his not listening as divinely predicted, is all part of YHWH's divine plan, which not only shows his control of Pharaoh but has the purpose of allowing YHWH to multiply the signs/wonders in a display of his power.

Turning, then, to explore the way in which Pg has reshaped earlier non-P traditions and texts in combination with its own unique elements with regard to the details to present its own distinctive picture, our discussion will look at each of the signs/wonders in turn following the sequence in Pg's structure.

#### First Sign/Wonder: Aaron's Rod Transformed into a Sea Monster (Exod 7:8–13)

In the first in the series of signs/wonders Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition in Exod 4:2–4, where at YHWH's instigation Moses's staff is turned into a snake (and then turned back again into a staff), by adding its own unique elements in the following ways.

First, the context and purpose of the sign is different. In Exod 4:2–4, the sign occurs in the context of Moses's call narrative and is intended for the Israelites to convince them of Moses's authenticity and authority as the messenger of YHWH and therefore of his message.<sup>107</sup> In Pg's portrayal, the context of the sign is the confrontation with Pharaoh at the Egyptian court, at the request of Pharaoh as predicted by YHWH (7:8).

Second, Pg has accentuated the role of Aaron and his staff. In Exod 4:2–3, in line with the function of the sign as authenticating Moses's role, it is Moses alone whom YHWH commands and who performs the action with his staff. In Pg, however, YHWH's directions regarding the sign and its predicted outcome is given in a speech to both Moses and Aaron, whereby Moses is to tell Aaron to perform the action with Aaron's own staff (7:9).

---

107. See Childs, *Exodus*, 138; Noth, *Exodus*, 71; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 53–54.

Third, Pg has heightened or intensified, and reinterpreted, the sign by portraying the transformation of Aaron's rod, when he throws it down in obedience to YHWH's command, into a תנין, that is a sea dragon (Exod 7:10), in contrast to the earlier tradition where Moses's rod becomes a land snake נחש when he throws it on the ground (4:3).<sup>108</sup> With Pg's use of תנין the sign takes on cosmic dimensions. Reference to the תנין as the sea monster or sea dragon often occurs in Hebrew texts in the context of creation imagery (e.g., Isa 51:9; Job 7:12; Ps 74:13); the תנין represents the forces of chaos and is that which is defeated to bring about the cosmic act of creation. The cosmic dimension of this sign is reinforced when considered in relation to Egyptian mythology and culture. As Scott Noegel has argued, the serpent had cosmic import in Egyptian mythology in that Apophis, the giant serpent, was the divine enemy of Ra whom Ra would battle as he made his circuit through the underworld.<sup>109</sup> Therefore, whether viewed from a Hebrew or Egyptian perspective, the action of throwing down the staff and transforming it into a תנין has cosmic creation overtones. Moreover, the association of תנין with chaos suggests that this sign of throwing down the staff to become a תנין has to do with having the power to control or direct chaos, including unleashing it.<sup>110</sup>

Fourth, Pg introduces for the first time its unique element of the competition with the Egyptian magicians (Exod 7:11–12). As discussed above, these חרטמים (7:11) are, as chief ritualists or high-ranking priests, in charge of ritual, both priests and magicians and as introduced here, match the sign performed by Aaron in that they do the same, each throwing down their staff, which is transformed into a תנין (7:11–12a). However, they accomplish this by their "secret arts" (7:11), ritualistic actions, whereas the sign Aaron performs is an execution of YHWH's commands through Moses, thus setting up a competition and confrontation between the divine powers of Egypt and YHWH.<sup>111</sup> It would seem that both are

---

108. See Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 212.

109. Scott B. Noegel, "Moses and Magic: Notes on the Book of Exodus," *JNES* 24 (1996): 47.

110. It also possibly reflects Egyptian magical practice with regard to the casting down of Apophis; see *ibid.*, 46, 47–48. See also the parallel story in Papyrus Westcar, cited, e.g., by Römer ("Competing Magicians," 22), in which an Egyptian changes a wax crocodile into a real one by throwing it into water, and when he takes it out it turns back into wax.

111. See pp. 246–48 above.

capable of controlling and unleashing the cosmic forces of chaos. As Dozeman comments, "The ability of the Egyptian magicians to conjure up the sea dragon with their magical staffs signifies a primordial confrontation about the control of chaos in the land of Egypt."<sup>112</sup>

However, the notice in Exod 7:12b that Aaron's staff swallowed up those of the Egyptian magicians, symbolizing the absorption of their power and knowledge (that is their power is both destroyed and acquired),<sup>113</sup> makes quite clear that YHWH has the upper hand. It is YHWH who has the power to control and manipulate the forces of chaos to the extent of absorbing and obliterating the forces of chaos conjured up by the Egyptian magician/priests by their secret arts, thus rendering powerless the Egyptian divine powers implicitly behind them.<sup>114</sup>

That this is really a contest between YHWH and the Egyptian divine powers, both the Egyptian gods and Pharaoh whom they invest with divine power, is supported by the further symbolism of the *תנין* ("serpent") implied when the cobras of Pharaoh's diadem are brought into consideration. John Currid, in exploring the symbolism of serpents in ancient Egyptian culture, has drawn out the implications of seeing such a connection, of perceiving the *תנין* as touching on the symbolism of the cobras on the Pharaoh's diadem.<sup>115</sup> These cobras, he maintains, symbolized the two goddesses, Uraeus and Nekbet, and connoted the power of these goddesses and that of Horus imbued to Pharaoh. The Pharaoh's serpent crested crown, then, was the symbol of his divine power. Thus, he argues, Moses's and Aaron's actions in transforming the staff into a serpent, and in particular the swallowing of the Egyptian magicians' staffs, was not only a polemic against Egyptian thought and practices but also a polemical taunting of Pharaoh's divine status and power: "Pharaoh's cobra crested diadem had no power against YHWH."<sup>116</sup> This view is reinforced by the

---

112. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 213.

113. See Noegel, "Moses and Magic," 49–50.

114. If this sign reflects in some way Egyptian magical practice regarding the casting down of Apophis (see Noegel, "Moses and Magic," 46, 47–48, and above n. 110), this would symbolize the beating of the Egyptians at their own game, so to speak, and as a polemic against Egyptian magic.

115. John. D. Currid, "The Egyptian Setting of the 'Serpent': Confrontation in Exodus 7:8–13," *BZ* 39 (1995): 208–13.

116. *Ibid.*, 213.

approximately contemporary references to Pharaoh as the great תַּנִּין in Ezek 29:3; 32:2.<sup>117</sup>

It can be concluded, therefore, that the significance of Pg's sign of the staff transformed into a תַּנִּין by the command of YHWH, and the swallowing of the magicians' staffs, similarly transformed, by Aaron's staff, has to do with the cosmic power of the creator, YHWH, in relation to which, not only the power of Pharaoh's representatives is swallowed up and rendered as nothing, but the divine power of Pharaoh and the Egyptian god(desses) who invest him with this power is swallowed up and obliterated by YHWH's cosmic power. Moreover, the unleashing of the powers of chaos by the cosmic creator, YHWH, symbolized in this sign, foreshadows the undoing of creation in the land of Egypt portrayed in the following signs.

In the face of this sign, Pharaoh's heart is hardened and he does not listen (Exod 7:13), something that jars, given the radical nature of the sign and its implications for Pharaoh, his power, and the divine powers that invest him with this, and ultimately for the land of Egypt. But even his not listening resulting from his hardened heart is part of YHWH's divine plan ("as YHWH had said"; 7:13, and see 7:3–4), further implying that YHWH is in control.

Second Sign/Wonder: Water Transformed into Blood (Exod 7:19, 20aα, 21b, 22)

In the second in the series of signs/wonders, Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition in Exod 4:9 and the earlier non-P plague tradition in 7:14–18, 20aβ–21a, 23–24, regarding the transformation of the Nile into blood, and added its own unique elements in the following ways.

First, Pg has drawn on the context of the non-P plague tradition (Exod 7:14–18, 20aβ–21a, 23–24) of a confrontation with Pharaoh rather than that of the call of Moses in which the instruction for the sign in Exod 4:9 is set: Pg has contextualized this sign as part of the signs/wonders performed to prove a point to Pharaoh and the Egyptians rather than as a sign to authenticate Moses's authority and message to Israel (4:9).

Second, Pg has again accentuated the role of Aaron and his staff. In line with both Exod 4:9 and 7:14–18, there is in Pg an (initial) YHWH speech

---

117. See *ibid.*, 212; Noegel, "Moses and Magic," 47; and Terence E. Fretheim, "The Plagues as Ecological Signs of Disaster," *JBL* 110 (1991): 388.



to Moses alone,<sup>118</sup> regarding the sign, the action to be carried out, and what will result from this (7:19). However, whereas in 4:9 and 7:14–18 it is Moses who is to carry out the action, in the latter case involving Moses's staff, in Pg Moses is instructed by YHWH to tell Aaron to carry out the action which involves Aaron's staff (7:19), as in Pg's first sign/wonder (7:9), and this they both obediently do.

Third, Pg has heightened or intensified the sign of the transformation of water into blood drawn from the earlier tradition. Whereas in the non-P material (in both Exod 4:9 and 7:14–18, 20b–21a, 23–24) it is the waters of the Nile only that are turned into blood, in P it is all the waters and waterways of Egypt that are turned into blood, so that the blood is throughout “the whole land of Egypt,” repeated twice and therefore emphasized (7:19, 21b).<sup>119</sup> But this sign is heightened even further in comparison with the earlier tradition in that the terminology *מקוה* is used in relation to the waters (“all the gathering [*מקוה*] of their waters”). *מקוה* has cosmic dimensions; it is the word used in Gen 1:10 in relation to the separating and naming of the primordial deep as seas. Therefore this sign takes on cosmic significance.<sup>120</sup> It evokes the cosmic power of YHWH as creator who plays havoc with his creation in the land of Egypt. With all the waters of Egypt transformed into blood, with blood throughout all the land of Egypt (Exod 7:19, 21b), the primeval elements of creation, the water and land, in Egypt, have been polluted and rendered unclean (see Num 35:33).<sup>121</sup> Creation in the land of Egypt is contaminated; it is dislocated and touches into the unleashing of chaos in that land.

---

118. Cf. Pg's first sign, where the YHWH speech is addressed to both Moses and Aaron (Exod 7:8).

119. The meaning of the expression *ובעצים ובאבנים* in Exod 7:19 is obscure and could mean “in the wood and in the stones” in the sense of in the sap of trees and wells of water and therefore be a way of referring to everything on the face of the earth as suggested by Ziony Zevit (“The Priestly Redaction and Interpretation of the Plague Narrative in Exodus,” *JQR* 66 [1976]: 199) or could have a more localized reference to vessels of wood and vessels of stone. Benedicte Lemmelijn (“The Phrase *ובעצים ובאבנים* in Exodus 7,19,” *Bib* 80 [1999]: 264–68) interprets this as referring to gods or idols made of wood or stone as polluted and therefore to their subjugation to the power of YHWH.

120. Zevit, “Priestly Redaction,” 199; Zevit, “Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues,” *BRev* 16 (1990): 22; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 216.

121. Zevit, “Priestly Redaction,” 200; see also Dozeman, *God at War*, 117; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 217. Other connotations have been read into this sign,



Fourth, in Pg's unique element of the competition with the Egyptian magicians that follows (Exod 7:22a), the Egyptian magicians are able to match exactly the sign that Aaron enacts. This element functions, on the one hand, to show that the powers of the Egyptian magicians cannot be taken lightly.<sup>122</sup> However, the irony of this is also apparent: in matching the sign, the Egyptian magicians at least symbolically (since all the waters in Egypt have already been transformed into blood) exacerbate the situation, doubling the pollution of their land, and therefore feeding into the dislocation and unleashing of chaos, so to speak, in their own land.<sup>123</sup> Such irony suggests a derogatory nuance in the picture given of the Egyptian magicians. Moreover, irony lies in the fact that the Egyptian magicians, though seemingly pitting their powers and that of the divine forces behind them against Moses and Aaron, are in fact implicitly assisting Moses and Aaron in the carrying out of YHWH's plan.

In the face of this sign, Pharaoh's heart is hardened, and he does not listen, just as YHWH said (Exod 7:22b). This implies that Pharaoh sees only the matching of power and fails to see the irony of the double pollution of the land of Egypt and the way in which his magicians are assisting in YHWH's plan; Pharaoh's reaction itself is part of YHWH's plan.

Third Sign/Wonder: Frogs (Exod 8:1–3 [Eng. 8:5–7]; 8:11b [Eng. 8:15b])<sup>124</sup>

Pg has reshaped the non-P tradition of the plague of frogs in Exod 7:26–29; 8:4–11a [Eng. 8:1–4, 8–15a]. Similar comments can be made with regard to the ways in which Pg has done this, along with the unique elements that have been incorporated, as were made with regard to the way Pg has reshaped non-P's plague of the transformation of the Nile into blood to give its portrayal of the second sign.

---

such as it representing an attack on the Egyptian pantheon (directed either at the god Khnum, the creator of water and life, or Osiris whose bloodstream was the Nile, etc.) (see Zevit, "Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues," 21). There may be overtones of this but such connotations do not seem to me to be of primary significance.

122. As Römer ("Exodus Narrative," 166) comments, the author takes the magical capacities of the Egyptians seriously.

123. Fretheim, *Exodus*, 116. Noegel ("Moses and Magic," 48–49) refers to this dynamic as the opponents being made to function as allies or "subjected opponents" since they assist Moses and Aaron in what they are doing.

124. See n. 74.

As in the non-P tradition in Exod 7:26–29, the context of Pg’s sign is a confrontation with Pharaoh, and there is an initial YHWH speech to Moses regarding the sign, the action to be carried out and what will result from this; but once again Pg uniquely highlights the role of Aaron and Aaron’s staff in the instructions YHWH commands Moses to give Aaron and the obedience of Aaron to YHWH’s instructions through Moses resulting in the sign (Exod 8:1–2).<sup>125</sup>

As in the second sign, Pg has heightened or intensified the sign of frogs drawn from the plague of frogs in the non-P tradition. Whereas in the non-P plague of frogs it is the river only from which the frogs swarm (Exod 7:28 [Eng. 8:3]), in Pg the frogs come up from all the waters and waterways of Egypt (8:1–2 [Eng. 8:5–6]), described in a way similar to the waters of Egypt that are transformed into blood in the second sign (rivers, canals, and ponds: 7:19 [non-P]; 8:1 [Pg] [Eng. 8:5]). Moreover, whereas in the non-P tradition the emphasis in the plague of frogs is on their presence on Pharaoh, his officials, the Egyptians, and their living places and places of work and causing the land to stink (7:27–29; 8:10 [Eng. 8:14]), in Pg the emphasis is on the frogs covering “the land of Egypt” (again emphasized by being mentioned twice, 8:1, 2 [Eng. 8:5, 6]). This emphasis in Pg signifies a cosmic dimension to this sign. Here YHWH plays havoc with creation in the land of Egypt, not only in the sense of creating an overabundance but most importantly in transgressing its categories and boundaries: the creatures that the waters bring forth (see Gen 1:20) are now not confined to their proper realm but have crossed the boundary from water into the realm of dry land where they do not belong.<sup>126</sup> The symbolism here in priestly thinking is that of a reversion of the created order, which was created and maintained by appropriate boundaries, being returned to chaos.<sup>127</sup> In this sign, therefore, YHWH the cosmic creator dislocates his

---

125. Aaron’s staff is not mentioned in Exod 8:2a but is implicit, given YHWH’s instructions in Exod 8:1.

126. See Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 219

127. On the boundaries, see Gen 1:1–2:3. Moreover, according to the food laws in Lev 11:9–12, frogs are unclean, though creatures of the water, because they do not have fins and scales; see Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 220. The symbolism of frogs could also be significant in terms of Egyptian mythology in that the goddess Heket, a goddess of childbirth, was represented as a frog; see Zevit, “Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues,” 21. In addition, it seems that in Egypt the frog was a symbol of life-giving power and renewal of life and thus this sign is paradoxical since the excess of frogs becomes the opposite; see Noth, *Exodus*, 75.

creation in the sense of reversing creation, undoing its order and boundaries by unleashing chaos. Whereas the first two signs in Pg, regarding the sea monster and the transformation of the waters of Egypt, likened to the primordial sea, into blood, have to do with the realm of water, this sign of frogs has to do with the transition from water to land, but in such a way that symbolizes the undoing of creation in “the land of Egypt.”

Again, as in the second sign, in Pg’s unique element of the competition with the Egyptian magicians that follows (Exod 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]), the Egyptian magicians are able to match exactly the sign that Aaron enacts. As in the second sign, this has the connotation, not only of asserting the power of the Egyptian magicians that should not be underestimated, but ironically, of exacerbating the situation, symbolically doubling the dislocation of creation and the unleashing of chaos in their own land, and thereby implicitly making the Egyptian magicians accomplices in YHWH’s plan.

Again, Pharaoh’s not listening, just as YHWH said (Exod 8:11b [Eng. 15b]),<sup>128</sup> itself part of YHWH’s plan, implies that Pharaoh sees only the matching of power and fails to see the irony of the exacerbation of the undoing of creation and its ordered boundaries in the land of Egypt and the way in which his magicians are assisting in YHWH’s plan.

Fourth Sign/Wonder: Dust Transformed into Insects (Exod 8:12–15 [Eng. 8:16–19])

Pg has reshaped the non-P tradition of the plague of flies in Exod 8:16–28 (Eng. 8:20–32). Again, there are similarities in the way Pg has done this, along with the unique elements incorporated, to how Pg has reshaped the tradition into its second and third signs.

Pg, as in signs two and three, draws on the context of a confrontation with Pharaoh and the beginning of the scenario with a speech of YHWH to Moses alone regarding the sign, the action to be carried out, and the consequences, from the earlier tradition in Exod 8:16–17 (Eng. 8:20–21). However, once again, as in the first three signs, Pg gives an important role to Aaron and his rod in the instructions YHWH commands Moses to give Aaron and the obedience of Aaron to YHWH’s instructions through Moses which results in the sign (8:12–13).

---

128. The hardening of Pharaoh’s heart is missing here in Pg, but it is thought that it has been omitted in favor of the expression of this in non-P in 8:11a (Eng. 8:15a); see n. 74.

As in the second and third sign (and also the first sign), Pg's portrayal of the sign of the dust transformed into gnats represents a heightening or intensification of the plague of flies in the earlier tradition. Whereas in the non-P tradition swarms of flies are sent (Exod 8:17, 20 [Eng. 21, 24]), in Pg the scale is even greater in that "all the dust of the earth" (כל עפר הארץ) is transformed into gnats in all the land of Egypt (which here too is emphasized by being referred to twice; 8:17, 20 [Eng. 21, 24]).<sup>129</sup> Cosmic nuances of this sign are apparent in the chaotic overabundance of gnats of unimaginable number, since dust is used as a metaphor for something that is innumerable (e.g., Gen 13:16; 28:14; Isa 40:12); and especially, as a distortion of Gen 1:24, where the earth brings forth crawling creatures, in the transformation of the dust of the earth itself into gnats, that is, into something it was never created to be.<sup>130</sup> Therefore, in this sign also, as in signs two and three, YHWH the cosmic creator plays havoc with his creation, distorting the dry land itself and rendering it chaotic, in "the land of Egypt."

In Pg's unique element of the competition with the Egyptian magicians in relation to this sign, there is a divergence from signs two and three in that this time the Egyptian magicians are unable to match the sign that Aaron enacts (Exod 8:14 [Eng. 8:18]). Moreover, the magicians say to Pharaoh that "this is the finger of God [אלהים]"<sup>131</sup> (8:15a [Eng. 8:20a]), which is an acknowledgement of the superior power of God. אלהים ("God") is the term used in Pg in Gen 1–10\* in speaking of the whole world and is thereby the term by which YHWH is known to all peoples outside the Israelites, or more precisely those who cannot claim Abraham as their ancestor.<sup>132</sup> Therefore this is implicitly an acknowledgement by the Egyptian magicians of the power of YHWH (whom they can only know as אלהים) in relation to which their power through their magical

129. See Schmidt, *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung*, 79.

130. On the crawling creatures, see Zevit, "Priestly Redaction," 202; Zevit, "Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues," 22. Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 244) surmises that perhaps P has the Egyptian god Geb, who represents the dry ground, in mind, in which case it may represent a polemic against an Egyptian god (see Exod 12:12).

131. Römer ("From the Call of Moses," 143; "Exodus Narrative," 161) thinks that this refers to Aaron's stick; whereas Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 224) sees the finger of God as associated with the arm or hand of God.

132. Römer, "From the Call of Moses," 143; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 161; Römer, "Competing Magicians," 20. Römer ("From the Call of Moses," 143) also surmises that אלהים here may also be an allusion to Moses's Elohim role in Exod 7:1.

arts (and implicitly the divine powers behind these) are as nothing. This acknowledgement by the Egyptian magicians shows that they understand YHWH's superior power, and therefore their role as unwitting accomplices within YHWH's plan, implicit through the irony of their actions in signs two and three, is now stated openly, ironically through their not being able to match the sign.

However, the understanding and acknowledgement of the superior power of YHWH by the Egyptian magicians (in their own terms of אֱלֹהִים), though stated to Pharaoh, is contrasted with Pharaoh's behavior, who does not understand or acknowledge this, summed up in typical fashion as Pharaoh's heart being hardened and his not listening as predicted by YHWH (Exod 8:15b [Eng. 8:20b]).

#### Fifth Sign: Boils (Exod 9:8–12)

The sign of boils stands out since it has no close equivalent in the earlier non-P texts and is therefore particular to Pg.<sup>133</sup> In this sign, YHWH's speech is addressed to Moses and Aaron as in the first sign but in contrast to the signs two to four where only Moses is addressed. However, whereas in the first sign (and in the second, third, and fourth signs) Moses is to tell Aaron what to do with his staff, both Moses and Aaron are to take handfuls of soot from the kiln, but then Moses only is to throw it into the heavens, to result in boils on humans and animals (Exod 9:8–9). Therefore, although in this sign Aaron is more important than is generally the case in the earlier non-P plagues, he is less important than in the other Pg signs/wonders, and there is no mention of his staff; rather, Moses becomes the primary actor. Since Moses carries more weight because Aaron is subordinated to him (7:1), this perhaps adds to the gravity of this sign.<sup>134</sup>

This sign is in some ways different from the other signs that have to do with the dislocation of the elements of creation of water and land, in terms of their transformation (water into blood, dust to gnats) or breaking out of boundaries (frogs, from water to land), on a cosmic scale in the land of Egypt, in that it has to do with signs of death with regard to humans and animals when the fine dust resulting from throwing soot in the air settles on "all the land of Egypt" causing boils on humans and

133. See n. 72.

134. Propp (*Exodus 1–18*, 331–32) comments that this might be because P did not want to have Aaron, as future high priest, causing a defiling skin disease.

animals.<sup>135</sup> The boils, as a skin disease that “breaks out” (פרה), render the humans and animals unclean (see Lev 13:18–23).<sup>136</sup> Now not only all the waters in the land of Egypt are polluted (Exod 7:19, 20a, 21b), but so are all the Egyptians and their animals (repeated twice in 7:9) defiled: “the plague of boils will advance contamination of the water and land of Egypt to humans and animals.”<sup>137</sup> Skin disease as a sign of uncleanness is associated with the realm of death and chaos.<sup>138</sup> It symbolizes the realm of death encroaching on the realm of life for humans and animals alike.

With regard to the motif of the competition with the Egyptian magicians, in this sign there is no competition. The magicians too are afflicted with boils, and therefore Egypt’s ritual specialists are rendered ritually unclean, to the point where they cannot even stand before Moses. They are completely defeated. They have no power at all, a point reinforced by the fact that their secret arts are not even mentioned. They are rendered completely powerless, as are, implicitly, the divine powers behind them.

Finally, in the face of this, it is explicitly stated that YHWH hardens Pharaoh’s heart—he is rendered completely powerless to even harden his own heart—and he does not listen, just as divinely predicted (Exod 9:12). Pharaoh’s reaction of not listening makes no sense in the face of this sign and the complete defeat of his magicians; but he has no choice because he is now entirely and explicitly subsumed under the control of YHWH and YHWH’s plan (7:12; and see 7:3–4; 11:9–10).

It remains to sum up Pg’s distinctive portrayal of the signs/wonders as a whole resulting from the reshaping of the earlier tradition, with its own unique elements, into a repeated stereotypical or paradigmatic pattern such that it takes on something of the nature of a timeless vision.

### Pg’s Distinctive Paradigmatic Picture of the Signs/Wonders as a Whole

At the heart of Pg’s stereotypical pattern repeated in relation to each sign, of a YHWH speech commanding Moses (and Aaron), regarding the exe-

135. Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 231–32) thinks throwing soot in the air suggests a liturgical action (see Ezek 10:2; Lev 16:12)

136. Ibid., 232; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 331.

137. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 232.

138. See, e.g., Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. Stalker, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), 1:275–79; Jacob Milgrom, “Rationale for Cultic Law: The Case of Impurity,” *Semeia* 45 (1989): 103–9; Fretheim, “Plagues as Ecological Signs,” 390; Zevit, “Priestly Redaction,” 207.

cution of the sign/wonder, the execution of the command and the realization of the sign, the action of the magicians who attempt to match the sign and succeed or fail, and the notice of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart and his not listening as YHWH had said, is that YHWH, as cosmic creator, is in complete control of everything that occurs. YHWH's initiating and unconditional commands, regarding the cosmic signs relating to the land of Egypt, are executed through the obedience of his wonder-workers, Moses and Aaron. Although pitted against the divine powers of Egypt, YHWH's power renders these as nothing, symbolized both in the ironic mocking of the Egyptian magicians when they match the signs, thereby creating further havoc and being implicit accomplices to YHWH's plan or in defeating them entirely. Even Pharaoh's reaction to the signs, with his hardened heart and not listening, is predicted by YHWH, and part of the YHWH's plan of multiplying his signs in a display of his power, a point that is emphasized by the passages that bracket this repeated pattern in Exod 7:3–4 and 11:9–10.

The details within each of the signs that have been shaped into this repeated stereotypical pattern reveal trends that add complexity and nuance to this theological assertion unfolded by the repeated pattern of the signs, of YHWH as creator of the cosmos who is in complete control and whose power renders opposing divine powers as nothing. These trends show that Pg's portrayal of the signs/wonders can be said to be paradigmatic, not only in the sense of repeated patterns that are designed to make a theological statement, and where in a sense time stands still because of the repetition, but also in the development of motifs across the signs such that it can be described as a paradigmatic narrative. When the trends across the signs, and the interaction between their motifs, are examined the following nuances come to light within this paradigmatic picture.

First, that YHWH speaks to Moses and Aaron in the first and last signs, in contrast to only speaking to Moses in other signs, singles these signs out as not only bracketing the second, third, and fourth signs but as having distinctive roles within the series of signs. Moreover, the fact that in the first sign Aaron carries out the action with his staff, whereas in the last sign Moses is the primary actor, is significant.

The first sign is paradigmatic of what is to occur in that it is proleptic of what is to follow in the second, third, and fourth signs, with all four signs carried out by Aaron with his staff in obedience to YHWH's command through Moses. The transformation of Aaron's staff into a תַּנְיִן ("sea



monster”), the matching of this sign by the Egyptian magicians initially, but the swallowing up of their staffs by Aaron’s staff sum up symbolically and foreshadow the rest of the signs in the following ways. First, the sign is cosmic in its dimensions, symbolizing the cosmic power of the creator God, YHWH, who can unleash the forces of chaos as symbolized in the תנין (“sea monster”), which denotes a reversal of creation: this is what effectively occurs in signs two, three, and four, where cosmic chaos is unleashed in the land of Egypt, undoing creation, in the waters or primeval deeps transformed into blood, frogs breaking the ordered boundaries of creation in moving in overabundant numbers from water to land, and the dust of the earth transformed into innumerable gnats, something it was never created to be. Second, the initial matching of the sign but then the swallowing up of the magicians’ staffs symbolizes and foreshadows what is to come in the initial matching of the signs in signs two and three but the defeat of the Egyptian magicians as seen especially in signs four and five; and not only the magicians’ defeat and demise, but, as we have seen, YHWH’s defeat of the divine powers of Egypt and Pharaoh, whom the Egyptian gods have invested with divine power, which the defeat of the magicians represents. YHWH’s power renders powerless the opposing divine powers of Egypt.

The last sign, standing out as unique to Pg and enacted primarily by Moses, represents the climax of Pg’s signs/wonders in that it is not only the elements of water and land that are affected by the unleashing of chaos, the undoing of creation, in the land of Egypt, but now also animals and humans, including the magicians, the ritual specialists who are polluted, rendered ritually unclean, on whom are the marks of mortality and death. The defeat of the magicians and thereby the Egyptian divine powers foreshadowed in the first sign here reaches its complete fulfillment.

Second, the way in which the actual signs/wonders themselves are elevated to cosmic dimensions and symbolize the creator God, YHWH, reversing or undoing the cosmic creation in the (whole) land of Egypt (an expression that is repeated throughout Pg’s portrayal) is nuanced in various ways and moves from the elements of water to land to animals and humans on the land.<sup>139</sup> The תנין belongs to the realm of the sea and

---

139. See Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 197), who draws attention to the aspects of water, land, and air. It must be acknowledged that in the non-P plagues the motif of the reversal of creation in Egypt is also inherent, but Pg, as we have seen, has heightened or intensified this tradition to more cosmic dimensions.



symbolizes the cosmic forces of chaos, which threaten the cosmic creation. All the gathered (מקוה) waters of Egypt, echoing the primeval deep of Gen 1:10, are transformed into blood and therefore are contaminated as is the whole land of Egypt. The frogs flag a transition from water to land. They are not only in chaotic proportions but transgress the created boundaries of their domain of water to come up onto the land. As for the land, its very dust is transformed into something it was never created to be: unimaginably innumerable gnats. Finally, the animals and humans who dwell on the land are rendered unclean and marked by death from fine dust that comes from above in the air.

Third, the derogatory portrayal of the Egyptian magicians is nuanced in a clever progression whereby, after the proleptic summing up of what is to come in the first sign where they first match the action followed by their staffs being swallowed up by Aaron's, they initially match the action of Aaron in signs two and three, cannot match the fourth sign, and are rendered totally powerless in the fifth sign by which as ritual specialists they are rendered ritually unclean and cannot even stand before Moses.<sup>140</sup> However, even when the Egyptian magicians match the sign there is a biting irony, in that in so doing they align themselves with YHWH's action in unleashing chaos, or undoing creation, in the land of Egypt and are therefore in their actions unwitting accomplices subsumed under YHWH's control and plan. They come to acknowledge the power of YHWH by stating "this is the finger of God" when they can no longer match the sign in the fourth wonder, and then they and the divine powers behind them are completely defeated and stripped of all power in the final sign.

Finally, the motif of Pharaoh's hardened heart that means he does not listen, as predicted by YHWH, though part of YHWH's plan throughout as indicated by the introduction in Exod 7:3 and conclusion in 11:10 that bracket the signs, is nuanced in that in the first three signs the agency of YHWH in hardening Pharaoh's heart is not given, allowing for the slight possibility, if these signs are taken in isolation, that Pharaoh may have some responsibility in this. However, this is clarified in the last sign where it states explicitly that YHWH hardened Pharaoh's heart. This occurs at the point where the power of the Egyptian magicians and the divine powers

---

140. See Schmidt, "Intention der beiden Plagenerzählungen," 229–32. Schmidt (*ibid.*, 232) points out that during the course of the presentation the power relations are reversed, with Moses and Aaron presenting themselves before Pharaoh in the beginning but the Egyptian magicians not being able to stand before Moses in the end.

behind them, including Pharaoh whom the Egyptian gods have invested with divine power, have been totally defeated and disempowered. It therefore reinforces the point that YHWH is in complete control of everything, including Pharaoh's heart.

In all these ways, Pg's paradigmatic narrative that unfolds in a repeated stereotypical pattern nuances its central theological assertion that YHWH as cosmic creator is in complete control of what occurs in his creation and in the life of a nation and whose power renders opposing divine powers, their king, and religious functionaries as totally powerless and as nothing. In Pg's paradigmatic picture, this relates specifically to the land of Egypt, its Pharaoh, the Egyptian magicians, and the nation of Egypt. However, the cosmic dimensions within this picture, such as the gathering of the (primeval) waters in Exod 7:19 (מִקְוֵה; see Gen 1:10) and the use of the term תַּנִּין (Exod 7:9, 10, 12), which elsewhere is not only used for Pharaoh (Ezek 29:3; 32:2) but, in the context of material concerning Babylon in Jer 51:34, of Nebuchadrezzar,<sup>141</sup> suggests that Pharaoh and the land of Egypt can be seen as symbolic of foreign nations, their gods, their lands, and their kings in general. This is basically the view of Jürgen Kegler, who argues that Egypt is symbolic of Babylon/Persia; Thomas Dozemann, who sees the P signs as "polemical signs for the nations" and states that P "explores the power of YHWH as creator and the influence of God over the nations"; and Walter Brueggemann, who also makes this hermeneutical move, referring to "the openness of this paradigmatic narrative to other ... points of reference," and surmising that in relation to the exilic period, "Yahweh's 'Pharaonic connection' in the exodus may be a comment upon links of Yahweh to Nebuchadnezzar."<sup>142</sup> Further to this, given that Pg formulates its picture in a repeated stereotypical pattern that as a

141. See Fretheim, *Exodus*, 114.

142. Jürgen Kegler, "Zu Komposition und Theologie der Plagenerzählung," in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 55–74. Note also that Fretheim ("Plagues as Ecological Signs," 386) finds a parallel here with exilic Israel who is captive to outside forces. See Dozeman, *God at War*, 116, and *Commentary on Exodus*, 194; Walter Brueggemann, "Pharaoh as Vassal: A Study of a Political Metaphor," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 48 n. 60 and 49. It should be noted that Brueggemann is referring to the final form of the text in both instances, but his observations are equally applicable to exilic P. See also Bauks ("Dämonische im Menschen," 251), who comments that YHWH is responsible for the fate of all and is shown as a God of universal significance; and Currid's statement ("Egyptian Setting of the 'Serpent,'" 206) that the

whole in all its nuances portrays a theological perspective regarding the supreme power of YHWH as cosmic creator who is in control of all that occurs in his creation, surely this has a timeless dimension: it is relevant for all time and in all situations and in that sense is truly paradigmatic.

#### 4.1.2.2. Exodus 14<sup>\*143</sup>

The earlier traditions and texts that Pg seems to have drawn on in formulating its picture of the sea event are as follows. The closest parallel, and therefore the text that Pg seems to have deliberately reshaped, is the earlier non-P account in Exod 14:5–7, 9aα, 10, 11–14, 19–20, 21aβ, 24–25, 27aβb, 30–31. The events of the same basic story line, of the Egyptians pursuing the Israelites and through the divine manipulation of the waters their being drowned in the sea, is presented in a similar sequence.<sup>144</sup>

Pg also seems to have drawn on the non-P plague tradition with regard to the motifs of the recognition, or knowledge, of YHWH by Pharaoh/Egyptians (Exod 14:4b, 18 [Pg], and see also 7:5; 7:17 [non-P], and see also 8:6 [Eng. 8:10]; 8:18 [Eng. 8:22], and the reverse side of this motif in 5:2);<sup>145</sup> and the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (14:4a, 8 [Pg], and see also 14:17, though here referring to the Egyptians; 7:14; 8:11a [Eng. 8:15a]; 8:28 [Eng. 8:32]; 9:7b [non-P]).<sup>146</sup>

---

issue in Exod 7:8–13 is, “who was the one true God, who was sovereign over the operation of the universe, and whose will was to come to pass in heaven and upon earth.”

143. Pg comprises Exod 14:1–4, 8, 9aβb, 15aαb, 16–18, 21aαb, 22–23, 26, 27aα, 28–29.

144. Exod 15:1–18 also has close parallels with Pg's account in Exod 14\*. However, the dating and tradition history of this text is much debated. George W. Coats (“The Traditio-Historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif,” *VT* 17 [1967]: 262) sees it as postexilic; but it may reflect a poetic tradition that is quite early (see Brevard S. Childs, “A Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Tradition,” *VT* 20 [1970]: 411–12; Childs, *Exodus*, 245; Fretheim, *Exodus*, 152). The primary focus for comparison with Pg in the ensuing discussion will therefore be the earlier non-P text in Exod 14 that runs parallel with the P account, with parallels with Exod 15 noted where relevant.

145. The formula “I am YHWH” occurs in other earlier texts such as in Gen 28:13; Exod 15:26; 20:2; Hos 12:9; 13:4, and it is quite probable that this formula has its roots in ancient liturgical tradition; see Zimmerli, *I Am YHWH*, 1–28.

146. As Pg has done throughout its signs/wonders portrayal: Exod 7:13, 22; 8:15 (Eng. 8:19); 9:12; 11:10.

Finally, Pg's imagery of the splitting of the waters of the sea (Exod 14:16, 21b) has its roots in the mythological language for creation such as found in the Ugaritic texts regarding Baal's battle with, and victory over, Yam or the sea monster, and in particular in the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* where Tiamat's body is split in two.<sup>147</sup>

In order to see how Pg has reshaped these earlier traditions, we will compare Pg's account with its closest parallel in the non-P account in Exod 14\*, first with regard to the broad structure of each and then in relation to the details. In the discussion of the latter, the way in which Pg has drawn on and reshaped other earlier traditions, that is, the motifs of the knowledge of YHWH and the hardening of Pharaoh's heart from the earlier non-P plague tradition and the use of ancient Near Eastern mythological imagery for creation, will emerge.

Pg's account in Exod 14\* is clearly structured into a stereotypical thrice repeated pattern comprising an initial speech of YHWH to Moses setting out the divine commands and plan followed by their unfolding through the obedience of Moses (and the people). It comprises:

- I. First speech of YHWH to Moses and the consequences (14:1–4, 8–9)
  - A. Speech of YHWH to Moses (14:1–4ab $\alpha$ )
    - ◆ Command and reason regarding geographical location (14:2–3)
    - ◆ Divine plan and purpose (14:4ab $\alpha$ )
 

I will harden Pharaoh's heart, and he will pursue them

I will get glory over Pharaoh and his host

---

147. See Childs, "Traditio-Historical Study," 409, 413–14; Childs, *Exodus*, 223; Fretheim, *Exodus*, 160; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 298. Childs (*Exodus*, 223) maintains that this creation language had fused with the language of redemption at the sea by the time of P. However, whereas the splitting of the sea signifying creation in line with the imagery in *Enuma Elish* is a significant motif in Pg's portrayal, it is not present in the parallel non-P account in Exod 14\*, which does not speak of the splitting of the sea, although this latter account perhaps can be seen as echoing the Canaanite myth of Baal and Yam (see Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 300), but this is more remote. In addition, given the parallels between the imagery for the crossing of the Jordan in Josh 3–4 (esp. 3:16–17; 4:22–24) and Pg's portrayal in Exod 14\*, it is quite possible that the Jordan crossing tradition has influenced the tradition of the sea event, and that perhaps what lies behind this is ongoing cultic celebration; see Childs, "Traditio-Historical Study," 414–15; Childs, *Exodus*, 223; Fretheim, *Exodus*, 158; and Coats, *Exodus 1–18*, 115.

The Egyptians shall know that I am YHWH

- B. Consequences (14:4b $\beta$ , 8, 9a $\beta$ b)
  - ◆ Obedience of Moses and the people
  - ◆ Divine plan begins to unfold: YHWH hardens Pharaoh's heart and he pursues them and the Egyptians overtake them
- II. Second speech of YHWH to Moses and consequences (14:15a $\alpha$ b, 16–18, 21a $\alpha$ b, 22–23)
  - A. Speech of YHWH to Moses
    - ◆ Command and reason: tell the people to go forward, lift up your rod and stretch out your hand over the sea and divide it, so that the people may go on dry ground through the sea (14:15 a $\alpha$ b, 16)
    - ◆ Divine plan and purpose: I will harden the Egyptians' hearts, and they will pursue them.  
I will get glory over Pharaoh and his host.  
The Egyptians shall know that I am YHWH (14:17–18)
  - B. Consequences (14:21a $\alpha$ b, 22–23)
    - ◆ Obedience of Moses and consequences: stretches out his hand over the sea, the waters are divided and the people go into the sea on dry ground
    - ◆ Divine plan further unfolds: the Egyptians pursue them
- III. Third speech of YHWH to Moses and consequences (14:26, 27a $\alpha$ , 28)
  - A. Speech of YHWH to Moses (14:26)
 

Command and reason: stretch out your hand over the sea so that the waters come back on the Egyptians
  - B. Consequences (14:27a $\alpha$ , 28)
 

Obedience of Moses and consequences: stretches out his hand over the sea and the waters return and cover all the Egyptians = fulfillment of divine plan
- IV. Concluding remark: the Israelites walked on dry ground through the sea, a wall of water on each side (14:29)

In terms of its broad structure, Pg's account is similar to the earlier non-P account in Exod 14\* in that it proceeds from the pursuit of the Israelites by Pharaoh and the Egyptians (14:4, 8–9 [Pg] (section I); Exod 14:5–7, 9a $\alpha$ , 10a [non-P]), through the movement of the waters of the sea, first moving back so that dry land appears (Exod 14:21b, 22a [Pg] [section II]; Exod 14:21a $\beta$  [non-P]) followed by their return to their place (Exod 14:28 [Pg] [section III]; Exod 14:27a $\beta$  [non-P]), linked with the annihilation of the

Egyptians in the sea (Exod 14:28 [Pg]; Exod 14:27b, 30b [non-P]).<sup>148</sup> Pg is therefore clearly drawing on this earlier tradition with regard to these key elements and their sequence in the shape of its account.

However, in terms of its specific structure, Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition in the non-P material in Exod 14\* quite significantly. In particular, Pg has introduced a distinct perspective in structuring its account in terms of three YHWH speeches setting out the divine commands and divine plan that duly unfold. This lies in contrast to the non-P account where there are no YHWH speeches at all, the only speeches being that of the people who grumble to Moses in Exod 14:11–12 and Moses's response to them in 14:13. Moses role is different in Pg where, in contrast to the non-P account of reassuring the people by predicting the salvation of YHWH, Moses is the one to whom the divine speeches are addressed; as such, he is pictured as the mediator of YHWH's commands to the people and also the one through whose obedience to YHWH's instructions of lifting up his staff and stretching out his hand over the sea that the divine action occurs. In addition, unique to Pg is the explicit, almost word for word, two-fold repetition of the divine plan in the first two YHWH speeches (14:4abα, 17–18), which is progressively unfolded in all three sections (14:8, 9aβb, 23, 28). Therefore, in terms of its structure, Pg has reshaped the non-P account to portray its own particular emphasis and perspective of the event at the sea as orchestrated at every turn by YHWH according to YHWH's plan. YHWH is in complete control, and the divine plan communicated to Moses duly unfolds through the obedience of Moses (and the people).

Turning, then, to the details of Pg's picture, a comparison with the non-P account in Exod 14 will show how Pg has further reshaped this account, drawn on other earlier traditions, and added its own unique features to express its own particular perspective.

First, Pg has reshaped the earlier non-P account by changing the geographical context. Whereas the non-P account locates the sea event as part of the wilderness traditions, as seen from the use of the imagery of the cloud (Exod 13:21–22; 14:19b–20) and the inclusion of the murmuring tradition (14:11–12),<sup>149</sup> Pg locates this event in Egypt. This is indicated in

---

148. The poem in Exod 15 also has these elements: the Egyptian pursuit (Exod 15:9), the movement of the waters of the sea (15:8, 10), and the drowning of the Egyptians (15:10).

149. See Childs, "Traditio-Historical Study," 407–8; Childs, *Exodus*, 222.

Pg by having the Israelites, at the command of YHWH through Moses, “turn back” after they have gone out of the land of Egypt (12:41), and although the exact locations of the places where they are to camp in Exod 14:2 are not really known, the seemingly Egyptian name of Pi-ha-hiroth and the association of Migdol with Egypt in Jer 46:14; Ezek 29:10; 30:6 speak for a location within Egyptian territory.<sup>150</sup>

Second, the reason for the pursuit of the Israelites by Pharaoh and the Egyptians is different in Pg from the non-P account. In the non-P account, Pharaoh and his officials change their minds about having let the people go (Exod 14:5). In sharp contrast, in Pg’s picture the pursuit by Pharaoh is part of the divine plan instigated and orchestrated by YHWH: YHWH hardens Pharaoh’s heart so that he will pursue the Israelites as stated in YHWH’s speech (14:4) and subsequently carried out (14:8). Pg takes this yet a stage further, then, in causing the Egyptians to pursue the Israelites further into the sea by hardening their hearts according to the divine plan (14:17, 23).<sup>151</sup>

Third, Pg has introduced the motif of Pharaoh’s hardened heart, not found in the non-P material in Exod 14\*, into the event of the sea along with two other motifs, which are also not found in the non-P material in Exod 14\*, of YHWH gaining glory for himself (כבוד, *niphal*) over Pharaoh and his army (14:4, 17), and the knowledge of YHWH by the Egyptians (“I

---

150. See Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 310; and see Noth, *Exodus*, 109–10; John I. Durham, *Exodus*, WBC 3 (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 186–87. See further Childs (“Traditio-Historical Study,” 408) and Dozeman (*God at War*, 112, 117, 124, 126; *Commentary on Exodus*, 200, 304, 309–10), who locate the event within Egypt. Therefore, for Pg, the sea event is closely linked with the exodus in the territory of Egypt, and the presentation of the wilderness traditions begins only after they have crossed the sea; see Childs, *Exodus*, 222–23. This is also indicated by the connections between Pg’s signs/wonders section in P in Exod 7–11\* and its account in Exod 14\*, which will be discussed later; see Childs, “Traditio-Historical Study,” 409. Pace Coats (“Traditio-Historical Character,” 256), who sees the P material in Exod 14\* as part of the wilderness tradition; however, Childs’s arguments for associating P’s account with the exodus are more persuasive.

151. This is in line with Pg’s portrayal in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, where, unlike the non-P tradition where it is Pharaoh and the Egyptians who finally tell Moses, Aaron and the Israelites to leave, the exodus occurs by the action of YHWH as the result of cultic practice. In Pg’s account in Exod 7–11\*, also, it is not within the Pharaoh’s power to decide the fate of the Israelites either, since not letting the Israelites go is part of the divine plan, the result of YHWH hardening Pharaoh’s heart (11:10, and see 7:3–4); here, too, YHWH is in complete control.



am YHWH,” 14:4, 18). These three motifs are inseparably linked together, and their importance is seen in their repetition almost word for word, the first time in the first YHWH speech to Moses (14:4), and the second time in the second YHWH speech to Moses (14:17–18). Indeed, these three motifs not only spell out YHWH’s plan within the divine speech, but define the heart of Pg’s interpretation of the sea event. Although none of these motifs occur in the non-P material concerning the sea event in Exod 14\*, Pg would seem to have drawn on earlier non-P plague tradition, which does include each of these motifs, but reshaped them and combined them in its own unique way. We will take each of these motifs in turn before returning to the effect of their combination in Pg’s picture.

The hardening of Pharaoh’s heart, as noted in our earlier discussion of Exod 7–11\*,<sup>152</sup> is found repeatedly in the non-P plague material in Exod 7:14; 8:11a (Eng. 8:15a); 8:28 (Eng. 8:32); 9:7b. Pg would appear to have drawn on this tradition not only with regard to the signs/wonders (see 7:13, 22; 8:15 [Eng. 19]; 9:12; and see 7:3; 11:10), but also in 14:4a, 8, 17. In using this motif in 14:4a, 8, 17, Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition by transferring it from the plague tradition to the context of the event at the sea and by referring not only to the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart (14:4a, 8), but to the hardening of the Egyptians’ hearts in general (14:17). Pg’s reshaping is also seen in Exod 14:4a, 8, 17, as in its signs/wonders section, in the use of the term חזק instead of כבד as in the earlier non-P tradition, and in clearly emphasizing that it is YHWH who hardens the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, in contrast to the earlier non-P tradition, which does not refer to YHWH’s agency and gives the impression that Pharaoh is in control of his own heart. For Pg in Exod 14:4a, 8, 17, the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians are totally under the control of YHWH.

Although Pg uses the term חזק for the hardening of the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, Pg does use the term כבד in Exod 14:4, 17–18, in an echo of the earlier hardening (כבד) of the heart tradition. However, Pg uses כבד in quite a different sense from its use in the non-P plagues material: to refer to YHWH getting glory for himself (כבד, *niphal*) over the Pharaoh and the Egyptians.<sup>153</sup> For Pg, YHWH hardens the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians so that in their pursuit of the Israelites, YHWH will

152. See §4.1.2.1.

153. See the comment on this by Van Seters (*Life of Moses*, 91 n. 41) that perhaps P uses חזק instead of כבד in relation to the hardened heart because P uses כבד in a different sense (“get glory”) in Exod 14:4, 17, 18; see n. 93 above.



gain glory for himself (כבוד) over them. In Pg, כבוד now refers to YHWH, rather than Pharaoh as in the earlier tradition, and it now has a positive rather than a negative connotation at least for YHWH; it functions as the purpose of YHWH's action in hardening the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians.

In Pg, the further purpose or consequence of YHWH hardening the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, causing them to pursue the Israelites as far as and right into the sea, is that the Egyptians will know that "I am YHWH" (Exod 14:4, 18). Here also Pg would seem to be drawing on the earlier non-P plague tradition. There this motif is nuanced in various ways<sup>154</sup> but almost always introduced by an address to Pharaoh "(that) you may (will) know" (see 7:17; 8:6 [Eng. 10]; 8:18 [Eng. 22]). Exodus 7:17 in the earlier tradition comes closest to Pg's formulation in that it uses the expression, "I am YHWH," but here it refers to Pharaoh's knowledge of YHWH, whereas in Pg it is all the Egyptians that will know that "I am YHWH" (14:4, 18).<sup>155</sup> However, in Pg this motif of the knowledge of YHWH in Exod 14:4, 18 functions in a different way from its use in the earlier non-P plague tradition.

Given the occurrence of the motif of the knowledge of YHWH by Pharaoh within the earlier non-P plague material in various forms,<sup>156</sup> part of the intended function of the signs in the non-P material is to lead Pharaoh to knowledge of YHWH.<sup>157</sup> The hardening of Pharaoh's heart that occurs at the conclusion of each plague in the non-P material<sup>158</sup> represents the response to the cessation of the plague and therefore shows the failure of the plague to effect its purpose. Even though this purpose is primarily to motivate Pharaoh to obey the command of YHWH to let the people go,<sup>159</sup> where the knowledge of YHWH by Pharaoh is referred to as part of the intention of the plague, then the hardening of Pharaoh's heart also negates his coming to the knowledge of YHWH (see Exod 7:17, 23; and 8:6 [Eng.

---

154. See Brueggemann, "Pharaoh as Vassal," 36–37 for a discussion of the nuances of these non-P knowledge texts.

155. See n. 145 above concerning possible earlier roots of the expression "I am YHWH."

156. Exod 7:17; 8:6 (Eng. 10); 8:18 (Eng. 22); and see 5:2.

157. See Childs, *Exodus*, 171; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 92.

158. Exod 7:23; 8:11a (Eng. 8:15a); 8:28 (Eng. 8:32); 9:7b; and see 7:14.

159. See Wilson, "Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," 26–27; and see n. 97 above.

10]; 8:11a [Eng. 8:15a]; and 8:18 [Eng. 22]; 8:28 [Eng. 8:32]).<sup>160</sup> In complete contrast to this, Pg, in shifting the full expression of the knowledge of YHWH by the Egyptians to the sea event in Exod 14\* and framing it as the consequence of YHWH hardening the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, expresses a view that is quite the opposite of that expressed through the combination of these motifs in the non-P plague material. Instead of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart preventing the knowledge of YHWH as in the non-P plague tradition, for Pg YHWH's hardening of the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians leads ultimately to their knowledge of YHWH in the sea event.

That this motif of the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH is of key significance within Pg's portrayal of the event of the sea is suggested, not only because it is the ultimate outcome of YHWH's hardening of the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, but because it is highlighted in Exod 7:5, which states that "the Egyptians shall know that I am YHWH" (see 14:4, 18) and as such forms the introduction to Exod 14\* in Pg's schema. Such a central motif in Pg's picture of the event at the sea stands in stark contrast to a central theme within non-P's account in Exod 14\* where, although the knowledge of YHWH is not referred to explicitly, the Israelites go from fearing the Egyptians to fearing in, and believing in, YHWH (see 14:10–14, 31).<sup>161</sup> Pg therefore has reshaped the earlier non-P account of the event at the sea to focus on what the Egyptians come to know, rather than the Israelites change of attitude.

Pg, then, has linked these three motifs of YHWH hardening the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, of gaining glory for himself over Pharaoh and his army, and the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of "I am YHWH," reshaped from the earlier non-P plague tradition, in a unique way to sum up the whole purpose and significance of the event at the sea, as stated by YHWH in both of his speeches to Moses that spell out the divine plan (Exod 14:4, 17–18). YHWH hardens the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, so that they pursue the Israelites up to and right into the sea, and the purpose of this is so that YHWH will gain glory for himself over Pharaoh and his army, which itself has the ultimate purpose of the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH. The primary goal of

---

160. See Childs, *Exodus*, 172: "The hardening serves to prevent the proper functioning of the plagues as a means of knowing YHWH ... the writer attributes the failure of the plague to produce true knowledge of YHWH to Pharaoh's heart being hardened."

161. See Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 304.

everything that YHWH does (through the obedience of Moses) in Pg's picture of the sea event is to bring the Egyptians to knowledge of himself. How YHWH gains glory for himself, and the Egyptians thereby come to the knowledge of YHWH, is unfolded in the way in which Pg has reshaped the earlier non-P account of the event at the sea in Exod 14\* in terms of the divine manipulation of the waters by which the Egyptians are annihilated.

Fourth, Pg has reshaped the non-P account in Exod 14\* with regard to the movement of the seawaters, how this occurs, and the behavior of the Israelites and Egyptians in relation to the waters.

In the earlier non-P account, YHWH drives the sea back with an east wind all night (Exod 14:21aβ) and at dawn the sea returns to its normal depth (14:27aβ); the sea recedes by the direct agency of YHWH with the wind as an element of nature. The Israelites do not cross through the sea; indeed they are told by Moses to stand firm and observe YHWH's act of deliverance expressed in holy war language (14:13–14). The Egyptians who have pursued the Israelites try to flee before the returning sea but YHWH, again acting as direct agent, tosses them into the sea (14:27; and see 14:24–25<sup>162</sup>). In contrast, in Pg's picture the waters are divided through Moses's carrying out of YHWH's command in his second speech to stretch out his rod/hand over the sea (14:16, 21aαβ); and the waters come back together again through Moses's carrying out YHWH's command in his third speech to stretch out his hand over the sea (14:26, 27aα, 28). Moses is the mediator of the divine action by the use of his staff/hand in obedience to the command of YHWH. The Israelites, as intended by YHWH, cross through the sea between the divided waters, where they walk on dry land (14:16, 22, 29). The Egyptians who have pursued them up to and into the sea, under YHWH's control, since he has hardened their hearts (14:4, 8, 17), are drowned when the divided waters come back together and cover them as orchestrated by YHWH through the obedience of Moses (14:26, 27aα, 28).<sup>163</sup> Pg, therefore has reshaped the earlier non-P account in Exod

---

162. Noth (*Exodus*, 118) notes a certain unevenness here and sees elements of two variant traditions here, one of the Egyptians fleeing in panic and YHWH tossing them into the sea, and the other of the driving back and return of the sea. Exodus 15 also speaks in a similar fashion of YHWH having thrown horse and rider into the sea (15:1b), and like the non-P prose account also uses holy war language (15:3, 6). However, the imagery for the drowning of the Egyptians is slightly different in Exod 15:10, where it is said that the sea covered them and they sank like lead in the waters.

163. It is interesting to note that the poem in Exod 15 contains imagery of the

14\* by: imaging the movement of the waters as a splitting of the sea and then the coming together of these divided waters, rather than imaging this as a receding of the waters and then their return to their normal level; having Moses as the mediator of the divine action by obediently carrying out YHWH's instructions, rather than the direct agency of YHWH by means of an east wind; in picturing the Israelites as moving forward and crossing the sea on dry ground between the divided waters, rather than having the Israelites standing still and observing; and by imaging the destruction of the Egyptians in terms of their drowning when the divided waters of the sea come together again, rather than YHWH's direct action in tossing them into the sea when it returns to its normal depth.

Pg's imagery of the splitting of the sea, with the Israelites walking through it on dry land, and the coming together of the divided waters to annihilate the Egyptians is clearly symbolic and cosmic in its scope. This is mythological language. It draws on the Babylonian creation account, *Enuma Elish*, where Tiamat's body is split in two to create the universe. The splitting of the sea and the Israelites walking through it on dry land also recalls the imagery of the creation of the cosmos in Gen 1:1–2:3 (itself formulated in dialogue with the *Enuma Elish* mythology): the term used for the dry land (יבשה) in Exod 14:16, 22, 29 is the same as that used in Gen 1:9–10, where the dry land appears when the waters are gathered together.<sup>164</sup> Pg's picture of the Israelites walking through the divided waters of the sea on dry ground is therefore clearly cosmic creation imagery: it signifies the creation of the nation of Israel.<sup>165</sup> Within this mythological para-

---

wind and piling up of the waters into a heap (15:8, 10). However, Exod 15 differs from the prose accounts in its imagery of the fury of YHWH associated with the wind (15:7b, 8a, 10a). Another major difference is the way in which this poem associates the destruction of the Egyptians in the sea with the conquest and YHWH's bringing the nation to the sanctuary (15:13–17); see Childs, *Exodus*, 244.

164. Römer, "From the Call of Moses," 146; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 168. Römer also sees echoes of Gen 1, though the terminology is different, in the reference "in the midst of the sea [הים]" in Exod 14:16, 22–23, 27 to Gen 1:6 where the firmament appears "in the midst of the waters [המים]", and the dividing (בקה) of the waters in Exod 14:21 to the separating (בדל) of the waters in Gen 1:6 (and see Gen 7:11 where בקה is used in relation to the fountains of the deep).

165. As Fretheim (*Exodus*, 159) states, "The divine creative act in the sphere of nature serves as the vehicle for the creation of a liberated people." See also, Römer, "From the Call of Moses," 34; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 168; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 304.

digm, then, the coming together of the waters again over the Egyptians in Exod 14:26, 28 symbolizes the reversal of creation. It recalls Pg's account of the cosmic flood in Gen 6–9\*, where the waters divided at creation (Gen 1:6–10) come back together again (see esp. Gen 7:11). The cosmic imagery of Pg's picture of the divided waters coming back again and covering the Egyptians therefore signifies, not only the annihilation of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, but the decreation of the nation of Egypt by the cosmic creator YHWH. In Pg's portrayal of the sea event, YHWH as the cosmic creator creates the nation of Israel and undoes the creation of the nation of Egypt.

This decreation of the Egyptians by YHWH as cosmic creator when they are covered by the divided waters coming together again is how YHWH gains glory for himself over Pharaoh and his army, which is the goal of YHWH's control of Pharaoh and the Egyptians through hardening their hearts (Exod 14:4, 17); in the very act of their decreation the Egyptians come to the knowledge of YHWH as the cosmic creator who can destroy his creation and the nations (14:4, 18). However, this goes hand in hand with the creation of the nation Israel. As in Exod 7:5, which introduces this account, where the Egyptian knowledge of YHWH is linked inseparably with YHWH's deliverance of the Israelites, so the decreation of the Egyptians through the coming together of the waters is inseparably linked with the splitting of the waters with which the creation of Israel is associated, a point that is highlighted particularly by the juxtaposition of these two motifs in Exod 14:28–29. This is at the heart of what Pg wishes to portray in its picture of the event at the sea.

In conclusion, Pg's distinctive picture of the event at the sea is clear. Located in Egypt and therefore closely linked with what has preceded in the signs and wonders (Exod 7–11\*) and the exodus (Exod 12\*), YHWH, the cosmic creator, is pictured as being in complete control, both of his creation (in the splitting of the waters and their return together) and the nation of Egypt and its Pharaoh. The events of the sea are orchestrated at every point by YHWH. In three speeches, YHWH gives instructions as to what is to occur and outlines the divine plan (repeated twice in very similar wording, indicating its importance) whereby YHWH's hardening of the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, causing them to pursue the Israelites up to and right into the sea, has the purpose of YHWH gaining glory for himself over them, which itself has the purpose of the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH. The events unfold seamlessly according to the divine plan through the obedience of Moses (and the people), with Pharaoh and the Egyptians having no choice but to fulfill YHWH's plan

since YHWH controls everything they do through hardening their hearts. The events that unfold are expressed in mythological cosmic creation imagery: the splitting of the waters and Israel walking through the divided waters, symbolizing the creation of the nation of Israel; and the subsequent coming together again of the waters covering the Egyptians, symbolizing the decreation of the Egyptians. Inseparably linked with YHWH's creation of the nation of Israel, in the annihilation and decreation of the Egyptians, YHWH gains glory for himself, and the purpose of the divine plan is fulfilled—the Egyptians come to know YHWH as the cosmic creator whose total power is such that he controls everything, including their fate, who can destroy his creation and the nations, including themselves. Moreover, since Pharaoh, believed to be invested with divine powers by the Egyptians, is totally controlled by YHWH and annihilated along with all the Egyptians, the divine powers of Egypt are shown to be powerless in relation to YHWH and rendered as nothing. As in Pg's portrait of the signs and wonders, the cosmic imagery employed in Exod 14\* suggests that Pharaoh and the Egyptians are symbolic of all nations and their leaders other than Israel.<sup>166</sup> YHWH, therefore, is imaged as cosmic creator who is in control of, and dictates, all that happens in creation and to the nations, whether their creation or destruction, and in relation to whom other nations, their leaders, and any other divine powers are rendered as nothing. YHWH creates the nation of Israel, hand in hand with the annihilation of any nation, their leader, and their gods, who oppose or seek to control the Israelites.

The paradigmatic nature of Pg's portrayal of the events at the sea is seen in the following traits. The repetitive nature of its structure, which comprises a thrice repeated pattern of a YHWH speech and the consequences that unfold from this, along with the repetition of the divine purpose within the first two YHWH speeches (Exod 14:4abα, 17–18)<sup>167</sup>, while moving the plot along, at the same time gives the impression of marking time. The progression between the sections comprising YHWH speeches and the consequences gives nuance to the, in a sense timeless, theolog-

---

166. See Dozemann (*God at War*, 118), who comments in relation to the recognition formula in P that "it is meant to emphasize the power of God over creation and other nations," and Fretheim's comment, in relation to Exod 14:4 (*Exodus*, 154) that "the objective is to bring the Egyptians, indeed the entire world, to the point of knowing that Israel's God is the Lord of all the earth."

167. See the structure outlined above near the beginning of this section.

ical statement to which all aspects of this picture point: YHWH as the cosmic creator who is in complete control of the elements of creation and the nations, whether in creating or destroying. That is, the cosmic dimensions of this picture, and in particular YHWH as cosmic creator, point to its universal relevance through time, and for all time, in relation to any nation. The timelessness of this picture is highlighted by the mythological imagery for creation and its reverse in the splitting of the waters and the coming together of them again in a return to chaos; in mythologizing the events of the sea in this way, like all myths, what it portrays has a universal dimension and significance that is timeless.<sup>168</sup>

Pg's account in Exod 14\* together with its account in Exod 7-11\*, forms a frame around the central picture of Exod 12:1, 3-13, 28, 40-41. Exodus 7-11\* and Exod 14\*, though different in content are both designed to unfold a central theological assertion that YHWH as cosmic creator is in complete control of all that occurs in his creation and in the life of nations, and whose power renders opposing divine powers and their representative (symbolized in Pharaoh) completely powerless. This plays out for Pharaoh and the Egyptians in terms of the destruction or decreation of their land, and ultimately themselves, at which point they come to the knowledge of YHWH. The central picture in Exod 12:1, 3-13, 28, 40-41 also portrays these themes, as seen in the reference to YHWH's judgment on the gods of Egypt, the killing of the firstborn Egyptians, and the statement "I am YHWH" (12:12). It is time, then, to look at how the ritual centerpiece in Exod 12:1, 3-13, 28, 40-41 interacts with its frame in Exod 7-11\* and 14\*, particularly in terms of the issue of the hermeneutics of time, to produce Pg's complex paradigmatic picture extending from Exod 7-14\*

#### 4.1.3. The Interaction of the Ritual Centerpiece and Narrative Frame

On the analogy of a framed painting, where frame and central painting interact with each other to give a combined picture which is different from the painting on its own or the frame on its own, the paradigmatic centerpiece in Exod 12:1, 3-13, 28, 40-41 and its paradigmatic frame in Exod 7-11\*; 14\* exert a mutual influence on each other to produce a complex

---

168. See Römer ("Exodus Narrative," 167-68), who speaks of the "mythologization of the exodus" and of P describing Israel's salvation at the sea in mythological terms, and Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 304), who refers to the splitting of the sea as having universal significance.



paradigmatic picture. In particular, the paradigmatic nature of the frame is enhanced by taking on the timeless ritual, or liturgical, character of the centerpiece; and the centerpiece takes on the added richness of meaning contributed by the frame which interprets it further, and draws out its implications, each time the ritual is performed.

The way in which the centerpiece of the Passover ritual and its performative effects in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 influences its narrative frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\* will first be discussed before turning to the effect of the narrative frame on the ritual centerpiece and the resulting complex paradigmatic picture as a whole.

#### 4.1.3.1. How the Passover Rite and Its Hermeneutics of Time Influence the Frame

It has been shown how in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 reshaped earlier traditions are synthesized with ongoing contemporary praxis and unique elements to present a timeless paradigmatic picture whose hermeneutics of time is that of liturgical time. Set within the remote past, but reflecting ongoing contemporary ritual practice, and comprising prescriptive ritual instructions whose performance effects the exodus, time is collapsed; its time is ritual time, where past/present/future are one, where time as incorporating all time is transcended. As such, it invites the practice of the Passover rite so described as a way of actualizing or realizing its worldview and the reality it effects at any time or wherever its participants find themselves through time.

It has also been shown how its frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\* is paradigmatic in that it comprises reshaped traditions synthesized with unique elements into stereotypical repeated patterns that take on the tinge of timelessness. The actual pattern repeated in Exod 7–11\* and the repetitive structure of Exod 14\* are different, although they do have in common the repetition of divine command and execution throughout; however, it is the very fact of their repetitive nature that gives the impression of a typicality through time, giving the theological statement at their heart a kind of timelessness. This, along with the cosmic and mythological language and imagery used to express their theological perspective, makes these narratives paradigmatic in the sense of giving a universal perspective that is relevant at any time and through time.

However, the paradigmatic nature of the framing narrative in Exod 7–11\* and 14\* in these terms is enhanced further by its proximity to, that



is, as surrounding, the centerpiece of the Passover ritual and its performative effects in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41; as such, the frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\* takes on the hermeneutics of time that is akin to ritual or liturgical time inherent in its centerpiece in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41. The timelessness of the frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\* is heightened by being colored by association with the timelessness of ritual or liturgical time, where past/present/future are one, where time as incorporating all time is transcended, which is the hermeneutical nature of the Passover rite and its effects as described in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41. The celebration of the Passover through time, at any time, effects not only what is described in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 but also celebrates and effects what is unfolded in, or the theological perspectives that are at the heart of, the framing narratives in Exod 7–11\* and 14\*.

Indeed, it is not only through proximity that this dynamic occurs, but through the explicit links that bind together the centerpiece in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and its frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\*. One indication that Exod 7–11\* and Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and Exod 14\* are tightly connected to each other is seen in the interlinking of the verses of 7:3–5 that introduce each: Exod 7:3 that introduces Exod 7–11\* is interlinked with 7:4, which introduces 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 through the juxtaposition of Pharaoh's hardened heart (7:3) with Pharaoh's not listening (7:4) as found in Exod 7–11\* (see 7:13, 22; 8:11b [Eng. 8:15b]; 8:15 [Eng. 8:19]; 9:12 and also 11:9–10); and 7:5, which introduces Exod 14\* is interlinked with 7:4, which introduces Exod 12\*, in that both verses refer to YHWH's hand in relation to Egypt and bringing the Israelites out.<sup>169</sup> However, it is the explicit links between 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and its frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\* and what they have in common that, in binding them to each other, are highlighted and play off each other as each is manifested in their own ways in centerpiece or frame. As such, these explicit motifs become the focus of the way in which the hermeneutics of time of the centerpiece becomes that of the frame in terms of specifics, as well as showing how the narrative frame further interprets and unfolds the implications of the ritual centerpiece.

These common motifs/features of the frame (Exod 7–11\*; 14\*) and centerpiece (12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41) are as follows.

---

169. See the more detailed discussion of Exod 7:3–5 and the way they interlink and introduce the particular sections above, §4.1.

- ◆ Both frame and centerpiece consistently comprise YHWH speeches to Moses (and Aaron) with instructions that are obediently carried out by Moses (and sometimes Aaron and sometimes the people) (Exod 7:8–10aβa, 19–20a; 8:1, 2a [Eng. 8:5, 6a]; 8:12, 13a [Eng. 8:16, 17a]; 9:8–10a; 14:1–4, 15aαb, 16–18, 21aα, 26, 27aα; and Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28), with the desired effects (Exod 7:19bβ, 21b; 8:2b [Eng. 8:6b]; 8:13b [Eng. 8:17b]; 9:10b; 14:8, 9aβb, 21b, 22–23, 28; and Exod 12:40–41): YHWH is in control of all that occurs—the divine plan unfolds inexorably.
- ◆ With both frame and centerpiece situated within Egypt, destruction, or the undoing of creation, of Egypt occurs throughout the frame and the centerpiece in various forms: within the frame, destruction, contamination, or reversal of creation of “the land of Egypt” (repeatedly referred to; see Exod 7:19, 21b; 8:1 [Eng. 8:5]; 8:2 [Eng. 8:6]; 8:12 [Eng. 8:16]; 8:13 [Eng. 8:17]) occurs in the signs of blood, frogs, and gnats (7:8–13, 19, 20aα, 21b, 22; 8:1–3 [Eng. 8:5–7]; 11b–15 [Eng. 8:15b–19]), and of its people and Pharaoh in Exod 14\*, foreshadowed in the sign of boils (9:8–12); and within the centerpiece it is the destruction of the firstborn, human and animals, in “the land of Egypt” (repeated three times) in Exod 12:12–13.
- ◆ Both frame and centerpiece emphasize YHWH’s defeat of, or rendering as nothing, the divine powers of Egypt; this is unfolded in the frame in the competition with the Egyptian magicians who are progressively rendered completely powerless (Exod 7:11–12, 22a; 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]; 8:14–15a [Eng. 8:18–19a]; 9:11) and in the demise of the divinely endowed Pharaoh in Exod 14\*; and is crystallized in the statement in Exod 12:12b of YHWH’s claim to execute judgment on all the gods of Egypt.
- ◆ Both frame and centerpiece are concerned with the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH: in the frame this motif occurs in Exod 8:15a (Eng. 8:19a), where the Egyptian magicians recognize behind the sign of gnats that they cannot match “the finger of God [אלהים],”<sup>170</sup> and in Exod 14\*, where in their demise (described in terms of reversal of creation imagery by which YHWH gains glory

---

170. As already noted, אלהים is the title by which nations who are not descendants of Abraham know the cosmic creator YHWH (see Gen 1–10\*).

over them) all the Egyptians come to the knowledge of the cosmic creator YHWH (“I am YHWH,” see 14:4, 18); and in the centerpiece in the reference to “I am YHWH” (12:12b).

- ♦ The decreation or obliteration of Egypt/the Egyptians and their gods, including Pharaoh, by which they come to the knowledge of YHWH goes hand in hand with a positive outcome for Israel: in the frame in Exod 14\* Israel as a nation is created with YHWH’s final liberation of them from the Egyptians as pictured in cosmic creation imagery of the splitting of the sea through which they walk on dry land (14:21b, 22, 29); and in the centerpiece, the Passover rite celebrates Israel’s protection from plague when YHWH smites the Egyptians (thereby executing judgment on the gods of Egypt and showing “I am YHWH,” 12:12–13), and effects their liberation in the exodus (12:40–41).

In terms of distribution, alongside the overall format of divine speech and execution common to frame and centerpiece throughout, the motifs, found throughout the frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\*, of the destruction, or undoing of creation, of Egypt (land, people, and Pharaoh), YHWH’s defeat or rendering as nothing the divine powers of Egypt, and the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH as cosmic creator (and destroyer) while Israel is created as a nation, are all focused in the centerpiece specifically in 12:12–13, 40–41 where the etiology or the interpretation of what the Passover rite is celebrating (12:12–13) and what it ultimately effects (12:40–41) is concentrated. At the heart of the Passover celebration is YHWH’s smiting of the firstborn in the land of Egypt and YHWH’s executing judgments on the gods of Egypt, which show who YHWH is as summed up in “I am YHWH,” which goes hand in hand with protecting Israel (12:12–13) and liberating them (12:40–41).

That the explicit links with the frame within the centerpiece are concentrated in Exod 12:12–13, 40–41, which spells out the meaning of what is celebrated in the Passover rite and what it effects, suggests that it is particularly in relation to these motifs that the frame takes on the hermeneutics of time in the Passover rite, the timelessness of liturgical or ritual time. Therefore, it is particularly these perspectives, celebrated by the Passover rite, unfolded in various ways throughout the frame in Exod 7–11\*; 14\*, whose inherent timelessness and universality evidenced in the repeated patterns and mythological imagery is enhanced by taking on the timelessness of ritual or liturgical time of the centerpiece: the inexo-

rable unfolding of the divine plan where YHWH as cosmic creator decreates opposing nations, their land, leader, and people, rendering their gods as nothing, and who in their demise come to the knowledge of YHWH, inseparably linked to YHWH's creative acts in relation to Israel.

In turn, however, these perspectives that are variously nuanced in the narrative frame interpret further, and unfold the implications of, the meaning and effect of the celebration of the Passover rite as spelled out in the centerpiece in Exod 12:12–13, 40–41, whenever it is celebrated through time. To this we will now turn.

#### 4.1.3.2. How the Frame in Exodus 7:8–11:10; 14\* Influences the Pass-over Rite

In order to see how the frame in Exod 7–11\* and 14\* further interprets and draws out the implications of what the Passover rite celebrates and effects, it is first necessary to examine more closely the relationship between Exod 7–11\* and 14\* and how these motifs play out specifically within the frame as a whole.

The motifs held in common between Exod 7–11\* and 14\* specifically, over and above their setting within the land of Egypt, are as follows. The divine plan given in YHWH's instructions to Moses and/or Aaron unfolds inexorably through their obedience (7:8–10ab $\alpha$ , 19–20a, 21b; 8:1–2 [Eng. 8:5–6]; 8:12–13 [Eng. 8:16–17]; 9:8–10; and 14:1–4, 8, 9a $\beta$ b, 15a $\alpha$ b, 16–18, 21a $\alpha$ b, 22–23, 26, 27a $\alpha$ , 28), including the use of a rod and/or hand (7:9–10, 12, 19; 8:1 [Eng. 8:5]; 8:12–13 [Eng. 16–17]; and 14:16, 21a $\alpha$ , 26, 27a $\alpha$ ). YHWH hardens the hearts of Pharaoh/the Egyptians (9:12, and see 7:13, 22; 8:15 [Eng. 8:19]; 9:12 in light of 7:3; 11:10; and 14:4, 8, 17) signifying YHWH is in complete control. YHWH as cosmic creator destroys or decreates Egypt, whether land, people, or Pharaoh, by unleashing chaos upon them (7:8–13, 19, 20a $\alpha$ , 21b, 22; 8:1–3 [Eng. 8:5–7], 11b–15 [Eng. 8:15b–19]; 9:8–12; and 14:28). YHWH defeats, or renders as nothing, the divine powers of Egypt (including Pharaoh) (7:11–12, 22a; 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]; 8:14–15a [Eng. 8:18–19a]; 9:11; and 14:17–18, 23, 26–28). The Egyptians come to the knowledge of YHWH (8:15 [Eng. 8:19]; and 14:4, 18). Cosmic mythological creation imagery is used in the control of the forces of chaos symbolized in the sea monster, תנין, in 7:9–10, 12,<sup>171</sup> and in the separating

171. See also, the gathering (מקוה) of the waters in Exod 7:19.

of the waters and their coming together again in 14:16, 21aαbβ, 22, 26, 27aα, 28.

In examining how these motifs are nuanced and interplay with each other within the narrative frame, we will begin with the last feature noted: the use of cosmic mythological creation imagery in Exod 7:8–13 and in 14\*; these texts form a bracket around signs two, three, four, and five, within the frame as a whole. The first sign in 7:8–13, of the staffs of Aaron and the magicians transformed into the *תנין* and the swallowing up of the magicians' staffs by that of Aaron, sums up in microcosm and foreshadows not only the unleashing of chaos on the land of Egypt, its people, and animals and the defeat of the magicians and the divine powers behind them in the subsequent signs, but in particular the sea event in Exod 14\*. Drawing on the mythological imagery of the defeat of the sea monster as an act of creation (such as found in *Ennuma Elish*), YHWH's unleashing of chaos imaged in Aaron's rod transformed into a *תנין* and it then swallowing up the Egyptian magicians' staffs in 7:8–13 is proleptic of the ultimate defeat and destruction, or decreation, of Pharaoh (the great *תנין*; see Ezek 29:3; 32:2) and the Egyptians in Exod 14\* with the return of chaos, the reversal of creation, in the coming together of the waters. Exodus 7:8–13 also foreshadows and forms a bracket with Exod 14\* in that the symbolism inherent in it, of the cosmic power of the creator YHWH swallowing up the powers behind Pharaoh's representatives and therefore obliterating or rendering as nothing the divine power of Pharaoh and the god(esse)s who invest him with it,<sup>172</sup> is unfolded explicitly in the annihilation and decreation of Pharaoh himself in the sea in Exod 14\*. In addition, implicit within the imagery of 7:8–13, with the defeat of the Egyptian *תנינים*, albeit in seminal form, is the positive element of creation that results from YHWH as cosmic creator controlling the powers of chaos. This is explicitly imaged in Exod 14\* in the separating of the seawaters through which the Israelites walk, symbolizing the creation of the nation Israel. In all these ways, the first sign in Exod 7:8–13 and Exod 14\* form an outside bracket for the frame as a whole in Exod 7–11\*; 14\*.

The other motifs that Exod 7–11\* and 14\* have in common are woven throughout in such a way as to show the events at the sea in Exod 14\* as

---

172. See discussion above in §4.1.2.1 under First Sign/Wonder: Aaron's Rod Transformed into a Sea Monster (Exod 7:8–13).

the conclusion and climax of the signs/wonders unfolded in Exod 7–11\*.<sup>173</sup> We will take each of these in turn.

Both Exod 7–11\* and 14\* proceed by means of YHWH's commands, which are duly executed through Moses and/or Aaron, denoting the inexorable unfolding of the divine plan. However, the content of these commands evolve from instructions regarding the signs/wonders that progressively decimate the land of Egypt, its people, and animals in order to display YHWH's cosmic power in Exod 7–11\* to instructions whose purpose in part is YHWH "gaining glory [כבוד]" over the Egyptians by decimating them entirely. Thereby, YHWH's display of power as cosmic creator is heightened in describing it using the verb כבוד. A trend is also discernible in that the agent carrying out the sign in obedience to YHWH's instructions through Moses (and some cases Aaron) progresses from Aaron and his rod and/or hand in the first four signs (7:9–10, 12, 19; 8:1–2 [Eng. 8:5–6]; 8:12–13 [Eng. 8:16–17]), to Moses as the primary actor in the fifth sign (9:8, 10), to Moses and his rod and/or hand as the sole agent carrying out YHWH's commands in Exod 14\* (esp. 14:16, 21aα, 26, 27aα). Although Aaron is important in Pg, Moses has greater authority (see 7:1), so the increasing prominence of Moses here signifies the increasing importance of the actions carried out in obedience to YHWH's instructions.

Closely related to the inexorable unfolding of the divine plan throughout is the motif of YHWH hardening the heart of Pharaoh and/or the Egyptians, which signifies YHWH's control of Pharaoh and/or the Egyptians and the events that unfold in relation to them. This motif, though found repeatedly in Exod 7–11\* reaches its crescendo in Exod 14\*. Although it is clear in Exod 7–11\* that it is YHWH who hardens Pharaoh's heart (see 7:3; 9:12; 11:10), in the first four signs this is only implied from the context as bracketed in 7:3; 11:10 and is stated within the signs scenarios themselves only in relation to the fifth sign (9:12), therefore hinting at a progression where it might be read as Pharaoh having some control over his own heart to YHWH's complete control of it by the end of the signs. In Exod 14\*, the motif of YHWH's action in hardening hearts is emphasized by repeating it explicitly three times (14:4, 8, 17) and extending it from not just Pharaoh's heart (14:4, 8) but the hearts of all the Egyptians (14:17). Moreover, whereas YHWH's hardening of Pharaoh's heart in Exod 7–11\* is so that

---

173. As Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 304, 311) comments, Exod 14\* represents the final and decisive conflict or confrontation between YHWH and Pharaoh in the land of Egypt, begun in, and continued throughout, Exod 7–11\*.

YHWH can multiply the signs/wonders in a display of power, YHWH's hardening of the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians in Exod 14\* is so that they will pursue the Israelites up to, and right into, the sea where the nation as a whole meets its demise, an act which shows not only YHWH's ultimate power and control since thereby YHWH gains glory over them, but through which they come to the knowledge of YHWH.<sup>174</sup> In these ways, the motif of YHWH's hardening of the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians reaches its conclusion and climax.

In Exod 14\* also the motif of YHWH as cosmic creator who destroys or decreates Egypt/the Egyptians by unleashing the powers of chaos in the land of Egypt reaches its climax and conclusion. With the first sign in 7:8–13 acting as a microcosm foreshadowing Exod 14\*, as well as the unleashing of chaos in the following signs, there is a progression from YHWH's reversal of creation in relation to the land of Egypt itself in signs two, three, and four, to the beginnings of the destruction of the people and animals of the land of Egypt, to the total destruction, or decreation, of all the Egyptians and their Pharaoh in the land of Egypt in Exod 14\*. The land of Egypt is decreated when all the waters of Egypt are transformed into blood in the second sign (7:19, 20aa, 21b, 22) and therefore both the waters and the whole land of Egypt are polluted; the frogs break the ordered boundaries of creation in moving from all the waters to the land in the third sign (8:1–3, 11b [Eng. 8:5–7, 15b]); and the land itself is transformed into something it was not created to be when the dust is changed into gnats (8:12–15 [Eng. 8:16–19]). The people and animals of the land of Egypt are polluted and marked with the signs of mortality and death in the fifth sign of the boils (9:8–12). This is proleptic of, or a stage on the way to, the death and total destruction of all the Egyptians, including Pharaoh, in Exod 14\*.<sup>175</sup>

The motif of YHWH's defeat of, and rendering as nothing, the divine powers of Egypt is unfolded progressively within the frame, throughout Exod 7–11\* and concluding with Exod 14\*. With the defeat of the magicians and the divine powers behind them, as well as the divinely endowed Pharaoh, foreshadowed in the symbolism of the first sign where Aaron's

---

174. Childs, *Exodus*, 173.

175. See Fretheim, "Plagues as Ecological Signs," 387; Fretheim, *Exodus*, 123. In a sense, Exod 12\* with its motif of the killing of the firstborn humans and animals also represents a stage in this trajectory from the people and animals being marked by death through the death of the firstborn to the death of the whole nation.



rod transformed into a **תנין** swallows up those of the magicians (7:8–13), this cosmic creator YHWH, the controller of chaos, is then portrayed as progressively defeating the Egyptian magicians or religious functionaries and thereby the divine powers behind them. Though matching the second and third signs of water transformed into blood and the frogs (7:22; 8:3 [Eng. 8:7]), they cannot match the fourth sign of gnats (8:14 [Eng. 8:18]), and in the fifth sign they are rendered utterly powerless in being inflicted with boils, the marks of death, such that these ritual specialists are not only rendered ritually unclean but cannot even stand before Moses (9:11). This disempowering of the divine powers of Egypt to the point of utter powerless reaches its finale in the swallowing up of the divinely endowed Pharaoh in the waters of chaos, his complete obliteration and decreation.

The Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH also climaxes in Exod 14\*. In Exod 7–11\*, the Egyptian magicians, in being unable to match the sign of the gnats, recognize the power of YHWH behind this sign in stating “This is the finger of God [**אֱלֹהִים**]” (8:15a [Eng. 8:19a]), where **אֱלֹהִים** signifies the way in which Egypt as a nation not descended from Abraham would know the cosmic creator, who, according to Pg, is known by YHWH only to the Israelites (see Gen 1–10\* and Exod 6:2–3). However, although the magicians, the Egyptian ritual and religious functionaries, show their knowledge of YHWH and his cosmic power here, Pharaoh does not come to know YHWH here; although the magicians tell Pharaoh that this is the finger of God, Pharaoh’s heart is hardened and he does not listen (Exod 8:15b [Eng. 8:19b]). It is only in Exod 14\* that all the Egyptians including Pharaoh come to the knowledge of YHWH in their demise; the Egyptians finally come to know who YHWH is when YHWH gets glory over them in decreating them in the waters of chaos, which is the purpose of their obliteration (14:4, 17–18).

Finally, the motif linked inseparably with the destruction or decreation of the Egyptians when the waters come back together again, of the creation of the nation Israel symbolized in their walking on dry land through the separated waters, stands out in Exod 14\*. Only a whisper of this is implied, as noted above, through the use of cosmic mythological creation imagery in the first sign where YHWH’s control of chaos has within it the expectation of an act of creation. However, the remaining signs in Exod 7–11\* focus purely on the destruction of Egypt, its people, animals, and the rendering of its gods as powerless. The full blown mythical imagery for creation of the nation of Israel in Exod 14\* is highlighted, therefore, in comparison.



In all these ways, these common motifs spanning Exod 7–11\* and 14\* are unfolded in such a way that the first sign in Exod 7:8–13 and 14\* form a corresponding outer bracket within the frame, and Exod 14\* represents the conclusion and climax of the developing trends within Exod 7–11\*.

How then does the frame in Exod 7–11\*; 14\* interpret further and draw out the implications of the ritual centerpiece in 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41? As already observed, the motifs that the centerpiece has in common with its frame are concentrated in 12:12–13, 40–41, which spell out the meaning of the Passover rite and what it effects. The frame in Exod 7–11\* therefore adds a richness of meaning, and further dimensions, to what the Passover rite celebrates and effects over and above what is stated in its etiology in 12:12–13 and in 12:40–41: YHWH's killing of the firstborn as the execution of judgments on the gods of Egypt,<sup>176</sup> showing who YHWH is ("I am YHWH"), while protecting Israel, (12:12–13), and the effect of celebrating the Passover as the liberation of the Israelites from the land of Egypt. Taking each of these elements in turn, how the frame further interprets them and draws out their implications is as follows.

First, YHWH's smiting of the firstborn of humans and animals in the land of Egypt (Exod 12:12a) and his smiting the land of Egypt (12:13bβ) is unfolded in the frame in terms of YHWH, as cosmic creator, unleashing chaos upon, or decreation of, the land of Egypt by transforming all the waters in Egypt to blood and therefore contaminating the whole land, breaking the boundaries of creation by the frogs moving from the waters to the land, and transforming the very dust of the earth itself into gnats, something it was never created to be, and the inflicting of humans and animals with boils, signs of uncleanness and marks of death, followed by total destruction or decreation of the whole nation of Egypt in the sea episode. Moreover, given the cosmic dimensions and the mythological language used for the demise or decreation of Egypt and its people, this has a universal dimension, where Egypt/the Egyptians is symbolic of any foreign nation, its land and people, who oppress and oppose Israel.

Second, the interpretation of this as YHWH executing judgments on all the gods of Egypt in Exod 12:12b (an element unique to Pg in relation to the earlier tradition and therefore of significance<sup>177</sup>) is unfolded in the frame in terms of the progressive defeat of the magicians and the divine

---

176. Which takes on an extra dimension in the nuance of not just destroying the firstborn but YHWH claiming the firstborn for himself.

177. See §4.1.1.1.

powers behind them, as well as the divinely endowed Pharaoh, foreshadowed in the first sign (7:8–13) and followed by the progressive rendering of the magicians as powerless (see sign four) to the point that they cannot even stand, being marked with the signs of death (sign five), and the obliteration of the divinely endowed Pharaoh in YHWH's cosmic act of reversing creation in Exod 14\*. The power of YHWH as cosmic creator evidenced in the signs and in the manipulation of waters at the sea renders the divine powers of Egypt, including Pharaoh, as nothing. Again, given the cosmic dimensions and the mythological creation and decreation language, the gods of Egypt are symbolic of all the gods of foreign nations who oppress Israel and seek to oppose YHWH.

Third, the reference to “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) in Exod 12:12b (also an element of significance since it is unique to Pg in this context<sup>178</sup>), which here is linked with YHWH's action against Egypt in killing the firstborn as executing judgments against the gods of Egypt, is unfolded in the frame in terms of who this YHWH is shown to be in the signs/wonders and in the events at the sea: the all powerful cosmic creator whose divine plan unfolds inexorably, who is in complete control of all that occurs to Egypt, its land, people, and Pharaoh, unleashing chaos and reversing his creation in relation to the land of Egypt, its people and its divinely endowed Pharaoh, thereby rendering their gods as nothing while gaining glory for himself. Given the cosmic dimensions and mythological language, this can be said of who YHWH is in relation to any nation who oppresses Israel and seeks to oppose YHWH. Most significantly, the frame adds the dimension of how the Egyptians come to the knowledge of YHWH, first by the magicians recognizing YHWH's power behind the sign of gnats (8:15a [Eng. 8:19a]) and in explicitly expanding the expression “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) into the statement that the Egyptians will know that I am YHWH (emphasized by being repeated twice, 14:4, 18). The Egyptians, symbolizing all foreign nations who oppress Israel, come to the knowledge of YHWH when he gets glory over them by destroying, obliterating, and decreating them.

Finally, it is clear so far that the focus in the meaning of the Passover as further interpreted by the frame is weighted toward who YHWH is and how he acts in relation to Egypt and their gods as symbolizing foreign nations who oppress Israel and their divine powers, in general, and how they come to the knowledge of him in their demise as the universal

---

178. See §4.1.1.1.

cosmic creator who is in complete control of their fate and in relation to whom their gods are powerless. However, there is a positive flipside to this for Israel, which goes hand in hand with the destruction of Egypt/foreign nations. In Exod 12:12–13, at the same time as YHWH passes through the land of Egypt destroying the firstborn and striking the land, he passes over the Israelites and protects them from plague. Moreover, the celebration of the Passover effects the liberation of Israel from the land of Egypt (12:40–41). The frame adds a further dimension to the protection and liberation of the Israelites that the Passover rite celebrates and effects, in imaging the creation of Israel as a nation in terms of the cosmic mythological imagery of the splitting of the sea through which they walk on dry land, an act that is inseparable from YHWH's final act of protecting and liberating them from the Egyptians in the destruction and decreation of the Egyptians with the coming together of the waters again.

In all these ways, the frame in Exod 7–11\*; 14\* enriches the meaning of the Passover rite and what its celebration effects, adding interpretative dimensions, and drawing out its implications wherever and whenever it is celebrated.

It is time to sum up the resulting complex paradigmatic picture of Exod 7–14\* as a whole, comprising the ritual centerpiece (12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41) and its frame (Exod 7–11\*; 14\*) as they interact with each other.

#### 4.1.4. Conclusion: The Complex Paradigmatic Picture of Exodus 7–14\* as a Whole

At one level, and in terms of content only, Exod 7–14\* can be seen to comprise three phases in sequence introduced by the interlocking verses in 7:3–5,<sup>179</sup> showing the following trends: from decreating the land of Egypt in signs two, three, and four to foreshadowing the death of Egyptian people and animals in the boils sign, to the death of the firstborn of the people and animals (12:12), to the death of the whole nation in Exod 14\*; from the progressive defeat and rendering as nothing the divine powers of Egypt in the contest with the magicians in the signs through the explicit statement of YHWH executing judgment on all the gods of Egypt (12:12) to the death of the divinely endowed Pharaoh in Exod 14\*; from the Egyp-

---

179. With Exod 11:9–10 providing a transition from the signs to Exod 12\* with YHWH's hardening of Pharaoh's heart now linked to him not letting the Israelites go, thus flagging the theme of their liberation in Exod 12\*.

tian magicians coming to the knowledge of YHWH as cosmic creator and his power (8:15a [Eng. 8:19a]) through the assertion “I am YHWH” in 12:12 to Pharaoh and the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH in their demise when he gets glory over them in Exod 14\* (see esp. “I am YHWH” in 14:4, 18); and from the protection of the Israelites and their liberation out of Egypt (12:13, 40–41) to their final deliverance from the Egyptians and their creation as a nation in Exod 14\*. However, when the paradigmatic nature of this material and its hermeneutics of time is the focus of the whole complex paradigmatic picture of Exod 7–14\*, what emerges is as follows.

The ritual centerpiece in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and its hermeneutics of time, the timelessness of ritual or liturgical time that encompasses all time past, present and future, is the focus. The frame in Exod 7–11\*; 14\* is inherently paradigmatic seen in its reshaping of past traditions with unique elements into repeated patterns to express its theological perspective and using cosmic mythological language, all of which gives it a nuance of typicality and universality, and therefore in a sense touches into a kind of timelessness. However, the frame’s paradigmatic quality is enhanced by taking on the timeless ritual or liturgical time of the Passover rite at its center.<sup>180</sup> Therefore, the further dimensions of interpretation that the frame adds to the etiology of the Passover and its effect in 12:12–13, 40–41 take on even further a universality and timelessness, making it, and in particular the motifs it has in common with its centerpiece, even more relevant for all time and applicable to any situation where a foreign nation oppresses Israel and opposes YHWH at any given time. Each and every time the Passover rite is performed, at any time and through time, it celebrates and effects the whole paradigmatic picture, not only what is spelled out in 12:12–13, 40–41, but also what is

---

180. Various authors seek to describe this dynamic in various ways. Johannes Pedersen (*Israel: Its Life and Culture* [Copenhagen: Branner Og Korch, 1940], 728–37) speaks of a cult legend, albeit in relation to the final form of Exod 1–15. Mann (“Passover,” 242) uses the terminology, from comparative religion, of “myth and ritual” to describe the juxtaposition of narrative and liturgy. The comments of Fretheim (*Exodus*, 133, 136), though speaking of the final form of Exod 12–15 or texts within this, where there is an interweaving of story and ritual, are pertinent to Exod 7–14\* when he states that “one is invited, indeed compelled, to read the story through a liturgical lens” (133) and that “the effect of this liturgical hermeneutic ... gives them [the events] a character ... beyond normal time and space.... The flow is somewhat episodic, like ... rubrics from a liturgy” (136).

contained in the frame that, in adding further interpretative dimensions, enriches that which is celebrated and effected. The ritual of the Passover is the means of bringing the whole complex paradigmatic picture to reality at any time and through time.

What the Passover celebrates and what it effects, then, each time it is celebrated over time, is as follows. YHWH is the cosmic creator who is in complete control of all that occurs in the creation, and to the nations, their people, leaders, and their lands, whether creating or destroying; whose divine plan unfolds inexorably through the obedience of his chosen agents. It celebrates first and foremost this YHWH's destruction or decreation of foreign nations (their lands, leaders, and people), who oppress Israel or who oppose YHWH and his plan; and, along with this, YHWH's defeat of their gods, who are rendered powerless and as nothing in relation to YHWH's power. It also celebrates these foreign nations' recognition and knowledge of the all-powerful cosmic creator YHWH, who controls their fate, at the point of their decreation and demise. It celebrates and effects YHWH's protection, deliverance, and creation, of the nation of Israel, as inseparably linked with YHWH's judgment on, and destruction of, foreign nations and their gods.<sup>181</sup>

This is the reality that is ever-present in the celebration of this ritual. The celebration of the Passover is a timeless cultic event, into the reality of which each generation can enter at any time. Those who perform the ritual through time enter into the timelessness of the ritual and thereby participate in the reality that it celebrates and effects. It is potentially relevant at any time and applicable to a variety of different specific situations over time.<sup>182</sup> This is the essence of this complex paradigmatic paradigm in Exod 7–14\*, and the way in which it has the potential to function over time.

We will turn now to an exploration of the paradigmatic nature of Exod 16–Num 27\*.

---

181. See the comment of Dozeman (*God at War*, 129): "The passover legend of the P tradents is an event of creation, which has universal implications of potential judgment and salvation."

182. Therefore at the time Pg is writing, the exile, this would be applicable to Babylon and Nebuchadnezzar, e.g., see Brueggemann, "Pharaoh as Vassal," 48–49.

## 4.2. EXODUS 16–NUMBERS 27\*

When we look at Exod 16–Num 27\*<sup>183</sup> in terms of its paradigmatic nature, it can be seen to comprise a paradigmatic centerpiece in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\* concerning the ordinances and their execution for the tabernacle and its personnel, surrounded by a narrative frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*. The paradigmatic nature of Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\*, as seen in the way in which it collapses time—past, present, and future—into a kind of timelessness, stands out most clearly in that it reshapes earlier traditions and synthesizes these with unique and visionary elements into a picture whose hermeneutics of time is akin to ritual time and as such transcends time. The narrative frame that surrounds it is also paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping earlier tradition with unique elements into repeated patterns that take on a kind of timelessness; and as surrounding the centerpiece in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\* it takes on its ritual/liturgical timelessness, further unfolding its significance and what it effects. Accordingly, the paradigmatic nature of the centerpiece in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\* will first be explored, before turning to a discussion of its narrative frame and the way in which they can be seen to interact.

## 4.2.1. The Paradigmatic Nature of Exodus 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\*: The Sinai Pericope as Ritual Centerpiece

Exodus 25–29\*<sup>184</sup> portrays the instructions given by YHWH to Moses on Mount Sinai (Exod 24:15b–18) regarding the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its furnishings, or sacred space, and its personnel or priesthood (sacred persons), as the means by which YHWH can dwell (שכן) among the people (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46), and meet (פגש) with Moses and the people (25:22; 29:43). Exodus 39–40\*<sup>185</sup> notes briefly the execution of these instructions by Moses and the people and the consequent presence

183. I.e., Exod 16:1, 2–3, 6–7, 9–15, 21, 35\*; 17:1abα; 19:1, 2a; 24:15b–18a; 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34; Num 10:11–12; 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38; 20: 1a, 2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8aα\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12, 22b–29; 22:1; 27:12–14.

184. More precisely, Exod 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46 (see §1.2.2.4.1, above).

185. More precisely, Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34 (see §1.2.2.4.1, above).

of YHWH in relation to the tent of meeting, symbolized by the glory of YHWH filling it and the cloud covering it. The paradigmatic nature of this scenario is seen in the way in which, within this material, past and present traditions and experiences have been taken up, reshaped, and synthesized both with each other and future hopes into a timeless vision. This collapsing or transcending of time, past/present/future, into a timeless vision is akin to ritual time. Or, put another way using Gorman's terminology, what we have here are founding ordinances or rituals, portrayed in the distant past and yet relevant for, or encompassing all time, past/present/future, and so in this way transcending time; specifically here in relation to sacred space (Exod 25–27\*) and sacred personnel (Exod 28–29\*).<sup>186</sup>

In what follows, therefore, we will explore the possible past traditions and experiences drawn on and how they seem to have been reshaped, synthesized, and combined with future hopes into a unique vision, a timeless paradigmatic scenario. This will occur in three stages. First we will focus on the paradigmatic nature (or founding) of sacred space, in particular the detailed instructions, portrayed as given to Moses by YHWH according to the pattern (תבנית) shown to him,<sup>187</sup> for the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its furniture. Second, the paradigmatic nature of the instructions for (the founding of) sacred persons or the priesthood will be discussed. Finally, we will explore the issue of modes of divine presence that relates particularly to the tabernacle/tent of meeting, but also to its priesthood.

---

186. See Gorman, "Priestly Rituals." Although these are not the precise texts named by Gorman as founding rituals of sacred space and sacred personnel, I have argued in ch. 3 that Exod 25–27\*, along with the execution of these instructions (Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b) and the sanctification of the tent of meeting by YHWH's glory, promised in Exod 29:43–44 and fulfilled in Exod 40:34, represent the founding of sacred space in Gorman's terms; and the instructions in Exod 28–29\* and the execution of these in Exod 40:33b, along with YHWH's promise in Exod 29:44 to sanctify Aaron and his sons, represents the founding of sacred persons in Gorman's terms. See ch. 3 n. 144.

187. Exod 25:9; see also 25:40; 26:30 (27:8). תבנית seems to suggest not only that the plans of the tabernacle are shown to Moses, but that the earthly tabernacle is a copy of the heavenly sanctuary or divine dwelling, in line with, or echoing, the Canaanite idea that the earthly sanctuary as a copy of the heavenly prototype allows the deity to dwell on earth; see Richard Clifford, "The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 225–26; Childs, *Exodus*, 535; Frank M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon," in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*, ed. Frank Cross (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 86; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 610.



#### 4.2.1.1. The Tabernacle/Tent of Meeting and Its Furniture

The description of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its furniture, as contained in the YHWH speeches to Moses (esp. Exod 25–27\*) would seem to draw on and reshape earlier traditions (and experience, past and present) of both tents or tent shrines and temples to present its unique paradigmatic picture. Possible tent/tent shrine and temple traditions (and experience) can be traced from the ancient Near East more broadly and from respective traditions seen in earlier biblical texts.<sup>188</sup> Both are important, not least because tent and temple traditions in ancient Israel have themselves been influenced by ancient Near Eastern traditions and the Israelites living in exile would have experienced (neo-)Babylonian temples; but in the following discussion, more weight will be given to specifically Israelite traditions regarding tent shrines and the Solomonic or preexilic Jerusalem temple since these represent more directly the heritage of the author(s) of Pg who are here shaping specifically Israelite paradigmatic space.

#### Tent/Tent Shrine Traditions

The features of Pg's tabernacle that would appear to be drawing on tent traditions include the following: the terminology of "tent of meeting" (אהל מועד) (Exod 29:4, 10, 11, 30, 32, 42, 44; 40:34); the structure of the tabernacle/tent of meeting as a portable tent, comprising boards or frames (קרשים), curtains with coverings, including red leather, to form temporary walls (Exod 26), pegs and cords (27:19); and the use of acacia wood.<sup>189</sup>

Evidence of ancient Near Eastern traditions of tent shrines, and traditions concerning them, is quite scant. The two most important tent shrine traditions that have parallels with aspects of Pg's tabernacle are the eighteenth-century BCE large public tent of Mari described in the Akkadian

188. See George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 10–11, 62, 192.

189. Frank M. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," in *Old Testament Issues*, ed. Samuel Sandmel (London: SCM, 1968), 57, 59; Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon," 87; Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 195–96. Some of the material features listed here lie in the realm of credible hypothesis rather than empirical evidence, at least from biblical texts. See also the rings and poles associated with the various pieces of furniture for carrying them (Exod 25:12–13, 27–28; 27:4, 6–7), which relate to the portrayal of the tabernacle/tent of meeting as a portable tent.



text M.6873 and the tent of El described in the thirteenth-century Ugaritic myths.<sup>190</sup> Daniel Fleming has argued that the Mari tent described in M.6873 is a mobile structure with a religious function (housing attendant gods during a sacrificial event). It has affinities with Pg's tabernacle in that its structure comprises *qeršu*, that is, wooden frames, to which the קרשים of the Pg tabernacle correspond in size and function.<sup>191</sup> El's tent (*'hl*), described in Canaanite mythology, although a cosmic rather than earthly tent, situated as it is at the source of cosmic waters, displays a number of similarities with Pg's tabernacle. It too, like the Mari tent, is composed of wooden frames, *qršm*. But over and beyond this, it has furnishings with affinities to those of Pg's tabernacle (throne/footstool, see Exod 25:10–22;<sup>192</sup> table, see Exod 25:23–30), and it is the place not only where El, the high god of the Canaanite pantheon, dwells (see Exod 25:8; 29:45–46), but also where the Canaanite gods assembled (*m'd* being the Canaanite word for political assembly; see Pg's terminology of אהל מועד) and from where El issued oracles or decrees (see Exod 25:22).<sup>193</sup> Especially since the קרשים of Pg's tabernacle would seem to reflect the *qršm* of these tent shrine traditions, for they are not found in the description of the Solomonic temple, it is quite possible, or even likely, that Pg has drawn on an ancient Near Eastern tent shrine tradition, and in particular the tradition of El's tent, given the influence of the El mythology elsewhere in biblical texts.<sup>194</sup> However, the echoes of this tent shrine tradition in Pg have been reshaped and com-

190. See also Hurowitz, *I have Built You an Exalted House*, 328–29, for examples of temporary tents for deities in ancient Near Eastern literature.

191. Daniel Fleming, "Mari's Large Public Tent and the Priestly Tent Sanctuary," *VT* 50 (2000): 484–98.

192. The symbolism of the ark and the cherubim as part of the *kapporet* and whether there is throne and/or footstool associations will be discussed shortly. Additionally, in El iconography cherubim are associated with El's throne.

193. See Clifford, "Tent of El"; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 321–22; Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon," 87–90; Michael Homan, *To Your Tents, O Israel! The Terminology, Function, Form, and Symbolism of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, CHANE 12 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 94, 96–97.

194. Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon," 89. See also the iconography of the El tradition where El sits on a cherubim throne (see Exod 25:17–22 and the discussion below regarding the cherubim associated with the *kapporet* and whether or not this is throne imagery). Indeed, Cross argues that ultimately the Priestly tabernacle derives from the mythological conceptions of the tent of El (though more immediately from the tent of David).

bined with other traditions. For example, while El's tent is the place where the gods meet with El, in Pg the tent of meeting is where YHWH meets with the Israelites (Exod 29:43). Unlike Pg's tabernacle, there is no segmentation associated with this tent shrine tradition, as seen for example in El's tent: such divisions into an inner and outer sanctum are more akin to temple traditions.<sup>195</sup>

Within earlier Israelite tradition specifically, the tent traditions associated with the presence of God are: the "tent of meeting" (אהל מועד) tradition, as found in Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:16–17, 24–26; 12:4–5, 10;<sup>196</sup> the Shiloh shrine (Ps 78:60, where it is called a tent; see also 1 Sam 1:7, 9, 24; 3:15; and see the reference to the tent and tabernacle in 2 Sam 7:6); and the tent of David (2 Sam 6:17).

The terminology used by Pg of אהל מועד (Exod 29:4, 10, 11, 30, 32, 42, 44; 40:34) is the same as, and therefore almost certainly drawn from, the "tent of meeting" (אהל מועד) tradition (itself possibly influenced by the tent of El tradition) in Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:16–17, 24–26; 12:4–5, 10.<sup>197</sup> However, whereas in this older tradition the tent of meet-

---

195. Kenneth Kitchen ("Tabernacle: Pure Fiction or Plausible Account," *BRev* 16 [2000]: 14–21) and Michael Homan ("The Divine Warrior in His Tent: A Military Model for Yahweh's Tabernacle," *BRev* 16 [2000]: 22–33, 55; *To Your Tents*, 111–14) draw parallels with the thirteenth-century BCE military camp of Rameses II, arguing that its spatial layout is the closest parallel to that of the Priestly tabernacle: they are both rectangular and oriented on an east-west axis, with an inner and outer chamber surrounded by the camp, with the winged god Horus associated with the throne of the pharaoh in the inner chamber, paralleling the cherubim in the inner sanctum of the Pg tabernacle. There may be echoes of this in Pg, but since such divisions are common in the temple traditions of the ancient Near East, in particular with regard to the Solomonic temple with its cherubim in the inner sanctum, the parallelism of the Pg tabernacle to temple traditions is more immediate and more likely to be the traditions on which Pg has drawn in this regard.

196. I am assuming that these texts are earlier than Pg in line with, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 254–55; Childs, *Exodus*, 584–85; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 39, 723–24; William H. Propp, *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 2B (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 583; Budd, *Numbers*, 133–34; Thomas Dozeman, "Numbers," *NIB* 2:105, 107. Pace, e.g., Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 47, esp. n. 146) and Römer ("Israel's Sojourn," 433–36), who see these texts as post-P.

197. See Gerhard von Rad, "The Tent and the Ark," in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), 103–24; von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 1:235; Noth, *History of Pentateuchal*

ing, where YHWH meets with Moses, is outside the camp, Pg's tent of meeting is where YHWH will meet with the Israelites (Exod 29:44) (and with Moses in the inner sanctum, 25:22), and it is situated in their midst (25:8; 29:45–46).

While for some scholars this “tent of meeting” tradition is the primary tent tradition reflected in Pg's tabernacle,<sup>198</sup> others have argued that Pg has also drawn on traditions regarding the Shiloh sanctuary and/or the Davidic tent, as structures housing the ark and as part of the ancient Israelite tent tradition. In particular, Menahem Haran maintains that Pg's tabernacle reflects the Shiloh sanctuary, which he argues was a tent/tabernacle (see 2 Sam 7:6–7; Ps 78:60), albeit influenced by, or recast in the form of, Jerusalem temple tradition.<sup>199</sup> Frank Cross sees the Davidic tent, referred to in 2 Sam 6:17 as the culmination of the development of ancient Israel's tent shrine tradition, which includes the Shiloh sanctuary (see 2 Sam 7:6–7), and maintains that Pg's tabernacle in almost all of its essential features reflects this Davidic tent, which as built at the height

---

*Traditions*, 244; Cross, “Priestly Tabernacle,” 61; Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961), 294–95; Trygve N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabbaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, ConBOT 18 (Lund: Gleerup, 1982), 82–83. It is also possible that מִשְׁכָּן (tabernacle), also used by Pg for the sanctuary (e.g., Exod 25:9; 26:1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27; 27:9, 19), derives from an early tent tradition, given that it occurs in Ugaritic literature and early biblical poetry in parallel with “tent” (see, e.g., Num 24:5; Ps 78:60), as has been argued by, e.g., Cross (“Priestly Tabernacle,” 62–63), de Vaux (*Ancient Israel*, 295), and Haran (“Shiloh and Jerusalem,” 18; *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, 196). However, מִשְׁכָּן also appears in texts reflecting the Zion tradition (e.g., Pss 46:5 [Eng. 4]; 84:2 [Eng. 1]; 132:5, 7). and it seems to me more probable that P would have picked up this terminology more immediately from the Zion tradition, and therefore the Jerusalem temple tradition, in agreement with Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 245, and Mettinger (*Dethronement of Sabbaoth*, 82–83); see later discussion.

198. See esp. de Vaux (*Ancient Israel*, 297), who makes a clear distinction between the “tent of meeting” (Exod 33:7–11) and the Shiloh sanctuary, which he sees as a permanent building (1 Sam 1:7, 9; 3:15), and the tent of David (2 Sam 6:17).

199. Menahem Haran, “Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 21–22; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, 198–204. He maintains that the references to it as a permanent building in 1 Sam 1:7, 9, 24; 3:15 are anachronisms from the monarchical period. See also Josh 18:1; 19:51, although these are late Priestly references.

of David's power when his empire was fully established would have been quite elaborate.<sup>200</sup>

It is quite possible that Pg has drawn on the Shiloh sanctuary and David tent traditions, but the evidence that has come down to us provides little detail about them over and above providing housing for the ark and, in the case of the Davidic tent, perhaps also an altar (see 1 Kgs 2:30). Cross goes beyond the evidence in supposing that Pg's tabernacle reflects almost entirely the Davidic tent; although in his earlier work he maintains that it is undeniable that there is some influence of the Jerusalem temple on Pg's tabernacle account, in his later work he is more tentative, admitting that Pg may have drawn on, and reduced, the Solomonic temple measurements, but then undercutting this by saying that the Solomonic temple may have preserved the proportions of the Davidic tent.<sup>201</sup> Cross's view is therefore quite speculative.<sup>202</sup>

It is more probable that Pg drew, not only on ancient tent traditions—whether the “tent of meeting” tradition primarily or the Shiloh/David tent traditions as well—but also temple traditions, both ancient Near Eastern temple traditions and most immediately and directly Jerusalem temple traditions and experience, in formulating Pg's distinctive picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting.<sup>203</sup> This is seen primarily in spatial design and measurements and the gradations of materials used. It is also probably the case with regard to the cherubim iconography and furniture. True, the ark

---

200. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 322; Cross, “Priestly Tabernacle,” 52, 59–60; Cross, “Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon,” 92–93. See also, Fretheim (“Priestly Document,” 323–27), who follows Haran regarding the nature of the Shiloh sanctuary as a temporary structure and who sees both the Shiloh sanctuary and the tent of David as encompassed within the old tent tradition, upon which Pg has drawn.

201. See Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 59; Cross, “Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon,” 87.

202. The view of Homan (*To Your Tents*, esp. 135–37) is even more extreme than that of Cross. He sees the Shiloh tent and the Davidic tent as one and the same and the only model for P's tabernacle, maintaining that there are no temple features at all. His argument is weak, since, when he compares the P tabernacle with the Solomonic temple he dismisses too lightly the similarities, focusing primarily on perceived differences and weighting them far more than the similarities.

203. This position is widely held: see, e.g., Clements, *God and Temple*, 114; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 296–97; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 81–83; Haran, “Shiloh and Jerusalem,” 20–22; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, 198–204; Fretheim, “Priestly Document,” 315, 323–27.

is associated with the Shiloh sanctuary and the Davidic tent, but it is also associated with the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 8:6a); and, although a table is part of El's tent, and El sits on a cherubim throne, it is likely that with regard to these Pg draws on the more immediate Jerusalem temple tradition, itself influenced not only by El traditions but traits of ancient Near Eastern temples and cherubim iconography common throughout the ancient Near East. The elements drawn from temple traditions can be seen to represent a significant reshaping of ancient Israel's tent tradition—at least from the little we know of it from the evidence of the biblical texts. We will now turn to the evidence for the influence of temple traditions (and experience) on Pg's paradigm of the tabernacle/tent of meeting.

### Temple Traditions

The account of P's tabernacle/tent of meeting has been compared with ancient Near Eastern royal building inscriptions for temples.<sup>204</sup> The closest parallels to this genre are found in Exod 35–40, since in the ancient Near Eastern texts, as well as in the description of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 6–7), which is seen as the closest biblical example to these temple building inscriptions, the description of the structure and its furnishings is almost always contained in the description of the process of actually building it.<sup>205</sup> Although I have not included Exod 35–40 as a whole in Pg, there are some affinities with regard to the generic pattern between Pg's tabernacle account as defined in chapter 1 and some ancient Near Eastern temple building inscriptions, albeit in a modified form.<sup>206</sup> These are, in particular, the divine command to build a sanctuary (Exod 25:1–2aα, 8–9) and the description of its structure and furnishings (25:10–40;

204. See esp. Hurowitz, "Priestly Account"; George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 160–62. It should be noted that these discussions are based on Exod 25–40\* (P) or beyond in contrast to Pg as outlined in §1.2.2.4.1, above, which comprises Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\*.

205. See the parallels outlined in Hurowitz ("Priestly Account," 24) between Exod 35–40 and 1 Kgs 5–7\*; and his discussion of the parallels to 1 Kgs 5–9\* in ancient Near Eastern building inscriptions, according to the pattern he identifies as the divine command or divine permission, acquisition and preparation of building materials, construction and description of the structure and furnishings, dedication, blessings, and curses in Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House*, 129–321.

206. See §1.2.2.4.1, i.e., Exod 25:1–2aα, 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34.

26:1–37; 27:1–19).<sup>207</sup> It could be argued, therefore, that Pg's tabernacle account draws on the standard pattern of ancient Near Eastern royal building inscriptions but reshapes it in some quite significant ways. First, whereas these building inscriptions (both ancient Near Eastern texts and the description of the Solomonic temple) have to do with fixed structures at a particular site; Pg's tabernacle is in the form of a mobile tent.<sup>208</sup> Second, these building inscriptions relate to royal building projects, with the king as a central figure in the process, whereas in Pg's account of the tabernacle there is no king; it is Moses who is instructed by YHWH and who ensures the execution of these instructions.<sup>209</sup> Third, the detailed description of the structure and its furnishings, almost always described in the execution of the task of building in the ancient Near Eastern and Solomonic temple accounts, in Pg's account is part of the divine instructions. There are two ancient Near Eastern texts in which the description of the temple is described by the god: in the Gudea inscription and Samsuiluna B.<sup>210</sup> However, Pg's description is far more detailed than these inscriptions, and ancient Near Eastern royal building inscriptions in general do not display the same detailed repetition that is part of Pg's account (see, e.g., Exod 25:31–36).<sup>211</sup> The effect of this is to throw the emphasis on its nature as divinely commanded: the fact that Pg's tabernacle/tent of meeting in all its detail is the will of YHWH. This also perhaps slants it toward being constituted as a timeless vision, for although there are brief statements concerning the execution of these instructions and the results of this (Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34), the focus has shifted away from the process of building the structure that has been completed, as in the temple inscriptions.

The primary area in which Pg's tabernacle account has drawn on ancient Near Eastern temples and temple traditions is with regard to the

---

207. See the pattern of the ancient Near Eastern and Solomonic temple royal building inscriptions identified by Hurowitz as outlined in n. 205. In addition, perhaps Exod 39:43 corresponds to the blessing, and Exod 29:43–44; 40:34 together correspond to the dedication.

208. See George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 162.

209. Ibid., 162–63. This makes sense in its narrative setting and also because of its exilic context. Indeed it would seem that any royal imagery in Pg in relation to humans is now associated with the priesthood.

210. See Hurowitz, "Priestly Account," 25–26.

211. See George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 168; Amy H. C. Robertson, "'He Kept the Measurements in His Memory as a Treasure': The Role of the Tabernacle Text in Religious Experience" (PhD diss., Emory University, 2010), 26, 82, 89.

perceived function of such temples as the divine residence or dwelling place for the deity on earth (see Exod 25:8–9) and in the zones comprising it.<sup>212</sup> The division within Pg's tabernacle of the holy place and most holy place (see 26:33) has its roots in, and reflects, the differentiation within ancient Near Eastern temples of an outer sanctuary and an inner sanctuary, the place of the cult image that was set off from the larger outer sanctuary either by situating the cult image within a niche at the back of the sanctuary or within its own small room.<sup>213</sup> As with the Pg tabernacle, most ancient Near Eastern temples had a court (either within the temple complex as in the case of Mesopotamian temples or surrounding the temple per se as in the case of Syro-Palestinian temples).<sup>214</sup> In addition, as in Pg's account, there was only one entryway to each of the zones, and these entrances or gates were relatively well adorned (see Exod 26:31, 36) to mark their special status as the means of moving from one zone to another.<sup>215</sup> Common to Pg's tabernacle and ancient Near Eastern temples in general, therefore, is that the place where the deity is present (in the case of the ancient Near Eastern temples, where the cult image or statue is placed,<sup>216</sup> in the case of Pg the most holy place above the *kapporet*, which is on the ark) is behind the most walls and through the most doors, that is, in the most secluded part of the sanctuary or temple.<sup>217</sup> In some Mesopotamian temple traditions, progression toward the sanctuary was marked by

---

212. George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 147, 175–76; Michael Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*, WAWSup 3 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 3–136.

213. Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 15, 51, 53, 111–12, 134. This is the case in general, but in particular (and of most relevance to Pg) this pertains both to the more elaborate Mesopotamian temples, which had, as well as an inner and outer sanctuary, a vestibule that stood between the sanctuary and the outer world, as well as the more modest Syro-Palestinian temples. See also Jens Kamlah, “Temples of the Levant—Comparative Aspects,” in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.)*; *Proceedings of a Conference on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen (28–30 May 2010)*, ed. Jens Kamlah and Henrike Michelau, ADPV 41 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 507–34.

214. *Ibid.*, 114, 122, 132.

215. Michael Hundley, “Before YHWH at the Entrance of the Tent of Meeting: A Study of Spatial and Conceptual Geography in Priestly Texts,” *ZAW* 123 (2011): 21; Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 134.

216. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 515.

217. Hundley, “Before YHWH,” 22; Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 134.



increasing value of metals and adornments, for example, from unadorned bricks to gold and lapis lazuli,<sup>218</sup> which is reflected in Pg's tabernacle where gold is associated with the most holy place and holy place, but bronze with the court. In addition, as in Pg's tabernacle, in some instances a table has been found in association with the outer sanctuary of Mesopotamian temples, and altars are common in ancient Near Eastern temples (see Exod 25:23–26; 27:1–8).<sup>219</sup>

It is clear that Pg has drawn on ancient Near Eastern temple traditions in these ways but has reshaped them in two significant ways: Pg's tabernacle/tent of meeting is not a fixed building at a particular site but a mobile tent, and Pg's tabernacle has no cult image or statue but instead the ark and the *kapporet* with its cherubim above which YHWH's presence is found (see Exod 25:22).<sup>220</sup>

The Solomonic temple as described in 1 Kgs 6–8\* also reflects the traits of ancient Near Eastern temples of different zones graded according to proximity to the presence of the deity: an inner and outer sanctuary and vestibule/court, with more valuable materials, such as gold associated with the inner and outer sanctum in contrast to bronze in the court, and furniture, such as a golden table, and the altar in the court.<sup>221</sup> It is highly probable that Pg drew on this Jerusalem temple tradition, the Solomonic temple, as described in 1 Kgs 6–8\*, and perhaps this preexilic temple as experienced in later history,<sup>222</sup> and in an even more direct way than the

---

218. Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*, 75.

219. On tables in Mesopotamian temples, see *ibid.*, 53; Propp (*Exodus* 19–40, 507–8) refers to ancient Near Eastern art and texts that depict tables with food (e.g., bread) placed before the god's statue. On altars, see George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 177.

220. The symbolism of the ark and the *kapporet* with its cherubim will be discussed shortly.

221. The issue of possible levels of redaction in 1 Kgs 6–8 is complex. I am assuming here, in line with Antony Campbell and Mark O'Brien (*Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000], 344–58) that the majority of 1 Kgs 6–7 (excluding 6:1, 11–13) and 1 Kgs 8:1a–b, 2, 6a, 12–13, 62–64 represents pre-Deuteronomistic material and therefore traditions older than P.

222. See Cory D. Crawford (“Between Shadow and Substance: The Historical Relationship of Tabernacle and Temple in Light of Architecture and Iconography,” in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, ed. Mark Leuchter and Jeremy Hutton, AIL 9 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011], 117–33, esp. 127–31), who argues that Pg's tabernacle reflects the Jerusalem temple more closely after Ahaz remodeled it by removing the bulls and lions and that the experience of the post-Ahaz temple has influenced Pg's tabernacle narrative.



ancient Near Eastern temples and temple traditions whose traits it also reflects, since it is part of Pg's direct Israelite heritage. The features of the account of the building of the Solomonic temple in 1 Kgs 6–8\* and the preexilic Jerusalem temple in general that are reflected in Pg's tabernacle description, and the way in which Pg has reshaped or transformed them are as follows.

With regard to form, since the description of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 5–8\*) is close to the pattern of ancient Near Eastern royal temple inscriptions, Pg's tabernacle account would seem to have drawn on, but reshaped quite significantly, this pattern as found in 1 Kgs 5–8\*. It does this in the same three ways as described in relation to the ancient Near Eastern royal building inscriptions discussed above. First, Pg's tabernacle/tent of meeting is not a fixed building but a mobile tent. Second, it is not associated with a king, for Moses is not a king. Third, although both accounts are quite detailed, Pg's account of the structure and the individual pieces of furniture are the more detailed and repetitive; and, since Pg presents these details as part of the divine instructions rather than the description of the building process itself, Pg puts the emphasis on the divine vision and will rather than on the actual building of it.

Whereas the name of Pg's structure as "tent of meeting" (מועד אהל) derives from ancient Israel's tent shrine tradition, its other name, the "tabernacle" (משכן) (Exod 25:9; 26:1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27; 27:9, 19) is probably drawn from the Jerusalem temple tradition, given that משכן refers to the Jerusalem temple in some of the (Zion) psalms, for example, Pss 46:5 [Eng. 4]; 84:2 [Eng. 1]; 132:5, 7; 43:3; 74:7.<sup>223</sup> This is not clear-cut, however, since משכן is also found in parallel with "tent" in Hebrew poetry (e.g., Num 24:5; Isa 54:2; Jer 30:18; Ps 78:60, and in Ugaritic literature); therefore, some scholars argue that משכן derives from an early tent tradition.<sup>224</sup> Although it seems likely that Pg has picked up this terminology more immediately from the Zion/Jerusalem temple tradition, it may well be the case, alternatively, that, since משכן is used for both portable tents and fixed dwellings,<sup>225</sup> and the temple specifically, Pg has used

223. So Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabbaoth*, 82–83; Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 245.

224. See, e.g., Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle," 62–63; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 295; Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem," 18; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, 195–96.

225. D. Kellerman, "משכן," *TDOT* 9:58–64; Homan, *To Your Tents*, 22–23.

משכן intentionally precisely because it encompasses both meanings, thus reflecting Pg's tabernacle as both tent-like and temple-like.

The features of Pg's tabernacle account that reflect the Jerusalem temple tradition as described in the account of the building of the Solomonic temple in 1 Kgs 6–8\*, albeit in modified form, relate to its zones (graded according to proximity to the presence of the deity), its materials, ornamentation, and furniture.

First, the general structure, orientation, and measurements of Pg's tabernacle have enough in common with the description of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 6–8\*) to suggest that Pg has drawn on this and/or experience of the Jerusalem temple later in its history.<sup>226</sup> Both are rectangular structures with an eastern orientation.<sup>227</sup> Both have a most holy place or inner sanctum (see 1 Kgs 6:16, 19–20 [דביר]; Exod 26:33–34) and a holy place or outer sanctum (1 Kgs 6:17 [היכל]; Exod 26:33), and a courtyard (1 Kgs 6:36; 7:12; and see 1 Kgs 8:64; Exod 27:9–19). Solomon's temple, however, also has a vestibule or forecourt (אולם) adjoining the outer sanctum (1 Kgs 6:3) and a structure with side chambers on various levels surrounding the two sides and back of the inner and outer sanctum, or perhaps something like a surrounding wooden crate (1 Kgs 6:5–6, 10),<sup>228</sup> which Pg does not have, and is therefore more complex than Pg's tabernacle. The underlying principal, however, is similar; as in ancient Near Eastern temples in general, areas are graded according to proximity to the divine presence, and the inner and outer sanctum are the heart of both structures.

Although in terms of measurements Pg's tabernacle is much smaller than the Solomonic temple as described, the proportions are not dissimilar. The Solomonic temple is 60 cubits long, 20 cubits wide, and 30 cubits high (1 Kgs 6:2). The measurements of Pg's tabernacle are not exactly clear. It is 10 cubits high (Exod 26:16) and thus a third of the height of the Solomonic temple. It is most likely 30 cubits long (that is twenty boards/frames [קרשים] that are 1.5 cubits wide [Exod 26:18, 20]), that is, half the length of the Solomonic temple. Its width, however, is unclear: Exod

226. For a description of the Solomonic temple based on 1 Kgs 6–7, see Victor Hurowitz, "YHWH's Exalted House: Aspects of the Design and Symbolism of Solomon's Temple," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day, LHBOTS 422 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 69–90.

227. See George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 80; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 503; Hurowitz, "YHWH's Exalted House," 69.

228. Hurowitz, "YHWH's Exalted House," 70–72.

26:22–23 refers to six קרשים, that is, 9 cubits, since each is 1.5 cubits wide, plus two corner frames for which no measurements are given. Some scholars assume that the corner frames round out the width to 10 cubits, thus making the width, like the length, half of that of the Solomonic temple.<sup>229</sup> However, others question this and come up with varying figures for the width.<sup>230</sup> Although the width cannot be precisely calculated from the evidence in the text, it seems most probable that 10 cubits is at least credible and that therefore the area of Pg's tabernacle is half that of the Solomonic temple.<sup>231</sup>

Second, in both the Solomonic temple and Pg's tabernacle the quality and value of materials used reflects the grades of holiness or proximity to the deity of the respective areas (as was the case in ancient Near Eastern temples). The metals used have a precise correspondence. In both, gold is found in relation to the most holy place and holy place (or inner and outer sanctum), but bronze is associated with the court. In the Solomonic temple, the inner surfaces of the inner and outer sanctums, including that of the doors, are gold (1 Kgs 6:20–22, 30, 32, 35); and the furniture of the inner and outer sanctums are also made of gold, for example, the cherubim in the inner sanctum (6:28) and the table and lampstands in the outer sanctum as well as various utensils and containers (7:48–50). Outside of the inner and outer sanctum (in the court), however, there is no gold, only bronze (7:23–39).<sup>232</sup> Similarly, in Pg's tabernacle the furniture of the most holy place, that is, the ark and the *kapporet* with its cherubim are made of, or overlaid with, pure gold (Exod 25:11–13, 17–18), and the furniture of the holy place, that is, the table and its associated objects and the lampstand and its associated objects (25:24–29, 31, 36, 38–39), are made of, or

---

229. See, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 212; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, 181; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 626.

230. E.g., Propp (*Exodus 19–40*, 503) proposes 12 cubits, and Homan (*To Your Tents*, 180) comes up with 10.9 cubits (and 31.5 cubits for the length). See also Richard E. Friedman (“Tabernacle,” *ABD* 6: 292–300), who maintains that the frames are overlapping rather than side by side and calculates the width to be 6–8 cubits (and the length as 20 cubits).

231. Crawford (“Between Shadow and Substance,” 126–27) argues for the possibility of the measurements of Pg's structure, including the court, as correlating with the exterior dimensions of the Solomonic temple building as a whole (including the surrounding tiered structure) in an attempt to see the Jerusalem temple and Pg's structure as even more similar.

232. See Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, 189–90.

overlaid with, gold.<sup>233</sup> In terms of the structures of the most holy place and the holy place, the bars joining the frames and their rings (26:29), the pillars of the curtain dividing the most holy place and the holy place and their hooks (26:32), and the pillars of the screen for the entrance into the holy place/tent of meeting and their hooks, are of gold or overlaid with gold (26:37).<sup>234</sup> However, as with the Solomonic temple, in Pg's court there is bronze, with the altar of burnt offering overlaid with bronze (27:2), bronze bases for the pillars of the court (27:17, although their bands and hooks are silver), and bronze utensils and pegs (27:19).

Although Pg's tabernacle does not have fixed wooden walls, floors, and doors to overlay with gold as does the Solomonic temple, its curtains reflect a similar gradation in quality or value corresponding to the graded holiness of the space or proximity to the presence of the deity. The tabernacle curtains and the curtain that divides the holy place from the most holy place are a mixture of wool and linen, blue, purple, and crimson, with cherubim worked into them (Exod 26:1, 31), whereas the court hangings are of linen only with no mention of dyed colors (27:9). As Haran points out, a mixture of wool and linen is superior to linen only, as is the dying of materials, in contrast to being plain, with the colors blue, purple, and crimson in descending order of superiority.<sup>235</sup> Therefore, using the same schema of the graded preeminence and value of materials depending on proximity to the deity as in the Solomonic temple, Pg has replaced fixed walls with curtains, in this way reshaping the fixed building of the Jerusalem temple tradition into a tent.

---

233. See *ibid.*, 158–59.

234. There is also a gradation in metals in relation to the sockets of bases of these structures: the bases for the frames are silver (Exod 26:19) as are the bases for the pillars for the curtain dividing the most holy place and holy place (Exod 26:32), whereas the bases of the screen for the entrance to the tent of meeting are bronze (Exod 26:37); see *ibid.*, 163–64. Haran (163) also makes the interesting observation that, because the inner furnishings are made of “pure” gold, while the structures and associated hooks are overlaid, or made, simply with gold, the furniture is more important.

235. See *ibid.*, 160–64. It should be noted that the screen into the court is made of a mixture of wool and linen of blue, purple, and crimson, embroidered with needlework (Exod 27:16) and therefore more preeminent than the court hangings of linen only, reflecting the fact that entrances are more important than the surrounding walls, as in ancient Near Eastern temples. However, the screen into the court is less important than the curtain dividing the holy place and most holy place since it does not have cherubim worked into it.

Third, in terms of ornamentation, the Solomonic temple as described and the Pg tabernacle have in common cherubim carved or worked into the walls/curtains and door/dividing curtain of the inner sanctum/most holy place (1 Kgs 6:29, 32, 35; Exod 26:1, 31). The Solomonic temple, unlike Pg's tabernacle, has cherubim on the walls of the outer sanctum also and also palm trees and flowers on the walls of the inner and outer sanctum. Pg does, though, have flower imagery and tree imagery in relation to the lampstand (Exod 25:31–36).<sup>236</sup> The Solomonic temple has other visual features that are not found in Pg's tabernacle; for example, in the court the bronze sea, standing on twelve oxen (1 Kgs 7:23–26) and the imagery of bulls and lions on bronze stands.<sup>237</sup> Therefore, although the imagery found in the Pg tabernacle occurs in the Solomonic temple in one form or another, Pg does not reflect all of the imagery described in the Solomonic temple,<sup>238</sup> which is more complex and ornate.

Fourth, the furniture in Pg's tabernacle has corresponding items in the Solomonic temple. In both there is in the outer sanctum or holy place a golden table for the bread of the presence (1 Kgs 7:48; Exod 25:23–30). There, also in both, are gold lampstands, ten in the case of the Solomonic temple, but one seven-branched lampstand in Pg's tabernacle (1 Kgs 7:49; Exod 25:31–40).<sup>239</sup> In the courtyard in both is a bronze altar of burnt offering along with utensils (1 Kgs 8:64; 2 Kgs 16:14; 1 Kgs 7:38, 45; Exod 27:1–8).<sup>240</sup> Most significantly, in the inner sanctum or most holy place in both the Solomonic temple and in Pg's tabernacle there is

---

236. See Carol Meyers ("Lampstand," *ABD* 4:141–43), who likens Pg's lampstand to a stylized tree of life, symbolizing fertility in nature and the life-giving power of God. So also Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 619. Cf. Propp (*Exodus* 19–40, 511), who, although acknowledging the flower imagery, argues against the lampstand being seen as a tree.

237. In light of this, Crawford ("Between Shadow and Substance," 127–31) argues that, since Ahaz is said to have removed the oxen/bull and lion imagery from the temple, Pg draws on the experience of the post-Ahaz temple.

238. *Ibid.*, 127.

239. Unlike in Pg, the structure and shape of the lampstands in the Solomonic temple are not described.

240. Crawford ("Between Shadow and Substance," 121–22) makes the point that the bronze altars of the Jerusalem temple and Pg's tabernacle are the only bronze altars mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. Haran (*Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, 191–92) sees Pg's bronze altar as a reflection of the bronze altar of the Solomonic temple, especially given its ornamentation and horns (Exod 25:2, 4–5).

the ark and the iconography of the cherubim. However, whereas in the Solomonic temple the cherubim are 10 cubits high and stand side by side facing toward the entrance to the inner sanctum, each with their wings touching the side walls and each other, the cherubim in Pg's tabernacle are much smaller and part of the *kapporet* (cover?), an object that is unique to Pg,<sup>241</sup> and they face each other, with their wings overshadowing the *kapporet*.<sup>242</sup> The significance of this symbolism will be discussed shortly. Before turning to this, however, it can be concluded that, given the many points of contact, Pg would seem to have drawn on the Solomonic/Jerusalem temple tradition with regard to its furniture. However, Pg's description of the items of furniture is different from that of the Solomonic/Jerusalem temple in one particularly important respect: in Pg the items of furniture are portable, having rings and poles, (Exod 25:12–15, 26–28; 27:4–7),<sup>243</sup> unlike the furniture within the Solomonic temple.<sup>244</sup> Pg therefore has reshaped the Jerusalem temple tradition regarding its furniture to make it conform to the nature of the tabernacle as a portable tent.

More needs to be explored in relation to Pg's portrayal of the ark and the *kapporet* with its cherubim that reside in the most holy place, particularly with regard to the traditions drawn on by Pg, how Pg has reshaped these, and the resultant symbolism. These are particularly significant as the only objects within the most holy place, which, like the Solomonic temple, but unlike ancient Near Eastern temples, contains no cult image or statue of the deity.

### The Ark, the *Kapporet*, and Its Cherubim

Israelite traditions concerning the ark that potentially inform Pg's portrayal of the ark (Exod 25:10–16) are: the ark as signifying YHWH's presence, in early traditions concerning holy war (Num 10:35–36; 1 Sam 4–6; 2 Sam 6; esp. 1 Sam 4:4, 21–22; 2 Sam 6:2; Num 14:44), and as residing in the inner sanctum of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 8:6a); and the repeated

241. Except for the later reference in 1 Chr 28:11.

242. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 20.

243. George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 75–79.

244. I am assuming with Campbell and O'Brien (*Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History*, 349–50) that 1 Kgs 8:3–5, 6b–11 is a late Priestly addition in its context and therefore is not earlier than Pg.

reference particularly (but not exclusively<sup>245</sup>) in Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic texts to “the ark of the covenant” (הַבְּרִית אֲרוֹן), as well as quite possibly the ark as the receptacle for the stone tablets inscribed by the law (Deut 10:1–5;<sup>246</sup> and see Deut 31:26). We will take each of these in turn.

There seems to have been a developing tradition in preexilic times concerning the ark as symbolizing YHWH’s presence. In early traditions, the ark is portrayed as a sacred object symbolizing the divine presence, particularly in holy war contexts (see Num 10:35–36; the so-called ark narrative in 1 Sam 4–6; 2 Sam 6; and Num 14:44).<sup>247</sup> In 2 Sam 6 the ark is portrayed as taken up to Jerusalem by David, and in 1 Kgs 8:6a it is portrayed as being brought into the inner sanctum of the Solomonic temple.<sup>248</sup> Because of the expression “YHWH of hosts, who sits/is enthroned on the cherubim [יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִּים]” associated with the ark in 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2, as well as its placement in the inner sanctum of the Solomonic temple where there are the two cherubim (1 Kgs 6:23–28) (traditionally associated with thrones of the gods in ancient Near Eastern iconography), some scholars maintain that the ark was conceived of as the throne of YHWH in preexilic times.<sup>249</sup> Others, however, see the ark, particularly as portrayed in association with the Solomonic/Jerusalem temple as the footstool of

245. See, e.g., Num 10:33; 14:44.

246. I say quite possibly because the relative dating of Deut 10:1–5 is difficult to determine in relation to Pg. However, since Pg seems to have changed the traditional Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic expression אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית to אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת, and I am not taking Exod 25:16, 21 as secondary additions but as part of Pg (contra, e.g., Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 48–50), it seems likely that Pg has drawn on Deut 10:1–5 in seeing the ark as a container for the הָעֵדֻת.

247. C. Leong Seow, “Ark of the Covenant,” *ABD* 1:387–91; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 612; Pekka Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From Settlement to the Building of Solomon’s Temple*, GDNE 5 (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2004), 39.

248. See n. 221 for an outline of pre-P material in 1 Kgs 8.

249. See also 2 Kgs 19:15; Jer 3:16–17. See Noth, *Exodus*, 205; von Rad, “Tent and the Ark,” 106, 121; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 299–301. Von Rad, however, sees the cherubim as merely protecting the ark, which is YHWH’s throne, whereas de Vaux sees the ark and the cherubim as representing the throne of God, with little or no distinction between the ark as throne or footstool.



YHWH (see, e.g., Pss 99:5; 132:7).<sup>250</sup> Be that as it may, in these traditions the ark signifies the presence of YHWH, albeit in an aniconic way.<sup>251</sup>

In these pre-P traditions in which the ark is associated with the presence of YHWH, there is no mention of the ark as a receptacle or storage box.<sup>252</sup> The Hebrew word for ark, אֲרוֹן, has the sense of chest or box (see 2 Kgs 12:9–11, where it refers to a collection box in the temple, and Gen 50:26, where it denotes a coffin).<sup>253</sup> In Mesopotamia documents, clay or stone tablets were sealed for safekeeping in a box.<sup>254</sup> In line with this, Deut 10:1–5 portrays the ark as the receptacle for the stone tablets inscribed with the law (the Decalogue).<sup>255</sup> Although the terminology of “ark of the covenant” (אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית) probably did not refer initially to the ark as container of the tablets as portrayed in Deut 10:1–5,<sup>256</sup> since this expression is not only used commonly throughout the Deuteronomistic literature but also in earlier traditions (see, e.g., 1 Sam 4:4; Num 10:33; 14:44), it takes on this meaning in light of Deut 10:1–5. Moreover, in Deuteronomy the ark is not associated with the presence of YHWH or with any imagery, suggesting that it has associations with YHWH’s throne or footstool.<sup>257</sup> Therefore, there would seem to be two distinct traditions concerning the ark, one as symbolizing the divine presence and the other as a receptacle for the tablets of the law.

The description of the ark in Pg’s account of the tabernacle in Exod 25:10–16, with its terminology of “the ark of the testimony” (אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת), its positioning in the most holy place, and with the *kapporet* with its cherubim on top of it (Exod 26:34; and see 25:21) would seem to be drawing on

---

250. Seow, “Ark of the Covenant,” 389; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 254–55; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 23; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 613; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 520; Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary*, 44.

251. In contrast to ancient Near Eastern god images, since the ark is not a representation of YHWH; Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary*, 41.

252. I am assuming with Campbell and O’Brien (*Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History*, 350) that 1 Kgs 8:3–5, 6b–11 is not pre-P but a later redaction and therefore that the ark within the Solomonic temple did not contain the tablets of stone as described in 1 Kgs 8:9.

253. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 612.

254. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 516.

255. See also Deut 31:26, which associates the ark with the book of the law, although its position is beside it rather than in it.

256. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 50.

257. Seow, “Ark of the Covenant,” 391.



both of the ark traditions outlined. Its placing under the *kapporet* on the ends of which, and as part of it, are the two cherubim (Exod 25:18–20), and within the most holy place (Exod 26:35), echoes the placing of the ark within the inner sanctum of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 8:6a) where the two large cherubim are stationed (1 Kgs 6:23–28). This suggests that the ark in Pg is associated in some way symbolically with the tradition of the ark (along with the cherubim) as signifying the divine presence;<sup>258</sup> this is confirmed in Exod 25:22 with the notice that YHWH will meet (יעד) with Moses there.<sup>259</sup> But its designation as “the ark of the testimony” (ארון העדות), which would seem to be a deliberate renaming of the ark by Pg with reference to “the ark of the covenant” (ארון הברית), along with the placing of the “testimony” (העדות) within the ark (Exod 25:16, 21), would seem to be taking up the tradition of the ark as receptacle as found in Deut 10:1–5 albeit in transformed form.<sup>260</sup>

Taking this latter point first, it is necessary to explore what Pg might mean in using the terminology of העדות with reference to the ארון העדות and the placement of the העדות within the ark. עדת is in some ways equivalent to ברית in that it can refer to oaths, covenants, or treaties,<sup>261</sup> but at the same time its root עוד has the sense of witness.<sup>262</sup> It is understandable that Pg would not use ברית in relation to the ark in this context of the Sinai tabernacle instructions, since for Pg ברית refers to the covenants with Noah and Abraham only (Gen 9:8–17; 17); there is no covenant (ברית) at Sinai in Pg.<sup>263</sup> But to what then does העדות refer? The context of the ארון העדות

258. The precise symbolism is explored in the later discussion.

259. The portrayal of divine presence in Pg will be taken up later, in §4.2.1.3.

260. On the renaming, see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 50. Nihan (48–49) sees Exod 25:16, 21b as later additions preparing for 31:18, which is late, i.e., a pentateuchal redaction. Although I have not included 31:18 within Pg, agreeing with Nihan that this is late, this is not necessarily the case for 25:16, 21b, since, as argued below, these verses do not, in my opinion, refer to the stone tablets referred to in 31:18, but in some way to the instructions for the tabernacle as outlined in Exod 25–29\*. I am assuming here that Deut 10:1–5 is earlier than Pg: see n. 246.

261. Seow, “Ark of the Covenant,” 387.

262. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 50.

263. See *ibid.* Pace C. Leong Seow (“The Designation of the Ark in Priestly Theology,” *HAR* 8 [1984]: 194), who sees העדות as referring to the stone tablets of the covenant at Sinai in Exod 31:18. However, as we have delineated Pg here, Exod 31:18 is not included, and seen as a later redaction, and therefore העדות cannot refer to the stone tablets on which the law is inscribed.

of the instructions for the tabernacle at Sinai provides a clue. With its connotation of witness or attestation, it is likely that העדות refers in some way to Pg's tabernacle or the instructions for it. Susanne Owczarek, followed by Nihan, suggests that ארון העדות is that which witnesses to YHWH's presence in Israel.<sup>264</sup> In support of this, some Priestly texts (though admittedly most are later than Pg) refer to "the tent of the testimony" (אהל העדות, Num 9:15; 17:22, 23; 18:2) or "the tabernacle of the testimony" (משכן העדות, Num 1:50, 53; 10:11) where העדות can be interpreted as standing for the tent or tabernacle as the means of divine presence;<sup>265</sup> and, of course, in Exod 25:22, the place of YHWH's presence within the sanctuary is where the ארון העדות is situated, along with the *kapporet* with its cherubim. This is a definite possibility. However, this does not account for the references to the placing of העדות into the ark in Exod 25:16, 21.<sup>266</sup> In light of Exod 25:16, 21, the connotation of העדות as witness, and the close association of העדות with the tent/tabernacle in this context and (the later) Priestly expressions of the tent/tabernacle of the testimony, it seems most likely that העדות refers to a document containing the divine instructions for the tabernacle, albeit as the means of the divine presence. This is basically the view of Thomas Dozeman.<sup>267</sup> It is also close to the position of Mark George, who sees העדות as the building inscription of the tabernacle, on the analogy of the Neo-Assyrian practice of placing building inscriptions in stone boxes, that is, foundation deposit boxes, which were placed in the walls or foundations of the building.<sup>268</sup> This, he maintains, has been reshaped in Pg by the placing of the ark with its inscription in the most holy place;<sup>269</sup> I would add, so has the building inscription form been reshaped in Pg with its emphasis on divine instruction rather than the building process,<sup>270</sup> its detailed repetitive nature, its lack of any reference

264. Owczarek, *Vorstellung vom "Wohnen Gottes inmitten seines Volkes" in der Priesterschrift*, 170–71; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 50.

265. Owczarek, *Vorstellung vom "Wohnen Gottes inmitten seines Volkes" in der Priesterschrift*, 170–71; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 50.

266. I have included Exod 25:16, 21 within Pg; *pace* Owczarek and Nihan, who see Exod 25:16, 21b as later insertions and thus the ארון העדות as containing no tablets or documents.

267. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 614.

268. George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 41, 157–60, 167–74.

269. *Ibid.*, 172.

270. *Pace* George (*ibid.*, 171), who sees this inscription as containing Exod 25–31; 35–40 whereas in my view it is only the divine instructions in Exod 25–29\* (and the

to a king, and its description as a mobile tent rather than a fixed building, as discussed above. If the **העדת** refers to a document containing the divine instructions for the tabernacle as the means of the divine presence, then the **ארון העדת** (“the ark of the testimony”) is the receptacle for the record of these divine instructions. Thus Pg has drawn on the tradition of the ark of the covenant (**ארון הברית**) as the receptacle for the stone tablets of the law (Deut 10:1–5) but transformed it to become the ark of the testimony (**ארון העדת**), the receptacle for the divine instructions for the tabernacle, now positioned in the most holy place.

The placing of the ark within the most holy place, and more specifically under the *kapporet* with its cherubim, brings us to the issue of the way in which Pg seems to have drawn, not only on the tradition of the ark as a receptacle, but also on ark traditions in which the ark signifies divine presence. There is already a hint of this in the content of **העדת** for which it is a receptacle, as the divine instructions for the tabernacle as the means of YHWH’s presence. Moreover, the ark as both a receptacle for the testimony (**העדת**) and its association with YHWH’s presence as reflected in Pg would seem to be coherent with ancient Near Eastern practices of putting important documents such as oaths and covenants under images of the gods in temples and thus in close proximity to the deity’s presence.<sup>271</sup> In order to understand the particular way in which Pg has combined the traditions of the ark as receptacle with the traditional symbols associated with divine presence, including the ark, it is necessary to explore the *kapporet* with its cherubim, which in Pg is placed on the ark of the testimony (Exod 25:17–22; 26:34), the possible traditions that Pg has drawn on and reshaped, and the resulting symbolism.

Cherubim in the ancient Near East are associated with divine presence and in particular are often portrayed as throne bearers of the gods.<sup>272</sup> They are also portrayed as guardians or protectors (Gen 3:24). In the Solomonic temple, the large cherubim in the inner sanctum (1 Kgs 6:23–28) represent throne bearers, though without the explicit mention of a throne: they signify the space where YHWH is invisibly enthroned.<sup>273</sup> Pg would seem to

---

brief notices of their execution and consequences in Exod 39–40\*) as contained in my Pg that would form the content of **העדת**.

271. See de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 301; Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary*, 44.

272. See, e.g., Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 21–22.

273. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 518–20; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 246; Seow, “Ark of the Covenant,” 389; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 37; Othmar Keel,

have drawn on this but reshaped it: in Pg, the cherubim are part of the *kapporet*, situated at either end and therefore much smaller than the 10-cubit-high cherubim of the Solomonic temple, since the *kapporet* itself is only 2.5 by 1.5 cubits (Exod 25:17–19); and, moreover, Pg's cherubim face one another and are looking down at the *kapporet*, with their wings stretched over it, in contrast to the Solomonic temple cherubim, which stand side by side and face toward the entrance of the inner sanctum.<sup>274</sup> Before investigating what Pg's cherubim might signify, it is necessary first to discuss the *kapporet* of which they are a part.

The *kapporet* is only mentioned in Priestly material (with the exception of the later text of 1 Chr 28:11)<sup>275</sup> and could therefore be seen as an innovation of Pg (or at least the Priestly circles that gave rise to Pg). The meaning of the term *kapporet* has been associated with כפר (*piel*), “to wipe out,” thus to cleanse or purify.<sup>276</sup> However, in the specific context of Exod 25:17, it is portrayed as having the same length and width as the ark (that is, 2.5 by 1.5 cubits, Exod 25:10, 17) and as placed upon it and possibly reflects the connotation of “to cover” or “hide” (from *kapara*), since it does seem to function as a covering for the upper surface of the ark.<sup>277</sup> Leaving aside the derivation of the term, the description of the *kapporet* as having two cherubim, one at either end, and of a piece with it, and as that above which YHWH will meet with Moses, between the cherubim (Exod 25:22), indicates that the *kapporet* with its cherubim parallels and replaces the cherubim throne of the Solomonic temple.<sup>278</sup> But what exactly does it signify here in Pg? The positioning of the *kapporet* in relation to the ark and the specific description of its rather diminutive cherubim will help to clarify this.

---

“Paraphernalia of Jerusalem Sanctuaries and Their Relation to Deities Worshipped Therein during the Iron Age II A–C,” in Kamlah, *Temple Building and Temple Cult*, 329–32; Kamlah, “Temples of the Levant: Comparative Aspects,” 526. Cf. von Rad (“Tent and the Ark,” 106), who sees the function of the cherubim in the Solomonic temple as guarding the ark, which he sees as the throne of YHWH.

274. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 20.

275. Exod 25:17, 18, 19, 20, 21; 26:34; 30:6; 37:9; 39:35; 40:20; Num 7:89; Lev 16:2, 13, 14, 15.

276. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 521; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 44–45; and see Lev 16:14, 15.

277. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 45, and n. 136.

278. *Ibid.*, 46.

The *kapporet* is placed exactly over the ark, since it has the same dimensions, and since the cherubim are an intrinsic part of the *kapporet*, the *kapporet* seems to function as that which links the cherubim more closely with the ark than is the case in the description of the Solomonic temple where the ark and the cherubim are separate objects brought together only so far as they both occupy the inner sanctum.<sup>279</sup> Might it be, then, that Pg, in linking more closely the ark and the cherubim, is, on the one hand, reinforcing the tradition of the ark that associates it with divine presence, given the association of cherubim with divine presence, and, on the other hand, reinforcing the function of the ark as receptacle for the testimony, given that the cherubim cover the *kapporet* with their wings and look down at it as it sits on the ark, thus protecting the ark and its contents?<sup>280</sup> This is likely, but in order to understand the specific nuances of this, especially in relation to the traditions of the cherubim as enthroning YHWH, as found in the Solomonic temple, and of the ark as throne/footstool, it is necessary to explore further Pg's specific imagery of the cherubim.

There is a complex debate surrounding the symbolism of the cherubim in Pg. Many scholars maintain that the cherubim in Pg, unlike the cherubim described in relation to the Solomonic temple, no longer symbolize throne bearers for YHWH.<sup>281</sup> In support of this, the usual verb for YHWH's enthronement (ישב, see, e.g., ישב הכרבים in 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15)<sup>282</sup> is not used here in relation to the ark and the

---

279. I am assuming with Campbell and O'Brien (*Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History*, 350) that 1 Kgs 8:6b–7 is late. See von Rad, "Tent and the Ark," 106; Liss, "Imaginary Sanctuary," 685–86. Liss (p. 686) indeed maintains that "literarily, P 'invented' the כפרת in order to assign a new location to the ארון and the cherubim."

280. Liss ("Imaginary Sanctuary," 686) takes this in a different direction, maintaining that in making a close connection between the ark and the cherubim via the *kapporet*, P links the Northern and Southern Kingdoms, symbolized respectively by the ark and the cherubim.

281. Seow, "Designation of the Ark," 190–91; Seow, "Ark of the Covenant," 392; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 87–88; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 613–14; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 519; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 389, 390 n. 501. Cf. Haran (*Temples and Temple Service*, 248–51) who maintains that Pg's cherubim are the counterpart of the two cherubim of the Solomonic temple and represent nothing less than the throne of God.

282. See also the ancient Near Eastern iconography of kings/deities sitting on thrones. See Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 25–28.

*kapporet* with its cherubim.<sup>283</sup> Instead, יעד (meet) is used in this context: YHWH will meet (יעד) with Moses from above the *kapporet* between the two cherubim (Exod 25:22). Therefore, it is argued, the cherubim of the *kapporet* in Pg, rather than being associated with a throne, function as guards (or guardian angels) of the ark and its testimony.<sup>284</sup> Clearly part of the function of the cherubim, as facing each other with their wings overshadowing the *kapporet* is to protect the *kapporet* and the ark. It is true that Pg has moved away from the traditional formulation of YHWH as king seated (ישוב) on the cherubim.<sup>285</sup> But this is not the case entirely; if this were so, why would Pg have the iconography of the cherubim as part of the *kapporet* within the most holy place at all? The very presence of the cherubim recalls the traditional association of the thrones of deities and thus more generally at least as the place of divine presence.<sup>286</sup> Although YHWH is no longer enthroned (ישוב), above the *kapporet* and between the cherubim is still the site of divine presence or manifestation but now expressed in terms of the meeting point (יעד) between divine and human, between YHWH and Moses.<sup>287</sup> Since the *kapporet* with its cherubim sits on top of, and therefore is very closely linked with, the ark, the traditional association of the ark with divine presence is reinforced.<sup>288</sup>

---

283. Ibid., 88, 90.

284. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 87–88; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 614; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 389. Seow (“Designation of the Ark,” 190–91; “Ark of the Covenant,” 392) reduces the significance of the cherubim further, maintaining that they are simply ornaments.

285. See Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 25–28, 37 for a discussion of the association of ישוב with YHWH as king enthroned in the temple.

286. George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 172.

287. See Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 46), who notes that in P “the space between the two cherubim—which, as hybrid beings, mark themselves the boundary between heaven and earth—nevertheless remains the *axis mundi*, the focal point where heaven and earth converge.”

288. Pace, e.g., Seow (“Ark of the Covenant,” 392) and Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 614–15), who see the function of the ark as receptacle of the testimony only. Michael Hundley (*Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*, FAT 2/50 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 40), while maintaining that the ark and the *kapporet* in P are clearly connected to divine presence, reinforces the point that they serve as the location where YHWH manifests his presence (יעד, Exod 25:22) and, unlike ancient Near Eastern cult images, do not partake in the divine essence. This is also the case with the earlier traditions concerning the ark as associated with divine presence upon which Pg draws: see n. 251.

The lack of any reference to the enthronement of YHWH (יְהוָה) suggests that Pg is reshaping earlier traditions regarding divine presence and in particular that Pg is dispensing with a static notion of divine presence suggested by the imagery of the deity sitting on a throne at a fixed location, that is, in Jerusalem.<sup>289</sup>

In sum, Pg's close linking of the cherubim on the *kapporet* with the ark as receptacle of the testimony has a double function: it associates the ark with the divine presence, thus reinforcing this tradition but distancing the traditional imagery of YHWH as sitting as enthroned; and it reinforces the importance of the testimony (the instructions for the tabernacle as the means of God's presence) and the ark as its receptacle in that the cherubim guard or protect it with their outstretched wings. By introducing the *kapporet* as linking ark and cherubim and thereby reshaping and combining the ark traditions associated with divine presence and as receptacle for the law and the cherubim traditions, Pg has presented a unique picture or paradigmatic vision of the furniture in the most holy place and its significance. The implications of this will be taken up further when the issue of Pg's paradigm of divine presence is explored in the later discussion.

### Resulting Paradigmatic Picture

What is the resulting paradigmatic picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting with its furniture, formed as it is from drawing on earlier tent and temple traditions as well as other traditions and reshaping and synthesizing these with its own unique elements?

There has been a tendency in the past to perceive the identity of Pg's tabernacle/tent of meeting either primarily in terms of the tent tradition or in terms of the temple tradition, in particular the Jerusalem temple tradition. The result of this has been to underplay the significance of the features drawn from the temple tradition if the tent tradition is seen as primary, or to underplay the significance of the features drawn from the tent tradition if the temple tradition is seen as primary. For example, the older view advocated by Wellhausen and others that Pg's sanctuary is a retrojection of the Jerusalem temple back into the wilderness and therefore transformed into a portable tent<sup>290</sup> stresses the identity of the

289. See the later discussion concerning divine presence in Pg in §4.2.1.3.

290. See Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Atlanta: Scholars



Pg tabernacle in Jerusalemite temple terms at the expense of the old tent tradition. On the other hand, there are those such as Cross, Fretheim, and Haran, who see the identity of the tabernacle/tent of meeting as primarily a tent and for whom, correspondingly, the Solomonic/Jerusalem temple traditions are either practically nonexistent, or something against which Pg's tabernacle/tent of meeting is a polemic, or a call to return to the tent tradition rather than the rebuilding of a second temple in the postexilic period.<sup>291</sup>

However, rather than seeing the identity of Pg's tabernacle/tent of meeting primarily in terms of the earlier tent traditions or the Jerusalem temple tradition, it is preferable to see in Pg's description of the tabernacle/tent of meeting a genuine synthesis of tent and temple traditions reshaped in themselves and in relation to each other with other distinctive elements (such as the *kapporet*) in such a way as to present a unique picture. Thus, for example, the tent traditions have been reshaped to include temple traditions of graded zones corresponding to proximity to the divine presence with corresponding gradations in the quality and value of the materials used and corresponding furniture such as the ark; and these temple traditions have been reshaped into a smaller, simpler, and less ornate structure (at least compared to the Solomonic/Jerusalem temple), where the walls and the furniture are no longer fixed to a particular site but are portable with the walls becoming the curtains of a tent and the furniture having rings and poles. Such a synthesis of reshaped past traditions and unique elements, while not corresponding exactly to any past traditions, though embodying recognizable reminiscences at every turn, presents a paradigmatic picture, a vision for the future.

However, yet more can be said about the distinctive traits of this paradigmatic picture and what its paradigmatic nature consists in, or is reinforced by, over and above its nature as a synthesis of reshaped past traditions and unique elements into a future vision.

The ordering of the items described in Exod 25–27\* is significant. The order moves from the inside toward the outside, beginning with the furniture within the most holy place, the ark (Exod 25:10–16) and the *kapporet*

---

Press, 1994), 38–45, and followed by, e.g., Kuenen, Gressmann, Pedersen, as cited in Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem," 17.

291. Nonexistent: Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle"; "Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon"; polemic: Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem"; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 197; call to return: Fretheim, "Priestly Document."



with its cherubim (25:17–22), followed by the furniture of the holy place, the table (25:23–30), and the lampstand (25:31–39), then the structure of the tabernacle (26), and finally the altar of the court and the court itself (27:1–8 and 27:9–19).<sup>292</sup> This suggests that what is being described is from the divine perspective.<sup>293</sup> This is reinforced by Dozeman's observation that the terminology of "tabernacle" (משכן) is used repeatedly in Exod 25–27 whereas the terminology of "tent of meeting" (אהל מועד) is used repeatedly in Exod 28–29 and that this suggests that Exod 25–27 is describing the sanctuary (משכן) primarily from the point of view of YHWH who will dwell there (שכן, 25:8) whereas Exod 28–29, concerning the priesthood, is describing the sanctuary (אהל מועד) from a different perspective, that is, from the human perspective of the priesthood who enter the sanctuary and participate in its rituals.<sup>294</sup> The description of the tabernacle and its furnishings from the divine perspective in Exod 25–27\* is highlighted also, not only through the ordering of the items described, but by the refrain found throughout these chapters that these items and the tabernacle itself are to be made in accordance with the "pattern" (תבנית) that YHWH shows Moses on the mountain (25:9, 40; and see 26:30; 27:8 although תבנית is not used there). Given this, and the form of Exod 25–27 as divine instructions,<sup>295</sup> the tabernacle and its furnishings as described reflect YHWH's choices or preferences for the divine dwelling and therefore something of who YHWH is.<sup>296</sup> It is portrayed as the divine vision for how YHWH may be present on earth.

Those who receive and participate in these instructions, whether the ancient Israelite audience or the reader, are therefore invited to participate in the divine perspective concerning the tabernacle, this sacred space as the means of YHWH's dwelling on earth, in being guided through the tabernacle as described from the inside, beginning with furniture of the most holy place, to the outside, ending with the court. Amy Robertson has argued convincingly that the style of the text, and in particular the

292. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 603; George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 133.

293. George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space*, 133.

294. Tabernacle terminology: Exod 25:9; 26:1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30, 35; 27:9, 19; tent terminology: Exod 28:43; 29:4, 10, 11, 30, 32, 42, 44. See Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 598.

295. Rather than as a description of the actual building process, as is common in the ancient Near Eastern building inscriptions.

296. See Robertson, "He Kept the Measurements," 194–96.

repetition of details, are designed to engender visualization, “to evoke a visionary, meditative experience.”<sup>297</sup> The detailed repetitive description of items such as the cherubim as part of the *kapporet*, and in particular the lampstand (Exod 25:28–29, 33–35), create a visual experience, “almost as if it is leading the mind’s eye over the surface of the object.”<sup>298</sup> This has the effect of allowing the reader to appreciate each aspect of the object, as well as the object itself, and creates a sense of discovery.<sup>299</sup> Although such repetition is found mainly in Exod 25\* and does not pervade the whole of Exod 25–27\*, Robertson argues that the repetition and its absence (e.g., in the description of the tabernacle’s structure in Exod 26) work together to create a coherent visual experience akin to a visual guided tour in which some objects or aspects are dwelt over at length and others skipped over more lightly depending on how visually or aesthetically interesting and how visually available they are for someone being guided through the tabernacle space.<sup>300</sup>

Robertson goes further in likening the effect of the tabernacle text on the reader in terms of a visual experience or guided tour as similar to participating in ritual. She aligns features within the tabernacle text with features characteristic of ritual activity, in particular its repetition and formalism (or patterns and refrains), but also performance (what the text does for the experience of the reader) and authenticity of engagement (for without this the reader merely tunes out from the repetition and detail). As such the tabernacle text can be called ritualized text.<sup>301</sup> She states:

The experience-oriented nature of this text—its strong appeal to the senses ... and its general preference to avoid abstraction ... —these things offer the absorbed reader an experience that very closely mimics an actual ritual performance. The fact that this experience is facilitated largely through repetition and formalism—two features commonly asso-

---

297. Ibid., 139; and see George, *Israel’s Tabernacle*, 68–69.

298. Robertson, “He Kept the Measurements,” 162.

299. Ibid., 177, 183.

300. Ibid., 168–69, 176–78. E.g., the lampstand (Exod 25:31–40) is easily observed and is visually interesting, whereas the altar in the court is not, and the leather coverings (26:7–10) are neither visually available nor visually interesting for someone walking through the tabernacle space, and hence the different style of description for each of these.

301. See *ibid.*, 2, 28–29, 35, 74–75, 77.

ciated with ritual performance—creates a strong case for understanding this text as ritualized literature.<sup>302</sup>

Moreover, Robertson maintains that this ritualized text, and in particular its repetitive nature and the way it evokes a visual experience, tends to affect the reader's perception of time, in the sense of slowing or even denying the passage of time. The text describes static, unchanging objects, and the repetition within it gives the impression that each moment is almost the same, evoking an enduring experience that seems to be the same moment over and over again, making it difficult for the reader to orient themselves in relation to time.<sup>303</sup> In these ways, the tabernacle text, in a way similar to ritual, directs attention away from the passage of time: time is in a sense transcended.<sup>304</sup> Since the tabernacle is the means of YHWH's dwelling in the midst of Israel, the implicit message therefore is that God, or Israel's connection to God, is not ruled by time.<sup>305</sup>

Although approaching Exod 25–27\* from a different angle, the coherence of Robertson's observations and arguments regarding the ritualized form of the text and its effect on the reader in terms of its hermeneutics of time with Gorman's discussion of founding rituals is apparent. I have argued that Exod 25–27\*, along with the execution of these instructions (Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b) and the consequences (Exod 40:34), represents the founding of sacred space in Gorman's terms.<sup>306</sup> For Gorman, such founding rituals are set in the past and yet are a paradigm of what is to be and therefore transcend time past/present/future, and the ritual texts that describe them open up a worldview or world of meaning for the reader, or, in my terminology, embody a world of meaning that the reader can enter into and appropriate cognitively and existentially.<sup>307</sup> Robertson in a sense has explored more deeply what occurs for the reader, or reader-participant, taking into account the style and form of the text as more precisely defined, particularly in relation to the sensual or more

---

302. *Ibid.*, 185–86.

303. As well as space, according to Robertson (*ibid.*, 197), as seen from the way in which Exod 25–26\* delays describing where each item of furniture in the tabernacle is situated in relation to each other (Exod 26:33–35) until after the detailed description of each (Exod 25\*).

304. See *ibid.*, 70–71, 177, 188, 197–206.

305. *Ibid.*, 227.

306. See ch. 3 n. 167; and above n. 186.

307. See §3.3, above.

specifically the visual experience that is engendered: the reader experiences this ritualized text in a way akin to participating in a ritual, and it is through this experience that the implicit meanings of this ritualized text are arrived at. For both, time plays a role: for Gorman, time is transcended since past, present, and future are collapsed into a timeless paradigm; whereas for Robertson the passage of time is in a sense suspended into a kind of static timelessness, and in this sense time is transcended. Robertson's discussion therefore, though differently nuanced, complements that of Gorman and as such reinforces the paradigmatic nature (as unfolded in ch. 3) of the tabernacle text in Exod 25–27\*.

Gorman, however, goes beyond, or diverges from, Robertson's framework, in that, whereas for Robertson the experience of the reader akin to participating in a ritual comprises primarily a visual or imaginative experience through which implicit messages or meaning are received, for Gorman such (founding) ritual texts not only provide a worldview (or cognitive aspect) that impacts on the reader, but the performance or acting out of the ritual ordinances described are a way of enacting, actualizing, and realizing this worldview and situating oneself in that world.<sup>308</sup> Consequently, the issue arises as to whether or not the instructions in Exod 25–27\* are intended to be carried out and actualized in the concrete world or whether they are intended to remain as an imaginary vision only.

As is often pointed out, the description of the tabernacle contained in the instructions in Exod 25–27\* seem to be inherently ambiguous in that although presenting a detailed description, there are significant gaps that work against attempts to determine how exactly it and some of its objects might be constructed and where exactly its furnishing should be situated.<sup>309</sup> For example, the width cannot be calculated precisely because the width of the corner frames is not given (Exod 25:23). The height of the *kapporet* is not given. Even though there is much detail provided in relation to the lampstand, it is difficult to gain a clear picture of it as a whole. Information about the exact positioning of the tabernacle within the court is not provided, nor is the exact location of the ark and *kapporet* within the most holy place, the table and lampstand within the holy place (although their position relative to each other is given), or the altar within

---

308. See §3.1.3, above.

309. See, e.g., Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 150, 155; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 625–26; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 497, 512; George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 73–74.

the court. In light of these gaps, some scholars see the instructions in Exod 25–27\* as purely imaginary rather than as something to be constructed.<sup>310</sup> Others, though leaning in this direction, are a little more ambivalent. For example, Dozeman, on the one hand, seems to see the tabernacle instructions as imaginary, that is, as a utopian picture that takes the reader into an alternative world that provides a refuge and a critical perspective on the sacred for the exilic/postexilic Israelites; but, on the other hand, he sees the plans for the tabernacle from God as a blueprint,<sup>311</sup> and he speaks of the “tendency of the literature towards concreteness” and its tendency to “push the interpreter towards concreteness, not abstraction,” with the literary description of the tabernacle as “certainly intended to influence postexilic cultic practice.”<sup>312</sup> George tends toward the view that the tabernacle described in Exod 25–27 is an “imagined space” whose “spatial practices of portability and orientation make possible the metaphorical and symbolic re-creation and reproduction of tabernacle space wherever Israel finds itself, even if no physical objects of the tabernacle exist.”<sup>313</sup> On the other hand, he speaks of the “material plausibility” of the descriptions of the tabernacle and its objects.<sup>314</sup>

Acknowledging the gaps, but also the concrete detailed descriptions that have the character of material plausibility, it seems to me that the tabernacle and its furnishings as described in Exod 25–27\* can in essence be put into practice in one form or another. Given the gaps, at various times the praxis of constructing the tabernacle may take slightly different form or shape (e.g., the width may vary), some of the objects may take different forms (such as the height of the *kapporet* or the exact appearance of the lampstand), and the exact placement of the tabernacle within the court and the exact placement of the furniture within the assigned spaces (the ark and the *kapporet* with its cherubim in the most holy place and the table and lamp within the holy place) may vary. However, even with these variations, indeed, put more positively, with the scope for creative variation, there is enough description to capture the essentials of what is visualized for it to be put into practice, such that this vision or paradigm is embodied

---

310. See, e.g., Liss, “Imaginary Sanctuary”; Robertson, “He Kept the Measurements,” 135, 169, 172, 185.

311. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 610.

312. *Ibid.*, 627.

313. George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, 16 and 188.

314. *Ibid.*, 13, 43.

in one form or another; its essence can be embodied throughout time in various ways (and indeed can act as a measure to judge the places of worship throughout time) such that this founding ritual of sacred space that is relevant for all time, and in that sense is timeless or transcends time, is concretely enacted and its worldview realized in the life of the ancient Israelites. Therefore, I would go a step further than George, who maintains that the portability and orientation of the tabernacle space described makes possible its metaphorical and symbolic re-creation and reproduction wherever Israel finds itself, to conclude that the intention of this text is for this to occur, not only imaginatively, but also concretely as a way, in Gorman's terms, of realizing its worldview or, in terms of the original audience, for ancient Israel to situate itself within that worldview wherever it finds itself through time.<sup>315</sup>

#### 4.2.1.2. The Priesthood

Similar comments can be made concerning the paradigmatic nature of the "founding ritual" of the priesthood/sacred persons in Exod 28–29\* as were made for the founding ritual of sacred space in Exod 25–27\* with regard to the way in which it reshapes past traditions, synthesizing these with each other and with its own unique, indeed programmatic, elements to present a vision of the future or a paradigm that transcends time; and, as ritualized text, it impacts its audience by engendering a visual experience (see esp. Exod 28\*<sup>316</sup>) that in a sense suspends time and allows the audience to enter into its worldview through the experience of this imaginary vision, as well as to enact its ordinances concretely. Accordingly, Pg's unique paradigmatic picture of the priesthood in Exod 28–29\* will be explored taking into account the way in which earlier traditions appear to have been reshaped and synthesized with unique elements to present a vision that transcends, or is pertinent for, all time. The more general issue of the prominence of a

---

315. Part of the essence of this tabernacle paradigm is that there is no place for a king or even for the imagery of YHWH as enthroned king (see George [*Israel's Tabernacle*, 164–65], who surmises that the role of king in relation to this building project is played by YHWH). Since no king is needed, this coheres with the dating of Pg in the exilic/early postexilic period and supports the view taken here that the essence of the tabernacle instructions in Exod 25–27\* are intended to be put into practice concretely in the future.

316. Robertson, "He Kept the Measurements," esp. 145–46, 151, 154–63.

primary or high priest pictured here and that this figure is Aaron specifically, with he and his sons constituting the priesthood, will be addressed first before exploring the details of the priestly clothing and ordination as described in Exod 28–29\*.

#### Aaron as High Priest and the Aaronite Priesthood in General

Pg's picture of the priesthood comprising Aaron as the primary or high priest and his sons as priests is foreshadowed to a certain extent in references within the Deuteronomistic History to the priesthood associated with the Jerusalem temple, particularly from the divided monarchy onward.<sup>317</sup> For example, 2 Kgs 12:11 refers to **הכהן הגדול** ("the great priest") with reference to Jehoiada, as does 22:4, 8; 23:4 in relation to Hilkiah; and 25:18 refers to Seraiah as **כהן הראש** ("chief priest"). In the context of 2 Kgs 12:11, priests are referred to (12:5, 8–9); 23:4; 25:18 refer to a second priest or priests (**כהן משנה**); and 19:2 refers to senior priests (**זקני הכהנים**; see also Isa 37:2). Therefore, in the late preexilic period, there appears to have been a hierarchy within the priesthood associated with the Jerusalem temple, with the great or chief priest singled out by name. This has similarities with Pg's picture of Aaron as high priest among the priests, though in Pg these are his sons, and Pg could well be drawing on the structures of the Jerusalem priesthood in the late preexilic period. However, if so, Pg has reshaped these considerably in that Aaron has a much more significant role than appears to be the case for the great/chief priests of the Jerusalem temple. Clearly, in 2 Kgs 12:22–23 (and see also 16:10–16), the great/chief priests are under the authority of the king: the priests, including the great/chief priest and second priests, exercise their temple duties, which seem to be concerned primarily with temple maintenance and alterations, at the command of the king. It is the king who is the religious and cultic authority rather than the great/chief priests, who are effectively royal servants. It is the king who makes the decisions con-

317. The references to the Levites as subordinate to the Aaronites in the Priestly material (Num 3–4\*; 8\*) is perceived as later than Pg and not included in it and therefore will not be addressed in our discussion of the priesthood. The picture of the priesthood closest to this later Priestly material concerning the Levites is found in the Zadokite additions in Ezek 40–48 (esp. 44:10–16; 48:11) where they are subordinated to the Zadokite priesthood, but these texts are also generally seen as relatively late; see, e.g., Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 88.



cerning the temple, who is often pictured as carrying out a sacrificial role (see, e.g., 1 Kgs 8:62–64; 2 Kgs 16:12–13), and who represents the nation before God.<sup>318</sup> However, in Pg there is no king, with Moses instead having the key role within this reshaped building inscription, and there is a move away from the traditional motif of YHWH as enthroned king. Instead, Pg has elevated the role of the priesthood, and the high priest in particular, in that Aaron as high priest is set up, via the divine instructions and through the agency of Moses, as the central figure in cultic matters and the one who represents the nation before God (see Exod 28:11–12, 21, 29–30) in place of the king. It is the Aaronic priesthood whereby the role of high priest is passed on to Aaron's heirs (see Num 20:22b–29) that is to be the religious and cultic authority for the Israelites into the future and not a king.<sup>319</sup> The role and identity of Aaron as high priest and his heirs the Aaronites in Pg is therefore different from that of the preexilic priests under the monarchy as presented in 2 Kings; it is more high profile and indeed takes on the religious and cultic role traditionally played by the king.

But where might the identification of the figure of Aaron in particular as high priest and the Aaronic priesthood in Pg have come from? Though the figure of Aaron is found in preexilic texts, there seems in these earlier traditions to be no direct and explicit association of Aaron with the priesthood, and there is no mention of Aaronite priests. Can any background to this be discerned from the texts concerning the priesthood that have come down to us, or might it be that Pg has introduced this *de novo* as a programmatic vision partly on the basis of earlier traditions concerning Aaron as a leadership figure associated with Moses?

Without entering into the minefield of attempting to construct a history of the priesthood *per se*,<sup>320</sup> some significant observations from earlier

---

318. Deborah Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*, OTM (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 48–49, 73–79.

319. Rooke (*ibid.*, 78–79) also argues that the high priest's profile is more elevated within P because within P there is only one sanctuary and one priesthood, whereas in the preexilic period the Jerusalem temple (even in light of the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah since they were not very effective) was not the only sanctuary within Israel, with the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood never achieving overriding religious importance before the exile.

320. The history of the priesthood in ancient Israel is notoriously difficult to try to reconstruct, and, while several attempts have been made, most acknowledge that there are many gaps and that any reconstruction is at best tentative and ultimately remains in the realm of speculation. This is particularly the case with regard to such issues as



texts prior to Pg regarding who were identified as priests in ancient Israel, by way of comparison and contrast to Pg's selection of Aaron as high priest and an Aaronite priesthood, are as follows.

Some early traditions associate the priesthood with the Levites. For example, Deut 33:8–11 associates priesthood with the Levites, and in Judg 17:7–13 Micah is portrayed as installing a Bethlehem Levite to be his priest on the basis of which he believes YHWH will make him prosperous. However, other early texts do not associate the priesthood with Levites. For example, Micah is said to have installed his son as his priest prior to installing the Levite as his priest (Judg 17:5). Texts in Samuel speak of Eli and his sons as priests at Shiloh (1 Sam 1–3) with no explicit mention of them as Levites, and this is also the case with regard to the Elides, Ahijah (1 Sam 14:3), Ahimelech (1 Sam 21:2), and Abiathar (1 Sam 22:20–21).

During the Davidic monarchy, the priests comprise David's sons (2 Sam 8:18), Abiathar, Zadok, and Ira the Jairite (2 Sam 8:17; 20:25–26), none of whom are associated with the Levites.<sup>321</sup> Abiathar, according to the tradition (1 Sam 22, esp. 20–21), was the only surviving descendant of Eli who had escaped when Saul destroyed the Elide priesthood at Nob (1 Sam 22), the new cult center they had set up after Shiloh was destroyed. Zadok seems to simply appear, named alongside Abiathar, as does Ira the Jairite, as David's priests (2 Sam 8:17; 20:25–26). It is generally acknowl-

---

the detailed history of the identity of the Levites and their relationship to the priesthood; the origins of Zadok the priest and the subsequent history of the Zadokites; as well as the origins and rise to prominence of the Aaronite priesthood. For discussions and various hypotheses concerning the history of the priesthood in general, see, e.g., de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 345–405; Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*, AnBib 35 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969); Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 58–111, esp. 84–111; Leopold Sabourin, *Priesthood: A Comparative Study*, SHR 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 98–157, esp. 122–35; Richard Nelson, *Raising up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 3–14; Lester Grabbe, *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995); Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 66–97; Risto Nurmela, *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998); Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, esp. 44–79; Alice Hunt, *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*, LHBOTS 452 (London: T&T Clark, 2006); Leuchter and Hutton, *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*.

321. 2 Sam 8:17 refers to "Ahimelech son of Abiathar," but in light of 1 Sam 22:20 and 2 Sam 20:25 this should read "Abiathar son of Ahimelech"; see Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, 64–69.

edged that Zadok's origins are unknown: although one attractive suggestion is that he originally served the Jebusite sanctuary, this remains in the realm of speculation.<sup>322</sup>

In the portrayal of Solomon's reign, Abiathar is banished to Anathoth (1 Kgs 2:26–27), and it is the Zadokite priesthood that is portrayed as constituting the official priesthood in Jerusalem (see 1 Kgs 4:2–4).<sup>323</sup> Some scholars simply assume that the Zadokites would have continued to occupy the office of the priest during the Judaeen monarchy.<sup>324</sup> However, in the preexilic texts, Zadok is not mentioned in any of the descriptions of the monarchy after Solomon's time, nor are any descendants of Zadok mentioned beyond his son in 1 Kgs 4:2, and it is not known whether the preexilic priestly leadership in Jerusalem was hereditary.<sup>325</sup> There are no references within preexilic texts to other priests associated with the Jerusalem temple during the divided monarchy and up to the exile, such as Jehoiada (2 Kgs 11–12), Uriah (16:10–16), Hilkiah (22–23), and Seraiah (25:18), as being Zadokites or Levites for that matter.<sup>326</sup> It is therefore not possible on the evidence available to draw any credible conclusions regarding a Zadokite dynasty in Jerusalem extending throughout the monarchy.

---

322. 2 Sam 8:17 puts Zadok in the line of Ahitub, a descendant of Eli, but this conflicts with 1 Sam 2:27–36 that refers to Zadok replacing the Elide line, so its veracity is suspect. See Rooke (*Zadok's Heirs*, 63–64) who argues convincingly that 2 Sam 8:17 should be emended to “Zadok and Abiathar son of Ahimelech son of Ahitub.” The origins of Ira are also unknown. On Zadok serving in the Jebusite sanctuary, see Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 77; Cody, *History of Old Testament Priesthood*, 89–93; Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, 64–69.

323. The exilic reference in Jer 1:1 perhaps hints that a colony of priests existed there down to that time. The reference in 2 Kgs 2:4 to Abiathar is contradicted by the narrative in 1 Kgs 2:26–27.

324. See, e.g., de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 374; Cody, *History of Old Testament Priesthood*, 134; Nurmela, *Levites*, 179.

325. In 1 Kgs 4:2, Zadok's son is called Azariah, but in 2 Sam 18:27, 36 his son is called Ahimaaz. See further Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 76–77, 89; Hunt, *Missing Priests*, 81–86, 143.

326. A possible hint of a Zadokite association is the name of the high priest Joshua's father as Jehozadak (Hag 1:1, 12) in the Persian period, but this is a very late reference and is slim evidence for maintaining a Zadokite dynasty during the preexilic Judean monarchy. This is also the case with the Chronicler's genealogy (1 Chr 6:1–15) which maintains that during the Judean monarchy the chief priesthood was a hereditary office occupied by the descendants of Zadok—it is not only late but the list is probably fictive and schematic; see Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 84.

The next mention of Zadok after his portrayal and that of his son in the Solomonic era is in the late, that is, probably postexilic texts, in Ezek 40–48 (40:45–46; 43:19; 44:15–16; 48:11), where, unlike the references to Zadok in 2 Samuel, the sons of Zadok are called Levites (44:15; and see 43:19). Therefore, whether or not the preexilic priests in Jerusalem after Solomon were Zadokite, or even Levite, is unknown.

In the preexilic texts that describe the preexilic era, prestate and in the united and Judean monarchies under the Davidic line, therefore, there seems to have been many priestly groups or figures, some Levitical (e.g., Judg 17:7–13; Deut 33:8–11), others not (at least explicitly), for example, the Elides (1 Sam 1–3, 4; 22; 2 Sam 8:17–18; 20:25), David's sons (2 Sam 8:18), Zadok (2 Sam 8:17; 20:25), and Ira (2 Sam 8:17; 20:26). However, according to Deuteronomy, the core at least of which is preexilic, all priests are Levites, that is “sons of Levi” (Deut 10:8; 17:9, 18; 18:1; 21:5; 24:8; 31:9; 33:8).<sup>327</sup> Indeed, the standard designation for the priesthood in Deuteronomy is “Levitical priests” (e.g., Deut 17:9, 18).<sup>328</sup>

Trying to solve the issues surrounding the Levitical priesthood and its history is not our concern,<sup>329</sup> beyond noting the complexities of the evidence, where according to some traditions the priesthood is Levitical while for others, or in relation to various priestly figures, it is not or at least there is no evidence of it being so.<sup>330</sup> What is pertinent in terms of trying to discern whether there is any evidence that might provide insight into the background behind Pg's figure of Aaron as high priest and the Aaronite priesthood is that clearly in all these earlier traditions concerning priesthood there is no explicit mention of an Aaronite priesthood or of Aaron as a priest. But how, then, did Pg's picture of Aaron as priest and an Aaronite priesthood arise?

---

327. Possibly related to this is the passage in Exod 32:25–29, which has been inserted into an underlying narrative in Exod 32 where the sons of Levi ordain themselves (מִלֵּא יִד, Exod 32:29) for the service of YHWH. The question of whether Exod 32 in all its complexity might be able to shed any light on the background to the Aaronite priesthood will be taken up shortly.

328. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 85.

329. This includes the issue of the origins of the Levites as subordinate to the Aaronites in the Priestly material (Num 3–4\*; 8\*) since this material is perceived as later than Pg and not included in it; see n. 317.

330. Pace Haran (*Temples and Temple Service*, 71–83), who argues that all legitimate priests of Israelite temples were Levites, including Zadok, but this goes beyond the evidence.

In order to explore this further, it is necessary to look at earlier traditions concerning the figure of Aaron that Pg may have drawn on in presenting Aaron as high priest. The two references to Aaron in earlier texts that could implicitly touch on Aaron as associated with a priestly role are Exod 4:14 and Exod 32.

Exodus 4:14 refers to Aaron as a Levite, as is Moses his brother (2:1), but in this context he is not described as having a priestly function, but rather as the figure who will speak Moses's words. Given this, and the rather checkered and inconsistent evidence in texts prior to Pg concerning the association between Levites and the priesthood, Exod 4:14 is slim evidence for seeing this as a reference to Aaron as a priest.<sup>331</sup>

The closest portrayal of Aaron in a cultic context within a text that is earlier than Pg is found in Exod 32:1–6, as part of a basic narrative probably comprising at least 32:1–6, 15\*, 19–24, 30–34.<sup>332</sup> The link between Exod 32:1–6, where Aaron makes a golden calf, and 1 Kgs 12:25–33, which describes Jeroboam making two golden calves at Bethel (and Dan) and appointing a non-Levitical priesthood, is well established.<sup>333</sup> Could this reflect an early tradition of an Aaronite priesthood associated with Bethel?<sup>334</sup> This is possible, but without further more explicit evidence referring to an Aaronite priesthood in preexilic times, this remains in the realm of speculation. In addition, it can be argued against this view of an early Aaronite group at Bethel that within the context of the basic

---

331. It is also interesting to note that within Pg as defined here there is no reference to Aaron as a Levite, as there is explicitly in later Priestly material (e.g., Exod 6:14–25), in line with the overall trend in the postexilic period to see all priests as Levites—as evidenced in Ezek 43:19; 44:15; 1 Chr 6:1–15. In addition, it might perhaps be expected that, if Exod 4:14 was clearly a reference to Aaron as priest, and if Pg was familiar with it, given Pg's propensity to draw on earlier tradition, Pg would have picked up on this and stated explicitly that Aaron was a Levite in setting up Aaron as high priest. However, as an argument from silence this provides only tentative support for the view that Exod 4:14 does not refer to Aaron as a priest.

332. See, e.g., Childs, *Exodus*, 559–62; Boorer, *Promise of the Land*, 231–61; and more recently, see Suzanne Boorer, "The Promise of the Land as Oath in Exodus 32:1–33:3," in Dozeman, *Book of Exodus*, 245–66, esp. the discussion of recent views regarding this basic narrative, 252–56.

333. See esp. the same formulation in relation to the golden calf/calves in Exod 32:4b and 1 Kgs 12:28: "These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt."

334. See, e.g., Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 75, 86; Sabourin, *Priesthood*, 123–25.

narrative of Exod 32, Aaron, although carrying out a cultic action, is not acting as a priest, since building an altar is not an activity reserved for priests, and—at least according to the MT—it is the people who offer sacrifices (Exod 32:6).<sup>335</sup> However, with the later addition within this context of Exod 32:25–29, which concerns the sons of Levi ordaining themselves (מלא יד, Exod 32:29) for the service of YHWH, the effect is to set a pro-Levite passage in relation to Aaron cast in a negative light and hence to accentuate an anti-Aaron polemic. This perhaps suggests implicitly that behind this is a Levitical group in competition with a priestly group identifying with Aaron, at least at this later stage. It is difficult to know, however, when Exod 32:25–29 might have been inserted.<sup>336</sup> Its strong pro-Levitical stance perhaps suggests that it is to be aligned with the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic tradition, and therefore it could well have been inserted prior to Pg<sup>337</sup> or at least around the same time as Pg. This is supported by the negative reference to Aaron in Deut 9:20 in the context of a parallel account to Exod 32 in Deut 9:9–21, 25–29, within the context of the book of Deuteronomy for whom all priests are Levites.<sup>338</sup> In any case, the addition of Exod 32:25–29 to the basic narrative in Exod 32, which includes

---

335. Cody, *History of Old Testament Priesthood*, 148, 155; Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 311.

336. As generally agreed, Exod 32:25–29 is clearly an insertion into the earlier basic narrative. It interrupts the narrative coherence of the basic narrative, introducing another punishment over and above, and at odds with, that of Exod 32:20, 30–34, since in Exod 32:30–34, unlike the immediate killing of 3,000 people, the punishment is delayed.

337. See Childs, *Exodus*, 561.

338. Although Deut 9:20 is often seen as a later addition within its context, as I have argued elsewhere (Boorer, *Promise of the Land as Oath*, 305, 312; “Promise of the Land as Oath in Exodus 32:1–33:3,” 262), it makes sense within its context as a blind motif dependent on knowledge of the elements of the basic narrative in Exod 32:1–6, 21–24, answering the question left hanging in Exod 32:21–24 as to what happens to Aaron and why. Michael Konkel (“Exodus 32–34 and the Quest for an Enneateuch,” in Dozeman, *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Enneateuch*, 169–84) has argued recently that Exod 32:26–29 is post-P, serving a linking function in the composition of the Pentateuch. However, whereas Konkel (180) also sees the addition in Exod 32:7–14 as post-P and on the same level as Exod 32:25–29, I have argued that Exod 32:7–14 is earlier than this, i.e., pre-Deut 9:9–21, 25–29 (see Boorer, *Promise of the Land as Oath*, 303–4, 308–9, 314–18, 320–24; “The Promise of the Land as Oath in Exodus 32:1–33:3,” 259–63), and this perhaps suggests that the addition of Exod 32:25–29 is also pre-Pg.

32:1–6, might well imply a situation, probably in the late preexilic/exilic period of rival priestly groups, seeking to stake their claims, one of which is Levitical, the other associated with the figure of Aaron.

Hence, although no explicit mention is made of Aaron as a priest or of an Aaronite priesthood in preexilic texts, Exod 32 in its final form might well implicitly reflect an Aaronite priestly group (albeit from the perspective of an opposing Levitical group), which was (eventually) behind the formulation of Pg. If we take into account the Zadokite priesthood referred to in the relatively late texts of Ezek 40–48 (40:45–46; 43:19; 44:15–16; 48:11), it could be speculated further that in the late preexilic/exilic period there may have been several different priestly groups vying for legitimacy, one Levite, another Aaronite, and yet another Zadokite.<sup>339</sup> It is out of this situation, from one of these particular groups, that Pg's picture of Aaron as founding high priest and an Aaronite priesthood arose. This seems likely, but, given the evidence available to us, it is only something that might be implied, and it ultimately remains in the realm of speculation.

However, though we know little about the origins of those behind the formulation of the Aaronite priesthood in Pg, it is possible to explore the way in which the programmatic vision of Aaron as high priest and an Aaronite priesthood came to be shaped in Pg on the basis of earlier traditions concerning Aaron as a leadership figure associated with Moses.

If there were different priestly groups vying for legitimation and if Exod 32:25–29 was inserted into its context prior to (or approximately contemporary with) Pg, it can be argued that Pg sought to legitimize Aaron as the high priest against the pro-Levite and anti-Aaron tradition reflected in the late stages of Exod 32. This Pg has done by reshaping this negative tradition concerning Aaron, substituting this with instructions

---

339. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 89. Pace Nurmela (*Levites*, 179–81, 137), who argues that the Aaronite and Zadokite priesthoods are one and the same thing. He does this on the assumption that there was a Zadokite dynasty during the monarchy and that the Zadokite lineage is based on this fact, whereas the view that they originated prior to this from Moses's brother Aaron is a projection into the remote mythic past typical of the Priestly code. However, given that there is no credible evidence to assume there was a Zadokite dynasty during the monarchy, and that nowhere is the Aaronite priesthood equated with the Zadokite priesthood, it seems more probable that they reflect different priestly groups, one that claimed Zadok, the priest of the united monarchy as its eponymous ancestor, and one that claimed Aaron as its eponymous ancestor.

by YHWH given through Moses for Aaron and his sons to be consecrated as primary priest and priests respectively (Exod 28–29\*) for the one legitimate sanctuary commanded by YHWH through Moses (25:1).<sup>340</sup> In addition, in this way the rift between Moses and Aaron evident in the basic narrative in Exod 32 (esp. 32:1–6, 21–24) is reversed such that Moses and Aaron are pictured as working together in harmony, as has been the case up to this point in Pg.

This also would seem to address the probably earlier negative tradition regarding Aaron in Num 12:1–16,<sup>341</sup> in which Aaron (and Miriam) speaks against Moses because of his Cushite wife and by challenging Moses's unique prophetic authority (12:1–2), and Aaron (and Miriam) is called to account for this, with YHWH's anger kindled against them (12:4–9). The rift between Aaron and Moses, and seemingly between YHWH and Aaron (Aaron unlike Miriam escapes punishment) appears to be overcome when Aaron reverts to a subordinate position to Moses, referring to him as “my lord” (יְדִידִי), confessing his (and Miriam's) sin and interceding with Moses for Miriam (12:11–12). The position reached within 12:1–16 of Aaron as subordinated to Moses is reflected in Pg, with Aaron as Moses's prophet; in Pg also Moses, as in 12:1–16, is the mediator of YHWH's words (see 12:6–8), and these include instructions for Aaron and his sons to serve YHWH as priests, which goes beyond Aaron's explicit role as portrayed in 12:1–16.

Elsewhere in earlier non-P traditions, Aaron appears as a positive figure alongside but subordinate to Moses. He occurs as a figure subordinated to Moses but with some authority in relation to the Israelites alongside other figures such as Hur (see, e.g., Exod 17:10, 12; 18:12; 19:24; 24:1, 9, 14). He is portrayed as Moses's brother and spokesman or mouthpiece (4:14–16).<sup>342</sup> He appears alongside Moses in conversations with the elders and with Pharaoh when asking him to let the Israelites go and in relation to the plagues (4:14–15, 29; 5:1–3, 20; 8:8, 12, 25; 9:27; 10:3, 16). Pg

---

340. See Rolf Knierim, “Conceptual Aspects in Exodus 25:1–9,” in Wright, *Pomegranates and Golden Bells*, 117–18.

341. Those who see Num 12:1–16 as earlier than P include Noth, *Numbers*, 93; Budd, *Numbers*, 133–34; Levine, *Numbers 1–20*, 311, 333; Davies, *Numbers*, 114; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 107–8. Pace Römer (“Israel's Sojourn,” 436, 440, 442–43), who sees Num 12:1–16 as later than P.

342. See the discussion above on the reference to Aaron as a Levite in Exod 4:14. He is also portrayed as brother to Miriam (Exod 15:20).



would seem to have drawn on these positive traditions concerning Aaron. Pg picks up on the tradition of Aaron as Moses's brother and mouthpiece (4:14–16) in portraying Aaron as Moses's brother and prophet and also on the tradition of Aaron as a figure alongside Moses in relation to the plagues/signs. However, Pg has reshaped the role of Aaron in relation to the plagues, giving him a more extensive role: instead of simply being present alongside Moses as in the earlier tradition, in Pg Aaron actually assists Moses in bringing on the plagues/signs with the use of his staff (8:5–6, 9–11, 16–17, 19, and see also Exod 9:8–10).

Indeed, Pg portrays Aaron only in a positive way throughout the exodus, wilderness, and Sinai pericopes, unlike the earlier non-P traditions (see Exod 32; Num 12:1–16). After the plagues/signs, Aaron continues to be portrayed alongside Moses in a positive leadership role: in Exod 12:1, where the Passover regulations are revealed to both Moses and Aaron; in Exod 16:2, 6, where the people complain to, and are responded to by, Moses and Aaron; and in Num 14:2, 26, where the people murmur against Moses and Aaron and God responds to the people through both of them. The only episode where Aaron appears in a negative light in Pg is in Num 20:2–12\*, where the leadership of both Moses and Aaron is condemned and hence their fate of dying outside the land.

Therefore, Pg seems to have drawn on the earlier traditions that show Aaron in a positive leadership role in association with Moses, to have enhanced them, and to have extended them to encompass other episodes and, in particular, to portray Aaron uniquely as priestly figurehead or high priest with his sons as priests as instituted by YHWH through instructions given to Moses in such a way as to counter negative traditions concerning him such as found in Exod 32 (and see also Num 12:1–16). As long as Moses is a positive figure in Pg, so is Aaron, with Aaron shown in a negative light only at the end, where Moses himself in becoming a negative leader spells the demise of both himself and Aaron (Num 20:2–12\*).

In conclusion, the appearance of Aaron as high priest and the Aaronite priesthood in Pg seems to emerge *de novo* in terms of explicit evidence from traditions earlier than Pg that have come down to us, for there is no direct reference prior to Pg of Aaron as a priest or of an Aaronite priesthood. It is more than likely that Pg's picture of the priesthood has emerged from an Aaronite priestly group who claimed Aaron as their eponymous ancestor and who were vying for legitimacy with other priestly groups such as those who were Levitical or Zadokite in the late preexilic/exilic



period.<sup>343</sup> In order to validate their claim of an Aaronite priesthood as the only legitimate priesthood, the Aaronite group behind Pg drew on earlier traditions and reshaped them to present a paradigm of the priesthood for the future. It is clear that Pg has drawn to a certain extent on hierarchical structures of priesthood evident in the Jerusalem temple but expanded the role of the primary priest to function as the central figure in cultic matters (a role that was carried in preexilic times by the king) in relation to Pg's one legitimate sanctuary. Pg has also drawn on earlier traditions concerning Aaron as a leadership figure associated with Moses, enhancing and extending the positive traditions and countering the negative ones to finally present its unique and innovative picture of Aaron as high priest and his sons as priests. This picture of the priesthood is legitimated by presenting it in terms of a founding ritual, relevant for all time, for the first high priest and for the priesthood in general; a founding ritual that is commanded by YHWH through Moses (Exod 25:1; 28–29\*). In this way, Aaron as high priest and the Aaronite priesthood is constituted by Pg as the only legitimate identity for the priesthood for all time; that is, it functions through its reshaping of traditions combined with its unique vision of Aaron as priest into a programmatic imperative that is paradigmatic for the future and for all time.<sup>344</sup>

More can be said, however, in relation to the particular way in which the Aaronite priesthood is presented by exploring selective details within Exod 28–29\*, which, along with Exod 40:33b, represents the founding ritual of the priesthood; in particular Pg's description of the main items of Aaron's priestly clothing and the words used for constituting the priest-

---

343. Grabbe (*Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages*, 62) refers to "rival factions that not only maneuvered politically but also literarily by developing traditions that favoured their particular group."

344. It seems that Pg's picture of the priesthood had much influence and won out over other competing views of the time. This is seen, e.g., from the fact that for the Chronicler the only legitimate priesthood is Aaronite (1 Chr 6:1–15). Much of the genealogy in 1 Chr 6:1–15, especially in the middle, is probably fictive and schematic, seen in particular from the fact that Zadok, who in the preexilic traditions is quite separate from Aaron, has been placed as a descendant of Aaron with twelve generations either side (Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 84). However, it does show that in order to be recognized as a legitimate priest in the later postexilic period it was necessary to trace one's genealogy back to Aaron. In Ezra 7:1–6, Ezra is portrayed as in the line of Zadok and Aaron. Elsewhere in Chronicles priests are consistently referred to as of the descendants of Aaron (e.g., 1 Chr 15:4; 23:28, 32).

hood, that is, consecration (קדש, *piel*), ordination (יד מלא), and anointing (משח) of Aaron and his sons (esp. Exod 28:41; 29:1, 7, 9b, 35, 44b).<sup>345</sup> An investigation of these details will show how Pg has reshaped earlier traditions into its own particular vision of the priesthood and its function.

---

345. See above n. 186 and ch. 3 n. 144. The particular details regarding how Moses is to consecrate/ordain Aaron and his sons, including the various sacrifices as described in Exod 29\* will not be addressed. This is because, although I have included Exod 29:1–35\* as part of Pg, this is only tentative, and I remain basically undecided; see the discussion of this in §1.2.2.4.1, above. As I commented there, the inclusion or exclusion of Exod 29:1–35\* does not significantly affect the overall argument concerning the theology and hermeneutics of Pg. On the one hand, Exod 29:1–35\* expands on Exod 28:41; 29:44b to provide the details of the process of consecration/ordination, and Exod 28:41, along with Exod 29:44b, would have been sufficient within the formatting of Pg's account, without the detailed instructions contained in Exod 29:1–35\*. On the other hand, even with Exod 29:1–35\* included as part of Pg, attempting the complex task of trying to discern what earlier traditions Pg might have taken up and reshaped into the description of the ritual of consecration/ordination described here, and exploring the complexities of the symbolism and meaning of these details would not contribute significantly to my overall argument. The way in which Pg has reshaped earlier traditions with regard to the priestly clothing and in using the words consecration, ordination, and anointing, will provide sufficient evidence to show that Pg here in relation to the priesthood, as with regard to the tabernacle/tent of meeting, is shaping its own particular vision that echoes and yet is different from the earlier traditions on which it draws. Given Pg's propensity to do this, it can be safely assumed that Exod 29:1–35\* draws on earlier priestly ritual law (see esp. Lev 1 and 4 concerning burnt offerings and sin offerings), but it is difficult to know exactly what earlier traditions there might have been regarding the extended processes of consecration/ordination as described here, given that our only other evidence is in Lev 8 which is also priestly material and probably later than Exod 29:1–35\*, and therefore whether and how Pg might have reshaped and elaborated earlier traditions concerning the consecration of priests. The symbolism and meaning of the details in Exod 29:1–35\* and Lev 8\* with their various sacrifices represents a complex area of discussion; see, e.g., Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, esp. 542–49, 553, 566–69 and passim; Propp, *Exod 19–40*, 454–73, 528–32; Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 60, 61, 63–64, 70–71, 73–90. If we were to delve into this here, it would not add to the overall argument regarding Pg's paradigm or vision for the priesthood sufficiently to justify the extended exploration that would be required. It is sufficient to note that Exod 29:1–35\* as part of Exod 28–29\*; 40:33b represents a founding ritual for the Aaronite priesthood.

### Priestly Clothing

In Exod 28\* YHWH instructs Moses to bring Aaron and his sons near for the act of becoming YHWH's priests (כהן, *piel*) (Exod 28:1 and 41, where it is linked explicitly with consecration/ordination).<sup>346</sup> In this context YHWH's instructions for the priestly garments of holiness are given (28:2–40\*) in relation to both Aaron as high priest and his sons as priests, bracketed by the reference to their purpose for “glory [כבוד] and splendor [תפארת]” (Exod 28:2, 40). These words echo both royal imagery and divine imagery: glory is often an attribute of a king,<sup>347</sup> as well as God (Ps 29:1–2; 26:8), and within Pg the manifestation of the divine presence is symbolized by “the glory [כבוד] of YHWH” (esp. Exod 29:43; 40:34),<sup>348</sup> and splendor can have the connotation of sovereignty and is associated with the enthronement of God in the temple in Ps 96:6.<sup>349</sup>

The clothing that Aaron and his sons have in common as priests—the tunic, sash or girdle, and headpiece—are only briefly mentioned (Exod 28:39–40), and there are differences between those items in relation to Aaron in comparison with those of his sons. The tunic was a common piece of clothing that could be worn by anyone; Aaron's tunic, however, is distinguished from those of his sons in that it is checkered (שבץ).<sup>350</sup> The girdle (עבנט) has royal associations (see Isa 22:21); Aaron's girdle, unlike those of his sons, is embroidered.<sup>351</sup> In terms of headpieces, Aaron's sons have caps or headbands (מגבעות), whereas Aaron has a turban (מצנפת).<sup>352</sup> Aaron's turban is superior to the headband of the priests and is a royal symbol in that the only reference outside of P material is in Ezek 21:26, where it is paralleled with crown (עטרה) and associated with the prince of Israel, that is, the king of Judah.<sup>353</sup>

346. See Propp, *Exodus* 19–40, 430.

347. Ibid.

348. The “glory of YHWH” will be discussed in the next section (4.2.1.3) addressing the issue of divine presence.

349. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 643.

350. Noth, *Exodus*, 226.

351. Ibid.

352. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 648.

353. Ibid., 641; Noth, *Exodus*, 226; Propp, *Exodus* 19–40, 433.

The primary focus of the description of the priestly clothing, however, is the vestments that are unique to Aaron: they comprise the ephod, the breastpiece, the robe of the ephod, and the “flower” (פִּזְיָא) (Exod 28:6–38).

In general, the materials of the vestments that are unique to Aaron tend to correspond with that of the inner curtains of the tabernacle, the curtain dividing the holy place from the most holy place, and the screen at its entrance, as well as the golden furniture within the tabernacle.<sup>354</sup> In particular, the ephod (Exod 28:6–14) and the breastpiece (28:15–30), like the curtains and screen, are made of a mix of wool and linen, with the colors of blue, purple, and crimson; they do not have cherubim worked into them as the tabernacle materials do, but woven in with the wool and linen is gold, as perhaps the dominant ingredient, reflecting the furnishings of the tabernacle. Moreover, the chains of the ephod and the breastpiece (28:14, 22), the golden bells on the hem of the robe of the ephod (28:31–34), and the golden flower (פִּזְיָא, 28:36) mirror the golden furniture of the tabernacle.<sup>355</sup> This reflection of Aaron’s distinctive robes with the tabernacle materials lies in contrast to Aaron’s other items of clothing that he has in common with his sons as priests (the tunic, the turban, and the sash), which, although more ornate than those of his sons, are made of linen only (28:39): as such, these garments reflect the linen hangings of the court.<sup>356</sup> Admittedly, the robe of the ephod (28:31), distinctive to Aaron, is not described as comprising mixed yarns and is blue only and therefore does not reflect the tabernacle materials, except for the pomegranates on its hem which are of blue, purple, and crimson wool and its golden bells. However, Haran accounts for this by arguing convincingly that as such the robe of the ephod forms a barrier between the ephod and breastpiece that reflect the inner tabernacle and the other garments that reflect the court.<sup>357</sup> The significance of this lies not only in the fact that the contrast between Aaron’s unique vestments and those he has in common with his sons as priests reflects the graded holiness of the tabernacle, but also that Aaron’s unique vestments are part and parcel of the tabernacle itself, as therefore also, in wearing these robes, is Aaron as high priest.<sup>358</sup>

---

354. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 165–72, 210–11.

355. *Ibid.*, 169.

356. *Ibid.*, 171, 210.

357. *Ibid.*, 180.

358. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 165–66; Robertson, “He Kept the Measurements,” 207.

Each of the garments unique to Aaron as high priest is described in some detail. Like the description of the furniture in Exod 25\*, the repetition of details engenders a visual experience that allows the appreciation of each of the aspects of the garments in itself (see esp. 28:33–35) and in a sense suspends time into a kind of static timelessness; that is, in Robertson's terminology, as ritualized text it invites its audience into an experience akin to participating in a ritual whose repetition has the effect of transcending time.<sup>359</sup>

We will take each of the items of clothing specific to Aaron as high priest in turn, noting traditions drawn on and combined with Pg's distinctive features to formulate the specific portrait or vision and function of each.

The ephod as described in Pg (Exod 28:6–14), comprising gold, with blue, purple, and crimson wool mixed with linen, reflects divine and royal motifs. In Mesopotamia, elaborate golden garments were used to drape the statues of deities and in the ancient Near East elaborate garments of these colors were associated with royalty.<sup>360</sup> However, as reflected in pre-exilic biblical texts, the primary tradition on which Pg appears to be drawing is the tradition of an ephod, which in all these references is associated with priests or the cult. Exactly what it was is unclear in some of these texts and would seem to denote different things. In Judg 8:27; 17:5; 18:14, 17, 18, 20; 1 Sam 21:9, it appears to be a cultic object or image; in 1 Sam 14:3 (see 1 Sam 14:36–42); 23:9–11; 30:7–8, it seems to be an object used for oracular divination; and in 1 Sam 2:18, 28; 22:18 (and see 2 Sam 6:14), the linen ephod is a priestly garment.<sup>361</sup> Like the latter, Pg's ephod is a priestly garment but limited now to the high priest Aaron, and like Judges

---

359. See the earlier discussion of Robertson's thesis, "He Kept the Measurements," and esp. 70–71, 139, 145–46, 148, 151, 154–62, 168–69, 176–78, 183, 185–86, 188, 197–206, 227. In addition, as with Exod 25–26\*, although there is much detail given, there are gaps and it is in places difficult to reconstruct the exact picture as it is described, e.g., for the ephod and for the breastpiece, and the exact placing of the vestments specific to Aaron in relation to the garments that he has in common with his sons, whether over (which is most likely the case) or under them.

360. Carol Meyers, "Ephod," *ABD* 2:550; Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, 17.

361. Propp, *Exodus* 19–40, 432; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 644; Robert Kugler, "Ephod," *NIDB* 2:279. Meyers ("Ephod," 550) warns against too rigid a classification of cultic object and priestly garment as separate categories since either way the ephod functioned symbolically to bring a human representative of the Israelite community in contact with God.

8:27 it is predominantly gold. Moreover, as will be discussed shortly, since the breastpiece with its divinatory device(s) of the Urim and Thummim is attached to the ephod, Pg's ephod also echoes the traditions that portray the ephod as an oracular device. Thus, Pg's ephod would appear to be a development of the earlier linen ephod but now comprising predominantly gold woven with the royal colors of blue, purple, and crimson into an ornate robe that, in tandem with the breastpiece, is associated with oracular divination.

Unique to Pg are the two precious stones set in gold and set on the shoulder pieces of the ephod (Exod 28:9–14). These are important since they are described in detail using repetition (see esp. 28:9–11); this repetition slows the pace and cements in the audience the significance of what is being described here.<sup>362</sup> The central idea that is emphasized through repetition here is the engraving of the names of the twelve tribes on these stones (with six tribes on each). Whether this has precedence in the priestly tradition of the Jerusalem temple we do not know; but in terms of our evidence it appears that Pg has uniquely introduced and given primary emphasis to these stones inscribed with the twelve tribes of Israel in relation to the ephod. That the twelve tribes are listed can be seen as a visionary and programmatic statement on the part of Pg, since, by the time of Pg the twelve tribes have long ceased to exist, with only Judah remaining; for Pg's paradigm it is all twelve tribes that represent the nation of Israel.

The function of the two stones set on the ephod that Aaron as high priest is to wear is as stones of remembrance (זכרון) for the sons of Israel; that is, Aaron is to bear the names of the Israelite tribes before, or in the presence of, YHWH on his shoulders for remembrance (זכרון) (Exod 28:12). Thus these stones function as a reminder to YHWH to remember (זכר) his covenant with Israel, which in Pg refers to the Abrahamic covenant and its promises (Gen 17), with its backdrop of the Noahic covenant (Gen 9:8–17). The theme of God remembering (זכר) his covenant is significant in Pg (see Exod 2:24; 6:5; and see Gen 8:1), and here, like the bow in Gen 9:13–15 by which God remembers the covenant with all creatures, by these stones inscribed with the twelve tribes of Israel on Aaron's shoulders, YHWH will be reminded of his people and the

---

362. See Robertson, "He Kept the Measurements," 154–57; she refers to the type of repetition here as building repetition in which a central idea (in this case that of engraving the names of the sons of Israel on them) is repeated twice, each time fleshing out the idea with more details building to a coherent picture.

Abrahamic covenant promises given to them.<sup>363</sup> Thus in Pg's paradigm or vision the nation Israel comprising the twelve tribes, and God's covenantal promises to them, are constantly remembered by YHWH by means of the stones of the ephod worn by Aaron as high priest, who is part and parcel of the tabernacle.

The breastpiece (חֹשֶׁן) of judgment (Exod 28:15–30), which is attached to the ephod (see 28:22–28) and made of the same materials (28:15) and therefore echoing divine and royal motifs, is unique to P.<sup>364</sup> Again, whether or not this has precedence in the Jerusalem temple tradition we do not know; but in terms of the evidence available to us it appears Pg has introduced this as a significant garment that is closely related to the ephod. It comprises a mixture of elements, some of which would seem to draw on earlier priestly and possibly royal traditions that are reshaped and synthesized with some innovative features.

Set into the material of which it is composed are twelve precious stones in four rows of three (Exod 28:17–20),<sup>365</sup> each of which is inscribed with one of the twelve tribes of Israel. The inscription with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel is likely an innovation of Pg, since, like the engraving on the stones of the ephod, this would seem to represent a visionary and programmatic statement on the part of Pg.<sup>366</sup> The significance of this is the same as for the stones set on the ephod—for a continual remembrance (זִכְרוֹן) of the twelve tribes before/in the presence of YHWH (28:29), with the same connotations of God remembering his covenant in relation to the Israelites. These stones as part of the breastpiece, however, rather than being set on the shoulders, are set upon Aaron's heart when he goes into the holy place (28:29). It is interesting that there are two sets of stones that have the same function of remembrance of the twelve tribes before YHWH as part of the high priest's clothing. Propp speculates that the stones set on the ephod may symbolize the reading of them by YHWH in heaven, while the stones set in the breastpiece may symbolize the reading of them by YHWH on earth, given the horizontal orientation of the tabernacle.<sup>367</sup> Robertson makes a significant point, referring to the form of the stones

---

363. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 644–45.

364. Noth, *Exodus*, 222.

365. The specific identification of the stones is uncertain (*ibid.*, 223; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 646).

366. See Noth, *Exodus*, 223.

367. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 524 (citing Houtman).



in relation to the ephod as juxtaposed with the stones of the breastpiece and the effect of this: this repetition, which she calls blurring repetition, repeats the central idea (the names of the twelve tribes on Aaron's attire and their significance in terms of remembrance) but the further details that flesh out this repetition each time do not build a coherent image, but rather two different images (of stones on the ephod and stones set in the breastpiece) such that the effect on the audience is to dwell on the idea rather than the image.<sup>368</sup> In this way, the idea of Aaron representing the twelve tribes on his clothing before YHWH as a reminder to YHWH of them is emphatically emphasized.

The breastpiece with precious stones perhaps draws on royal imagery, but if so, within Pg's picture this has been combined with an old priestly tradition of the Urim and Thummim, which within Pg are placed within the breastpiece of judgment (Exod 28:30).<sup>369</sup> Little is known about the Urim and Thummim beyond the fact that reference to them occurs in early texts such as Deut 33:8 (in relation to the Levites) and 1 Sam 14:41–42 (and see 1 Sam 28:6), where they are associated with discerning the divine decisions.<sup>370</sup> Within Pg their role in ascertaining the divine will is reinforced by the description of the breastpiece in which they reside as specifically the breastpiece of judgment (משפּת), with משפּת here possibly therefore having the connotation of rendering decisions.<sup>371</sup> With the Urim and Thummim upon his heart, as well as the engraving of the twelve tribes of Israel, when he goes in before/in the presence of YHWH, Aaron will not only bring the Israelites to remembrance before YHWH but will carry the משפּת, the divine will in relation to the Israelites on his heart

---

368. Robertson, "He Kept the Measurements," 157–62. She maintains that there is a similar dynamic in relation to the description of the engraved stones upon Aaron's heart when he goes in before YHWH (Exod 28:29) juxtaposed with the description of the Urim and Thummim on Aaron's heart when he goes in before YHWH (Exod 28:30), which invites the audience to dwell on the idea that Aaron as high priest functions as a representative of the people rather than the somewhat incoherent image.

369. For royal imagery, see de Vaux (*Ancient Israel*, 400), who maintains that it recalls the rich breastplate worn by the Pharaohs and the kings of Syria (as found at Byblos); and see Noth (*Exodus*, 222) who likens it also to a Phoenician royal pectoral. However, there is no evidence from preexilic biblical texts that the Israelite kings wore such an item. On Urim and Thummim, see Noth, *Exodus*, 222; Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, 19. See also Noth, *Exodus*, 223.

370. Robert Kugler, "Urim and Thummim," *NIDB* 5:719–21.

371. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 646–47.



before YHWH continually (Exod 28:30), perhaps underscoring his oracular function as mediator of the divine will to the Israelites.<sup>372</sup>

The robe (מעיל) of the ephod (Exod 28:31–35) is simpler than the ephod and the breastpiece since it is not made of mixed yarns and is only blue in color. However, the primary focus of the description, as seen from the amount of detail and repetition designed to appeal to the visual imagination of the audience,<sup>373</sup> is on its hem that comprises pomegranates of blue, purple, and crimson color, interspersed with golden bells (Exod 28:33–35).

The robe (מעיל) was traditionally a garment worn by persons of high status, including, but not exclusively, kings (e.g., 1 Sam 2:19; 15:27; 1 Sam 24:5, 11; 1 Sam 18:4).<sup>374</sup> It can be seen to have royal overtones, however, especially given that it is mentioned in relation to Saul when he was king (1 Sam 24:5, 11), the symbolic significance in 1 Sam 18:4 of Jonathan handing over his robe, armor, weapons, and belt as foreshadowing David's kingship in place of Jonathan the heir apparent, and the depiction of king Jehu on the black obelisk of Shalmaneser III as wearing a full-length robe.<sup>375</sup>

Pomegranates were used as decoration and for jewelry in the ancient Near East and are described as part of the decoration of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 7:18, 20, 42; Jer 52:22–23) and most likely have an aesthetic function in Pg, as well as perhaps symbolizing the life and fructifying power of the divine.<sup>376</sup> The bells are significant by virtue of being golden and therefore aligning with the golden furniture of the tabernacle and because their sound is linked with the function of the robe with its ornate hem of bells and pomegranates as apotropaic (Exod 28:35). The particular significance of the sound of the bells has been variously interpreted; for example, their ringing protects the high priest from demons or powers of darkness when crossing the threshold at the entrance of the tent of meeting,<sup>377</sup> or their sound allows the people outside to hear the high priest moving around inside the tabernacle and therefore to know that all is well or to participate

---

372. Ibid., 647; and see Noth (*Exodus*, 222), who sees the Urim and Thummim on Aaron's heart as a symbol of the power of YHWH as righteous judge over the Israelites.

373. See Robertson, "He Kept the Measurements," 145–46, 151.

374. Daniel Fleming, "The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests," *JBL* 117 (1998): 409.

375. Propp, *Exodus* 19–40, 433.

376. Propp, *Exodus* 19–40, 445; Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs*, 17.

377. Noth, *Exodus*, 224;

vicariously in his ritual acts.<sup>378</sup> Be that as it may, what is clear from the text is that the bells, along with the robe as a whole, in some way protect the high priest from death: Aaron is to wear the robe with its bells when he ministers within the tabernacle so that he will not die (28:35).

Finally, the remaining piece of attire that is distinctive to Aaron as high priest is the golden “flower” (צִיץ) that is placed on the turban (מִצְנֶפֶת) (Exod 28:36–38). This flower (צִיץ), symbolizing life,<sup>379</sup> is equivalent to the נֹזֶר (usually translated “crown” or “diadem”) in Exod 29:6 (and see Ps 132:18 where the נֹזֶר blossoms [יִצְיִן]).<sup>380</sup> The נֹזֶר signifies “consecrated/consecration” and in earlier texts is a royal tradition associated only with kings (2 Sam 1:10; 2 Kgs 11:12; Ps 89:40; 132:18).<sup>381</sup> Here in Pg it has been transformed to be part of the high priest’s clothing, and, as made of gold, it aligns with the inner furniture of the tabernacle. On it is engraved “Holy to YHWH” (Exod 28:36), which signifies that Aaron as high priest belongs to YHWH, to the sacred realm and no longer to the profane world.<sup>382</sup> It has also been argued that the flower with its inscription serves to protect Aaron as high priest like the serpent (*nzt.t*) on the crown of the Pharaoh.<sup>383</sup> This is supported by the function of the צִיץ with its inscription in that it allows Aaron to carry any guilt incurred by the holy offerings of the Israelites so that these offerings/the Israelites<sup>384</sup> may find favor before YHWH (Exod 28:38). The flower with its inscription, therefore, would seem to both protect Aaron as high priest from the dangers of contaminated cultic offerings (probably death) when he takes the consequences of this on himself and to evoke divine grace toward the Israelites and their offerings, allowing them to be acceptable even when infractions occur.<sup>385</sup> Therefore, Aaron as high

378. Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs*, 17; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 446.

379. Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs*, 18.

380. Noth, *Exodus*, 225; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 400.

381. On the meaning of the term, see Noth, *Exodus*, 225; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 651. See also Fleming, “Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests,” 409; Propp (*Exodus 19–40*, 526) comments that the צִיץ on Aaron’s head is paralleled by the attire of Mesopotamian gods and kings.

382. De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 347; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 447, 448, 524; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 647.

383. Noth, *Exodus*, 226; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 651.

384. The reference is ambiguous and could mean either the offerings (so Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 449), or the Israelites, or both; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 641.

385. Noth, *Exodus*, 225; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 449–50; Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs*, 18; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*, 215, 227; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 648.

priest, bearing the names of the twelve tribes and the flower, symbol of the power of life, with its inscription of “holy to YHWH” performs a mediating and reconciling function between the Israelites and YHWH.<sup>386</sup>

In conclusion, clearly Pg has drawn on royal, and older priestly traditions, as well as traditions associated with the divine, and reshaped and synthesized them with unique or seemingly innovative elements to present his paradigmatic picture or vision with regard to the clothing for the priesthood, and for Aaron as high priest in particular, and their functions. Motifs taken over from royal traditions and reshaped to be attributes of priestly clothing include: the head attire of the Aaron, that is, the turban (מצנפת), the flower/crown (נזר/ציץ); the girdle or sash (עבנט); probably the robe (מעיל); perhaps the breastpiece with its precious stones; the gold and colors making up the ephod and the breastpiece; and the purpose of the clothing for their glory and splendor. Glory and splendor, garments of gold such as the ephod and the breastpiece, and the flower echo not only royal tradition but also have some association with the divine (God or the gods of Mesopotamia, for example). Older priestly traditions that have been reshaped in and through synthesis with these royal and divine traditions include the linen ephod and the Urim and Thummim, both of which are associated with divination. But these traditions have also been synthesized with, and reshaped by, elements that would appear to be unique to Pg and therefore perhaps represent Pg’s innovative elements, at least as far as the evidence can take us. These unique elements are the materials of Aaron’s ephod and breastpiece as reflecting, and aligned with, the materials of the tabernacle, its curtains, and furniture, showing Aaron as high priest as intrinsic to the tabernacle; and in particular the engraving of the twelve tribes of Israel on the stones of the ephod and on the stones of the breastpiece as a visionary and programmatic statement concerning the constitution of the nation of Israel.

The resulting picture of the priestly clothing in Pg, formulated in this way, is to show the priesthood, and in particular Aaron as founding high priest, as intrinsic to the tabernacle and in particular as mediator between the Israelites and God.<sup>387</sup> Like the tabernacle, the clothing of Aaron signifies that the high priest represents the place where the Israelites and God meet.<sup>388</sup> Thus Aaron as high priest is both an Israelite but of God in that

386. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 525.

387. Ibid., 527; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 642.

388. Robertson, “He Kept the Measurements,” 207. Note the repeated reference

he wears garments that echo the divine.<sup>389</sup> He represents the Israelites, defined as the twelve tribes, before God through the engraved stones on the ephod and the breastpiece, and at the same time he is the property of God in that his flower/crown is engraved with “holy to God.” Thereby he mediates or represents the people to God and God to the people, a role traditionally undertaken by the king in the preexilic monarchy.<sup>390</sup> He does this specifically in Pg by bringing to remembrance before YHWH the twelve tribes of Israel with its connotation of reminding YHWH of his covenant to Abraham and its promises through the engraved stones of the ephod and breastpiece; by carrying the divine will for the Israelites symbolized by Urim and Thummim upon his heart in the breastpiece of judgment; and by reconciling the Israelites with God in carrying the guilt/punishment for any contamination or infraction in the offering of gifts by wearing the flower/crown that protects him from death, so that both the gifts and the Israelites may be in favor before YHWH.

The paradigmatic nature of Pg’s picture in the sense of taking up various earlier traditions, reshaping them and synthesizing them with unique or innovative elements to present a vision for the future, that encompasses all time, is reinforced by the form and style of this portrayal. As ritualized text, its repetition of details engenders in its audience a visual imaginative experience that suspends time into a kind of timelessness and also (particularly in places through blurring repetition) emphasizes the significance and the function of the priesthood and especially Aaron as high priest as mediator between God and Israel.<sup>391</sup>

### Consecration/Ordination/Anointing

The Aaronic priesthood is constituted, along with the clothing of Aaron and his sons (Exod 28:41; 29:5–6), by consecration (שְׁקַדַּת, *piel*), ordination

---

to “the tent of meeting” (אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד) throughout Exod 29 (Exod 29:4, 10, 11, 30, 32, 42, 44) in contrast to the terminology of מִשְׁכָּן concentrated throughout Exod 25–27 (Exod 25:9; 26:1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30, 35; 27:9, 19): Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 598.

389. Propp (*Exodus 19–40*, 525–26) even speculates that, because Aaron’s clothing is the same as the curtains of the tabernacle that tents over the divine presence, along with the garments for his glory and splendor that echo the divine, there is an implicit equation here between Aaron as priest and God.

390. George, *Israel’s Tabernacle*, 132, 178 n. 116.

391. See Robertson, “He Kept the Measurements,” 145–46, 151, 157–62.

(מלא יד), and anointing (משח) (Exod 28:41; 29:1, 7, 9b, 35, 44b).<sup>392</sup> Here as Pg appears to have drawn on and synthesized royal and older priestly traditions.

The verb used in relation to consecration, קדש in the *piel*, means to sanctify or place into a condition of holiness.<sup>393</sup> With regard to people, in earlier texts it is used in relation to a priest (1 Sam 7:1) but also in relation to those who are not priests (e.g., in Josh 7:13, Joshua sanctifies the people; in 1 Sam 16:5, Samuel sanctifies Jesse and his sons [interestingly in the context of David's anointing, 1 Sam 16:13]), though it tends to occur, though not exclusively, in cultic settings (e.g., 1 Sam 7:1; 16:5). In Pg, as used in relation to Aaron and his sons, consecration is that "by which the priests are transferred from the sphere of the profane into that of the holy"<sup>394</sup> to perform priestly service (Exod 28:41; 29:1, 44). This aligns them with the sanctuary by means of which YHWH is present (מקדש, Exod 25:8; 28:29), and in particular with the holy place and holy of holies (הקדש, קדש הקדשים, Exod 26:33–34), with the tent of meeting and altar as consecrated (קדש, *piel*) by YHWH (Exod 29:44), and therefore implies that, as consecrated, "they belong to the divine sphere."<sup>395</sup>

The expression "fill the hand" (מלא יד) that in Pg denotes ordination (Exod 28:41; 29:9b) has its roots in older tradition where it is used exclusively for installing or instituting a priest to his office. Propp comments that it has a parallel in the Mari texts where it connotes "a divine commissioning, a transfer of authority from a god to a sacred human."<sup>396</sup> It is used for the installation of Micah's son as a priest (Judg 17:5) and the Levite as a priest (Judg 17:12) and for ordaining priests for the high places (1 Kgs 13:33) (and see Exod 32:29).<sup>397</sup> In using this expression, therefore, Pg is drawing on older traditions in relation to priests.

392. In Exod 28:41; 29:7, 9b, 35, it is Moses who is commanded by YHWH to consecrate/anoint/ordain Aaron and his sons, but in Exod 29:44 it is YHWH who consecrates them (along with the tent of meeting and the altar). However, as Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 51 n. 168) points out, there is no tension here since in the ancient worldview it is YHWH who ultimately can consecrate priests for service. Therefore Moses is merely the mediator of YHWH's act of consecration.

393. Helmer Ringgren, "קדש," *TDOT* 12:534.

394. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 230.

395. Ringgren, "קדש," 12:534.

396. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 452.

397. Noth, *Exodus*, 231; Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 79–80.

The anointing (משח) of Aaron and his sons would seem to draw, primarily at least, on royal tradition.<sup>398</sup> In terms of evidence from preexilic biblical texts, the ritual of anointing is nowhere used in relation to priests, but it is used, when relating to persons, in the overwhelming majority of cases in relation to kings.<sup>399</sup> The kings portrayed as being anointed are Saul (1 Sam 9:16; 10:1; 15:1, 17), David (1 Sam 16:3, 12–13; 2 Sam 2:4, 7; 3:39; 5:3, 17; 12:7), Solomon (1 Kgs 1:39), Jehu (1 Kgs 19:16; 2 Kgs 9:3, 6, 12), Joash (2 Kgs 11:12), Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 23:30), and Hazael of Damascus (1 Kgs 19:15).<sup>400</sup> Therefore, many have held that the anointing of priests in ancient Israel was only introduced with P, where the royal tradition of anointing was transferred to the priesthood and Aaron as high priest in particular.<sup>401</sup> This has been disputed by Daniel Fleming who, in light of evidence from the ancient Near East, in particular the description of the anointing of a priestess found from the Emar tablets, argues that priests as well as kings would have been anointed in Israel in early times prior to the exile, that the absence of biblical references to the anointing of priests elsewhere is not surprising since P is the principal repository for cultic traditions in the Bible, and that it is reasonable to suppose that the P texts reflect early preexilic tradition.<sup>402</sup> This is, of course, possible. However, given the multiple references to the anointing of kings within the non-P preexilic texts and their total silence with regard to the anointing of priests, it seems more likely, as traditionally held, that Pg has drawn primarily on royal traditions with regard to its picture of the anointing of priests.

Anointing, whether of kings in the preexilic literature, or priests within Pg, connotes a change, that is, elevation of status.<sup>403</sup> Pg, in drawing on the tradition of the anointing of kings has reshaped and trans-

---

398. Exod 28:41 refers to the anointing of Aaron and his sons, but Exod 29:7 refers to the anointing of Aaron only. Exodus 29:21 describes a different ritual of anointing incorporating Aaron and his sons from that in Exod 29:7, which refers to Aaron only. Fleming ("Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests," 409–12) sees different origins of the rituals described in Exod 29:7 and Exod 29:21; however, this does not concern us since Exod 29:21 is not part of Pg as we have defined it, but a later addition.

399. 1 Kgs 19:16 refers to the anointing of a prophet (and see Isa 61:1).

400. K. Seybold, "משח," *TDOT* 9:45.

401. See, e.g., Noth, *Exodus*, 230; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 347; Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 80, 176 n. 36.

402. Fleming, "Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests."

403. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 451; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 643.

formed it by associating it with consecration (קִדְּשׁ, *piel*) and the priestly tradition of ordination (מִלּוֹא יָד) into a rite of sanctification, a rite that confers holiness.<sup>404</sup>

In short, in combining both traditional priestly and royal offices resulting from ordination and anointing, respectively, Pg has reshaped these traditions to give a new paradigm of leadership such that the priestly role has “acquired some of the aura and trappings of the monarchy.”<sup>405</sup>

## Conclusion

It has been shown how Pg has reshaped earlier traditions and synthesized them with seemingly innovative, programmatic, or visionary elements to present a unique paradigmatic picture. The earlier traditions include: non-Priestly traditions concerning Aaron; royal traditions (some of which touch on divine traditions) such as the turban, the flower, perhaps the stone-studded breastpiece, the robe of the ephod, the girdle, the gold of the ephod and breastpiece as gold and the colors of their material, the purpose of the clothing for glory and splendor, and the installation of the priesthood through anointing; older priestly traditions such as the ephod, the Urim and Thummim, and the constitution of the priesthood through ordination (מִלּוֹא יָד). The seemingly innovative, programmatic, or visionary elements include: the Aaronite priesthood as the only legitimate priesthood at the only sanctuary and the identity of Israel as comprising the twelve tribes as engraved on the stones of the ephod and the breastpiece.<sup>406</sup> The picture that emerges from the reshaping and synthesis of all these elements in relation to each other is of an Aaronite priesthood, with the high priest in particular as intrinsic to the tabernacle (given the resonances of his clothing with that of the curtains and furniture of the tabernacle) with the function of mediating between the Israelites and God, a role in general previously filled by the king under the preexilic monarchy. This is pictured in particular in terms of bringing the twelve tribes of Israel into remembrance before YHWH (with the connotation of reminding YHWH of his covenant), in carrying on his

404. Propp, *Exodus* 19–40, 451.

405. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 80.

406. True, this is drawing on earlier tradition, but at the time of Pg the twelve tribes were long gone and therefore this constitutes a vision for the future that recaptures the past.



heart the divine will for Israel, and reconciling the Israelites with YHWH as the means by which the Israelites and their offerings stay in favor with YHWH even in the face of infractions. Pg's picture is not only paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping and synthesizing earlier traditions with programmatic elements into a timeless vision or founding ritual for the priesthood relevant for all time, but, as ritualized text, in engendering a visual, imaginary, and cognitive experience in its audience by means of its repetitive description, especially in Exod 28\*, such that time in a sense stands still.<sup>407</sup> In addition, I would argue that, as with the instructions for the tabernacle and its furnishings, its paradigmatic function is intended to go beyond providing an imaginative and cognitive experience, or worldview, for its (original) audience by inviting them into enacting or actualizing this worldview, by putting into praxis the paradigm described here, as a way of situating itself within that worldview wherever it finds itself through time.<sup>408</sup>

One final area remains to be explored in relation to Pg's paradigmatic picture contained in the Sinai pericope: the way in which Pg has portrayed the divine presence.

#### 4.2.1.3. The Divine Presence

In one sense, the divine presence in relation to the Israelites is mediated through Aaron as high priest. His clothing, in particular the stones of the ephod and breastpiece, the Urim and Thummim carried in the breastpiece,

---

407. See Robertson, "He Kept the Measurements," *passim*.

408. This is particularly the case for the priestly garments. The ritual of consecration/ordination/anointing is more complex since, unlike the making of the tabernacle and its furnishings and at least implicitly the priestly clothing, this is the prerogative of YHWH/Moses only, with Moses as paradigmatic founding figure (see Exod 40:33b). It is interesting to note that in Num 20:25–28, when Aaron dies, Moses puts his clothes on Eleazar his son, but does not consecrate/ordain/anoint him. It could be argued on the surface that Aaron's sons have already been consecrated/ordained/anointed by Moses (Exod 28:41), but might this also hint at the view that, since the Aaronite priesthood is hereditary, the founding ritual of consecrating/ordaining/anointing of Aaron and his sons is valid for all time and does not need to be repeated? As with the details concerning the tabernacle and its furniture, in relation to the priestly garments, there are gaps that make it difficult to construct the precise picture for reconstruction; however, as for the tabernacle and its furniture, there is enough detail to be able to embody the essence of what is described and its significance, with scope for creative variation.



and the “flower,” show that as high priest he mediates between the people and YHWH, indeed as clothed in this way he represents the place where the Israelites and YHWH meet.

However, over and above this, Pg presents a complex array of terms and symbols associated with, or to express, divine presence, particularly in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting as that by means of which YHWH is present and of which the priesthood is an intrinsic part.<sup>409</sup>

One area of symbolism found in Pg regarding the divine presence already touched on pertains to the ark and *kapporet* with its cherubim within the holy of holies.<sup>410</sup> As already discussed, in Pg’s picture the ark retains its traditional symbolism as associated with divine presence; Pg affirms and reinforces this by linking the ark closely with the cherubim via the *kapporet*, with the cherubim themselves, given their symbolism in the ancient Near East and the Solomonic temple, denoting the place of divine presence.<sup>411</sup> However, a key term used for expressing the presence of God in the temple on Zion, שׁוּב (“sit” or “be enthroned,” e.g., 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16 and see 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2) is never used in Pg.<sup>412</sup> Instead Pg uses the verb יָעַן: above the *kapporet* and between the cherubim YHWH “meets” with Moses to give instructions. This is one place where the divine presence manifests itself in Pg.

---

409. The complexity of Pg’s picture of divine presence is partly because of the nature of its subject. As Hundley (*Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 39) states: “Divine presence, like divinity itself, is difficult to explain, much less envision, as one must describe in human terms what by definition transcends them.... The Priestly writers use the language and imagery at their disposal to describe YHWH in a way that accurately and approximately reflects him, yet not so definitively that the description becomes a distortion.”

410. See the discussion in §4.2.1.1, above.

411. See Benjamin Sommer (“Conflicting Constructions of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle,” *BibInt* 9 [2001]: 49), who comments, “wherever one finds a cherub ... one finds divine presence.” Hundley (*Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 40, 56) makes the helpful comment that, in contrast to ancient Near Eastern statues, the ark and *kapporet*, though clearly connected with divine presence, do not partake of the divine essence but are clearly distinguished from YHWH himself, serving explicitly only as the location where YHWH manifests his presence (Exod 25:22).

412. See Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 26–28, 36–37. Both 1 Sam 4:4 and 2 Sam 6:2 may reflect earlier tradition still, although Trygve Mettinger (“The Name and the Glory: The Zion-Sabaoth Theology and its Exilic Successors,” *JNSL* 24 [1998]: 2) sees the expression given there of YHWH enthroned on the cherubim as rooted in the conceptual world of the temple.

The use of **יָעַד** here suggests intermittent or temporary encounters for a specific purpose, in contrast to **יָשַׁב**, which, at least as used in the Jerusalem temple tradition, suggests continuous or permanent presence at a fixed site.<sup>413</sup> However, the presence of the ark with the *kapporet* and its cherubim within the most holy place, that is, within the structure of the tabernacle with its areas of graded holiness, which echoes temple imagery, perhaps hints at a more permanent notion of divine presence. This raises an issue that has been much debated, that is, as to whether Pg's picture of divine presence is to be perceived only, or primarily, as intermittent or temporary, or whether it is pictured as continuous or permanent albeit also expressing specific manifestations.<sup>414</sup> The attempt to resolve this issue will be important in the following discussion that will explore Pg's picture of divine presence as a whole. For the symbolism of the ark, the *kapporet*, and its cherubim is only one aspect of Pg's presentation of divine presence, and it is necessary to explore the other terms and symbols for divine presence contained in Pg over and above this and the resulting paradigmatic picture that emerges from their interrelationship.

The other terms and symbols for divine presence in Pg are as follows. The verb **יָעַד** ("meet") is used in Pg in relation to the divine presence not only in relation to the ark, *kapporet*, and its cherubim within the most holy place where YHWH meets with Moses but also in relation to YHWH's meeting with the Israelites at the tent of meeting (Exod 29:43).<sup>415</sup> Moreover, not only is **יָעַד** used in relation to the divine presence, but also **שָׁכַן** ("dwell") is a significant verb used with YHWH as subject to

---

413. On the temporary aspect, see von Rad, "Tent and the Ark," 120; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 88; Seow, "Designation of the Ark," 191; on the permanent, see Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 591.

414. Those who see the divine presence as intermittent include Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle," 63–64; von Rad, "Tent and the Ark," 120–21; von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 1:239; Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 246; M. Görg "יָעַד," *TDOT* 6:144; Fretheim, "The Priestly Document"; Thomas Dozeman, *God on the Mountain: A Study of Redaction, Theology, and Canon in Exodus 19–24*, SBLMS 37 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 129–30; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 591–92. Those who see the divine presence as continuous or permanent include: Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 88–89, 97; Mettinger, "Name and the Glory," 15; Moshe Weinfeld, "כְּבוֹד," *TDOT* 7:32; Schwartz, "Priestly Account," 125, 133–34.

415. **שֹׁמֵה** refers to the tent of meeting (see Exod 29:44); indeed, Exod 29:43 with its use of **יָעַד** can be seen as the etiology for the **מֹועֵד אֹהֶל** referred to in Exod 29:44; see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 38.

denote YHWH's presence "in the midst of" (בתוך) the Israelites (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46; see also Exod 24:16). The importance of שכן is seen from its occurrence at the beginning and the end of the divine instructions and from the fact that YHWH's dwelling (שכן) in the midst of the Israelites is described as the purpose of the sanctuary and of YHWH's action in bringing them out of Egypt (Exod 25:8; 29:46). In terms of symbolism for the divine presence, the כבוד יהוה ("the glory of YHWH") is central. It denotes the divine presence at key points within the Sinai pericope—in Exod 24:16 in relation to Mount Sinai and in Exod 29:43 and 40:34 in relation to the tent of meeting, with the latter reference occurring significantly at the end of the material in Pg concerning the instructions for and setting up of the tent of meeting. כבוד יהוה also occurs outside of the Sinai pericope in Pg, in Exod 16:7, 10; Num 14:10b; 20:6. This כבוד יהוה is in places associated with cloud (ענן): Exod 16:10; 24:16; 40:34. The glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה), in turn, is used as the subject of a number of verbs: שכן ("dwell"; Exod 24:16), מלא ("fill"; Exod 40:34), and ראה (*niphal*, "appear"; Exod 16:10; Num 14:10b; 20:6), as well as being that by which the tent of meeting is sanctified (קדש, *piel*, Exod 29:43).

In order to understand Pg's complex paradigmatic picture of divine presence, it is necessary to explore how Pg has drawn on, reshaped, and synthesized older traditions to present its own unique theology or vision regarding how YHWH is present to Israel. Just as Pg drew on older diverse traditions, including in particular the old tent of meeting tradition and Jerusalem temple traditions, reshaping and synthesizing these to present its paradigm of the structure and furnishings of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, a similar dynamic is found with regard to Pg's formulation of its paradigm of divine presence; in relation to this also Pg has drawn on older traditions that describe YHWH's qualities, presence, or manifestation, especially from Jerusalem temple or Zion tradition and the old tent of meeting tradition, and reshaped and synthesized these in quite a complex and ambiguous way to formulate its paradigmatic picture.<sup>416</sup> A case in point is the symbolism of divine presence associated with the ark, *kap-*

416. Mettinger (*Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 81) comments that any attempt to interpret the conceptions of the presence of God in relation to P's tabernacle must be founded on a tradition-historical analysis, maintaining that P materials display "the ambiguous characteristics of a photographic double exposure; in them we find influences from both an ancient ... tent tradition and from the temple theology of the Jerusalem tradition."

*poret*, and its cherubim, which draws on Jerusalem temple tradition but also on the old tent of meeting (אהל מועד) tradition (Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:16–17, 24–26; 12:4–5, 10) since the terminology of יעד (Exod 25:22) is used to denote YHWH's presence in relation to them, rather than ישב as in the ark tradition in 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2<sup>417</sup> and in the cherubim tradition of the Jerusalem temple (see 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16).<sup>418</sup>

In general, Pg would seem to have drawn on, but reshaped, the old tent of meeting (אהל מועד) tradition contained in Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:16–17, 24–26; 12:4–5 in formulating its picture of divine presence with respect to the use of יעד, not only in relation to meeting Moses in the most holy place within the tent of meeting (Exod 25:22), but also with regard to meeting the Israelites at the tent of meeting (Exod 29:43) and the imagery of the cloud (Exod 24:15b, 16, 18; 40:34; and see also Exod 16:10).

In the old tent of meeting tradition, the presence of YHWH is portrayed as comprising YHWH's temporary and intermittent meetings with Moses primarily (but also Miriam and Aaron; see Num 12:5) to speak with him (them) for a specific purpose (Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:16–17, 24–25; 12:4–5). Pg would seem to have drawn on this tradition of divine presence in using the terminology of יעד ("meet") in Exod 25:22 and 29:43 to portray a temporary encounter between YHWH and Moses/the people in

---

417. See n. 412.

418. It would seem that the tent of meeting tradition and the ark tradition were originally quite separate, since there is no mention of the ark in the old non-P tent of meeting texts (Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:16–17, 24–26; 12:4–5, 10). Therefore, it is quite likely that it was Pg who was responsible for bringing together the traditions concerning divine presence associated with the tent of meeting on the one hand, and the ark and cherubim on the other, into this unique portrayal of YHWH meeting (יעד) with Moses above the *kapporet* between the cherubim upon the ark in the holy of holies. See von Rad, "Tent and the Ark," passim, esp. 119–20; von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 1:234–38. Admittedly, it is possible that Pg might have drawn on the traditions of the sanctuary of Shiloh and/or the tent of David (if seen as later developments of the old tent tradition; see Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem," 21–22; Cross "Priestly Tabernacle," 52, 59; Friedman, "Tabernacle," 299) in a form where the tent housed the ark (see esp. 2 Sam 6:17; 7:2, 6–7). However, in terms of the available evidence with regard to how YHWH is present in relation to the tent, it is only the old tent of meeting texts of Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:16–17, 24–26; 12:4–5, 10 that speak of this explicitly, and therefore it is these texts that will be focused on in the following discussion of the way in which Pg has reshaped traditions of divine presence in relation to the tent to express YHWH's presence in association with the tent of meeting in Pg.

relation to the tent of meeting (אהל מועד).<sup>419</sup> However, Pg has reshaped this: in Exod 25:22, the place of this meeting in Pg in relation to the tent of meeting is more precisely defined as above the *kapporet* and between the cherubim that are on the ark, with all the symbolism of presence that these bring; and in Exod 29:43, the meeting is to take place between YHWH and the people rather than just Moses or the other leaders.<sup>420</sup> Pg's picture of divine presence also differs from that of the old tent of meeting tradition in that, whereas in the latter the tent is outside the camp and therefore the place of divine encounter is also outside, in Pg the tent of meeting is the means of YHWH's dwelling in the midst of the people (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46) and hence the place of divine encounter is among the people.<sup>421</sup> Even more significantly, whereas the old tent of meeting consistently uses the term ירד to describe the presence of YHWH, whether simply YHWH himself (Num 11:17) or as symbolized in the cloud (Exod 33:9; Num 11:25; 12:5), Pg never uses the terminology of ירד in association with YHWH's presence in the Sinai periscope or in Israel's wanderings in the desert.<sup>422</sup> Therefore, the theological picture in the old tent of meeting tradition which sees YHWH as residing in heaven and descending (ירד) intermittently to meet with humanity and then departing (see Num 12:9–10)<sup>423</sup> is not found in Pg; true, Pg portrays the presence of YHWH in terms of temporary encounters or meetings (יעד) with Moses/the people in Exod 25:22; 29:43, but there is no suggestion that YHWH “comes down” (ירד) to do this and then returns again to the transcendent realm. Might this hint at, or at least leave the gate open for, a more continuous divine presence in relation to the people?<sup>424</sup>

419. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 86; Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 39, n. 2.

420. However, see Exod 33:7, which perhaps hints at an encounter between YHWH and the people more generally.

421. Weinfeld, “כבוד,” 34; Sommer, “Conflicting Constructions,” 44.

422. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 86; Weinfeld, “כבוד,” 34.

423. Mettinger (*Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 83) refers to this as rendezvous theology and divine revelation from above. Robert Kawashima (“The Priestly Tent of Meeting and the Problem of Divine Transcendence: An ‘Archeology’ of the Sacred,” *JR* 86 [2006]: 230) speaks of God's apparition as in effect permanently anchored to the transcendent realm and the fleeting nature of the divine intrusion into space and time.

424. The possible significance of this will be explored further when we discuss other aspects of Pg's picture of divine presence.

The other element that Pg would seem to have taken over, at least in part, from the old tent of meeting tradition is the imagery of the cloud. In the old tent of meeting tradition, the intermittent presence of YHWH in relation to the tent is symbolized by a cloud: in Num 11:25; 12:5, YHWH comes down (יֵרֵד) in a cloud/pillar of cloud;<sup>425</sup> in Exod 33:9, the pillar of cloud descends (יֵרֵד); and in Num 12:10, the cloud that has descended (Num 12:5) turns back (סוֹר). Although Pg does not use the verb יֵרֵד in relation to the divine presence, Pg does use cloud imagery in association with the divine presence in Exod 16:10; 24:15b, 16, 18; and 40:34, albeit, unlike in the tent of meeting tradition, linked consistently with the glory of YHWH (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה). Pg's imagery of the cloud as related to divine presence in Exod 40:34 in particular would seem to draw on the old tent of meeting tradition since here the cloud, as there, is found in proximity to the tent of meeting, although in Pg the cloud covers (כִּסָּה) the tent of meeting whereas in Exod 33:9; Num 12:5 the pillar of cloud stands at the entrance of the tent of meeting. In addition, as in the old tent of meeting tradition (see Exod 33:9; Num 11:25), in Pg in Exod 16:10; 24:15b, 16, 18; 25:1 the imagery of the cloud associated with divine presence is linked with speaking to Moses.

As well as drawing on the cloud imagery of the old tent of meeting tradition, it would appear that Pg has also drawn on other traditions where cloud imagery is used in relation to the divine presence, such as the motif of the cloud as a divine chariot (Pss 68:4; 104:3; Isa 19:1)<sup>426</sup> and divine theophanies in general (see Ps 97:2–3; Exod 19:9, 16). Pg seems to have drawn on these traditions in that as in the imagery of the divine chariot that speaks of the movement of the deity, the cloud associated with divine presence in Pg moves, for example, from covering Mount Sinai (Exod 24:15b, 16, 18) to covering the tent of meeting (40:34); and in particular, as in 19:9, 16, where the cloud symbolizing theophany is associated with the mountain (19:16) and with the deity speaking to Moses (19:9; and see

425. Cf. Num 11:17 where it is said simply that YHWH will come down (יֵרֵד).

426. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 202; Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 49 n. 5. See also the tradition of the cloud associated with divine guidance in Exod 13:21–22 (and see also Ps 78:14; 105:39) or with divine protection in Exod 14:19b, 24. Although later Priestly material has drawn on the tradition of the cloud associated with divine guidance (see Num 9:15–23), this motif is absent from Pg as I have defined it.

19:19), so also in Pg the cloud covers Mount Sinai and is associated with YHWH speaking to Moses (24:18; 25:1).

Therefore, Pg would seem to have drawn on both old tent of meeting tradition and the theophanic tradition in using the imagery of the cloud in association with the divine presence. However, Pg has reshaped these traditions. In particular, the cloud in Pg never descends (יֵרֵד) as occurs in the old tent of meeting traditions, and so Pg does not depict the divine presence as coming down from heaven and returning there. Moreover, whereas, on the one hand, in the tent of meeting tradition the cloud is the only image associated with God's presence, and, on the other, in the theophanic tradition it is one of a number of elements which include, for example, fire and storm imagery (e.g., Ps 97:2–3; Exod 19:16, 18), in Pg the cloud as associated with divine presence never occurs on its own but is always associated specifically with the “glory of YHWH” (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה), which is Pg's primary symbol for the presence of YHWH. In Exod 16:10, the glory of YHWH appears in the cloud; in Exod 24:15b, 16, the cloud covers the mountain, the glory of YHWH settles on the mountain, and the cloud covers it (the glory and/or the mountain); and in Exod 40:34, the cloud covers the tent of meeting and the glory of YHWH fills the tabernacle. The cloud therefore in Pg is that which veils, covers, or screens the glory of YHWH, which is the more direct symbol for YHWH's presence in Pg, and in this sense is associated with YHWH's presence to both mark the presence of YHWH and to conceal it.<sup>427</sup>

Furthermore, the cloud as associated with the divine presence, always linked with the glory of YHWH, occurs in Pg only before the existence of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and up until, and including, the sanctification of the tabernacle/tent of meeting by YHWH's glory (Exod 16:10; 24:15b, 16, 18; 40:34 [which fulfills Exod 29:43]). After this, the glory of YHWH appears on its own in relation to the tent of meeting (Num 14:10b; 20:6). This suggests that the tent of meeting, once sanctified by YHWH's glory, replaces the cloud as protecting the glory, with the cloud covering the tent of meeting which is filled by the glory of YHWH in Exod 40:34

---

427. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 47. Hundley comments that the cloud as veiling the glory is, however, diaphanous since the glory is partly visible through the cloud; and states that, “The partial shielding adds an air of mystery. A hint of fiery glory is a reminder that something magnificent lurks intangibly beyond the cloudy veil.” See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 202.



as marking the transition from the cloud plus the glory of YHWH (Exod 16:10) to the tent of meeting plus the glory of YHWH (Num 14:10b; 20:6).

In these ways, then, Pg has drawn on, reshaped, and synthesized traditions of divine presence associated with the old tent of meeting tradition and theophanic cloud imagery. But in order to investigate Pg's distinct paradigmatic picture of divine presence further, it is necessary to explore more the other expressions for divine presence presented by Pg that do not have their roots in the old tent of meeting tradition: the symbolism of Pg's primary expression for divine presence, the "glory of YHWH" (כבוד יהוה), and the other verb beside יעד that Pg has used in relation to divine presence, שכן. The discussion of these will also involve an examination of the traditions drawn on, reshaped, and synthesized, in the formulation of Pg's distinctive picture of divine presence. Does the כבוד יהוה and the use of שכן have overtones of a more continuous or permanent presence or not? What is Pg's overall paradigm of divine presence that comprises the combination of Pg's use of כבוד יהוה and שכן with its use of יעד and cloud imagery as unfolded here?

The "glory of YHWH" (כבוד יהוה) is the primary symbolism used by Pg to denote divine presence. It occurs in Pg in the Sinai pericope in Exod 24:16–17; 29:43 (כבדי within a YHWH speech); 40:34 and outside the Sinai pericope in Exod 16:7, 10 and Num 14:10b; 20:6.

In preexilic tradition, the term כבוד is often used in relation to God/YHWH as king, primarily as an attribute of God and with the nuance of power, majesty, or splendor.<sup>428</sup> For example, in Ps 24:7–10 YHWH is described as "the king of glory" (מלך הכבוד); in Ps 29 YHWH is described as "the God of glory" (אל הכבוד, 29:3) in the context of proclaiming YHWH as enthroned king (see 29:1, 2, 9, 10); in Ps 145 כבוד occurs in the context of God as king (Ps 145:5, 11, 12, and see 145:1); in Pss 96 and 97 כבוד is found in the context of the proclamation of YHWH as king (Ps 96:7–8, and see 96:10; Ps 97:6, and see 97:1); and in Isaiah's temple vision, the seraphim proclaim in Isa 6:3 that the whole earth is full of the glory (כבוד) of YHWH, described in Isa 6:8 as the king.<sup>429</sup> Finally, Ps 26:8 refers to the temple as the place where YHWH's glory dwells (מ שכן כבודך). Given this, as Mettinger has argued convincingly, the use of כבוד in association with YHWH was part of Jerusalem temple tradition

428. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 115; Weinfeld, "כבוד," 25–29.

429. See also Ps 72:19. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 117–19.



and theology.<sup>430</sup> Moreover, since the occurrences of כבוד in Pss 29:3 and 97:6 are linked not only with YHWH as king but also with the description of a theophany in Pss 29:3 and 97:6, the theophanic tradition, as well as Zion tradition, was cultivated in the milieu of the Jerusalem temple.<sup>431</sup> It was these temple traditions, in particular the theophanic tradition, that Pg would appear to have drawn on in formulating its distinctive picture of the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה).<sup>432</sup>

That Pg has drawn on the theophanic tradition, such as found in Ps 97,<sup>433</sup> is seen not only in relation to the cloud associated with the glory (Exod 16:10; 24:15b–18; 40:34; see Ps 97:2, 6), but also with respect to the imagery of fire (Ps 97:3), which is a conventional element of theophanies (see, e.g., Ps 18:8; Isa 6:3–4; Exod 19:18), for in Exod 24:17 Pg refers to the appearance of the כבוד יהוה like a devouring fire. However, whereas in the theophanic tradition fire is an attendant element and in Ps 97:6 the glory would seem to embrace the elements attendant on the theophany as a whole, comprising cloud, fire, and lightning,<sup>434</sup> in Pg the fire, rather than being an attendant element or part of that which comprises the glory, is simply used as an analogy in an attempt to describe the glory's appearance. Moreover, Mettinger argues that Ps 24, which is usually seen as referring to the procession of the ark into the sanctuary,<sup>435</sup> with its reference to the king of glory, is a ritual actualization of theophany during temple worship and that this motif has been picked up and applied in Pg's conception of the glory of YHWH filling the tabernacle in Exod 40:34.<sup>436</sup> Alternatively, or as well, the concept of God's glory (כבוד) filling the earth, such as found

---

430. Ibid., 89, 95, 118, 134.

431. Ibid., 118–19, 122, 133; Mettinger, “Name and the Glory,” 19–20. The theophanic tradition goes back to early, premonarchic roots; and the association of glory with deities and kings also goes back early as seen from the association of glory with crowns in ancient Near Eastern traditions (e.g., in Egypt); see Weinfeld, “כבוד,” 27, 29.

432. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 122; Mettinger, “Name and the Glory,” 19–20.

433. See also Exod 33:18–23. Mettinger (*Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 119) links this theophany with the cult and in particular with beholding God in the temple (see Pss 63:3; 27:13).

434. Or as Mettinger (ibid.) comments, a comprehensive term for the royal apparel of God, of cloud, fire, and lightning.

435. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 204.

436. On “king of glory,” see the connection between the ark and the glory in

in Isa 6:3; Ps 72:19 may lie behind Exod 40:34,<sup>437</sup> as might the temple as the dwelling place of YHWH's glory as referred to in Ps 26:8. In addition, it is quite possible that, as Mettinger argues, the exhortations for God to "shine forth" (יָפֵעַ, *hiphil*, Pss 50:2; 80:2), which stem from the theophanic tradition as cultivated in the milieu of the temple (as linked with the Zion tradition and God as enthroned on the cherubim respectively) lies behind Pg's expression of the glory of YHWH (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה), especially with regard to specific manifestations (e.g., Exod 16:10; Num 14:10b; 20:6).<sup>438</sup>

Given that the roots of Pg's expression, the glory of YHWH (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה), lie in the Jerusalem temple tradition, including the theophanic tradition, how has Pg reshaped these traditions of God's/YHWH's glory, and what exactly does the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה as used in Pg connote?

Pg has taken up the glory of YHWH from the Jerusalem temple tradition, including its theophanic elements, and transformed it from an attribute primarily to the central symbol or most direct expression for the presence of YHWH.

The importance of the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה is seen in that it occurs throughout the material in Pg after the exodus from Egypt. Within the Sinai pericope, it occurs at the beginning and end, framing the divine instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel and the carrying out of these instructions: in Exod 24:16 the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה settles (שָׁכַן) on Mount Sinai, covered by cloud, that is, in the place from which Moses receives the divine instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel; and in Exod 40:34, once the instructions have been carried out, it fills (מָלֵא) the tabernacle, which is covered by the cloud. The filling of the tabernacle by the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה symbolizes the fact that the presence of YHWH has come to reside in the tabernacle and that the tabernacle is now consecrated by YHWH in fulfillment of YHWH's promise in Exod 29:43 that the tent of meeting will be sanctified (קָדַשׁ, *piel*) by "my glory" (כְּבוֹדִי).<sup>439</sup> Within the Sinai pericope therefore the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה, the divine presence, moves from Mount Sinai into the tabernacle as YHWH's dwelling place. Outside the Sinai pericope the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה occurs in each of the scenarios comprising the wanderings of the Israelites in the wilderness: in Exod 16:7, 10 the

1 Sam 4:21–22, which could be an early reference. See further Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 88; Mettinger, "Name and the Glory," 14.

437. Weinfeld, "כְּבוֹד," 29.

438. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 95; "Name and the Glory," 19.

439. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 44, 56, 92.

כבוד יהוה appears (ראה, *niphal*) in the cloud as the Israelites face toward the wilderness; in Num 14:10b the כבוד יהוה appears (ראה, *niphal*) at the tent of meeting to all the Israelites; and in Num 20:6 the כבוד יהוה appears (ראה, *niphal*) to Moses and Aaron at the entrance of the tent of meeting.<sup>440</sup> In all these scenarios, the כבוד יהוה appears in response to the complaining or rebellion of the people, and the appearance of the כבוד יהוה is followed by a speech to Moses (and/or Aaron), with either a promise of, or instructions for, helping/healing the people (Exod 16:11–12; Num 20:7, 8\*), which subsequently occurs, or the announcement of judgment (Num 14:26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35) and its unfolding. In these wilderness-wandering scenarios, the appearance of the כבוד יהוה is for a specific purpose: the manifestation of the כבוד יהוה is a prelude to the intervention of YHWH either for the well-being of the Israelites or over against them. The settling of the כבוד יהוה on Mount Sinai has a similar function in that it is a prelude to the instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting and their subsequent execution. However, once the כבוד יהוה has moved from Mount Sinai to fill the tabernacle (Exod 40:34), that is, as consecrating it and taking possession of it as YHWH's dwelling place, the כבוד יהוה functions to picture the presence of YHWH as residing at the heart of the Israelite community in an ongoing basis. Consequently, although prior to the existence of the tabernacle, the כבוד יהוה appears to the Israelites in the cloud in the wilderness/Mount Sinai (Exod 16:10; and 24:15b–17), after the tabernacle is constructed and consecrated by the כבוד יהוה filling it (Exod 40:34), from then on, the כבוד יהוה manifests itself directly to the people in relation to the tent of meeting only, that is, directly to the people standing outside the tent of meeting and with no cloud covering it (Num 14:10b; and see Num 20:6 in relation to Moses and Aaron).<sup>441</sup> Thus, as used in Pg the כבוד יהוה represents “the concrete effective presence of YHWH both in Israel's history and in Israel's cult.”<sup>442</sup>

440. In addition, in Exod 14:4, 17–18, YHWH says that he will gain glory for himself (כבד, *niphal*).

441. However, as Sommer (“Conflicting Constructions,” 42 n. 4) points out, the precise location of the כבוד יהוה in relation to the tabernacle is not clear. See Ursula Struppe, *Die Herrlichkeit in der Priesterschrift: Eine semantische Studien zu Kebod Yhwh*, ÖBS 9 (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 222–30 for a discussion of the glory of YHWH and its distribution in Pg.

442. Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 158.

But what is the precise connotation of the כבוד יהוה as it occurs in Pg in this way? Although the כבוד יהוה in Pg clearly signifies the visible presence of YHWH on earth, it is difficult to determine the exact relationship between the כבוד יהוה and YHWH himself.<sup>443</sup> Mettinger sees the כבוד יהוה almost as denoting God himself or virtually a divine name.<sup>444</sup> Moshe Weinfeld perceives P's כבוד יהוה, while semantically expressing the majesty of sovereign divine power, as denoting a conception of God in a corporeal rather than abstract way, as a "corporeal representation of the Deity."<sup>445</sup> This is disputed by Robert Kawashima, who argues for a more abstract concept, maintaining that P's glory "is present and concrete but utterly disembodied."<sup>446</sup> Hundley's discussion of the כבוד יהוה is most helpful. He argues that P's כבוד יהוה, as the visible aspect of the divine presence, is in a sense YHWH's clothing or cloak that highlights his importance and otherness and reveals his location and at the same time "conceals him in its radiant folds."<sup>447</sup> The glory, therefore, as both revealing YHWH's presence and concealing it, shrouds the divine form itself, if there is one; the divine form itself cannot be seen and therefore cannot be defined.<sup>448</sup> The glory, as the surrounding radiance of the indefinable YHWH, functions as a metonym for YHWH himself, capturing some of the divine essence and therefore fittingly identifying and locating the divine presence, but at the same time it ensures the mystery and elusiveness of the deity himself.<sup>449</sup> Even the כבוד

---

443. See Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 590. Hundley (*Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 40 n. 4) lists a number of possible options such as the glory is a visible aura that surrounds and locates God's invisible presence; it is God's clothing; it is part of his presence used as a metonym for the whole; or like the cloud, it is a veil that at once hides and locates the divine presence.

444. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 115, 122.

445. Quotation from Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 200; see further 202, 206; Weinfeld, "כבוד," 36. Here Weinfeld is drawing on the connotation of כבוד as "body" (Exod 33:18, 20) or "substance" (Isa 17:4), and in particular the weight and importance of a substance.

446. Kawashima, "Priestly Tent of Meeting," 256–57.

447. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 43; for the larger discussion, see 40–51, 204–5.

448. *Ibid.*, 45–47.

449. *Ibid.*, 43, 51. Hundley (*ibid.*, 51, 204) compares the כבוד יהוה to ancient Near Eastern cult statues as the locus of divine presence, arguing that, because the כבוד יהוה emanates from the person of YHWH himself rather than being connected to a human object, YHWH's presence is more elusive, with fewer limitations and anthropomorphisms (since it cannot be deported or destroyed).

as the tangible sign of divine presence is only described via a simile, that is, like fire (Exod 24:17), and therefore how much less can YHWH himself be described.<sup>450</sup> What YHWH's true form or presence looks like, if visible at all, and how and where it exactly dwells in the tabernacle remains elusive.<sup>451</sup>

Does the **כבוד יהוה** represent a temporary presence or one that is continuous and permanent? Although the **כבוד יהוה** appears intermittently in the wilderness wanderings in Pg, each time for a specific purpose, it never "comes down" (**ירד**) as in the theology of temporary presence associated with the old tent of meeting tradition (Exod 33:9; Num 11:17, 25; 12:5). Indeed, a strong case can be made for seeing the **כבוד יהוה** as a continuous and permanent presence within the tabernacle once it comes into existence.<sup>452</sup> This is signaled by the **כבוד יהוה** filling the tabernacle in Exod 40:34, which represents not only the consecrating of the tabernacle but also taking possession of it, with no hint of leaving.<sup>453</sup> In addition, the gradations or zones of holiness comprising the tabernacle suggest that the residence of the **כבוד יהוה** within it is of a continuous and permanent nature.<sup>454</sup> The specific appearances of the **כבוד יהוה** after the completion of the tabernacle and its filling it occur only in relation to the tabernacle, albeit visible outside it (Num 14:10b; 20:6). These specific manifestations after the completion of the tabernacle do not undermine the continuous and permanent presence of the **כבוד יהוה** within the tabernacle. As Pitkänen explains, just as Mesopotamian cult statues, which locate the god on earth while still seeing the god as present in heaven and can be set up in more than one place, so the **כבוד יהוה** as signifying YHWH's presence can be continuously present inside the tent of meeting and yet manifest itself in a special way in another place, that is, outside the tent of meeting, on

---

450. Ibid., 51.

451. Ibid.

452. Those that advocate a continuous permanent presence include Schwartz, "Priestly Account," 125, 133–34; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191; Weinfeld, "כבוד," 32; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 88–89; Mettinger, "Name and the Glory," 18; Sommer, "Conflicting Constructions," 42, 44, 62; Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary*, 46 n. 191; Kawashima, "Priestly Tent of Meeting," 230; Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 49, 50 n. 56. Pace Dozeman (*God on the Mountain*, 131; *Commentary on Exodus*, 591–92), who sees the **כבוד יהוה** as an impermanent or temporary presence.

453. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 88; Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 50 n. 56.

454. Mettinger, "Name and the Glory," 15.

special occasions.<sup>455</sup> Mettinger holds together these public manifestations (see Num 14:10b; 20:6) with the permanent presence within the tabernacle by speaking of these as “emanations of the kabod,” which is constantly present within the tabernacle, on the analogy of the earlier temple tradition of God shining forth (יָפַע, *hiphil*) from the temple on Zion (Pss 50:2; 80:2).<sup>456</sup> However, although it can be argued that the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה is continuously and permanently present within the tabernacle, this does not mean that it is a static presence, as in the Jerusalem temple tradition, where YHWH’s presence is located at a particular fixed site, reinforced by the use of יָשַׁב (“sit,” “be enthroned”). In contrast, the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה in Pg is continuously and permanently present in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting, which is a mobile sanctuary, and therefore moves with this mobile sanctuary through space (and time) in the midst of the Israelites.<sup>457</sup> Consequently, the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה is not static in the sense of being permanently associated with a fixed location but can be seen as permanently and continuously present in relation to the mobile tabernacle/tent of meeting (Exod 40:34), in relation to which it also appears as public manifestations from time to time (Num 14:10b; 20:6).

So far it has been argued that כְּבוֹד יְהוָה represents the continuous presence of YHWH within the tabernacle/tent of meeting once the tabernacle has been completed, as well as manifesting itself publicly on special occasions. However, as already noted, Pg also uses the verb יָעַד in Exod 25:22; 29:43 and, as reflecting old tent of meeting traditions, suggests temporary encounters between YHWH and Moses/the Israelites. In addition, another important verb is used in Pg in association with divine presence, שָׁכַן (“dwell”), and whether or not שָׁכַן denotes temporary or permanent presence is debated. A final and complete picture of divine presence in Pg, and in particular with regard to the issue of temporary or permanent presence, therefore, cannot be given without taking Pg’s use of יָעַד into account and addressing the issue of Pg’s use of שָׁכַן and its possible connotations.

455. Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary*, 46 n. 191.

456. Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 88–89.

457. See Sommer, “Conflicting Constructions,” 48, 53, 62. Therefore, in contrast to the transience of the divine presence in the earlier tent of meeting tradition, signified by the use of יָרַד, as commented by Hundley (*Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 49), “rather than using movement as a sign of transience, the Priestly texts use movement to indicate permanence.”

שכן is a significant verb relating to the divine presence in Pg. It is used in relation to the כבוד יהוה itself in Exod 24:16 where the glory of YHWH settles (שכן) on Mount Sinai. It occurs also with YHWH as subject, significantly at the beginning and end of the divine instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting; that is, in Exod 25:8, where YHWH's dwelling (שכן) in the midst of the Israelites is the stated purpose of the making of the sanctuary, and in Exod 29:45–46, where it is linked with the promise to be their God and the stated purpose of bringing them out of the land of Egypt in the exodus, which, overall, brings them to knowledge of YHWH.

What, then, is the particular nuance of שכן within Pg? Opinion is divided as to whether שכן, as used within Pg, connotes temporary or permanent presence.<sup>458</sup> In general, שכן is used of encamping or settling impermanently (see, e.g., Gen 9:27; 35:21–22; Judg 5:17; Num 24:2 [see also Ugaritic texts]) and also for a permanent stay at a location (see, e.g., 2 Sam 7:10; Isa 18:3; 34:17; Pss 37:27, 29; 102:29 [Eng. 28]).<sup>459</sup> Those who see שכן in P as denoting a temporary or impermanent presence tend to emphasize the use of שכן in the former sense of encamping or settling impermanently; Cross, for example, argues that P, in a departure from Jerusalem temple theology, has eschewed the term ישב (“dwell”) and drawn on archaic desert terminology such as found in Ugaritic texts and early texts such as Judg 5:17; Num 24:2 and used it as an abstract term to express the theological concept of the paradox of God as transcendent and yet imminent in the tabernacle, describing the divine presence as tabernacled or settling impermanently.<sup>460</sup> However, Mettinger has argued

458. Those who see שכן as denoting temporary or impermanent presence in P include: Cross, “Priestly Tabernacle,” 63–64; M. Görg, “שכן,” *TDOT* 14:698–701; M. Görg, “יעד,” *TDOT* 6:143–44; Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 592; Dozeman, *God on the Mountain*, 129. Those who see שכן as denoting permanent presence in P include Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191 n. 2; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 95–96; Mettinger, “Name and the Glory,” 17; Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 39 n. 1.

459. On the Ugaritic texts, see Cross, “Priestly Tabernacle,” 63–64. In general, see Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 91–92. Similarly מושכן in general is used to refer to a tent (see, e.g., Num 24:5; Isa 54:2; Jer 30:18; Ps 78:60 [and see the Ugaritic literature]), but also to a permanent dwelling such as the grave (e.g., Isa 22:16; Ps 49:12[11]) or the Jerusalem temple (see, e.g., Pss 43:3; 46:5[4]; 84:2[1]; 74:7; 132:5, 7); and see discussion of מושכן under §4.2.1.1, above.

460. Cross, “Priestly Tabernacle,” 63–64; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 245, 299. Görg (“יעד,” 143–144; “שכן,” 698–701), however, argues on the grounds that



convincingly, over against this, that, not only is שֹׁכֵן quite often used to denote permanent dwelling but that שֹׁכֵן was a term used in the Zion/Jerusalem temple tradition to denote durative or continuous presence, and this is the sense in which P also uses the term שֹׁכֵן in relation to its sanctuary.<sup>461</sup> Noting that in the preexilic Zion tradition the temple sanctuary is the site where space is transcended, that is, where God is located simultaneously on earth and in heaven (see, e.g., Pss 20:3 [Eng. 2], 7 [Eng. 6]; 14:2, 7; 11:4), he draws attention to Ps 68:17 (Eng. 16) and Isa 8:18, which describe YHWH as dwelling (שֹׁכֵן) on the mountain/Mount Zion, and Ps 135:21, which parallels Zion with YHWH as dwelling (שֹׁכֵן) in Jerusalem. These references to שֹׁכֵן denote permanent dwelling. Moreover, in Ps 68:17 (Eng. 16) and 1 Kgs 8:12–13 שֹׁכֵן and יָשָׁב (“dwell,” “sit [enthroned]”) are paralleled with each other and can be taken as synonymous with respect to denoting permanent or durative presence: they differ in nuance here only in that יָשָׁב has the connotation of to sit or be enthroned, whereas שֹׁכֵן does not have this connotation but is “a less specific expression for a temporally continuous divine presence.”<sup>462</sup> P, then, draws on שֹׁכֵן with its connotation of continuous divine presence as found in the Zion/Jerusalem temple tradition and uses it to connote continuous or durative presence in relation to the tabernacle in Exod 25:8; 29:45–46.

Mettinger makes a strong case here and therefore it can be concluded that the use of שֹׁכֵן in describing the divine presence in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting in Pg (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46) has the meaning of continuous or permanent presence, especially given its zones of graded holiness. Indeed, it can be argued that Pg has used the verb שֹׁכֵן and not the verb יָרַד in speaking of the divine presence in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting in order to replace the temporary and intermittent theology of divine presence associated with the old tent of meeting tradition that uses יָרַד with that of the Zion/Jerusalem temple tradition of YHWH’s continuous presence encapsulated in שֹׁכֵן. The connotation of שֹׁכֵן as denoting continuous and permanent presence in Exod 25:8; 29:45–46 is in line with our conclusion regarding the glory of YHWH

---

שֹׁכֵן generally connotes an active dynamic dwelling and that its use in Exod 29:45–46 should be read in the light of יָעַד in Exod 29:43.

461. For use of the term for a permanent dwelling, see, e.g., 2 Sam 7:10; Isa 18:3; 34: 17; Pss 37:27, 29; 102:29 (Eng. 28). See Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 28–30, 92–97.

462. Ibid., 94, and see 92; Mettinger, “Name and the Glory,” 16–17.



as continuously and permanently present in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting. However, the glory of YHWH moves from Mt Sinai into the tabernacle (Exod 24:16; 40:34). In Exod 24:16, the glory of YHWH is said to שָׁכַן ("settle") on Mount Sinai and in this context, since the glory moves from there to the tabernacle, שָׁכַן denotes a temporary presence of the glory in relation to the mountain; the glory of YHWH only becomes a continuous and permanent presence in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting. Therefore, the use of שָׁכַן in relation to Mount Sinai in Pg differs from the Zion tradition, where YHWH is said to dwell permanently (שָׁכַן) on Mount Zion, in that it is a temporary, rather than a permanent presence on the mountain. However, in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting in Pg (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46), the use of שָׁכַן, far from being a departure from Jerusalem temple theology as temporary or impermanent as Cross maintains, is in line with it in the sense of connoting continuous presence in relation to the sanctuary. However, the use of שָׁכַן in relation to the sanctuary in Pg does differ from Zion/temple theology in one important respect: whereas in the Zion/temple theology the temple, and therefore the continuous divine presence that dwells (יָשַׁב/שָׁכַן) there, is located at a fixed site, in Pg the tabernacle/tent of meeting is mobile and therefore the continuous divine presence moves with the tabernacle/tent of meeting; YHWH, by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting dwells continuously (שָׁכַן) in the midst of the people, but because this sanctuary is mobile, YHWH's presence is not tied to a particular fixed location but can move from place to place.<sup>463</sup> It is this mobility of the divine presence that reflects the use of שָׁכַן in contexts that speak of tents and encamping, rather than any connotation of being temporary in the sense of being temporally intermittent.<sup>464</sup> This is perhaps at least part of the reason why Pg does not use יָשַׁב, with its sedentary and therefore more static connotations in the sense of sitting at a fixed location. YHWH dwells continuously and permanently (שָׁכַן) in the midst of the people through the portable tabernacle/tent of meeting and moves with it through space and time.

The nature of the divine presence is continuous and permanent in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting as signified especially by in the glory of YHWH (Exod 40:34) and the use of שָׁכַן (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46). How-

463. See Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 96–97, 114; Sommer, "Conflicting Constructions," 48, 53, 61–62.

464. As Hundley (*Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 49) states, "rather than using movement as a sign of transience, the P texts use movement to indicate permanence."

ever, this is not the whole story. We have seen that Pg also uses the verb יַעַד (*niphal*) in relation to the divine presence in Exod 25:22 and 29:43. This verb, derived from the old tent of meeting tradition, has the connotation of temporary encounter or meeting. In Exod 25:22, יַעַד (*niphal*) has replaced the traditional use of יָשָׁב as associated with the cherubim, to indicate divine presence above the *kapporet* between the cherubim, and therefore Pg would seem to have deliberately changed the nuance here from a static continuous presence (יָשָׁב) to a temporary encounter between YHWH and Moses for a specific purpose, that is, to give instructions.<sup>465</sup> In Exod 29:43, the verb יַעַד (*niphal*), this time referring to YHWH's promise to meet with the Israelites at the tent of meeting, occurs in the context of, and alongside, the use of שָׁכַן, denoting continuous presence in Exod 29:45–46 (and see Exod 25:8). However, this does not mean that the intermittent meetings replace, overshadow, or correct the divine presence as durative and permanent or vice versa.<sup>466</sup> Rather, this suggests that, within Pg's paradigmatic picture, the divine presence in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting is both continuous and permanent, though mobile along with the tabernacle/tent of meeting, and consists in intermittent encounters for specific purposes. The permanence and durative nature of the divine presence is held together with specific meetings between YHWH and Moses/the Israelites; Pg's paradigm of divine presence embodies both.<sup>467</sup>

In conclusion, it has been found that, as with the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its furnishings, Pg draws on both old tent of meeting traditions and Zion/Jerusalem temple traditions and reshapes and synthesizes these to give a complex paradigmatic picture of divine presence. Pg draws on the old tent of meeting tradition in the use of the verb יַעַד and in using the imagery of the cloud. Pg also draws on theophanic tradition with reference to cloud imagery and the analogy of the glory as being like fire. Pg draws on Jerusalem temple tradition, including the theophanic tradition incorporated into it, with reference to the ark and *kapporet* with its cherubim, the terminology of the glory of YHWH as central symbol for YHWH's presence, and the use of the verb שָׁכַן. The picture that emerges from the reshaping and synthesis of these elements associated with divine

465. See pp. 353–54, above.

466. Pace, e.g., von Rad, "Tent and the Ark," 120–21; von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 239; Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 245–46; Cross, "Priestly Tabernacle"; Fretheim, "Priestly Document."

467. See Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 39 n. 1.

presence in these earlier traditions is one that embodies both permanent and continuous divine presence in relation to the mobile tabernacle/tent of meeting and intermittent temporary encounters or meetings for specific purposes. Pg accomplishes this in the following way: On the one hand, Pg uses the verb **יַעַד** (from the old tent of meeting tradition), which denotes intermittent or specific encounters for a purpose (Exod 25:22; 29:43), and never the verb **יָשַׁב** (“sit enthroned,” from the Jerusalem temple tradition), which denotes continuous and static presence, thus describing the divine presence as meeting with Moses/the Israelites on specific occasions. On the other hand, Pg describes the glory of YHWH (**כְּבוֹד יְהוָה**) as filling the tabernacle (Exod 40:34), comprised of zones of graded holiness, whose purpose is to **שָׁכַן** (“dwell continuously,” Exod 25:8; 29:45–46) (all from the Zion/Jerusalem temple tradition), and nowhere using the verb **יָרַד** (“descend,” used in the old tent of meeting tradition for YHWH’s intermittent presence on earth); in this way, Pg emphasizes the permanence and continuous nature of the divine presence in relation to the tabernacle. Therefore, in synthesizing these elements together into the picture of the tabernacle, its furnishings, and its personnel as a whole (Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\*), that is, the use of the verbs **יַעַד** and **שָׁכַן**, along with the glory of YHWH, Pg holds together the continuous presence of YHWH in relation to the tabernacle and intermittent meetings between YHWH and Moses/the Israelites in association with the tabernacle/tent of meeting. Moreover the symbolism of the glory of YHWH holds these two aspects within itself: in relation to the tabernacle it is a permanent, continuous presence, and it also appears (**רָאָה**, *niphal*) on specific occasions (Exod 16:10; Num 14; 10b; 20:6), albeit, after the tabernacle/tent of meeting comes into existence, always in association with it, perhaps representing an emanation of the continuously present **כְּבוֹד יְהוָה** (Num 14; 10b; 20:6).

The divine presence in Pg’s picture is not associated with one particular fixed site. Indeed, the divine presence is mobile and moves from place to place. The glory of YHWH moves from the wilderness (Exod 16:10) to Mount Sinai, where it settles (**שָׁכַן**, in this one instance impermanently, 24:16), and from Mount Sinai into the tabernacle, where it takes up permanent residence (40:34). But even as continuously and permanently present within the tabernacle/tent of meeting the divine presence is itinerant because the tabernacle/tent of meeting itself is mobile: the divine presence, as permanently attached to the tabernacle/tent of meeting, symbolized by the glory of YHWH filling it (40:34) and YHWH himself dwelling (**שָׁכַן**, 25:8; 29:45–46) in the midst of the people by means of it,

inevitably moves with it, and appears in relation to it (Num 14:10b; 20:6) at different locations.

Finally, in Pg's picture the elusiveness and mystery of the divine presence is preserved in its very descriptions. Pg's primary symbol for the divine presence, the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה), while no longer simply an attribute of God as in the earlier tradition but rather metonymically linked, and emanating from, YHWH himself, both reveals and conceals the divine presence: as the surrounding radiance of YHWH it hides YHWH's true form, if there is one, and ensures that, while locating YHWH's presence, YHWH himself is indefinable, with even the appearance of the glory itself remaining elusive, described only by the analogy of fire (Exod 24:17).<sup>468</sup> Moreover, the glory is veiled or covered, first by the cloud (16:10; 24:15b–16; 40:34) and then by the tabernacle (40:34) adding to its elusiveness. The promise that YHWH will dwell (שכן) in the midst of the people (25:8; 29:45–46) is not further defined: Pg leaves unclear and undefined how YHWH dwells in the tabernacle, or exactly where, or what it means exactly for YHWH to do this.<sup>469</sup> In these ways, Pg points in tantalizing ways to the divine presence in association with the tabernacle/tent of meeting but preserves its elusiveness, mystery, and in the end its indefinability.

#### 4.2.1.4. Conclusion

Our exploration of the paradigmatic nature of Pg's Sinai pericope in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\* has shown how earlier traditions have been taken up, reshaped, and synthesized with each other and with unique and programmatic elements to present a unique vision, a timeless paradigmatic picture, a picture of the founding rituals of sacred space and sacred personnel that are the means by which YHWH is present to the Israelites and that is relevant for, or encompassing and therefore transcending, all time, past, present, and future.

The earlier traditions drawn on, reshaped, and synthesized by Pg in formulating its paradigmatic picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its furniture in its various aspects, including its form as reshaped building inscription, the terminology used, its structure and the zones compris-

468. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 40–51.

469. *Ibid.*, 49–51.

ing it, its materials and ornamentation, and its furniture, including the ark and cherubim, the lampstand, table, and altar, comprise ancient Near Eastern tent and temple traditions, earlier Israelite traditions concerning tent shrines and in particular the old tent of meeting tradition, and pre-exilic Jerusalem temple traditions. Along with reshaping and synthesizing elements drawn from these traditions, Pg has incorporated distinctive elements such as the *kapporet* into its visionary picture.

The earlier traditions drawn on, reshaped, and synthesized by Pg in formulating its paradigmatic picture of the personnel that are intrinsic to the tabernacle/tent of meeting, that is, the priesthood and in particular the high priest Aaron, as seen in particular in the description of the clothing and the means by which the priesthood is constituted, comprise divine motifs, royal motifs and traditions, earlier priestly and cultic traditions, and earlier (non-P) traditions concerning the figure of Aaron. Along with these reshaped and synthesized traditions, Pg has integrated into its paradigmatic picture innovative and programmatic elements such as the Aaronite priesthood as the only legitimate priesthood at the only sanctuary and the vision of the nation of Israel as comprising all twelve tribes.

In formulating the paradigm of the divine presence associated with the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood and comprising such aspects as the use of the verbs *יעד* and *שכן*, the symbolism of the glory of YHWH (like fire) and the cloud, Pg has drawn on, reshaped, and synthesized elements found in the old tent of meeting tradition, theophanic tradition, and the Zion/Jerusalem temple tradition (which incorporates theophanic tradition) with its royal overtones.

Pg's resulting unique paradigmatic picture is of a structure that has features, albeit reshaped, of both tent shrines and temples and their furnishings, the features of which are portrayed from the divine perspective as seen from the ordering of their description from the inside to outside. Intrinsic to this tabernacle/tent of meeting are its priesthood, and in particular Aaron as high priest, who has absorbed traditionally royal motifs and who mediates YHWH to the people and the people to YHWH, described as the twelve tribes. The tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel are presented as the divine vision of the means by which YHWH is present to the Israelites, which comprises both temporary meetings and permanent and continuous presence in relation to the mobile tabernacle/tent of meeting and therefore is not connected with a fixed site but moves with the tabernacle/tent of meeting to different locations.

We have also seen that there is an added dimension to the paradigmatic nature of Pg's picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood with its associated divine presence, over and above its nature comprising earlier traditions that have been reshaped and synthesized with unique visionary and programmatic elements into a timeless paradigm. Its very style of repetition and formalism (esp. in Exod 25\*; 28\*) has a similar impact on the reader as ritual and can therefore be called ritualized text; and as such it engenders a visual, imaginary, and cognitive experience in the audience such that in a sense time stands still or is transcended.<sup>470</sup>

Furthermore, the visual, imaginary, and cognitive experience of its exilic audience, or the entering of the audience into the world of this paradigmatic text, would comprise the partial recognition of reshaped earlier traditions combined with each other and with unique and programmatic elements. But this paradigmatic picture, I would argue, goes beyond providing an imaginative and cognitive experience and understanding by inviting its audience to enact and actualize its worldview by putting into praxis the instructions and ordinances, as a way of realizing that worldview wherever it finds itself through time. True, the instructions and ordinances in places are ambiguous and contain gaps, but there is enough description to capture the essence of the essentials such that the visionary paradigm can be embodied in one form or another that allows for creative variation over time.

This paradigmatic picture in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\* forms a centerpiece that is on either side framed by narrative, in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*, respectively. This narrative frame is itself paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping past traditions into timeless patterns, with the stories in Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\* that follow the Sinai pericope displaying a similar structural pattern to Exod 16\*, which precedes the Sinai pericope, by way of counterpoint and reversal.<sup>471</sup> This narrative frame has elements in common with the Sinai pericope, and these common elements link them together. The most obvious common element is the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה) (Exod 16:7, 10; Num 14:10b; 20:6; see Exod 24:16; 40:34); like the colors in the frame of a painting, the כבוד יהוה in the framing narratives picks up one of the most significant colors in the picture itself. As such, in exploring the narratives in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*,

470. See Robertson, "He Kept the Measurements."

471. See §§1.2.2.5.1 and 2.2.2, above.

it will be seen that, on the one hand, the paradigmatic nature of these narratives is highlighted further by virtue of their forming a narrative frame around the central picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood and its associated divine presence, whose paradigmatic nature we have unfolded, and, on the other hand, the framing narratives spell out further the significance and implications of the central picture, including the divine presence as expressed in the **כבוד יהוה** (Exod 24:16; 40:34), for the life of the community. To the discussion of this we will now turn.

#### 4.2.2. The Paradigmatic Nature of the Narrative Frame: Exodus 16\*; Numbers 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*

The way in which each of Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20:2–12\* have reshaped older traditions into a similar paradigmatic pattern will be discussed in turn.

##### 4.2.2.1. Exodus 16\*<sup>472</sup>

Although there is not enough evidence to recover an earlier non-P manna story paralleling Pg's account in Exod 16\*, Pg would seem to have drawn on older stories concerning Israel's complaints about a lack of water or meat such as found in the non-P stories in Exod 15:22–25; 17:1–7; Num 21:4–9; and, most significantly, Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34.<sup>473</sup> In common with Exod 15:22–25 and 17:1–7, Pg in Exod 16\* has the motif of the people complaining against (לִיז/לִיז עַל) Moses (Exod 15:24 [*niphal*]; 17:3 [*hiphil*]; see 16:2 [*niphal*] [and see 16:7, 9]). In common with Exod 17:1–7 and Num 21:4–9, the complaint of the people in Exod 16\* involves a rejection of the exodus (Exod 17:3; Num 21:5; see Exod 16:3). This is also the case in Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 (see 11:20 in relation to 11:5, 18). Indeed, the non-P account in Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 would seem to form the closest parallel with Pg's Exod 16\*, since the common elements between these two accounts include: not only a rejection of the exodus (Num 11:20 [and 11:5, 18]; Exod 16:3), but remembrance of the food in Egypt in contrast to what is available to them in the wilderness (Num 11:5; Exod 16:3), all of which comes to the atten-

472. Exodus 16\* (Pg) comprises Exod 16:1, 2–3, 6–7, 9–15, 21, 35\*; see §§1.2.2.3 and 1.2.2.6, above.

473. See §1.2.3, above.



tion of YHWH (Num 11:18; Exod 16:7, 9, 12); and YHWH's provision of meat for them, the promise of which is delivered in a YHWH speech to Moses which is subsequently fulfilled (Num 11:18–20, 31; Exod 16:12, 13). It is likely, therefore, that Pg in Exod 16\* drew on an earlier cycle of stories concerning Israel's complaints about a lack of water and/or food in the wilderness and YHWH's response such as evidenced in the earlier non-P stories of Exod 15:22–25; 17:1–7; Num 21:4–9; Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34, from which Pg drew in particular the motif of the people complaining against (לִי/לִיֹן עַל) Moses, their rejection of the exodus, and YHWH's provision of food. Since Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34, among these stories, forms the closest parallel to Pg's account in Exod 16\*, a comparison between the two accounts will be helpful in exploring the way in which Pg might have reshaped earlier tradition into its specific paradigmatic pattern in Exod 16\*, which is similar to Pg's other wilderness stories (Num 13–14\*; 20:2–12\*).<sup>474</sup>

---

474. There could well also have been an earlier manna story on which Pg drew, given the reference to the manna that the people appear to have already in Num 11:6 (see Childs, *Exodus*, 275, 280–81; cf. Schmidt, "Priesterschrift in Exodus 16," 497), but there is not enough evidence that has come down to us to be able to reconstruct it. Attempts have been made to try to fathom the tradition history behind the non-P wilderness stories that have so much in common; e.g., Coats (*Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 249–50) argues that behind J there lies a process in which positive traditions concerning YHWH's aid in the face of crises arising in relation to the wilderness were reshaped by a negative murmuring tradition. Childs (*Exodus*, 258–60), however, identifies two patterns (one that functioned as a form of relating stories of Israel's miraculous preservation in the desert and one that focused on Israel's disobedience, punishment, and forgiveness in the desert), both of which contained negative complaint from the beginning and that influenced each other prior to J. This goes against Coats's view of a primary positive tradition that was transformed into a negative one. Whatever might have been the tradition history behind these wilderness stories, in terms of the evidence as it has come down to us in the texts themselves we will use Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 primarily as the closest example of these earlier wilderness stories to Exod 16\* (Pg) to give us at least an approximate guide as to how Pg may have reshaped this earlier tradition. It should be noted that it is quite likely that underlying Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 there is an earlier version comprising 11:4b, 10a, 13, 18–20a, 21–24a, 31–32 (as argued by Davies [*Numbers*, 102] drawing on Fritz [see §1.2.3, above]), which contains no judgment or punishment and emphasizes the miraculous nature of YHWH's provision of meat. However, it is difficult to separate this out on literary critical grounds and the story of the provision of meat as we now have it in the non-P text that is earlier than Pg is given in 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34, so it is this text that will form the basis of comparison with Pg in Exod 16\*.



Pg's account in Exod 16\* displays the following structural pattern:<sup>475</sup>

- ♦ The congregation complains (נִלֵּן) against Moses and Aaron with a speech comprising a death wish and an accusation (Exod 16:2–3);
- ♦ There is a disputation speech in response to the complaint (Exod 16:6–7);
- ♦ The glory of YHWH appears (Exod 16:10, prepared for by Exod 16:7, 9), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses that includes an instruction to speak to the people (Exod 16:11–12);
- ♦ The delivery of the oracle is simply assumed, with the unfolding of the ensuing events reported straight after the YHWH speech (Exod 16:13–15, 21, 35\*).

The structures of Exod 16\* and Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 are not dissimilar. The similarities include the following: Both begin with a complaint that shows their dissatisfaction with their present situation (Exod 16:2–3; Num 11:4–6). In response, there is a speech of Moses (Exod 16:7–8<sup>476</sup>; Num 11:13), and a speech of YHWH to Moses that tells Moses what to say to the people (Exod 16:11–12; Num 11:18–20). Subsequently, what is promised by YHWH is unfolded. In terms of the broad structure, they differ only in that in Num 11:21–24 there is a speech of Moses in response to YHWH's speech (11:21–22), followed by YHWH's response to this (11:23) and a notice that Moses told the words of YHWH to the people (11:23), elements that are not present in Exod 16\*; and in Exod 16:9–10 there is an introduction preparing for the YHWH speech, in the form of a speech of Moses to Aaron to tell the people to draw near to YHWH, and a description of the theophany. The structures are similar enough to further confirm that Pg drew on Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 in formulating Exod 16\*.

A comparison of the similarities and differences between the details of Exod 16\* and Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 is helpful in seeing not only how in particular Pg might have drawn on Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34 but how Pg reshaped the earlier tradition to highlight its own particular perspective. This comparison will be carried out by taking each section of Pg's structure in Exod 16\* in turn.

475. See §1.2.2.5.1 and ch. 2 n. 134.

476. The speech in Pg is by Moses and Aaron.

## Exodus 16:2–3: The Complaint

The complaint of the people in both texts is similar in that it reflects their dissatisfaction with their current circumstances with regard to the provision of food in the wilderness by alluding back to the food in Egypt (Exod 16:2–3; Num 11:4–6).

However, the complaint in Exod 16:2–3 arises out of perceived life-threatening hunger and can perhaps be seen as more justifiable than that in Num 11:4–6 in that they have food in the form of manna, but crave meat over and above this.<sup>477</sup>

Moreover, the form of the complaint is different.<sup>478</sup> In Num 11:4–6, the complaint takes the form of weeping (בכה) and is not explicitly addressed to anyone in particular. It is the weeping (בכה) of the people that is emphasized in this account (Num 11:4, 10, 18, 20), with Moses and then YHWH seeing it as directed at them as the account progresses (11:10 and 11:18, respectively). However, although the remembrance of the rich food in Egypt (11:5) hints at and foreshadows a rejection of the exodus, this becomes explicit only later, in the YHWH speech as part of YHWH's accusation against the people, where YHWH interprets it as a rejection of himself and links it with judgment (11:20 [and see 11:18]). In Exod 16\*, in contrast, Pg explicitly uses the verb לון ("complain," "murmur"), likely drawn from Exod 15:24; 17:3, from the beginning (Exod 16:2), and it is alluded to throughout (16:7, 9, 11), therefore emphasizing the rebellion of the people up front and repeatedly. In addition, the content of their complaining or rebellion is stated explicitly from the beginning in their own words as a rejection of the exodus, which is likely drawing on Exod 17:3; Num 21:5 (as well as Num 11:20). Moreover, it is expressed strongly in terms of a death wish and accusation (Exod 16:3). This complaint (לון) with its accusation is directed by the people against Moses and Aaron (Exod 16:2), but it is later pointed out by Moses and Aaron that it is really a complaint against YHWH (Exod 16:6–7). Ironically, in contrast to Num 11:4–6, 20, here Pg would seem, on the one hand, to be emphasizing more the rebellion of the people against the exodus from the beginning through their own words and the strong expressions used (Exod 16:2–3) but, on the

477. Schmidt, "Priesterschrift in Exodus 16," 497.

478. See Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 101, 106–7, 115.

other hand, though portraying this as a rebellion against YHWH (Exod 16:6–7), omits any negative reaction to this on the part of YHWH by not portraying YHWH himself as accusing the people of rejecting him and bringing judgment as in Num 11:20.

#### Exodus 16:6–7: Disputation Speech

Whereas in Num 11:13 Moses's response to the people's weeping is directed at YHWH, in Exod 16:6–7, the speech of Moses and Aaron is directed to the people. Also, the content of the speeches is quite different. In Num 11:13, Moses complains to God about the demands of the people for meat, asking where he is to get meat from for all these people. Along a similar line, after the YHWH speech Moses questions God with regard to his promise of supplying vast quantities of meat (11:21–22). Moses is portrayed here in his first speech to God as thinking he has to do it all; and in the second, which has no parallel in Pg, as doubting YHWH's ability to carry out what he has promised, which acts somewhat as a foil to accentuate the power of YHWH and the miraculous nature of YHWH's supply of meat (see 11:23). The portrait of Moses and Aaron in Exod 16:6–7 is quite the opposite. Instead of responding to the people's complaint by thinking they themselves have to do something about it or doubting the power of YHWH, they instruct the people in the ways of YHWH, focusing on YHWH, not themselves, and pointing to the power of YHWH as the one who brought them out of Egypt by way of correcting the people's assertion that it was Moses and Aaron that have brought them out (אֲנִי, a word associated with the exodus) to the wilderness (Exod 16:3). Pg, therefore, has not only added Aaron alongside Moses but, most importantly, has presented Moses and Aaron in a much more positive light, as YHWH's faithful leaders of the people, than the self-focused and doubting figure of Moses in Num 11:13.

#### Exodus 16:10–12 (Prepared for by 16:7, 9): Theophany and YHWH Speech

In both accounts, there is a YHWH speech to Moses as to what to tell the people as a result of their complaining, which YHWH acknowledges hearing (Exod 16:12 [לִזְוֹן]; Num 11:18 [בְּכֹהֶה]).

However, whereas the YHWH speech in Num 11:18–20 occurs after Moses's speech to YHWH in Num 11:13 (and the brief note prior to this regarding YHWH's anger [11:10]), the YHWH speech in Exod 16:12

is carefully prepared for by the speech of Moses and Aaron in 16:6–7, Moses's speech to Aaron in 16:9, and, most importantly, the description of the theophany in 16:10. Exodus 16:6 foreshadows the motif of the knowledge of YHWH in the YHWH speech (16:12), as well as looking back by way of correction to the Israelite's complaint in 16:3. Exodus 16:7 and 9 state that YHWH has heard their complaining (לִזֹּן), which adds emphasis to this motif when it is confirmed by YHWH in 16:12.

Exodus 16:7 foreshadows the appearance of the "glory of YHWH" (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה) in 16:10, as does Moses's instructions to Aaron to tell the people to draw near to YHWH, an expression associated with encountering YHWH (at the sanctuary).<sup>479</sup> These preparatory remarks have the effect of emphasizing the actual appearance of the glory of YHWH (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה) in the cloud in 16:10, with the glory of YHWH symbolizing most directly in Pg the presence of YHWH.<sup>480</sup> The appearance of the glory of YHWH is not found in the non-P material and is unique to Pg; the introduction of the theophany described in this way is, as Childs comments, in relation to the wilderness tradition "a strikingly new feature in the P material."<sup>481</sup>

The content of the YHWH speeches that tell Moses what to say to the people in Exod 16:11–12 and Num 11:18–20 is similar, not only in YHWH's acknowledging that he has heard the complaint of the people (Exod 16:12; Num 11:18), but also with regard to the general promise of meat for the people (Exod 16:12; Num 11:18b).

However, they are quite different in notable respects. In Num 11:18–20, meat is promised—they already have bread/manna—whereas in Exod 16:12 both meat and bread are promised, and subsequently in Exod 16\* it is the bread that takes center stage.

Most important, in Num 11:19–20 the promise of a surfeit of meat is seen as something negative (it will become loathsome) and as a punishment or judgment on the people for rejecting YHWH by rejecting the exodus. However, in Exod 16:12, even though the people have rebelled against YHWH in rejecting the exodus (16:2–3, 6–7), YHWH's promise of meat and bread is a positive and gracious gift that will enable them to know who YHWH is: "I am YHWH your God" (אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם). The people will not only encounter YHWH with the appearance of the glory

479. Childs, *Exodus*, 287.

480. See §4.2.1.3, above.

481. Childs, *Exodus*, 261.

of YHWH to them, but they will know who YHWH is in YHWH's act of sustenance of them.

#### Exodus 16:13–15, 21, 35\*: Unfolding of Ensuing Events

The unfolding of this promise is prefaced in Num 11:21–24 by Moses's questioning of YHWH's ability to deliver on his promise, YHWH's response in terms of his power to fulfill his word, and a note that Moses told YHWH's words to the people, whereas in Exod 16\*, in typical Pg manner, the unfolding of the promise occurs immediately after the YHWH speech.

Corresponding to the respective YHWH speeches, in Num 11:31–34 the great amount of quail that fall around the camp is an act of judgment and has a negative outcome, whereas in Exod 16:13–15 the coming of the quail and the bread, identified as manna (16:15), is a positive gift from YHWH (16:15), a gift that allows the people to know who YHWH their God is.

Moreover, in Exod 16\* the coming of the quail to the camp (16:13a), promised “between the evenings” (16:12) and therefore perhaps alluding to the exodus in an echoing the Passover meal (see 12:6) is somewhat eclipsed by the rather lengthy description of the bread /manna (16:13b–15a) and the explicit focus of the bread as gift of YHWH (16:15b). This suggests that, while Pg has drawn on the account of Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34, the motif of the meat picked up there has been included in a rather fragmentary way in Exod 16\*, with the focus being more on the bread/manna. This is born out in Exod 16:21, 35\*, which describes the ongoing collection of the manna and its role as sustaining the people throughout the wilderness period, with no reference as to whether or not the provision of the quail was also ongoing or not.<sup>482</sup>

Finally, Pg has situated its account of the quail/manna at the beginning of the wilderness wanderings, prior to Sinai, in contrast to the non-P quail story that is situated after Sinai. This is in order to show how YHWH nourished Israel throughout the wilderness period with the gift of bread/manna (and quail?). It also functions in its context straight after Pg's account of the Reed Sea episode in Exod 14\*, to show how the Israelites were brought to knowledge of YHWH through this gift of nurturing as promised with the appearance of the glory of YHWH, in contrast to the way in which the

---

482. See *ibid.*, 280–81.

Egyptians came to knowledge of YHWH in YHWH's gaining glory over them in their demise in Pg's account in Exod 14\*. YHWH, who brought them out of Egypt in the exodus (Exod 16:6), becomes known to them as the one who sustains them in the wilderness.

In conclusion, in reshaping earlier wilderness traditions and in particular Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34, the emphases and unique elements that have emerged in Pg's account in Exod 16\* are as follows. The people are portrayed, from the beginning as (perhaps understandably in the face of hunger) rebellious, complaining (לִיץ) in the strongest of terms (through a death wish and accusation) as rejecting the exodus, yet YHWH, in response, brings no accusation or judgment against them but only an act of nurturing that educates them, allowing them to come to the knowledge of YHWH. Moses and Aaron are portrayed in a positive light as faithful leaders in relation to YHWH; they focus on YHWH, not themselves, pointing to the power of YHWH as the one who brought them out of Egypt and instructing the people in the ways of YHWH, who will respond to their complaint. Moreover, Moses and Aaron, and Moses through Aaron, carefully prepare the people for the theophany of YHWH and the speech of YHWH by foreshadowing the appearance of the glory of YHWH and the motifs of YHWH's hearing their complaint and their coming to the knowledge of YHWH. The appearance of the glory of YHWH in association with the YHWH speech stands out as a unique feature in Pg's account. In the face of their rebellion, YHWH promises to provide meat and bread as a positive and gracious gift that will enable them to know "I am YHWH your God" (אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם). In the fulfillment of this promise, both meat and bread arrive but the quail is somewhat overshadowed by the bread/manna, which is explicitly described as an ongoing gift throughout the wilderness period, and hence the placing of this account at the beginning of the wilderness period. Its juxtaposition straight after the episode at the Reed Sea in Exod 14\* also provides a contrast between how the Israelites experience the glory of YHWH and come to know "I am YHWH" from how this occurs for the Egyptians: in Exod 14\*, the Egyptians come to know who YHWH is in their demise when YHWH gets glory (כָּבֵד) over them, whereas the glory of YHWH appears to Israel, who rebel against YHWH in the face of hunger and initially seem to be unaware of YHWH's role in the exodus on their behalf, and through YHWH's gift of quail and bread they come to know YHWH who brought them out of Egypt as the one who nourishes and sustains them in the wilderness.

Pg's picture that has resulted from the reshaping of older wilderness traditions in this way is structured into a stereotypical pattern, which recurs in a similar fashion in Pg's other wilderness accounts in Num 13–14\* and 20:2–12\*. The structural pattern of Pg's account of the rebellion at the edge of the land in Num 13–14\* is particularly close, with basically the same structural elements in the same order, and to a discussion of this, and the way in which Pg has drawn on, and reshaped, corresponding earlier non-P tradition, we will now turn.

#### 4.2.2.2. Numbers 13–14\*<sup>483</sup>

The structural pattern that Pg's account in Num 13–14\* has in common with Exod 16\* is as follows.<sup>484</sup>

- ♦ The congregation complains (יָלַן) against Moses and Aaron with a speech comprising a death wish and an accusation (Num 14; 1a, 2–3; see Exod 16:2–3).
- ♦ There is a disputation speech in response to the complaint (Num 14:6, 7, 9aβb; see Exod 16:6–7).
- ♦ The glory of YHWH appears (Num 14:10b; see Exod 16:10), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron that includes an instruction to speak to the people (Num 14:26–29, 31, 35; see Exod 16:11–12).
- ♦ The delivery of the oracle is simply assumed, with the unfolding of the ensuing events reported straight after the YHWH speech (Num 14:36–38; see Exod 16:13–15, 21, 35\*).

However, this pattern, found more specifically in Num 14\*, is set against the backdrop of Num 13\* comprising YHWH's command to Moses to send men to survey the land (Num 13:1–2) and Moses's obedience to the command (Num 13:3a, 17aβ), the surveying of the land (Num 13:21, 25), and the report of the surveyors (Num 13:26, 32, 33aαb). It is in reaction to the surveyor's report in Num 13:26, 32, 33aαb that the congregation complains (יָלַן) and the pattern found also in Exod 16\* as outlined here ensues.

483. Num 13–14\* (Pg) comprises 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38. See §§1.2.2.5.1 and 1.2.2.6, above.

484. See §1.2.2.5.1, and ch. 2 n. 134.



In this case, there is direct parallel to Pg's account in Num 13–14\* in the earlier non-P account of the same episode in Num 13:17b–20, 22–24, 27–31; 14:1b, 4, 11–25, 39–45. The overall structure of Pg's account in Num 13–14\* reflects quite closely the structure of the non-P account in Num 13–14\*, as do many of its details. Almost certainly, therefore, Pg has drawn on and reshaped this non-P account to formulate its own specific paradigmatic picture, which at least in Num 14\* reflects closely the pattern in Exod 16\*. A comparison of the similarities and differences between the non-P and Pg accounts, first in terms of structure and then in terms of details, will bring to light the way in which Pg has reshaped the non-P tradition into its particular paradigmatic picture with its particular emphases and unique elements.

The structure of Pg's account in Num 13\* mirrors closely the structure of the non-P account in Num 13:17b–20, 22–24, 27–28. In both, there is a command to make a survey of land (Num 13:1–2 [Pg]; Num 13; 17b–20 [non-P]); a description of the survey (Num 13:21, 25 [Pg, although this is preceded by an explicit note concerning Moses's obedience to the divine command in Num 13:3a, 17aβ]; Num 13:22–24 [non-P]); and a report by the surveyors (Num 13:26, 32, 33aαb [Pg]; Num 13:27–28 [non-P]). In the rest of the account, which begins with the responses to the surveyors' report by the various parties, Pg in Num 14\* follows quite closely the structure of the non-P account in Num 13:30–31; 14:1b, 4, 11–25, 39–45. In broad outline they are similar, with both comprising a response by various parties to the report of the surveyors (Num 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10a [Pg]; Num 13:30–31; 14:1b, 4 [non-P]); YHWH's response to the people (judgment) (Num 14:10b, 26–28, 29\*, 31[?], 35 [Pg]; Num 14:11–25 [non-P]); and the unfolding of YHWH's judgment (Num 14:36–38 [Pg]; Num 14:39–45 [non-P]). However, a comparison of the structures in more detail highlights some important differences.<sup>485</sup>

The non-P account is structured as follows:

- I. Survey of the land (Num 13:17b–20, 22–24, 27–28)
  - A. Moses's command to make survey (13:17b–20)
  - B. Survey (13:22–24)
  - C. Report of all the surveyors (13:27–28)

---

485. See Suzanne Boorer, "Kaleidoscopic Patterns and the Shaping of Experience," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Marvin Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 214–15.

1. Positive (13:27)
2. Negative (13:28)
- II. Response to the survey (Num 13:30–31; 14:1b, 4)
  - A. By the surveyors (13:30–31)
    1. Caleb: positive (13:30)
    2. Others: negative (13:31)
  - B. By the people: negative (14:1b, 4)
- III. YHWH's response to the people: (Num 14:11–25)  
YHWH speech to Moses—judgment on people
- IV. Unfolding of YHWH's judgment (Num 14:39–45)

Pg's account is structured as follows:

- I. Survey of the land (Num 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb)
  - A. Divine command to make survey and Moses's obedience (13:1–3a, 17aβ)
  - B. Survey (13:21, 25)
  - C. Report of surveyors: negative (13:26, 32, 33aαb)
- II. Response to the survey (Num 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10a)
  - A. By the people: negative *complaint* (נִלְנָה) (14:1a, 2–3)
  - B. By Moses and Aaron: prostrate before people (14:5)
  - C. By Joshua and Caleb: positive counter-report—*disputation* (14:6–7, 9aβb)
  - D. By congregation: negative (14:10a)
- III. YHWH's response to the people: (Num 14:10b, 26–28, 29\*, 31 [?], 35)
  - A. *Appearance of glory of YHWH* (14:10b)
  - B. *YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron—judgment on the people* (14:26–28, 29\*, 31 [?], 35)
- IV. *Unfolding of YHWH's judgment*<sup>486</sup> (Num 14:36–38)

Apart from Pg's emphasis on the obedience of Moses to the divine command in Num 13:1–3a, 17aβ, the main difference in terms of structure is found in the section of response to the survey (II). In the non-P account, first the surveyors themselves respond and this is followed by a response

---

486. The italics highlight how Pg, though reshaping the structure of the non-P account, has shaped it in such a way that it conforms with the main structural elements and their ordering in Pg's account in Exod 16\*, resulting in the same stereotypical structural pattern in both texts (Exod 16\* and Num 14\*).

by the people. In response to the survey report, which has both positive and negative elements, only one of the surveyors, Caleb, has a positive response, and the rest of the surveyors respond negatively. In response to these two different perspectives, the people choose to respond negatively. Consequently, YHWH in a speech to Moses pronounces judgment on the people.<sup>487</sup> The responsibility for the failure of that generation to enter the land lies with the majority of the spies (all except Caleb) and the people as a whole who are swayed by the majority view and with them take a defeatist attitude.<sup>488</sup> In contrast, in Pg the people, perhaps understandably, in response to a totally negative survey report, complain negatively, Moses and Aaron fall on their faces before the congregation,<sup>489</sup> but Joshua and Caleb counter the people's negativity with a disputation speech that comprises a positive perspective that contradicts the initial negative survey report, but the people violently reject this positive perspective, threatening to kill Joshua and Caleb. Consequently, the glory of YHWH appears and in a speech to Moses and Aaron YHWH pronounces judgment on the people. The response to the initial survey report in Pg is therefore more complex. The people's initial negative reaction in the form of a complaint is more understandable since the initial survey report is completely negative, and in contrast to the non-P account, they are initially not offered any positive perspective at all. However, the people choose to rigidly hang on to their first negative reaction, refusing to change their minds when they are then offered a positive perspective. Indeed, far from being open to the reassurance offered them by Joshua and Caleb, they seek to annihilate them. Therefore, although in Pg the responsibility for the failure of that generation to enter the land lies, as in the non-P account, with the majority of surveyors and the people, Pg has reshaped the non-P account to give a more complex and nuanced picture of the various responses and their progression than does the non-P account.<sup>490</sup>

In terms of structure, there is one more significant difference between the non-P and P accounts: Pg introduces the unique element of a theophany, the appearance of the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה) at the tent of meet-

---

487. Moses through intercession mitigates this judgment from obliteration of the nation as a whole to destruction of that generation only.

488. Boorer, "Kaleidoscopic Patterns," 206.

489. What this might signify will be taken up shortly.

490. See Boorer, "Kaleidoscopic Patterns," 207.

ing, prior to, and in association with, the YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron that pronounces judgment on the people.

In these ways, Pg has drawn on but reshaped the non-P account in terms of structure. Moreover, in Num 14\* Pg has reshaped the non-P account to conform to the pattern found in Pg's account in Exod 16\*, as outlined above, comprising the complaint (לִין), the disputation, the appearance of the glory of YHWH with its accompanying YHWH speech, followed by the unfolding of the ensuing events, as highlighted by the italics in Pg's structure above.

A comparison of the details—the similarities and differences—between the non-P and P accounts in Num 13–14 will clarify further the way in which Pg has drawn on and reshaped the non-P account into its own particular paradigmatic picture with its peculiar emphases and unique elements.<sup>491</sup> This comparison will proceed according to the structure of Pg's account in Num 13–14\* outlined above, where Pg's material pertaining to the survey of the land in Num 13\* (that is, 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb) forms the backdrop to the stereotypical pattern of Num 14\* (shown in italics) that is found also in Exod 16\*.

Numbers 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb

Reflecting the sequence of elements in the non-P account in Num 13:17b–20, 22–24, 27–28, Pg's account in Num 13:1–3a, 17ab, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aαb comprises the command to survey the land, the survey, and the report of the surveyors.

The Command to Survey the Land (Num 13:1–3a, 17aβ)

Whereas in the non-P account the command to explore the land arises from human initiative, in Pg it is YHWH who commands the survey (תֹּר) of the land (Num 13:1–2).<sup>492</sup> Correspondingly, a unique element in Pg

---

491. For discussions of the similarities and differences between the P and non-P accounts in Num 13–14, see, e.g., Noth, *Numbers*, 101, 103–12; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 117–27; Levine, *Numbers 1–20*, 347–48; Davies, *Numbers*, 127–29; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 121–26; Frankel, *Murmuring Stories*, 120–21; Boorer, “Kaleidoscopic Patterns,” 205.

492. Presumably the command is given by Moses in the non-P account; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 121. For Noth (*Numbers*, 104), the beginning of the spy story in

is an explicit notice regarding Moses's obedience to the divine command (Num 13:3a, 17a $\beta$ ).

Unlike the non-P account, which has specific details as to what the spies are to investigate regarding the land and its inhabitants (whether the land is good or bad, fertile or not, and whether its inhabitants are many and its towns fortified or not, Num 13:17b–20), Pg uses an umbrella term, referring to the land they are to survey as the land of Canaan (14:2). However, this land of Canaan described here as that which YHWH is giving to the Israelites (13:2) specifically refers to the promised land of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17:8; Exod 6:4). Moreover, Pg defines those who are to carry out the survey more precisely, that is, a man from each of the ancestral tribes (Num 13:2), which implicitly includes the twelve tribes, both northern and southern (see Exod 1:1–5, 7; 28:10, 21), therefore alluding to a vision of the prospective fulfillment of the land promise for Israel defined as the twelve tribe nation.<sup>493</sup>

#### The Survey (Num 13:21, 25)

The surveyors, who in Pg go from the wilderness of Paran (Num 13:3a), in contrast to the spies in non-P who probably go up from Kadesh,<sup>494</sup> explore a different area of land in the respective accounts. In the non-P account, the land that is spied out is a southern area only, that is, the Negeb, Hebron, and the Wadi Eshcol, thought to be in the same general area (Num 13; 22–24); in Pg it is the whole extent of the land of Canaan, from south to north (13:21).<sup>495</sup>

Pg adds, over and above non-P, a chronological notice regarding the length of the survey as forty days (Num 13:25).

---

non-P has been omitted and he surmises on the basis of Deut 1:19b–33 that it may have been the case that in the non-P account Moses's instructions to spy out the land may have been given in compliance with the Israelite's request for this. תֹּוֹר probably has the sense of exploring or evaluating the land; McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 120–21; Dozeman, "Numbers," 121–22.

493. Num 13:4–16, which is most likely a later addition, spells this out more explicitly.

494. See the reference to Kadesh in Num 13:26 which Noth sees as a non-P fragment, and see Deut 1:19b, 46; Noth, *Numbers*, 101.

495. Noth, *Numbers*, 104–6; Davies, *Numbers*, 134–35; Dozeman, "Numbers," 121–22.

In non-P, what the spies found in the land is described as part of the description of the survey (Num 13:22–24) as well as the report of the spies (13:27–28), whereas Pg's parallel to this is contained in the report of the surveyors only (13:26, 32, 33a**b**).

#### The Report of the Surveyors (Num 13:26, 32, 33a**b**)

In non-P, in the description of the survey, the emphasis is on the peoples of the land, including the descendants of Anak (Num 13:22), and on the fertility of the land symbolized by the large cluster of grapes and other fruit (13:23–24). In line with this and the instructions given in Num 13:17b–20, the spies' report in non-P (13:27–28) describes the fertility of the land (13:27) but also the strong people, the large and fortified towns, and the sons of Anak, traditionally seen as a race of giants descended from Anak.<sup>496</sup> In non-P, therefore, the picture of the land is mixed, with both positive and negative elements.

In the report of the surveyors in Num 13:26, 32, 33a**b**, Pg picks up on the giant inhabitants (the Anakim) of the non-P account, with the description of all the inhabitants as very large and the reference to the Nephilim, traditionally primeval monsters (see Gen 6:1–4), emphasizing their size by the comparative description of themselves as grasshoppers (Num 13:32b, 33a**b**).

However, Pg diverges radically from the non-P account in relation to the surveyors' description of the land itself in Num 13:32. True, Pg picks up on the motif of the fruit of the land in Num 13:26, but this is a brief reference in comparison to the emphasis put on the land's fruit in non-P (Num 13:23–24) and is therefore somewhat played down. In Num 13:32, Pg recounts that the surveyors brought an unfavorable or bad report of the land (דַּבַּת הָאָרֶץ), or slandered the land,<sup>497</sup> describing it as devouring its inhabitants (אָרֶץ אֹכֶלֶת יוֹשְׁבֵיהָ). On the basis of Ezek 36:13, this expression of the land devouring its inhabitants probably refers to the loss of its inhabitants because of battles and warring,<sup>498</sup> but it also quite likely

496. Davies, *Numbers*, 136; Dozeman, "Numbers," 122–23.

497. Lohfink, "Original Sin," 111; Lohfink, "Priestly Narrative," 159. דַּבַּה is used only negatively (see, e.g., Ps 31:14; Jer 20:10; Prov 10:18; 25:11; Gen 37:2; and esp. Ezek 36:3).

498. See Noth, *Numbers*, 107; Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 141; Davies, *Numbers*, 140; Milgrom, *Numbers*, 106–7.

has mythological overtones of the land personified in imagery akin to the swallowing Mot.<sup>499</sup> This description of the land, followed by reference to its huge inhabitants and the Nephilim is surely ironic: “Only the freakish Nephilim could live in a land that ate its inhabitants.”<sup>500</sup>

Therefore, whereas in non-P the description of the land and its inhabitants is mixed, with the land itself described as fertile and in rather glowing terms but its towns and inhabitants as large and formidable, in Pg the surveyors’ report of the land is entirely negative both with regard to the land itself as well as its inhabitants. In Pg, this negativity toward the land in particular is described in the most strident of terms—a slandering of the land that devours its inhabitants—a description which is all the more radical since this land is the land promised by YHWH to the Israelites in the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17:8; Exod 6:4; Num 13:2).

#### Numbers 14:1a, 2–3: The Complaint

While in the non-P account, the mixed report of the surveyors is followed immediately by the response of the spies (positive in the case of Caleb, but negative by the remaining spies, Num 13:30–31) and then after this the negative response of the people (Num 14:1b, 4),<sup>501</sup> in Pg the totally negative report of the surveyors is followed immediately by the complaint of the people (14:1a, 2–3).

The response of the people in the non-P account, both to the report and the defeatist attitude of all the spies except Caleb, is to weep all night and to want to choose a leader (רֹאשׁ) and go back to Egypt (Num 14:1b, 4), which represents not only a rejection of Moses’s leadership but a rejection of the exodus (and wilderness) expressed in terms of a reverse exodus. Implicit within this rejection of the exodus is a rejection of YHWH—but this is not stated explicitly. Pg sharpens some of these elements and makes them more explicit. Pg emphasizes that it is all the congregation/Israelites (14:1a, 2) that complain against (לִן עַל,

---

499. McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 135–36; see also Olson’s comment on this verse (*Numbers*, 79): “the spies mythologize both the land and the inhabitants into primeval monsters.”

500. Dozeman, “Numbers,” 123.

501. The non-P account, however, does hint at the disquiet of the people immediately after the report in a passing reference in the introduction to Caleb’s speech in Num 13:30.



with its connotation of rebellion) Moses and Aaron (14:2), but also YHWH explicitly (14:3). Moreover, significantly, all the Israelites reject the exodus and all that has occurred in the wilderness, including the events of Exod 16\* and what has occurred at Sinai, explicitly and in the strongest possible terms of a death wish: their wish that they had died in Egypt (Num 14:2b $\alpha$ ), that is, before the exodus had occurred, along with their rhetorical question that asserts that it would be better for them to go back to Egypt (14:3c), not only alludes to a reversal of the exodus as in the non-P account (14:4) but could not present a stronger rejection of the exodus; and their wish that they had died in the wilderness (14:2b $\alpha$ ) is a complete rejection and wish for annihilation of all that has occurred in Exod 16\* and at Sinai. But not only does Pg portray all Israel as rejecting what has gone before in the exodus and wilderness, but over and above the non-P account, all Israel explicitly rejects YHWH with an accusation against YHWH that he is about to bring them into the land to kill them and to give their wives and little ones over as prey/spoil (Num 14:3). In Pg, the complaint of the people against Moses, Aaron, and YHWH could not be more far reaching, since it encompasses all that has gone before and what is to come: the unfolding of the divine plan past and future.

#### Numbers 14:5, 6–7, 9a $\beta$ b, 10a: Disputation Speech

The disputation speech by Joshua and Caleb in response to the people's complaint in Pg (Num 14:6–7, 9 a $\beta$ b) is preceded by the reaction of Moses and Aaron, an element not found in the non-P account. In response to Israel's complaint, Moses and Aaron fall on their faces before them. The significance of this is disputed, and it is difficult to fathom since on the surface at least it appears to be an act of submission to the people.<sup>502</sup> Most commentators move away from this interpretation by arguing, for example, that it anticipates Num 14:10b and is an act of submission to God, is an act of contrition before God, signifies anger at the people as a response to the murmuring, is an act of intercession to avert YHWH's wrath, or is an act that half anticipates the divine wrath and is half intercession for God's forgiveness.<sup>503</sup> However, although it is possible that it is an anticipa-

502. Knierim and Coats, *Numbers*, 187.

503. For submission, see Knierim and Coats, *Numbers*, 187–88. For contrition, see Davies, *Numbers*, 141. For anger, see Dozeman, "Numbers," 124. For intercession, see Budd, *Numbers*, 156. For anticipation and intercession, see Olson, *Numbers*, 79.

tion of the appearance of the glory of YHWH in Num 14:10b (see Num 20:6), there is surely a hint in this context of the submission of Moses and Aaron to the people, perhaps hinting at their powerlessness in the face of such overwhelming rejection of themselves and YHWH or, since here the disputation speech in response to the people's complaint is given by Joshua and Caleb and not Moses and Aaron as in Exod 16:6–7, it perhaps hints at the beginning of the demise of Moses and Aaron as leaders that will occur explicitly in Num 20:12.<sup>504</sup>

The disputation speech spoken by Joshua and Caleb in Pg (Num 14:6–7, 9aβb) is introduced by a note, specific to Pg, of Joshua and Caleb tearing their clothes in a gesture of mourning, lament, or grief.<sup>505</sup> Likewise in an element unique to Pg, Joshua and Caleb counter the slandering of the land as a killer by the other surveyors (Num 13:32) by affirming that the land is exceedingly good (טובה הארץ מאד מאד, 14:7) in a reference back to Gen 1:12 but with more emphasis through the repetition of מאד.

In a sense, the rest of this speech by Joshua and Caleb in Pg in Num 14:9aβb, though set in a different place, corresponds to the speech of Caleb in the non-P account in 13:30, since both concern the belief in possessing the land in the face of its large and formidable inhabitants.<sup>506</sup> However, Pg's account is more theological: in the non-P account Caleb exhorts the people to go up and occupy the land because we are indeed able to do it (יכול, 13:30) whereas in Pg Joshua and Caleb put the focus not on the ability of the people but on YHWH, exhorting the people not to fear the people of the land for YHWH is with us (14:9aβb). This assertion that YHWH is with us in Pg's context is an affirmation by Joshua and Caleb of what has occurred at Sinai, with the coming into existence of the tabernacle/tent of meeting by means of which YHWH dwells in the midst of the people (Exod 29:45–46). Moreover, this assertion, along with the exhortation “Do not fear” in Num 14:9aβb, is holy war language, and in line with this, the inhabitants of the land are described here as “our bread”

504. See Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 59 n. 39.

505. Davies, *Numbers*, 141; Knierim and Coats, *Numbers*, 187; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 124.

506. Pg's introduction of Joshua alongside Caleb perhaps represents the northern tribe of Ephraim and the southern tribe of Judah—see Num 13:5, 8, 16, although this is a later addition; or, since Joshua represents another figure alongside Moses in the tradition (see, e.g., Exod 32:17; 33:11), Pg has drawn on this tradition as well as the Caleb tradition as found in the non-P account in Num 13–14\*.

(לחמנו) whose protection (צל), that is, the support of their gods,<sup>507</sup> has been removed from them. This represents a play on Num 13:32: instead of the land devouring its inhabitants, the Israelites will consume the land's inhabitants like bread because YHWH is with them. It also represents an affirmation that not only counters the people's complaint that they will be killed by the sword in the land in 14:3ab, but also counters their rejection of the exodus in 14:2b, 3c since it affirms that the gods of other nations are as nothing in relation to YHWH as expressed in Exod 12:12 and the surrounding narrative frame in Exod 7–11; 14\* (Pg).

The response of the people as a complete rejection of Joshua and Caleb and their speech in their intended act of stoning them is an element specific to Pg, although in the non-P account the people also reject Caleb's speech about being able to occupy the land in that after it they weep and express the wish to return to Egypt (Num 14:1b, 4). In rejecting Joshua and Caleb and their speech in Num 14:7, 9aβb, they reject not only the land as exceedingly good but also the exodus and the dwelling of God in their midst through the tabernacle/tent of meeting, since they reject the assertion that the gods of the inhabitants of the land no longer protect them (see Exod 12:12) and that YHWH is with them. In so doing, they cling to their complaint in Num 14:1b, 2–3, which itself constitutes a rejection of the exodus, all that has happened in the wilderness including Sinai, along with their fear of death in the land.

Numbers 14:10b, 26–28, 29\*, 31 (?), 35: Theophany and YHWH Speech

Whereas in the non-P account the YHWH speech comes right after the people's negative reaction of weeping and wishing for a reversal of the exodus (Num 14:11–25<sup>508</sup>), in Pg the unique element of theophany, of the appearance of the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה), at the tent of meeting (14:10b) occurs in association with the YHWH speech (14:26–28, 29\*, 31[?], 35), and this follows the counterspeech of Joshua and Caleb and the people's rejection of them. As in Exod 16:10, the appearance of the glory of YHWH is significant in Pg's account. Here it would appear to head off the people's threat to stone Joshua and Caleb as well as introduce the YHWH speech.

507. Noth, *Numbers*, 108; Budd, *Numbers*, 156; Levine, *Numbers*, 364; Davies, *Numbers*, 141.

508. This includes the intercession of Moses.

With regard to the YHWH speech, Pg has a number of elements and motifs in common with the non-P account, albeit differently expressed or nuanced. Although the non-P account is addressed to Moses only (Num 14:11) and Pg's account is addressed to Moses and Aaron (Num 14:26), they are both judgment speeches. They both begin with a rhetorical question beginning with "how long?" (עַד אַנְהָ, 14:11 [non-P]; עַד מָתַי, 14:27 [Pg]) and a complaint or lament about the people's attitude or behavior toward YHWH (in non-P [14:11–12], it is the people's despising of YHWH and refusal to believe,<sup>509</sup> and in Pg [14:27], it is the complaining of the people against YHWH [לִזְנוֹן עַל]). In both, there is an oath expressed in the terminology of "as I live" (חַי־אֲנִי, 14:21 [non-P]; 14:28 [Pg]). In both, YHWH decrees the very thing that they wish for: in the non-P account the people have wished to go back to Egypt (14:4), and accordingly YHWH tells the people to turn back into the wilderness by way of the Sea of Reeds (14:25); in Pg's account the people have expressed a wish that they had died in this wilderness (14:2), and accordingly YHWH pronounces that this will be their fate, their corpses will fall in this wilderness (14:29a; see 14:35). In both, therefore, with the exception of the majority of surveyors in Pg (14:37), the death of that generation is not necessarily immediate, but it will occur in the wilderness—that generation of the nation will not see or go into the land (14:22–23 [non-P]; 14:29a, 35 [Pg]). In both accounts, there are exceptions: in non-P Caleb and his descendants will possess the land that he spied out (14:24); and in Pg, at least implicitly, Joshua and Caleb, who alone out of the surveyors remain alive, presumably do not come under the judgment of death in the wilderness (14:38).<sup>510</sup> In both, it is only this generation that is judged by YHWH, with the promised land open to the next generation; in the non-P account, this is contained implicitly in the reference to the oath of the land to the people's ancestors in Num 14:23, which therefore still stands for a subsequent generation; and in Pg this is explicitly stated in 14:31, which we have tentatively included within Pg, where their little ones will know the land in counterpoint to the people's assertion in 14:3 that their little ones would become prey/spoil.

509. It should be noted that in the non-P material an initial speech in Num 14:11a, 23b–25 has been expanded by a Dtr-like addition in 14:11b–23a, but, since in my view this occurred prior to Pg, 14:11–25 which includes the intercession of Moses will be taken as a whole; see Boorer, *Promise of the Land as Oath*, 338–55.

510. Num 14:30, which is possibly an addition, does state explicitly that Joshua and Caleb are the exceptions in terms of coming into the land.

Over and above these different nuances with regard to the elements and motifs they have in common, Pg diverges from the non-P account in other ways. Pg bypasses the complexity of the non-P account that contains the intercession of Moses that heads off the complete destruction of the nation and limits it, at least implicitly, to that generation of the nation (see Num 14:23),<sup>511</sup> drawing only on the beginning and end of non-P's section, in Num 14:11 (YHWH's lament and accusation) and 14:21–23 (the oath and judgment that that generation [implicitly] will not possess the land). In addition, unlike the non-P account, Pg draws on the prophetic oracle form to express the judgment on the people as seen in 14:28, where the expression “says YHWH” (נאִם־יְהוָה) is used and YHWH's judgment that Moses is to tell the people is relayed in direct second-person plural address (Num 14:28, 29a, 31).<sup>512</sup> In line with this, there is a particular emphasis in Pg on the effectiveness of the spoken word, both the words of the people and YHWH's words of judgment: in Num 14:28, YHWH swears to do what “you spoke in my ears” (דְּבַרְתֶּם בְּאָזְנִי), and in 14:35, YHWH states, “I YHWH have spoken” (אֲנִי יְהוָה דִּבַּרְתִּי). Moreover, in line with the people's death wish in Num 14:2, there is a particular emphasis in Pg on the death of that generation as stated in 14:29 and reiterated in strong terms in 14:35 (“in this wilderness they will come to a full end [יָתֵמוּן] and there they will die [יָמָתוּ]”). Finally, Pg describes the people as a whole not only as “this evil congregation” (עֵדָה הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת, 14:27) but most significantly as those “meeting against me” (הַנוֹעֲדִים עָלַי, 14:35); this latter expression plays on the reference to YHWH meeting with (יָעַד לִ) the Israelites in Exod 29:43 at the tent of meeting and therefore has the connotation of a rejection or negation of what has occurred at Sinai with the setting up of the tent of meeting as the means of YHWH's presence in their midst and therefore a rejection not only of their identity as YHWH's nation, but of YHWH himself.

511. This complexity in the non-P account in Num 14:11–25 is due to a Dtr-like expansion of the underlying story; see n. 509.

512. See McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 126; Davies, *Numbers*, 146. In non-P, the only part of the YHWH speech addressed to the people in the second-person plural is in Num 14:25b, the command to go back into the wilderness by way of the Sea of Reeds.

## Numbers 14:36–38: Unfolding of Ensuing Events

The unfolding of ensuing events in Pg is quite different from what occurs after YHWH's judgment speech in the non-P account in Num 14:39–45. The non-P account reinforces the point that the promised land is not open to that generation by portraying the people as disobeying YHWH's command to go back into the wilderness by way of the Reed Sea in a reverse exodus (Num 14:25) and instead, by their own initiative, trying to go up into the promised land from which they are driven out. Instead, Pg's account in Num 14:36–38 describes the fate of the surveyors. The emphasis in Pg here is on the sin of the surveyors by bringing a bad report of the land, which is repeated twice, and in so doing making all the congregation complain against him (YHWH). Their fate is immediate death by plague before YHWH. This singles out the behavior of the surveyors as worse than that of the people and therefore their immediate death in contrast to the people whose death in the wilderness is not recounted. The death of the surveyors, however, foreshadows the death of the congregation in the wilderness that will occur implicitly at a later date in line with the non-P tradition.<sup>513</sup> Joshua and Caleb, however, as the surveyors who countered the initial report, are exempted and remain alive, whereas in the non-P account Caleb only is singled out (Num 14:24).<sup>514</sup>

## Conclusion

In conclusion, in reshaping the earlier non-P tradition in Num 13:17b–20, 22–24, 27–31; 14:1b, 4, 11–25, 39–45, the emphases and unique elements that have emerged in Pg's account in 13:1–3a, 17aβ, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33aab; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38 are as follows. It is YHWH who commands the survey of the land, and Moses's obedience to this is emphasized. This land of Canaan is the land promised in the Abrahamic covenant to the Israelites, envisioned in terms of their (twelve) ancestral tribes. The land surveyed over a period of forty days is the whole land of Canaan from its southern to its northern-most borders. Though alluding briefly to the fruit of the land, the report of the surveyors is totally negative; it is negative not only with regard to the giant inhabitants of the

---

513. McEvenue (*Narrative Style*, 143) refers to the death of the surveyors as a symbolic fulfillment of the divine judgment, a fulfillment "in nuce."

514. See n. 506.

land as in the tradition, but in particular, in contrast with non-P, in relation to the land itself. The bad report of the land is emphasized, being repeated three times (Num 13:32; 14:36, 37). The content of this slandering of the land is expressed in the radical language of the land devouring its inhabitants—the land is a killer such that only the Nephilim can survive in it. The people are portrayed as complaining against (לֹאן עַל) not just Moses and Aaron, but also against YHWH (14:3, 27). Their rejection of the exodus, taken over from the tradition, is sharpened and made more explicit. Moreover, the people not only reject the exodus, but also all that has occurred in the wilderness up to this point, including what has occurred as described in Exod 16\* and at Sinai, in wishing they had died in Egypt or in this wilderness. The people also reject what is to come and who they have experienced YHWH to be, in the exodus, in Exod 16\*, and at Sinai, in complaining that YHWH is bringing them into the land to kill them and for their wives and little ones to become prey, and in rejecting the speech of Joshua and Caleb assuring them that they need not fear the inhabitants of the land since the protection (צֶל) of their gods is removed from them (see Exod 12:12) and YHWH is with them. In particular, the rejection of all that has occurred at Sinai, and especially the rejection of YHWH who is present to them by means of the tent of meeting, is highlighted, not only in their rejection of Joshua's and Caleb's reassurance that YHWH is with them, but also, tellingly, in the description of the congregation as gathered against (עַל יְיָ) YHWH. In the disputation speech of Joshua and Caleb after Moses's and Aaron's gesture of submission (to YHWH? to the people?), the focus is on what YHWH can and will do for the people rather than on their own abilities; and they stress that the land is exceedingly good, an allusion back to, and heightening of, the land pronounced as good by God in Gen 1:12. As in Exod 16\*, the appearance of the glory of YHWH in association with the YHWH speech stands out as a unique feature in Pg's account. It functions to stop the threatened stoning of Joshua and Caleb in a radical rejection by the people of their positive counter-report as well as to introduce the YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron. This YHWH speech comprises a complaint or lament against the people and judgment in the form of a prophetic oracle that Moses is to relay to the people and incorporates an oath. With an emphasis on the effectiveness of the spoken word, the people who wished they had died in this wilderness will get exactly what they have wished for, death in this wilderness. This applies to that generation only, however, with their little ones who they said would become prey coming to know the land; Joshua and Caleb also are implicitly exempt from the judg-



ment. The unfolding of events after the judgment speech makes quite clear that responsibility lies with the surveyors (except Joshua and Caleb) who led the people astray by bringing a defamatory report of the land, which is their primary sin. They die in a symbolic foreshadowing of the death of that generation of the people that will occur some time in the future in the wilderness outside the promised land.

Pg's picture that has resulted from the reshaping of older tradition found in the non-P account in Num 13–14\* in these ways follows closely, albeit with some variation as we have seen, the structure of this earlier story. However, this has been done in such a way as to present what follows the report of the surveyors (Num 13:32.33a<sub>2</sub>b) in Num 14\* in accordance with the pattern found in Exod 16\*. Thus against the backdrop of the command to survey the land, the actual survey and the surveyors' report in Num 13\*, Pg presents, in line with Exod 16\*, its stereotypical pattern of the complaint of the people (including a death wish and accusation), a disputation speech, the appearance of the glory of YHWH and accompanying YHWH speech, and the unfolding of ensuing events. A similar pattern, at least in broad outline, occurs in Pg's account in Num 20:2–12\*, and to a discussion of this, and the way in which Pg has drawn on and reshaped corresponding earlier non-P tradition, we will now turn.

#### 4.2.2.3. Numbers 20:2–12\*; 20:22b, 23a<sub>2</sub>, 25–29; 27:12–14

The structural pattern that Pg's account in Num 20:2–12\* and 20:22b, 23a<sub>2</sub>, 25–29; 27:12–14 has in common with Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* is as follows.<sup>515</sup>

- ♦ The congregation speaks against Moses and Aaron with a speech comprising a death wish and an accusation (Num 20:2, 3b, 4; see Exod 16:2–3; Num 14; 1a, 2–3).
- ♦ The glory of YHWH appears (Num 20:6; see Exod 16:10; Num 14:10b), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses to speak to a third party<sup>516</sup> (Num 20:7, 8a<sub>2</sub>\*β; see Exod 16:11–12; Num 14:26–29, 31, 35).

515. Pg in Num 20:2–12\* comprises 20:2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8a<sub>2</sub>\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12. See further §1.2.2.5.1 and ch. 2 n. 141, above.

516. In Num 20:8a<sub>2</sub>β this third party is the rock in contrast to the people in Exod 16:12 and Num 14:28.



- ◆ Consequently what happens is unfolded (Num 20:10, 11b, 12 and 20:22b, 23aa, 25–29; 27:12–14; see Exod 16:13–15, 21, 35\*; Num 14:36–38).<sup>517</sup>

Although this pattern which Num 20:2–12\*; 20:22b, 23aa, 25–29; 27:12–14 has in common with Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* is not as precise as, and departs somewhat from, that between Pg's accounts in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*, which mirror each other more exactly, the similarities in structure are still significant, and where Num 20:2–12\*; 20:22b, 23aa, 25–29; 27:12–14 departs from elements in the structure of Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* is significant in terms of the message Pg wishes to communicate.<sup>518</sup>

In this case Pg, particularly in Num 20:1–12\*, would seem to have drawn on and reshaped the earlier tradition found in the non-P material in Exod 17:1–7, and this is seen not only from the subject matter but in particular from the structural elements and sequence that they have in common.<sup>519</sup>

The structures of Num 20:1–12\* and Exod 17:1–7 are similar in the following respects. After an itinerary (Num 20:1a; Exod 17:1abα), the situation of no water for the people/congregation is noted (Num 20:2a; Exod

---

517. I have included Num 20:22b, 23aa, 25–29; 27:12–14 because these verses basically unfold what YHWH decrees in 20:12.

518. E.g., in Num 20:2–12\* there is no disputation speech before the appearance of the glory of YHWH as in Exod 16:6–7; Num 14:6–9\*. However, there is a speech of Moses and Aaron to the people, with the tone of a disputation, occurring after the appearance of the glory of YHWH and YHWH's speech to Moses, in Num 20:10. Putting a disputation-like speech after the YHWH speech, and effectively as part of the unfolding of events has the express purpose in Num 20:2–12\* of highlighting Moses's disobedience regarding YHWH's command of what to speak and the addressee of the speech, which leads to YHWH's judgment on Moses and Aaron in a second YHWH speech that also breaks the pattern of Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; this will be discussed shortly.

519. Exod 15:22b–25 is also a story concerning the complaint of the people regarding a lack of drinking water and contains some similar elements to Exod 17:1–17 and Num 20:2–12\*; namely, the lack of drinking water, the complaint by the people against Moses, and Moses's turning to YHWH. However, Exod 17:1–7 represents a closer parallel to Pg's account in Num 20:2–12\*, and so we will limit our discussion to a comparison between Num 20:2–12\* and Exod 17:1–7, in line with a number of scholars; see, e.g., Noth, *Numbers*, 146; Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 71; Childs, *Exodus*, 306; Budd, *Numbers*, 217; Scharf, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 109–11, 117–18; Artus, *Études sur le livre des Nombres*, 221, 225, 230; J. Lim Teng Kok, *The Sin of Moses and the Staff of God: A Narrative Approach*, SSN 35 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1997), 90–94.

17:1b $\beta$ ). In response, the people gather against/complain against Moses (and Aaron) (Num 20:2b; Exod 17:3a), and their speech in both accounts includes the interrogative “why?” (למה) and involves an accusation against Moses/Moses and Aaron for bringing them to this situation where they and their livestock will die (Num 20:4; Exod 17:3).<sup>520</sup> In response to this, Moses (and Aaron) turn to YHWH (Num 20:6a; Exod 17:4), and there is a YHWH speech to Moses that contains instructions for getting water from the rock (Num 20:8a $\alpha$ \* $\beta$ ; Exod 17:5–6a), followed by an account of what occurs after this (Num 20:10, 11b, 12 [and 20:22b, 23a $\alpha$ , 25–29; 27:12–14]; Exod 17:6b).

Over and above these commonalities, a comparison of the details between these two accounts will show how Pg has reshaped the non-P account into its own particular paradigmatic picture with its specific emphases and unique elements. The discussion will proceed according to the pattern that Num 20:2–12\* and 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 has in common with Pg’s accounts in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* as outlined above.

#### Numbers 20:2, 3b, 4

In the face of the situation where, as in Exod 17:1b $\beta$ , there is no water, the congregation gathers against Moses and Aaron (Num 20:2). Whereas Exod 17:3 uses the more stereotypical terminology of “complain against” (לון על), in Num 20:2b Pg uses “gather against” (קהל על), which echoes Num 14:35 where the congregation “meet/gather against” (יעד על) YHWH. In this case, they gather against both Moses and Aaron, whereas in Exod 17:3 the object of the people’s complaint is Moses only.

The speech of the congregation in Num 20:3b–4, though similar to the speech in Exod 17:3 with respect to the accusation against the leadership phrased as a question as to why they have been brought here for themselves and their livestock to die, diverges from Exod 17:3 in some significant respects. Pg, in Num 20:3b, in line with Pg’s pattern in Exod

---

520. There is a doublet in Exod 17:1b $\beta$ –2 and 17:3. This has been variously interpreted, with Noth (*Exodus*, 139) suggesting that 17:1b $\beta$ –2 are J and 17:3 denoting two versions with 17:3 as E; Coats (*Rebellion in the Wilderness*, 55, 62) attributes this to two different traditions at a preliterate level; Childs (*Exodus*, 306) simply says that the issue cannot be decided with any certainty. Since both 17:1b $\beta$ –2 and 3 are non-P, they are both pre-Priestly, and it is 17:1b $\beta$  and 3 that form the closest parallel with Pg in Num 20:2.

16\* (16:3) and Num 14\* (14:2), adds a death wish prior to the accusation: the congregation wishes that they had died “when our brothers died [גוע] before YHWH.” This is probably a reference back to the surveyors who died (מות) before YHWH in Num 14:37,<sup>521</sup> in which case it is a wish that they had died earlier with their tribal leaders before YHWH instead of thirst in this wilderness place.<sup>522</sup> This death wish forms the backdrop to the congregation’s accusation against Moses and Aaron in Num 20:4, which, though similar to the non-P account in Exod 17:3, differs in three important respects. First, in Pg the accusation is directed against Moses and Aaron (2nd masc. pl. address), rather than Moses only (Exod 17:3). Second, Num 20:3b, 4 makes no reference to the exodus since the people simply wish they had died earlier in the wilderness when the surveyors died, and this stands in contrast to Exod 17:3, where the people’s complaint is an explicit rejection of the exodus. Third, in referring to themselves as the “the assembly of YHWH” (קהל יהוה), and making no reference to the exodus, the people make clear that their complaint is against Moses and Aaron only, and not YHWH, whereas in Exod 17:3 with its reference to the exodus, the complaint against Moses is implicitly a complaint against YHWH (and see Pg in Exod 16:2–3; Num 14:2–3). In Pg, they “gather against” (קהל על) Moses and Aaron specifically in contrast to their “meeting/gathering against” (יעד על) YHWH in Num 14:35.

Numbers 20:6, 7, 8α\*β

Whereas in response to the people’s complaint, in Exod 17:4, Moses cries out to YHWH and addresses a question to YHWH, in Num 20:6 Moses and Aaron go away from the assembly to the entrance of the tent of meeting and fall on their faces; in the Pg account, Moses and Aaron seek the presence of YHWH in a gesture of submission at the tent of meeting but they do not address YHWH.<sup>523</sup>

521. See Frankel, *Murmuring Stories*, 297, 304. Although the use of גוע suggests a reference back to Num 17:27–28, this is not necessarily the case. The use of גוע here is appropriate. Elsewhere in Pg it denotes the death of the patriarchs (see Gen 25:8; 35:29) or the death of all flesh in the flood (Gen 6:17; 7:21), and the nuance here after the judgment in Num 14:29, 35 is of eventual death in the wilderness, which parallels the death as a result of the flood. See Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 58 n. 38.

522. *Ibid.*, 58–59.

523. Samuel Balentine (“Prayer in the Wilderness Traditions,” *HAR* 9 [1985]:

Significantly, Pg adds its unique element of the appearance of the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה, Num 20:6b), and here it appears only to Moses and Aaron, as they have gone away from the assembly to the tent of meeting.

The YHWH speech to Moses that follows in Num 20:7, 8a $\alpha^*\beta$ , as in Exod 17:5–6, contains instructions for bringing out water from the rock. However, Pg has reshaped the non-P account in Exod 17:5–6 from an instruction to Moses to strike the rock so that water will come out of it to an instruction to Moses and Aaron (second masculine plural) to speak to (דבר אל) the rock so that it will give its water (Num 20:8a $\alpha^*\beta$ ).<sup>524</sup> Moreover, whereas in Exod 17:5–6 it is the elders only that witness this (7:5 and see 17:6b [לעני זקני ישראל]), in Pg it is the whole congregation that is to be assembled (Num 20:8a $\alpha^*\beta$ , לעיניהם). Therefore, Pg emphasizes the effectiveness of the spoken word commanded by YHWH (see Num 14:2, 28, 35) in contrast to the action of striking commanded by YHWH in relation to the miracle of water from the rock.

Numbers 20:10, 11b, 12 and 20:22b, 23a $\alpha$ , 25–29; 27:12–14

With regard to what occurs after the YHWH speech, Pg diverges dramatically from the non-P account. Exodus 17:6b simply states that Moses was obedient, that he did thus in the sight of the elders of Israel (לעני זקני ישׁ), with the silent assumption therefore that the miracle occurred. In contrast, in Pg, Moses (and Aaron) are disobedient (Num 20:10b), and although water comes out of the rock for the congregation and their livestock to drink (Num 20:11b), Moses and Aaron reap the consequences of their disobedience (Num 20:12 and 20:22b, 23a $\alpha$ , 25–29; 27:12–14).

Moses and Aaron carry out YHWH's instructions in so far as they gather (קהל) the assembly (see Num 20:8a $\alpha^*$ ) before the rock, but they disobey YHWH's command to speak to the rock in a number of respects. One of them, probably Moses, speaks to the people rather than the rock, and the other one (Aaron) does not speak at all. In addition, Moses, in addressing the people as "rebels" (המררים), accuses or judges the people, whereas YHWH in his speech in Num 20:7–8a $\alpha^*\beta$  utters no accusation

---

64–66) points out that generally in P, unlike in the non-P material, Moses and Aaron do not address God, but are addressed by God and relay messages from God only. It should be noted, however, that Exod 6:12 is an exception.

524. Pg's account in Num 20:8a $\alpha^*\beta$  reads: "Assemble the congregation, you and your brother Aaron, and speak to the rock before their eyes to yield its water."

of, or judgment against, the people. As we have seen, the people have not complained against YHWH in Num 20:3b–4, but only against Moses and Aaron, and Moses retaliates with this accusation therefore only on his own behalf, thus hinting at usurping YHWH whose role it is to judge or not. Most importantly, the content of the question “shall we bring forth water from the rock?” not only contravenes YHWH’s command to speak to the rock so that the rock will give its water but puts the focus on Moses and Aaron as the ones who will provide the water.<sup>525</sup> The primary nuance of the question here is that Moses (and Aaron) are usurping the place of YHWH as the providers of the water in the eyes of the people. This is supported by the observation that immediately after Moses’s speech it is stated that water comes out of the rock for the congregation and their livestock to drink; given that the people were not privy to YHWH’s instructions to Moses and Aaron, which are given to them at the tent of meeting away from the assembly (Num 20:6), from the point of view of the people the miracle of the water has no reference point in YHWH and since they do not know that Moses and Aaron in their speech are disobeying YHWH’s instructions, they would perceive that Moses and Aaron have provided the water. The accusation of YHWH that follows in Num 20:12, that Moses and Aaron did not show YHWH’s holiness before the eyes of the Israelites (לעיני בני ישראל), is coherent with this interpretation, and makes sense in light of it.<sup>526</sup>

---

525. Boorer, “The Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 61.

526. There is an extensive debate regarding the nuance of Moses’s question in Num 20:10; see Olson, *Numbers*, 126–28 for a helpful summary of the possible nuances. Their question could, e.g., be interpreted, alternatively, as expecting the answer no, and therefore as Moses (and Aaron) implying that either YHWH is not able, or is unwilling (in view of the nature of the people as rebels), to provide the people with water. In that case the appearance of the water from the rock in Num 20:11b would show Moses and Aaron up as mistaken in their speech and is supported by YHWH’s accusation of them in Num 20:12 that they did not trust in YHWH. However, the interpretation given here of Moses (and Aaron) attempting to usurp the place of YHWH is more appropriate when seen from the point of view of the people who would assume that Moses and Aaron have accomplished this miracle and it accounts better for YHWH’s accusation in Num 20:12 that Moses and Aaron did not show YHWH’s holiness in the eyes of the Israelites. In addition, when Pg’s account in Num 20:2–12\* is seen in relation to Exod 16\* (Pg) which together with Num 13–14\* (Pg) form a frame around Exod 19–40\* (Pg), the emphasis on the disobedience of Moses and Aaron as having to do with an attempt to usurp YHWH’s place as the provider of the water comes into sharp relief; see Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,”

All that occurs subsequently in Num 20:11b, 12 and 20:22b, 23a $\alpha$ , 25–29; 27:12–14, like Moses's speech in 20:10, is unique to Pg and not found explicitly in Exod 17:1–7. The disobedience and failure of Moses and Aaron in Num 20:10b does not prevent YHWH acting and the miracle occurring, for their speech is followed directly by the provision of abundant water from the rock to nurture the people and their livestock (20:11b). In response to the disobedience and failure of Moses and Aaron in their speech in Num 20:10, YHWH's speech to them in 20:12 comprises an accusation and judgment: because they did not trust in YHWH to show his holiness in the sight of the Israelites (לעיני בני ישראל), that is, they usurped the place of YHWH as provider of the miracle of water in the eyes of the people (see the emphasis in the tradition in Exod 17:5, 7 of the miracle of the water as performed in the sight of the elders of Israel לעיני זקני ישראל), they will not bring the assembled people into the promised land. They will be stripped of their leadership.

Numbers 20:22b, 23a $\alpha$ , 25–29; 27:12–14 unfold this judgment: first Aaron dies outside the land (20:22b, 23a $\alpha$ , 25–29), then Moses, though allowed a glimpse of the land, will also die outside it. However, though Pg's account here ends, as Jean-Louis Ska observes, on a minor tone and in

---

61–62, and the later discussion in §4.2.3.2. Those who support the interpretation given here include Jacob Milgrom, “Magic, Monotheism and the Sin of Moses,” in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honour of George E. Mendenhall*, ed. Herbert B. Huffmon, Frank A. Spina, and A. R. W. Green (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 251–65; Budd, *Numbers*, 218–20; Scharf, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt*, 118; Katherine Sakenfeld, *Journeying with God: A Commentary on the Book of Numbers*, ITC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 114; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 160; Olson, *Numbers*, 127; Blazej Strba, “Did the Israelites Realize Why Moses Had to Die?” *RB* 113 (2006): 337–65. The literature is extensive with regard to the sin of Moses in Num 20:2–12, and a variety of views have been proposed; see, e.g., Davies, *Numbers*, 204–7; Meshullam Margalit, “The Transgression of Moses and Aaron in Num 20:1–13,” *JQR* 74 (1983): 196–228; Sakenfeld, “Theological and Redactional Problems”; William G. Propp, “The Rod of Aaron and the Sin of Moses,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 19–26; Propp, “Why Moses Could Not Enter the Promised Land,” *BRev* 14.3 (1998): 36–40, 42–43; Kok, *Sin of Moses and the Staff of God*; Frankel, *Murmuring Stories*, 265–70, 274, 276; Won Lee, “The Exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land: A Conceptual Approach,” in Sweeney, *Changing Face of Form Criticism*, 217–39. However, these discussions concerning the sin of Moses for the most part are based on the final form of the text of Num 20:2–12 and therefore are not directly relevant to our discussion, which is based on Pg as defined here as Num 20:1a, 2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8a $\alpha$ \* $\beta$  (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12.

gray colors,<sup>527</sup> there is a visionary element, a note of hope, precisely with regard to the issue of leadership. In contrast to Num 20:10, Moses's last act as leader is one of obedience to the divine command in the sight of the whole congregation (לְעֵינֵי כָל־הָעֵדָה, Num 20:27): Moses transfers Aaron's vestments to his son Eleazar, an act symbolizing Eleazar's succession to the high priestly office (see Exod 28–29\*). Aaron dies and so will Moses, but the leadership into the future is assured in terms of the Aaronic priesthood.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, in reshaping the earlier non-P tradition in Exod 17:1–7, the emphases and unique elements that have emerged in Pg's account in Num 20:2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8aα\*β ("assemble the congregation ... to yield its water"), 10, 11b, 12; 20:22b, 23aα, 25–29; 27:12–14 are as follows: The congregation gathers specifically against Moses and Aaron only and not against YHWH. Their complaint makes no reference to the exodus and is not a rejection of it, but only that they had not died sooner post-Sinai when the surveyors died. In response Moses and Aaron, in a gesture of submission, fall on their faces at the entrance to the tent of meeting. As in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*, the appearance of the glory of YHWH stands out as a unique feature in Pg's account. In this case, it appears only to Moses and Aaron rather than the Israelites in general since Moses and Aaron have gone away from the assembly to the tent of meeting. The instructions of YHWH in the YHWH speech are heard only by Moses and Aaron and the emphasis here is on the effectiveness of the spoken word in producing water from the rock: Moses and Aaron are to speak to the rock (in contrast to striking it in the tradition), and it will give its water, and this is to be done in front of the congregation (in contrast to the elders only in the tradition). In contrast to the obedience of Moses to YHWH's instructions in the tradition, in Pg Moses and Aaron disobey YHWH's instructions, in speaking to the people rather than the rock (or in the case of Aaron not speaking at all), in judging the people as rebels where YHWH does not, and in usurping YHWH's place in setting themselves up as the providers of the water in the eyes of the people. The water appears anyway, which the people would misinterpret as being provided by Moses and Aaron, given that they have not been privy to YHWH's command and therefore would

---

527. Ska, "Récit sacerdotal," 653.



not know that Moses (and Aaron) have disobeyed it and would therefore take Moses's words about them bringing water from the rock at face value. YHWH's judgment on Moses and Aaron follows. The YHWH speech contains the accusation that they did not show YHWH's holiness in the sight of the Israelites, therefore the judgment that they will not bring them into the land. Accordingly, Aaron dies outside the land, as will Moses, but the leadership continues, symbolized by the transference of Aaron's vestments to his son Eleazar who therefore takes on the leadership role as high priest, this time through the obedience of Moses to YHWH's command. In short, Pg reshapes the tradition of the miracle of water in response to the people's complaint implicitly against YHWH in terms of the exodus in Exod 17:1–7 into a story about the people's complaint against Moses and Aaron only, the primary focus of which then becomes the disobedience of the leaders and therefore the stripping from them of their leadership into the future in relation to the promised land. Moreover, this explains why Pg has placed its account in this position post-Sinai and at the edge of the land in contrast to the tradition in Exod 17:1–7, which occurs pre-Sinai.

Pg's picture resulting from the reshaping of the older tradition in Exod 17:1–7, although following its structure quite closely, has been structured in such a way as to conform in broad contours to the pattern seen in Pg's accounts in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*. In accordance with this pattern, the structure comprises: the congregation speaks against Moses and Aaron with a speech comprising a death wish and an accusation (Num 20:2, 3b, 4; see Exod 16:2–3; Num 14; 1a, 2–3); the glory of YHWH appears (Num 20:6; see Exod 16:10; Num 14:10b), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses to speak to a third party<sup>528</sup> (Num 20:7, 8aα\*β; see Exod 16:11–12; Num 14:26–29, 31, 35); and consequently what happens is unfolded (Num 20:10, 11b, 12 and 20:22b, 23aα, 25–29; 27:12–14; see Exod 16:13–15, 21, 35\*; Num 14:36–38).<sup>529</sup>

The primary difference in the pattern of Num 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 in comparison with that in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* pertains to its specific purpose and message regarding the failure of the leadership. The only real difference lies in the placing (as well as the content) of the disputation speech of the leaders to the people. In Exod 16\* and Num

---

528. In Num 20:8aβ this third party is the rock, in contrast to the people in Exod 16:12 and Num 14:28.

529. I have included Num 20:22b, 23aα, 25–29; 27:12–14 because these verses basically unfold what YHWH decrees in Num 20:12.

13–14\*, the disputation speech (by Moses and Aaron, and Joshua and Caleb, respectively) occurs immediately after the complaint of the people, in response to it, and prior to the appearance of the glory of YHWH and its accompanying YHWH speech (Exod 16:6–7 and Num 14:6–7, 9aβb). In Num 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14, there is no disputation speech immediately after the complaint of the people; the text moves straight from the complaint of the people to the appearance of the glory of YHWH with Moses's and Aaron's gesture of submission. However, Num 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 does have the equivalent of a disputation speech with the people by the leadership in the speech of Moses addressed to the people in Num 20:10. However, this is placed after the appearance of the glory of YHWH and the YHWH speech and represents Moses's (and Aaron's) response to YHWH's instructions with the express purpose of showing the disobedience of Moses (and Aaron) to them. Moreover, Exod 16:6–7 and Num 14:6–7, 9aβb as spoken by the leaders are a positive counter to the complaint of the people against not only Moses and Aaron, but YHWH himself that point the people to who YHWH is. In contrast, Num 20:10 is negative, and in it Moses (and Aaron) completely misrepresent YHWH to the people, accusing the people of being rebels when YHWH has not, since they have not complained against YHWH at all but only Moses and Aaron, and drawing attention to themselves in a way that usurps YHWH's place as provider of water. Seen in relation to the disputation speeches in Exod 16:6–7 and Num 14:6–7, 9aβb, the completely different function of Num 20:10 is highlighted, that is, of showing Moses's (and Aaron's) disobedience to YHWH, their complete failure, and what this really means as leaders of the Israelites, in contrast to the positive examples of leadership in the former disputation speeches.

Allowing for the different position of the disputation speech, then, Num 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 conforms very closely to the pattern in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*, comprising the complaint of the people (including a death wish and accusation), the appearance of the glory of YHWH and accompanying YHWH speech, and the unfolding of ensuing events which begins with a disputation speech.

#### 4.2.2.4. Conclusion

It has been shown how Pg in Exod 16\*; Num 13–14\*; Num 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 has drawn on and reshaped corresponding earlier traditions into a common paradigmatic pattern comprising the elements

of the complaint of the people (including a death wish and accusation), the appearance of the glory of YHWH and accompanying YHWH speech, and the unfolding of ensuing events, as well as the incorporation at some point of a disputation speech. This common pattern is paradigmatic in the sense that its very repetitiveness gives it a timeless dimension, the nuance of typicality through time.

Exodus 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 form a narrative frame around the paradigmatic centerpiece of the Sinai pericope in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\*. As such, on the analogy of a frame that picks up certain colors from the picture it surrounds and vice versa to give a combined picture, which is different from either the painting or the frame on its own, the paradigmatic centerpiece influences its frame and these framing narratives influence the centerpiece. The paradigmatic nature of the centerpiece with its hermeneutics of time influences the paradigmatic nature of the narrative frame; and aspects of the centerpiece are found in various places within the paradigmatic patterns of the framing narratives. The framing narratives, with their paradigmatic patterns containing their distinctive details, pick up and interpret further the centerpiece as well as drawing out its implications. To a discussion of this we will now turn.

#### 4.2.3. The Interaction of the Centerpiece and Narrative Frame

The way in which the centerpiece of the Sinai pericope influences its narrative frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 will first be discussed before turning to the effect of the narrative frame on the Sinai pericope as centerpiece.

##### 4.2.3.1. How the Sinai Pericope (Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\*) and Its Hermeneutics of Time Influence the Frame

It has been shown how in the Sinai pericope in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\* earlier traditions have been taken up, reshaped, and synthesized with each other and unique and programmatic elements to present a unique vision, a timeless paradigmatic picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood as the means of divine presence in the midst of the Israelites or a picture of the founding rituals of sacred space and sacred personnel, by which YHWH is present to the people, that is relevant for, or encompasses and therefore transcends, all time, past, present, and future. Moreover, its style of repetition and formalism (and therefore as ritualized text) has the

effect of engendering a visual, imaginary, and cognitive experience in the audience such that time stands still and is transcended, as well as inviting its audience to realize its worldview wherever it finds itself through time by putting the ordinances into praxis.<sup>530</sup> Since the narratives in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*; 20:2–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14 form a frame around this paradigmatic picture in Exod 24\*; 25–29\*; 39–40\* with its inherent timelessness expressed in these varying ways, this narrative frame, by association, takes on the timelessness or transcendence of time of its centerpiece in the Sinai pericope; more precisely, the paradigmatic nature of the narrative frame, seen in the reshaping of past traditions with unique elements into a stereotypical pattern repeated with varying content in all three of its components (Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* and 20:1–12\*; 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14) and therefore itself having a timeless dimension, a typicality through time, is enhanced such that it and its paradigmatic pattern also takes on the timelessness, or hermeneutics of time, of the centerpiece that it surrounds.

This occurs not only through the proximity of the narrative frame as surrounding the Sinai pericope, but also through its explicit links with it. The motifs that the narrative frame have in common with its centerpiece of the Sinai pericope are: “the glory of YHWH” (כבוד יהוה) (Exod 24:16; 29:43; 40:34; see 16:7, 10; Num 14:10b; 20:6); the knowledge of “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה) (Exod 29:46; 16:12); the reference to the exodus (Exod 29:46; 16:3, 6; Num 14:2 [and 14:3, 9b, 10a]); YHWH as dwelling among/with the Israelites (Exod 29:45–46; see Num 14:9b [10a, and see 14:3]) or meeting with them (Exod 29:43; see Num 14:35); the obedience or disobedience of Moses (Exod 40:33b [39:32, 43]; see Num 20:10); the vestments of the high priest (Exod 28–29\*, esp. 28:41; see Num 20:26a, 28a).

These motifs within the centerpiece of the Sinai pericope occur primarily at its beginning and end and at the conclusion of the instructions in Exod 29:43–46: the glory of YHWH is found at the beginning and end, bracketing the Sinai pericope (24:16; 40:34), as well as in Exod 29:43, and the obedience of Moses is found at its end (40:33b [39:32, 43]); and the knowledge of “I am YHWH” (29:46), the reference to the exodus (29:46), and the dwelling of YHWH among them and YHWH meeting with them (29:43, 46) are all found in Exod 29:43–46.<sup>531</sup> These motifs in the centerpiece of the Sinai pericope primarily have to do with who YHWH is and

530. See §4.2.1.4, above.

531. The motif of the high priest's vestments occurs in Exod 28–29\*.

his presence in relation to, or by means of, the tabernacle/tent of meeting for the Israelites.

The occurrence of the motifs in common with the Sinai pericope within the frame is different from their distribution in the centerpiece. Moreover, they are distributed within the frame in a way that does not conform neatly with the stereotypical pattern of the stories constituting the frame but are variously distributed across the different stories within the elements of the pattern shared by these stories. The glory of YHWH stands out because it is a significant element of the pattern (always linked with a YHWH speech) in its own right in all three stories where it is unique to Pg and not found in the tradition (Exod 16:10 [foreshadowed in the disputation speech in 16:7]; Num 14:10b; 20:6). The knowledge that “I am YHWH” occurs within the YHWH speech in Exod 16:12 (and is fulfilled in it unfolding in 16:15) but is not found in the other stories. The reference to the exodus is found in the complaint of the people in Exod 16:3 and in Num 14:2 and is alluded to in the disputation speech in Num 14:9b (the reference to the protection of the gods of the inhabitants being removed) (see Exod 12:12 [and see 14:3, 10a]) but is not found at all in Num 20\*. YHWH being with the Israelites is found in the disputation speech in Num 14:9b (and see 14:3, 10a), and YHWH’s meeting with (יְעַד לֵ) the Israelites is alluded to by way of its opposite in the YHWH speech in Num 14:35 (the description of the congregations as “meeting against” [יְעַד עַל] YHWH) but is not found in the other stories. The motif of the disobedience of Moses is only found in the disputation speech in Num 20:10, which is also part of what ensues after the YHWH speech. The motif of Aaron’s vestments is part of the unfolding of events in Num 20:26a, 28a and not alluded to in any of the other stories.

The use of these common motifs in various places in the recurring pattern of the frame in the different stories binds the frame more closely to the central picture of the Sinai pericope than simply its association because of proximity either side of it. Indeed, the two modes of association between the frame and the centerpiece, that is, proximity and in terms of common motifs, complement each other. On the one hand, the paradigmatic nature of the common pattern of the stories of the frame is enhanced by its surrounding of the paradigmatic centerpiece in the Sinai pericope; and, on the other hand, the frame, in picking up motifs from the centerpiece in a way that does not conform neatly to its stereotypical pattern, adds a further dimension whereby these motifs, and the various placing of them in the frame, are highlighted as particularly significant.

These motifs in the frame pick up aspects of the Sinai pericope on the analogy of a picture frame that picks up different colors of the painting it surrounds but not necessarily in a symmetrical way and in a different way from their use within the painting itself. Therefore, just as some of the colors of the central picture, in recurring in a variety of ways in the frame, link the frame to the picture in a particular way to present a whole in which these colors are highlighted, so the motifs that the framing narratives have in common with the Sinai pericope link frame and centerpiece into a whole in which the use of their common motifs within the frame and centerpiece are highlighted. Thereby, as one integrated whole, the timelessness or hermeneutics of time of the centerpiece of the Sinai pericope becomes also that of its frame, not only with regard to its paradigmatic patterns and through sheer proximity, but in particular with regard to its common motifs.

The way in which the frame uses the motifs variously within its paradigmatic pattern, which is different from how they are used and distributed within the centerpiece of the Sinai pericope, has to do with the way in which the frame picks up and interprets further the centerpiece. The frame draws out the implications of its centerpiece in the Sinai pericope, thus influencing how the Sinai pericope is perceived, such that the impact of the centerpiece and its frame as a wholistic picture is different from the Sinai pericope simply taken on its own. To the task of seeing how the frame influences the Sinai pericope and adds further interpretative dimensions to form a paradigmatic picture overall we will now turn.

#### 4.2.3.2. How the Narrative Frame in Exodus 16\*; Numbers 13–14\*; 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 Influences the Sinai Pericope.

If we take each of the elements of the pattern in turn across the stories that make up the frame, the fact that the different stories use the motifs found also in the Sinai pericope in different elements of the pattern becomes even clearer.

1. In the complaint of the people, reference to the exodus is found in Exod 16:3 and Num 14:2 (see Exod 29:46) but not in Num 20\*.
2. In the dispute speech of the leaders, reference to the exodus is found in Exod 16:6 and in Num 14:9b (see the reference to the protection of the gods being removed). However, the motif of the glory of YHWH is also foreshadowed as part of the dispute speech

in Exod 16:7; and reference to YHWH being with the people is also found in the dispute speech in Num 14:9b. In the dispute speech of Moses in Num 20:10, the motif of the disobedience of Moses is at its heart.

3. In all three scenarios the appearance of the glory of YHWH, which is unique to Pg, occurs (Exod 16:10; Num 14:10b; Num 20:6).
4. In the YHWH speech in Exod 16:12 the motif of the knowledge that "I am YHWH" is important but does not occur in any of the other stories. Num 14:35 alludes to the motif of YHWH meeting with the people in the description of the people as meeting against YHWH.
5. In the description of ensuing events after the YHWH speech, the disobedience of Moses (and Aaron) and Moses's final obedience in vesting Eleazar as high priest, is the focus in Num 20:10; 20:26a, 27, 28a, but only here.

The difference between the stories that make up the frame in their use of the motifs that are also found in the Sinai pericope, and the point in the pattern in which they are used, is part of the way in which these stories, though mirroring each other with regard to the elements of the common pattern, in their details interact with, and play off, each other to give a rich tapestry of interpretation that illuminates further their centerpiece in the Sinai pericope.

In order to see how the motifs found in both the frame and the Sinai pericope enhance the interpretation of the latter and draw out its implications, it is necessary first to explore how the details of the framing stories interact with each other within their common pattern. In light of this, it will be seen how the interpretations that emerge from the frame illumine the Sinai pericope with regard to how the stories with their common pattern play off each other in forming a frame around the Sinai pericope and with regard to the motifs that are held in common with it.

#### The Interaction of Exodus 16\* and Numbers 13–14\* and How This Further Interprets the Central Sinai Pericope

Exodus 16\* and Num 13–14\* form the immediate frame either side of the centerpiece of the Sinai pericope. It has been shown that Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* have a common structural pattern: the congregation complains against Moses and Aaron with a speech comprising a death wish and an accusation (Exod 16:2–3; Num 14:1–3); there is a disputation



speech in response to the complaint (Exod 16:6–7; Num 14:6, 7–9aβb); the glory of YHWH appears (Exod 16:10; Num 14:10b), followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (and Aaron) that includes an instruction to speak to the people (Exod 16:11–12; Num 14:26–29, 31, 35); the delivery of the oracle is simply assumed, with the ensuing events reported straight after the YHWH speech (Exod 16:13–15; Num 14:36–38).

The similarities in pattern and in some of the details suggest that in their differences these accounts are being intentionally played off against each other.<sup>532</sup> Both accounts up to the speech of YHWH share many similarities. However, the differences tend to put the people in Num 14\* in a more negative light.

In both, the whole congregation “complains” (לָנִי) against Moses and Aaron (Exod 16:2; Num 14:1a, 2). In both, there is a wish that they had died in the land of Egypt (Exod 16:3; Num 14:2), which is a rejection of the exodus. However, in Exod 16:3, death in Egypt is qualified with “by the hand of YHWH,” which recognizes the power of YHWH, unlike Num 14:2 where in its context this death wish represents a rejection of the cosmic power of YHWH who controls the nations (see Num 14:3, 9aβb, 10a, and Exod 12:12; 14\*). In Exod 16:2–3, the death wish is expressed because of the threat of death by hunger in the wilderness, as stated in the accusation against Moses and Aaron in 16:3b. In contrast, in Num 14:2–3, the wish for death in the past, not only in Egypt but also, given the literary context, in the wilderness, is expressed because of a perceived threat of death through defeat in war in the land, as summed up in the explicit accusation against YHWH in 14:3; this denotes not only a rejection of the cosmic power of YHWH revealed in the exodus (Exod 7–14\*, and esp. Exod 12:12; see Num 14:9b) but also that YHWH is with them (see Num 14:9b, 10a, where they reject the reassurance by Joshua and Caleb that YHWH is with them expressed in holy war language). In both, the accusation is against YHWH, but whereas this is explicit in Num 14:3, in Exod 16:2–3 the people understand themselves as complaining against Moses and Aaron in rejecting the exodus, and they have to be instructed by Moses and Aaron that it is really a complaint against YHWH, since it was YHWH who brought them out of Egypt in the exodus (Exod 16:6–7). The appearance of the glory of YHWH is similar, differing only in that in

---

532. The way in which they do this is discussed in Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 56–58, and the following discussion is based on this.

Exod 16:10, set before the construction of the tent of meeting, the glory of YHWH appears in the cloud at a distance in the wilderness, whereas in Num 14:10b it appears at the tent of meeting, which in the context has now been constructed.<sup>533</sup> However, in Exod 16\*, this is prepared for by the disputation speech of Moses and Aaron that foreshadows it (16:6–7, 9) since this is the first time that the glory appears;<sup>534</sup> in Num 14\* it occurs after the people have tried to stone Joshua and Caleb in light of their counterspeech in a determined effort to cling to their complaint and to reject the reassurance that YHWH is with them (14:6, 7, 9aβb, 10a). In Exod 16\*, the people are instructed by Moses and Aaron, and there is no indication that they reject this instruction, whereas in Num 14\* the people, even after what they should have learned in Exod 16\* and at Sinai, are not open to instruction.

Therefore, although Exod 16:2–3, 6–7, 9–10 parallels Num 14:2–3, 5–7, 9aβb, 10 quite closely, the subtle differences are significant in putting the behavior of the people in Num 14\* in a more negative light. This is all the more jarring in its literary context after the instruction given in Exod 16\* and in the Sinai pericope.

Consequently the content of the YHWH speeches and the ensuing events move in opposite directions: in Exod 16\* all is positive, whereas in Num 14\* all is negative. In Exod 16:12, YHWH says he has heard the Israelite's complaint (לִנְיָ) and promises meat and bread by which they will know "I am YHWH your God." The quail and manna arrive as stated (Exod 16:13–15), and, in line with YHWH's promise that through this nourishment they will know "I am YHWH," it is made quite clear by Moses that the manna/bread is the gift of YHWH. In contrast, in Num 14:27a, YHWH asks, "How long will this wicked congregation complain [לִנְיָ] against me," and then utters an oath that this generation, described by YHWH as this wicked congregation gathered together against (עַד עָלָיו) him, will die in the wilderness in fulfillment of their wish in 14:2b (Num 14:28–29aα [31] 35). Consequently, all the surveyors (except Joshua and Caleb) die immediately (14:36–38), foreshadowing the fate of that generation.<sup>535</sup>

Thus, in their similarities and differences Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* mirror and play off each other. They begin in a similar fashion but with

533. See Schart, *Israel und Moses im Konflikt*, 142.

534. See *ibid.*

535. Hope resides only in Joshua and Caleb (Num 14:38) and the next generation (Num 14:31).

subtle differences that point to the more radically negative behavior of the people in Num 14\*. This leads to opposite outcomes. The appearance of the glory of YHWH is accompanied by a YHWH speech that in Exod 16\* unfolds with sustenance and life, but in Num 14\* brings judgment that issues in death. In Exod 16\*, the opposite of the people's prediction that they will die in the wilderness occurs: they are nourished and educated with the knowledge of YHWH. In Num 14\*, the people's wish that they had died in the wilderness, which represents a rejection of the sustenance that enabled them to know YHWH in Exod 16\*, and of the dwelling of YHWH with them as unfolded at Sinai, is fulfilled: they are to die in the wilderness.

The mutual influence between the paradigmatic centerpiece and its frame is evident in both the pattern of the stories constituting the frame and in its details.

The paradigmatic nature of this pattern is enhanced by virtue of its role as bracketing the paradigmatic picture contained in the Sinai pericope with its hermeneutics of time. As such, this pattern adds an interpretative dimension or draws out the implications of the paradigmatic picture of the Sinai pericope. The Israelites in relation to whom the tabernacle and its priesthood allow the presence of YHWH in their midst are typically portrayed as a complaining people. The leaders' role is to educate and counter their complaints. YHWH in specific manifestations of his presence (the glory of YHWH) responds to the people's complaints, and YHWH's words (whether positive or negative) are effective in the life of the nation.

In relation to the details, the Sinai pericope inevitably influences the interpretation of aspects of the frame, particularly in Num 14\*. Seen in light of the Sinai pericope that it immediately follows, the people's wish to have died in the wilderness is to be interpreted implicitly as a rejection of all that occurs at Sinai, and their rejection of the reassurance of Joshua and Caleb that YHWH is with them, and YHWH's description of them as meeting against (יַעַד עַל) YHWH, is to be interpreted as a rejection of YHWH's dwelling in their midst and meeting with them by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting (Exod 29:43, 45–46). However, it is the way in which Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* interact with each other in terms of their details to add an interpretative dimension to, or draw out the implications of, its centerpiece in the Sinai pericope which is of particular interest here.

The motifs within the Sinai pericope that the narrative frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* further interpret are specifically: the exodus (Exod 29:46; see 16:3, 6; Num 14:2 [3, 9b, 10a]); the knowledge that "I am

YHWH" (Exod 29:46; see Exod 16:12 [15]); the dwelling of YHWH in their midst and meeting with them (Exod 29:43, 45–46; see Num 14:9b, 10a, 35); and the glory of YHWH (Exod 24:16; 29:43; 40:34; see 16:[7], 10; Num 14:10b).

Within the Sinai pericope all these motifs are clustered in Exod 29:43–46, which spells out the whole point of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood, and the glory of YHWH is also found in Exod 24:16 and 40:34, which brackets the whole Sinai pericope. The whole point of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel is so that YHWH can dwell in the midst of the Israelites and meet with them and in this to know YHWH as "I am YHWH," who brought them out of Egypt in the exodus in order to do this; and this coheres with the motif of the glory of YHWH by which the tent of meeting is sanctified when the glory of YHWH fills it. Therefore within the Sinai pericope per se, the motifs it has in common with its frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* have to do with the presence of YHWH whom the people know through the exodus.

In picking up these motifs in their own particular way, and in interaction with each other, Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* draw out the implications of these central aspects in the paradigmatic and rather static picture of the Sinai pericope for the life of the nation as it travels through time.

The people's consistent rejection of the exodus (Exod 16:3, 6; Num 14:2 [3, 9b, 10a]), and therefore YHWH as the one who brought them out of Egypt (Exod 29:46), only has negative consequences once the tabernacle/tent of meeting has been established. Prior to this, the people complain out of an understandable need and out of ignorance: they do not know that their rejection of the exodus is a rejection of YHWH, who brought them out of Egypt (Exod 16:6–7). Instead of being judged, therefore, they are educated by YHWH into the knowledge that "I am YHWH" through YHWH's response to their need by nurturing them with the bread (Exod 16:12[15]), an education that continues with the setting up of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, where they will experience the presence of "I am YHWH" of the exodus. However, after the establishment of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, the people's rejection of the exodus (Num 14:2 [3, 9b, 10a]) is judged by YHWH since they are no longer ignorant of who YHWH is since, in line with their education by YHWH in Exod 16\*, they now know "I am YHWH" who brought them out of Egypt in the exodus (Exod 29:46). Moreover, the purpose of this is for YHWH to dwell in their midst (Exod 29:45–46) and meet with them (Exod 29:43). Knowing this, the Israelites in Num 14\* also reject YHWH as being with them, that is,

dwelling in their midst (Num 14:9b, 10a, and see 14:3). What is more, the description of them as meeting against YHWH (Num 14:35) in a play on the purpose of the tent of meeting as the means of YHWH meeting with them (Exod 29:43) also shows them as rejecting YHWH's presence with them. This, along with their rejection of the exodus, represents the absolute rejection of the whole purpose of the tabernacle/tent of meeting as the means by which YHWH, whom they know as the God of the exodus, is present to Israel (Exod 29:45–46). Therefore they are judged by YHWH.

The implications for the paradigmatic picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting as the means of YHWH's dwelling in the midst of the Israelites, then, is that it can be not only a positive thing, but also the cause of judgment and death if the people reject it and all that it stands for.

In line with this, the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה), symbolizing the divine presence (Exod 24:16; 40:34), functions in the life of the nation of Israel to bring, along with the effective word of YHWH, nurturing and life (Exod 16:[7], 10), or judgment and destruction (Num 14:10b).<sup>536</sup> The glory of YHWH, the most direct symbol of YHWH's presence in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting (Exod 40:34) is a destructive presence if the Israelites reject the paradigmatic picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel and its very purpose as the means of the presence of YHWH, whom they know through the exodus, in their midst.

In these ways the frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* adds interpretative dimensions, and draws out the implications of, these central motifs in the paradigmatic and static picture of the Sinai pericope for the ongoing life of the nation.

The Interaction of Numbers 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 with Numbers 13–14\* and with Exodus 16\* and How This Further Interprets the Central Sinai Pericope

Numbers 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 has a similar pattern to Num 13–14\* and Exod 16\*,<sup>537</sup> with the primary difference being that the disputation speech by the leader(s) in Num 20:10 occurs after the appearance of the glory of YHWH and the YHWH speech instead of before them (Exod

536. See Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 157–58.

537. The congregation speaks against Moses and Aaron with a death wish and accusation, the glory of YHWH appears followed by a YHWH speech to Moses to speak to a third party, and consequently what happens is unfolded.

16:7–8; Num 14:6–7, 9abb); this is because the disputation speech in Num 20:10 highlights the disobedience of Moses to YHWH's instructions. Moses here misrepresents YHWH in contrast to the disputation speeches in Exod 16:6–7 and Num 14:6–7, 9ab $\beta$ b that are a positive counter to the complaint of the people that point the people to who YHWH really is.<sup>538</sup> Yet, the water is still given to the people. The interpretative dimension that this variation of the pattern adds to the paradigmatic picture of the Sinai pericope is that, while the Israelites are still typically complaining people to whom YHWH responds in specific manifestations of his presence (the glory of YHWH) with words that are effective in the life of the nation, this is so whether or not the leaders are obedient to YHWH; water still flows for the people as is the intention of YHWH's instructions even though Moses does not obey the instructions.

In terms of the details embodied in this pattern, a comparison of Num 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 with Num 13–14\* will show that its primary focus is on Moses and Aaron rather than the people and that comparison with Exod 16\* not only confirms that the focus of Num 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 is on the leadership of Moses and Aaron but that it reverses their portrayal in Exod 16\*.<sup>539</sup>

The primary focus on Moses and Aaron in Num 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 becomes clear when it is compared with Num 13–14\*, which focuses primarily on the people.

In Num 20:2b, 3b, 4, as in Num 14:2–3, the congregation voices a complaint against Moses and Aaron. However, instead of the verb לון (Num 14:2), Num 20:2b refers to the congregation “gathering against” (קהל על) Moses and Aaron in an echo of Num 14:35, where the congregation have “gathered against” (יעד על) YHWH. As in Num 14:2–3, there is a death wish followed by an accusation in Num 20:3b, 4, using the same wording of לו (Num 20:3b; 14:2b) and למה (Num 20:4; 14:3). However, the wish to have died in the wilderness (see Num 14:2b $\beta$ ) is now expressed in Num 20:3b in terms of wishing to have died “when our brothers died [גוע] before YHWH,” a reference back to the scouts who died (מות) “before YHWH” in Num 14:37.<sup>540</sup> The accusation in Num 20:4, in contrast to Num 14:3, is directed not at YHWH but only against Moses and Aaron,

538. See discussion in §4.2.2.3, above.

539. This is explored in Boorer, “Place of Numbers 13–14\*,” 58–62, and the following discussion is based on this.

540. See Frankel, *Murmuring Stories*, 297, 304, and n. 521 above.

as denoted in the second-person plural masculine address and as reinforced by the people's self-reference as the assembly of YHWH. Instead of gathering against YHWH, they gather against Moses and Aaron and express their wish that they had died earlier with their tribal leaders before YHWH instead of from thirst in this wilderness place to which Moses and Aaron have brought them.

Continuing the focus on Moses and Aaron, the glory of YHWH then appears at the tent of meeting in Num 20:6, not to the people as in Num 14:10b, but to Moses and Aaron only.<sup>541</sup> In the speech of YHWH to Moses in Num 20:7, 8α\*β, there is no judgment on the people nor any instruction to speak to them, as in Num 14:26–28, 29α, (31), 35; there are instructions only for Moses and Aaron to speak to the rock so that it will give its water. The focus in Num 20:10, the equivalent to the disputation speech in Num 14:6–7, 9αβ, is therefore on the disobedience of Moses and Aaron to this command; Moses speaks to the people rather than the rock (and Aaron does not speak at all) and addresses the people as “rebels” (המרִים) and therefore judges the people whereas, unlike in Num 14\*, YHWH does not (see Num 20:7, 8α\*β). The people are provided with water (Num 20:11b). However, from the people's perspective, after the speech in Num 20:10 where the question puts the focus on Moses and Aaron (1st com. pl. pron.), there is no indication that YHWH is behind this miracle; clearly Moses and Aaron have usurped YHWH's position. This leads to YHWH's judgment of Moses and Aaron in Num 20:12 and the unfolding of this in Num 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14.

These parallels and divergences between Num 20:2–12\* and Num 13–14\* suggest that, whereas Num 13–14\* is concerned with the people, their rejection of the exodus, of what occurs in Exod 16\*, and the whole purpose of the paradigmatic picture in the Sinai pericope, and their demise, Num 20:2–12\* is concerned with the primary leadership, the figures of Moses and Aaron, their disobedience that results in their conse-

---

541. In both Num 14:5 and Num 20:6, Moses and Aaron fall on their faces. In Num 20:6, it is at the entrance to the tent of meeting, but in Num 14:5 it is before the people. It is possible that Num 14:5 denotes a gesture of submission to the people instead of to YHWH and therefore perhaps foreshadows the negative view of Moses and Aaron in Num 20:2–12\*. Moreover, with the disputation speech in response to the people's complaint in Num 14:6–9\* being given by Joshua and Caleb, in contrast to Moses and Aaron in Exod 16:6–7, perhaps this hints at the demise of Moses and Aaron as leaders in Num 20:12.



quent loss of leadership, and the passing of the leadership of high priest to Aaron's son Eleazar (Num 20:26, 28).

Numbers 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 picks up on the motifs of the obedience of Moses and the leadership of the high priest in the Sinai pericope (Exod 40:33b [39:32, 43]; and Exod 28–29\*, respectively). However, before exploring how it adds an interpretative dimension to the paradigmatic picture of the Sinai pericope, it is important to see how Num 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14, with its focus on the leadership of Moses and Aaron, interacts with, and plays off, Exod 16\* with regard to the issue of leadership, since these two texts form part of the frame around the Sinai pericope as centerpiece.

Numbers 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 and Exod 16\* share a common pattern,<sup>542</sup> but in their details the former reverses the portrayal of Moses and Aaron in the latter.

In both Num 20:2–12\*; 22b–29\*; 27:12–14, and Exod 16\*, the initial speech of the congregation is against Moses and Aaron and comprises a death wish and an accusation against Moses and Aaron of bringing them into this wilderness for them to die (Num 20:2, 3b, 4; Exod 16:2–3). However, in Num 20:3b–4, there is no rejection of the exodus by the people as there is in Exod 16:3a. In Num 20:3b–4, the people acknowledge that they are the assembly of YHWH and merely wish they had died earlier (20:3b; see Num 14:37) and not been brought into this wilderness by Moses and Aaron to die there. The behavior of the people in Num 20:2, 3b, 4, whose fate is sealed after the judgment of Num 14:28–29aα, 35, does not represent a complaint against YHWH as does the complaint of the people implicitly in Exod 16:3a (and see 16:6–7). This suggests that the real concern of the narrative is not with the behavior of the people but with that of Moses and Aaron against whom they complain, and this is born out in Num 20:6, 7, 8aα\*bα, 10, 11b, 12.

In both Num 20:2–12\*; 22b–29\*; 27:12–14, and Exod 16\*, there is an appearance of the glory of YHWH (Num 20:6; Exod 16:10) followed by a YHWH speech to Moses (Num 20:7, 8aα\*bα; Exod 16:11–12) and the consequent provision of food/water. After the appearance of the glory of YHWH, the YHWH speeches in both of the narratives are positive toward the people, promising provision of nourishment, water in Num 20:8aα\*β, and meat and bread in Exod 16:11–12. This is consequently unfolded

---

542. See above n. 537.

(Num 20:11b; Exod 16:13–15). There are, however, significant differences. The glory of YHWH appears only to Moses and Aaron in Num 20:6 but to the congregation in Exod 16:10.<sup>543</sup> In the YHWH speech in Exod 16:11–12, Moses is told to speak (דבר) to the people, assuring them they shall eat meat and bread and thereby will know that “I am YHWH” their God. This emphasis on the knowledge of YHWH is followed through after the food is given in Moses’s explanation of the bread as given by YHWH in Exod 16:15. In contrast, in the YHWH speech in Num 20:8α\*β, there is an instruction to Moses and Aaron (2nd masc. pl. address) to speak (דבר), not to the people as in Exod 16:12, but to the rock for it to provide the water. The water is provided despite Moses and Aaron disobeying this instruction (Num 20:10), in a context where there is no acknowledgment of YHWH as its source to the people in Num 20:11b. Therefore, whereas in Exod 16:11–12, 13–15 the focus is on the people coming to the knowledge of YHWH mediated by the speech of Moses to them, in Num 20:6, 7, 8α\*β the focus is not really on the people but on Moses and Aaron and how they behave to block the knowledge of YHWH from the people.

The contrast in the behavior of Moses and Aaron in Num 20:2–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14; and Exod 16\* becomes crystal clear when the speeches of Moses (and Aaron<sup>544</sup>) to the people, found in both narratives (Num 20:10; Exod 16:6–7, and see 16:9), are examined. As we have seen, these speeches occur in different places in their respective narratives. They are also markedly different in content. In Exod 16\*, the speech of Moses and Aaron to the people, which comes as a response to the people’s complaint and before the appearance of the glory of YHWH, corrects the people’s perception that Moses and Aaron have brought them from Egypt into the wilderness (16:3) by pointing out to them that it is YHWH who brought them out of Egypt and so it is really YHWH against whom they are complaining; Moses and Aaron, by way of preparation for the theophany, point away from themselves toward YHWH as the one who unfolds these events (Exod 16:6–7, 9). This is coherent with the emphasis in Exod 16:12 on YHWH’s provision of food as bringing the people to a knowl-

---

543. As in Num 14:10b, the glory of YHWH appears in relation to the tent of meeting in Num 20:6, whereas in Exod 16:10 the glory of YHWH appears in the cloud at a distance because of the differing literary contexts after and before Sinai respectively.

544. Although in Num 20:10 only he (probably Moses) speaks, the speech is on behalf of both Moses and Aaron (see first common plural pronoun).

edge of YHWH, reinforced by Moses in 16:15. The behavior of Moses and Aaron is in accord with YHWH's intention of bringing the people to the knowledge of YHWH. In sharp contrast, the speech of Moses in Num 20:10 on behalf of both Moses and Aaron, coming after the speech of YHWH, is not in accord with YHWH's command in that speech (Num 20:8aa\*β): Moses speaks to the people rather than the rock, with the tone of a dispute with the people that accuses them of being rebels, whereas YHWH has not,<sup>545</sup> and draws attention to himself and Aaron as providers of the water from the rock. When seen in relation to, and as the antithesis of, Pg's account in Exod 16\*, that the primary disobedience and sin of Moses (and Aaron) lies in usurping the place of YHWH by crediting themselves with providing the water is clear, since this is set in contrast to their speeches in Exod 16:6–7, 9 where they clearly point away from themselves to YHWH as the one who brought the people out of Egypt, hears their complaint, and provides the people with food (see Exod 16:15), allowing the people through their experience of this sustenance to come to the knowledge of YHWH (see Exod 16:12). Hence the accusation of Moses and Aaron by YHWH in Num 20:12 is not trusting in YHWH to show YHWH's holiness before the eyes of the Israelites; and YHWH's judgment therefore is that they will not lead the people into the land. They can no longer lead the people because they have failed to mediate the knowledge of YHWH to the people. Consequently they are to die outside the land (Num 20:22b–29\*; 27:12–14).

However, there is a glimmer of hope, a visionary element, in Moses's last explicit act which is one of obedience to YHWH's instructions to put the vestments of Aaron on his son Eleazar just before Aaron dies, which he does before the eyes of the whole congregation (Num 20:22b–29\*, esp. 20:25–28). Aaron dies and Moses will die outside the land (27:12–14), but the leadership continues in the hereditary office of the high priest.

In what ways do Exod 16\* and Num 20:1–12\*; 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 as bracketing or framing the paradigmatic picture of the Sinai pericope as centerpiece bring interpretative dimensions to it? These lie in the area of the leadership of the community to whom YHWH is present, dwelling in their midst, by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood.

---

545. The people have not complained against YHWH in Num 20:3b–4, but only against Moses and Aaron, and Moses retaliates with this accusation therefore only on his own behalf, thus hinting at usurping YHWH, whose role it is to judge or not.

The paradigmatic picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood is realized by the obedience of Moses to YHWH's instructions that he is to speak (דבר) to the people (Exod 25:1). Moses's obedience enables the people to be obedient (Exod 40:33b; and see 39:32, 43) and the divine presence (כבוד יהוה), YHWH, is enabled to dwell in the midst of the people by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel (29:45–46; 40:34). Moreover, in this paradigmatic picture, the vestments of the high priest, Aaron, mediate the people to YHWH (see the stones of the ephod with the names of the twelve tribes [28:12] and the stones of the breastpiece with the names of the twelve tribes [28:21, 29–30]) and YHWH to the people (see the “flower” engraved with “holy to YHWH” [28:36–38]).<sup>546</sup>

Exodus 16\* and Num 20:1–12\*; 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 add interpretative dimensions, and draw out the implications, of these aspects of the paradigmatic centerpiece that they bracket. With regard to the obedience of the leadership, Exod 16\* shows that through the obedience of Moses and Aaron to YHWH and in particular in pointing away from themselves to YHWH as responsible for the exodus and as providing the gift of food, the people are brought to the true knowledge of YHWH (“I am YHWH”) as the one who brought them out of Egypt and provides them with nourishment. This is the YHWH who dwells in their midst by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting (Exod 29:46). However, the reverse of this, Moses's (and Aaron's) disobedience to YHWH's instructions and usurping YHWH's role instead of witnessing to YHWH and his provision for the people in the eyes of the people, means that they are deposed as leaders. Their disobedient and corrupt leadership does not disadvantage the people in terms of YHWH's provision for them—they are still provided with the water. However, such leadership that does not bring the people to knowledge of YHWH means those leaders are stripped of their leadership by YHWH and replaced.

The leadership that takes the people into the future is the Aaronic line, symbolized in the son of Aaron, Eleazar, who is invested with the clothing of Aaron that allows him to mediate the people to YHWH and YHWH to the people in the tent of meeting. But, in light of Exod 16\* and Num 20:2–12\*, he, too, is only enabled to do this as long as he is obedient to YHWH's commands and fulfills his role as bringing the people before

---

546. See §4.2.1.2, above.

YHWH and YHWH to the people, of pointing the people to YHWH as the source of their well-being and not trying himself to usurp YHWH's role. That is, he too, appropriately for the high priest, must fulfill the role of showing YHWH's holiness before the eyes of the people. If he does not, by implication he, too, will die and the next in the hereditary succession of the Aaronic line will take over as high priest as long as he, too, is obedient to YHWH and witnesses correctly to YHWH in the eyes of the people.

In these ways, Exod 16\* and Num 20:1–12\*; 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 draw out what is involved in true leadership of the nation, inherently found in static and timeless form in the paradigmatic picture of the Sinai pericope, in particular in Exod 25:1; 39:32, 43; 40:33b and Exod 28\*, as it moves through time from the past into the future.

Summary of How Exodus 16\*; Numbers 13–14\*; 20:1–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 Interpret Further the Central Sinai Pericope

In sum, the interpretative dimensions and implications of the paradigmatic picture of the Sinai pericope for the life of the nation embodied in the narrative frame in Exod 16\*; Num 13–14\* and Num 20:1–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 are as follows.

Their common paradigmatic pattern further defines the Israelites, in relation to whom the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood allow the presence of YHWH to dwell in their midst, as a typically complaining people. The presence of YHWH in their midst, in response to their complaining, meets with them and/or their leaders in specific manifestations of the glory of YHWH and with words that are effective (whether as nurturing or in judgment) in the life of the nation. This is the case whether the leaders are faithful, in terms of countering the people's complaints and educating them by pointing to who YHWH is or what he will do for them, and obediently carrying out YHWH's instructions for the people, or not.

The details of these framing narratives interact with each other to show that YHWH's dwelling in the midst of the Israelites, his divine presence, can be a positive, nurturing presence or bring judgment and destruction if the Israelites reject the paradigmatic picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel as the means of the presence of YHWH, the God of the exodus, in their midst. The role of the leadership is to be obedient to YHWH's instructions and to be faithful witnesses to YHWH who dwells in the midst of the people through the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood, that is, to obediently allow the people to come to

the knowledge of YHWH. If they fail to be obedient to YHWH's words and do not witness to YHWH before the people, though not preventing YHWH's words from unfolding for the people, such leaders are deposed and replaced. The leadership for the community into the future is the high priest in the Aaronic line, in each case implicitly subject to being obedient to YHWH and carrying out his appropriate mediating role, and in particular witnessing to YHWH, and his holiness, before the people.

#### 4.2.4. Conclusion: The Complex Paradigmatic Picture of Exodus 16–Numbers 27\* as a Whole

At the center of this complex paradigmatic picture is the Sinai pericope (Exod 19–40\*). Its paradigmatic nature is multifaceted. It is paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping and synthesizing earlier traditions with unique and programmatic elements into a timeless vision of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood as the means of divine presence in the midst of the Israelites; or, in other words, it presents a picture of the founding rituals of sacred space and sacred personnel by which YHWH is present to the people that is relevant for, or encompasses and therefore transcends, all time, past, present, and future. In addition, its style of repetition and formalism (and therefore its nature as ritualized text) has the effect of engendering a visual, imaginary, and cognitive experience in the audience such that in a sense time stands still and is transcended. It also invites its audience to realize its worldview wherever it finds itself through time by putting the ordinances into praxis.

With regard to the narratives that frame this paradigmatic centerpiece, their paradigmatic nature is seen in their reshaping of earlier traditions into a common pattern that is repeated through time, thereby taking on a sort of timelessness; and in the way in which, in framing the centerpiece, the Sinai pericope, these narratives take on its hermeneutics of time. These framing narratives are linked closely with their centerpiece by shared motifs; like the frame that picks up some of the colors of a painting in various ways, the framing narratives pick up on central motifs in the centerpiece. The motifs shared in common between the frame and its centerpiece have to do primarily with the presence of YHWH and who YHWH is, as well as leadership issues. As such, the motifs within the Sinai pericope highlighted by the framing narratives are: the dwelling of YHWH, whom they will know as the God of the exodus, in the midst of the Israelites (Exod 29:45–46), who will meet

with them (Exod 29:43), and the glory of YHWH (Exod 24:16; 29:43; 40:34)—as well as motifs regarding leadership (Exod 28\*; 25:1; 40:33b [39:32, 43]). The interplay of the details in the narrative frame, and in particular the interplay of these motifs relating to divine presence and leadership, distributed as they are variously within the common structural pattern of each of these stories, adds further interpretational dimensions to these motifs contained in the static and timeless paradigm of their centerpiece. They draw out the implications of these motifs in the timeless paradigm of the Sinai pericope for the ongoing life of the nation over time. However, they do this in such a way that there is a recurring pattern or typicality regarding how these motifs play out, which, as thereby touching into a kind of timelessness, is part of the paradigmatic nature of the narrative frame. The way in which the presence of YHWH and the role of the leadership play out in the various situations as described in the framing narratives shows a constancy through time and therefore a certain timelessness: typically YHWH responds, through specific manifestations of the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה), to the people, typically portrayed as a complaining people, in words that are effective, for good, or for ill precisely if they reject the picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel as the means of the presence of YHWH, the God of the exodus, in their midst; and this is true no matter how the leadership behaves—the obedience or disobedience of the leadership merely determines their own fate.

Narrative frame and central picture interact in these ways such that the centerpiece, the Sinai pericope, and its narrative frame are an integral whole—a complex paradigmatic picture whose hermeneutics of time is one of timelessness, or the transcending of time, and therefore relevant for all time.

#### 4.3. EXODUS 1:13–7:7<sup>547</sup>

So far, in approaching Pg's story of Israel in Exod 1\*–Num 27\* from the point of view of its paradigmatic nature, two major complex paradigmatic pictures have been identified and analyzed: Exod 7–14\* with its ritual/liturgical centerpiece in Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41 and its framing narrative

---

547. I.e., Exod 1:13–14; 2:23aβb–25; 6:2–12; 7:1–7.



in Exod 7–11\*; 14\*; and Exod 16–Num 27\* with its ritual centerpiece<sup>548</sup> in Exod 19–40\* and its framing narrative in Exod 16\*; Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*.

Both of these complex paradigmatic pictures, however, are introduced by Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 against its backdrop of Exod 1:13–14; 2:23aβb–25. Exodus 6:2–8 in particular introduces both Pg's material in Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* inseparably within its structure. In Exod 6:2–8, references to YHWH's deliverance of the Israelites from the Egyptians in 6:5–7, foreshadowing Exod 7–14\*, are surrounded by references to the promise of the land of Canaan and its fulfillment in 6:4, 8, which, though introducing Exod 7–14\*, looks forward in particular to Exod 16–Num 27\*. The unfolding of the land promise is implicit within Exod 7–14\* in the liberation of Israel from Egypt as the first stage of this occurring (Exod 12:40–41). It is much more the focus of attention in Exod 16–Num 27\*, however, through Israel's journey east toward the land via itineraries and, albeit in a negative way, in the people's rejection of the promised land in Num 13–14\* and the motif of Moses and Aaron being barred from leading the people into the land in Num 20\*; 27\*. Moreover, the repetition of "I am YHWH" (and the knowledge of this) in Exod 6:2, 6, 7, 8 points forward, not only to Exod 7–14\* (see esp. Exod 12:12; 14:4, 18) but also to Exod 16–Num 27\*, as seen in the references to it in Exod 16:12 and Exod 29:46. The promise to be their God in Exod 6:7 points forward, not only to the liberation of Israel as noted in this verse (and see also Exod 29:46), but, most significantly, to the Sinai pericope in Exod 25–40\* where the tabernacle as the means of God's presence dwelling in their midst is portrayed as the fulfillment of YHWH's promise to be their God as summed up in Exod 29:45–46. This is continued in Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*, where YHWH's being Israel's God manifests in judgment.<sup>549</sup> Exodus 6:10–12; 7:1–7 is a continuation of Exod 6:2–8 and 9 (where Moses carries out his commission given in 6:6–8) as seen from the way in which 6:12 refers back to the motif of the Israelites not listening to Moses in 6:9. Exodus 6:10–12; 7:1–7, then, introduces Exod 7–14\* specifically. Exodus 7:1–5 is YHWH's response to Moses's objection in Exod 6:12 to his commission in Exod 6:10–11: Exod 7:1–2 reaffirms his commission and Exod 7:3–5, as we have seen, introduces Exod 7–14\* (with 7:3 introducing Exod 7–11\*,

---

548. Ritual in the sense of the founding rituals of sacred space and sacred personnel and also its style as ritualized text.

549. See §2.2.2, above.

7:4 introducing Exod 12\*, and 7:5 introducing Exod 14\*);<sup>550</sup> and Exod 7:6–7, which notes the obedience of Moses and Aaron to what YHWH commanded, foreshadows the inevitable unfolding of what is summed up in Exod 7:1–5 in Exod 7–14\*.

That Exod 1:13–7:7\* introduces both paradigmatic pictures in Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* in an inseparable and integrated way suggests that these two paradigmatic pictures can also be seen in their combined form as constituting one whole complex paradigmatic picture. Therefore, in what follows, we will first look at the way in which the introduction in Exod 1:13–7:7\* reshapes earlier traditions and synthesizes these with unique elements into a structured pattern, before turning to ask the question: What picture of the story of the nation from the point of view of its paradigmatic nature results from the combination of these two complex paradigmatic pictures?

Exodus 1:13–14; 2:23aβb–25

Exodus 1:13–14; 2:23aβb–25 forms the backdrop to 6:2–12; 7:1–7, and 6:2–8 in particular. Exodus 2:23aβb–25 follows on from the notice in 1:13–14 regarding Israel's slavery (עבדה, 1:14; 2:23aβ) and forms a bridge to 6:2–8, as seen from the common motifs between 2:23aβb–25 and 6:5–6: God/YHWH hears (שמע) their groaning (נאקה), 2:24; 6:5; God/YHWH remembers (זכר) his covenant, 2:24; 6:5; and the reference to Israel's slavery (עבדה), 2:23b; 6:6.<sup>551</sup>

As in the non-P account in Exod 1:9–12, the oppression of the Israelites through slavery in Pg's account in 1:13–14 occurs in the context of the Israelites becoming numerous in Egypt (see 1:7 that immediately precedes 1:13–14). However, Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition; whereas Exod 1:9–11 links the great number of the Israelites with their slavery by way of cause and effect (and vice versa in 1:12), Pg simply juxtaposes these two motifs<sup>552</sup> by way of summary of this tradition. Pg's emphasis in 1:13–14 is

550. See §2.2.2 and the introduction under §4.1, above.

551. See Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 266. See also the use of the verb עבד in Exod 1:13 and 6:5.

552. Peter Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur priesterschriftlichen Exodusgeschichte*, FB 9 (Würzburg: Echter, 1973), 43.

on the ruthlessness of the Egyptians and on the great extent of the oppression in the tasks imposed.<sup>553</sup>

In Exod 2:23aβb–25, Pg seems to be drawing on the motifs in the earlier tradition reflected in 3:7, 9 of the cry of the Israelites reaching to YHWH (see 2:23), his hearing of it (see 2:24), and seeing their situation and knowing it (see 2:25), by way of summary.<sup>554</sup> The emphasis in Pg's summary here is on the activity of God (אלהים), who is mentioned five times, four of which as the subject of activity. Moreover, Pg has added a unique element: "God remembered [זכר] his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (2:24). It is this, along with hearing the groans of the Israelites, that becomes the basis for YHWH's act of deliverance (see 6:5–6).<sup>555</sup>

Exodus 6:2–12; 7:1–7

In formulating Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7, Pg would seem to have drawn on earlier traditions of the self-revelation formula "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה) (see 6:2, 6, 7, 8; 7:5) such as found in Gen 28:13; Exod 7:17; 15:26; 20:2; Hos 12:9; 13:4.<sup>556</sup> Zimmerli has argued convincingly that it has its roots in ancient

---

553. Pg could possibly be picking up on the earlier tradition contained in Exod 5:1–23 (esp. 5:6–18) of the increased oppression of the Israelites by the Egyptians, with tasks beyond all reasonable expectation, summarizing it in a succinct statement as the situation from the beginning. If so, Pg bypasses the motifs of this as a consequence of the request of Moses and Aaron to Pharaoh to let the people go (Exod 5:1–3), of the Israelite supervisors blaming Moses and Aaron, and Moses's blaming of YHWH (Exod 5:19–23), thereby putting the responsibility for the oppression squarely on the shoulders of the Egyptians.

554. In places using distinct terminology such as נאקה and, of course, אלהים, but not YHWH before Exod 6:2–3.

555. See Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur priesterschriftlichen Exodusgeschichte*, 76.

556. Possibly also Ezekiel where this formula in its own right and as part of the recognition formula is found repeatedly, although it is likely that both are drawing on common tradition; see Zimmerli, *I Am YHWH*, 29–98. It is also possible that Exod 6:2–8 and esp. 6:6–8 was influenced by Ezekiel, although it is difficult to determine the direction of influence. Johan Lust ("Exodus 6:2–8 and Ezekiel," in Vervenne, *Studies in the Book of Exodus*, 209–24, esp. 222–24) argues, albeit tentatively, for Ezekiel as influencing Exod 6:6–8, seeing the influence of Ezekiel particularly in the expression, "lift the hand" in Exod 6:8 (see Ezek 20:42 where it is also linked with the promised land and with the expression "I am YHWH" with regard to the Israelites coming to the knowledge of YHWH in the context), and in the adoption of Ezekiel's oracular style where a private message precedes a public oracle introduced by the formula,

liturgical tradition.<sup>557</sup> Pg has also drawn on earlier traditions of the promise of the land to the patriarchs (see Exod 6:4, 8) such as Gen 12:7; 26:3; 28:13, as is the case in Gen 17:8 to which Exod 6:4 in particular refers.

However, it is the non-P traditions in Exod 3–4 upon which Pg would seem to have drawn extensively in formulating Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7. This can be seen from the multiple motifs that they have in common:

- ♦ The divine self-revelation formula (“I am YHWH,” Exod 6:2, 6, 8 [Pg]; “I am God,” 3:6 [non-P]);
- ♦ The linking of the self-revelation of God with the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 6:3 [Pg]; 3:6 [non-P]);
- ♦ The linking of the name YHWH, as revealed first to Moses, to the God of the patriarchs (Exod 6:3 [Pg]; 3:15–16 [one tradition within non-P (E)]);
- ♦ YHWH hearing the cries/groanings of the Israelites in the context of their slavery (Exod 6:5 [Pg] [see also 2:23aβb]; 3:7, 9, [16] [non-P]);
- ♦ YHWH’s commission of Moses to speak to the Israelites/elders (Exod 6:6 [Pg]; 3:16 [non-P]);
- ♦ The divine promise of deliverance from the Egyptians in the context of hearing their cries/groanings (Exod 6:6, 7b [Pg]; 3:8a, [10], 17a [non-P]);
- ♦ This deliverance as involving God’s outstretched hand/arm and divine acts of judgment/wonders (Exod 6:6b and see 7:4–5 [Pg]; 3:20 [non-P]);
- ♦ The divine promise of the land in the context of this deliverance (Exod 6:8 [Pg]; 3:8b, 17b [non-P]);
- ♦ Moses and/or Aaron telling the Israelites/elders what YHWH tells him to say to them linked with the motif of whether they listen/believe (Exod 6:9 where they do not listen [Pg]; 3:18a; 4:30–31

---

“therefore say” (לכן אמר) as seen in Exod 6:2–8 and esp. 6:6. See also Römer (“From the Call of Moses,” 138–39) who notes the similarity between Exod 6:8 and Ezek 20:42, and also between Exod 6:2–12 and Ezek 20:5–8, including that in both YHWH’s self-revelation takes place in Egypt, but leaves the relationship between the two open.

557. Rather than in prophetic tradition; see Zimmerli, *I Am YHWH*; or, as part of the recognition formula, its roots lie, according to Zimmerli (*I Am YHWH*, 71–79) in contexts of symbolic events.

[non-P] [see also this motif of listening/believing as the content of Moses's third objection in 4:1]);

- ♦ A commission to Moses to go to Pharaoh so Israel can be freed from Egypt and the execution of this (Exod 6:11 and 7:2b, 6 [Pg]; 3:10, 18b; 5:1–3 [non-P]);
- ♦ The motif of Pharaoh not listening to Moses (Aaron) (Exod 6:12b and 7:4a [Pg]; 5:2 [non-P]);
- ♦ An objection by Moses to his commission in terms of his inability to speak well (Exod 6:12 [Pg]; 4:10 [non-P]);
- ♦ The divine response or reassurance that YHWH will teach/command Moses what to speak and that Aaron will speak for Moses (Exod 7:1–2 [Pg]; 4:12, 15–16 [non-P]);
- ♦ The divine prediction concerning Pharaoh not letting the Israelites go linked with YHWH's deliverance by his hand and mighty acts of judgment/wonders (Exod 7:3–5 and 6:6b [Pg]; 3:19–20; 4:21 [non-P]).<sup>558</sup>

Pg would also seem to have drawn, to some extent at least, on the form and structure of Exod 3:1–4:17. As is well recognized, Exod 3:1–4:17 (which consists of different levels and additions) clearly comprises the elements of a call narrative of an introductory word (3:7–9), commissions (3:10, 16–17, 18b), objections (3:11, 13; 4:1, 10, 13), reassurances or divine responses to the objections (3:12a, 13–15; 4:2–9, 11–12, 14–16), and a sign (3:12b). So too does Pg's account in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7, with the exception that there is no sign: there is an introductory word (6:2b–5), commissions (6:6–8 and 6:10–11), an objection (6:12), and a divine response (7:1–2).<sup>559</sup> Both passages incorporate (at least) two commissions (6:6–8

---

558. See Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 183–84, for a similar list of similarities between Exod 6:2–13 and Exod 3–4\*. Given these multiple similarities it is probable that Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–5 is literarily dependent on Exod 3–4\* as maintained by Noth (*Exodus*, 61–62); cf. Childs (*Exodus*, 112), who is more cautious and prefers the view of a common oral tradition behind Exod 3–4 and Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7, with a long period of independent development. Schmid (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 184–93) advocates literary dependence but with Exod 3–4\* as literarily dependent on Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7, but see the refutation of this in §1.2.3, above.

559. See Childs, *Exodus*, 111; Coates, *Exodus 1–18*, 56. Pace Ska (“Place d’Ex 6:2–8”) who argues that Exod 6:2–8 is not a call narrative but more akin to a “disputation” according to the pattern found in Ezekiel, and the rebuttal of this by Lust, “Exodus 6:2–8 and Ezekiel,” 213.

and 6:10–11 [Pg]; 3:10 and 3:16–17 [non-P]; and see also 4:12), and both contain divine predictions (7:3–5 [Pg]; 3:18a, 19–22 [non-P]). Moreover, in very broad outline both passages move from being centered on the identity of God, incorporating the self-revelation of God, mixed with the generic element of commission (6:2–9 [Pg]; 3:1–15, and see also 3:16–17 [non-P]), to a concern on the part of Moses concerning his capacity or effectiveness in carrying out his commission that leads to the incorporation of Aaron as Moses's spokesperson (6:10–12; 7:1–2 [Pg]; 4:1, 10–16 [non-P]).<sup>560</sup> On a more microlevel, part of Pg's account in Exod 6:6–12; 7:1–2, that is, 6:6–8, 9b, 10–11, 12; 7:1–2, follows the sequence of motifs found in 3:16–18; 4:10, 14–16: a divine commission for Moses to speak to the Israelites/elders that includes reference to the self-revelation or appearance of YHWH, a promise to deliver them from the Egyptians or bring them out of Egypt, and the promise of the land (6:6–8 [Pg]; 3:16–17 [non-P]), followed by the motif of the Israelites/elders listening or not (6:9 [Pg]; 3:18a [non-P]), then a second divine commission to go to the king of Egypt to petition him to let them leave Egypt (6:10–11 [Pg]; 3:18b [non-P]), and an objection by Moses in terms of his lack of eloquence (6:12 [Pg]; 4:10 [non-P]), leading to the motif of Aaron being Moses's spokesperson (7:1–2 [Pg]; 4:14–16 [non-P]).

All this suggests that Pg is drawing on the earlier text of Exod 3:1–4:17. However, in many respects, Pg's account is different from what is presented in Exod 3–4\*, and this can be seen particularly in the way Pg has taken up and reshaped detailed elements in Exod 3–4\*, in places drawing them together from disparate positions as they occur in Exod 3–4\* or putting them in a different order and synthesizing them with its own unique elements into a tightly structured presentation. We will turn now to the way in which Pg has reshaped the material in Exod 3–4\* into its own unique and ordered picture, first by exploring its tightly formulated

---

560. See Dozeman, "Commission of Moses," 111–17; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 161–63. Dozeman identifies two main sections in each of Exod 3:1–4:17 and Exod 6:2–7:7, the first in Exod 3:1–15 and Exod 6:2–9 respectively that is focused on the identity of God but mixes the genres of divine self-revelation and commission, and the second in Exod 3:16–4:17 and Exod 6:10–7:7 respectively that focus on the authority of Moses concluding with Moses and Aaron. However, in a sense Exod 3:16–17 has traits of his first section in that it mixes divine self-revelation with a commission; and his conclusions with regard to the authority of Moses in Exod 6:10–7:7 are based in part on seeing Exod 6:13–30 as part of P, a passage which we have excluded from Pg as secondary.

structure before a discussion of its details as they occur in sequence within this structure.

Pg's structure in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 is as follows:

- I. First commission and execution (Exod 6:2–9)
  - A. Speech of YHWH (Exod 6:2–8)
 

Introductory word: self-revelation of YHWH as God of patriarchs with whom he established his covenant and his remembrance of it in the face of hearing the groans of the Israelites under Egyptian slavery (Exod 6:2–5)

Commission: Moses to speak to the Israelites concerning what YHWH will do—that is, free them from slavery to the Egyptians, to be their God whom they will come to know through this, and give them the land promised to the patriarchs (Exod 6:6–8)
  - B. Execution of commission by Moses and people's response (they do not listen) (Exod 6:9)
- II. Second commission and execution (Exod 6:10–12; 7:1–7)
  - A. Speech of YHWH: commission to tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites leave his land (Exod 6:10–11)
  - B. Moses's objection: Pharaoh will not listen since the Israelites did not, and given his ineloquent speech (Exod 6:12)
  - C. YHWH's response (Exod 7:1–5)
 

Reaffirmation of commission incorporating Aaron as his spokesperson (Exod 7:1–2)

Prediction of what will occur in Exod 7–14\* (including Pharaoh not listening) (Exod 7:3–5)
  - D. Execution of commission by Moses and Aaron (Exod 7:6–7)

What is noticeable about this structure is how streamlined and coherent it is in comparison with the non-P material in Exod 3–4\*. Most noticeably, in the non-P material in Exod 3–4\*, there are a number of commissions scattered throughout, in 3:10, 16–17, 18; 4:12, (17), a number of objections on the part of Moses in 3:11, 13; 4:1, 10, 13, and a number of divine responses to these in 3:12, 14–15; 4:2–9, 11–12, 14–17,<sup>561</sup> whereas in Pg

---

561. This is the result of a number of levels within the text and possibly the combination of sources, all of which are presumed to be earlier than Pg, at least within Exod 3:1–4:17; see §1.2.3, above.



there are simply two commissions (6:6–8 and 6:10–11), one objection (6:12), and one divine response to this (7:1–5), followed by the obedience of Moses and Aaron (7:6–7).

Taking each of the structural elements of Pg in turn, first, the introductory word in Exod 6:2–5, which contains the motifs of the identity of God/YHWH in relation to the patriarchs and his noticing of the Israelite's plight in common with Exod 3–4\*, Pg has streamlined these in comparison, with the former motif occurring in Exod 3–4\* in three different places (3:6, 14–15, 16), as does the latter motif (3:7, 9, 16).

Second, Pg has rendered more coherent the commissions in Exod 6:6–8, 10–11, which it has in common with those in Exod 3–4\*, where they appear scattered throughout (3:10, 16–17; 4:12). In Exod 3–4\*, the commissions in 3:10 and 3:16–17; 4:12 are not entirely coherent with each other: in 3:10 the commission is for Moses to go to Pharaoh to bring the Israelites out of Egypt; later, in 3:16–17 (and see 4:12), before any execution of the commission in 3:10, Moses is commissioned to tell the Israelite elders that YHWH will bring them out of Egypt to the land, and then they and Moses are to go and request Pharaoh to let them go into the wilderness.<sup>562</sup> Pg has rearranged and ordered these commissions coherently, in portraying Moses's first commission as telling the Israelites that YHWH will free them from the Egyptians in Exod 6:6–8, which he duly carries out in 6:9, followed then by the second commission to go and tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of the land. Moreover, within each of these commissions, Pg has ordered coherently motifs within Exod 3–4\* that are repeated in different places: in the first commission, the motifs of YHWH promising deliverance (6:6), linked with the motif of the land (6:8) found in 3:8 and repeated in 3:17; in the second, the approaching of Pharaoh to let the Israelites go from his land (6:10–11) found in 3:10 and again in 3:18. This is so also in relation to Moses's execution of this commission in Exod 6:9 with regard to the Israelites not listening, a motif found (whether in positive or negative form) scattered throughout Exod 3–4\*, in 3:18; 4:1, 31.

Third, the one objection on the part of Moses in Exod 6:12 is a response to the second commission only in 6:10–11, after he has been obedient to the first commission (6:9). This is more coherent than in 3:1–4:17, where some of the objections are to the commission outlined in 3:10 (those in

---

562. This possibly reflects different sources; see Exod 3:7–8 which is more coherent with Exod 3:16–18, on the one hand, and Exod 3:9–10 on the other.

Exod 3:11, 13) and others are to the commission in 3:16–18 (those in Exod 4:1, 10), as well as the one in 4:13 to the commission in 4:12. Moreover, Moses's objection in 6:12 follows logically within Pg's structure from his initial obedient execution of his first commission in 6:9, where the people do not listen to him, arguing reasonably that since the Israelites have not listened to him how then will Pharaoh. Moreover, in the divine response in Exod 7:1–5, it becomes clear that what Moses says is true—Pharaoh will not listen to him (7:4), albeit as part of the divine plan rather than because of Moses's speech (6:12). Moses's reference to his ineloquence is drawn from the tradition (see 4:10), but this functions as the motivation for the necessary incorporation of Aaron (see this motif in 4:14–16), again foreshadowing what is to occur (see the role of Aaron in Exod 7–11\*). In this way, Pg not only simplifies, indeed downplays Moses's objection, by only incorporating one objection (drawn from the tradition; see 4:10) in comparison with Moses's multiple and increasingly unreasonable objections (see esp. 4:1 coming after 3:18; and 4:13), but renders it, within the structure of Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 as a whole, as quite logical and reasonable and as a foreshadowing of what is to occur in the divine plan. Indeed, as Dozeman comments, Moses's objection in Exod 6:12 fulfills the form of this generic element but lacks its function.<sup>563</sup> That is, it is barely an objection in terms of the conventional use of this formal element within call narratives, such as found in Exod 3:1–4:17, since it does not really have to do with showing Moses's authority and barely touches on his fear of future inadequacy for the task (and therefore does not require the conventional element of divine reassurance that usually follows an objection); rather it primarily states a fact based on past experience and functions to foreshadow what is to come.

Finally, then, the divine response in Exod 7:1–5, with the obedience of Moses and Aaron duly noted thereafter (7:6–7)—itself drawing on motifs found in disparate places in Exod 3–4\*, that is, 4:15–16 (regarding the role of Aaron) and 3:19–20 (regarding the recalcitrance of Pharaoh and therefore YHWH's wonders)—coherently responds to Moses's one objection in 6:12, including lending truth to what has been said and foreshadowing what is to come. This stands in contrast to the multiple and

---

563. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 163; Dozeman, "Commission of Moses," 116.

complex divine responses in 3:1–4:17, which take various forms such as reassurance (3:12; 4:11–12) or instruction (3:14–15; 4:2–9, 14–16).

Turning, then, from these broader considerations in terms of Pg's overall structure, to explore in more detail the way in which Pg has reshaped traditions drawn especially from Exod 3–4\* and synthesized these with its own unique elements to present its own distinctive picture in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7, we will consider each of the motifs as they occur within the sequence of Pg's structure.<sup>564</sup>

In contrast to Exod 3:1–4:17, which is set at Horeb, the mountain of God, Pg's account of the call of Moses is set in Egypt.<sup>565</sup> This is a theological move, in line with Pg's perspective, of YHWH as the cosmic God of Gen 1–9\* and 11–50\* (see Exod 6:3 and comments below) whom Israel will come to know, beginning in Egypt with their deliverance from the Egyptians as predicted in Exod 6:7,<sup>566</sup> and where, in what follows in Exod 7–14\*, YHWH as cosmic God decides the fate of Egypt and symbolically that of foreign nations in general.<sup>567</sup>

#### Exodus 6:2–9: First Commission and Execution

The initial speech of YHWH in Exod 6:2–8 is particularly significant within Pg's account of the call of Moses since it introduces and foreshadows not only the deliverance of Israel from Egypt (see Exod 7–14\*) but contains a

---

564. Throughout the ensuing discussion, and in particular regarding the way in which Pg in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 has reshaped motifs within Exod 3–4\*, I will be drawing on the list of elements that these texts have in common, and in a similar order, as listed on pp. 430–31, above.

565. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 111, 112, 163; Römer, "Exodus Narrative," 162. In this respect, it agrees with Ezek 20:5.

566. Although the Israelites coming to the knowledge of YHWH is not explicitly referred to in the unfolding of this in Exod 7–14\*, where the emphasis is on the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH.

567. See Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 111), who links the setting in Egypt with P's exploration of the power of God in the broader relationship with the Egyptians and Pharaoh. Pace Schmid (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 186) who uses the setting in Egypt as one of his arguments for seeing Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 as more original than Exod 3–4\*, since it is hard to imagine that P would have changed the setting at the holy mountain to the more profane one in Egypt. However, he fails to take into account the theological move that Pg has made here.

wider perspective that introduces and foreshadows what is unfolded in the whole story of the nation, including Exod 16–Num 27\*.

#### Exodus 6:2–8: Speech of YHWH

The divine speech begins with the self-revelation formula, “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה). As already noted, Pg has taken this expression over from earlier tradition (see Gen 28:13; Exod 7:17; 15:26; 20:2), where its probable roots lie in ancient liturgical settings.<sup>568</sup> Pg has used this expression repeatedly, like a refrain, throughout this speech; indeed, it constitutes its frame and centerpiece. It occurs at its beginning (6:2b) and also at its conclusion (6:8bβ), forming an *inclusio*. It not only represents the initial words spoken to Moses alone in 6:2b, but also begins and ends the words Moses is to speak to the Israelites in the first commission (6:6aβ, 8bβ); and the consequence and end result of YHWH’s promised actions of deliverance within this commission will be that the Israelites will know that “I am YHWH” (6:7b).<sup>569</sup>

The initial self-revelation spoken by God in the earlier tradition in Exod 3:6 is as the God of the patriarchs: “I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” Drawing on this, Pg in Exod 6:2b–3 also links its self-revelation formula, that is, “I am YHWH,” with the God of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but in so doing reflects the earlier tradition in Exod 3:15 where the revelation of the name YHWH is equated with the God of the ancestors, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Pg therefore in Exod 6:2b–3 has brought together the elements of the tradition in 3:6, 15. However, Pg has, significantly, made clearer what is contained in the non-P tradition in more muted form, that the name YHWH, as the God of the patriarchs, was first revealed to Moses, by revealing himself to Moses as YHWH in the formula “I am YHWH” (6:2b) and explicitly stating that by the name YHWH he did not make himself known to the patriarchs.<sup>570</sup>

568. Zimmerli, *I Am YHWH*, and see n. 557 above.

569. See Zimmerli (*I Am YHWH*, passim and esp. 46), who argues that YHWH’s acts, and within the P Moses material the leading out of Egypt in particular, are both the means and content of the knowledge of “I am YHWH.” The further significance of this expression and its nuances in this divine speech will be taken up later when we sum up Pg’s distinctive portrayal in this speech as a whole.

570. That the revelation of the name YHWH first to Moses is more muted in

Moreover, distinctive to Pg's portrayal here are two stages of revelation, one relating to the era of the patriarchs where God appeared to them as El Shaddai (see Gen 17:1; 35:11) and the other to the era of the nation where God is now self-revealed as YHWH.<sup>571</sup>

In Exod 6:4–5, the introductory word of YHWH (6:2b–5) continues with YHWH's references to his covenant with the patriarchs (6:4, 5b) surrounding a notice that YHWH has heard the groanings of the Israelites in their slavery (6:5a). In the reference to the covenant in 6:4, the emphasis lies on the promise within this on the gift of the land of Canaan. This refers directly back to Pg's Abrahamic covenant, and in particular to Gen 17:8,<sup>572</sup> in relation to which, as here, Pg drew on earlier tradition concerning the promise of the land as evidenced in the non-P material (e.g., Gen 12:7; 28:13). The importance of the covenant here is reinforced in Exod 6:5b where (as in Exod 2:24) God/YHWH remembers (זכר) his covenant, an expression that is unique to Pg. Indeed, the references to the covenant with the patriarchs in this context are distinctive to Pg, since, although in Exod 3:1–4:17 there is mention of the land (3:8b, 17), there is no mention of covenant. The significance of the covenant with the patriarchs, and in particular its land promise in Pg's picture is seen therefore, not only in that it is twice mentioned in 6:4–5b but in particular in that it is an element unique to Pg here. Indeed, the recollection of the covenant with the patriarchs, surrounding as it does the notice that YHWH has heard the Israelites' groanings in their slavery in 6:5b, taken over by Pg from the

---

non-P is almost certainly because of the composition of the non-P material from different traditions (traditionally labeled J and E), where in the J material in Exod 3:7–8 God is already called YHWH as has been the case throughout the J Genesis material, in contrast to the E material that contains the tradition that the name YHWH was first revealed to Moses as in Exod 3:15.

571. There are in Pg actually three stages of divine revelation, the first in Gen 1–9\* where God is known as Elohim (אלהים), the second in the patriarchal era (Gen 11–50\*), where God is known as El Shaddai, and the third in the story of the nation Israel where God is known to the Israelites as YHWH: see §2.2.1, above. As commented by Römer (“Exodus Narrative,” 162), thereby P advocates “inclusive monotheism,” that all peoples of the earth have the same God, whether known as Elohim, El Shaddai, or YHWH. The significance of the name YHWH in relation to the nomenclature of El Shaddai will be discussed shortly when we discuss this YHWH speech as a whole.

572. Note the similar wording (participial form) נתן, ארץ כנען, ארץ + גור. The promise of the land is also repeated to Jacob in Gen 35:12.

earlier tradition (3:7, 9, 16), is the basis for YHWH deciding to deliver the Israelites from Egyptian slavery (Exod 6:6–8).<sup>573</sup> The motif of the covenant here, therefore, looks back to the patriarchal period, and Gen 17 in particular, and becomes the motivation for YHWH to act for Israel in the future in light of their present situation of slavery.

Accordingly, the first commission of Moses, to speak to the Israelites concerning the divine intentions in Exod 6:6–8, echoing 3:16, begins in 6:6, after the self-revelation formula “I am YHWH,” with a promise to deliver them from the slavery of the Egyptians, taken over from earlier tradition in 3:8a, 17a, where there, as here, it comes in the context of YHWH hearing what is occurring to the enslaved Israelites. This is reinforced with a promise that YHWH will redeem them with outstretched arm, echoing Exod 3:20, and with “great judgments” (ובשפטים גדלים), an expression of some significance since it is distinctive to Pg in this context and is repeated again in Exod 7:4 (and see the reference to שפטים in 12:12).

The next promise in Exod 6:7a, YHWH’s promise to take the Israelites as his people and to be their God, a repetition of the Abrahamic covenant promise in Gen 17:7b, 8, is also unique to Pg in this context, with no equivalent in the non-P material and therefore of particular significance. Here it is linked with the consequence of YHWH’s promised action of deliverance in Exod 6:6, that the people will know that “I am YHWH” their God (taken over from earlier tradition<sup>574</sup>) who has freed them from Egyptian slavery (6:7b).

The final promise in Exod 6:8 is the promise to bring the Israelites into the land, described as the land sworn (literally, “the land I lifted up my hand to give it”) to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.<sup>575</sup> This is a reference back to Gen 17:8 (see also 35:12), in relation to which, as commented with regard to Exod 6:4, Pg has drawn on earlier land promise traditions (e.g., Gen 12:7; 28:13), and on the earlier tradition in Exod 3:8b, 17b in terms of bringing them to the land. However, distinctive to Pg is the land promise here as an oath which places it in the realm of a covenant (see Exod 6:4), and its significance is seen in that it is the second time that YHWH’s promise of the land is referred to in this speech.

---

573. Römer, “Exodus Narrative,” 163.

574. See nn. 557 and 568.

575. Lifting up the hand is thought to be gesture signifying the swearing of an oath; see Römer, “From the Call of Moses,” 128, 136. This verse is very close to Ezek 20:42 but it is difficult to know the direction of influence.

Moses's commission, and the divine speech as a whole, concludes with the self-revelation formula, "I am YHWH."

In terms of reshaping motifs of the earlier tradition upon which Pg has drawn quite extensively,<sup>576</sup> Pg has emphasized particularly strongly through repetition the self-revelation formula "I am YHWH" (Exod 6:2, 6, 7, 8), and the land (6:4, 8). Also of much significance are the elements unique to Pg in this context, that is, the references to the patriarchal (Abrahamic) covenant and its promise of the land, and in particular YHWH's remembering (זָכַר) this covenant, (6:4, 5b, 8), and the promise (also part of the Abrahamic covenant in Gen 17) to be their God (6:7a).

In seeking to sum up the specific portrayal in the YHWH speech of Exod 6:2–8, it is helpful to see the way that the motifs in this speech are structured in a chiastic pattern as follows.<sup>577</sup>

- A "I am YHWH" (6:2b)
- B Reference to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (6:3a)
- C Reference to the covenant and land promise (6:4b)
- D Reference to their slavery by the Egyptians (6:5a)
- E "I am YHWH" (6:6b)
- Promise of deliverance (6:6cd)
- Promise to be their God (6:7a)
- E' You will know that "I am YHWH" (6:7b)
- D' Reference to their slavery by the Egyptians (6:7c)
- C' Reference to the land and covenant (oath) (6:8a)
- B' Reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (6:8b)
- A' "I am YHWH" (6:8d)

Clearly, the formula "I am YHWH" is emphasized in this structure (A/A', E/E'), to the point of functioning like a refrain. In forming an *inclusio*

---

576. With regard to the self-revelation formula ("I am YHWH"), both in its own right and in its form in the recognition formula, the motif of the self-revelation of God as the God of the patriarchs (Exod 3:6), the linking of the revelation of the name YHWH to Moses with the God of the patriarchs (Exod 3:15), God's hearing the cries of the Israelites in slavery (Exod 3:7, 9) and in this context promising deliverance from the Egyptians (Exod 3:8a, 17a), a deliverance involving God's outstretched hand/arm (Exod 3:20), and the reference to the land in the context of this deliverance (Exod 3:8b, 17b).

577. See Jonathan Magonet, "The Rhetoric of God: Exodus 6:2–8," *JSOT* 27 (1983): 56–67, esp. 62; Römer, "From the Call of Moses," 127–28.



around the whole speech (A/A') and around its center (E/E'), it is associated with all its motifs. As a formula that asserts the authority of the speaker of the name and reveals the character of God,<sup>578</sup> it asserts, therefore, that YHWH is the one who remembers his covenant with the patriarchs, who will bring his covenant promises of the gift of the land and to be their God to fulfillment, in part through delivering the Israelites from Egyptian slavery.<sup>579</sup> Linked as it is with the revelation of the name YHWH to Moses and therefore with the era of the nation, as distinct from the era of the patriarchs where God is known as El Shaddai (Exod 6:2b–3), the self-revelation of YHWH is not a new revelation as such, but the unfolding of the revelation given to the patriarchs (see Gen 17:1, 7–8) in which God is known as YHWH in fulfilling the Abrahamic covenant promises of the land and to be their God through his acts of deliverance.<sup>580</sup> The formula “I am YHWH” functions here, therefore, as the self-revelation of the character of God through his acts to fulfil his promises to the patriarchs and as a guarantee of the reality of the God who promises and brings his promises to fulfillment.<sup>581</sup> The consequence of YHWH’s divine

---

578. Childs, *Exodus*, 113.

579. Abrahamic covenant promises of land and to be their God only are emphasized in this context since they are the promises that remain to be fulfilled. The other Abrahamic covenant promise, that of descendants (Gen 17:2, 4–6), has already effectively been fulfilled in Exod 1:7. On delivery from slavery, see Noth, *Exodus*, 60; Childs, *Exodus*, 115; Zimmerli, *I Am YHWH*, 7, 9–10.

580. See Norbert Lohfink, “Die priesterschriftliche Abwertung der Tradition von der Offenbarung des Jahwenamens an Mose,” *Bib* 49 (1968): 1–8, followed by Childs, *Exodus*, 113; Coates, *Exodus*, 56; Durham, *Exodus*, 77. W. Randall Garr (“The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 385–408, esp. 397, 406–8) argues that the name El Shaddai represents a limited or partial aspect of God, known in his promises only and that YHWH is a more complete representation of the same God, who is known fully in the fulfillment of the promises. Accordingly, he interprets Exod 6:3 as follows (401): “I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (in limited form) as El Shaddai (who makes covenantal promises). But I was not the object of (full) covenantal knowledge to them as conveyed by my name YHWH who keeps covenantal promises.” So also Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 271. See also Dozeman (*Commentary on Exodus*, 166–67) who argues, particularly on the basis of the formula “I am YHWH” as framing the commission in Exod 6:6–8, that the new social condition of slavery draws out a new dimension of the deity such that El Shaddai must become YHWH in order to fulfil the covenant promises to the ancestors, to be their God and to bring them into the promised land, which now involves leading Israel out of slavery.

581. See Childs, *Exodus*, 115.

action to fulfil his promises will be the knowledge of YHWH, Israel's recognition of "I am YHWH" (Exod 6:7b), the power and character of God as seen in his acts of deliverance (6:7b), and fulfillment of the covenant promises of land and to be their God.<sup>582</sup>

Over and above the emphasis on the formula "I am YHWH" and its significance, the chiasmic pattern of motifs highlights its reference back to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (B/B'), in particular the covenant promise of the land (C/C'). Moving further toward the center, it also highlights the present situation of Egyptian slavery (D/D') and the focal point in the middle of the promise of deliverance and the promise to be their God (one of the Abrahamic covenant promises). Thus YHWH's recollection of his past covenant with the patriarchs, unique to Pg in this context, and in particular the promises comprising it of land and to be their God (the latter also unique to Pg) that have not yet been fulfilled, becomes the basis for YHWH's concern in the present situation of Egyptian slavery, and hence the emergence of the promise of deliverance as a stage in the fulfillment of these particular covenant promises. It is the patriarchal covenant that forms the wider perspective within which the present situation is to be understood (Exod 6:3–5). While YHWH's action of deliverance is emphasized in what Moses is to tell the people (Exod 6:6, 7b), this is linked inextricably with the unfolding of the patriarchal covenant promises, to be their God (Exod 6:7a) and of possession of the land (Exod 6:8).<sup>583</sup>

Therefore in this passage, in terms of its literary context, past, present, and future are inextricably bound together: it reaches back to the patriarchal covenant, addresses the present situation of Egyptian slavery in light of that covenant, and points forward to the unfolding of the patriarchal covenant promises to be their God and to give them the land through the more impending act of deliverance.<sup>584</sup> Thereby Exod 6:2–8 provides an introduction not only to the more immediate unfolding of YHWH's

---

582. See Zimmerli, *I Am YHWH*, 10. See also the insightful discussion of Zimmerli (*I Am YHWH*, 83–85) regarding the divine self-revelation "I am YHWH" rather than YHWH only as the object of knowledge or recognition, showing that YHWH remains the subject in the event of recognition, that is, YHWH's revelation of himself in divine actions being what the people come to know and recognize.

583. See Magonet, "Rhetoric of God," 64; and Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur priesterschriftlichen Exodusgeschichte*, 351.

584. See the comment by Weimar (*Untersuchungen zur priesterschriftlichen Exodusgeschichte*, 173) that the horizon reaches back to the patriarchs and forward to the gift of the land.

liberation of the Israelites from Egypt in Exod 7–14\* but also to the rest of the story of the nation in Exod 16–Num 27\*, where the covenant promise to be their God further unfolds (see esp. Exod 16:12; 29:46), as does the motif of the promise of the land even if, in Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*, in negative form.

#### Exodus 6:9: Execution of First Commission

Moses immediately and obediently executes his commission to tell the Israelites YHWH's intentions in Exod 6:6–8. However, the people react negatively: they do not listen to Moses because of their broken spirit and cruel slavery. In this, Pg would seem to be drawing on the motif of whether or not the people will listen to Moses/Aaron when he relays YHWH's words to Moses scattered within Exod 3–4 in Exod 3:18; 4:1, 30–31 but has reshaped it from the positive reaction of the people who listen and believe as predicted (Exod 3:18; 4:31) to quite the opposite of not listening because of their current harsh situation.<sup>585</sup>

#### Exodus 6:10–12; 7:1–7: Second Commission and Execution

Moses's second commission (Exod 6:10–11), this time to go and tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of his land, draws on the earlier traditions of commissions for Moses to go to Pharaoh so that the Israelites can leave Egypt in Exod 3:10, 18b.

Moses's one objection (Exod 6:12) draws on the earlier tradition in Exod 3:1–4:17 where, as an element of the form of call narrative, Moses objects five times (3:11, 13; 4:1, 10, 13). As already commented in the discussion of this element under the way in which Pg has reshaped the non-P tradition in terms of its broad structure, Pg here downplays this formal element, not only because there is only one objection and that given only after the second commission that follows his obedience to the first commission, but also because Moses's objection that Pharaoh will not listen is quite logical and reasonable, given that the Israelites have not listened.

---

585. It is possible that there are echoes here of Exod 5, esp. vv. 9, 11, where the terminology of עֲבָדָה is also used. There is perhaps here, in the people's refusal to hear YHWH's intention to be their God and to bring them into the land (Exod 6:7, 8) through their deliverance, a foreshadowing of the negativity of the people in relation to YHWH's promises of the land and to be their God in Num 13–14\*.

Indeed, Moses is right about this since Pharaoh's not listening is part of the divine plan (7:4). Thereby Pg portrays Moses in a much more positive light than in Exod 3:1–4:17, where his objections become increasingly unreasonable (see 4:1 after 3:18; and 4:13). With a nod to the tradition where one of Moses's objections is in terms of his ineloquent speech (4:10), Pg portrays part of Moses's objection in terms of "uncircumcised lips" (ערל שפטים).<sup>586</sup> However, as in the tradition, this leads ultimately to the inclusion of Aaron as Moses's spokesperson, where YHWH will tell Moses what to speak and Aaron will speak for Moses (7:1–2; see 4:12, 14–16). Aaron, as we have seen, figures prominently alongside Moses (though he is ultimately his subordinate) in Exod 7–11\*; 12\*, and so Pg has drawn on the tradition here as a means of incorporating Aaron and his role into what will unfold. In sum, Pg has reshaped earlier tradition of the formal element of an objection to portray Moses as stating a fact based on past experience, foreshadowing the divine plan within which Pharaoh will not listen, and instigating what is to come in terms of Aaron's role.

YHWH's response to Moses's objection (Exod 7:1–5) in Exod 6:12 comprises a reassertion of the commission in Exod 6:10–11 but this time with the inclusion of the role of Aaron in Exod 7:1–2, followed in 7:3–5 by the outline of what YHWH will do in Egypt, which introduces and foreshadows 7:8–14:29\*.<sup>587</sup>

In Exod 7:1–2 Pg portrays YHWH dealing with Moses's objection in 6:12 in three ways. First, to counter Moses's objection that Pharaoh will not listen, YHWH makes Moses like God to Pharaoh, thus asserting his superiority and foreshadowing the subsequent contest between YHWH/Moses and Pharaoh/the gods of Egypt in Exod 7–11\*; 14\*. This represents a reshaping of the earlier tradition in 4:16, where Moses is to serve as God to Aaron. Second, to counter Moses's objection about his faulty speech, YHWH appoints Aaron as Moses's prophet,<sup>588</sup> with Moses speaking what

---

586. Propp (*Exodus 1–18*, 274) comments that this expression possibly connotes impeded speech, but primarily describes inherent unfitness to transmit YHWH's word. If this is the case, then YHWH's response to Moses in Exod 7:1–2 suggests that Moses is not correct in this regard, since not only is Moses to be like God to Pharaoh, and implicitly also to Aaron as his prophet, but he is to speak all that YHWH commands him, with Aaron as spokesperson to Pharaoh.

587. See also Childs, *Exodus*, 138–40.

588. Propp (*Exodus 1–18*, 282) points out that this is the only place in P where a prophet (נביא) is referred to, and to appoint the future Aaronic high priest as a prophet

YHWH commands him, implicitly to Aaron, and then Aaron speaking these words. Here also Pg is drawing on earlier tradition, since in 4:12, 15–16 YHWH's response to Moses's two objections (one of which is his lack of eloquence) in Exod 4:10 and 13 is that YHWH will teach Moses what to speak (4:12, 15) and Aaron will speak Moses's words for him, serving as Moses's mouth (4:16). Finally, the content of these words is that of the commission in Exod 6:11, which is thereby reaffirmed, to tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of his land. Pg has here reshaped the earlier tradition in 4:16, where Aaron is to speak for Moses to the people, that is, the Israelites, not to Pharaoh (although Aaron does accompany Moses to speak to Pharaoh in 5:1).<sup>589</sup> In these ways, Pg, in response to 6:12, has reshaped earlier tradition in Exod 3–4\* to portray Moses's elevated status and power in relation to Pharaoh, to incorporate a role for Aaron in what is to follow, and to reaffirm the second commission to Moses.

The rest of the divine speech in Exod 7:3–5 echoes earlier traditions regarding the resistance of Pharaoh/king of Egypt linked with YHWH's wonders and outstretched hand (see 3:19–20; 4:21), as well as the recognition formula (עֲדִי plus "I am YHWH"),<sup>590</sup> this time however, in relation to the Egyptians. It also incorporates its own distinctive elements such as Pharaoh not listening and the terminology of "judgments" (שְׁפָטִים) (see elsewhere in Pg in 6:6; 12:12). Thereby it presents an introduction and foreshadowing of 7:8–14:29\*, with Exod 7:3 introducing Exod 7–11\*, Exod 7:4 introducing Exod 12\*, and Exod 7:5 introducing Exod 14\*.<sup>591</sup> Thereby Exod 7:3–5 affirms Moses's objection in Exod 6:12 that Pharaoh will not listen by showing that this is part of the divine plan but not, as Moses supposes, because of his faulty speech, and outlines what will unfold in what follows in Exod 7–14\* as being according to the divine plan.

Finally, then, the obedience of Moses and Aaron (Exod 7:6–7) to the second commission in 6:10–11, as reaffirmed in 7:2, which incorporates Aaron's role, is noted, along with the ages of Moses and Aaron when this occurred. This is typical of Pg's style of divine speech followed by a notice of obedience, which means that what is asserted in the divine

---

here either functions to show that the Aaronic priesthood is superior to prophets or legitimates prophets by including Aaron as one of them.

589. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus*, 174; Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 273, 285.

590. See n. 557 above. See also the earlier tradition in the non-P plagues regarding Pharaoh's hardened heart discussed in §4.1.2.1, above.

591. See §2.2.2 and the introduction under §4.1, above.

speech will inevitably unfold.<sup>592</sup> Therefore, Moses's and Aaron's obedience in carrying out their commission in telling Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of the land, expressed in summary form at the beginning here, is taken as a given throughout what follows in Exod 7–11\*. Their obedience here flags that what is outlined in the whole YHWH speech of 7:1–5 describing the divine plan will inevitably unfold, and this duly occurs in Exod 7–14\*.

This more detailed discussion of Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–7 in terms of the way in which it has drawn on, and reshaped, earlier traditions, and synthesized these with unique elements into a highly structured account shows clearly the way in which Pg intends it to form an introduction to both Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\*. In particular, those elements in Pg's picture that are emphasized or are unique to Pg are specifically the ones that point forward to the whole of Exod 7–Num 27\*. The unique elements of YHWH's remembrance of his covenant with the patriarchs, with the emphasis on the covenantal promises, of the land (repeated twice [Exod 6:4, 8]), and to be their God (which is unique to Pg), that will now be fulfilled (Exod 6:7, 8), not only look backward to the patriarchal era but introduce, and look forward to, the unfolding of these covenantal promises throughout the whole of Exod 7–Num 27\*. The repetition, and therefore the emphasis on, the formula "I am YHWH" (both on its own and as part of the recognition formula [with *יְדִי*]), linked both with these covenantal promises (Exod 6:7, 8) and with the new stage in revelation signified by the name YHWH from that of the patriarchal era where God was known as El Shaddai (Exod 6:2b–3), shows YHWH as the one who reveals himself through his fulfillment of the covenant promises of the land and to be their God unfolded, in one way or another (be it positive or negative), throughout Exod 7–Num 27\*. The first stage of the unfolding of these covenant promises, and of revealing who YHWH is (in the expression "I am YHWH" on its own and in the recognition formula), is the deliverance of the Israelites from the Egyptian slavery flagged in 6:6, 7b, which introduces and foreshadows Exod 7–14\*; however, since 6:6, 7b is an intrinsic part of Moses's first commission in 6:6–8, this first stage of deliverance is inseparably linked with the wider agenda of unfolding the covenant promises to be

---

592. See, e.g., the divine speech in Exod 12:1, 3–13 and the notice of obedience in 12:28, where the obedient performance of the Passover rite inevitably has its intended effect (see 12:12–13 and 12:40–41).

their God (6:7a) and to bring them to the land (6:8) unfolded in the whole of Exod 7–Num 27\*. In the second commission, Moses's objection, the divine response and the final obedience of Moses and Aaron in 6:10–12; 7:1–7, the focus is narrowed to introducing and foreshadowing the deliverance of the Israelites from the Egyptians, whereby the Egyptians come to the knowledge of "I am YHWH" (7:5), as unfolded in Exod 7–14\* specifically.

It is now time, therefore, to explore the complex paradigmatic picture that Exod 1:13–7:7\* introduces, comprising the combination of both the paradigmatic pictures of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\*, that is, the paradigmatic nature of the story of the nation of Israel as a whole in Exod 7–Num 27\*.

#### 4.4. THE COMBINATION OF EXODUS 7–14\* AND EXODUS 16–NUMBERS 27\*

In exploring this issue of the complex paradigmatic picture as a whole that emerges from the combination of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\*, our starting point will be Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*, the material that occurs after the Sinai pericope. This is because the details of Num 13\*–14\*; 20\*; 27\* reverse not only what is found in Exod 16\*, with which they form a narrative frame around the Sinai pericope, but indeed all that has gone before in the story of the nation, including all that is contained in the paradigmatic picture of Exod 7–14\* as well as Exod 16\* and the Sinai pericope.<sup>593</sup> By taking seriously the fact that Num 13\*–14\*; 20\*; 27\* reverses the story of the nation thus far, we will see that the resulting complex paradigmatic picture as a whole that encompasses the combination of the two complex paradigmatic pictures of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16\*–Num 27\* is slightly different from these when taken on their own.

##### 4.4.1. Numbers 13\*–14\*; 20\*; 27\* as Reversing Exodus 1–40\*

The motifs in Num 13\*–14\*; 20\*; 27\* reverse the story of the nation up to this point in Exod 1–40\* in the following ways.<sup>594</sup>

593. Reference has been made to this in ch 2; see §§2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

594. Although this has been addressed to a certain extent in ch. 2 (see previous note) it will be helpful at this point to draw together and summarize the main evidence



In Num 13–14\*, the tribal leaders reject the land of Canaan and influence the people to complain and reject it also. This represents a negation of the YHWH's promise of the land of Canaan in the Abrahamic covenant, which YHWH recalls and confirms in Exod 6:4, 8 (see Gen 17:8). The tribal leaders reject the land of Canaan by bringing a defamatory report of the land (דְּבַת הָאָרֶץ), a motif that is repeated three times (Num 13:32; 14:36–37), describing the land as devouring, that is killing, its inhabitants, so that the only inhabitants left in the land are giants (13:32b, 33a<sup>ab</sup>). That this is YHWH's promised land of Canaan is clear from its description as the gift of YHWH (14:2) and the description of its extent in 13:21. The slandering of the land (13:32) leads to the downfall of the people (see 14:36). The people believe and collude with this negative report, stating in their retrospective death wish in Egypt and the wilderness, and their preference to go back to Egypt, in Num 14:2–3, that they wished that they had never set out on a journey to the promised land and wish to reverse this journey. Moreover, they reject the opposite point of view expressed by Joshua and Caleb (14:7), that the land is exceedingly good, in the strongest possible terms by threatening to stone Joshua and Caleb (14:10a). The people's rejection of YHWH's promised land and their journey to it thus far could not be stronger, and this leads to the judgment that they will die outside the land. With the exception of Joshua and Caleb, the land promise is not fulfilled, but negated, for the Mosaic generation.

Closely related to the negation of the land, the people reject all the stages of what has occurred for them from Exod 6\* through to Exod 40\*, encompassed as it is within the arc of the unfolding of the land promise.

In Num 13–14\*, the people reject the exodus, and in particular who YHWH is shown to be in the account of their deliverance in Exod 7–14\*: as the one who, as cosmic creator, controls the cosmos and the nations, whether creating (Israel) or decreating foreign nations who oppress Israel and oppose YHWH, symbolized in the decreating of the land of Egypt (Exod 7–8\*) and its people through the manipulation of the waters (Exod 14\*; and see 9:8–12; 12:12), against whom their divine powers and gods are rendered powerless and as nothing.<sup>595</sup> The Israelites' rejection of the

---

for the reversal of Exod 1–40\* by Num 13\*–14\*; 20\*; 27\*. See also Boorer, "Place of Numbers 13–14\*," 54–56, 62.

595. See the contest with the Egyptian magicians in Exod 7–11\*; YHWH's executing judgments on the gods of Egypt in Exod 12; and the demise of Pharaoh in Exod 14\*.

exodus is seen in Num 14:2b $\alpha$ , their wish that they had died in Egypt, before the exodus could have occurred, and in 14:3b $\beta$ , their wish to go back to Egypt, symbolizing a reversal of the exodus. In rejecting the exodus, they reject the first stage of their creation as a nation through the divided waters of the Reed Sea (Exod 14\*). Their negation of YHWH as in control of the cosmos and nations, and against whom other gods are as nothing, is seen in Num 14:3a where the people assume that they will suffer military defeat and be killed in the land. This is escalated in Num 14:10a, where the people reject the counter assurances of Joshua and Caleb in holy war language, not to fear the people of the land, since YHWH is with them, and the protection (צ) of the people of the land, that is the support of their gods, is removed so that instead of the land eating the Israelites, its inhabitants will, as bread, be consumed by the Israelites (Num 14:9a $\beta$ b).

In their death wish in relation to the wilderness in Num 14:2b $\beta$ , the Israelites negate the nurturing they have received in the wilderness in Exod 16\* with the giving of the manna and meat so that they would know that "I am YHWH" (Exod 16:12).

Their wish that they had died in the wilderness in Num 14:2b $\beta$  is also a rejection of all that has occurred at Sinai. The Israelites' rejection of all that has occurred at Sinai (Exod 19–40\*), the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel as the means of YHWH dwelling in their midst and being present to them, is also seen quite forcefully in Num 14:9a $\beta$ b, 10a, where the people dramatically reject the reassurance of Joshua and Caleb that YHWH is with them. This rejection of YHWH as present with them and dwelling in their midst by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting (Exod 29:45–46; 40:34), the place where YHWH meets with (יעד ל) them (29:43) is highlighted in Num 14:35, where the people are described as this wicked congregation as "meeting against" (יעד על) YHWH.

In short, their rejection of all that has occurred in the exodus and wilderness is a rejection of YHWH, whom they have come to know in his deeds for them, summed up in the expression "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה), of delivering them from the Egyptians and bringing them out of the land of Egypt (Exod 6:7; 29:46, where thereby the Egyptians also come to the knowledge of YHWH in their destruction [12:12; 14:4, 18]), of nurturing them in the wilderness (16:12), and of dwelling among them (29:46).

Therefore, that generation will die in the wilderness in accordance with their wish (see Num 14:2b $\beta$ ). They have rejected all that YHWH has brought about for them in the exodus and wilderness (Exod 16\* and Exod

19–40\*), and therefore, in their death, all this is negated for that generation of the nation.

Numbers 20:1–12\*, 22b–29\*; 27:12–14 focuses primarily on the leadership and in particular the disobedience of Moses and Aaron and their failure to witness to, or mediate correctly, YHWH's action and presence in relation to Israel, and therefore the deposition of their leadership and their demise. The negative portrayal of Moses and Aaron in these ways represents a reversal, not only of their portrayal in Exod 16\* where they consistently point to, and witness to YHWH and what he has done and is doing for the people, but a reversal of their behavior throughout Exod 6–40\*. Throughout Exod 6–40\*, including in relation to the exodus in Exod 7–14\*, in Exod 16\* and at Sinai in Exod 19–40\*, the obedience of Moses and/or Aaron to YHWH and YHWH's instructions is impeccable, and the content of YHWH's commands is duly unfolded (see Exod 7:6, 10, 20; 8:2, 13 [Eng. 8:6, 17]; 9:10; 14:21, 27; 39:32, 43; 40:33b). Since Num 12:10 is the only place where Moses and Aaron are disobedient, this anomaly stands out as the point at which the positive portrayal of their leadership is reversed.<sup>596</sup>

In all these ways, Num 13\*–14\*; 20\*; 27\* reverse the story of the nation in Exod 1–40\*.

#### 4.4.2. The Consequent Picture

Taken from the perspective of Num 13\*–14\*; 20\*; 27\* as reversing the story of the nation in Exod 1–40\*, a slightly different paradigmatic picture as a whole emerges from the two complex paradigmatic pictures in Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16\*–Num 27\* considered separately.

---

596. As commented in ch. 2 n. 144, the only exception perhaps is Moses's "objection" to his commission to go and tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of his land (Exod 6:10) in 6:12 that the people will not listen to him as he is a poor speaker. This however, reflects the earlier tradition contained in the non-P material in 3:1–4:17 that emphasizes Moses's many objections much more. Pg has played down Moses's resistance here by including only one objection and making it much more reasonable than its parallel in 4:10, where it is one of a number of objections, by placing it after the note that the Israelites have not listened to him (6:9). Moreover, 6:12 functions in Pg, as in the earlier tradition, to introduce the role of Aaron, so important in Pg, as Moses's spokesman and offside, and foreshadows the motif of Pharaoh not listening, which is part of the divine plan (7:4).

In terms of the structure and content of Pg overall, as outlined in chapter 2, Exod 1–40\* represents the creation of the nation and Num 13–27\* represents the reversal of the creation of the nation, or the destruction of that generation of the nation and its leadership. Taking into account the paradigmatic nature of this material, the creation of the nation, then, in Exod 1–40\* comprises the complex paradigmatic picture in Exod 7–14\* (with its introduction in Exod 1–7\*), consisting of its ritual/liturgical centerpiece (Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41) and its framing narrative (Exod 7–11\*; 14\*), and the paradigmatic picture of the Sinai pericope in Exod 19–40\* (also introduced by Exod 6\*), with Exod 16\* forming a bridge between them. That is, the story of the creation of the nation comprises the whole of the first complex paradigm of Exod 7–14\*, but only the paradigmatic centerpiece of the second complex paradigm, the Sinai pericope in Exod 19–40\*, without most of its narrative frame. The narrative frame of the Sinai pericope now functions slightly differently viewed from the perspective of the pattern of the creation of the nation in Exod 1–40\* and its reversal in Num 13–27\*. On the one hand, instead of, or over and above, forming part of the surrounding frame of the Sinai pericope with Num 13–27\*, Exod 16\* functions as a bridge between the paradigmatic pictures that make up the creation of the nation. Within this context, the bridging function of Exod 16\* is seen in its motifs of the knowledge of “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה, 16:12) and the “glory of YHWH” (כבוד יהוה, 16:7, 10), both of which look backward and forward. The motif of the knowledge of “I am YHWH” through YHWH’s nurturing in Exod 16:12 looks back to “I am YHWH” that the Israelites will know in YHWH’s freeing them from the Egyptians (6:7); its link with YHWH’s killing of the firstborn and his judgment on the gods of Egypt in Exod 12:12; and the Egyptian’s knowledge of “I am YHWH” in their demise in Exod 14:4, 18. It looks forward to the Israelites’ knowledge of “I am YHWH” as the God of the exodus who dwells among them in fulfillment of YHWH’s promise to be their God in Exod 29:46.<sup>597</sup> The motif of the glory of YHWH in Exod 16:7, 10 looks back to and echoes 14:4, 17, 18 where YHWH gains glory for himself (or glorifies himself, כבוד *niphal*) over Pharaoh in destroying the Egyptians, and forward to the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה) on Mount Sinai in Exod 24:16–17 and then permanently in relation to the tent of

597. See Schmidt, “Priesterschrift in Exodus 16,” 490.

meeting in 40:34 (and see also 29:43).<sup>598</sup> On the other hand, Num 13–27\*, not only forms a narrative frame with Exod 16\*, but now functions to portray the reversal of the whole of the creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*, including Exod 16\*) for that generation of it.

Taking into consideration, then, the paradigmatic nature of the material, what picture of the creation of the nation, and its reversal, emerges?

#### 4.4.2.1. The Creation of the Nation: Ritual Centered

What stands out in the creation of the nation in Exod 1–40\* is that it occurs in two stages, at the heart of which is ritual or ritual ordinances: the Passover ritual/liturgy and the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood (or the founding ritual of sacred space and sacred personnel). As we have seen, it is in these paradigmatic passages that the collapsing of time, past/present/future, into a timelessness or transcendence of time, albeit in various ways, is at its most obvious. Moreover, these ritual ordinances not only have a cognitive and existential effect on their audience, but they invite their audience to realize their worldview, or enter into the reality they effect, wherever and whenever it finds itself through time by putting these ordinances into praxis. That is, by performing these ritual ordinances the nation of Israel as defined by them in all their rich interpretation can become a reality at any time and through time. When the reader(s), originally exilic Israel, enters into the fulfillment of this complex paradigm of the creation of the nation by appropriating the world of the text cognitively and existentially, and carrying out the divinely constituted ordinances/rituals that enable the embodying of that world, the true nation of Israel comes into existence.

#### 4.4.2.2. The Reversal of the Creation of the Nation: The Rejection of Ritual and Its Performative Effects

In contrast, what is striking about the reversal of the creation of the nation in Num 13–27\* is that it does not center on ritual or ritual ordinances but is quite devoid of them. The only hint of ritual is found in Num 20:26, 28, the placing of Aaron's vestments on Eleazar. However, this ritual action is not part of the reversal of the creation of the nation as such, but a glimmer of hope, a future visionary element, regarding the ongoing leadership of

---

598. See Ruprecht, "Stellung und Bedeutung," 291–93.

the nation under the Aaronic priesthood. It can be concluded, therefore, that the typical behavior of the people and their leaders as portrayed in Num 13–27\*, which contains no ritual but rejects, negates, and reverses the creation of the nation centered on ritual/ritual ordinances with their cognitive, existential, and performative effects, represents a negation and rejection of ritual/ritual ordinances and what they effect in the creation of the nation.

In this chapter, we have interpreted the story of the nation in Exod 1–Num 27\* in terms of its paradigmatic nature. Building on this, in the next chapter, we will situate this within the context of Pg as a whole, including its backdrop in the Pg material within Genesis (Gen 1–11\* and Gen 11:27–Exod 1:7\* respectively), which itself is paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping older traditions into timeless patterns. The next chapter in effect, therefore, will address the place of the story of the nation as part of the trajectory of Pg and its unfolding promises and as paralleling the cosmic material in Gen 1–9\*, now, not simply in terms of the content as in chapter 2, but as interpreted as a complex paradigm as a whole (Gen 1–Num 27\*) in terms of its hermeneutics of time. In short, in the next chapter we will demonstrate both the paradigmatic and historiographical nature of Pg as a whole.





THE INTERPRETATION OF THE STORY OF THE NATION  
WITHIN PG AS A WHOLE, ITS TRAJECTORY, AND  
PARALLELS, IN LIGHT OF ITS HERMENEUTICS OF TIME

In seeking to situate the story of the nation in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\* as we have analyzed it in chapter 4 in terms of its paradigmatic nature, in its context as preceded by Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\*, its historiographical nature, which is indeed inseparable from its paradigmatic nature, will become more apparent.

The historiographical nature of Pg, as discussed in chapter 3 (esp. §3.3), consists primarily in its sequential trajectory of contingent events moving toward a future goal that reflect “historical” traditions (albeit in reshaped form). Indeed, the specific sequence in Pg itself reflects in broad outline the sequence or sequences in the earlier tradition(s).<sup>1</sup> In interpreting the story of the nation within its context as preceded by Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\*, it is the trajectory or sequential unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promises, of descendants, everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, and to be their God, that is particularly important in this regard, although the sequence from the initial creation to the new creation after the flood that forms the backdrop to this is also significant.

However, Pg’s historiographical nature cannot be separated from its paradigmatic nature. As we have seen in chapter 4, contingent earlier historical traditions have been taken up and reshaped by Pg with unique programmatic elements into its “timeless” paradigmatic por-

---

1. If the traditions in Genesis regarding the ancestors and the exodus traditions were joined before Pg, then Pg takes up the sequence in non-P as a whole, but if not, then Pg has at least for the most part followed the sequential ordering of the Genesis ancestral traditions, and those within Gen 1–11\*, and that of the exodus traditions and beyond.

trait of the nation, both with regard to the two pictures in Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* and the complex paradigmatic picture of Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\* as a whole. As we shall see, this is also the case to a certain extent in relation to the Pg material in Genesis, where earlier traditions are reshaped into a structured pattern. Moreover, the inseparability of the paradigmatic and historiographic nature of Pg has already been touched on in the analysis of the paradigmatic nature of the story of the nation per se, and not only in the sense of noting the contingent historical traditions reshaped into timeless paradigms. In putting the two paradigmatic scenarios in Exod 7:8–14:29\* and Exod 16–Num 27\*, as introduced by Exod 1:13–7:7\*, in their sequence to give the complex paradigmatic picture of the story of the nation as a whole, historiographical considerations have already been incorporated, since this involved taking seriously its contingent sequence, which in broad sweep portrays the sequential unfolding of the creation of the nation and its destruction. This illustrates how, in the end, it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate out Pg's historiographical and paradigmatic nature and consider one without the other.

Indeed, the historiographic trajectories of the promises themselves (begun in Gen 17\* and extending throughout to Num 27\*), individually and in combination, can be said to be paradigmatic in the sense of reshaping past traditions into future vision *at every point* throughout, such that *at each point* there is a dimension of timelessness in the sense of incorporating all time, past and future. This is seen most clearly in the way the promises are unfolded through, or by means of, the timeless paradigmatic scenarios of the story of the nation, indeed through the complex paradigmatic picture of the story of the nation as a whole, where reshaped traditions synthesized with unique and programmatic elements present a timeless vision that incorporates all time. But it is also intrinsic to the sequential trajectories of the promises themselves, individually and in combination, that results from their nature as comprising reshaped contingent past traditions moving toward a future goal of the fulfillment of the promises that is as yet not fully realized and is therefore visionary; as such there is a future dimension, as yet unrealized, of the reshaped contingent past tradition at every point in the sequence that stems from its pointing forward at each point in the sequence toward the future goal and from that goal itself remaining in the realm of (eschatological) vision. Thereby future vision is inherent in every aspect of the unfolding of the promises, in its paradigmatic scenarios especially of the story of the nation through

which they unfold, and in its narrative trajectory as such at every point and therefore as a whole.

We will see also that the cosmic material in Gen 1–9\* is both historiographical and paradigmatic. In line with the former, it reflects a contingent sequence of creation through the reversal of creation to a new (and inferior) creation, but it also touches into the paradigmatic in that its reshaped traditions that are combined with unique elements are forward-looking in nature, especially as part of the trajectory that links with that of Gen 11–50\*. Moreover, the cosmic pattern of creation and reversal of creation in Gen 1–9\* is repeated in the story of the nation. This repeated pattern not only enhances the paradigmatic nature of both the story of the cosmos and the story of the nation, but also of the sequential trajectory itself since in the bulk of it, that is, at its beginning (Gen 1–9\*) and end (Exod 1:13–Num 27\*), its historiographical sequences fall into a parallel paradigmatic pattern.

It is time now to extend our discussion of the paradigmatic (and historiographical) nature of the story of the nation by situating it within its context as preceded by Pg's account in Gen 1:1–Exod 1:7\*. We will begin by exploring the story of the nation against its backdrop in the ancestral material in Gen 11:27–50:13\* and the transition to the nation in Exod 1:1–5, 7. In so doing, we will seek to see how both the historiographical nature of this material, seen clearly in the contingent sequential trajectory of the unfolding of the promises in Gen 17:1–Exod 1:7\*, and the complex paradigmatic picture of the nation that constitutes the further unfolding of the promises (Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*), is paradigmatic in terms of its hermeneutics of time, in the sense of combining past (and present) tradition into future vision throughout, at every point on its trajectory and as a whole. After that, we will examine the cosmic material in Gen 1–9\* and the transition to the ancestral material in Gen 10:1–11:26\* in its historiographical sequence and paradigmatic pattern, which parallels that of the complex paradigm of the story of the nation.

#### 5.1. THE PARADIGMATIC NATURE OF THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL TRAJECTORY OF THE PROMISES IN THE STORY OF THE NATION AND ITS ANCESTORS IN GENESIS 11:27–NUMBERS 27:14\*

As seen in §2.2.2, practically the whole concern of Pg's ancestral material in Gen 11:27–50:13\* and the transition to the story of the nation in Exod 1:1–5, 7 centers on the statement of the Abrahamic covenant promises of

descendants, everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, and to be their God (Gen 17:1–8; see 35:11–12) and the ways in which these can be seen to initially unfold; this is carried through in the story of the nation (the existence of which is itself part of the unfolding of the promise of descendants, see Exod 1:7) that, in the context of Gen 11:27–Exod 1:7\* as well as Exod 6:2–8, itself represents the unfolding of these promises. In order to explore the paradigmatic nature of the obviously historiographic nature of the unfolding of these promises, we will first examine the way in which Gen 11:27–50:13\*; Exod 1:1–5, 7 reshapes earlier traditions and combines them with unique elements into a structured pattern. After that, we will explore how the trajectory of each of the promises, and their combination, not only in Gen 11:27–Exod 1:7\* but in the story of the nation as a whole (which has already been analyzed in terms of its paradigmatic nature) is paradigmatic in that at every point its contingent sequence of elements comprising reshaped past tradition is forward-looking, or having a future reference point, or visionary nature beyond itself, whether by virtue of the visionary or timeless nature of the paradigmatic picture(s) of the nation that comprises the bulk of their trajectory and/or from the nature of the trajectory itself as a whole and at every point as pointing toward an as yet unrealized and therefore future fulfillment that is rooted in the past.

#### 5.1.1. Pg's Picture in Genesis 11:27–50:13\*; Exodus 1:1–5, 7

In order to formulate Gen 11:27–50:13\*; Exod 1:1–5, 7,<sup>2</sup> Pg has drawn on earlier non-P traditions within Gen 11–50\* and Exod 1:9–12.<sup>3</sup> This can be seen most clearly from the way in which Pg's picture in Gen 11:27–50:13\* contains many parallel elements with non-P in Gen 11–50\* and for the most part, and in broad outline, follows their sequence. For example, Pg

---

2. As noted in §1.2.2.1, I am basically taking the delineation of P by Noth (*History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17–18) as a default position with regard to what comprises Pg within Gen 11–50\*: see ch. 1 n. 243 for the outline of verses. However, I am persuaded by the arguments of Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 108–9) that Gen 21:21 and 25:11b, settlement notices regarding Ishmael and Isaac respectively, should probably be included within Pg (with Gen 21:21 probably originally placed between Gen 25:12 and 25:13–16) given their conformity to the pattern of settlement notices within Pg for Esau and Jacob, and also Abraham and Lot.

3. Whether or not the earlier non-P Genesis traditions were joined with the non-P material in Exod 1\* before Pg is not of importance since it does not affect significantly our discussion of the way in which Pg drew on and reshaped the earlier traditions.

and the earlier non-P traditions have the following episodes or elements in common and in a similar sequence within their respective contexts:

- ♦ Abram, with Lot, journeys to the land (Canaan) (Gen 12:4b–5 [Pg]; 12:1–4a, 6–9 [non-P]);
- ♦ Abram and Lot split up and live in different locations, Abram in the land and Lot the cities of the plain/Sodom (Gen 13:6, 11b, 12a [Pg]; 13:5, 7–13 [non-P]);
- ♦ Ishmael as Abram's first son by Hagar (Gen 16:1a, 3, 15 [Pg]; 16:1b–2, 4–14 [non-P]);<sup>4</sup>
- ♦ The promise of a son to Sarai (Gen 17:15–19 [Pg]; 18:1–15 [non-P]);<sup>5</sup>
- ♦ The birth of Isaac (Gen 21:1b, 3–5 [Pg]; 21:1b, 6–7 [non-P]);
- ♦ Isaac's marriage to Rebekah (Gen 25:19–20 [Pg]; 24 [non-P]); and birth of children (Esau and Jacob) (Gen 25:26b [Pg]; 25:21–26a [non-P]);<sup>6</sup>
- ♦ Jacob is sent away to Laban in Paddan-aram/Haran (Gen 26:34; 27:46–28:5 [Pg]; 27:1–45 [non-P]);
- ♦ The revelation at Bethel with the divine restatement of the Abrahamic promises of descendants and land (Gen 35:9–13a, 15 [Pg]; 28:10–22 [and see 32:22–32] [non-P]);<sup>7</sup>

---

4. Both Pg and the earlier non-P tradition have a divine promise of descendants for Ishmael, though in a slightly different order, in Gen 17:20 and Gen 16:10 respectively. Both Pg in Gen 17 and earlier tradition in Gen 15 may have contained a covenant with Abram, if Gen 15 is earlier than Gen 17, in which case Pg has changed the sequence in non-P from the giving of the covenant followed by the Hagar/Ishmael episode to placing the birth of Ishmael before the Abrahamic covenant. However, I have chosen to leave the question of whether Gen 15 is earlier than Gen 17 open; see §1.2.3, above.

5. Pg also incorporates a note about Lot being rescued in relation to the divine judgment on/destruction of the cities of the plain (Sodom and Gomorrah) in Gen 19:29 that represents a very abbreviated parallel to the earlier non-P tradition in Gen 19:1–28, although originally Pg's note on this in Gen 19:29 probably occurred after Gen 13:12a (see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 13, 17).

6. It would seem that part of Pg is missing here, with the later redactor substituting the non-P account of the birth of Esau and Jacob for that within Pg; see *ibid.*, 14.

7. Although in Pg the revelation at Bethel occurs when Jacob returns to the land, whereas in the non-P tradition it occurs on his way out of the land to go to Laban (Gen 28:10–22; but see Gen 32:22–32, esp. 32:28, which parallels Pg in Gen 35:10 where Jacob's name is changed to Israel). The list of Jacob's twelve sons in Pg's account

- ♦ The beginning of the Joseph story with the motif of conflict (Gen 37:2 [Pg];<sup>8</sup> Gen 37\* [non-P]);
- ♦ Jacob and family go to Egypt and live there (Gen 46:6–7, 27b [Pg]; 46:1–5; 46:28–47:27a [non-P]);
- ♦ Adoption/blessing of Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen 48:5 [Pg]; 48:8–20 [non-P]);
- ♦ Jacob's burial commission, (death), and burial according to commission (Gen 49:29–33; 50:12–13 [Pg]; 50:1–11, 13 [non-P]).<sup>9</sup>

There are many differences between Pg and the earlier non-P traditions: many traditions found in the earlier non-P material in Gen 11–50\* are not in Pg; some unique elements in Pg have no equivalent in the earlier non-P tradition; and there are differences between the elements or episodes they have in common with regard to length and/or details.<sup>10</sup> However, these

---

in Gen 35:22b–26 finds its parallel in the earlier non-P tradition in Gen 29:31–30:24; 35:16–22a. In both Pg and the earlier tradition, a wealthy Jacob comes back to the land (Pg Gen 31:18\*; 33:18c; 35:6; non-P Gen 31:37–33:20\*).

8. There are only fragments of the Joseph story in Pg, i.e., in Gen 37:2; 41:46a, since presumably a later redactor inserted the bulk of the non-P story, overshadowing and displacing Pg's hypothesized account; see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 14.

9. See Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 126–27, for a similar outline of parallel elements in P and non-P.

10. Non-P material from Gen 11–50 but not in P includes, e.g., the wife-sister stories in Gen 12:10–31:1; 20; the covenant between Abraham and Abimelech in Gen 21:22–34; the near sacrifice of Isaac in Gen 22:1–19; various Isaac traditions in Gen 26; Jacob and Esau traditions of Esau selling his birthright to Jacob and Jacob cheating Esau out of Isaac's blessing in Gen 25:29–34; 27:1–45; and Jacob's poem to his sons in Gen 49:1–27.

Unique elements in Pg include, e.g., Pg's account of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah in Gen 23, and related texts such as Gen 25:9–10; 48:29–32; 50:13; and Esau's move to a distant land from Jacob (Seir) because of their possessions and livestock that the land could not support in Gen 36:6–8.

Examples of where Pg's account gives only summarizing statements of the parallel extended accounts in the earlier non-P material are: the rescue or escape of Lot when God destroyed the cities of the plain/Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:29 [Pg]; Gen 19:1–28 [non-P]); the birth of Ishmael as Abram's first son through Hagar (Gen 16:1a, 3, 15 [Pg]; Gen 16:1b–2, 4–14 [non-P]; and see Gen 21:8–20); the marriage of Isaac to Rebekah (Gen 25:20 [Pg]; Gen 24 [non-P]); the sons of Jacob (Gen 35:22b–26 [Pg]; Gen 29:31–30:24; 35:16–22a [non-P]).

The differences in detail will be discussed shortly, but Pg's reshaping of details is seen especially, e.g., in Isaac's sending Jacob to Laban (Gen 26:34; 27:46–28:5 [Pg]; Gen

multiple common parallels ordered in a similar sequence strongly suggests that Pg has drawn on the earlier non-P tradition, with the differences explained by Pg reshaping the earlier non-P tradition by omitting or summarizing many of the earlier traditions, or reshaping parallel elements with regard to their details, and synthesizing these with its own unique material. To the way in which Pg has done this we will now turn.<sup>11</sup>

One of the ways in which Pg has reshaped the earlier non-P traditions in Gen 11–50\* and Exod 1:9–12 is seen in the way in which Pg, though following in general terms the sequence of the non-P tradition, has shaped its account, in contrast to the earlier non-P tradition, into a tightly structured and repetitive pattern. This pattern is as follows.<sup>12</sup>

- I. Descendants (*toledoth*) of Terah: Terah's son Abram/Abraham as primary focus (11:27–25:10\*)
  - A. *Toledoth* of Terah: introduction of Abram, Sarai, and Lot (11:27)
  - B. Geographical location of Terah and his descendants in relation to the land of Canaan (11:31–16:16\*)
    - ◆ Terah and descendants move from Ur to Haran
    - ◆ Abram, Sarai, and Lot come to the land of Canaan
    - ◆ Abram and Lot separate: Abram settles in the land of Canaan and Lot outside the land of Canaan
    - ◆ Ishmael, Abram's first son through Hagar born in the land of Canaan
  - C. God's covenant with Abraham, including self-revelation as El Shaddai, the promise of descendants to Abraham, the establishing of an everlasting covenant with Abraham and his descendants, to be their God and to give them everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, and the promise of a son to Abraham through Sarah (17:1–27)

---

27:1–45 [non-P]); and the revelation at Bethel (Gen 35:9–13a, 15 [Pg]; Gen 28:10–22; Gen 32:22–32 [non-P]) (and the covenant with Abram if Gen 15 is earlier than Gen 17, but this is an open question).

11. In what follows the discussion of the P material and its relationship to the non-P material by Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 78–113, 120–29) will be drawn on to a certain extent.

12. For a slightly different structure, see Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 124–25.



- D. Covenant promises begin to unfold in relation to Abraham (21:1b–23:20\*)
  - 1. Promise of descendants: birth of Isaac (21:1b–5)
  - 2. Promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan: Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah as a burial site (23:1–20)
- E. Death and burial of Abraham by Isaac and Ishmael in the cave of Machpelah (25:7–10)

*Transition:* God blesses Isaac and geographical location of Isaac in the land (Beer lahoi roi) (25:11)

- II. Next generation: Isaac's son Jacob as primary focus (25:12–35:29\*)
  - A. *Toledoth* of Ishmael and Isaac (25:12–26a)
    - 1. *Toledoth* of Ishmael and geographical location outside the land (25:12–17; 21:21<sup>13</sup>)
    - 2. *Toledoth* of Isaac: birth of Esau and Jacob (25:19–20, 26a)
  - B. Geographical location of Jacob in relation to the land of Canaan (26:34–33:18a\*)
    - 1. Jacob sent outside the land to Paddan-aram with Isaac's blessing (including a wish for descendants and possession of the land) (26:34–35; 27:46–28:9)
    - 2. Jacob returns to the land of Canaan (31:18\*; 33:18a)
  - C. Epiphany to Jacob at Bethel, including, God blesses Jacob, self-revelation as El Shaddai, and repetition of covenant promises of descendants and land (35:6, 9–13a, 15)
  - D. Covenant promise of descendants begins to unfold in relation to Jacob: the names of the sons of Jacob (35:22b–26)
  - E. Death and burial of Isaac by Esau and Jacob (35:27–29)
- III. Next generation: Jacob's sons as primary focus (36:1–50:13\*)
  - A. *Toledoth* of Esau and Jacob (36:1–41:46a\*)
    - 1. *Toledoth* of Esau and geographical location outside the land (36:1–14)
    - 2. *Toledoth* of Jacob, with focus on Joseph (37:1–2; 41:46a)
  - B. Geographical location of Jacob and his descendants: the move from the land of Canaan to Egypt and settlement there (46:6–7; 47:27b, 28)

---

13. See n. 2 above.

- C. Jacob recalls to Joseph the epiphany at Bethel by El Shaddai, including God blessing him, and the covenant promises of descendants and everlasting possession of the land (48:3–4)
- D. Note relating to the unfolding of the covenant promise of descendants: Jacob adopts Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh (48:5–6)
- E. Death and burial of Jacob by his sons in the cave of Machpelah, here all the other patriarchs and matriarchs (except Rachel) are buried (49:1a, 29–33; 50:12–13)

*Conclusion and transition:* the sons of Israel, which are named, multiply in the land of Egypt (Exod 1:1–5, 7)

This structure shows what is important to Pg in reshaping the earlier tradition and what Pg specifically wishes to express in relation to the ancestors.

The structure falls into three main sections (I, II, and III). Each section is introduced by the *toledoth* formula (“These are the descendants of ...”, I A, II, A, III, A) and concludes with a death and burial notice (I E, II E, III, E). These sections cover the generations from Terah, Abram’s father, through the sons of Jacob. The primary focus of each section is not the ancestor introduced by the *toledoth* formula but one of his sons: in the first section, Terah’s son Abram; in the second section, Isaac’s son Jacob; and in the third section, Jacob’s son Joseph, phasing into all twelve sons. This goes some way to explaining why there are no *toledoth* associated with Abram, since it would seem that for Pg Isaac is not of primary importance,<sup>14</sup> and therefore a *toledoth* heading introducing his father Abraham in line with the pattern here is omitted. It is Abram, Jacob, and Jacob’s sons that are of primary significance and therefore their fathers, Terah, Isaac, and Jacob, respectively, whose descendants are introduced by the *toledoth* formula.<sup>15</sup> Admittedly, the listing of the descendants of Ishmael and Esau are also

---

14. In addition, in terms of the earlier non-P tradition on which Pg is drawing, there is little material associated with Isaac in his own right and much of it seems to be a repetition of traditions associated with Abraham (see Gen 26); he is little more than a transitional figure between the primary figures of Abraham and Jacob; see Carr (citing Blum), *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 98; Elizabeth Boase, “Life in the Shadows: The Role and Function of Isaac in Genesis; Diachronic and Synchronic Readings,” *VT* 51(2001): 312–35.

15. Another indication of the relative unimportance of Isaac is that whereas Isaac is described as Abraham’s son (Gen 25:19) (as is Ishmael, Gen 25:12), Jacob is not described as Isaac’s son (Gen 37:2) (neither is Esau, Gen 36:1, 9).

introduced by the *toledoth* formula (II A and III A), but perhaps this is because Pg found it important to situate the primary figures in the line of Abraham in relation to their siblings who represent nations outside the Abrahamic covenant.<sup>16</sup>

Pg is concerned to situate the ancestors in relation to the land of Canaan (esp. I B, II B, and III B) prior to the references to the covenantal promises (I C, II C, and III C). In section I, Abram, the primary figure, settles in the land of Canaan (I B). In section II, the primary figure, Jacob, is born in the land but is sent outside the land to Paddan-aram (II B 1) and later returns to the land (II B 2). In section III, Jacob's sons move with him out of the land of Canaan to Egypt (III B). In each case, after these geographical notices, there is reference to the Abrahamic covenant promises.

In terms of the geographical location of the more minor figures, aside from Isaac, who is born in the land (I D, Gen 21:1b–5) and resides there, never leaving it (25:11, *Transition* between I and II, and see 35:27–29, II E), those not in the direct covenantal line of Abraham settle outside the land. Lot, Abram's nephew, settles outside the land of Canaan among the cities of the plain (I B). Ishmael is born in the land (I B) but settles outside the land (21:21, II A 1). Finally, Esau moves out of the land and settles in Seir for the same reason Lot moves out of the land (36:6–8, III A 1; see 13:6, 11b, 12).

In each section, there is reference to the covenantal promises after the geographical location of the one to whom the promises are given (I C, II C, and III C). In section I, in the land of Canaan, after the self-revelation of El Shaddai, God establishes his covenant with Abraham and his descendants comprising the promise of descendants to Abraham, the promises of the everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, to be their God to Abraham and his descendants (Gen 17:1–8, I C), and the promise of a son, Isaac, with whom the covenant will be established, to Abraham through Sarah (17:15–21, I C). In section II, in the land of Canaan when Jacob returns, God blesses Jacob,<sup>17</sup> changes his name to Israel, and after the self-revelation of El Shaddai, gives to Jacob the covenant promise of descendants

---

16. This is also the case with Abraham and his nephew Lot, although not associated with the *toledoth* formula. Perhaps also Abraham is not associated with his own *toledoth* since, as the one with whom the covenant is established, he is the primary father of all the descendants including the nation of Israel, not just one of the fathers in the sequence.

17. See, prior to this, the note in Gen 25:11 that God blesses Isaac.

and to Jacob and his descendants the covenant promise of the land (35:6, 9–13a, II C). Finally, in section III, now in the land of Egypt, Jacob recalls to Joseph that El Shaddai appeared to him in the land, blessed him, and gave the covenant promises of descendants to him, and the land to his offspring (48:3–4, IIIC).<sup>18</sup> Since Abraham and Jacob are the figures who receive a direct epiphany from God in which they are given the covenantal promises,<sup>19</sup> clearly it is Abraham and Jacob that are the most important figures, as has been already established in our discussion of the pattern of the three sections introduced in each case by the *toledoth* formula.

In each section, then, after the statement of the covenant promises, the promise of descendants and/or the promise of the land begins to unfold (I D, II D, and III D). In section I, the covenant promise of descendants (and of a son through Sarah) begins to unfold in the birth of Isaac (Gen 21:1b–5, I D 1) and the covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan begins to unfold in Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah where Sarah is buried (23, I D 2), as is Abraham (25:7–10, I E). In section II, the covenant promise of descendants further unfolds in the listing of Jacob's sons (35:22b–26, II D). Finally, in section III, there is a note regarding the unfolding of the promise of descendants in relation to Jacob's grandsons whom Jacob adopts as heirs of the promises (see 48:3–4) (48:5–6, III D); prior to this there is an important note in Gen 47:27b that Jacob's family multiply in the land of Egypt.

Finally, at the end of each section, the death of one of the patriarchs is noted and their burial by their respective sons. In section I it is the death of Abraham and his burial by Isaac and Ishmael in the cave of Machpelah in the land (Gen 25:7–10, I E). In section II it is the death of Isaac and his burial by his sons Esau and Jacob (Gen 35:27–29, II E). Although there is no note here that he was buried in the cave of Machpelah (perhaps another indication of Isaac's relative insignificance compared to the dominant figures of Abraham and Jacob), this is later referred to in Jacob's speech in Gen 49:31. Finally, in section III, in a more extended section, which includes a speech of Jacob charging his sons to bury him in the cave of

---

18. See the chart outlining the similarities between these texts in Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 81.

19. Isaac does not receive an epiphany. Isaac refers to the covenant promises of descendants and land only as a wish in the context of his blessing of Jacob when he sends him away from the land, and the emphasis is on these promises to Abraham (Gen 28:3–4).

Machpelah, where all the other patriarchs and matriarchs (except Rachel)<sup>20</sup> are buried, Jacob dies and is buried by his sons in the cave of Machpelah in the land. This emphasizes the point that, although Israel's ancestors lived in the land of Canaan as resident aliens (גֵּרִים), they did own that bit of the land, the cave of Machpelah that Abraham purchased, and therefore that piece of the land of Canaan where they were buried, represents the initial unfolding of the covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan.

Finally, in the conclusion and transition to the story of the nation in Exod 1:1–5, 7, Jacob/Israel's twelve sons, who are here named again, multiply in Egypt—thereby looking back to Gen 35:22b–26; and 47:27b—to become the nation of Israel, thereby looking forward to the story of the nation.

It is clear from this fivefold repeated pattern in each of the three sections extending through the generations from Abraham's father to Jacob's sons, that Pg in Gen 11:27–50:13\* (and the transition to the story of the nation in Exod 1:1–5, 7) has sought to highlight the importance of Abraham and Jacob in particular as those to whom the covenant promises of descendants and land are directly given by God in a divine epiphany: God, as El Shaddai, in a speech to Abraham establishes his covenant with Abraham and his descendants, and in a speech to Jacob repeats and confirms the covenant promises to him. Over and above the statement of the covenant and its promises, the rest of the material is concerned with the way in which the promises of descendants and land begin to unfold and work themselves out in the ancestral period. The whole structure of three sections introduced by the *toledoth* formula extending through the generations from Terah to the sons of Jacob represents, in light of the covenant and its promises, the initial unfolding of the promise of descendants. This promise is particularly unfolded in the details of the birth of Isaac to Abraham and Sarah (I D 1), the birth Jacob (and Esau) (II A 2), and in Jacob's twelve sons (II D), and grandsons (III D, and see Exod 1:1–5, 7). The material associated with the land of Canaan, promised as an everlasting possession to Abraham and his descendants (Gen 17:8; see 35:12), is more complex. Pg emphasizes that Abraham and Jacob are both in the land of Canaan when they receive the divine revelation concerning the covenant

---

20. This is probably because there seems to have been a strong tradition regarding Rachel's burial place; see Gen 35:16–22a.

promises (I B and C, and II B and C), and in contrast to this, Jacob's reference to the epiphany at Luz where the covenant promises are stated to him occurs in Egypt (III B and C). Those not in the direct covenantal line, Ishmael and Esau, move away from the land of Canaan and settle outside it (II A 1 and III A 1, respectively), as did Abram's nephew Lot (I B). The promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan is fulfilled for the patriarchs (and matriarchs) within the covenant through Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah (I D 2) and their burial in it (I E and III E): they possess that piece of the land of Canaan forever in death, as the place of their graves.

That Pg's account of the ancestors, and the transition to the story of the nation in Exod 1:1–5, 7, which also forms its conclusion, is oriented in all its parts and as a whole around the statement of the covenant and its promises and the unfolding of the covenant promises of descendants and land is further borne out by the way in which Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition, summarizing and reshaping individual elements and synthesizing these with its own unique elements. Although the promises of descendants and land and their initial unfolding are to be found running through the earlier non-P tradition, this material comprises a number of extended episodes that at best can be said only loosely to relate to this theme, in contrast to Pg's tightly structured portrayal where each element relates to the covenant and its promises. To a comparison of Pg with the non-P tradition on which it draws we will now turn. We will follow the sequence of Pg's particular pattern, although in broad outline this is generally the sequence of the elements that make up the earlier non-P tradition, albeit in a less structured and patterned way.<sup>21</sup>

In terms of Abram and Lot coming to the land of Canaan, Pg has reshaped the non-P tradition, where Abram is commanded to go to an unknown land, linked with the promises of blessing and descendants, which he comes to know only when he has arrived and it is promised to him (Gen 12:1–4a, 7) and through which he travels and encamps (12:6–9),

---

21. See the outline of episodes or elements that Pg and the non-P material have in common listed on pp. 459–60 above. This will not be an exhaustive discussion, since our primary focus is the story of the nation and not the Genesis material as such, but it will be enough to show how Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition to focus at every point on the covenant promises and how they work themselves out and unfold initially in the ancestral period. For an extended discussion, see Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 81–108, 125–29.

to portray Terah, and later Abram, as deliberately setting out to the land of Canaan, and Abram settling in the land (11:31–32; 12:4b–5).<sup>22</sup> For Pg, the land of Canaan is clearly the goal and place for Abram to be from the beginning. Pg follows the earlier tradition in the separation of Lot and Abram, although Pg's account is briefer and has a different reason for it, that the land could not support both of them given their possessions (13:6), rather than because of conflict, as in the earlier tradition (13:7). Pg makes quite clear that Abram settles in the land of Canaan, but, unlike the non-P tradition, has no land promise (nor promise of descendants) associated with this (see 13:14–17). Pg shows little interest in the extensive tradition in non-P regarding the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and Lot's escape from there (19:1–28), except to note the destruction of the cities of the plain and that Lot survived because God "remembered" Abram (19:29), therefore emphasizing the importance of Abram as a primary figure. The emphasis in Pg so far, then, is situating Abram, the primary figure, in the land of Canaan, although there are as yet no divine promises of descendants and land.

Pg gives a skeletal summary in Gen 16:1a, 3, 15 of the earlier Hagar tradition (see 16:1b–2, 4–14), simply noting that since Sarai had born no children for Abram, after ten years in the land of Canaan Sarai gave Hagar to Abram as a wife and she bore Abram's first son, Ishmael.<sup>23</sup> These motifs, along with Abram's settlement in the land of Canaan, provide the backdrop for the covenant with Abraham in Gen 17, which picks all these motifs up in the covenant promise of the land of Canaan, the promise that Sarah will bear a son, and the place and destiny of Ishmael, in 17:8, 15–22.

Whereas in the non-P tradition the divine promises of descendants, blessing, and land have already occurred (Gen 12:2–3, 7; 13:14–17), it is only at this point in Pg, as part of the content of the covenant with Abraham (Gen 17), that the divine promises of descendants and land are given. Pg has reshaped these promises in the earlier tradition, which include over and above the promises of descendants and the land, the promise of blessing for other nations through Abram (12:3), by omitting any reference to blessing for the nations, reformulating the land promise in terms of the land where Abraham is a resident alien (גֵר), the land of Canaan, as a perpetual holding (17:8), and adding the promise to be their God (17:7b, 8b).

22. See *ibid.*, 105, 106.

23. Pg incorporates no reference to the tradition regarding the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael in Gen 21:8–20.



In terms of the Abrahamic covenant that these promises comprise in Pg, if Gen 15 is earlier than Gen 17, then Pg has reshaped this by moving the divine self-introduction in Gen 15:7 to the beginning (17:1), changing the divine name from YHWH to El Shaddai in line with its three-stage revelation of the divine name where the name YHWH is first revealed to Moses (Exod 6:2–3); transforming the covenant motif linked with the promise of the land only in Gen 15:7–18 to encompass the promise of descendants (see Gen 15:1–6) as well (17:1–8); and adding the covenant promise to be their God (17:7b, 8b).<sup>24</sup> If Gen 15 is not earlier than Gen 17 then Pg's Abrahamic covenant stands out all the more as an element unique to Pg that has a pivotal role in Pg's whole picture. Moreover, Pg in Gen 17:16–21 incorporates into God's speech, in which the covenant is established, the promise of a son to Abraham through Sarah, drawn from the earlier tradition (18:1–15),<sup>25</sup> linking this with the motif found elsewhere in the earlier tradition of the promise of descendants for Ishmael (16:10);<sup>26</sup> in this process Pg makes quite clear that the covenant is established through Isaac (not Ishmael also; Gen 17:21). Distinctive to Pg is the motif of circumcision as the sign of keeping the covenant. Pg's Abrahamic covenant, then, stands out as the beginning of the promises, in contrast to the scattering of promises within the sequence of traditions in non-P paralleling those that, within Pg, merely form the backdrop to Gen 17, and is programmatic for that which ensues: the unfolding of these promises, and within Pg's ancestral material in particular the initial unfolding of the promises of descendants and the everlasting possession of the land of Canaan.

Pg follows the non-P tradition with regard to the birth of Isaac (Gen 21:1b–5 [Pg]; 21:1a, 6–7 [non-P]), even if in Pg it is Abraham who names his son rather than Sarah, with Pg going beyond the non-P tradition in noting the circumcision of Isaac in line with the covenant, and the age of Abraham. The next episode in Pg is unique and therefore stands out within Pg's picture: Abraham buys the cave of Machpelah to bury Sarah there. This episode and the references to Abraham and Jacob and all the other patriarchs and matriarchs (except Rachel) in the covenant line as being buried there (25:9–10; 49:29–32; 50:12–13), also unique to Pg, represent the initial unfolding of the covenant promise of the land where the

24. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 83–85.

25. Reshaping it so that it is Abraham and not Sarah who laughs in reaction.

26. Although in the earlier tradition the divine promise of descendants is given to Hagar, but in Pg to Abraham.

ancestors possessed this piece of the promised land of Canaan in death. Thereby Pg is solely focused on the initial unfolding of the covenant promises, of descendants, in the birth of Isaac, and the land, in the purchase of the cave of Machpelah as the burial site for the ancestors under the covenant, which stands in contrast to the more loosely connected series of stories in the non-P tradition at this point.<sup>27</sup>

After the death and burial of Abraham, God's blessing of Isaac, a note regarding his settling in the land (Gen 25:11b), and the genealogy of Ishmael (which also probably originally incorporated a note regarding his location outside the land [21:21]) concluding with a notice of his death,<sup>28</sup> which speaks of Pg's interest in situating the figures of the covenant line in relation to their siblings and the nations they represent, Pg notes briefly initially, under the *toledoth* of Isaac, his marriage to Rebekah and Isaac's age at the birth of his sons (Esau and Jacob).<sup>29</sup> Pg's summary note regarding Isaac's marriage to Rebekah in comparison to the extended story that leads up to this in the earlier non-P account in Gen 24 focuses only on the details of Rebekah's lineage as related to Terah and Abram (see the non-P tradition in 24:24) as the daughter of Methuel and brother of Laban. Following this, omitting any reference to the earlier non-P traditions of Esau selling his birthright to Jacob and Jacob cheating Esau out of Isaac's blessing (25:29–34; 27:1–45) (as well as various traditions centering on Isaac in Gen 26), Pg focuses on the issue of Jacob's future marriage in contrast to the marriages of Esau (26:34; 27:46–28:5) as the reason for Jacob to be sent to Rebekah's brother Laban in Paddan-aram. Here Pg's account is a reshaping of the earlier non-P tradition where Rebekah sends Jacob away to her brother Laban in Haran to keep him safe because Esau hates him and intends to kill him because he had cheated Esau out of Isaac's blessing (27:41–45). In Pg,

---

27. The non-P tradition proceeds after the birth of Isaac with a number of stories to which there is no parallel in Pg: e.g., the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael (Gen 21:8–21); Abraham and Abimelech make a covenant (21:22–34); and the near sacrifice of Isaac (22:1–19).

28. There is no parallel to Abraham's death notice (or that of Isaac), nor to the genealogy of Ishmael in non-P. However, as Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 98) points out, there were probably death notices within the earlier non-P tradition but there was little reason for the redactor to include both notices from P and non-P respectively. This may also be the case with respect to genealogies.

29. It is probable that Pg's birth notices of Esau and Isaac have been suppressed by the redactor in favor of the non-P material regarding this; see n. 6 above.

Isaac sends Jacob away (though at the instigation of Rebekah who fears Jacob will marry one of the Hittite women as Esau has) with his blessing (as Isaac blesses Jacob in the earlier tradition [27:27–29]).<sup>30</sup> This blessing contains the wish for many descendants and the blessing of Abraham in terms of the possession of the land, along with the instruction to marry one of the daughters of Laban, Rebekah's brother (28:1–4). This not only anticipates the non-P tradition where Jacob in fact marries two of Laban's daughters (29:1–30) but emphasizes the keeping of the purity of the line. This stands in contrast to Esau who marries two Hittite women and then the daughter of Ishmael (26:34; 28:6–9). Thereby Jacob and Esau are distinguished in that Jacob is to marry a cousin who is in the line of Terah, whereas Esau marries women who are not within the covenant and its promises. Pg thus reshapes the earlier non-P tradition to show the preservation of the purity of the line in the unfolding of the promise of descendants in relation to Jacob's generation.

Omitting the complexities and details of Jacob's time with Laban, including how Jacob came to marry Leah and Rachel and how Jacob profited and became wealthy, in the earlier tradition (Gen 29:1–31:18a, 19–55), Pg simply notes that Jacob returns to the land of Canaan with all the property and livestock he had acquired (31:18\*; 33:18a),<sup>31</sup> and there is no mention of his encounter with Esau as in the earlier tradition (see 32:1–21; 33:1–17). In Pg, it is at Luz in the land of Canaan after he has come back from Paddan-aram that God appears to Jacob (35:6, 9–13a, 15), and in this scenario Pg has conflated elements from two scenarios in the earlier non-P tradition where Jacob is encountered by God, namely, at Bethel on his way out of the land to go to Laban in Gen 28:10–22 and at the ford of Jabbok on his way back to the land in 32:22–32. Taking the motifs of the divine blessing and the change of name from Jacob to Israel in 32:28, 29b, Pg combines this with God's assertion to Jacob of the covenant promises of descendants and land introduced by the self-identification formula (35:11–12), drawn from Gen 28:13–14, and with Jacob then calling the place Bethel (35:15), also drawn from 28:17, 19. In so doing, Pg has reshaped the self-revelation of God from "I am YHWH" (28:13) to "I am El Shaddai" (35:11) in line with Gen 17:1, expressed the promises

---

30. See Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 86–88.

31. Although it would seem that Pg is not complete here, and part of it has probably been omitted by the redactor in favor of the non-P material; see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 14, 17.

of descendants in the terminology of that promise as given to Abraham (35:11; see 17:6), linked the land promise with that given to Abraham and Isaac (35:12), and linked the change of name from Jacob to Israel with the covenant promise of descendants, a move that foreshadows Exod 1:1–5, 7. Clearly, then, Pg's specific emphasis here is God's giving of the Abrahamic promises to Jacob, as the significant figure alongside Abraham in the land of Canaan in such a way, with the change of name, that it foreshadows the nation Israel as the descendants of Jacob.

Accordingly, straight after this the twelve sons of Jacob are listed, with an allusion to the tradition that they were born in Paddan-aram, when Jacob was with Laban as unfolded in detail in Gen 29:31–30:24,<sup>32</sup> an indication of the unfolding of the covenant promise of descendants.

After the death and burial of Isaac, there is the genealogy of Esau. What would seem to be unique to Pg here is the description of Esau and his family, and his property and livestock, moving to a land distant from Jacob, that is outside the land of Canaan, to Seir (Gen 36:6–8). The reason given is the same as that which is given as to why Lot moved away from Abraham to outside the land of Canaan, that is, the land could not support both of them because of their possessions (36:7; see 13:6). Thereby Pg shows which line is heir to the promise of the land of Canaan: the line of Abraham and Jacob and not that of Esau. Consequently, then, Pg states explicitly that Jacob settled in the land of Canaan (37:1).

Under the *toledoth* of Jacob, Joseph in particular is introduced. However, Pg is fragmentary at this point (Gen 37:2; 41:46a), and it is probable that P material has been omitted by the redactor in favor of the extensive non-P tradition in Gen 37:3–45:28.<sup>33</sup> What is found in Pg is the move of Jacob and all his family and everything they had acquired in the land of Canaan down to Egypt (46:6–7). This motif of Jacob and all his family migrating to Egypt is drawn from the tradition (46:1–5), although Pg does not go into the detail of Joseph settling his family in Goshen and dealing with the famine in Egypt (46:28–47:27a). Instead, Pg stresses how Jacob and his sons are fruitful and multiply exceedingly in the land of Egypt (47:27b) in line with the unfolding of the promise of descendants, and proleptic of Exod 1:1–5, 7.

32. However, whereas the earlier tradition has Benjamin born in the land of Canaan (Gen 35:16–18; 48:7), Pg has Benjamin being born in Paddan-aram.

33. See Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 14, 17.

In relation to Jacob's death, Pg draws on the earlier non-P tradition, where Jacob charges Joseph to bury him, not in Egypt but with his ancestors (Gen 47:29–31), blesses Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh (48:1–2, 8–20), and Joseph buries Jacob back in the land (50:1–11). However, Pg has reshaped these traditions in the following ways: Rather than charging Joseph only with the task of burying him in the land, Jacob charges all his sons to bury him in the land of Canaan (49:1a, 29–32). In his speech prior to this to Joseph alone, Jacob recalls El Shaddai's revelation to him at Luz in the land of Canaan (48:3–4), where he blessed him and spoke to him the covenantal promises of descendants and land as a perpetual holding (an echo of which is found in Israel's speech to Joseph in the earlier tradition in 48:21). Linked with these covenant promises in Jacob's speech is his adoption, rather than blessing, of his grandsons born in Egypt to Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh (48:5–6). Thus, Pg once again focuses on the covenant promises and the beginnings of the unfolding of the promise of descendants in Jacob's grandchildren. Jacob's charge to all his sons, not just Joseph, to bury him in the land of Canaan, then, specifically refers to his wish to be buried, not just with his ancestors, as in the tradition, but specifically in the cave of Machpelah that was purchased from the Hittites, where all the ancestors in the line of the covenant (except Rachel), Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, and Leah are buried (49:1a, 29–32). With the death of Jacob, all his sons bury him in the land of Canaan, once more repeating, in the cave of Machpelah that was bought (by Abraham) from the Hittite. Thereby Pg emphasizes this piece of land within the land of Canaan where the ancestors are buried as the possession of the ancestors and therefore the beginnings of the unfolding of the covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan.

Finally, in the conclusion and transition to the story of the nation in Exod 1:1–5, 7, Pg in 1:1–5 brings together the motifs in its account in Gen 35:10 of Jacob's name change to Israel and the listing of the sons of *Jacob* in Gen 35:22b–26 by presenting the same list of sons under the heading of the sons of *Israel*. In an allusion back to Gen 46:6–7; Exod 1:5 differentiates between the sons and their offspring (totaling seventy), who came to Egypt and Joseph who was already there. In these ways, Pg refers back to what has gone before in the ancestral period. In Exod 1:7, Pg draws on the earlier non-P tradition in Exod 1:9, 20 regarding the Israelites multiplying (רבה) and becoming strong (עצם), where the same verbs are used, but links this inextricably with Exod 1:1–5 by presenting it as an extension of Israel's (that is Jacob's) offspring, but with Israel here now connoting

not Jacob but the nation.<sup>34</sup> Thereby, Pg cleverly joins the reference back to the ancestral era in Exod 1:1–5 with the forward-looking reference to the story of the nation in Exod 1:7.

Clearly this discussion of the way in which Pg has reshaped the non-P tradition and synthesized it with its own unique elements has shown that all the elements in Pg's account are concerned with either the statement of the covenant and its promises, specifically to Abraham and Jacob, who are the most significant figures, or how the covenantal promises of descendants and the land of Canaan initially work themselves out and unfold for those in the covenantal line, who are situated in relation to those outside the covenant. As the analysis of Pg's structure has shown, all these elements have been shaped into a highly structured pattern that displays and reinforces this, that is, the statements of the covenant and the initial working out of its promises of descendants and everlasting possession of the land of Canaan.

It is time now to look at the paradigmatic nature of the trajectory that is concerned with the statement of the Abrahamic covenant and the unfolding of its promises, not just in Gen 11:27–Exod 1:7\* but also throughout the trajectory of the story of the nation in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*, that is, with regard to Gen 11:27–Num 27:14\* as a whole.

#### 5.1.2. Pg's Paradigmatic Trajectory in the Unfolding of the Ancestral Promises in Genesis 11:27–Numbers 27:14\*

Pg's trajectory in Gen 11:27–Num 27:14\* is paradigmatic in the sense that at every point of its contingent (historiographic) sequence of elements, comprising reshaped past traditions synthesized with unique elements, it is forward-looking beyond itself, that is, intrinsically visionary. This is by virtue of it being made up in part of the paradigmatic picture(s) of the nation, which is in a sense timeless, incorporating past and future, that forms the bulk of the trajectory, and/or because of the forward-looking trajectory itself, as rooted in the past or past tradition, that moves at every point toward a yet unrealized and therefore future fulfillment.

The statement of the Abrahamic covenant in Gen 17 (to which 11:27–16:16\* [and 19:29] forms an introductory backdrop) with its promises of descendants, everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, and to be

---

34. Childs, *Exodus*, 2.

their God, though rooted in the past and comprising reshaped earlier traditions synthesized with Pg's unique elements, is inherently future-looking and visionary by virtue of its promissory nature, as is the content of the subsequent trajectory that partially unfolds these promises. The same can be said with regard to the divine restatement of the covenant promises (of descendants and land) to Jacob (Gen 35:9–12, 13a) and to Moses (of the land and to be their God) in Exod 6:2–8, as well as the references to these promises within Isaac's blessing of Jacob in Gen 48:3–4 and Jacob's speech to Joseph in Gen 48:4. The unfolding of these promises along the trajectory is then forward-looking at each point, and not only by virtue of the forward movement of the trajectory throughout. In particular, this is due to the fact that the story of the nation that unfolds these promises, as set in the past and comprising paradigmatic scenarios that in reshaping past tradition synthesized with unique and programmatic elements, presents a future vision or visions as yet unrealized, as does the trajectory itself which, though reaching into the past, concludes with the promises as yet not fully realized and looking toward completion in the future. Both the paradigmatic scenario(s) of the story of the nation as a good part of the trajectory and the trajectory as a whole are visionary and open-ended.

In order to tease this out, we will consider how each of the Abrahamic covenant promises can be seen as paradigmatic in this sense as it unfolds along the trajectory before considering the paradigmatic unfolding of all three promises together.

#### 5.1.2.1. The Promise of Descendants

Within Pg's picture of the ancestors, the unfolding of the promise of descendants is highlighted through its threefold genealogical structure in which each section is introduced by the *toledoth* formula, which moves inexorably forward in sequence through the generations, from the offspring of Terah, that is, Abraham with whom the covenant including the promise of descendants is established, through Isaac, to Jacob to whom the promise of descendants is repeated, to the sons of Jacob. So far the forward-looking movement of each element, set in the ancestral period and comprising reshaped earlier tradition, is obvious.

However, can it be said that the multiplying of Jacob/Israel's descendants in Exod 1:7, which is part of the transition to the story of the nation in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14, represents a fulfillment of the promise of descen-



dants as some have supposed,<sup>35</sup> in which case the nation itself as pictured in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\* would represent its fulfillment? This is certainly not the case. Not only is the story of the nation open-ended, with its conclusion forward-looking to the next generation (see Num 13:1–27:14\*),<sup>36</sup> but indeed, Exod 1:1–5, 7, in reshaping earlier tradition to portray the transition to the story of the nation, contains within itself an as yet unrealized future vision. This is seen in the list of the twelve sons of Jacob, now called Israel, in Exod 1:1–5, that multiply in Exod 1:7. Within Exod 1:1–5, 7 there is a clever progression from, and play on, the reference to the sons of Israel (בני ישראל) in Exod 1:1 that clearly refers to the sons of Israel the patriarch (that is, Jacob) since it is followed by a listing of his sons' names in Exod 1:2–5, to the reference to the sons of Israel (בני ישראל) in Exod 1:7 that refers now to the nation Israel as being fruitful and multiplying. With the bracketing of the list of twelve names by “the sons of Israel” (בני ישראל) in these two senses, the implication is that the names of the twelve sons listed intrinsically also refer to the twelve tribes of Israel. It can be argued therefore that Exod 1:1–5, 7 reflects not only the early tradition of Jacob's twelve sons but a future reference or vision that looks forward to the nation as comprising twelve tribes.

This is foreshadowed in Gen 35:22b–26 that lists the same twelve sons of Jacob, after his name change to Israel in Gen 35:10, and in Gen 48:5, where Jacob adopts as his own the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh. This reflects earlier traditions in which Ephraim and Manasseh were considered full-fledged tribes with their own territory, while often being grouped under Joseph.<sup>37</sup> The tradition would appear to be fluid and Pg would seem to reflect this fluidity—in naming Joseph in the list of twelve names/tribes in Gen 35:22b–26 and Exod 1:2–5 (reflecting the early poems of Gen 49:2–27 and Deut 33), but in the adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh, therefore implicitly elevating them to tribal status,<sup>38</sup> reflecting traditions in which Ephraim and Manasseh (as the descendants of Joseph) are portrayed as individual tribes with their own territories. Pg does not appear to have attempted to reconcile these traditions in terms of the

35. See, for example, Lohfink, “Priestly Narrative,” 167.

36. This will be discussed in more detail shortly.

37. See Serge Frovol, “Manasseh, Manassites,” *NIDB* 3:782–85; and Daniel Hawke, “Ephraim, Ephramites,” *NIDB* 2:280–83.

38. Hawke, “Ephraim,” 280.



number twelve.<sup>39</sup> However, that there is a future vision of the descendants of Jacob/Israel in terms of (twelve) tribes named for the sons of Jacob/Israel here within Pg is apparent.

This is confirmed in the future unfolding of the trajectory in the paradigmatic picture of the nation in Exod 28:9–12 and Exod 28:17–21, 29 where the high priest (Aaron) is to wear as part of his clothing the stones inscribed with the twelve tribes of Israel, in relation to the ephod and the breastpiece of judgment, respectively. As discussed in §4.2.1.2, the two stones of the ephod inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes (six on each), as the stones of remembrance, mean that Aaron bears the names of the sons of Israel on his shoulders before YHWH (Exod 28:9–12), and the twelve stones of the breastpiece, with each inscribed with one of the names of the sons of Israel, also signifies Aaron bearing the names of the sons of Israel, this time on his heart, before YHWH, as a continual remembrance. Both sets of stones, therefore, function as a reminder to YHWH to remember his nation and the covenant and its promises by which they are shaped every time the high priest goes into the holy place. As argued in §4.2.1.2, Pg has placed much emphasis on the significance of these inscribed stones as seen, not only from the possibility that these stones are unique to Pg, but in particular from the blurred repetition of the different sets of stones that do not necessarily create a coherent image, which thereby has the effect of emphasizing the central idea to which they point, that is, as the means for YHWH's remembrance of the nation defined in terms of twelve tribes.

The definition of the nation in terms of twelve tribes here (in Exod 28\*), found in seminal form in the earlier part of the trajectory in Exod 1:1–5, 7 (and Gen 35:22b–26; 48:5–6) that reflects earlier traditions regarding the twelve tribes is forward-looking and visionary, not simply in terms of its lack of realization along Pg's trajectory.<sup>40</sup> Most importantly,

---

39. In Num 1 in the listing of the twelve tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh are listed as separate tribes, with Levi being replaced. See also Num 13:3b–17a. These texts are likely from later hands, albeit within the Priestly school.

40. It should be noted, however, that Num 1–2, which here we have attributed to a later hand, does further unfold a vision of the nation as twelve tribes arranged around the sanctuary at its center. It more closely defines, albeit in terms of a military census and a military camp, the twelve tribes. Moreover, it would seem to reflect earlier and/or contemporary tradition or experience in that it describes Judah as the largest tribe and the one that is to lead the nation in its formation around the sanctuary and in its journey east.

it is visionary because it is part of Pg's paradigmatic picture of the nation, and in particular that part of it that describes the tabernacle and its personnel in Exod 24–29\*; 39–40\*, where, as we have seen (§4.2.1), earlier traditions are reshaped with unique and programmatic elements into a timeless vision that incorporates all time (as seen from its nature as founding ritual and also its nature as ritualized text). As such, the unfolding of the promise of descendants in terms of twelve tribes, though reflecting earlier tradition, is visionary, something that is not yet fully realized: it is a vision of a twelve-tribe nation held in constant remembrance before YHWH through the cultic service of its high priest, who is intrinsically part of the tabernacle/tent of meeting.<sup>41</sup>

Moreover, the beginnings of the creation of this nation, envisioned in terms of twelve tribes in the future, is portrayed also along the trajectory as the unfolding of the promise of descendants in the paradigmatic picture in Exod 14\*. Here the nation of Israel is created after their liberation from the oppressing nation (Exod 12\*), and this is linked inseparably with the destruction or reversal of creation of the oppressive foreign nation and its gods in such a way as to be symbolic of all such nations. This too, though rooted in, and representing a reshaping of, earlier tradition, is also visionary in that it is part of Pg's paradigmatic picture in Exod 7–14\*, which as such is timeless, incorporating all time, or akin to liturgical time.<sup>42</sup> The performance of the Passover rite celebrates and effects YHWH's judgment on the oppressing nation's gods, liberates Israel from them, and in destroying that nation, its king and gods completely, creates the nation Israel. Further, this can occur at any time and through time. For Pg's exilic audience, in a foreign land under foreign rule, this provides a visionary picture for them of their future as created by YHWH. The reshaped exodus traditions in relation to Egypt is at the same time a vision for their future in relation to any nation to whom they are subservient—for the exilic audience Babylon in particular—that will become a reality for them with the celebration of the Passover.

---

41. See §4.2.1.2, above. The impact of this vision of Israel as a twelve-tribe nation on Pg's exilic audience will be taken up in ch. 6. Suffice to flag at this point that, for Pg's exilic audience, though familiar with the traditions of the twelve tribes in the past, this is no longer a reality for them, with only Judah remaining, and so this picture of twelve tribes for them would have been truly visionary.

42. See §4.1, above.

Therefore the unfolding of the promise of descendants points forward along the trajectory from a seminal vision of a twelve tribe nation (Exod 1:1–5, 7; and see Gen 35:22b–26; 48:5–6) through the creation of the nation (Exod 14\*) to the nation as comprising twelve tribes, which are brought to remembrance before YHWH through the high priest, who is an intrinsic part of the tabernacle. Since, especially in relation to the creation of the nation and its identity as twelve tribes in relation to the tabernacle and its personnel, reshaped traditions from the past and unique and programmatic elements have been synthesized to give the timeless paradigmatic pictures of which they are a part, of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* (and especially Exod 24–40\*), which as such incorporate all time, past/present/future, these ways in which the promise of descendants unfolds, in echoing the past, present a vision for the future, especially for Pg's exilic audience, that is not yet realized and is yet to be.

This is reinforced by the forward movement of the trajectory of the unfolding of the promise of descendants, which reaches into the past, and is forward-looking along its trajectory at every point, and in particular at its conclusion which is open-ended: the Mosaic generation will die outside the land (Num 13:1–27:14\*), but Aaron's vestments, implicitly including the stones of the ephod and the breastpiece, each inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes, are placed on Eleazar as the high priest of the future generation. The fulfillment of the promise of descendants as a nation created through the destruction of its oppressors and their gods and comprising twelve tribes remembered by YHWH through its tabernacle and the vestments of the high priest when he comes before YHWH remains, in particular for Pg's exilic audience, as yet a future vision or hope.<sup>43</sup>

#### 5.1.2.2. The Promise of the Land

Within Pg's picture of the ancestors, the unfolding of the promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan (Gen 17:8) is found in seminal form in Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah as a burial plot for Sarah, which then becomes the burial place for all the patriarchs and matriarchs (except Rachel) of the covenant line (23:19–20; 25:9–10; 49:29–32; 50:13). Therefore, whereas in life the ancestors of the covenant line

---

43. More can be said concerning the identity of the nation as an aspect of the unfolding of the promise of descendants, but this will be taken up in the discussion of all three promises in §5.1.2.4, below.

are resident aliens (גר) in the rest of the land, in death they possess that small piece of the land of Canaan that they own as a burial plot. Whether this is expressed in terms of a symbolic fulfillment of the land promise, or its fulfillment “in nuce,”<sup>44</sup> or as a concrete guarantee<sup>45</sup> that gives their descendants the right to possess the land,<sup>46</sup> this is proleptic of the future unfolding of the land promise in terms of everlasting possession of the whole land of Canaan by the nation Israel. As such, therefore, it is visionary and future-directed.

The promise of the land proleptically fulfilled in a small piece of the land for the ancestors, then, looks forward toward its further unfolding along the trajectory of the nation: after Israel fills the wrong land, the land of Egypt (Exod 1:7), the land promise is restated with emphasis in Exod 6:4, 8, where it is highlighted as central to the Abrahamic covenant, and it unfolds by means of itineraries from Egypt to Elim to Sin to Sinai to Paran to Zin to Mount Hor to the plains of Moab (Exod 15:22\*, 27; 16:1; 19:1, 2a; Num 10:12\*; 20:1\*, 22b), that is, east toward the land of Canaan and up to its edge. As part of the paradigmatic scenarios of the nation, indeed as part of the means by which these scenarios are linked into one complex paradigm of the nation, they reflect not only past tradition, but at every point, like the paradigmatic scenarios themselves in incorporating all time past, present, and future, are at one and the same time future-directed and visionary. The paradigmatic scenario in Exod 7–14\* represents the first stage of the unfolding of the land promise in the nation’s liberation from the land of the oppressive nation, which YHWH destroys, effected through the celebration of the Passover ritual at any time and through time. Further, the land promise continues to unfold within the second paradigmatic scenario in Exod 16–Num 27\* with the setting up of the tabernacle and its personnel as situated in its paradigmatic narrative frame, which, as a whole, though rooted in the past, is also a future vision.

Moreover, the trajectory of the unfolding of the land promise is itself visionary, not only because it is an intrinsic part of the complex paradigmatic picture of the nation, but in proceeding from the past (of the ancestors) and being forward-looking at every point to a conclusion that is open-ended. The paradigmatic picture of the nation concludes with the Mosaic generation dying outside the land as they wished because they reject in no

---

44. McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 119, 142–43.

45. Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 196.

46. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 122.

uncertain terms the promised land, in slandering the land and refusing to believe the assertion by Joshua and Caleb that the land is exceedingly good (Num 13:32; 14:1a, 7, 10a, 36–37) and in rejecting the exodus and all that has occurred in the wilderness thus far (Num 14:2–3), that is, the paradigmatic scenarios of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16\*; 24–29\*; 39–40\*, which are portrayed as stages in the unfolding of the land promise.<sup>47</sup> There is only a glimmer of hope with Moses glimpsing the land and with the vesting of Aaron's son Eleazar as the high priestly leader into the future, though still outside the land. The fulfillment of the everlasting promise of the land is not yet and, though partially unfolded, has never been fully realized and remains a future vision or hope. In addition, as pictured as unfolding within Pg's complex paradigmatic picture along its trajectory of paradigmatic scenarios, the implication is that the full realization of the land promise, as everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, will only occur when all aspects of the visionary paradigmatic scenarios and the whole complex paradigmatic picture of the nation are fully realized, including the full unfolding in their various ways of the other covenant promises of descendants and, and significantly to be their God.<sup>48</sup>

This brings us, then, to the final covenant promise, the promise to be their God.

---

47. Or, in the case of Moses and Aaron, they disobey YHWH and do not witness to him before the people.

48. The impact of this promissory vision of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan on Pg's exilic audience will be taken up in ch. 6. Suffice to flag at this point; for Pg's exilic audience, with their traditions of life lived in the land in the past, Pg's specific formulation of *everlasting* possession of the land of Canaan also places the fulfillment of this promise in the future, as a vision and hope for the future, given their specific situation. Though, like the ancestors, they have tasted life in the land, this was not the full fulfillment of everlasting possession of the land since it was temporary. Just as their traditions stemming from the past and passed on when they lived in the land, such as, e.g., their liberation from Egypt, their temple and tent of meeting traditions, royal traditions especially with regard to clothing, in being reshaped and synthesized with unique and programmatic elements into a vision of the future in Pg's paradigmatic scenarios in Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\*, or the complex paradigmatic picture as a whole in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*, become part of the whole future vision and a partial echo or glimpse of what is yet to be, so also in relation to the trajectory of the land promise, their life in the land in the past for a temporary period is but a partial glimpse of the full reality of the fulfillment of the promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan.

### 5.1.2.3. The Promise to Be Their God

Although the promise to be their God is not explicitly referred to again in the ancestral material after Gen 17:7–8, its unfolding infiltrates the whole of the paradigmatic picture of the nation, and each of its scenarios, introduced by the reference to it in covenant form in Exod 6:7. As unfolded throughout the paradigmatic scenarios of the story of the nation and its complex paradigm as a whole, as being timeless or incorporated all time, reshaping past traditions into visions of the future, the promise to be their God is, while reflecting past traditions, always at every point visionary.

Within Exod 7–14\*, introduced by 6:6–7, the promise to be their God is unfolded in terms of YHWH as the cosmic creator who is in complete control of his creation and the nations and in relation to whom the divine powers of other nations are powerless and rendered as nothing. As such, YHWH destroys, or reverses creation in relation to Egypt, its land, people, and Pharaoh and exercises judgment on their gods (including the divinely endowed Pharaoh), thereby delivering and creating his nation Israel. Thereby the Egyptians, and implicitly the Israelites (see 6:7) come to the knowledge of YHWH (“I am YHWH,” 14:4, 18). As a paradigmatic scenario that reshapes earlier traditions with unique elements to present a timeless vision, this unfolding of the promise to be their God has echoes in the past but at one and the same time is future-directed and visionary. As such, and given that the picture is cosmic in its dimensions, YHWH as cosmic creator will destroy any nation and its divine powers that oppresses his covenantal people in order to liberate them through time, and this is effected through Israel’s celebration of the Passover rite. Thereby, the Israelite nation has through its past traditions glimpsed YHWH’s liberating action, which goes hand in hand with the destruction of their oppressors (Egypt) in their earlier traditions and Passover celebrations, but this is only a partial glimpse and is yet to be fully embodied in the future. For Pg’s exilic audience with its inherited exodus and Passover traditions and as an oppressed people in Babylon, this paradigmatic scenario points to their liberation and the destruction of the oppressing foreign nation, Babylon, in whose land they are now residing (and potentially any similar situation in which the Israelites might find themselves) as a future hope through the celebration of the Passover as prescribed. This is the vision of how YHWH as cosmic creator is to be their God.

In the paradigmatic scenario of Exod 16–Num 27\*, the way in which the promise to be their God is unfolded is quite complex. The primary way

in which this is unfolded is in terms of the presence of YHWH by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel, and in particular its high priest. In this picture, YHWH dwells (שכן) in the midst of the Israelites, which is the whole purpose of his liberating them from Egypt and by which they will come to the knowledge of YHWH (“I am YHWH”), by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting (Exod 29:45–46; 25:8). YHWH also meets (יעד) with the Israelites at the tent of meeting (29:43) and with Moses within the most holy place (25:22). Moreover, the figure of the high priest mediates between YHWH and the people, as symbolized in his clothing—the stones of the ephod and the breastpiece inscribed with the twelve tribes to bring the nation into remembrance before YHWH in the holy place and the flower on his turban inscribed with “holy to YHWH” therefore signifying the high priest’s representation of YHWH to the people. As such, the tabernacle/tent of meeting and the high priest, who clearly is part and parcel of the tabernacle/tent of meeting since his clothing matches the graded holiness of its materials, are the means by which YHWH is present in the midst of the people. The presence of YHWH, symbolized in particular by “the glory of YHWH” (כבוד יהוה), that fills the tabernacle (40:34), seems to be a permanent presence in the midst of the people that moves along with the mobile tabernacle as the people journey through space and time. At the same time, the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה) manifests itself at particular times to the Israelites on specific occasions, that is, when the people are complaining, with a YHWH speech that effects either sustenance and nurturing (Exod 16\*, the provision of bread by which they come to the knowledge of YHWH [“I am YHWH”]; Num 20:6–7, 8\*, 11b, the provision of water) or judgment (Num 14:10b, 26–37\*; and see Num 20:12). All these aspects are part of Pg’s paradigmatic picture in Exod 16–Num 27\*. As such, though rooted in the past, since Pg has reshaped many earlier traditions (such as temple and tent of meeting traditions, royal and earlier priestly traditions, traditions of divine presence and its imagery, stories of complaining in the wilderness and rebellion at the edge of the land; see §4.2), the picture is visionary in nature, since as paradigmatic in nature in the various ways spelled out in chapter 4,<sup>49</sup> it has a timeless quality that incorporates all time, past, present, and future.

The promise to be their God through the continuous dwelling of God in their midst, and guiding and directing them through specific meetings,

---

49. See §4.2, and especially §4.2.1, above.



by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood, though echoing past traditions, will be fully realized in a positive sense only when the whole picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and the high priest and his vestments, comprising these earlier traditions reshaped with unique and programmatic elements into a future vision, has been brought into existence. What is more, how this promise to be their God is unfolded in the future, whether in terms of nurturing or judgment, depends on how the people respond to this timeless vision, particularly as it is unfolded in Exod 16\*, 24–29\*; 39–40\*. The typically complaining Israelites will be nurtured by YHWH if their complaints arise from a genuine need or ignorance (Exod 16\*; Num 20:2–12\*). However, if their complaining comprises the very rejection of the unfolding of the covenant promise to be their God, as pictured in Num 13–14\*, the presence of YHWH (the glory of YHWH) will bring judgment. For in Num 13–14\*, the Israelites, in wishing they had died in Egypt or the wilderness (14:2), wanting to go back to Egypt (14:3c), and doubting YHWH's ability to destroy foreign nations (14:3ab; see 14:9\*, 10a), reject all that has unfolded in the paradigmatic pictures to this point, in Exod 7–14\* and 16–40\*: they reject the exodus itself and who YHWH has shown himself to be as cosmic creator God who destroys oppressive foreign nations and creates the nation Israel (Exod 7–14\*), and they reject YHWH's nurturing presence (Exod 16\*) and the whole paradigmatic picture set at Sinai (Exod 24–29\*; 39–40\*) of YHWH dwelling in their midst, signified explicitly in their rejection of the assertion that YHWH is with them (Num 14:9, 10a; see 14:3) and in their portrayal as meeting against (יַעַד עַל) YHWH (Num 14:35) in a play on YHWH meeting with (יַעַד לְ) them in Exod 29:43. Accordingly, the presence of YHWH brings judgment and death for them (Num 14:10b, 28–37\*). As for the leaders of the nation, symbolized in Moses and Aaron, if they do not witness to YHWH, who is unfolding the promise to be their God, and show his holiness, or mediate his presence, to the people, by seeking to usurp YHWH's place, YHWH will depose them as leaders (Num 20:2–12\*). However, hope lies in the vesting of Aaron's son as future high priest who, through his very vestments, will mediate the presence of YHWH to the people, and the people to YHWH, if he is obedient and does not work against the unfolding of the promise to be their God by seeking to usurp YHWH's place as Moses and Aaron did. Therefore how the promise to be their God unfolds in the future depends on whether the people (and their leaders) embrace the paradigmatic vision of the unfolding of the promise to be their God unfolded in the paradigmatic scenarios of the nation in



Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–40\* or reject it; in the case of the former this will bring life, in the case of the latter judgment will occur in the form of death and destruction, at least for that generation.

Indeed, at the end of Pg's trajectory the people (and the leaders) not only reject the paradigmatic scenarios and how they unfold the promise to be their God but, in rejecting these scenarios and the promised land itself (Num 13:32; 14:1a, 2–3, 7, 10a, 36–37), they reject the unfolding of the promise of the land, the fulfillment of which remains as a future hope for a future generation of descendants. This brings us then, by way of summary, to the paradigmatic nature of the trajectory of all three covenantal promises.

#### 5.1.2.4. Conclusion: All Three Promises

It has been argued that the historiographic contingent sequence of the trajectory of the statement of the covenant promises and their unfolding is at one and the same time paradigmatic. It is paradigmatic in the sense of reaching into the past and reflecting reshaped earlier traditions that at every point along the trajectory is also future-looking and visionary by virtue of the forward movement of the trajectory whose conclusion is open-ended and looks forward to future fulfillment; and as comprising the paradigmatic scenarios of the nation in particular, through which the promises are unfolded, which by virtue of being paradigmatic are in a sense timeless, incorporating all time, past, present, and future, and therefore, though echoing the past in the reshaped traditions of which they are composed, are at the same time oriented to the future. This has been demonstrated in relation to each of the promises individually, which at every point, though rooted in the past, are at every point visionary.

The way in which all three promises—of descendants, everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, and to be their God—as they interplay with each other along Pg's historiographical trajectory, are paradigmatic is as follows.

Within the picture of the ancestral era as rooted in the past, over and above stating to Abraham and Jacob in particular the covenant and its promises, which as promissory are intrinsically future oriented, the promises of descendants and land begin to unfold: the promise of descendants unfolds through the generations from Abraham to the sons of Jacob, and as listed by name in relation to the double reference of Israel to Jacob and the nation in Exod 1:1–5, 7, contain a seminal vision of the twelve tribes

of Israel; and the initial unfolding of the land promise is symbolized in the ownership of a small piece of the land of Canaan, the cave of Machpelah as the burial place of the patriarchs and matriarchs.

Most significantly, within the paradigmatic scenarios of the story of the nation, and the complex paradigm as a whole, introduced by Exod 6:2–8, the unfolding of the promises, comprising reshaped traditions combined with unique and programmatic elements into a vision or visions, interplay with each other as follows.

Rooted in the past and in past traditions, the paradigmatic picture of Exod 7–14\* envisions in the future the partial unfolding of the land promise through YHWH's demonstration of who he is ("I am YHWH") and therefore the partial unfolding of the promise to be God, as the cosmic creator who controls the elements of nature and the nations, destroying oppressive nations and rendering their gods as nothing, and liberating the Israelites who are thereby initially created as a nation as the partial unfolding of the promise of descendants.

Also rooted in, and comprising, past traditions (albeit reshaped), the paradigmatic picture of Exod 16–Num 27\*, and especially Exod 16–40\*, envisions in the future the further unfolding of the land promise through the itineraries moving east toward and up to the edge of the land of Canaan, through the unfolding of the promise to be their God who shows himself to be YHWH ("I am YHWH") who nurtures them on the journey through space and time and shows them the means for his dwelling in their midst through the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel. Though rooted in (reshaped) earlier traditions, when this is embodied in the future, YHWH will dwell permanently in the midst of the people and journey along with them through space and time, meeting with them on specific occasions in relation to particular situations. Thereby the promise of descendants will unfold further in terms of the identity of the nation, as those in whose midst is the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood, through which YHWH is present to them, as defined in visionary terms as twelve tribes, and indeed through them to his whole creation.<sup>50</sup>

---

50. On the twelve tribes, see the stones of the ephod and breastpiece, vestments of the high priest, inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes. Further, since the tabernacle/tent of meeting is in a sense the completion of God's creation (Gen 1:1–2:3), albeit in the postflood world; see §2.2.4, above.

Finally, all three promises, though rooted in past tradition, are consistently visionary, not only because each point on the trajectory is forward-looking and by virtue of their unfolding by means of the paradigmatic scenarios, but in particular because the conclusion of the trajectory is open-ended and looks to the future for fulfillment. In Num 13–14, in rejecting the promised land, and therefore the whole vision of the land promise, and indeed the whole of the paradigmatic unfolding of the story of the nation in Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–40\* with the future they envision with YHWH as their God, the consequence is that YHWH as their God brings judgment and they die outside the land. In Num 20:2–12\*, Moses and Aaron in rejecting the unfolding of the promise to be their God (by seeking to usurp his place and not being true to this promise before the people) are also judged by YHWH and will die outside the land. Hence the promises of the land and descendants, particularly as it relates to their identity as a nation envisioned in Exod 1–40\*, are unfulfilled, as is the promise to be their God as unfolded in a positive sense in Exod 1–40\*, and these look to the future for their fulfillment in relation to a future generation. Pg's trajectory, in line with this, concludes with a glimmer of hope, with the vesting of Aaron's son (Num 20:23a, 25–29) and therefore the further unfolding of the promise to be their God in a future generation, and Moses's glimpse of the land (Num 27:12–14) that looks toward its eventual possession in a future generation. Therefore the total fulfillment of all three promises, of descendants, land, and to be their God is future-oriented and visionary, an as yet unrealized hope, not only throughout the trajectory, including its paradigmatic scenarios, but right up to and including its very end.

In these ways, Pg's trajectory that is concerned with the covenantal promises throughout Gen 11:27–Num 27:14\* is both historiographic and paradigmatic.

However, as outlined in §2.2.1, the backdrop to Gen 11:27–Num 27:14\* is found in the cosmic picture of Gen 1–9\* and the transition from this to the story of the nation with its backdrop in the ancestral material in Gen 10:1–11:26\*. This also constitutes part of Pg's trajectory (see §2.2.2). However, Gen 1–9\* also forms a parallel pattern with the story of the nation in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\* (see §2.2.3). To the historiographic and paradigmatic nature of Gen 1–9\*; 10:1–11:26\* we will now turn.

5.2. THE HISTORIOGRAPHIC AND PARADIGMATIC NATURE OF THE  
COSMIC BACKDROP IN GENESIS 1–9\* AND THE TRANSITION FROM  
THE WORLD TO ABRAHAM IN GENESIS 10:1–11:26\*

We will begin by exploring briefly the way in which Pg has reshaped earlier non-P traditions into its own unique patterns and overall picture in Gen 1–9\* and 10:1–11:26\*.<sup>51</sup>

5.2.1. Pg's Picture in Genesis 1:1–11:26\*

Pg follows in broad outline the sequence in the non-P material of a creation account (Gen 1:1–2:3 [Pg]; Gen 2:4b–3:24 [non-P]), a flood story (6:9–9:17\* [Pg]; 6:5–8:22\* [non-P]) preceded by a genealogy effectively from 'ādām/Adam to Noah (5:1–28, 30–32 [Pg]; 4; 5:29 [non-P]), a table of nations after the flood and a genealogy from Shem to Abram (10:1–7, 20, 22–23, 31–32; 11:10–26 [Pg]; 9:18–19; 10:8–19, 21, 24–30; 11:28–30 [non-P]).<sup>52</sup> Pg, however, presents a much more highly structured picture that contains repeated patterns.

Taking each of these in turn, Pg's creation account is in many ways quite different from the non-P account in Gen 2:4b–3:24. However, there is enough in common to tentatively suggest that Pg has, at least to a small extent, drawn on the non-P account and in places sought to correct it, as has been argued by Carr.<sup>53</sup> They begin in a similar way referring to God/YHWH God creating/making the heavens and earth (or vice versa) (1:1 [Pg]; 2:4b [non-P]); they both refer to the gift of plants (1:11–12, 29–30 [Pg]; 2:8, 16–17 [non-P]); the origin of animals by divine initiative from the earth (1:24–25 [Pg]; 2:19 [non-P]); and the divine creation of humans of both sexes (1:27 [Pg]; 2:7, 21–22 [non-P]).<sup>54</sup> There are many

---

51. I am assuming here that the non-P material in Gen 1–11\* is earlier than the Pg material in Gen 1–11\*; see §1.2.3, above. Much has been written on Gen 1–11, and since our primary focus is the story of the nation in Exod 1:13–Num 27:14\*, the discussion here will be very brief and by no means exhaustive, and will seek only to highlight some of the major features. In this discussion I will draw to a certain extent on Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 41–77.

52. Although it would seem that much of the non-P material regarding the table of nations and in particular the genealogy of Shem has been omitted in favor of Pg; see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 13.

53. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 63–67.

54. See the chart, *ibid.*, 63.

differences,<sup>55</sup> but the most notable are: Pg's highly structured and repetitious pattern of seven days in comparison with the unfolding plot of the non-P account; the different images of God in the two accounts, with Pg's cosmic and transcendent God whose word is automatically effective standing in contrast to non-P's anthropomorphic images of a God who can fail as well as succeed (Gen 2:18–23); and the picture of humanity, portrayed in Pg as created from above in God's image and likeness and as such divinely blessed (1:27–28) in contrast to the non-P account where the human attempt to be more God-like is seen as problematic and results in a divine curse and expulsion from the garden (3:5, 14–19, 22–24).<sup>56</sup> If Pg drew on Gen 2:4b–3:24, it has reshaped it in these ways quite radically.

But Gen 2:4b–3:24 is not the only tradition that Pg might have reshaped. Pg's account in Gen 1:1–2:3, as is well recognized, also dialogues with, and reshapes, ancient Near Eastern traditions, such as the Babylonian Enuma Elish, of creation as a result of conflict between a god and cosmic opposing divine forces imaged as the sea/sea monsters where after victory the god reconfigures the waters into creation.<sup>57</sup> Pg alludes to this tradition in Gen 1:2 in its references to the “deep” (תהום), that echoes Tiamat in Enuma Elish, to the wind of God which can be seen to allude to the motif of Marduk summoning the wind to fight Tiamat, and to the darkness that echoes the darkness prior to creation in the Mesopotamian creation accounts.<sup>58</sup> Pg has reshaped this tradition in that in Gen 1:1–2:3 there is no conflict or violence as in Enuma Elish where Marduk kills Tiamat (symbolizing the primeval waters) and splits her body in two. Although, as often commented, the cosmology of the separation of the waters is similar, the waters in Gen 1:1–2:3 are not an opposing force and offer no resistance to God, but simply become part of God's good order, with the sea monsters, as creatures only, brought forth from these waters pronounced by God as good (Gen 1:21). Instead, Pg substitutes divine speech (possibly related to the divine wind in Gen 1:2) for divine conflict.<sup>59</sup>

---

55. E.g., the order in which animals and humans (including the woman) are created.

56. See Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 66.

57. This is then followed by the setting up of the god's temple in the newly created world; see Mark Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010), 8, 16–18.

58. See *ibid.*, 53, 54, 69.

59. See *ibid.*, 53–54, 60–61, 69, 108; William Brown, *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The*

Pg, then, in its creation account in Gen 1:1–2:3 has reshaped 2:4b–3:24 and the ancient Near Eastern tradition to give its unique picture, which is highly structured into a repetitive pattern of seven days in which God is portrayed as the transcendent cosmic creator who creates in an orderly manner by divine speech which automatically unfolds, with humankind, male and female created in the image and likeness of God and blessed by God.

Pg's flood account in Gen 6:9–9:17\* follows quite closely the non-P flood story in Gen 6:5–8:22\*<sup>60</sup> in that in both:

- ♦ God/YHWH sees the problem (the earth as corrupted by violence of all flesh, Gen 6:11–12 [Pg]; the wickedness of humankind, 6:5 [non-P]).
- ♦ Noah is a positive figure (Gen 6:9 [Pg]; 6:8, and see 7:1 [non-P]).
- ♦ God/YHWH announces his intention to kill all living creatures with a flood, gives instructions concerning who (Noah and family) and what (for Pg two of every species, for non-P seven pairs of clean animals and one pair of unclean animals) is to go into the ark, and Noah's obedience is noted (Gen 6:13–22 [Pg]; 7:1–5 [non-P]).
- ♦ There is the coming of the flood and the entrance into the ark (Gen 7:6, 11, 12–16a [Pg]; 7:7, 10, 12, 16b [non-P]).
- ♦ The waters multiply and rise and the ark rises with them (Gen 7:18–20 [Pg]; 7:17 [non-P]).
- ♦ All life dies, including humans (Gen 7:21 [Pg]; 7:22–23 [non-P]; [except Noah and those with him in the ark]).
- ♦ The cause of the flood ceases (Gen 8:2a [Pg]; 8:2b [non-P]).
- ♦ The waters gradually recede (Gen 8:3b–5 [Pg]; 8:6–12 [non-P]).
- ♦ The ground is dry (Gen 8:14 [Pg]; 8:13b [non-P]).
- ♦ There is a concluding promise never to destroy all living things with a flood (Gen 9:8–17 [Pg]; 8:21–22 [non-P]).<sup>61</sup>

---

*Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1999), 40–42, 45–46, 125, 129.

60. Pg's account in Gen 6:9–9:17 comprises basically 6:9–22; 7:6, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; 8:1, 2a, 3b–5, 13a, 14–19; 9:1–17; see Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17. Non-P's account in Gen 6:5–8:22 comprises basically Gen 6:5, 6, 7\*, 8; 7:1, 2, 3b, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 16b, 17b, 22, 23a,b; 8:2b, 3a, 6–12, 13b, 20–22; see *ibid.*, 28.

61. See the chart of parallels in Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 52–53.

Clearly, given these common elements and, for the most part, their similar order, Pg draws on the earlier non-P account,<sup>62</sup> but Pg has reshaped the earlier tradition most significantly in the following ways.<sup>63</sup>

Pg's flood is on a larger scale than in non-P's account. In the non-P tradition, the flood is a rainstorm in which the flood lasts forty days (Gen 7:4, 10, 17; 8:6) and the process of drying lasts for fourteen days (8:6, 10, 12).<sup>64</sup> However, in Pg the flood is pictured as the reversal of creation as pictured in Gen 1:1–2:3, with the fountains of the deep bursting forth and the windows of the heavens being opened, therefore signifying the coming together of the waters that were divided in the act of creation in 1:6–10. It lasts 150 days (7:11, 24; 8:3b–4), and the drying-out process occurs over a period of months (8:4b, 5, 13, 14).<sup>65</sup> Therefore, although non-P's account can be said to be a reversal of creation in that all living things die, Pg makes this even more explicit and portrays it on a grander scale.

Indeed, Pg's account emphasizes more explicitly the implications of the flood and the way it plays out for the whole of creation. The non-P account is more human centered, whereas Pg centers emphatically on the whole creation, all flesh and the earth itself (see Gen 6:13). In the non-P account, although all living things are blotted out, it is the wickedness of humans and the evil inclinations of their hearts that is the reason for the flood (6:5–7); and when this tradition does focus on the animals, for example, in stipulating that seven pairs of clean animals and one pair each of unclean animals are to be taken into the ark (7:2–3), it is primarily in preparation for the sacrifice after the flood in Gen 8:20.<sup>66</sup> In Pg, however, it is the corruption of the earth that God sees,<sup>67</sup> through the violence of all flesh, that is the cause of the flood (6:11–12), and Pg emphasizes, through repetition, the pairs of each species, described in some detail,<sup>68</sup> rescued in the ark (6:19–20; 7:13–16; 8:17, 19) (as well as the death of those outside

---

62. And both are quite close also to ancient Near Eastern flood stories, in particular tablet XI of the *Gilgamesh* epic.

63. There are, of course, many differences in details and terminology (see Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 52–55), but I will only outline the major differences here.

64. *Ibid.*, 56.

65. *Ibid.*

66. *Ibid.*, 59.

67. Gen 6:12, which is set in deliberate contrast to Gen 1:10 where God sees that the earth is good (and see also Gen 1:31).

68. Using terminology akin to Gen 1:21, 24, 30.



the ark in detail [7:21]) for their own sake, since Pg has no sacrifice at the end of the flood.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, although the accounts in non-P and Pg have in common the divine promise at the end that the earth will never again be destroyed/cursed, nor all creatures destroyed by a flood (9:11, 15–16 [Pg]; 8:21–22 [non-P]), the non-P account still tends to focus on humans, linking this promise with the evil inclinations of the human heart (8:21), whereas in Pg God's (covenantal) promise is established not just with Noah and his descendants but with every living creature, repeatedly emphasized and described in detail (9:9–10, 12, 15, 16), therefore focusing very much on the whole creation.

Pg's specific concerns, over and above its wish to emphasize the flood as a catastrophe on a grand scale, the explicit reversal of the cosmic creation in Gen 1:1–2:3, and its implications for the whole of creation, not just humans, can be seen clearly in the elements that are unique to Pg within its account in Gen 6:9–9:17\*. The major elements unique to Pg are as follows.<sup>70</sup>

First, the turning point, and the reason for the cessation or reversal of the flood (see Gen 8:2a, where the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven are closed therefore signifying the separation of the waters above and below once more), is when God remembers (זָכַר) Noah and all the animals with him in the ark (8:1a).

Second, the wind (רוּחַ) God makes blow over the earth (Gen 8:1a) is the beginning of the end of the flood, and most significantly is the beginning of the new creation, as the wind (רוּחַ) of God hovered over the waters of the deep at the beginning of creation in Gen 1:2.

Third, after the earth has dried God tells Noah to go out of the ark with his family and bring out all the living creatures with them so that they may abound and be fruitful (פָּרָה) and multiply (רָבָה) on the earth (Gen 8:15–17), which accordingly happens (8:18–19). In echoing the terminology of פָּרָה and רָבָה in Gen 1:22, 28, this signifies God's intention with regard to the fertility of all creatures in the new postflood creation.

Fourth, God blesses Noah and his sons and tells them to be fruitful (פָּרָה) and multiply (רָבָה) and fill/abound on the earth (Gen 9:1, 7), that is, the earth of the new creation, as was commanded in Gen 1:28.

---

69. In Pg, there can be no sacrifices before Sinai.

70. Other unique elements are: God's detailed instructions for the building of the ark (Gen 6:14–16); the chronological notices citing years, months, and days regarding Noah's age and for the stages of the flood (7:6, 11; 8:5, 13a, 14); and the exact measurement for the height of the flood waters (7:20).

However, in comparison with the picture of creation in 1:1–2:3, this new creation is violent, even though that violence is to a certain extent structured and limited (9:4–6) and there is a reference back to humankind as made in the image of God, as in Gen 1:27. Although there is no command to subdue the earth, as in 1:28, and no explicit reference to humankind having dominion over all creatures, as in 1:26, 28, in this new creation the relationship between humans and creatures is certainly hierarchical and far more negative: in the new creation, using holy war terminology, the creatures are in fear and dread of humans into whose hand they are delivered (9:2), and all creatures, as well as plants, are now food for humans, in contrast to Gen 1:29–30, where both humans and creatures are vegetarian.

Finally, Pg has transformed the divine promise never to curse the earth and its creatures in a flood into God's establishment of an everlasting covenant with Noah (already flagged in Gen 6:18), his descendants and all future generations and all living creatures, remembered (זָכַר) by God through his bow, never to destroy all flesh and the earth in a flood (9:8–17). In Pg's picture, the stability and permanence of the new creation is guaranteed through this covenant.

In sum, Pg's specific picture of the flood and its implications is one which focuses on the whole creation, humans and all the creatures as well as the earth. The flood is the explicit reversal of the good creation in Gen 1:1–2:3, and the reversal of this flood results in a new creation. This new creation comes about by God remembering Noah and the creatures in the ark and is initiated by God's wind. As in the original creation in 1:1–2:3, both humans and creatures are to multiply on the earth. But this new creation is inferior to the original creation judged by God to be very good (1:31). It is inherently violent, with humans at war with the creatures who have now become their prey. The stability and permanence of this new creation is guaranteed by God through the establishment of his everlasting covenant with Noah and all creatures.

Pg's creation account in Gen 1:1–2:3 is linked with its reversal of creation and the emergence of a new creation in Gen 6–9\* by a highly structured genealogy that extends from 'ādām/Adam to Noah and his sons (5:1–28, 30–32; see 6:9; 9:28–29). Whether or not Pg might have drawn on the non-P genealogy in Gen 4 (especially 4:17–22) or has incorporated a source (the “book/scroll [סֵפֶר] of the *toledoth* of Adam”),<sup>71</sup> in formulating

71. Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 68, 71, 72) argues for this latter view,

Gen 5:1–28, 30–32, what stands out in Pg’s picture is the following: there is a repetitive pattern extending through ten generations from Adam to Noah whereby the age of the person is given when his first son was born, followed by how long he then lived and a note that he had other sons and daughters, concluding with the total years of his life and a notice of his death (5:3–27, 30–32; with this pattern, begun in 5:32 in relation to Noah, concluded effectively in 9:28–29<sup>72</sup>).<sup>73</sup> Also striking, and unique to Pg, is the way in which Pg has explicitly connected this genealogy to the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:3 in 5:1–3. This is accomplished by referring back in the same wording in 5:1b, 2abα to the creation of humankind (אדם) in God’s likeness (דמות) as male and female (זכר ונקבה) and his blessing them in 1:26–28; and equating the “humankind” (אדם) as created by God (5:2bβ) with “Adam” (אדם) as a person who fathers a son, Seth, according to his likeness (דמות) and image (צלם). Thereby the unfolding of the descendants of Adam in the genealogy is portrayed as the unfolding of God’s blessing in Gen 1:28, which involves being fruitful and multiplying. Pg’s distinctive emphasis of the unfolding of blessing here suggests that Pg has formulated Gen 5:1b, 2, 3b at least, as an introduction to the genealogy, as a deliberate contrast to the non-P genealogy of Gen 4, that has been expanded with the story of Cain (4:1–16) and Lamech’s poem (4:23–24), where with the unfolding of the generations and the unfolding of civilization there is a spread in violence (see especially, 4:1–16).<sup>74</sup>

---

and this is quite possible given that Pg’s genealogy is quite different from that in Gen 4 in terms of its tightly structured pattern. However, there is a commonality between the two in many of the names, albeit in a different order.

72. Although the flood is substituted for the birth of the son in Gen 9:28.

73. Pg here (or the source it may have incorporated) reflects ancient Near Eastern tradition such as the Sumerian King List, where the outline of the generations before the flood is linear and also names only one member of each generation which are ten in number: see Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 72.

74. This movement away from the connection of the genealogy with violence in Gen 4 to portraying the genealogy in terms of blessing on the part of Pg, if Pg is drawing in any way on the non-P account in Gen 4, may also be signified in that in Pg Adam’s descendants are listed as through the line of Seth (see Gen 4:25–26), with no reference to Cain. In general, Pg in one sense plays down motifs of violence and dislocation found repeatedly throughout the non-P material in Gen 2–11\*, omitting any reference to motifs in Gen 3, Cain’s murdering of Abel, and the tower of Babel. However, as we have seen, Pg does incorporate the motif of violence (and corruption) as the cause of the flood, the very reversal of creation (Gen 6:11–12, 13), and the new

Pg's table of nations, introduced as the *toledoth* of Noah's sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth, in Gen 10\* signifies, as in the non-P material in Gen 10\*, the spread of humanity, and the lands with which they are associated, postflood.<sup>75</sup> In Pg this explicitly represents the unfolding of God's blessing in the new creation in Gen 9:1, 7, to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth.

Finally, to Pg's linear genealogy extending through ten generations from Shem to Abram in Gen 11:10–26 there is no equivalent in the non-P tradition, although whether or not a parallel account once existed and was omitted in favor of Pg's genealogy can no longer be ascertained. Be that as it may, and whether or not Pg has incorporated a source or created the genealogy in Gen 11:10–26,<sup>76</sup> the emphasis in Pg in this genealogy, as an outgrowth of Gen 10\*, is on ten generations of descendants from Shem to Abram, mirroring in similar form the ten generations from Adam to Noah before the flood. Genesis 11:10–27 therefore, in Pg's picture, as one line arising from the spread of nations on the earth in the new creation represents, as does Gen 10\*, the unfolding of the God's blessing in Gen 9:1, 7 within the new creation. It forms a bridge between humanity in general and Abram, ancestor of Israel, with whom God's covenant with its promises, including that of descendants as a further unfolding of the blessing, is established (Gen 17).

Pg's genealogies in Gen 5:1–28, 30–31; 9:28; 10\*; and 11:10–27 represent the spread of blessing, given initially in the original creation (1:28) and unfolded in Gen 5\*, and repeated in the new creation in 9:1, 7 where it is unfolded in Gen 10\*; 11:10–27 as a backdrop to the ancestral material and in particular the Abrahamic covenant with its promise of descendants (esp. 17:2, 4–6).

In sum, Pg's picture in Gen 1:1–11:26\* is cosmic in scope, concerned with the whole of creation and its creatures, and narrowing down then to the specific ancestor of Israel. The initial unfolding of the blessing of

---

creation is portrayed as inherently violent, particularly with regard to the relationship between humans and creatures (Gen 9:1–7).

75. Pg's table of nations includes Gen 10:1a, 2–7, 20, 22, 23, 31, 32; I am following Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17 here. The non-P table is Gen 10:8–19, 21, 25–30; see *ibid.*, 28.

76. Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 72 n. 47, 74) argues against the view that a *toledoth* book underlies Gen 11:10–26, maintaining that P formulated Gen 11:10–26 on the pattern of Gen 5 but without the total age and death notice of each figure.

humanity in the original creation spans ten generations. The reversal of the original good creation in the flood is caused by the violence of all flesh that corrupts the earth. The new creation postflood, the result of God's remembering and initiative, is inferior to the original creation and intrinsically violent, though this violence is somewhat limited, and its stability and permanence is guaranteed by God's covenant with Noah and all creatures. The outworking of the blessing, restated in this new creation, proceeds in the populating of the earth by Noah's sons' descendants, and then the narrowing from cosmic and universal dimensions to the specific line through ten generations from Shem to Abram.

#### 5.2.2. The Historiographic and Paradigmatic Nature of Genesis 1:1–11:26\*

The paradigmatic nature of the historiographical trajectory of Gen 1:1–11:26\* is seen partly in that, as set symbolically at the beginning of time, its contingent sequence unfolds its reshaped traditions such that at each point it looks forward, albeit with a reversal in the middle, up to the figure of Abram and therefore ultimately to the Abrahamic covenant and its promises, whose trajectory in turn, as we have seen, is also paradigmatic in that at every point, though rooted in the past and comprising reshaped tradition, right through to the open-ended conclusion, there is a forward-looking vision. The forward movement of Gen 1:1–11:26\* results in setting the trajectory of the story of the nation and its ancestors in the new, and inferior, creation of the postflood world. This forward movement or visionary quality is seen particularly in the way in which it presents, within a cosmic and universal context, the seminal beginnings of what will become the Abrahamic covenant promises, unfolded in an open-ended and visionary way in the paradigmatic story of the nation.

The forward and continuous movement of the genealogies that unfold the blessing of humanity in the initial cosmic creation (Gen 5\*; see 1:28) and then in the new creation (11:10–26; see 9:1, 7; and 8:16–17),<sup>77</sup> looks toward the Abrahamic covenant promise of descendants (Gen 17:2, 4–6, and esp. 17:2 and 6 where *רבה* and *פרה* are used respectively). This promise then unfolds, as the continuation of the unfolding of divine blessing,

---

77. Note that this has a similar genealogical structure that denotes continuity after the reversal of the creation and the emergence of a new order.

in a continually forward-looking and visionary way. This occurs initially in the generation of Isaac, whom God blesses (25:11a), and Jacob, whom God blesses (35:9), and then in the multiplying of Jacob/Israel's sons into the nation Israel (Exod 1:7, which indeed reflects the terminology of Gen 1:28; 9:1, 7 of רבה and פרה). It then proceeds forward in the complex paradigmatic picture of the story of the nation with its open-ended future.

The earth of the new creation becomes filled with the descendants of the sons of Noah in their various lands (Gen 10\*), with Abram, the descendant of Shem (Gen 11:10–26), given the covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan for his descendants (Gen 17:8). Therefore, the initial cosmic earth in Gen 1:1–2:3 can be seen within this trajectory to foreshadow, albeit through reversal and reemergence, the cosmic earth of the new creation postflood, which in turn looks toward the statement and unfolding of the promise of that part of it that is the land of Canaan as the everlasting possession of the nation Israel. This is unfolded in seminal form for the ancestors of Israel, and partially in the paradigmatic picture of the nation, but with its fulfillment as yet in the realm of vision.

The cosmic creator God of Gen 1:1–2:3 and then of the new creation in Gen 8–9\*, who creates but can also destroy his creation, foreshadows and points forward to the statement and unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promise to be Israel's God (Gen 17:7b, 8b), especially in the paradigmatic scenario of Exod 7–14\*. In Exod 7–14\* YHWH, as the all-powerful creator, destroys Egypt, its land, and people (Exod 7–11; 14\*), to which the cosmic flood, with its coming together of the waters (Gen 6–7\*; Exod 14:26, 27\*, 28) points forward. YHWH as cosmic creator creates the nation of Israel, through the division of the waters to give dry land (Exod 14:21–22, 29), to which the division of the waters and the appearance of the land in the original creation (Gen 1:6–10), and then in the new creation (Gen 8\*) point forward. The paradigmatic scenario of Exod 7–14\* itself, then, by virtue of its timeless nature, or as incorporating all time, has a visionary dimension, and it also looks forward along Pg's trajectory to the paradigmatic scenario that unfolds YHWH as cosmic creator dwelling in the midst of Israel and thereby his creation (Exod 16–Num 27\*).

This then brings us to another dimension of the paradigmatic nature of Gen 1:1–11:26\*. The pattern of the broad trajectory from the initial cosmic creation (Gen 1:1–2:3) to new cosmic creation in relation to the chaotic waters of the flood (Gen 6–9\*) to the creation of the nation through the division and ordering of the chaotic waters (Exod 14\*) to

the paradigmatic scenario that has the tabernacle/tent of meeting as its center (Exod 16–Num 27\*) reflects the ancient Near Eastern pattern (such as found in *Enuma Elish*) of the emergence of creation through the splitting of the waters by the god and the subsequent building of a sanctuary for that god.<sup>78</sup> It is the backdrop to the paradigmatic picture of the nation (Exod 7–14\*; Exod 16–Num 27\*) in Gen 1–9\*, with its portrayal of the creation of the cosmos and new creation of the cosmos as the division and ordering of the waters, that foreshadows, and indeed explicitly interprets, the complex paradigmatic picture of the creation of the nation Israel, through the divided waters and the subsequent paradigmatic picture of the building of the tabernacle/tent of meeting as being (albeit in reshaped form) according to the ancient Near Eastern pattern. Thereby, the paradigmatic nature of both Gen 1–9\* and the story of the nation is enhanced in reflecting this mythological pattern.

However, of greatest significance for the paradigmatic nature of the trajectory of Gen 1–9\* is the pattern of its trajectory in moving from the creation of the cosmos (1:1–2:3) to the reversal of creation (Gen 6–7\*) to the emergence of the new creation (Gen 8–9\*).

As unfolded in chapter 2, the creation of the cosmos in Gen 1:1–2:3 is paralleled by the creation of the nation in Exod 1–40\*, and the reversal of the creation of the cosmos in the flood in Gen 6–7\* is paralleled by the destruction (or reversal of the creation) of the nation in Num 13–27\*, as seen from their parallel motifs.<sup>79</sup> Thereby the pattern of creation and reversal of the cosmic creation contained in Gen 1–7\* is paralleled by the creation and reversal of the creation of the (Mosaic generation of the) nation in Exod 1–Num 27\*.<sup>80</sup> Moreover, Exod 1–Num 27\*, as argued in §4.4, represents the combination of the paradigmatic scenarios of Exod 7–14\* and Exod 16–Num 27\* (with their introduction in Exod 1:13–7:7\*) into a complex paradigmatic picture of the nation as a whole. In this complex paradigmatic picture that reshapes traditions into a vision that incorporates all time, past, present, and future, at the heart of the creation of the nation in Exod 1–40\*, is ritual or ritual ordinances (the Passover and the ritualized texts concerning the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its

---

78. See §2.2.1, above.

79. See §§2.2.1 and 2.2.3, above.

80. That Num 13–27\* represents a reversal of Exod 1–40\* is seen in the way motifs contained in Num 13–27\* reverse what has occurred in Exod 7–40\* in particular; see §2.2.3, above.



priesthood) that not only have a cognitive and existential effect but invite their audience to realize their worldview through performance or praxis. In contrast, within this complex paradigmatic picture, in the reversal of the creation of the nation there is no ritual or ritual ordinances (apart from the passing on of Eleazar's vestments which represents the glimmer of a future hope). Indeed, in rejecting the creation of the nation centered on ritual, there is a rejection of ritual/ritual ordinances and what they can effect.<sup>81</sup> Genesis 1–7\*, in that it parallels this pattern of the complex paradigmatic scenario of the story of the nation in terms of creation and reversal of creation, can therefore be said also to be paradigmatic in a similar way to the story of the nation by association. This is mirrored also perhaps by the liturgical overtones of the repeated pattern in Gen 1:1–2:3 but the lack of any such overtones in the reversal of creation in the flood (Gen 6–7\*). In this way, the paradigmatic nature of the trajectory of Gen 1–7\* is further enhanced. Moreover, this repeated pattern mirrored in both the cosmic picture and the story of the nation can be said to also enhance the paradigmatic nature of the complex paradigmatic picture of the nation. Therefore, this repeated pattern not only enhances the paradigmatic nature of both the story of the cosmos and the story of the nation, but also of the sequential trajectory itself, since in the bulk of it, that is, at its beginning (Gen 1–7\*) and end (Exod 1–Num 27\*) its historiographical sequences fall into a parallel paradigmatic pattern.

However, although there is perhaps the hint of a parallel to the emergence of the earth in the new creation in Gen 8:5, 13a, 14 in Moses's glimpse of the promised land in Num 27:12–14\* (and in the vesting of Eleazar as high priest of the next generation in Num 20:23a, 25–29), there is no parallel to God's command to Noah and his family to go out with the creatures and abound on the earth and multiply (Gen 8:16, 17; 9:1, 7) and the initial unfolding of this (Gen 8:19; 10\*; 11:10–26).<sup>82</sup> The potential parallel to life lived on the cosmic earth in the new creation postflood, which in the story of the nation would be expected to take the form of living forever in the promised land of Canaan, is incomplete.<sup>83</sup> However, this lack of a parallel enhances the open-ended nature of the trajectory of the story of the nation, which is yet to reach completion as in its cosmic parallel; its conclusion is visionary and looks to the future for completion with the

---

81. See §§4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.2, above.

82. See §2.2.3, above.

83. See §2.2.3, above.

fulfillment of the covenantal promise of the land for a future generation, with that generation representing the further unfolding of the promise of descendants. This brings us full circle to the paradigmatic nature of the historiographical trajectory of Pg and in particular the story of the nation, which at every point, though rooted in the past and comprising reshaped traditions, is future oriented and visionary.

### 5.3. CONCLUSION: THE HISTORIOGRAPHIC AND PARADIGMATIC NATURE OF PG AS A WHOLE

Pg's picture, comprising its historiographical trajectory, extending from (symbolically) the beginning of time to the picture of Israel at the edge of the land, and repeated parallel pattern of creation and the reversal of creation within the cosmos and the story of the life of the nation, has been shown here to be both historiographical and paradigmatic at every point and as a whole.

It is historiographical in that it comprises a trajectory of contingent elements extending from the original cosmic creation through its reversal and the emergence of the new creation whose stability is guaranteed and within which the story of the nation Israel and its ancestors unfolds along its trajectory of the forward movement of the Abrahamic covenant promises. It is historiographical in that at every point earlier traditions are echoed, albeit in reshaped form.

Inseparable from its historiographical nature is its paradigmatic nature at every point and as a whole. There are a number of dimensions to this.

Its paradigmatic nature is seen in the fact that, in the story of the nation in Exod 1–Num 27\*, the contingent traditions that it echoes have been reshaped with unique elements into paradigmatic pictures, and a complex paradigmatic picture as a whole, that are timeless or incorporate all time, past, present, and future with a visionary dimension. These paradigmatic pictures, or the whole complex paradigmatic picture, are an intrinsic part of Pg's historiographical trajectory and as such render that part of the trajectory paradigmatic. The beginning of the trajectory, of the cosmic creation and reversal of creation, in mirroring the paradigmatic pattern of the complex paradigmatic picture of the nation, which is also one of creation (through ritual) and reversal of creation (where its creation through ritual is rejected), are therefore also paradigmatic. Therefore, the first part of the historiographical trajectory in Gen 1–7\* and its bulk in Exod 1–Num 27\* is paradigmatic.

However, over and above this, the contingent sequence of all the elements that make up Pg's trajectory, at every point, and as a whole, can be said to be paradigmatic. This is not only because it reflects the ancient Near Eastern mythological pattern of creation as a result of the ordering of the waters and the subsequent building of a temple, at least in Gen 1–Exod 40\*. It is also because of the fact that the elements comprising reshaped traditions at every point along the trajectory are visionary in nature, pointing forward at every point toward a further unfolding, not only via the paradigmatic scenarios, but by virtue of being part of the trajectory that consistently is future-looking right up to and including its very end, which is open-ended and looks to the future for its fulfillment.

What is unfolded paradigmatically in this way is the Abrahamic covenantal promises of descendants, everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, and to be their God, as the continuation of what is contained in the cosmic picture and its trajectory in seminal form: the cosmic blessing in Gen 1:28, and in particular in the new creation of the postflood world in Gen 9:1, 7 that unfolds through the genealogies, points forward to the promise of descendants. The cosmic earth of the original creation, but in particular that of the new creation, points forward to the promise of that part of it, the land of Canaan, to Israel as Abram's descendants. The cosmic creator God of the original creation, but in particular the new creation, points forward to YHWH as the cosmic creator who is in control of the nations, destroying them to create the nation Israel in whose midst he will dwell, which represents the unfolding of the promise to be their God. These Abrahamic covenant promises are therefore portrayed as unfolding within the new creation of the postflood world. As such, the trajectory of the unfolding of each of the promises, as they interplay with each other in the ancestral material and the story of the nation, is at every point visionary. This is so whether by virtue of pointing forward within the future-driven trajectory itself that is open-ended at its conclusion, and/or as part of the timeless paradigmatic scenarios or the complex paradigmatic picture as a whole of the nation, that incorporate all time. These visionary elements, portrayed through the reshaping of earlier traditions with unique elements—of the nation as comprising twelve tribes, liberated from foreign nations that will be destroyed, in whose midst YHWH will dwell through its tabernacle and its personnel for guidance, nurturing, or judgment, and who will possess forever the land of Canaan—remain as visionary to the very end. Here the historiographic and yet paradigmatic trajectory and the paradigmatic parallels between the cosmic picture and

that of the nation come together. The story of the nation as the creation of the nation and then its reversal, which reflects the creation and reversal of the cosmos, concludes effectively with this reversal. However, not only is there a nod to the future through the vesting of Aaron's son Eleazar and in Moses's glimpse of the land of Canaan, the covenantal promises of the everlasting Abrahamic covenant still stand, as does the vision for their embodiment as found throughout the trajectory and in particular in the paradigmatic scenarios of the creation of the nation. That the very end of Pg's trajectory itself looks toward fulfillment of these promises is reinforced by the lack of a parallel to that element of the pattern of the cosmic backdrop that it otherwise mirrors, of future generations abounding on the earth of the new creation, or in the case of Israel in the land of Canaan. Thereby at the end, the paradigmatic trajectory and parallel pattern intersect in their incompleteness, reinforcing the visionary nature of the whole.

In the next, and concluding, chapter the impact of Pg as a whole with its historiographic and paradigmatic nature on an exilic/early postexilic audience will be explored. Although, as argued and hopefully demonstrated in this chapter, Pg's historiographical and paradigmatic nature are inseparable, in a sense up to this point the emphasis has tended to be more on Pg's paradigmatic nature, or at least looking at Pg from the point of view of its paradigmatic nature. For in chapter 4 our primary question was: in what way can Pg, and in particular its story of the nation, be said to be paradigmatic? In this chapter, our primary question has been as to how Pg's historiographical trajectory and features can be said to be paradigmatic. In the next chapter, chapter 6, the importance of Pg's historiographical nature, though still inseparable from its paradigmatic nature, for interpreting Pg as both historiographical and paradigmatic in nature, will become clearer. This is because, in exploring the impact on the reader(s), that is, exilic/early postexilic Israel, we will move through the sequence of the trajectory in order, thereby placing each of its components and especially the paradigmatic scenarios of the story of the nation and their elements clearly in their contingent contexts within the trajectory. To this, then, we will now turn.

CONCLUSION: EMBODYING THE WORLD  
OF THE TEXT, COGNITIVELY, EXISTENTIALLY,  
AND THROUGH RITUAL PRAXIS, OR NOT

The task of this chapter is primarily to explore what the impact of Pg as a whole might have been on its original audience of the exilic/early postexilic period. However, this chapter has a double function. It also presents an integrated summary of the conclusions reached throughout this monograph concerning the meaning of Pg as a whole, interpreted in light of its genre and hermeneutics of time, as this is an integral part of unfolding how Pg might have functioned for its original audience (and indeed perhaps its ongoing readership). Exploring the possible effect Pg might have had on its original audience is in a sense an imaginative exercise, but one grounded in moving through the sense of the text of Pg in such a way that engages with the nature of the text as unfolded in the preceding chapters as both, and inseparably, historiographic and paradigmatic. As such, at the center of this exploration of Pg's potential impact on its audience is its hermeneutics of time.

In approaching this task, it will be imagined how an exilic/early postexilic reader might have moved through Pg in sequence, thereby taking seriously Pg's historiographical nature and placing its paradigmatic components in their contingent contexts within the trajectory. However, at each point in moving through the sense of the text with its particular trajectory and patterns (themselves touching into the paradigmatic in reflecting the sequence of ancient Near Eastern myths and consisting in repeating parallel structures), it will be noted, in line with its paradigmatic nature, what would have been, for its exilic/early postexilic audience, echoes of

past traditions,<sup>1</sup> albeit transformed, reflections of present experience or contemporary traditions and practice, and unique and visionary elements, synthesized and shaped into Pg's paradigmatic picture(s). This applies in particular to Pg's paradigmatic picture(s) of the story of the nation, which collapses, or incorporates, all time, past, present, and future, and is visionary throughout. But it applies also to each point on the trajectory by virtue of its position as part of the trajectory which is rooted in the past and reflects past traditions, but also is constantly future looking at every stage as it moves forward to an open-ended and visionary goal. The experience of the exilic/early postexilic reader imagined in this way would have been one of recognition, and therefore redemption, of past traditions and/or present traditions and experience, but only partially because these have been reshaped and taken up into a future vision, since they are integrally part of the paradigmatic nature of Pg at every point and as a whole that is constantly future-looking and visionary.

The world of the text opened up for the exilic/early postexilic reader would have comprised the accumulation of these constant partial recognitions of reshaped traditions and present experience integrated with unique and programmatic elements to give the reader the full vision of the complex paradigm as a whole that at each stage, and in its pattern and trajectory as a whole, combines inseparably past, present, and future.<sup>2</sup> It is into this complex "timeless" vision that the exilic/postexilic reader would have been invited.

Because of the paradigmatic nature of Pg, intrinsic to which is its visionary nature, the world of the text, itself inherently visionary, would have invited the exilic/early postexilic reader to enter into that vision, which, though partially experienced, would not yet have been fully embodied; that is, to allow the text to impact them cognitively and existentially, or in other words to inform their self-understanding and identity.<sup>3</sup> But more than this, the paradigmatic nature of Pg, particularly in its vision of the nation centered in ritual (Exod 1–40\*),<sup>4</sup> envisions the means by which Pg's paradigmatic picture of the creation of the nation could have been embodied fully in the life of the nation, its people, and leaders. The exilic/early postexilic reader moving through the sense of the text would have per-

---

1. Which also reflects Pg's historiographical nature.

2. See §3.3.

3. See §3.3.

4. See §4.4.2.1.

ceived that entering the world of the text involves more than appropriating it cognitively and existentially; it also requires putting its ritual ordinances into practice, for these are the means of fully embodying the vision of the nation's creation and identity, and not to do so would represent a rejection of its embodiment.

In short, the exilic/early postexilic reader in moving through Pg would have constantly experienced "the now ... but not yet," partial glimpses of the known combined with visions of the future not yet experienced, both at each point and as a consequence of the cumulative experience of reading the whole; and at the same time the reader is provided with the means of entering into, and embodying, the world of the text fully, the fulfillment of this complex "eschatological" paradigm with its future ultimately brought about by God when there is obedience to God's (ritual) instructions embodied in the text.

It remains, then, to move through the sense of Pg's text with its historiographic and paradigmatic nature, to imaginatively unfold the world of the text as it might have been experienced by Pg's original exilic/early postexilic audience<sup>5</sup>—this text, with its particular hermeneutics of time, that invites its audience to embody its world cognitively, existentially, and in praxis. For clarity, I will divide the following discussion of this into sections, but, since this is a cumulative exercise, the world of the text opened up to the reader discussed within each section encompasses within it the world of the text from the beginning, including that of the section or sections prior to it.

#### 6.1 GENESIS 1:1–11:26\*

In moving through the sense of Gen 1:1–11:26\*, the original reader would have recognized echoes of tradition in the broad sequence of creation and flood interspersed by genealogies, with the flood followed by the portrayal of the spread of humanity in their lands and subsequently the line of Abram their ancestor. In the creation account, echoes of ancient Near Eastern creation myths (the deep, the divine wind, the darkness) would have been perceived; and in the flood account the elements from the tradition, of the flood as a response to a problem, the death of all life except

---

5. For convenience, I will refer to the original audience of the exilic/early postexilic reader as the "exilic" reader only, given that, even after return to the land by a few there was still an exilic mentality as well as a continuing diaspora.



Noah and company (including animals) in the ark, and the divine promise after it has receded never to destroy all living beings with a flood again.

However, the reader would also have perceived the way in which these traditions have been reshaped and synthesized with unique elements in Pg to give its own specific picture, particularly in the following respects. What is emphasized in Pg's highly structured picture of creation, almost liturgical in its tone and concerned with sacred time, is that it is cosmic in its dimensions, which includes the structure of the world and its population (species of plants, animals, and humans); its various aspects come into being through the divine speech of the transcendent cosmic creator who is referred to by the generic term *Elohim* (and not through violence); and this highly ordered portrayal of creation is very good from the divine perspective. The highly structured genealogy through ten generations from Adam to Noah that follows is explicitly portrayed as the unfolding of the divine blessing in Gen 1:28 (see Gen 5:1–3) rather than being linked with the spread of violence as in the tradition. The emphasis in Pg's flood is on its cosmic scale, both in terms of its cause (the violence of all flesh that corrupts the earth) and its dimensions; its explicit portrayal as the reversal or undoing of the whole of creation (the earth and all flesh); the emergence of a new creation when God remembers Noah and the animals in the ark, within which there is structured violence and which is inferior to the original creation; and the divine promise to never again destroy living beings pictured in terms of the Noahic covenant established with the whole of this new creation as a guarantee of its stability. Pg's table of nations is explicitly the unfolding of the divine blessing spoken to Noah and his sons in the new creation (Gen 9:1, 7); as are the ten generations from Shem to Abram, which represent a narrowing down to one branch of the table of nations.

The significant aspects of the world of the text perceived by, and opened up to, the original (exilic) readers moving through the sense of the text so far that would have had an impact on them are as follows. There is one God who is the creator of the whole cosmos and all that populates it (plants, living creatures, and humans), who is known to all creation, including all humanity, generically as "God," that is, *Elohim*, with no acknowledgment of any other gods named by other nations (such as *Marduk*) known to Pg's audience. There is the vision of an initial ideal ("very good") and peaceful creation in remote antiquity at the beginning of time, brought into being primarily through *Elohim's* word. However, *Elohim* can, and chooses to, destroy or reverse this good creation in

response to the action of all flesh (including humans who have authority over the other living creatures), showing a cosmic pattern of creation and reversal of creation. Thereby the world of the ideal, very good, creation is no longer available, and all creatures and humans, including Pg's exilic audience, now live in an inferior world where there is violence (albeit limited to a certain extent), as imaged in the emergence of the new creation postflood. The vision of the ideal world lingers, and possibly, might have had an influence, "a compelling moral force,"<sup>6</sup> on the audience, but ultimately it is not accessible and remains in the realm of wishful thinking. Pg's readers, however, are assured that the inferior world that is inherently violent, in which they live, is stable and permanent, not threatened by total destruction (as was the first creation) because of Elohim's covenant with Noah and all creatures and the earth. Moreover, the audience is assured that Elohim's blessing, given initially in the ideal creation hidden in the mists of time (Gen 1:28) and unfolded in the antediluvian world through the generations from Adam to Noah, continues to unfold in the postflood world in which they live, since Elohim has spoken his blessing into this inferior creation (9:1, 7). Its unfolding is evidenced in the various nations and their lands—the nations of the world that know the creator God as Elohim. It is also evidenced in the genealogical line that concludes with the audience's ancestor Abram: exilic Israel's ancestor Abram appears as the result of Elohim's blessing.

The reference to Abram at the end of this section would have stirred in Pg's original audience not only memories of the traditions concerning their ancestor, but, as situated in relation to the nations of the world, would have given them a preliminary inkling into their own context in relation to other nations. Moreover, with the reference to their ancestor Abram at the end of a genealogical sequence that symbolizes the unfolding of Elohim's blessing within the postflood world that is their world, the exilic audience is reminded that their beginnings are rooted in the cosmic blessing of Elohim, the creator of the whole world and everything in it.

Thereby, this picture of remote antiquity begins to touch on the specific national roots of Pg's audience and in its forward movement, specifically through the unfolding of Elohim's blessing through the generations, points them to the future, and orients its audience in a forward direction, toward anticipating how the divine blessing might further unfold and/or

---

6. Brown, *Ethos of the Cosmos*, 56.

what life lived in this second creation, the world of Pg's exilic audience, through Elohim's word might further entail. The seeds of what is to come are contained in the world of the text so far experienced by Pg's exilic audience, but there are so far only seminal beginnings, and the reader must move on.

## 6.2 GENESIS 11:27–EXODUS 1:7\*

In continuing along the trajectory extending from Gen 11:27–Exod 1:7\*, the world of the text opened up for Pg's original exilic audience as they move through the sense of the text builds cumulatively on the world of the text opened up thus far in the predominately cosmic picture of Gen 1:1–11:26\*.

In moving through the sense of Gen 11:27–Exod 1:7\*, the original exilic readers would have recognized echoes of traditions concerning their ancestors in the following elements and their broad sequence: Abram's journey with Lot to the land and their splitting up such that Abram remains in the land and Lot moves out of it; Abram's first son, Ishmael, by Hagar; the promise of a son to Abraham through Sarah and the birth of Isaac; Isaac's marriage to Rebekah and the birth of children (Esau and Jacob); the sending away of Jacob to Laban; the revelation to Jacob at Bethel; the beginnings of the Joseph story with conflict; the move of Jacob and family down to Egypt to live there; Jacob's adoption/blessing of Manasseh and Ephraim; and Jacob's burial commission, death, and burial. Pg's audience would also have recognized from the tradition the repetition of the promises of descendants and land throughout, and in particular to Abraham and Jacob.

However, in moving through the sense of the text in sequence, Pg's audience would have perceived how Pg has reshaped these ancestral traditions and introduced unique elements in the following ways.

Beginning with the *toledoth* of Terah, Abram's father, in continuity with the genealogies in Gen 5\*; 10\*; 11:10–26, all of which begin with a reference to *toledoth* (Gen 5:1; 10:1; 11:10), the focus shifts almost immediately to Abram as the primary subject. Abram intentionally goes to the land of Canaan (rather than being directed to go to an unknown land). Pg has little interest in Lot, noting briefly Lot's separation from Abram, with the focus being on Abram and situating him in the land of Canaan. With only a brief note regarding the birth of Abram's first son through Hagar, in contrast to the tradition, this too is relatively unimportant. Given the

extended account of the covenant with Abram and its promises, Pg places great importance on this. The God of this covenant is uniquely revealed as El Shaddai. Unlike the tradition where the promises of descendants and land are given to Abram without association with a covenant (or prior to it if Gen 15 is earlier than Pg) (Gen 12:1–3, 7; 13:14–17), the promises form the content of the divine covenant. The reader would have noted the emphasis on the promises from the extended description of the promise of descendants (in 17:2–6) and that the promises of the land and to be their God to Abraham and his descendants constitute this “everlasting” covenant with them (17:7–8). The formulation of the promise of descendants in Gen 17:2, 6 (פרה and רבה) shows that this promise is a continuation of God’s blessing, in particular the renewed blessing in the new creation in Gen 9:1, 7, focused specifically here in the line of Abram; but the reader may have noticed that the traditional promise of blessing for other nations through Abraham/his descendants has been omitted. Pg’s audience would have particularly noted that the land promise is uniquely formulated as an “everlasting possession (or perpetual holding) of the land of Canaan” (Gen 17:8); and that the promise to be their God is also unique to, and therefore an innovation by, Pg. After the instructions concerning circumcision, specific to Pg, the divine promise of a son for Abraham through Sarah from the tradition is incorporated (though slightly reshaped) and linked with the promise from the tradition of descendants for Ishmael, while making quite clear that the everlasting covenant is with Isaac and his descendants only. The birth of Isaac follows smoothly after this promise (in contrast to the tradition). Abraham’s purchase of the cave of Machpelah to bury Sarah would have stood out as an extended passage unique to Pg, and as representing the beginning of the unfolding of the promise of the land of Canaan, with the ancestor’s possession as a burial place of this small part of it. Accordingly, the death and burial of Abraham also there by his sons, Isaac and Ishmael, follows.

Following God’s blessing of Isaac (Gen 25:11a), hinting at the further unfolding of the promise of descendants as the outworking of the blessing in Gen 9:1, 7, and a notice of his location in the land, the *toledoths* of Abraham’s sons Ishmael and Isaac, along with the geographical location of Ishmael outside the land (Gen 21:21), mirrors similar motifs in relation to Abram, and, as there, it is the son of the *toledoth* of the father that now becomes the focus—in this case the *toledoth* of Isaac introduces a focus on Jacob. The *toledoth* of Ishmael situates the covenant line in relation to related nations, and the *toledoth* of Isaac notes briefly his marriage to Rebecca (in

contrast to the extended story in the tradition), her lineage, and the birth of his sons. In this way, Pg has skipped lightly over Isaac to focus on Jacob as the next important ancestor in the covenant line. Accordingly, Jacob now takes center stage. The concern to locate Jacob in relation to the land of Canaan follows as in the portrayal of Abram. Jacob, as in the tradition, is sent away to his uncle Laban's place outside the land, but what would have stood out for the reader is the reason given for Jacob leaving, which is not because of conflict with Esau as in the tradition, but so that Jacob may keep the purity of the line by marrying a cousin (in contrast to Esau who has married foreign wives); its concern is with the further unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promise of descendants. Accordingly, Isaac's blessing in sending him away repeats El Shaddai's covenant promises of descendants and land for Jacob and his descendants. After noting how Pg passes lightly over the extensive Jacob-Laban traditions, referring to them only in summary form, Pg's audience would have perceived how the tradition has been reshaped in the revelation of El Shaddai to Jacob at Bethel, in the land of Canaan, on his return, in that it conflates two stories in the tradition concerning a divine revelation to Jacob when he leaves the land (Gen 28:10–22, situated at Bethel) to go to Laban's place and when he returns (32:22–32); God renames him as Israel (see 32:22–32), in parallel with the renaming of Abram to Abraham in the Abrahamic covenant in the context of the promise of descendants (17:5), and El Shaddai speaks the blessing of fruitfulness and the Abrahamic covenant promises of descendants, and the land, for Jacob and his descendants. Accordingly, this is followed by the listing of the sons of Jacob (drawing on the tradition), already born to him, representing the further unfolding of the promise of descendants, in a parallel to its initial unfolding after the statement of the covenant promises to Abraham in the birth of Isaac. Significantly, the readers may have found hints of the identity of the nation of Israel as comprising twelve tribes in the linking of the change of name from Jacob to Israel with the promise of descendants and its further unfolding in the listing of his sons. As in the picture of Abraham, the statement of the promises and their beginning to unfold is followed by a death and burial notice of an ancestor, this time Isaac.

By this point, Pg's audience, in moving through the sense of the text, will have realized that the picture of Jacob repeats the picture of Abraham with regard to the pattern of the *toledoth* of the father (Terah and Isaac respectively); the focus shifting to the son (Abraham and Jacob respectively); the noting of his relation to a relative (Lot and Esau respectively);

then situating him in relation to the land of Canaan; the statement of the covenant promises to him that follows with the epiphany of El Shaddai; the beginnings of the unfolding of the promise(s); and the notice of the death and burial of an ancestor (Abraham and Isaac respectively). The readers might well have been struck by the ordered structure of this repeated or typical pattern in contrast to the cycle of colorful, creative but somewhat messy cycle of traditional ancestral stories.

Moving on, the pattern begins again, this time with the *toledoths* of Esau and Jacob, with Esau's *toledoth* linked with his separating from Jacob, in a parallel with the separating of Abram and Lot, and settling outside the land of Canaan in Seir. Thereby the covenant line through Jacob is situated in relation to other nations and the expectation is engendered in Pg's audience, given the pattern so far, that it is Jacob's sons that will now become the primary focus. In Jacob's *toledoth*, Joseph in particular is the focus, and with a summary nod to the extensive Joseph story, Pg emphasizes, in line with the typical pattern so far, that part of the tradition concerning the location of the ancestor (Jacob) and his descendants in relation to the land of Canaan—Jacob initially settles in the land of Canaan but then moves with all his descendants and their families down to Egypt. Pg then emphasizes their multiplying in the land of Egypt. According to the pattern, Jacob then recalls the covenant promises of descendants and the land of Canaan as a perpetual holding given to him in the revelation of El Shaddai at Bethel. The note regarding the further unfolding of the promise of descendants ensues with Jacob's adoption of Joseph's sons born in Egypt, Ephraim and Manasseh (drawing on the tradition where they are blessed by Jacob). Concluding, according to the pattern, with the death and burial of the ancestor (here Jacob), Pg draws on the tradition of Jacob charging Joseph to bury him, not in Egypt, but with his ancestors, and his subsequent burial. However, Pg stresses that Jacob's charge is to all his sons, and in particular that he is to be buried in the cave of Machpelah where all the ancestors (except Rachel) are buried. There he is accordingly buried. It can be surmised that Pg's readers would have realized that such an emphasis on the cave of Machpelah as the part of the land of Canaan possessed by the ancestors for their burial symbolizes the initial unfolding of the covenant promise of the land as a perpetual holding.

By this stage, it would have been clear to Pg's readers that the elements of Pg's threefold repeated pattern through which the reader has moved—of *toledoth*, situation of the ancestor in relation to the land of Canaan, covenant promises, initial unfolding of these, and concluding death and

burial of the ancestor—are oriented entirely around the statement of the Abrahamic covenant and its promises and how for the ancestors its promises initially unfold. The promise of descendants is unfolded through the generations of the ancestors of the covenant line, situated in relation to other nations, signified by the repeated *toledoth* structure and the notices of their birth, with a particular focus on Abraham and Jacob; and everlasting possession of the land of Canaan is initially unfolded through the burial of the ancestors in that part of it that is the cave of Machpelah, which in death is their permanent possession. The impact of this on Pg's audience throughout would have been to point them to the future, toward expectations of the further unfolding of the promises.

As the exilic readers move on through the sense of Exod 1:1–5, 7, what has been hinted at earlier in Jacob's name change to Israel in the revelation at Bethel followed closely by the listing of the names of his twelve sons, concerning the nation of Israel as consisting of twelve tribes, emerges more explicitly. This is accomplished through bracketing the names of the twelve sons (1:2–5) at the beginning with a reference to “the sons of Israel” (בני ישראל) clearly denoting the sons of Jacob the ancestor (1:1), and at the end with a reference to the multiplying of “the sons of Israel” (בני ישראל) denoting the emergence of the nation (1:7). Given the language in Exod 1:7 (רבה and פרה), this represents the unfolding of the promise of descendants (see Gen 17:2, 6) as itself the unfolding of the blessing in Gen 9:1, 7 for the line of Abraham into the nation Israel. What is more, the emergence of the nation, in line with the tradition, occurs in Egypt: the land they fill is the land of Egypt.

The significant aspects of the world of the text perceived by, and opened up to, the original (exilic) readers moving through the sense of the text so far, that would have had an impact on them are as follows.

With the appearance of their ancestor Abram/Abraham, as the result of the unfolding of the cosmic creator Elohim's blessing in the inferior postflood world, how this blessing is to continue unfolding and what life is to be like and how it will be lived in this world, which is also the contemporary world of Pg's exilic audience, is defined for them by God's covenant with Abram. Pg's exilic audience would have perceived that the covenant with their ancestor Abraham, which is inherently visionary and future-oriented by virtue of its promissory content, ultimately defines their identity and destiny and sets the agenda for their contemporary lives, something that is emphasized by the divine revelation of the covenant promises also directly to Jacob who is named Israel, a name that



denotes both their ancestor Jacob and the nation descended from him itself (Exod 1:1–5, 7), and therefore applicable to the nation through time, including their own contemporary time. It is applicable to each of them, however, only if and when they choose to be part of the covenant community through circumcision.

It is El Shaddai who speaks this covenant to Abram/Abraham and effectively repeats its promises to Jacob/Israel. El Shaddai is the cosmic creator known as Elohim to the nations, but now the readers would have perceived that this one God Elohim, creator of all, is further defined to their ancestors as El Shaddai, the one who gives to their own ancestors the covenant and its promises in a special revelation, thereby defining who God (Elohim) is for them a little more precisely so far, that is, El Shaddai the God of their covenant with its visionary promises. One of the covenant promises, a promise uniquely emphasized by Pg, is that this El Shaddai will be their God. This El Shaddai who will be their God is perceived at this point by the readers as the one cosmic creator who makes a covenant with their ancestors and as an “everlasting” covenant with Abraham and his descendants it is also still relevant to them. This covenant with its promises itself represents the initial unfolding of the covenant promise to be their God, that they (themselves as contemporary readers as well as the generations that have gone before them) are the people to whom El Shaddai gives his covenant. Moreover, the promise to be their God is by definition future-oriented and visionary and points readers forward with the expectation of further insights regarding who El Shaddai is for them and how he will be their God—it inherently points Pg’s audience to look forward along the trajectory to its further unfolding.

El Shaddai’s promise of descendants to their ancestor Abraham, unfolded through Isaac and his blessing (Gen 35:11a) and through Jacob/Israel (to whom this promise is repeated) and his blessing (35:9), reinforces the exilic audience’s perception of themselves (from the tradition), as the descendants of Abraham, as the outcome of the unfolding of this promise (as the nation has been through its generations up to this point); indeed as part of the unfolding of Elohim’s blessing, initially through the genealogies from Shem to Abraham and of Isaac and Jacob and his sons in the new creation (Gen 9:1, 7; Exod 1:7) that is their world. Moreover, their identity as in the line of Isaac and Jacob differentiates them from neighboring nations such as those descended from Ishmael and the Edomites, who are related through Abraham but not heirs to the Abrahamic covenant. The identity of the nation Israel as comprising twelve tribes (which

incorporates the fluidity of the tradition around Joseph and Ephraim and Manasseh) (Gen 35:22b–26; 48:5–6; Exod 1:1–5, 7) would have been recognized by Pg’s audience as part of their tradition. However, at the same time, its impact, as a visionary element within Pg’s trajectory, on them as a diminished people comprising Judah only, would have been to perceive their identity as a twelve-tribe nation as a future vision—to point them to the future when this promise that echoes the past might be completely fulfilled and the twelve-tribe nation encompassing both southern and northern tribes might come (again) to fruition. For Judah in exile, the visionary promise of a twelve-tribe nation remains in the realm of vision, a future hope guaranteed by the covenant.

El Shaddai’s promise of the land, that part of the cosmic earth created by Elohim that is the land of Canaan, specifically formulated as “everlasting possession of the land of Canaan,” as part of El Shaddai’s everlasting covenant with Abraham and his descendants, and therefore with Pg’s exilic audience, is visionary. It looks forward to its future unfolding along Pg’s trajectory, where, initially, it comes to fruition for the ancestors in their burial in the Cave of Machpelah, their everlasting possession of that small part of it as their grave; however, this initial unfolding looks beyond itself since it foreshadows and anticipates symbolically its wider, more complete fulfillment for the ancestors’ descendants, in representing a guarantee of, or reinforcement of their right to, this land. Thereby, the readers are pointed in a forward direction to its further unfolding. For Pg’s original audience in exile, the impact of this promise of *everlasting* possession of the land of Canaan would have been to provide them with a vision for their future. Having been already in the land, their time living there in the past through the generations can now be perceived by the exiles as in no way the fulfillment of this promise of the land as a perpetual holding since their time there was only temporary, a foretaste perhaps, or partial glimpse, of what is yet to be, but not its full embodiment. The possession of the land of Canaan forever has not yet occurred and remains for Pg’s exilic audience still to be fulfilled; it is visionary, constituting a future hope, but an assured hope, guaranteed in the future as part of the everlasting covenant.

The emergence of the nation of Israel, pictured in terms of the filling of the land of Egypt at the end of this section of the trajectory would have begun to stir in Pg’s audience memories of their exodus traditions, and have begun to resonate with their present experience as a people living in a foreign land.

So far, then, by this stage in the trajectory, readers would have perceived that their identity as a nation is to be formed through the unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promises of descendants (itself the outworking of God's blessing), everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, and to be their God. These have been initially unfolded in relation to their ancestors, but they are far from being completely fulfilled at this point in the trajectory, with the nation implicitly constituted as twelve tribes emerging in a land different from the land promised to them. The trajectory invites the reader to move on to the future unfolding of the promises. But, more significantly, the original readers, reduced to Judah only and living in a foreign land, are invited to embrace Pg's vision in terms of the promises at this point, the vision of (yet again) a twelve-tribe nation whose land will finally be the land of Canaan as a perpetual holding or everlasting possession. To perceive how this can occur and how Elohim/El Shaddai will be their God specifically, over and above giving their ancestors the covenant and its promises, Pg's audience must move on through the text.

### 6.3 EXODUS 1:13–7:7\*

In continuing along the trajectory extending from Exod 1:13–7:7\*, the world of the text opened up for Pg's original audience builds cumulatively on the world of the text opened up thus far.

In moving through the sense of Exod 1:13–7:7\*, Pg's audience would have recognized strong echoes of tradition throughout. In the backdrop to the call of Moses in Exod 1:13–14; 2:23\*, 24–25, the traditions of Israel's slavery in the context of their multiplying in the land of Egypt, and their cry arising out of slavery being noticed by God would have been recalled. The call of Moses in Exod 6:2–12; 7:1–2 phasing into Exod 7:3–7 echoes not only the call of Moses in the tradition (Exod 3:1–4:17) with its formal elements of commission, objection, and reassurance, but many of its specifics (albeit in a disorderly fashion in the tradition), namely, the revelation of the name YHWH to Moses linked with the patriarchs; YHWH's hearing the utterances of the Israelites out of their slavery and his promise of their deliverance involving divine might; reference to the land in this context; the commission of Moses to speak to the Israelites/elders and the motif of whether they will listen or not; the commission of Moses to go to Pharaoh so the Israelites can be freed, and its execution and the divine prediction that Pharaoh will not let them go linked with a notice of YHWH's deliverance; and Moses's objection in terms of his inability to speak and the

divine response in terms of providing Moses with the message and Aaron then speaking for him, along with divine predictions as to what will occur. Moreover, the formula "I am YHWH" was likely familiar to Pg's audience from the tradition. So also would have been the motifs in Exod 7:3–5 of Pharaoh's hardened heart, YHWH's signs/wonders/plagues, and the Pharaoh/Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH

However, at the same time Pg's readers would have perceived the ways in which these traditions have been reshaped and synthesized with unique elements in Pg into its specific and highly structured and ordered account.

Within Exod 1:13–14; 2:23\*, 24–25, the significance, over and above the great extent of the oppression, lies in that in noticing the cries of the Israelites out of their slavery there is not only an emphasis on God's activity (God is the subject of four verbs), but in particular Pg's unique element that God remembers his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The readers recalling the motif of God remembering Noah (Gen 8:1) would therefore have expected a new divine act to occur. Indeed, this divine remembering of the covenant forms the backdrop to the call of Moses, intrinsic to which is the recollection of this covenant (Exod 6:4–5), and which is the beginning of the further unfolding of the covenant promises.

The readers would have perceived Pg's reshaping of the tradition in Exod 6:2–7:7\* in the much more coherently structured call narrative of Moses. In contrast to the tradition in Exod 3:1–4:17, where there are a number of commissions and objections that become increasingly unreasonable and repeated motifs scattered throughout, two commissions in Pg's account (for Moses to speak to the Israelites, and to tell Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of the land) follow one from the other, and Moses's one objection that Pharaoh will not listen is logical and reasonable, coming as it does after the Israelites not listening to him. Pg therefore plays down Moses's objection, transforming it into a true prediction since, as stated by YHWH in Exod 7:4, Pharaoh indeed will not listen to Moses, thereby putting Moses in a more positive light than does the corresponding tradition. The omission of any sign might have been noticed, as would Pg's extended reassurance, that incorporates Aaron, as in the tradition, but with the distinctive description of the roles, of Moses as God to Pharaoh, and Aaron as Moses's prophet, as well as how Pg has laid out by way of prediction what will occur by YHWH's action (7:3–5). The following note concerning Moses's and Aaron's obedience to the divine command (i.e., the second commission that is reaffirmed in 7:2) in Exod 7:6–7 would have flagged for the readers the inevitability of the divine plan.

Moreover, in moving through the sense of Exod 6:2–7:7\*, and in particular the divine speech in Exod 6:2–8, the emphases in Pg’s picture that would have been noted by the readers are as follows. The revelation of the name YHWH for the first time to Moses, though drawn from the tradition, is accentuated by virtue of the emphasis on the (traditional) formula “I am YHWH” (אני יהוה, 6:2) with which the divine speech begins and which is repeated throughout (6:2, 6, 7, 8), as is the unique statement that God appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El Shaddai but not YHWH (6:3). In recalling the covenant with the patriarchs, the focus of its content is on the promise of the land of Canaan (6:4), with the land promise repeated in Exod 6:8 as an oath to the patriarchs, which places it similarly in the context of the covenant. The emphasis on the covenant is further accentuated by the recapitulation of Pg’s unique element of God’s remembering of this covenant in hearing the groaning of the Israelites, and this indeed becomes the basis for YHWH deciding to deliver them. In the first commission to Moses directed at the Israelites, Pg links uniquely YHWH’s promise of deliverance, well known from the tradition though uniquely formulated as occurring by “great judgments” (שפטים גדלים), with its distinctive covenant promise to be their God, and significantly, the motif that thereby they will know something more of who YHWH is as their God in his freeing them from the Egyptians (6:6–7). By the conclusion of the divine speech, where the land promise and the “I am YHWH” formula are repeated (6:8), it would have been clear to the readers that within this speech the emphasis lies on the revelation of the divine name YHWH, the covenant as the basis for what is now to occur, the covenant promises of the land and to be their God, and how the promise to be their God is about to unfold further in that they will come to know something of who YHWH is when he delivers them. After this, the focus then narrows to how YHWH’s deliverance of them out of Egypt will begin to unfold through the second commission and the reassurances outlining what is to come in response to Moses’s objection (6:10–12; 7:1–7). In Exod 7:3–5, Pg’s emphasis is on what YHWH will do (given the four-fold repetition of the first-person subject in this YHWH speech) in relation to delivering them out of Egypt—involving controlling Pharaoh (hardening his heart) so he does not listen (a motif emphasized in Pg) in the face of multiple signs/wonders, bringing the people out of Egypt by “great judgments” (שפטים גדלים; see 6:6), when thereby the Egyptians this time will know “I am YHWH.”

Building on the world of the text opened up to Pg's audience so far, the significant aspects of the world of the text perceived by, and opened up to, the original (exilic) readers moving through the sense of this section of text would have had an impact on them in the following ways.

With the echo of the Moses and the exodus traditions in their ears, the situation of the nation in a foreign land would begin to resonate with the present experience of Pg's exilic audience, as would their domination by the foreign nation in that land. They might well have begun to perceive that hope lies for them in God remembering his everlasting covenant with their ancestors and their descendants and therefore with themselves as those descendants, for it is this remembrance of the covenant with them that once motivated and will motivate God once more to act to deliver them and free them from the dominating nation to which they are subject and to bring them out of this foreign land. The picture of Moses, well known to them as a key figure in their tradition and therefore having no need of an introduction, portrayed in such a positive light in the call narrative, could begin to be seen as the start of something momentous in the life of the nation situated in a foreign land as it did in their tradition, especially in terms of deliverance from a foreign power. Moses, as the figure to whom the name YHWH is revealed, as known from the tradition but accentuated more explicitly in Pg, reminds Pg's exilic audience that their God who is known as Elohim to the nations and was known as El Shaddai to their ancestors, the one who gives them the covenant and its promises, is known to them, the nation Israel, by the name YHWH who relates to them, not just in giving them the everlasting covenant, but who is now revealed as the one who acts to unfold these promises. The promises that their God YHWH promises to act to unfold in particular are those constituting the everlasting covenant to their ancestors' descendants (Gen 17:7–8) whom they are: the promises of the land of Canaan and to be their God reiterated here. Pg's exilic audience would have perceived that it is these promises that are particularly pertinent to them, residing as they are in a foreign land under the domination of a nation whose God (Marduk) is seemingly more powerful than their God YHWH, since it is Israel who have been defeated. To perceive that their God YHWH is the one God, the creator of the cosmos whom the other nations know, though by the generic expression Elohim, and that one of the ways YHWH shows himself to be their God according to the covenant promise is in delivering them from the dominant nation would not only begin to restore their faith in the power of their God YHWH but begin to reassure them regarding how YHWH

might relate to them in exile now, that is, as he had in the past, through his loyalty to the everlasting covenant and its promises. It would begin to give them hope in a future that is envisioned not only in terms of liberation from their present situation but which will eventually involve being brought by YHWH into the promised land of Canaan. The impact on Pg's audience could well have been to begin to give them a vision of their immediate future of being freed by YHWH, as well as beginning to provide, through its reiteration, a vision for their long-term future already inherent in the covenant land promise in terms of being brought by YHWH into the land of Canaan (once more). Moreover, they might begin to be assured that it is in the unfolding of this envisioned future that they will know who YHWH is as their God. This vision invites the audience to look forward along the trajectory, in order to perceive how this might come about and how indeed it might apply to them now under the domination of Babylon (or elsewhere in the diaspora). This is touched on in summary form in Exod 7:3–5 in terms of how YHWH will act to free them, and in particular how YHWH will act in relation to the foreign nation and its land, indeed in such a way that the foreign nation itself will come to know YHWH. To enter more deeply into this vision for their future as a nation, destined to come into the land of Canaan, where their ancestors are buried, forever, and how YHWH will be their God, the readers must move forward on through the trajectory and the visionary world it continues to open up for them.

#### 6.4 EXODUS 7:8–14:29\*

Moving along the trajectory, Exod 7:8–14:29\* is prefigured by the divine prediction in 7:3–5 that acts by way of a summary of what will occur in this section, and in so doing portrays it almost as a foregone conclusion, since Moses and Aaron are obedient to the second commission, and in any case the focus is on what YHWH will bring about.

In moving through the sense of Exod 7:8–14:29\*, Pg's exilic readers would have recognized echoes of tradition in the broad sequence unfolded of signs/plagues in Egypt, the killing of the firstborn, the Passover, the exodus from Egypt, and the Reed Sea tradition. Within this broad outline, Pg's readers would have recognized specific echoes of tradition in the following elements.

Within the picture of the signs (Exod 7:8–11:10\*), the traditions that would have been recognized (albeit in partial or reshaped form) are: the sign of the rod transformed into a snake, and the plagues of water trans-



formed into blood (a sign as well as a plague in the tradition), frogs, and insects; the initiation of these plagues by YHWH in a speech to Moses; and the motif of Pharaoh's hardened heart toward the end of each plague.

Pg's audience would have recognized that the picture of the Passover and exodus from Egypt (Exod 12\*) follows the tradition (in 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39) in its broad sequence of a speech with instructions concerning the Passover rite, the submission/obedience of the Israelites to these instructions, followed by a description of the exodus from Egypt. And in terms of details, the traditions (found especially in 12:21–23, 27b, 29–39 as well as Deut 16:1–7) echoed would have been as follows: probably most of the detailed prescriptions for the Passover rite in Exod 12:1, 3–11 would have reflected for the readers traditional or evolving contemporary practice (see especially 12:21–23), namely, with regard to its nature as a rite centered in the household, the selection of a lamb (and the timing for its selection and slaughtering), the placing of the blood on the lintels, when the lamb is to be eaten and not allowing any of it to remain until the morning, with what remains to be burned, and probably the eating of the lamb with unleavened bread. In addition, as in the tradition, there is an element of haste incorporated (although in Pg this is part of the liturgical rite whereas in the tradition this is associated with the exodus). The traditions echoed for Pg's audience in Pg's formulation of the meaning of the Passover rite would have been: the expression of YHWH passing through, but on seeing the blood "passing over" (פסח); YHWH's striking down (the Egyptians/firstborn in Egypt); and YHWH's protection of the Israelites from being struck down or destroyed on seeing the blood when he passes over.

Within Pg's picture of the rescue at the Reed Sea (Exod 14\*), the traditions echoed for Pg's audience would have been: the broad sequence of Pharaoh and the Egyptians pursuing the Israelites and the movement of the waters resulting in the annihilation of the Egyptians in the sea; the motifs of Pharaoh's hardened heart (from the plague tradition), and the motif of the knowledge of YHWH by Pharaoh (from the plague tradition); and the ancient Near Eastern myths of creation involving the splitting of the sea (e.g., Enuma Elish).

However, while recognizing these traditions, Pg's audience would have perceived the ways in which these traditions have been reshaped and synthesized with unique elements into Pg's own particular picture.

In moving through Exod 7:8–10:11\*, it would have been noticed that the initial wonder in Pg of the rod transformed into a snake echoes the similar sign in the tradition (designed to convince the Israelites of Moses's

authenticity), but in a different and unique context of the confrontation with Pharaoh and the Egyptian court. YHWH gives the instructions for the wonder to Moses and Aaron, with an emphasis on Aaron and his rod, and the wonder occurs. Striking to Pg's readers would have been that in Pg's picture the traditional sign has been reshaped such that the rod is transformed not merely into a snake but into a cosmic sea monster or dragon (תנין), the forces of chaos defeated to bring about creation. Therefore what is highlighted is YHWH's cosmic power, through the obedience of his representatives, to control chaos, including unleashing it. The unique element that follows, of the Egyptian magicians competing with Moses and Aaron, initially matching the wonder, but then having their staffs (transformed into sea monsters) swallowed up by Aaron's staff, would have stood out. This symbolizes the fact that although the divine powers behind the Egyptian magicians/priests, the Egyptian gods including Pharaoh, might have some power, YHWH's cosmic power is far superior, to the point of rendering them powerless; ironically, Pharaoh with his cobra diadem, symbolizing that he is divinely endowed, along with the gods that so endow him, are rendered as nothing when Aaron's rod turned into a snake/sea monster (תנין) swallows up the rods so transformed of the Egyptian ritual specialists. This would have given Pg's audience some clue as to how Moses will be like God to Pharaoh (Exod 7:1), with Aaron as his prophet (or in this case his coworker), and would have flagged for them in microcosm the unleashing of chaos in the land of Egypt, and the ultimate defeat of Pharaoh. The wonder concludes with an echo of the plague tradition in Pharaoh's hardened heart, linked distinctively in Pg's picture with Pharaoh's not listening as predicted by YHWH (see Exod 7:4) and therefore pictured as part of the divine plan.

The next sign/wonder would have recalled for the readers the traditional plague of transforming water into blood, but in reshaped form such that, as with the sign of the snake magnified into a sea monster, Pg's sign heightens and intensifies the tradition on a cosmic scale in that not just the Nile but all the waters and waterways, all the "gathering" (מקוה) of the waters (see Gen 1:10) throughout the whole land of Egypt, are transformed into blood, thus polluting the whole land of Egypt. This is the beginning of the cosmic creator unleashing chaos (or undoing creation) in the land of Egypt. The readers would also have begun to notice the similarity in the pattern of this sign/wonder to that of the first one. It begins with a direct command of YHWH to Moses (and/or Aaron) concerning the sign on YHWH's initiative (and not conditional on Pharaoh's behavior as in the

tradition), which occurs inevitably, mediated by Moses and Aaron in obedience; this is followed by Pg's distinctive element of the competition with the Egyptian magicians/priests, where in this case they match the sign, thereby ironically supporting YHWH's plan since this means an intensification of the pollution of the waters, symbolically at least; and it concludes with Pharaoh's hardened heart linked distinctively by Pg with Pharaoh's not listening as divinely predicted. The pattern would have reinforced for Pg's audience that YHWH is in complete control.

Moving on through the next two signs/wonders, the traditions of the plague of frogs and insects, it would have been noted that these have been similarly reshaped. Pg's signs represent a heightening of these plagues, with the frogs coming up from all the waters of Egypt and covering the whole land, symbolizing not just overabundance but the transgressing of the boundaries of the realm for which they were created, and with all the dust of the earth, which is innumerable, transformed into something it was never created to be, that is, gnats. The symbolism of the further unleashing of chaos, or the undoing of the cosmic creation in Egypt, by YHWH the cosmic creator would not have been lost on Pg's audience. Again, that these signs are structured in the same way as the first two signs would have been noticeable, with a direct command of YHWH, the obedience of Moses and Aaron, the inevitable unfolding of the sign/wonder, the motif of the Egyptian magicians/priests matching or trying to match the sign, and the concluding note regarding Pharaoh's hardened heart<sup>7</sup> and his not listening according to the divine prediction. However, although the magicians match the frogs sign (ironically adding to the chaos and therefore symbolizing their subjection to YHWH's plan), what would have stood out to Pg's readers is that they cannot match the gnats sign and instead acknowledge the power of God (Elohim, the designation of the one creator God for other nations, but whom Israel knows as YHWH).

Finally, the audience will have noticed that Pg has further reshaped the plagues tradition by adding a sign that is unique, the sign of the boils, structured with the same stereotypical pattern as the preceding signs. Its gravity perhaps would have been signaled by Moses's increased role. The skin disease afflicts all the Egyptians, humans and animals, throughout the whole of Egypt, including the magicians/priests, who now, far from

---

7. Although in relation to the frogs sign this is missing, with non-P's note concerning Pharaoh's hardened heart probably replacing Pg's note in the process of redaction.

competing with Moses and Aaron, cannot even stand before them; the ritual specialists of Egypt are rendered not only completely powerless, but also, along with all the Egyptians and their animals, ritually unclean. Pg's audience would have realized that the realm of death, by this stage, is encroaching on living creatures in the land of Egypt, and that the divine powers of Egypt behind the magicians/priests (including Pharaoh) are shown to be utterly powerless. The picture of YHWH, as cosmic creator unleashing chaos, or undoing creation, in the land of Egypt, and rendering the Egyptian divine powers as nothing, would have been by this point crystal clear. That YHWH is in complete control is reinforced for Pg's audience by the last element in the pattern, where Pharaoh's hardened heart is formulated in terms of YHWH hardening Pharaoh's heart so that he does not listen according to YHWH's plan, just as predicted.

Moving through these five signs/wonders, the readers, with the repetition of the stereotypical pattern over and over, have been led into the experience of marking time, of time standing still, and have been directed (over and over as well as progressively) to a clear theological statement that, in its cosmic dimensions as well as its typicality, begins to take on a kind of timelessness and relevance for all time. This theological statement is that YHWH is the cosmic creator who is in complete control of all that occurs in his creation, who chooses to unleash chaos, or reverse creation, in the beginnings of an echo of the undoing of the cosmic creation in Gen 6–7\*, in that part of his creation which is Egypt, and in relation to whom the divine powers of Egypt, including Pharaoh, are (progressively) rendered powerless and as nothing—YHWH even controls Pharaoh's heart so that he will not listen, as part of the divine plan so that YHWH can multiply his wonders/signs (see Exod 7:3–4; 11:9) in a demonstration of who he is in relation to other divine powers. This is the God who has promised Israel to be their God; the cosmic creator whom the nations know as Elohim, who was known to the ancestors as El Shaddai, who gave them the covenant promises, and now, as YHWH, proceeds to unfold his promise to be Israel's God. However, the readers need to move forward along the trajectory to see how YHWH will bring about what he has promised for Israel in the immediate context, their deliverance from the Egyptians (see Exod 6:6–7).

In moving through Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, Pg's audience would have noticed how their tradition of celebrating the Passover and its evolving contemporary practice and meaning have been reshaped and synthesized into Pg's unique picture in the following ways. Pg has reshaped the tradition, where the prescriptions for the Passover are given in a speech

of Moses (Exod 12:21–23) and submitted to by the people, into a YHWH speech communicated through Moses and Aaron to the people who then obey, thereby making quite clear that these Passover instructions and their unfolding are divinely ordained and part of the divine plan. In terms of ritual prescriptions, perhaps roasting instead of boiling is an innovative element, as perhaps is the reflection of the tradition in leaving in haste now pictured liturgically in terms of being dressed for a journey and eating hurriedly, thereby smoothing over the unevenness between the elements in the tradition of the measured Passover description and their leaving in haste. However, it is with regard to the formulation of what the Passover celebrates and its meaning that Pg's innovation would have been especially evident. Reshaping the tradition in Exod 12:23, 29, of the meaning of the Passover in terms of YHWH passing through and (the destroyer) striking the *Egyptians* but passing over the Israelite's houses, juxtaposed with the tradition of the plague of killing the *firstborn* in the land of Egypt, Pg's Passover celebrates YHWH's passing through and striking the *firstborn* in the land of Egypt but passing over the Israelites' houses (Exod 12:12a, 13).<sup>8</sup> For Pg, the killing of the firstborn is no longer the last plague but intrinsically part of what the Passover celebrates. In light of Exod 7:8–11:10\*, it is a further escalation of YHWH's undoing creation in the land of Egypt, with the marks of death in the boils sign/wonder on humans and animals now becoming the actual death of the firstborn, humans and animals, in the land of Egypt. Moreover, a significant element that would have been noticed in Pg's picture is the addition of the unique formulation in Exod 12:12b into the center of 12:12a, 13. This is Pg's own explanation of what this means exactly, that is, YHWH's execution of judgments (שפטים, Pg's unique expression in this context; see 6:6; 7:4) on the gods of Egypt linked with the expression "I am YHWH" (see 6:2, 6, 7, 8). Pg's unique emphasis, then, following on from Exod 7:8–11:10\* where the gods of Egypt are shown to be increasingly powerless in relation to the cosmic God YHWH, is that the death of the firstborn, the next step in undoing his creation in the land of Egypt, represents judgment on the gods of Egypt by YHWH, who reveals himself clearly as the one who judges and defeats the gods of other nations (Egypt) (and claims their firstborn as his own). Pg's audience would have realized, therefore, that for Pg the celebration of the Passover

---

8. In both the tradition and in Pg, YHWH's passing over occurs when YHWH sees the blood on the Israelite's houses, but Pg also reshapes the significance of the blood on the houses into a sign to the Israelites (Exod 12:13a).

effects the killing of the firstborn, which represents a further revelation of who YHWH is as the one who judges and defeats the gods of Egypt, the oppressing nation, and in so doing protects the Israelites. But not only so, Pg's audience in moving on to Exod 12:40–41 would have perceived that thereby, with the gods of Egypt vanquished, the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt occurs;<sup>9</sup> the celebration of the Passover effects not only the Israelite's protection from their oppressors, but the freeing of them such that they go out of their land. Whereas in the tradition the exodus occurs through Pharaoh's permission and command, in Pg the exodus occurs, according to the divine plan, when the Passover is celebrated according to the divine prescriptions.

The paradigmatic nature of Exod 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41, as unfolded in chapter 4,<sup>10</sup> comprising ritual prescription and performative effect to picture the exodus as a ritual event, and collapsing any distinction between past, present, and future, or incorporating all time, means that the Passover and what it celebrates and effects is relevant for all time; it can be carried out at any time and through time and its performative effects are realized. The impact of this on Pg's audience at this point would have been two-fold. First, it gives them a vision concerning the Passover and its meaning, comprising reshaped tradition and evolving contemporary practice of the Passover synthesized with unique elements, which refers not only, as in the past, to the Israelites as oppressed in Egypt, but to any situation where the Israelites are dominated by any nation and in whose land they are residing (such as Babylon); Pg's audience would have perceived that the meaning of the celebration of the Passover lies in the killing of the firstborn of the oppressing nation, which further reveals who their God is and promises to be—the one who thereby brings judgment on the gods of any nation that dominates or oppresses them, while protecting them and thereby liberating them from any foreign land in which they might find themselves. Second, Pg's audience would have realized that the way to experience YHWH's protection while they are in exile and to be liberated from the foreign land in which they are residing is to actually celebrate the Passover, to perform the Passover rite according the divine instructions,

---

9. This is by day rather than in the night, which represents the smoothing over of the unevenness in the tradition where the exodus occurs at night (Exod 12:29–39), but according to the Passover tradition they are not allowed to leave their houses until the morning (12:22).

10. See §4.1.1.2.

and their protection and deliverance, along with the defeat of the gods of the foreign nation, will be effected and become a reality. Through the celebration of the Passover rite is how their God YHWH is shown to act in relation to other nations and their gods, who now dominate them, and how YHWH is seen to unfold his promise to be their God through protection and liberation. YHWH's liberation of them effected thereby from the foreign land hints at the beginning of the unfolding of the covenant promise of the land of Canaan. However, at this point in the trajectory, it is only the firstborn in Egypt whose death is referred to and the readers must move on to perceive the fate of the whole nation of Egypt and its divinely endowed Pharaoh.

In moving through Exod 14\*, Pg's readers would have noticed its repetitive threefold structure, with each part comprising a YHWH speech with instructions that inevitably unfold through the obedience of Moses and the people. The YHWH speeches in the first two parts contain the divine plan, repeated almost word for word, of YHWH hardening the heart of Pharaoh (in the first part) and the Egyptians (in the second part) so that they will pursue/follow the Israelites, in order that YHWH may gain glory (כבוד) for himself and the Egyptians will come to the knowledge of YHWH ("I am YHWH," *אני יהוה*); and this is progressively unfolded in all three sections.

Pg's audience would have noted Pg's reshaping of details as follows. Set in Egypt, rather than in the wilderness as in the tradition, Pharaoh initially pursues the Israelites, not because he changes his mind as in the tradition, but, drawing on a motif from the plagues tradition and shaping it such that YHWH is responsible, because YHWH hardens his heart, a motif that is then broadened out to the Egyptians who thereby follow the Israelites into the sea. This motif of YHWH hardening hearts (Pharaoh's and the Egyptians') links back to Pg's signs section where in relation to the last sign of boils, YHWH hardens Pharaoh's heart (Exod 9:12; see also 7:3 and 11:10), indicating that Exod 14\* continues on from the signs and forms a frame with them around Exod 12\*. YHWH's gaining glory (כבוד) as a consequence of hardening Pharaoh's/the Egyptians' hearts (a play on the hardening [כבוד] of Pharaoh's heart in the plagues tradition), which results in the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of who YHWH is, inverts these motifs as found in the earlier plagues tradition where Pharaoh's hardening of his heart prevents him from coming to the knowledge of YHWH. The readers would thereby be clear that the emphasis in Pg's picture of the Reed Sea episode is on this divine plan and that all that



occurs is orchestrated throughout by YHWH, who is in complete control, according to, and in order to unfold, his divine plan.

The outworking of the divine plan through the movement of the waters represents a reshaping of the tradition, where the waters are driven back by YHWH with an east wind and when it returns to its normal depth YHWH tosses the Egyptians into the sea, by picturing, through Moses's obedience, the splitting of the waters in two with the dry land appearing such that the Israelites walk through the sea on dry land but the Egyptians in following them are drowned when the divided waters come back together again. Pg's readers would have recognized this and also echoes of ancient Near Eastern myths of creation (e.g., *Enuma Elish*) and therefore its cosmic dimensions. They would also have noticed that the imagery of the splitting of the waters through which the Israelites walk on dry ground parallels Pg's picture of Elohims's cosmic creation (also drawing on ancient Near Eastern creation myths), where through the separating and movement of the waters the dry land appears (Gen 1:6–10), and that therefore what is symbolized is YHWH as cosmic creator creating the nation Israel. This represents a further stage following on their protection and liberation (see Exod 12:13, 40–41) and is a further unfolding of the covenant promise of descendants. This goes hand in hand with the coming together again of the divided waters, through Moses's obedience to the divine command, upon the Egyptians, that parallels Elohims's reversal of the cosmic creation (Gen 7:11). The readers would have been aware that this symbolizes the reversal of creation of the Egyptians, including Pharaoh, the climax of the unleashing of chaos in relation to the Egyptians and their land, summed up proleptically in microcosm in the first sign (Exod 7:8–13) and progressively unfolded throughout the following signs/wonders and the celebration of the killing of the firstborn in Egypt. With the demise of the divinely endowed Pharaoh all the Egyptian divine powers are finally judged and obliterated (see Exod 7–11\*; 12:12). It would have been noticed that this also represents a further stage in the unfolding of the Egyptians' knowledge of "I am YHWH," already glimpsed by the magicians in Exod 8:16 (Eng. 8:19) and linked with YHWH's judgment on the Egyptian gods with the killing of the firstborn (12:12–13), for it is precisely in their destruction that the Egyptians come to the knowledge of who YHWH is, as stated in the divine plan (14:4, 18). As in the cosmic creation, YHWH as cosmic creator creates and reverses creation; YHWH creates his nation Israel and can and does reverse the creation of Egypt, thereby gaining glory for

himself over the Egyptians, who in their total demise finally come to full knowledge of YHWH.

Again the threefold repetitive pattern of YHWH's instructions and their unfolding, and the repetition of the divine plan, would not only have impressed Pg's readers with the fact that YHWH is in complete control, especially of the Egyptians, and has a divine purpose in relation to them but would have given the impression of marking time. This, along with Pg's use of mythological creation imagery and the cosmic dimensions of the whole picture, would have led the readers to see the theological statement that it unfolds as having a universal and timeless dimension that allows it to be relevant through time, including their own situation in exile. This theological statement or perspective asserts that YHWH as cosmic creator is in control of his creation and its elements and the nations, including any nation and its leader that dominates or oppresses Israel and can and will destroy such nations and their leaders, rendering their gods as nothing, in the process gaining glory for himself, with the nations themselves coming to the knowledge of who YHWH is, as Israel's God and the cosmic creator (and decreator), in their demise, or the reversal of their creation. The creation of the nation Israel is inseparably related to this. This is YHWH who acts to unfold the promise to be Israel's God, and, moreover, the promise of descendants, as the creator of Israel as a liberated nation, totally freed from their oppressors who are no more.

By this point, Pg's original readers would have perceived that Exod 7–11\* and 14\* interlink with each other through the common motifs of: YHWH's repeated instructions that unfold, according to the divine plan, through the obedience of Moses (and Aaron); the cosmic mythological creation imagery of unleashing chaos on Egypt, reversing their creation (Exod 7:8–13; 14:26–28); YHWH's hardening of Pharaoh's heart (7:3; 9:12; 11:10; 14:4, 8 [see also 14:18]); YHWH's defeating of, or rendering powerless, the Egyptian gods, including the divinely endowed Pharaoh; and the Egyptians coming to the knowledge of YHWH (8:16 [Eng. 19]; 14:4, 18). They also would have perceived that Exod 14\* represents the climax of the unfolding of these motifs in Exod 7–11\* with the complete destruction of the nation of Egypt and its divinely endowed Pharaoh in reverse cosmic creation imagery in which they come to know YHWH, the cosmic creator in control of all that occurs, who thereby gains glory over them, and, moreover, creates the nation Israel. As such, Pg's audience would have noticed that Exod 7–11\* and 14\* form a frame around Exod 12\* with which it is closely linked, not only through surrounding it, but also through the

common motifs of, instructions given by YHWH and their effect when obediently carried out, the destruction in relation to Egypt (12:12), the defeat or judgment on their gods (12:12), closely linked with the revelation or knowledge of who YHWH is ("I am YHWH," 12:12), and the protection and liberation of Israel (12:13, 40–41).

Moreover, by virtue of the paradigmatic nature of the frame and its centerpiece, Pg's original readers would have been drawn into its hermeneutics of time. The paradigmatic nature of the frame, seen in its repeated patterns, thereby giving a sense of typicality through time, along with its cosmic dimensions and use of mythological creation imagery, lends a sense of timelessness and universality to the theological statement or perspective to which the picture unfolded throughout Exod 7–11\* and 14\* points. As such, it applies not just to Egypt, but to any nation that oppresses or dominates Israel at any time, including the exilic time of Pg's original audience. This theological perspective is that YHWH, Israel's God, is the one cosmic creator who is in control of all that occurs in creation, including all the nations and their lands; YHWH has a divine plan that will unfold through the obedience of the Israelites and their leaders; YHWH can and will decimate nations, their leaders, and their lands, that dominate Israel, according to the pattern of reversing the cosmic creation in the flood, rendering their gods as nothing; and in this process such nations will, in their demise, know who YHWH as cosmic creator and destroyer is, that Elohim is YHWH the God of Israel who through decreating them creates Israel as a nation whom he protects and delivers from them.

However, it is Exod 12\* and its hermeneutics of time, as surrounded by this frame, that is the centerpiece and focal point for the reader. The paradigmatic nature of the ritual prescriptions for the Passover and its performative effects reflects the timelessness of ritual or liturgical time, as relevant for all time and through time. As surrounded by the frame, its hermeneutics of time enhance the paradigmatic nature of the frame; and the frame further unfolds that which the Passover celebrates and effects, particularly in relation to their common motifs, which comprise the core of the meaning and performative effects of the Passover and the frame's theological statement or perspective.

The impact on Pg's audience of this complex paradigmatic picture of Exod 7–14\* with its hermeneutics of time, at this point in their moving through the trajectory, would have been to provide them (cognitively) with a timeless vision, a vision applicable at any time and through time and therefore a vision applicable to their own contemporary exilic context.

This vision is that through celebration of the Passover rite according to the divine instructions, rather than perceiving themselves as defeated and dominated by the foreign power (Babylon) in their foreign land, with the gods of this foreign power thereby dominant over their God YHWH, with no foreseeable future, the reality so celebrated is the opposite. It is really their God YHWH who is the cosmic creator who is in complete control of his cosmos and its elements and all nations, and in relation to whom the gods of the foreign nation (Babylon) are as nothing and absolutely powerless. YHWH as cosmic creator will destroy the foreign land and nation(s) (Babylon) who now dominate Israel, decreating them as he can, as he chose to decreate the cosmos in the flood, such that even the foreign nation will come to the knowledge of him. In so doing, YHWH will create Israel anew as his protected and liberated nation, freed from the foreign land in a future exodus. Further, and most significantly, Pg's audience would have perceived that, since this a timeless vision, it can and will be effected through practicing the Passover rite according to the divine instructions and that they are invited to actually embody this vision, to be participants in the unfolding of the divine plan, by carrying out the ritual of the Passover so described. Thereby this vision will be effected, and they will experience its reality—all they need to do is celebrate the Passover for this to occur. In this way, this complex paradigmatic picture in Exod 7–14\* provides a vision of hope to exiled Israel and the means by which this vision can become a reality for them at any time, through time. Glimpsed partially in the past through their exodus and Passover traditions, it is for Pg's audience a vision waiting for them to fully embody.

In addition, this vision that can be embodied through celebrating the Passover with its performative effects, shows not just the foreign nation(s), but Israel, which includes Pg's exilic audience, who YHWH their God is, since it represents an unfolding of El Shaddai's covenant promise to their ancestors to be their God, as promised by YHWH in his self-revelation to the nation through Moses, as the one who will fulfill his covenant promises (Exod 6:2–8), including the promise to be their God (6:6–7). In addition, in the vision of the reality that can be effected through celebration of the Passover, Pg's audience would also have perceived, not only the unfolding of YHWH's promise to be their God, but the further unfolding of the promise of descendants with the creation of the nation as a divinely protected and liberated people; and, what is more, that YHWH's liberation of them from the foreign land in which they find themselves represents the initial step in YHWH's unfolding of the promise of the land of Canaan

(6:4, 8). The resonances and beginnings of hope that would have been stirred in Pg's audience in moving through Exod 1:13–7:7\*, as a nation in a foreign land, the situation into which the covenant promises to be their God and to bring them into the land of Canaan are reiterated, would have now become clearer for them at this point, given the hermeneutics of time inherent within Exod 7–14\* as timeless and relevant for all time. Its vision that contains within it the preliminary stages of the unfolding of YHWH's promise to be their God and of the promise of the land of Canaan applies, precisely because of its hermeneutics of time, not only to the context of the nation in relation to Egypt, but to the context of Israel dominated by any foreign nation in whose land they are living, and therefore to their contemporary situation in Babylon, thereby speaking directly to their contemporary experience. However, as the preliminary stages only of the unfolding of the everlasting covenant promises to them as descendants of their ancestors, Pg's readers must move forward, on through the forward-pointing trajectory and the visionary world it continues to open up, particularly in relation to the unfolding of the promise to be their God and to bring them into the land of Canaan such that they possess it forever.

#### 6.5. EXODUS 15–NUMBERS 27\*

As Pg's readers move on, the itineraries in Exod 15:22\*, 27; 16:1, from the sea to Sin, signals another stage in the unfolding of the promise of the land. In moving through the episode of YHWH's nurturing them in the wilderness in Exod 16\*, echoes of traditional stories concerning Israel's complaining in the wilderness because of a lack of food/water (which in some of them represents a rejection of the exodus) and YHWH's provision of water/food would have been discerned. The traditional stories vary, but the closest traditional story to Pg's account is found in Num 11:4–6, 10, 13, 18–23, 24a, 31–34; in both there are the elements of the complaint of the people involving an allusion back to food in Egypt, a speech of YHWH to Moses, in response to his having heard the complaining, as to what to tell the people in terms of the provision of food, and the unfolding of what YHWH has promised in the speech.

Pg's audience would have noticed how Pg, though drawing on this tradition of the various complaining stories, has reshaped it to highlight the following points within its specific picture. The structure of the story moves through the complaint of the people (לָלוּ) (including a death wish and accusation), a disputation speech of Moses and Aaron in response, the

appearance of the glory of YHWH and the accompanying YHWH speech, and the unfolding of ensuing events.

The complaint of the people against Moses and Aaron, while recalling the traditional motif of the food they ate in Egypt, makes clear that they perceive their situation as life threatening (Exod 16:2–3). Pg expresses their rejection of the exodus (found in the tradition [Exod 17:3; Num 21:5]) very forcefully: there is a death wish—they wish that they had died by the hand of YHWH in Egypt—for this is preferable to death from hunger in the wilderness for which Moses and Aaron are to blame for leading them there. Pg pictures the people, in their complaint (לון), as rebelling immediately after the exodus. However, in contrast to Num 11:20, YHWH does not accuse the people of rejecting him in rejecting the exodus and bring judgment upon them but responds only positively. But prior to YHWH's speech to that effect, not only Moses (as in the tradition), but Aaron as well, play a role. Pg presents Moses and Aaron in a positive light in contrast to Moses's negative portrayal in Num 11:13, 21–22. They respond to the people's complaint by instructing them that it is YHWH and not themselves who is responsible for the exodus; Moses and Aaron point attention away from themselves to YHWH and prepare the people for the appearance of YHWH (Exod 16:6–7). Pg's unique element of the appearance of "the glory of YHWH" (כבוד יהוה) in the cloud (16:10), foreshadowed by Moses and Aaron (16:7), would have stood out for Pg's audience as particularly significant.<sup>11</sup> Pg's readers would have noticed especially how Pg has reshaped YHWH's speech to Moses in the tradition concerning the provision of food (Num 11:18–20) from a negative judgment to a positive promise of food (meat and bread) as a gift of YHWH that will enable the people to come to the knowledge of YHWH ("I am YHWH," אני יהוה) as their God. YHWH's promise unfolds immediately and inevitably (Exod 16:13–15), with an emphasis on the manna, and incorporating an etiology that shows Moses once again pointing to YHWH in explaining to the people that the bread is the gift of YHWH, hence assisting the people to come to the knowledge of YHWH in his nurturing of them in the wilderness, something that occurs during their whole time in the wilderness (16:21, 35\*).

---

11. The issue of the traditions drawn on and reshaped in relation to this expression is addressed below.

In sum, therefore, the emphases in Pg's picture that would have impacted Pg's readers are: the rebellion of the people in their complaint, coming out of their genuine need, but phrased in terms of a rejection of the exodus (straight after it has occurred), although it has to be pointed out to them that their complaint is really against YHWH and therefore an implicit rejection of him; the positive role of Moses and Aaron in educating the people by pointing to YHWH and what YHWH does for them; significantly, the first theophany of YHWH in terms of the appearance of "the glory of YHWH" to the Israelites; YHWH's positive response, in hearing their complaint (even though it is against him and implicitly a rejection of him) of promising and providing food (especially bread/manna) for the Israelites throughout the wilderness period; and the purpose of YHWH's nurturing them in the wilderness in this way is so that they can come to the knowledge of YHWH ("I am YHWH").

Moreover, set in the wilderness of Sin as a further step in the unfolding of the promise of the land, it would have been clear to Pg's readers that in this story another stage in the unfolding of the promise to be their God ("I am YHWH") is portrayed; YHWH is now known to Pg's audience not only as the God who protects and liberates them ("I am YHWH," Exod 6:6-7; 12:12) but as the one whose presence draws near to them in the appearance of "the glory of YHWH" (Exod 16:10; see, by way of contrast, the motif of YHWH gaining glory [כבוד] over the Egyptians in 14:4, 17) and nurtures them in the wilderness (16:12, 15, 21, 35\*).

The world of the text opened up to Pg's exilic readers moving through this text and its impact on them might have been as follows. The picture of the Israelites as a complaining people may have had resonances with them in their present situation and their attitude in exile or the early postexilic period, reflecting perhaps a genuine need, interpreted by them in terms of a lack of nurturing for which their leaders are to blame (something that might be particularly pertinent for the early returnees in the face of famine, but also experienced on a more existential level for those still living in exile). But more than this, coming as it does straight after the vision into which the audience has entered in Exod 7-14\*, the complaint, interpreting their experience as a rejection of the exodus and YHWH's action in relation to that (as pointed out to them) and therefore of that whole vision, is very jarring. It might initially have led Pg's audience to be jolted into assessing their attitude and even to expecting censure or judgment (and perhaps here there is the seed of the beginnings of a warning), since their complaint seems so out of place in light of who YHWH has revealed him-



self to be in relation to them as their God in Exod 7–14\*. However, the world opened up to the readers here, precisely and radically in the face of their complaint, assures them that YHWH their God promises and indeed (will) provide for them and nurture them in the face of their genuine need, despite their rebellion against him and the divine plan. YHWH sustains them and educates them when their perception is off track. YHWH educates them, through proper leadership (signified in Moses and Aaron) that points consistently to YHWH and who YHWH is: the one who sustains them. Thereby they will come to the knowledge of YHWH who not only liberates them, but nurtures them in their ongoing journey as he continues to unfold his promise to be their God. Moreover, YHWH as their God, and as part of the unfolding of this promise, privileges them with the appearance of his presence, portrayed in Pg's unique imagery of "the glory of YHWH" (כבוד יהוה), in which he shows that he has heard and is responsive to their needs. Thereby Pg's readers, exilic Israel, would have realized that, in stark contrast to YHWH's treatment of oppressive foreign nations pictured by the Egyptians in relation to whom YHWH gets glory (כבוד) over them when he destroys them, Israel's experience of the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה)—at least at this point on the trajectory—is the opposite: it is one of nurturing and sustenance that gives them life. Thus the readers would have realized that their complaining may result from misinterpretation and indeed represent a rebellion against YHWH, but YHWH will provide for their genuine needs that have given rise to their complaining and educate them as to who their God YHWH is in relation to them. Thereby Pg's audience would have been able to perceive how the promise to be their God can further unfold for them, at a stage that represents another step in the unfolding of the promise of the land of Canaan.

Moving on through the text, Pg's audience would have perceived that what ensues is yet another step in the unfolding of the promise of the land of Canaan with the itineraries from the wilderness of Sin to Sinai (Exod 17:1\*; 19:1, 2a).

In the theophany on the mountain in Exod 24:15b–18, Pg's readers would have recognized earlier traditions of theophany that use cloud imagery (see esp. 19:9, 16, in the context of theophany on the mountain), as well as other cloud traditions associated with divine presence such as found in the Psalms (see Pss 68:4; 97:2–3; 104:3) and in association with the old tent of meeting tradition (Exod 33:10; Num 11:25; 12:5). Other traditions echoed are traditions cultivated in the Jerusalem temple, such as those that describe glory (כבוד) as an attribute of YHWH in association

with YHWH as king (Pss 24:7–10; 29:3; 96:7–8; 145:5, 11, 12; Isa 6:3, 8) and the theophanic tradition (Pss 29:3; 97:6), as well as the imagery of fire which is a traditional element of theophanies (Ps 18:8; Isa 6:3–4; and esp. Exod 19:18 in relation to the mountain). However, the readers would have noticed how Pg has reshaped these traditions to give its own distinctive picture, by transforming YHWH's glory from an attribute to the central symbol or most direct expression of the presence of YHWH ("the glory of YHWH," כבוד יהוה), by describing it as analogous to fire (rather than seeing fire as an element of a theophany), by linking it here very closely with the cloud as veiling the glory of YHWH (in Pg the cloud does not occur on its own to mark the divine presence as in the tradition, nor does it "descend" [ירד] as in the old tent of meeting tradition), and, finally, with the glory of YHWH "settling" (שכן) on Mount Sinai. This is the same "glory of YHWH" (כבוד יהוה) that in the previous episode appeared to the Israelites in the cloud in the wilderness at a distance. As in the tradition (Exod 19:20), Moses is summoned by YHWH and goes up the mountain where there is the presence of YHWH, pictured so distinctively. Pg's readers would then have noted that the chronological note regarding Moses being called up the mountain on the seventh day, refers back to the seven-day structure of Gen 1:1–2:3.

Moving on, Pg's audience would have been struck by Pg's departure from the tradition as to what is revealed with the theophany on the mountain. It is not the law and covenant-making as in the complex traditions contained in Exod 21–24\* (and see Exod 34\*), but instead, YHWH's instructions given to Moses concerning the tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and its personnel or priesthood (Exod 25–29\*), the execution of these instructions through Moses by the people (39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b) and what ensues (40:34). In this, Pg's readers would have experienced echoes of earlier traditions throughout, taken up and reshaped into a unique picture.

The traditions that Pg's audience would have recognized, albeit in partial form, in moving through the whole of the instructions, their execution, and the results, as well as the traditions Pg has drawn on in relation to "the glory of YHWH" already described, are as follows.

In terms of form, Pg's audience may have recognized echoes of ancient Near Eastern building inscriptions, reflected also in 1 Kgs 6–7. With regard to Pg's picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its furniture in Exod 25:10–27:19\*, the tent features of the tabernacle, and in particular the frames (*qršm*), ancient Near Eastern tents or tent shrines

(such as the tent of El) could have been detected; but the echoes of the old tent of meeting tradition (Exod 33:7–11; Num 11\*; 12:4–8, 10) and perhaps the Shiloh shrine (Ps 78:60; 1 Sam 1\*; 3:15; 2 Sam 7:6) and/or the tent of David (2 Sam 6:17) would have been of more immediacy for Pg's readers. The terminology of "the tent of meeting" (אהל מועד) echoes the old tent of meeting tradition, which may itself have been influenced by the tent of El where the gods assembled (*m'd*). With regard to spatial design (in terms of zones of holiness—most holy place, holy place, and the court) and gradations in the value or superiority of materials used, there are echoes of ancient Near Eastern temple traditions (including Neo-Babylonian temple tradition) but more immediately of the preexilic Jerusalem temple (itself influenced by the former), with, for example, gold in the most holy place and bronze in the court. It might have been noticed that Pg's tabernacle also has similar relative proportions to the Solomonic temple and, similarly, an eastern orientation. The terminology of "tabernacle" (משכן) would probably have been recognized as being drawn from the Jerusalem temple tradition (as seen in some of the Zion psalms) and possibly also reflecting early tent traditions. Reflections of the Solomonic temple tradition would also have been noticed in the cherubim iconography<sup>12</sup> within the most holy place as well as cherubim ornamentation worked into its curtains; and in the furniture, such as the golden table (also part of the tent of El tradition), lampstand, and the bronze altar of the courtyard. Pg's audience would have noticed that Pg's ark reflects earlier traditions of the ark (of the covenant) as an aniconic symbol of divine presence, especially in holy war contexts (see Num 14:44; 10:35–36; 1 Sam 4:4); and that, as positioned in the most holy place and associated with cherubim, it recalls the Solomonic temple tradition (1 Kgs 8:6a, 23–28). However, as receptacle of the testimony in Pg, it also reflects the tradition of the ark as receptacle in Deut 10:1–5.

With regard to Pg's picture of the priesthood of the tabernacle/tent of meeting in Exod 28:1–29:35\*, the readers would have seen a trace only of the hierarchical structure of the preexilic Jerusalem temple priesthood, with Aaron's reshaped role as cultic authority (and representing the nation before YHWH) reflecting most strongly royal traditions of the role of the king. The figure of Aaron would have called to mind earlier traditions (some of them negative; see Exod 32\*; Num 12\*) concerning Aaron as

12. There is also cherubim iconography associated with the tent of El.

a leadership figure associated with Moses. It is possible (in light of Exod 32:1–6, 21–24, 25–29) that within the context of Pg's original audience there was an Aaronite priestly group vying with other priestly groups such as Zadokites and Levites, out of which Pg's picture of an Aaronite priesthood emerged, but this is speculative. Echoes of royal and/or divine (both ancient Near Eastern and Israelite) traditions, as well as earlier priestly traditions, would have been seen in Pg's description of Aaron's clothing (and that of his sons): the purpose of the garments for glory and splendor, the gold of the ephod and breastpiece, and the flower (of the turban) are associated with the divine and reflect royal traditions; the turban (with its flower), the girdle or sash, probably the robe, and perhaps the breastpiece with precious stones, echo royal traditions; and the ephod and the Urim and Thummim (both associated with divination) reflect older priestly tradition. Echoes of older priestly tradition would also have been perceived in the ordaining (מלא יד) of the priests and in their consecration (קדש, which tends to be used in a cultic setting); but in their anointing (משח), it is royal tradition that is recalled, being used in the majority of cases in the earlier traditions in relation to kings.

In terms of the stated function of the tabernacle/tent of meeting regarding the divine presence in Exod 25:8, 22; 29:43–46, and signified in 40:34, it has already been seen that Pg's expression of the divine presence as "the glory of YHWH" (29:43; 40:34) would have echoed Jerusalem temple traditions and the theophanic tradition cultivated within it, and the cloud associated with this divine presence (40:34) would have recalled traditional imagery for a theophany as well as the older tent of meeting tradition.<sup>13</sup> The use of the term שכן in the stated purpose of the sanctuary/tabernacle/tent of meeting (so that YHWH can שכן [dwell] in their midst [25:8; 29:46]), reflects Zion/Jerusalem temple tradition, although it also echoes the use of this verb in contexts regarding tents and encamping. Moreover, as a place where YHWH will meet (יעד) with the people (29:43; and see 25:22), the old tent of meeting tradition is reflected.

However, along with these constant echoes of multiple traditions, Pg's audience would have noticed how these traditions have been taken up by Pg, reshaped, and synthesized with unique and programmatic elements to give its own unique picture that does not correspond specifically as a whole to any of their known traditions, thereby presenting a vision for the

---

13. See above discussion.

future that is yet to be. What Pg's audience would have noticed in moving through the text of Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\* in sequence is as follows.

In beginning to move through the divine instructions to Moses for the sanctuary/tabernacle and its furniture that the people are to build, there is a clear statement at the beginning that it is to be made according to the divine pattern that is revealed (repeated in Exod 25:40; 26:30; and see 27:8) and that its purpose is so that YHWH can dwell (שכן) in their midst (Exod 25:2aa, 8). Pg's use of שכן in relation to the sanctuary/tabernacle/tent of meeting denotes the permanent and continuous presence of YHWH (as is the nuance in the Zion/temple tradition), which moves along with the sanctuary, and as such it replaces other traditions that picture YHWH's presence descending (ירד) intermittently or dwelling (ישב) in a static way in relation to a fixed place.<sup>14</sup>

In moving on to the actual detailed instructions for the tabernacle and its furniture, and the court (Exod 25–27\*), Pg's readers might have noticed that, in contrast to ancient Near Eastern building inscriptions where the focus is on the description of the actual building process, the emphasis is on the divine instructions with only a short description of their execution, with the emphasis therefore falling on the divine plan and vision. Pg's readers would also have been struck by the ordering of the presentation of the divine instructions: the picture takes the readers through from the inside to the outside, from instructions concerning the furniture of the most holy place (the ark and the *kapporet* with its cherubim), to that of the holy place (the table and the lampstand), to the instructions for the tabernacle and the placing of the furniture within its graded areas, to the instructions for the altar in the court and for the court itself. Thereby the reader is given a tour from the divine perspective since it begins with items most closely associated with the divine presence (the ark with its *kapporet* and cherubim) to that which is spatially furthest away from the divine presence: the court and its altar.

In moving through Pg's description of the ark (Exod 25:10–22), the readers would have noticed how Pg has reshaped the divergent traditions of the ark as symbolizing YHWH's presence and associated with the cherubim throne in the Solomonic temple, and the ark as a receptacle, by bringing them together into a unique picture. The cherubim (much diminished in size in comparison with those of the Solomonic temple) are

---

14. See §4.2.1.3.

linked more closely with the ark (than in the Solomonic temple) by means of Pg's unique *kapporet*, which covers the ark exactly; and the "testimony" (עדת, in contrast to the designation of the ark of the covenant [ברית] of the tradition) is to be placed in the ark. The cherubim not only reinforce the symbolism of the ark in terms of divine presence, but the spreading of their wings over the *kapporet* and their looking down at it symbolizes their protection of the ark and its contents, reinforcing the importance of the testimony. The "testimony" for which the ark is to be a receptacle comprises the divine instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting as the means of the divine presence dwelling in their midst (echoing the tradition of building inscriptions, and standing in contrast to the law in Deut 10:1–5).<sup>15</sup> Thereby Pg combines inseparably the symbolism of the ark and cherubim associated with divine presence and the ark as receptacle of the very instructions that, when carried out, will lead to YHWH's presence in their midst, reinforcing the importance of each. In this context, however, the divine presence is pictured explicitly in terms of YHWH meeting (יעד, echoing the tent of meeting tradition) with Moses intermittently above the *kapporet* between the cherubim to give guidance for the Israelites, in contrast to the temple tradition in which YHWH sits enthroned (ישב) above the cherubim as a static presence in relation to a fixed location.

Pg's picture of the divine instructions for the table and the lampstand (Exod 25:23–40), both made with gold, for the holy place, while recalling the furniture of the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 7:48–49), has only one lampstand, not ten, and it is much more intricately portrayed. But the most striking thing that Pg's audience would have noticed is that these items of furniture are portable (as is the ark), with rings and poles.

In moving through the instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its court (Exod 26–27\*), Pg's audience would have seen how tent traditions, and in particular the old tent of meeting tradition, have been reshaped and synthesized with temple traditions, themselves reshaped, into a unique picture. The uniqueness of Pg's picture would have been perceived by Pg's audience in the following traits. Though drawing on tent traditions, Pg's tabernacle/tent of meeting, as a portable tent with frames (קרשים), curtains, pegs, and cords, is positioned in the midst of the Israelites rather than outside the camp as in the old tent of meeting tradition. Unlike the tent traditions and in line with temple traditions (ancient Near

---

15. See §4.2.1.1.

Eastern temples and the Solomonic temple), it has grades of holiness, a most holy place and a holy place, as well as a court, with a corresponding gradation in the value of the materials used (gold in the most holy place and the holy place, and bronze in the court as in the Solomonic temple tradition, and in Pg's picture a gradation of materials and colors used for the curtains and their ornamentation). It is less elaborate than the Solomonic temple (as described in 1 Kgs 6–7), and, although it has similar proportions, is smaller, approximately half the area and a third the height. Like the Solomonic temple, it has aniconic symbolism for the divine presence in the most holy place (in contrast to ancient Near Eastern temples which had a cult image or statue), though in reshaped form, as we have seen, in terms the ark and (diminished) cherubim as part of the *kapporet* (in contrast to the Solomonic temple description of large cherubim facing the entrance and only loosely associated with the ark). However, unlike temples, its walls are not fixed and, as a portable tent, it is not fixed to a particular location, but designed to move with the community of the Israelites, in their midst. In these ways, Pg's unique picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting is a hybrid of reshaped tent and temple traditions.<sup>16</sup>

Moving on through Exod 28:1–29:35\* regarding the priesthood, the first thing that would have struck the readers is that it is Aaron and his sons who are to be priests. Although there is little evidence, it is quite possible that this emerges from an Aaronic group that was vying for legitimacy with Levitical and Zadokite groups, of which Pg's audience might have been aware. However, what would definitely have been clear to Pg's audience was that the picture here has reshaped quite radically traditions regarding Aaron's leadership alongside Moses (which do not in general present Aaron in priestly terms and sometimes in a negative light), in such a way as to present as programmatic an Aaronic priesthood:<sup>17</sup> in Pg's picture, it is Aaron and his sons that are to constitute the priesthood associated with the tabernacle/tent of meeting. Moreover, in proceeding through Pg's innovative picture of the Aaronic priesthood in Exod 28–29\*, the readers would have realized that Aaron as high priest in relation to the

---

16. Its designation, as the tabernacle (משכן), which predominates in Exod 26–27\* mirrors predominantly the Jerusalem temple tradition, but also possibly echoes tent traditions, and its designation as the tent of meeting (אהל מועד), that will predominate in Exod 29\*; 40:34) also reflects this.

17. This is foreshadowed somewhat in the more extensive role given to Aaron in Pg's picture in Exod 7–14\*; 16\*.



tabernacle/tent of meeting has a more significant role than the great/chief priests of the preexilic Jerusalem temple, who were under the authority of the king and attended to temple maintenance; indeed, Aaron's role encompasses the traditional role of the preexilic kings, as central cultic figure and as representing the nation before God.

Moving through the detailed description of Aaron's garments (Exod 28:6–39),<sup>18</sup> it would have been clear to Pg's audience that what is depicted here, as already noted, mirrors both royal (and divine) and older priestly traditions, thereby symbolizing that Aaron as high priest is portrayed as taking on both royal and priestly roles, something that is significant in Pg's picture in which there is no king; in this picture the high priest replaces the king. The significance of Pg's picture of Aaron's garments, as reshaping and synthesizing royal and priestly traditions with unique elements, perceived by Pg's original audience would have been as follows.

Aaron's garments described as for his glory and splendor aligns him with kings (as well as echoing divine imagery), as does the gold and colors of the ephod. However, the ephod in the preexilic tradition is associated with priests or the cult and therefore in Pg's picture the ephod has both royal and priestly/cultic connotations, thus portraying Aaron's hybrid role. The two stones on the shoulder pieces of the ephod are engraved with the names of the sons of Israel, twelve in all and therefore symbolizing Israel as a twelve-tribe nation (Exod 28:9–13); described as stones of remembrance for the sons of Israel, their function is for Aaron to represent the nation, named as twelve tribes, before YHWH. In the description of the breast-piece of judgment, attached to the ephod, that follows, its twelve stones, each engraved with one of the twelve tribes of Israel, have a similar function to the stones of the ephod, namely for Aaron to bring the nation, comprising twelve tribes, to remembrance before YHWH (Exod 28:29). The significance of this motif, twice emphasized, would not have been lost on Pg's exilic audience. Not only would they have recognized Aaron's representation of Israel before YHWH as the traditional role of the king in the preexilic tradition; but, even more significantly, being reduced to the tribe of Judah only, they would have seen the nation as twelve tribes as visionary in nature and as a further unfolding of the promise of descendants that is yet to be (again) for them. Moreover, they might well have interpreted

---

18. This takes up the bulk of the description with regard to priestly clothing, with the garments of Aaron's sons mentioned briefly in Exod 28:40 in terms of tunics, sashes, and headpieces that are less elaborate than those of Aaron (see Exod 28:40).

the remembrance alluded to as now to remind YHWH of his covenant and its promises with them. This breastpiece with its twelve stones possibly reflects royal tradition, but the Urim and Thummim placed within it reflects earlier priestly tradition associated with divine decision making; like the ephod, the breastpiece is a hybrid of royal and priestly connotations. The Urim and Thummim will carry, or mediate, the divine will in relation to the Israelites (Exod 28:30). Thereby, as described in his clothing, the function of Aaron as high priest is to mediate between YHWH and the people and vice versa; he is the one who represents the people to YHWH, bringing them to remembrance before him, and YHWH to the people in terms of the divine will. Moreover, since the materials of the ephod and the breastpiece reflect the materials of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, the figure of Aaron is intrinsic to the tabernacle and with a similar function: being the meeting point, or that which mediates, or makes possible, the divine presence in relation to the people and vice versa. The robe of the ephod also has royal overtones, and it, along with its bells on its intricate hem, has an apotropaic function of protecting the high priest from death while he is ministering, when he comes and goes to and from the holy place. Finally, the golden flower (or diadem) on the turban, associated in preexilic times with kings, is here part of Aaron's high priestly clothing and is engraved with "holy to YHWH," therefore signifying that Aaron as high priest belongs to YHWH, to the sacred realm. Moreover it protects Aaron, allowing him to carry any guilt incurred by contaminated offerings by the Israelites and to invoke divine grace so that their offerings are acceptable and they find favor with YHWH. The description of Aaron's garments concludes with a note concerning the tunic, turban and sash, the latter having royal overtones.

In sum, Pg's audience in moving through this description of Aaron's clothing would have clearly understood that the high priest is part and parcel of the tabernacle, that the role of the high priest as pictured here has absorbed the roles of the king and the priesthood, and that his primary role is to mediate between the nation Israel, envisaged as twelve tribes (representing the further unfolding of the promise of descendants), and YHWH and vice versa. Like the tabernacle of which he is an intrinsic part, Aaron is the means by which the divine presence and the nation Israel are present to each other.

Pg's audience would have seen that the absorption of royal and priestly roles in Pg's picture of the priesthood is further borne out in the process whereby Aaron (and his sons) (Exod 28:40; 29\*) become priests, that is,

through consecration (קדש), ordination (מלא יד), and anointing (משח): consecration, reflecting earlier cultic settings, signifies the person's association with the divine sphere; ordination, traditionally used in relation to priests, signifies instituting a priest into his office; and anointing is used only in relation to kings in the Israelite preexilic traditions where it denotes their elevation to office. Moreover, in the stipulation that this is to take place over seven days, Pg's audience would have recognized echoes of the seven-day structure of Gen 1:1–2:3 and the reference to Moses being called up the mountain on the seventh day (Exod 24:16).

By this stage, Pg's programmatic picture for leadership would have been quite clear to its exilic audience: an Aaronic high priest who takes on both traditional priestly and royal roles, who mediates between YHWH and the people, defined in visionary terms as twelve tribes, and vice versa.

Moving on, the readers are given an explicit statement of the purpose of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood so pictured in Exod 29:43–46. Expressed in etiological terms “the tent of meeting” (אהל מועד), which will be consecrated (קדש) by YHWH and YHWH's “glory” (כבוד), as will its personnel, is where YHWH will “meet” (יעד) (Exod 29:43–44; see also 25:22) with the Israelites. YHWH will dwell (שבן; see Exod 25:8) in their midst. Pg's audience would have noticed in this juxtaposition the synthesis of divergent traditions of divine presence, with יעד stemming from the old tent of meeting tradition and שבן reflecting the Zion/temple tradition, such that YHWH's presence to the people by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting is both continuous and permanent (שבן) and comprises intermittent encounters (for specific purposes) (יעד). This is coherent with the nature of the tabernacle/tent of meeting as having grades of holiness (pointing to permanent, continuous presence) and yet being a portable tent associated with the people rather than a fixed place (in line with tent traditions with which יעד was traditionally associated). It also explains why Pg never refers to YHWH descending (ירד) as found in the old tent of meeting tradition, since YHWH is to be continuously present in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting; and why Pg does not refer to YHWH sitting enthroned (ישב) as found in the Jerusalem temple tradition, since YHWH's presence in relation to the tabernacle/tent of meeting as mobile is not statically fixed to a particular location, but to the Israelites as they move forward with the tabernacle in their midst (and so, in this sense another traditional connotation of שבן from its use in the context of encamping is appropriate if seen as relating to mobility). Pg's readers are then informed that this promise of YHWH to dwell (continuously) in the

midst of the Israelites and to meet with them from time to time by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting is an unfolding of the covenant promise to be their God (Exod 29:45). Moreover, Pg's audience is further informed that they shall know that "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה) their God, whose purpose in bringing them out of the land of Egypt is to dwell (continuously) (שכן) among them, in fulfillment of the covenant promise (Gen 17:8; Exod 6:7). This is reinforced by the reiteration of "I am YHWH" (אני יהוה) their God: Israel will know YHWH not only as the one who sustains and nurtures them (Exod 16:12) but also as the one who is continuously present in their midst. Here, then, Pg's picture of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel is linked back to the picture unfolded in Exod 7–14\* as a further stage in the unfolding of the promise to be their God. It has been made quite clear to Pg's exilic audience at this point that the promise to be their God and its unfolding through Exod 7–14\*; 16\* is to reach something of a climax with YHWH's presence in their midst by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting.

In moving through the brief statements concerning the obedient execution of the divine instructions regarding the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood by Moses and the people (Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b), Pg's audience would have noticed close parallels with the cosmic creation in Gen 1:31–2:3 in terms of "seeing," "finishing," and "blessing" (Exod 39:32, 43); and between the setting up of the tabernacle on New Year's Day (Exod 40:17, 33b) and the emergence of the new creation on New Year's Day in Gen 8:13a. Given these observations, along with the motif of seven days or the seventh day (Exod 24:15; 29:35), Pg's audience would have begun to see the way in which Exod 24–40\* forms a parallel picture with the cosmic creation in Gen 1:1–2:3 and the emergence of the new creation in Gen 8\*. Moreover, they would have been alerted to the significance of this in terms of Exod 24–40\* completing the creation of the nation begun in Exod 14\* in their walking through the divided waters on dry land (which parallels Gen 1:6–10), reflecting the ancient Near Eastern mythological creation pattern of the controlling or splitting of the water followed by the building of a temple for the god, albeit in the world of the second and inferior creation.

Finally, Pg's audience is informed that what is promised in Exod 29:43–45 is completed in Exod 40:34, once the divine instructions have been carried out. The tabernacle/tent of meeting is sanctified by the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה) as promised: the glory of YHWH as Pg's most direct symbol of YHWH's presence fills the tent of meeting which

is veiled by the cloud (also traditionally symbolizing divine presence and in the old tent of meeting tradition associated with the tent). The readers would have realized that the glory of YHWH, veiled by the cloud, that settles (שכן) on Mount Sinai (Exod 24:16, in this context temporarily) has now moved to fill the tabernacle permanently and continuously, thus symbolizing what YHWH has promised in Exod 29:45 in terms of dwelling (שכן, in this context now, in relation to, and by means of, the tabernacle/tent of meeting, permanently) in their midst. These motifs of divine presence (in 24:15b–18a and 40:34) that bracket the whole picture in Exod 25–29\*; 39–40\* would have reinforced for Pg’s audience the significance of the divine presence in the midst of Israel by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel, and Aaron as high priest in particular (as symbolized in his clothing), so envisaged, and that the unfolding of the covenant promise to be their God has truly reached its high point.

The paradigmatic nature of Exod 24–40\*<sup>19</sup> consists not only in the reshaping and combining of various traditions synthesized with programmatic elements to present a future vision for Pg’s original readers, but also in other aspects that, along with this, point to its timelessness, which impacts its audience. Not only is this seen in its nature, to use Gorman’s terminology,<sup>20</sup> as founding ritual of sacred space and sacred personnel set in the remote past, but relevant for all time, but its style of repetition and formalism (see esp. Exod 25\* and 28\*) engenders in the reader an experience similar to ritual, such that it can be called ritualized text.<sup>21</sup> As such, in moving through the sense of the text, Pg’s original readers would not only have recognized echoes of diverse traditions reshaped into a unique vision, with its significance as outlined above, a vision and its meaning that would have impacted them cognitively. They would also have entered into the visionary and imaginary experience, akin to a guided tour (from the divine perspective, from the inside to the outside) engendered by its repetitive style such that, as in ritual, time stands still or is transcended.<sup>22</sup> Thereby Pg’s audience would have been taken up cognitively and imaginatively into the divine vision (since it comprises divine instructions

---

19. See §4.2.1.

20. See §3.1.3. and esp. n. 144.

21. See Robertson, “He Kept the Measurements,” *passim*; and the discussion in §4.2.1.1.

22. *Ibid.*; see also the discussion in §4.2.1.1.

and proceeds spatially from the divine perspective) of how YHWH can be present to them in their midst, a vision that is valid at any time and through time. But more than this, this paradigmatic and timeless picture, the bulk of which comprises divine instructions, invites Pg's readers to enact these instructions and thereby to enter fully into its world and for it and its meaning to be actualized, namely, the presence of YHWH in their midst by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and its Aaronic priesthood. There may be gaps in the description, but this does not mean that the impact of this paradigmatic picture on Pg's audience is intended to be purely cognitive and imaginative. These gaps simply allow scope for creative variation through time. The essence or the essentials are given, its concrete embodiment is practicable for exilic Israel especially because the tabernacle/tent of meeting is relatively small, and is portable and not tied to any particular place. In fully embodying this paradigmatic picture, cognitively, imaginatively, and in practice, the presence of YHWH in their midst, mediated by the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood, as they journey through time (and space) will be realized. This is the potential impact of the timeless vision of Exod 24–40\* on Pg's exilic audience.

By this point also Pg's audience would have perceived that in entering fully into this reality, the world of the text of Exod 24–40\*, and embodying it, the covenant promise that YHWH will be their God (Gen 17:7, 8; and see Exod 6:7) is further unfolded over and above the reality entered into by celebrating the Passover with all that it effects as described in the paradigmatic picture in Exod 7–14\*, and as perceived in its unfolding in Exod 16\* (see 16:12), such that it reaches a climax, or its fulfillment, in positive terms. Thereby, they would know in a positive sense who YHWH their God is: the one who protects them, liberates them from foreign nations who dominate them by destroying them, nurtures them in the face of need, and is present continuously in their midst and meets with them for specific purposes.

Pg's audience at this point would also have perceived that the covenant promise of descendants is thereby further unfolded. This is found in the vision of the nation as comprising twelve tribes, represented before YHWH by the high priest who wears the inscribed stones of the ephod and those of the breastpiece, further reinforcing the beginnings of this vision in Exod 1:1–5, 7 (see also Gen 35:22b–26). It is visionary for Pg's audience since, although reflecting the past, this is not the reality of their present as reduced to Judah alone and therefore something

to be realized in the future. But the further unfolding of the promise of descendants is also envisioned in that the paradigmatic picture in Exod 24–40\* represents a further step in the creation of the nation pictured in Exod 14\* through the divided waters, in a reflection of the ancient Near Eastern mythological creation pattern of the building of a temple for the god after he has defeated or split the waters. Pg's audience would have perceived that the vision for themselves is that of the (twelve-tribe) nation in the midst of whom YHWH dwells, which is the whole purpose of their creation as a liberated nation in the exodus (see Exod 29:46); their very identity as a nation is as the people who are to embody the divine instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and its priesthood that enables YHWH to be permanently present with them. But more than this, they would also have perceived that their creation as a nation as such, pictured in Exod 14\* as an intrinsic part of Exod 7–14\* and in Exod 24–40\*, has parallels with the cosmic creation in Gen 1:1–2:3 and the new creation in Gen 8:13a, and thereby their creation as a nation by their God YHWH mirrors God's creation of the whole cosmos, albeit within the inferior new creation postflood. Therefore, their identity as a nation has cosmic implications; they themselves, as Israel, are not only the nation in the midst of whom YHWH is to dwell, but its tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel are to be the means by which YHWH is present to his whole creation within the postflood world.

Although the covenant promises of descendants and to be their God have reached something of a climax, Pg's audience moving through Pg's trajectory might have perceived that this is not the conclusion. The paradigmatic picture or vision in Exod 24–20\*, situated after an itinerary in the wilderness, is pictured as only a stage in the unfolding of the covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan; even when fully embodied the unfolding and fulfillment of the land promise will yet be incomplete. In pondering the land promise thus far, it might have occurred to Pg's audience that just as the traditions (of tents, temples, the ark, priests, and divine presence imagery) that have been taken up in reshaped form into the paradigmatic picture in Exod 24–40\* derived from, and were handed down during, their time in the land preexile and these were therefore a mere partial foreshadowing of the full divine vision for them yet to be realized, so their time in the land preexile was simply a temporary glimpse or partial foretaste of, or a stage on the way to, the full realization of the covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land



of Canaan (Gen 17:8) that is yet to occur.<sup>23</sup> So Pg's readers must move on along the forward looking trajectory to the next stage in the unfolding of the land promise as symbolized by the itinerary in Num 10:11a, 12a, 13\*.

In moving through Num 13–14\*, which occurs after the itinerary in Num 10:11–13\* to Paran and therefore represents the next stage in the unfolding of the promise of the land of Canaan, Pg's readers would have recognized reflections of the earlier tradition regarding the spying out of the land (as found in the non-P material in Num 13–14). Indeed, Pg's picture follows this tradition in terms of its primary motifs and broad structure of a command to carry out a survey, the survey, the report of the surveyors, the response to this report by various parties including the people, YHWH's response to the people as one of judgment, and the unfolding of YHWH's judgment. However, Pg's audience would have noticed how Pg has reshaped this traditional story in the following ways.

Pg has YHWH commanding the survey of the land, rather than it occurring through human initiative, and puts emphasis on Moses's obedience to this (Num 13:1–3a). The land is described explicitly as the land of Canaan as the gift of YHWH (Num 13:2) and therefore clearly as the land promised in the Abrahamic covenant to the Israelites. In defining who the surveyors will be, Pg envisions the nation in terms of their (twelve) ancestral tribes (13:2). The land surveyed over a period of forty days is the whole land of Canaan from its southern to its northernmost borders (13:21, 25), which is more expansive than the tradition, where the land that is spied out is the southern region only. Unlike the tradition, where the report of the spies is both positive (regarding the fertility of the land) and negative (regarding strong peoples and fortified towns), for Pg the report of the surveyors (though alluding briefly to the fruit of the land) is totally negative: it is negative not only with regard to the giant inhabitants of the land as in the tradition but in particular, in complete contrast to the tradition, in relation to the land itself (13:32, 33\*). The readers would have noticed the emphasis on the bad report of the land, because it is repeated three times (13:32; 14:36, 37). Pg expresses the content of this slandering of the land in the unique and radical language of the land devouring its inhabitants—the surveyors perceive the promised land of

---

23. In addition, there has been an ominous hint in the portrait of the people as a complaining people (Exod 16\*), and Pg's audience by this point are quite aware that the cosmic creator, who is their God YHWH, is capable of not only creating but reversing creation.

Canaan as a killer such that only the Nephilim can survive in it. In the tradition, the people's response (coming after the responses of Caleb and the other spies) is to reject the exodus and Moses's leadership, but in Pg the people are portrayed as complaining against (לון על) not only Moses and Aaron but also YHWH (Num 14:3; see also 14:27). In Pg's picture, as in the tradition, the people reject the exodus, but this is sharpened and made more explicit in terms of a death wish. What is more, Pg's audience would have been cognizant of the fact that, in wishing they had died in Egypt or in this wilderness (14:2), the Israelites not only reject the exodus but also all that has occurred in the wilderness up to this point, including what has occurred as described in Exod 16\* and at Sinai. Not only this, in complaining that YHWH is bringing them into the land to kill them and for their wives and little ones to become prey (Num 14:3), the people also reject what is to come and who YHWH is perceived to be, in the exodus (as their protector and deliverer who destroys opposing foreign nations), in Exod 16\* (as the one who sustains them), and at Sinai (as the one who dwells in their midst). Thereby they reject the divine plan up to this point and in the future. In the disputation speech by Joshua and Caleb in response to the people's complaint (Num 14:6–7, 9\*) (which comes after Moses's and Aaron's gesture of submission [to YHWH? to the people?]),<sup>24</sup> the stress is on the land as exceedingly good, an allusion back to, and a heightening of, the cosmic earth pronounced as good by God in Gen 1:12 (Num 14:7) that would not have been lost on Pg's audience. By way of countering the people's rejection of the exodus and all that has occurred in the wilderness, especially at Sinai, in Num 14:2–3, Joshua and Caleb also reassure the people in holy war language that YHWH is with them so that they need not fear the people of the land, for the protection (צל) of their gods is removed, and (instead of the land devouring its inhabitants) it is the Israelites who will consume them (Num 14:9\*). In contrast to the reaction of Caleb and the other spies in the tradition, where the focus is on what the people are able to do or not, Pg focuses on what YHWH can and will do for the people, in terms that are coherent with the portrait of YHWH in Exod 7–14\* (where he renders powerless the gods of the opposing nation) and Exod 24–40\* (where he comes to dwell in their midst). The people's rejection of Joshua and Caleb and their reassurances

---

24. Cf. the tradition where the response of the spies to their report comes straight after the report and before the response of the people.

(Num 14:10a) reinforces in no uncertain terms the nation's rejection of all that has occurred in the exodus and at Sinai as in their complaint (Num 14:2–3). It also represents a rejection of the very good land of Canaan, and therefore the covenant promise of the land. The appearance of “the glory of YHWH” (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה) in association with the YHWH speech that now occurs (14:10b), as a unique feature in Pg's account, would have stood out for the readers, as it did in Exod 16\*. It is linked with the YHWH speech to Moses and Aaron. This YHWH speech that announces judgment on the people (Num 14:26–28, 29\*, 31[?], 35) echoes that of the tradition in that there is a complaint regarding the people's behavior, an oath, the decree of YHWH that the very thing that the people wished for will occur, and they will not see/go into the land, with the exception of Caleb (and in Pg Joshua), but the promise of the land still stands (implicit in the tradition but explicit in Pg). However, the readers would have realized that Pg has reshaped the tradition, in using the form of a prophetic oracle to express the judgment to be relayed to the people, emphasizing the effectiveness of the spoken word, both that of the people (Num 14:28) and YHWH's word (14:35), and putting the emphasis on the death of that generation according to their death wish. The concluding description of the congregation gathered against (יַעַל עַל) YHWH (14:35), in playing on YHWH's meeting with (יַעַל לֵ) the Israelites (Exod 29:43), reinforces once again that in their complaint and in their rejection of the reassurances of Joshua and Caleb, the people are rejecting the whole picture at Sinai with the tabernacle as the means of YHWH's presence in their midst, and therefore their identity as a nation in these terms, as well as YHWH himself. The unfolding of events after the judgment speech makes quite clear that responsibility lies with the surveyors (except Joshua and Caleb) who led the people astray by bringing a defamatory report of the land, which is their primary sin. They die in a symbolic foreshadowing of the death of that generation of the people that will occur some time in the future in the wilderness outside the promised land.

Pg's audience could also have noticed that although Pg's picture in Num 13–14\* follows in broad outline the structure of the earlier story, Pg has reshaped the structure of the tradition after the report of the spies, in Num 14\*, in accordance with the pattern found in Exod 16\*. Against the backdrop of the command to survey the land, the actual survey, and the surveyors' report in Num 13\*, Pg presents, in line with Exod 16\*, the pattern of the complaint (לֹאן) of the people (including a death wish and accusation), a disputation speech (this time by Joshua and Caleb), the

appearance of the glory of YHWH and accompanying YHWH speech, and the unfolding of ensuing events. Pg's audience would have realized that the repetition of this pattern with its common motifs links Num 13–14\* with Exod 16\* and lends a paradigmatic quality to both Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* in giving the sense of a typicality over time.

Moreover, Pg's readers, in noticing this common pattern with its common motifs, would have perceived the way in which Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* interact with, and play off, each other. Both begin with the people's complaint against Moses and Aaron with a wish that they had died in Egypt, a rejection of the exodus, but in Num 14\* the people are portrayed in a more negative light than in Exod 16\*. In Exod 16\*, the people's complaint comes out of a genuine need of life-threatening hunger, they recognize the power of YHWH ("by the hand of YHWH," Exod 16:3), they see themselves as complaining against Moses and Aaron since they have to be instructed by Moses and Aaron that their complaint is really against YHWH, and they appear to be open to instruction leading them to the knowledge of YHWH. In contrast, in Num 14\* the people's complaint, as a death wish not only in relation to the exodus but in relation to the whole wilderness period so far, is a rejection of all that has occurred up to this point, including the episode in Exod 16\* and at Sinai (Num 14:2), and is not based on genuine need but fear of death in the land as a direct accusation of YHWH (14:3), which in the context is a rejection of both of the cosmic power of YHWH who controls the nations, as seen in the exodus (Exod 7–14\*), and that YHWH is with them as envisaged in Exod 24–40\*. They are not open to being instructed in the ways of YHWH (Num 14:9\*, 10a); in rejecting the words of Caleb and Joshua, they reject explicitly YHWH's promise of the land of Canaan (Num 14:7), and YHWH himself as the God who renders the gods of opposing nations as nothing (see Exod 7–14\*) and is present with them as portrayed in Exod 24–40\* (Num 14:9\*). In short, they are a nation gathered against (יעד על) YHWH (Num 14:35) in a negative play on Exod 29:43 portraying YHWH meeting with (יעד ל) them. Correspondingly, the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה) appears in both (in the cloud in Exod 16:10 and in relation to the tent of meeting in Num 14:10b), but the content of the YHWH speeches and their unfolding move in opposite directions: in Exod 16\*, YHWH's promise of food through which they shall know YHWH unfolds, and they are sustained on the journey with the knowledge of who YHWH is thereby; in Num 14\*, YHWH's judgment of death is spoken according to their death wish, and the surveyors die in a foreshadowing of the death of that whole generation.

However, over and above this Pg's audience could well have perceived that, as part of the frame surrounding Exod 24–40\*, Num 13–14\* as it interacts with Exod 16\* in these ways, takes on the hermeneutics of time of its centerpiece in Exod 24–40\*, to which it is bound by virtue of its proximity, but also through its common motifs, namely, reference to the exodus (Num 14:2 [and 14:9\*]; Exod 29:46; and see Exod 16:3, 6), YHWH's dwelling among/with the Israelites (Num 14:9\*; Exod 29:45–46) and/or meeting with them (see Num 14:35; Exod 29:43), and in particular “the glory of YHWH” (כבוד יהוה, Num 14:10b; Exod 24:16; 29:43; 40:34; see also 16:7, 10). For Pg's readers, both Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* take on the hermeneutics of time of their centerpiece, that consists, not only in terms of its nature as a timeless vision resulting from reshaped tradition synthesized with programmatic elements, but as ritualized text or founding ritual that incorporates all time, and is relevant at any time through time. The effect for Pg's audience is that its hermeneutics of time thereby enhances the paradigmatic nature of its frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* seen in their typical pattern; and the frame unfolds further the implications of, or adds further dimensions to, Pg's vision in Exod 24–40\* for the ongoing life of the nation at any time and through time. This is so especially in relation to the common motifs that bind them that revolve primarily around who YHWH is (אני יהוה, Exod 16:12; 29:46), and the presence of YHWH among or with the people (Exod 29:45–46; Num 14:9\*) and/or meeting with them (Exod 29:43; see Num 14:35), imaged especially in the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה) (Exod 16:7, 10; Num 14:10b; Exod 24:16; 29:43; 40:34), associated throughout with YHWH as the God of the exodus (Exod 16:3, 6; Num 14:2 [and 14:9\*]; Exod 29:46). The frame adds further depth to the centerpiece with regard to these motifs, and their paradigmatic quality is enhanced as they interact with the centerpiece. Because of its hermeneutics of time, Num 13–14\*, as an integral part of Exod 16\*–Num 14\*, cannot be relegated to the past but directly addresses Pg's contemporary audience (or indeed any generation of the nation at any time and through time).

The impact of Num 13–14\* on Pg's original audience at this point cannot be separated from its impact as an integral part of the whole complex paradigmatic picture of Exod 16–Num 14\* into the timeless vision of which they are taken up. This timeless vision mirrors back to Pg's audience—the very audience to whom is given the vision of their identity as the nation in the midst of whom the presence of YHWH who is known to them through the exodus, imaged in the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה),

permanently dwells (and through whom YHWH is present to the whole cosmos) by means of the divinely ordained tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and personnel—that they are typically a complaining people, in response to whom YHWH manifests himself on specific occasions (the glory of YHWH, כבוד יהוה) with words that are effective in the life of the nation for good or ill. It might be imagined that this could well have spoken to the experience of Pg’s original audience in exile or in the early postexilic period who may well have been complaining about their situation, whether the early returnees facing famine or the exiles fearing to go back to the land. In any case, Pg’s audience would have perceived that if complaining out of ignorance in the face of genuine and life-threatening need, they can be reassured that the presence of YHWH will be a life-giving and sustaining presence that educates them as to who YHWH is in sustaining them. However, once educated in the knowledge of YHWH by the vision of YHWH as the one who brought them out of the land of Egypt in the exodus by destroying the opposing nation and its gods, sustains them and is present in their midst and meets with them through the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel as the community moves through space and time (see esp. Exod 16:12; 29:43–46), the community who in their complaining rejects this vision, as is pictured in Num 14\* (see esp. Num 14:2–3; 7, 9\*, 10a, 36), will be met with the judging presence of YHWH. Thereby Pg’s audience would realize that the presence of YHWH envisaged by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its personnel and as meeting with them at specific times in the life of the nation, imaged in the appearance of the glory of YHWH (כבוד יהוה), is not always benign—it can be a judging presence. Whether the divine presence is positive or negative in the life of the nation as it travels through time and space depends on whether they embrace and embody the vision (in Exod 16\*; 24–40\*; and Exod 7–14\*) or reject it. If they reject it, the divine judgment will be the very negation of the vision for that generation; the vision, in terms of YHWH’s sustaining and life-giving presence, and the reality it effects, is no longer open to those who deny it, and this spells death (Num 14:2–3, 28–35\*). By this point, Pg’s readers would have been aware that Pg’s vision can be rejected: there is a choice for them to embody or reject it, and they would have been well aware of the consequences of doing this.

A particularly important motif within Pg’s picture in Num 13–14\*, not directly mirrored in Exod 16\* and 24–40\* (except in the interspersed itineraries), is also the slandering of the promised land of Canaan as a killer by the surveyors (Num 13:32), colluded with by the people in their fear of

being killed in the land (14:3) and in rejecting the reassurance of Joshua and Caleb that that part of the cosmic earth that is promised to them in the everlasting covenant, the land of Canaan, is very, very good (14:7; 10a). Indeed, this motif, which is unique to Pg, is so important that it is given as the reason for the death of the surveyors and as that which caused the people to complain (Num 14:36–37; see also 14:3). Behind the people's rejection of the vision in Exod 16\*; 24–40\* (and Exod 7–14\*) is their rejection of the promised land. In Num 13–14\*, the rejection of the promised land of the everlasting covenant is inseparable from their rejection of the vision of their identity as a nation and who YHWH has shown himself to be (as the unfolding of the promise of descendants and to be their God) in Exod 16\* and Exod 24–40\* (and Exod 7–14\*). The consequences of this rejection of the promised land along with the vision in Exod 16\* and Exod 24–40\* (and Exod 7–14\*), which represents stages in its unfolding is, appropriately for that generation, death outside the land. This probably would not have been lost on Pg's original audience. Indeed, it may have touched into their present situation if some at least of the people were resisting embarking on a (return) journey to the land in the early postexilic period. They might now have perceived that their resistance to this excludes them from being participants, not only in the unfolding of the land promise, but also from the vision for the unfolding of the promise of descendants and to be their God and therefore from being the nation in relation to YHWH they were intended to be. However, the everlasting covenant promise of the land of Canaan is not thereby negated, nor are the promises of descendants and to be their God, but they remain, along with the vision in Exod 16\* and 24–40\* (and Exod 7–14\*), to be embodied and not rejected, perhaps in future generations. The land promise itself has not been negated, and so Pg's trajectory moves inexorably forward with another itinerary in Num 20:1a.

The next stage, then, after this itinerary, is pictured in Num 20:2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8α\*β (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12, 22b–29; 22:1 and 27:12–14.

In moving through Num 20\*; 27\*, Pg's audience would have noticed echoes of traditional wilderness complaint stories and in particular the tradition reflected in Exod 17:1–7. The echoes of Exod 17:1–7 found in Pg's picture are: the situation of no water causes the people to object to this to Moses and ask why he/they have brought them into this situation where they and their livestock will die; in response Moses turns to YHWH; a YHWH speech giving Moses instructions for water to come



out of the rock is given; and this is unfolded. Pg's audience would also have been cognizant of how Pg has reshaped the tradition in the following ways. In Pg the people gather against Moses and Aaron, rather than complain against Moses (Num 20:2), and, before the accusation of their leaders that they have brought them there to die, express a death wish in terms of dying before YHWH with their brothers (Num 20:3b; in a reference back to the death of the spies in Num 14:37). For Pg, there is no rejection of the exodus here by the people, as is explicitly the case in Exod 17:3, and, in referring to themselves as the assembly of YHWH (Num 20:4), their complaint is explicitly against Moses and Aaron and not YHWH as is implicit in Exod 17:3. Once more the readers would have noticed Pg's unique element of the appearance of the glory of YHWH and how here it occurs after Moses and Aaron have fallen on their faces at the entrance of the tent of meeting away from the people (Num 20:6), with the emphasis on the instructions YHWH gives them in private for water to come out of the rock on the effectiveness of the spoken word commanded by YHWH (rather than striking the rock as in the tradition) (Num 20:8\*). Particularly striking to Pg's audience would have been the fact that, in contrast to Exod 17:6 where Moses obediently carries out YHWH's instructions, in Pg Moses (and Aaron) are disobedient, speaking to the people rather than the rock, calling them rebels, and therefore usurping YHWH's role as judge, as well as usurping YHWH's place in saying "shall we bring forth water from the rock?" (Num 20:10), thereby setting themselves up as providers of the water in the eyes of the people, who were not privy to YHWH's instructions and do not know that Moses (and Aaron) is disobeying them (20:10). The water appears for the people anyway. However, YHWH's judgment on Moses and Aaron follows; they will not lead the people into the land, because, as accused by YHWH, they did not trust in him to show his holiness before the eyes of the people (20:12). This accordingly unfolds with the death of Aaron outside the land, linked with the transference of his vestments to his son Eleazar before the eyes of the people as an act of obedience by Moses to the divine instructions (20:22b–29\*), signifying the leadership into the future, and the prediction of Moses's death outside the land, though he is allowed to glimpse it, in Num 27:12–14. For Pg's audience, it would be quite clear that the focus of Pg's story here is on the leaders—it is only against them the people gather and the leaders' disobedience to YHWH's command and the consequent stripping of their leadership in relation to the promised land, and the future leadership in the hands of Aaron's son, takes center stage.

Moreover, Pg's readers would have noticed that this story also has a similar pattern to that found in Exod 16\* and Num 14\*: the people speak against Moses and Aaron with a death wish and accusation, the glory of YHWH appears with a YHWH speech to Moses to speak to a third party (here the rock, rather than the people as in Exod 16\* and Num 14\*), and consequently what happens is unfolded. This pattern is not quite as tight as between Exod 16\* and Num 14\*, since the disputation speech, which in the latter texts comes before the appearance of the glory of YHWH, comes in Num 20\* (Num 20:10) after the appearance of the glory of YHWH and its accompanying YHWH speech. However, this is in order to accentuate its message of the disobedience and failure of the leadership, where, in disobeying YHWH's instructions in disputing with the people, they misrepresent YHWH to the people (Num 20:10), rather than, as the leaders do in Exod 16:6–7 and Num 14:7, 9\*, pointing to YHWH and what YHWH will do. The pattern is similar enough, however, to show Pg's audience that this scenario too takes on a paradigmatic nuance in terms of the typicality of the repeated pattern and forms part of the frame, with Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* around the central picture in Exod 24–40\*.

As part of the frame, Pg's audience would have noticed that Num 20\*; 27\* interacts with the rest of the frame in the following ways. Although as in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* the people complain against Moses and Aaron, it is only against them, and not a complaint against YHWH nor a rejection of the exodus, as in Exod 16\*; Num 13–14\*. As in Exod 16\*, their need is genuine and YHWH responds by providing sustenance, this time water, and this despite the leaders' disobedience. But, in contrast to Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*, the primary focus in Num 20\*; 27\* is on the leadership rather than the people. Accordingly, the glory of YHWH appears only to Moses and Aaron, whereas in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* it appears to the people as well, with the accompanying YHWH speech being not one of judgment as in Num 13–14\*, but, in line with YHWH's speech in Exod 16\* concerning the provision of nourishment (here water) for the people. However, in direct contrast to Exod 16\* in particular, where Moses and Aaron are not only obedient but consistently point away from themselves to YHWH and what YHWH is doing (Exod 16:6–7, 9, 15) such that the people can come to the knowledge of YHWH, and also to Num 13–14\* where Caleb and Joshua also witness to YHWH (Num 14:9\*), Moses and Aaron are disobedient and draw attention to themselves, usurping YHWH's place and role in the eyes of the people by not witnessing to YHWH and his holiness (quite a sin for Aaron as high priest!). As in

Exod 16\*, the people are nourished, but they are not, as there, brought to knowledge of YHWH because of the behavior of their leaders who have blocked such knowledge from them. Therefore, it is Moses and Aaron who are judged by YHWH, rather than the people as in Num 13–14\*, in being stripped of their leadership in relation to bringing the people into the promised land and therefore dying outside it, and leadership is passed on to the next generation (this time through Moses's obedience to YHWH's instructions) to Aaron's son Eleazar.

As part of the frame, Num 20\*; 27\* also, along with Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*, takes on the hermeneutics of time of the centerpiece in Exod 24–40\*, which enhances its paradigmatic nature in that it takes on a timelessness that is relevant for all time. This is so, not only by virtue of its proximity to the timeless vision of Exod 24–40\* (and the rest of the frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*), but through the explicit motifs it shares with it that binds them together: the obedience or disobedience of Moses (see Exod 39–40\*; Num 20:10; and see Exod 16:6–7, 15) and the garments of Aaron as high priest (see Exod 28\*; Num 20:26, 28). Thereby Num 20\*; 27\* adds a further dimension to the implications of the timeless vision of the centerpiece in Exod 24–40\* over and above those unfolded in the rest of the frame in Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\*, particularly in relation to the motifs it has in common with it and its frame, of the obedience/disobedience of the leaders and Aaron's garments. The dimension it adds concerns leadership of the community. The proper role of the leaders is to obediently carry out YHWH's instructions according to the divine plan (see esp. Exod 39:32, 43; 40:33b) and witness to what YHWH is doing for the Israelites as he unfolds his covenant promise to be their God (see esp. Exod 16:6–7, 9, 15; Num 14:7, 9\*). As long as they exercise this role in a proper manner they are the true leaders of the nation. However, if they do not, by not witnessing to YHWH and his holiness but seeking to take his place in relation to the people, blocking the knowledge of YHWH from them, they are not the true leaders of the nation and they will lose their leadership. However, even if Israel's leadership is disobedient YHWH will still provide for the nation. Such leaders will be obliterated but the divine plan will still unfold, and YHWH will ensure that there will be subsequent leaders in terms of the high priests of the Aaronic priesthood (symbolized in the transference of Aaron's clothing to his son Eleazar), so that this can occur, with each one judged in similar terms. If he is obedient to YHWH and witnesses to YHWH by mediating the presence of YHWH (as symbolized in his garments) he will remain leader; but if he blocks the knowledge

of YHWH by not exercising correctly his priestly duties, he too will be stripped of his leadership. With its timeless dimension, this is relevant for Pg's contemporary readers, or indeed for Israel at any time through time.

The impact of the paradigmatic picture of Num 20\*; 27\* on Pg's exilic audience, as part of the frame with Exod 16\* and Num 13–14\* surrounding the centerpiece in Exod 24–40\*, over and above the impact of Exod 16–Num 14\* as a whole is as follows. The people would be quite clear that the high priest of the Aaronic priesthood is *the* leader envisaged for the community. But each high priest will remain the leader only if he exercises his office in line with this vision of true leaders, that is, as obedient to YHWH's vision for the nation and as witnessing constantly to what YHWH has done, is doing, and will do for the nation Israel to unfold his covenant promise to be their God so that they know who YHWH is; as high priest he consistently mediates the presence of YHWH to the people (thereby witnessing to his holiness) and represents the people to YHWH (as symbolized in his priestly garments). If he does not, he will be deposed as leader and the leadership will pass on to the next high priest, who will exercise leadership according to the same conditions. This helps to provide a measuring stick in terms of leadership, for both the leader who clearly sees what his role is to be, and for the people. Moreover, the people are reassured that they are protected from any abuse of power by their leader(s), since, in this vision, YHWH will depose such a leader and the leadership will pass on to the next in line. Moreover, they are reassured that YHWH will act to unfold his vision for the nation regardless of the behavior of their leader(s) and will continue to appoint a succession of leadership, each one called to true leadership as envisaged here and judged accordingly.

Having reached this point at the end of the trajectory, Pg's audience would have realized, in looking back over the whole complex paradigmatic picture of the story of the nation, that the rejection of the vision in Exod 16\* and 24–40\*, found in Num 13–14\*; 20\*; 27\*, is also a rejection of Exod 7–14\*. In Num 14:2, 3bβ, the people reject the exodus, and in Num 14:3abα, 10 (as a rejection of 14:9\*), they reject YHWH as the cosmic God who controls the nations and defeats opposing nations and renders their gods powerless; and their rejection of the promised land represents a rejection of its unfolding in stages throughout Exod 7–40\*. Moreover, the disobedience of the leaders, Moses and Aaron, in Num 20:10 represents a reversal of their behavior throughout Exod 6–40\*, where they are consistently obedient to YHWH's commands. Therefore, Pg's audience, in

having moved through Num 13–27\*, would have realized that this represents a rejection of the whole creation of the nation (pictured in two stages in Exod 7–14\* [esp. Exod 14\*] and 16–40\*) in Exod 1–40\*. Since the creation of the nation not only reflects the ancient Near Eastern pattern of the building of a temple for the god who defeats or splits the waters, but parallels or mirrors God's creation of the whole cosmos, albeit within the inferior new creation postflood, they would have perceived that Num 13–27\*, in which the Mosaic generation is pictured not only as rejecting, but forfeiting, their creation as a nation, in their demise (except for Joshua and Caleb) parallels and mirrors the reversal of the cosmic creation (except for Noah and company) in Gen 6–7\*. This is reinforced by the parallel motif of sin in relation to the land in both Gen 6\* (where the earth is corrupted by the violence of all flesh) and Num 14\* (where the land is slandered as a killer). Thereby, Pg's audience would have perceived that the whole complex paradigmatic picture of the story of the nation parallels and mirrors the picture of the creation of the cosmos and its reversal in Gen 1–7\*, reinforcing further that their God YHWH is the one cosmic creator who is known to other nations as Elohim.

What is more, and most significantly, Pg's audience would have realized that the complex paradigmatic picture of the creation of the nation is centered in ritual, in an echo of the liturgical overtones of Gen 1:1–2:3; at the heart of the creation of the nation is the ritual of the Passover and the ritualized text, or founding rituals, regarding the tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and personnel, portrayed meticulously with all that they mean and effect. Because of its hermeneutics of time, Pg's audience would have been taken up into its vision cognitively and imaginatively and, most importantly, invited to embody it not only existentially but to realize it fully through praxis, that is by practicing the Passover rite with all its significance and bringing into being the tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and priesthood with all its significance. This is the way that the vision can come to reality at any time and through time. However, the rejection of this vision of the nation is on the whole devoid of ritual;<sup>25</sup> indeed, it could be said that at the heart of the rejection of the vision is the rejection of its ritual and performative effects. By this point, it would have been crystal clear to Pg's audience that they have a choice: to embody the

---

25. The transference of Aaron's garments on to his son in Num 20:26, 28 is a ritual act, but this is not part of the reversal of the creation of the nation as such throughout Num 14–27\*, but a visionary element; this will be addressed shortly.

vision for the nation through ritual or to reject it along with the ritual that brings it to reality.

Furthermore, Pg's audience, in looking back over Pg as a whole, would have realized that the cosmic parallel to the story of the nation in Exod 1–Num 27\* is incomplete: whereas in Gen 8–11\*, Noah and his descendants abound on the cosmic earth of the new creation, the story of the nation ends with the (predicted) demise of that generation of the nation and its leaders (Moses and Aaron) outside the land of Canaan, the very part of the cosmic earth that is promised to them. The parallel in the cosmic picture looks for completion in the story of the nation, which brings us to the other insight that Pg's audience would have had, standing at the end of the trajectory in light of Pg as a whole.

The perspective of Pg's readers standing at the end of the trajectory would have been future-looking and visionary, as has been the case throughout Pg's trajectory, and in particular in the complex paradigmatic picture of the creation of the nation (Exod 1–40\*). Pg's original audience, having reached the end of the trajectory and thereby having moved through the sense of the whole text into its world in a cumulative fashion, is directed toward the future in the following ways.

The end of the trajectory looks forward to the further unfolding of the Abrahamic covenant promise of descendants (as the further unfolding of the cosmic blessing) in the next generation, symbolized by Eleazar, Aaron's son (Num 20:25–26, 28). However, the whole of the unfolding of the promise of descendants—envisaged in terms of twelve tribes (Exod 1:1–5, 7; and see Gen 35:22b–26; and Exod 28:9–11, 21), in the creation of the nation as the nation delivered from oppressing foreign nations (Exod 7–14\*), and as the nation whose identity is the people in the midst of whom YHWH dwells by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting and its priesthood, and therefore the nation through whose cult YHWH is present to the whole creation (Exod 24–40\*)—is also visionary, as it is part of Pg's paradigmatic picture for the nation, and from the point of view of Pg's audience, yet to be realized. The reference to Aaron's clothing transferred to Eleazar hints at, and refers to, the further unfolding of this larger vision in Exod 1–40\* in that it contains the stones of the ephod and the breast-piece inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes, and in the symbolism of Eleazar himself, now as high priest, in his clothing as part of the tabernacle/tent of meeting mediating the presence of YHWH to the people.

Thereby the reference to Aaron's clothes being transferred to Eleazar his son also shows that the end of the trajectory looks forward to the further

unfolding of the everlasting covenant promise to be their God, since the garments of the high priest, as part of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, are the means by which he mediates the presence of God to the people and vice versa. However, the whole of the unfolding of the promise to be their God as seen in the paradigmatic picture of the creation of the nation in Exod 1–40\*, as the cosmic creator God who protects and delivers them through destroying opposing nations and their gods and dwells in their midst by means of the tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and priesthood, is visionary.

The future unfolding of this vision for Pg's audience of the promise to be their God, and the promise of descendants as pictured in all its depth, however, will only come to reality in the future if or when they do not reject the vision in Exod 1–40\*, as in Num 13–14\*; 20\*, but absorb it cognitively and existentially and embody it and realize it through praxis of the rite of Passover and the divine instructions for the tabernacle/tent of meeting, its furniture, and priesthood. If they reject the vision, in a sense the promise to be their God continues, but it is a presence that will not be benign and life-giving but a judging presence that leads to death.

Finally, the end of the trajectory looks forward to the unfolding of the everlasting covenant promise of everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, hinted at by the reference to Moses's glimpse of the land that he is allowed (Num 27:12–14). However, the unfolding of this promise of the land of Canaan is forward-looking and visionary throughout the trajectory since the itineraries are part and parcel of Pg's complex paradigmatic picture, especially in Exod 1–40\*. This promise of *everlasting* possession of the land, for Pg's audience, whether they are outside the land in exile or in the land in the early postexilic period, will only unfold and be fulfilled once the whole vision of the creation of the nation in Exod 1–40\* in all its aspects has been fully embodied and realized; and, since even when this is fulfilled it is pictured as only a stage or stages toward the unfolding of the land promise, if Israel does not reject the land (by slandering it). The vision of everlasting possession of the land will thereby be the last vision to be fulfilled, once the nation has embodied its full identity in fulfillment of the promises of descendants and all its implications, and to be their God (envisaged in Exod 1–40\*). Only then will the nation's parallel with its cosmic counterpart of the nations abounding on the earth be fulfilled, with Israel abounding on that part of the cosmic earth promised to them forever, the land of Canaan. In this way, Pg's audience is pointed toward the future once they have moved through this text into its world at its very end.



The choice remains for Pg's audience to seek to embody the vision through ritual praxis or to reject it and thereby exclude themselves from it. But if they choose to reject it, the vision that represents the unfolding of the covenant promises of descendants, to be their God, and everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, still stands for a future generation to either seek to embody or to reject.

In conclusion, although the audience imagined throughout this chapter is Pg's original exilic/early postexilic audience, given Pg's hermeneutics of time akin to the timelessness of ritual that incorporates all time past, present, and future, and its consistently visionary nature throughout, even at its end, Pg's vision is potentially relevant for any time, through time. At different times in the ongoing life of the nation, there may be different echoes of past traditions, reshaped and synthesized with unique and programmatic elements into this complex vision, depending on how, and to what extent, aspects of this vision might have been embodied or rejected. But Pg's timeless vision remains for any and every generation of the nation Israel, or readers of Pg, to seek to embody it cognitively, existentially, and in practice through ritual—or not.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achenbach, Reinhard. "Die Erzählung von der gescheiterten Landnahme von Kadesch Barnea [Numeri 13–14] als Schlüsseltext der Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuchs." *ZABR* 9 (2003): 56–123.
- . *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*. BZABR 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003.
- Ackroyd, Peter. *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* OTL. London: SCM, 1968.
- Ahuis, F. *Exodus 11,1–13,16 und die Bedeutung der Trägergruppen für das Verständnis des Passa*. FRLANT 168. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Artus, Olivier. *Études sur le livre des Nombres: récit, histoire et loi en Nb 13,1–20,13*. OBO 157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Presses Universitaires, 1997.
- Auld, A. Graeme. *Joshua, Moses and the Land: Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980.
- Baden, Joel S. "Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Considerations." Pages 13–29 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- . *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. FAT 68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- . "The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16." *ZAW* 122 (2010): 491–504.
- Balentine, Samuel. "Prayer in the Wilderness Traditions." *HAR* 9 (1985): 53–74.
- Bar-On, Shimon. "Zur literarkritischen Analyse von Ex 21,21–27." *ZAW* 107 (1995): 18–30.
- Bauks, Michaela. "Das Dämonische im Menschen: Einige Anmerkungen zur priesterschriftlichen Theologie (Ex 7–14)." Pages 239–51

- in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Armin Lange, Herman Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- . "Genesis 1 als Programmschrift der Priesterschrift (Pg)." Pages 333–45 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin. BETL 155. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- . "La signification de l'espace et du temps dans l'historiographie sacerdotale." Pages 29–45 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Thomas Römer. BETL 147. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Bergant, Dianne. "An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Interpretation: The Passover Supper in Exodus 12:1–20 as a Case Study." *Semeia* 67 (1994): 43–62.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "An Assessment of the Alleged Preexilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch." *ZAW* 108 (1996): 495–518.
- . *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "A Post-exilic Lay Source in Genesis 1–11." Pages 49–61 in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion*. Edited by Jan Gertz, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte. BZAW 315. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- . "The Structure of P." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 275–92.
- . *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*. LAI. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Blum, Erhard. "Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings." Pages 31–44 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- . "The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua." Pages 89–106 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. SymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. BZAW 189. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.
- Boase, Elizabeth. "Life in the Shadows: The Role and Function of Isaac in Genesis; Diachronic and Synchronic Readings." *VT* 51 (2001): 312–35.

- Boorer, Suzanne. "The Earth/Land (אֶרֶץ) in the Priestly Material: The Preservation of the 'Good' Earth and the Promised Land of Canaan throughout the Generations." *ABR* 49 (2001): 19–33.
- . "The Envisioning of the Land in the Priestly Material: Fulfilled Promise or Future Hope?" Pages 99–125 in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid. AIL 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- . "Kaleidoscopic Patterns and the Shaping of Experience." Pages 199–216 in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Marvin Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . "The Kerygmatic Intention of the Priestly Document." *ABR* 25 (1977): 12–20.
- . "The Place of Numbers 13–14\* and Numbers 20:2–12\* in the Priestly Narrative (Pg)." *JBL* 131 (2012): 45–63.
- . "The Priestly Promise of the Land: Genesis 17:8 in the Context of P as a Whole." Pages 175–86 in *The Earth Story in Genesis*. Edited by Norman Habel and Shirley Wurst. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- . *The Promise of the Land as Oath: A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch*. BZAW 205. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992.
- . "The Promise of the Land as Oath in Exodus 32:1–33:3." Pages 245–66 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr. VTSup 164. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Bray, Jason S. "Genesis 23: A Priestly Paradigm for Burial." *JSOT* 60 (1993): 69–73.
- Brown, William. *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1999.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. IBC. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- . "The Kerygma of the Priestly Writers." Pages 101–13 in *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*. Edited by Hans W. Wolff and Walter Brueggeman. 2nd ed. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- . "Pharaoh as Vassal: A Study of a Political Metaphor." *CBQ* 57 (1995): 27–51.
- Buckley, Jorunn. "A Matter of Urgency: A Response to the Passover Supper in Exodus 12:1–20." *Semeia* 67 (1994): 63–71.
- Budd, Philip. *Numbers*. WBC 5. Waco, TX: Word, 1984.

- Campbell, Antony F. "The Priestly Text: Redaction or Source?" Pages 32–47 in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: Für Norbert Lohfink*. Edited by Georg Braulik, Walter Gross, and Sean McEvenue. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1993.
- Campbell, Antony F., and Mark O'Brien. *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Carr, David. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- . "Scribal Processes of Coordination/Harmonization and the Formation of the First Hexateuch(s)." Pages 63–83 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . "What Is Required to Identify Pre-Priestly Narrative Connections between Genesis and Exodus? Some General Reflections and Specific Cases." Pages 159–80 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. SymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Childs, Brevard. *Exodus: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1974.
- . *Myth and Reality on the Old Testament*. SBT 27. London: SCM, 1960.
- . "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Tradition." VT 20 (1970): 406–18.
- Clements, Ronald E. *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and the Bible*. CBQMS 26. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1994.
- . "The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting." CBQ 33 (1971): 221–27.
- Coats, George W. *Exodus 1–18*. FOTL 2A. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God*. JSOTSup 57. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

- . *Rebellion in the Wilderness: The Murmuring Motif in the Wilderness Traditions of the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.
- . "The Traditio-Historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif." *VT* 17 (1967): 253–65.
- . "The Wilderness Itinerary." *CBQ* 34 (1972): 135–52.
- Cody, Aelred. *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*. AnBib 35. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Cortese, E. *Josua 13–21: Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*. OBO 94. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Crawford, Cory D. "Between Shadow and Substance: The Historical Relationship of Tabernacle and Temple in Light of Architecture and Iconography." Pages 117–33 in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*. Edited by Mark Leuchter and Jeremy Hutton. AIL 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Cross, Frank M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- . "The Priestly Tabernacle." Pages 39–67 in *Old Testament Issues*. Edited by Samuel Sandmel. London: SCM, 1969.
- . "The Priestly Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon." Pages 84–95 in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Frank Cross. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Crüsemann, Frank. *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*. Translated by Allen Mahnke. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Currid, John. D. "The Egyptian Setting of the 'Serpent': Confrontation in Exodus 7:8–13." *BZ* 39 (1995): 203–24.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Damrosch, David. *The Narrative Covenant: Transformations of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Traditions*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Davies, Eryl W. *Numbers*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Davies, Graeme I. "The Composition of the Book of Exodus: Reflections on the Theses of Erhard Blum." Pages 71–85 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions. A Tribute to Menahem Haran*. Edited by Michael V. Fox, Victor Hurowitz, Avi Hurvitz, Michael L. Klein, Baruch J. Schwartz, and Nili Shupak. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- . Review of *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, by Jan Gertz. *JTS* 53 (2002): 571–75.
- . "The Wilderness Itineraries." *VT* 33 (1983): 1–13.

- Dozeman, Thomas. "The Commission of Moses and the Book of Genesis." Pages 107–29 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. SymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . *Commentary on Exodus*. ECC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- . *God on the Mountain: A Study of Redaction, Theology, and Canon in Exodus 19–24*. SBLMS 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . "The Priestly Wilderness Itineraries and the Composition of the Pentateuch." Pages 257–88 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Durham, John I. *Exodus*. WBC 3. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.
- Edelman, Diana. "Exodus and Pesach-Massot as Evolving Social Memory." Pages 161–93 in *Remembering and Forgetting in Early Second Temple Judah*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin. FAT 85. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Elliger, Karl. "Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung." *ZTK* 49 (1952): 121–43.
- Elnes, Eric E. "Creation and Tabernacle: The Priestly Writer's Environmentalism." *HBT* 16 (1994): 144–55.
- Emerton, J. A. "The Priestly Writer in Genesis." *JTS* 39 (1988): 381–400.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- . *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*. New York: Schocken Books, 1979.
- Fleming, Daniel. "The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests." *JBL* 117 (1998): 401–14.
- . "Mari's Large Public Tent and the Priestly Tent Sanctuary." *VT* 50 (2000): 484–98.
- Fohrer, George. *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus: Eine Analyse von Ex 1–15*. BZAW 91. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.
- Frankel, David. *The Murmuring Stories of the Priestly School: A Retrieval of Ancient Sacerdotal Lore*. VTSup 89. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . "Two Priestly Conceptions of the Guidance in the Wilderness." *JSOT* 81 (1998): 31–37.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *Exodus*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox, 1991.



- . "The Plagues as Ecological Signs of Disaster." *JBL* 110 (1991): 385–96.
- . "The Priestly Document: Anti-Temple?" *VT* 18 (1968): 313–29.
- Frevel, Christian. *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung erinnern: Zum Ende der Priesterschrift*. HerBS 23. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2000.
- Fritz, Volkmar. "Das Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift." *ZTK* 84 (1987): 426–39.
- Garr, W. Randall. "The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3." *JBL* 111 (1992): 385–408.
- George, Mark K. *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space*. AIL 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Gertz, Jan. *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch*. FRLANT186. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- . "The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus." Pages 73–87 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. SymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Gilders, William. "Sacrifice before Sinai and the Priestly Narrative." Pages 57–72 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- Gorman, Frank. *Divine Presence and Community: A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus*. ITC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- . *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology*. JSOTSup 91. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . "Priestly Rituals of Founding: Time, Space, and Status." Pages 47–64 in *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honor of John H. Hayes*. Edited by M. Patrick Graham, William P. Brown, and Jeffrey K. Kuan. JSOTSup 173. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Grabbe, Lester. *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Greenstein, Edward L. "The Firstborn Plague and the Reading Process." Pages 555–68 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

- Guillaume, Philippe. *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18*. LHBOTS 391. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Ha, John. *Genesis 15: A Theological Compendium of Pentateuchal History*. BZAW 181. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989.
- Habel, Norman. "Geophany: The Earth Story in Genesis 1." Pages 34–48 in *The Earth Story in Genesis*. Edited by Norman Habel and Shirley Wurst. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Haran, Menahem. "Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source." *JBL* 100 (1981): 321–33.
- . "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch." *JBL* 81 (1962): 14–24.
- . *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985.
- Hollaway, S. W. "What Ship Goes There: The Flood Narratives in the Gilgamesh Epic and Genesis Considered in Light of Ancient Near East Temple Ideology." *ZAW* 103 (1991): 328–55.
- Homan, Michael M. "The Divine Warrior in His Tent: A Military Model for Yahweh's Tabernacle." *BRev* 16.6 (2000): 22–33, 55.
- . *To Your Tents, O Israel! The Terminology, Function, Form, and Symbolism of Tents in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. CHANE 12. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Hundley, Michael B. "Before YHWH at the Entrance of the Tent of Meeting: A Study of Spatial and Conceptual Geography in Priestly Texts." *ZAW* 123 (2011): 15–26.
- . *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*. WAWSup 3. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- . *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*. FAT 2/50. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Hunt, Alice. *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*. LHBOTS 452. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Hurowitz, Victor. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*. JSOTSup 115. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- . "The Priestly Account of Building the Tabernacle." *JAOS* 105 (1985): 21–30.
- . "YHWH's Exalted House: Aspects of the Design and Symbolism of Solomon's Temple." Pages 63–110 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. LHBOTS 422. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

- Hurvitz, Avi. "The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology." *RB* 81 (1974): 24–56.
- Hyatt, J. Philip. *Exodus*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Janowski, Bernd. "Tempel und Schöpfung: Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption." Pages 37–69 in *Schöpfung und Neuschöpfung*. Edited by Luis Alonso Schökel and Ingo Baldermann. JBTh 5. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- Jenson, Philip. *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. JSOTSup 106. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Kamlah, Jens. "Temples of the Levant: Comparative Aspects." Pages 507–34 in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.); Proceedings of a Conference on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen (28–30 May 2010)*. Edited by Jens Kamlah and Henrike Michelau. ADPV 41. Weisbaden: Harrossowitz, 2012.
- Kawashima, Robert. "The Priestly Tent of Meeting and the Problem of Divine Transcendence: An 'Archeology' of the Sacred." *JR* 86 (2006): 226–57.
- Keel, Othmar. "Paraphernalia of Jerusalem Sanctuaries and Their Relation to Deities Worshipped Therein during the Iron Age IIA–C." Pages 317–42 in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. B.C.E.); Proceedings of a Conference on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen (28–30 May 2010)*. Edited by Jens Kamlah and Henrike Michelau. ADPV 41. Weisbaden: Harrossowitz, 2012.
- Kegler, Jürgen. "Zu Komposition und Theologie der Plagenerzählung." Pages 55–74 in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Stegemann. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- Kitchen, Kenneth. "Tabernacle: Pure Fiction or Plausible Account." *BRev* 16.6 (2000): 14–21.
- Klein, Ralph W. "Back to the Future: The Tabernacle in the Book of Exodus." *Int* 50 (1996): 264–76.
- . "The Message of P." Pages 57–66 in *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Jörg

- Jeremias and Lothar Peritt. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- Knauf, Ernst A. "Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichten der Deuteronomisten." Pages 101–18 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Thomas Römer. BETL 147. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Knierim, Rolf. "The Book of Numbers." Pages 155–63 in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Stegemann. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- . "Conceptual Aspects in Exodus 25:1–9." Pages 113–23 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David N. Freedman, and Avi Hurowitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Knierim, Rolf P., and George W. Coats. *Numbers*. FOTL 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- . "Who Edited the Pentateuch?" Pages 359–67 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Koch, Klaus. "P-Kein Redaktor! Erinnerung an zwei Eckdaten der Quellscheidung." *VT* 37 (1987): 446–67.
- Köckert, Matthias. "Leben in Gottes Gegenwart: Zum Verständnis des Gesetzes in der priesterschriftlichen Literatur." Pages 29–61 in *Gesetz als Thema Biblischer Theologie*. Edited by Ingo Baldermann and Dwight R. Daniels. JBTh 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989.
- . "Das Land in der priesterlichen Komposition des Pentateuch." Pages 147–62 in *Von Gott reden: Beiträge zur Theologie und Exegese des Alten Testaments; Festschrift für Siegfried Wagner zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Dieter Vieweger and Ernst-Joachim Waschke. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.
- Kohata, Fujiko. *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3–14*. BZAW 166. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.
- Kok, Johnson Lim Teng. *The Sin of Moses and the Staff of God: A Narrative Approach*. SSN 35. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1997.

- Konkel, Michael. "Exodus 32–34 and the Quest for an Enneateuch." Pages 169–84 in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid. AIL 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Kratz, Reinhard. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- . "The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate." Pages 31–61 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Lee, Won W. "The Exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land: A Conceptual Approach." Pages 217–39 in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Marvin Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Lemmelijn, Benedicte. "The Phrase וּבַעֲצִים וּבָאֲבָנִים in Exodus 7,19." *Bib* 80 (1999): 264–68.
- Leuchter, Mark, and Jeremy M. Hutton, eds. *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*. AIL 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 4A. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Liss, Hanna. "The Imaginary Sanctuary: The Priestly Code as an Example of Fictional Literature in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 663–89 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. Edited by Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "God the Creator and the Stability of Heaven and Earth: The Old Testament on the Connection between Creation and Salvation." Pages 116–35 in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "Original Sin in the Priestly Historical Narrative." Pages 96–115 in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "Die priesterschriftliche Abwertung der Tradition von der Offenbarung des Jahwenamens an Mose." *Bib* 49 (1968): 1–8.

- . “The Priestly Narrative and History.” Pages 136–72 in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994. Originally published as “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte.” Pages 189–225 in *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977*. VTSup 29. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- . “The Strata of the Pentateuch and the Question of War.” Pages 173–226 in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Lust, Johan. “Exodus 6:2–8 and Ezekiel.” Pages 209–24 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation*. Edited by Marc Vervenne. BETL 126. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.
- Magonet, Jonathan. “The Rhetoric of God: Exodus 6:2–8.” *JSOT* 27 (1983): 56–67.
- Maiberger, P. *Das Manna: Eine literarische, etymologische und naturkundliche Untersuchung*. ÄAT 6. Weisbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- Mann, Thomas W. “Passover: The Time of Our Lives.” *Int* 50 (1996): 240–50.
- Margaliot, Meshullam. “The Transgression of Moses and Aaron in Num 20:1–13.” *JQR* 74 (1983): 196–228.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. “Moses’ Dealings with Pharaoh: Ex 7,8–10,27.” *CBQ* 27 (1965): 336–47.
- McEvenue, Sean. *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*. AnBib 50. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. ConBOT 18. Lund: Gleerup, 1982.
- . “The Name and the Glory: The Zion-Sabaoth Theology and Its Exilic Successors.” *JNSL* 24 (1998): 1–24.
- Milgrom, Jacob. “The Case for the Pre-exilic and Exilic Provenance of the Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.” Pages 48–56 in *Reading the Law: Essays in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*. Edited by J. Gordon McConville and Karl Möller. LHBOTS 461. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- . “HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah.” Pages 24–40 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler. VTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3A. New York: Doubleday, 1991.



- . *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . “Magic, Monotheism and the Sin of Moses.” Pages 251–65 in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*. Edited by Herbert B. Huffmon, Frank A. Spina, and A. R. W. Green. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- . *Numbers*. JPSTC. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.
- . “Rationale for Cultic Law: The Case of Impurity.” *Semeia* 45 (1989): 103–9.
- Mowinkel, Sigmund. *Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch: Die Berichte über die Landnahme in den drei altisraelitischen Geschichtswerken*. BZAW 90. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Raising up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. “P as an Originally Independent Source in the Pentateuch.” *IBS* 10 (1988): 192–206.
- . *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Niditch, Susan. *Chaos and Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Nihan, Christophe. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study of the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. FAT 2/25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- . “The Priestly Covenant: Its Reinterpretations and the Composition of P.” Pages 87–134 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- Noegel, Scott B. “Moses and Magic: Notes on the Book of Exodus.” *JNES* 24 (1996): 45–59.
- Noort, Ed. “Bis zur Grenze des Landes? Num 27,12–23 und das Ende der Priesterschrift.” Pages 99–119 in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*. Edited by Thomas Römer. BETL 215. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- Noth, Martin. *The Chronicler's History*. Translated by Hugh G. Williamson. JSOTSup 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- . *Exodus: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1962.
- . *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated by Bernard W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- . *Leviticus: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.
- . *Numbers: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.



- Nurmela, Risto. *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Olson, Dennis. *Numbers*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox, 1996.
- Olyan, Saul M. "An Eternal Covenant with Circumcision as Its Sign: How Useful a Criterion for Dating and Source Analysis?" Pages 347–58 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Otto, Eckart. *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumsrahmen*. FAT 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- . "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift." *TRu* 62 (1997): 1–50.
- . "The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch." Pages 135–56 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- Owczarek, Susanne. *Die Vorstellung vom "Wohnen Gottes inmitten seines Volkes" in der Priesterschrift: Zur Heiligtumstheologie der priesterlichen Grundschrift*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1998.
- Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*. Copenhagen: Branner Og Korh, 1940.
- Perlitt, Lothar. "Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?" Pages 123–43 in *Deuteronomium-Studien*. FAT 8. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Pitkänen, Pekka. *Central Sanctuary and Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple*. GDNE 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2004.
- Pola, Thomas. *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literaturkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von Pg*. WMANT 70. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.
- Propp, William H. *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 2A. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- . *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 2B. New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- . "The Rod of Aaron and the Sin of Moses." *JBL* 107 (1988): 19–26.
- . "Why Moses Could Not Enter the Promised Land." *BRev* 14.3 (1998): 36–40, 42–43.
- Prosic, Tamara. *The Development and Symbolism of the Passover until 70 CE*. JSOTSup 414. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

- Pury, Albert de. "Abraham: The Priestly Writer's 'Ecumenical' Ancestor." Pages 163–81 in *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Bible; Essays in Honor of John Van Seters*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Thomas Römer. BZAW 294. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
- . "The Jacob Story and the Beginning of the Formation of the Pentateuch." Pages 51–72 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. SymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Genesis: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1972.
- . *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. Stalker. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962.
- . *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch: Literarisch untersucht und theologisch gewertet*. BWANT 65. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.
- . "The Tent and the Ark." Pages 103–24 in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*. Translated by J. Scullion. JSOTSup 89. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "Myth versus History: Relaying the Comparative Foundations." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 1–13.
- Robertson, Amy H. C. "He Kept the Measurements in His Memory as a Treasure': The Role of the Tabernacle Text in Religious Experience." PhD diss., Emory University Press, 2010.
- Römer, Thomas. "Competing Magicians in Exodus 7–9: Interpreting Magic in the Priestly Theology." Pages 12–22 in *Magic in the Biblical World: From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon*. Edited by Todd E. Klutz. JSNTSup 245. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- . "The Exodus Narrative according to the Priestly Document." Pages 157–74 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- . "From the Call of Moses to the Parting of the Sea: Reflections on the Priestly Version of the Exodus Narrative." Pages 121–50 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by

- Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr. VTSup 164. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- . "Gen 15 und Gen 17: Beobachtungen und Anfragen zu einem Dogma der 'neueren' und 'neuesten' Pentateuchkritik." *DBAT* 26 (1989–1990): 32–47.
- . "Israel's Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Construction of the Book of Numbers." Pages 419–45 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and Brian Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . *The So-called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Römer, Thomas, and Brettler, Mark Z. "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch." *JBL* 119 (2000): 401–19.
- Rooke, Deborah W. *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. OTM. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Ruprecht, Eberhard. "Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Manawunder (Ex 16) im Aufbau der Priesterschrift." *ZAW* 86 (1974): 269–307.
- Sabourin, Leopold. *Priesthood: A Comparative Study*. SHR 25. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Sakenfeld, Katherine D. *Journeying with God: A Commentary on the Book of Numbers*. ITC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- . "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14." *CBQ* 37 (1975): 317–30.
- . "Theological and Redactional Problems in Numbers 20:2–13." Pages 133–54 in *Understanding the Word: Essays in Honor of Bernhard W. Anderson*. Edited by James T. Butler, Edgar W. Conrad, and Ben C. Ollenburger. JSOTSup 37. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Schart, Aaron. *Mose und Israel im Konflikt: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüstenerzählungen*. OBO 98. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Presses Universitaires, 1990.
- Schmid, Konrad. *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*. Translated by James Nogalski. Siphrut 3. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- . *The Old Testament: A Literary History*. Translated by Linda Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

- . “The So-called Yahwist and the Literary Gap between Genesis and Exodus.” Pages 29–50 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. SymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Schmidt, Ludwig. *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung in Exodus VII 14–XI 10*. StBib 4. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- . “Die Priesterschrift–kein Ende am Sinai!” ZAW 120 (2008): 481–500.
- . “Die Priesterschrift in Exodus 16.” ZAW 119 (2007): 483–98.
- . *Studien zur Priesterschrift*. BZAW 214. New York: de Gruyter, 1993.
- Schmidt, Werner H. “Die Intention der beiden Plagenerzählungen (Ex 7–10) in ihrem Kontext.” Pages 225–43 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation*. Edited by Marc Vervenne. BETL 126. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.
- Schwartz, Baruch J. “The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai.” Pages 103–34 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*. Edited by Michael V. Fox, Victor Hurowitz, Avi Hurvitz, Michael L. Klein, Baruch J. Schwartz, and Nili Shupak. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- . “Introduction: The Strata of the Priestly Writings and the Revised Relative Dating of P and H.” Pages 1–12 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- . “The Sabbath in the Torah Texts.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. San Diego, CA. 19 November, 2007. <http://tinyurl.com/SBL2627a>.
- Seebass, Horst. *Numeri: 2 Teilband Numeri 10,11–22,1*. BKAT. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003.
- Shectman, Sarah, and Joel S. Baden, eds. *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- Seow, C. Leong. “The Designation of the Ark in Priestly Theology.” HAR 8 (1984): 185–97.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Translated by P. Dominique. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . “Le récit sacerdotal: Une ‘histoire sans fin’?” Pages 631–53 in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*. Edited by Thomas Römer. BETL 215. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

- . “La Place d’Ex 6:2–8 dans la narration de l’exode.” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 530–48.
- . “Quelques remarques sur Pg et la dernière rédaction du Pentateuque.” Pages 95–125 in *Le Pentateuque en question: les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes*. Edited by Albert de Pury. MdB 19. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989.
- Smith, Mark. *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus*. JSOTSup 239. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- . *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010.
- Sommer, Benjamin. “Conflicting Constructions of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle.” *BibInt* 9 (2001): 41–63.
- . “Dating Pentateuchal Texts and the Perils of Pseudo-Historicism.” Pages 85–108 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. “The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplementation, and Replacement.” Pages 187–204 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zurich: TVZ, 2009.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. “Aufbauprobleme in der Priesterschrift.” Pages 287–308 in *Ernten was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by D. R. Daniels, Uwe Glessmer, and Martin Rösel. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991.
- . *World and Environment*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1980.
- Strba, Blazej. “Did the Israelites Realize Why Moses Had to Die?” *RB* 113 (2006): 337–65.
- Struppe, Ursula. *Die Herrlichkeit in der Priesterschrift: Eine semantische Studien zu Kebôd YHWH*. ÖBS 9. Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988.
- Tengström, Sven. *Die Toledotformel und die literarische Struktur der priesterlichen Erweiterungsschicht im Pentateuch*. ConBOT 17. Lund: Gleerup, 1981.
- Van Seters, John. *Abraham in History and Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- . *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

- . *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- . *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary*. Trajectories 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- . “The Place of the Yahwist in the History of Passover and Massot.” *ZAW* 95 (1983): 167–82.
- . *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961.
- Veijola, Timo. “The History of the Passover in the Light of Deuteronomy 16,1–8.” *ZABR* 2 (1996): 53–75.
- Vink, J. G. “The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament.” Pages 1–144 in *The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies*. Edited by J. G. Vink. OtSt 15. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Vervenne, Marc. “The ‘P’ Tradition in the Pentateuch: Document and/or Redaction? The ‘Sea Narrative’ (Ex 13:17 – 14:31) as a Test Case.” Pages 67–90 in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989*. Edited by C. Brekelmans and J. Lust. BETL 94. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.
- Wagenaar, Jan. “Passover and the First Day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread in the Priestly Festival Calendar.” *VT* 54 (2004): 250–68.
- Weimar, Peter. “Exodus 12,24–27a: Ein Zusatz nachdeuteronomischer Provenienz aus der Hand der Pentateuchredaktion.” Pages 421–48 in *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Literature: Festschrift for C. H. W. Brekelmans*. Edited by Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust. BETL 133. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- . “Sinai und Schöpfung: Komposition und Theologie der Priesterschriftlichen Sinaigeschichte.” *RB* 95 (1988): 337–85.
- . “Struktur und Komposition der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung.” *BN* 23–24 (1983–1984): 81–162.
- . “Die Toledot-Formel in der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung.” *BZ* 18 (1974): 65–93.
- . *Untersuchungen zur priesterschriftlichen Exodusgeschichte*. FB 9. Würzburg: Echter, 1973.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- . *The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel*. VTSup 100. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Wenham, Gordon. *Genesis 16–50*. WBC. 2 Dallas: Word, 1994.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1–11*. Translated by John J. Scullion. London: SPCK, 1984.
- . *Genesis 12–36: A Commentary*. Translated by John J. Scullion. London: SPCK, 1986.
- Wilson, Robert R. “The Hardening of Pharaoh’s Heart.” *CBQ* (1979): 18–36.
- Zenger, Erich. “Die Bücher der Tora/des Pentateuch.” Pages 60–186 in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Edited by Erik Zenger. 5th ed. KST 1.1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004.
- . *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken: Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie der priesterschriftlichen Urgeschichte*. SBS 112. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983.
- Zevit, Ziony. “Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P.” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 481–511.
- . “The Priestly Redaction and Interpretation of the Plague Narrative in Exodus.” *JQR* 66 (1976): 193–211.
- . “Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues.” *BRev* 6.3 (1990): 16–23, 42.
- Zimmerli, Walter. *I Am Yahweh*. Translated by Douglas W. Stott. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- . “Sinaibund und Abrahambund: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift.” Pages 205–16 in *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*. TB 19. Munich: Kaiser, 1963.



## APPENDIX

### TEXTS CONSTITUTING THE PRIESTLY NARRATIVE

#### Genesis

1:1–2:4a; 5:1–28, 30–32; 6:9–22; 7:6, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; 8:1, 2a, 3b–5, 7, 13a, 14–19; 9:1–17, 28–29; 10:1–7, 20, 22–23, 31–32; 11:10–27, 31–32; 12:4b, 5; 13:6, 11b, 12ab $\alpha$ ; 19:29; 16:1a, 3, 15, 16; 17:1–27; 21:1b–5, 21; 23:1–20; 25:7–11, 12–17, 19–20 ... 26b; 26:34–35; 27:46–28:9...; 31:18a $\beta$ b; 33:18a; 35:6, 9–13a, 15, 22b–29; 36:1–14; 37:1, 2a $\alpha$ b ... 41:46a...; 46:6, 7; 47:27b, 28; 48:3–6; 49:1a, 29–33; 50:12–13.

#### Exodus

1:1–5, 7, 13–14; 2:23a $\beta$ b–25; 6:2–12; 7:1–13, 19, 20a $\alpha$ , 21b, 22; 8:1–3 (Hebrew) ... 11b–15 (Hebrew); 9:8–12; 11:9–10; 12:1, 3–13, 28, 40–41; 14:1–4, 8, 9a $\beta$ b, 15a $\alpha$ b, 16–18, 21a $\alpha$ b, 22–23, 26, 27a $\alpha$ , 28–29; 15:22\*, 27; 16:1, 2–3, 6–7, 9–15, 21, 35\*; 17:1ab $\alpha$ ; 19:1, 2a; 24:15b–18a; 25:1–2a $\alpha$ , 8–9, 10–40; 26:1–37; 27:1–19; 28:1–2, 6–41; 29:1–20, 22–26, 31–32, 35, 43–46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34.

#### Numbers

10:11a, 12a, 13\*; 13:1–3a, 17a $\beta$ , 21, 25, 26, 32, 33a $\alpha$ b; 14:1a, 2–3, 5–7, 9a $\beta$ b, 10, 26–28, 29\*, 31(?), 35–38; 20: 1a, 2, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 8a $\alpha$ \* $\beta$  (“assemble the congregation ... to yield its water”), 10, 11b, 12, 22b, 23a $\alpha$ , 25–29; 22:1; 27:12–14.



## INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

Genesis		
1	16, 18, 19, 22 n. 100, 86 n. 395, 105, 120, 126, 127, 129 n. 77, 168, 184 n. 46, 276 n. 164, 453, 501	
1-5		123
1-7		498-500, 559
1-9	ix, 38, 107-8, 117, 119-20, 123-24, 126, 131-32, 136-38, 140, 164, 436, 438 n. 571, 453, 457, 487- 88, 498	
1-10	35, 50, 118-19, 125-26, 127 n. 64, 260, 282 n. 170, 288	
1-11	115-16, 127-28, 181, 453, 455, 488 n. 51	
1-50		139
1:1	25, 26, 110, 114-16, 455, 457, 488	
1:1-2:3	35 n. 182, 109 n. 1, 110, 115, 117, 120-22, 125, 127-28, 130, 132, 136-38, 140-41, 165, 169-72, 173 n. 160, 181 n. 33, 235, 258 n. 127, 276, 486, 488-94, 497-99, 535, 543-44, 547, 559	
1:1-2:4a	12, 25, 43 n. 219, 47 n. 237, 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 123, 201 n. 144, 202 n. 144	
1:1-11:26	ix, 215, 488, 495, 496-97, 505, 508	
1:2	110, 120, 141, 489, 492	
1:6		276 n. 164
1:6-8		141
1:6-9		141
1:6-10	127, 165, 168, 170, 277, 491, 497, 527, 544	
1:8		94
1:9		115
1:9-10		123, 276
1:10	141, 158, 256, 265-66, 491 n. 67, 521	
1:11-12		488
1:12		392, 397, 549
1:13		141
1:20		258
1:21		489, 491 n. 68
1:22		492
1:24		260, 491 n. 68
1:24-25		488
1:26		115, 140, 142, 493
1:26-27		120
1:26-28		31, 494
1:27		140, 142, 488, 493
1:27-28		489
1:28	24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 85-86, 110-11, 113 n. 15, 114, 116, 118- 19, 121 n. 41, 123, 127, 129-30, 136, 139-43, 145-48, 151, 170 n. 153, 492-97, 501, 506-7	
1:28-30		114
1:29-30	124, 142, 166 n. 149, 488, 493	
1:30		158, 491 n. 68
1:31	14 n. 53, 15, 66, 110, 115, 117, 120, 124, 138, 141, 151, 165- 66, 170, 491 n. 67, 493	
1:31-2:3		165, 544
2-11		92-93, 98, 494 n. 74
2:1		27, 120, 165, 170
2:1-3	27, 66, 109, 110, 123-24, 138	
2:2		27, 86, 110, 120, 165, 170
2:2-3		115, 140

*Genesis (cont.)*

2:3	115, 117, 120, 165, 170, 171 n. 154, 202 n. 144	6-9	123, 132, 138, 166, 277, 493, 497
2:4	110, 488	6:1-4	389
2:4-3:24	488-90	6:5	490
2:7	488	6:5-7	491
2:8	488	6:5-8:22	488, 490, 490 n. 60
2:16-17	488	6:6	490 n. 60
2:18-23	489	6:7	490 n. 60
2:19	488	6:8	490
2:21-22	488	6:9	110, 141, 145, 167, 172 n. 159, 490, 493
3	494 n.74	6:9-10	141
3:5	489	6:9-22	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 490 n. 60
3:14-19	489	6:9-7:24	125
3:22-24	489	6:9-9:17	488, 490, 490 n. 60, 492
3:24	315	6:11	38, 90 n. 413, 132, 137, 141
4	493, 494	6:11-12	490-91, 494 n. 74
4:1-16	494	6:11-13	14 n. 53, 141, 166
4:17-22	493	6:12	141, 151, 166, 491 n. 67
4:23-24	494	6:13	90 n. 413, 132, 137, 167, 491, 494 n. 74
4:25-26	494	6:13-22	490
5	35, 118, 121, 132, 139, 140-41, 143, 495-96, 508	6:13-7:24	132, 137
5-50	121	6:14-16	492 n. 70
5:1	110, 121, 140-41, 150 n. 121, 494, 508	6:17	80 n. 380, 167, 401 n. 521
5:1-2	121, 130, 139-40, 494	6:18	493
5:1-3	140, 494, 506	6:18-20	167
5:1-28	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 488, 493-95	6:19-20	491
5:1-9:28	122	6:22	110, 115, 117, 166
5:1-50:26	121-22, 150 n. 121	7	167
5:1-28		7:1	490
5:2	494, 494	7:1-5	490
5:3	140, 494	7:2-3	491
5:3-27	494	7:4	491
5:22	15, 141, 172 n. 159	7:6	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 490, 490 n. 60
5:24	15, 141	7:7	490
5:30-32	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 488, 493-95	7:8	388
5:32	141, 494	7:10	490-91
6	166, 559	7:11	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 141, 168, 276 n. 164, 277, 490-91, 527
6-7	132, 137, 141, 166, 168-69, 497-99, 523, 559	7:12	490
6-8	166	7:12-16	490

7:13–16	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 490 n. 60, 491	8:18–19	492
7:16	490	8:19	491, 499
7:17	490–91	8:20	491
7:18–20	490	8:20–22	490 n. 60
7:18–21	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 490 n. 60	8:21	492
7:21	80 n. 380, 401 n. 521, 490, 492	8:21–22	490, 492
7:22–23	490	9	8, 111–12, 113 n. 15, 119–20, 123–24, 126, 130, 132, 136–37, 140, 169, 173
7:24	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 490 n. 60, 491	9:1	24, 29, 85, 114, 119, 123–24, 127, 136, 142, 144–45, 147–48, 151, 170 n. 153, 492, 495–97, 499–500, 506, 509, 512–13
8	132, 137, 169–71, 497, 544	9:1–6	14 n. 53
8–9	132, 140, 170, 497–98	9:1–7	132, 495 n. 74
8–11	560	9:1–17	12, 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 123, 143, 490 n. 60
8:1	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 136, 141, 143, 151, 167, 342, 490 n. 60, 492, 516	9:2	29, 30, 142, 493
8:1–2	125	9:2–3	21, 124, 128, 166 n. 149
8:2	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 490, 492	9:2–4	142 n. 97, 171
8:3	490 n. 60	9:2–6	170, 172
8:3–4	491	9:3	142
8:3–5	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 125, 490	9:4	142
8:4	173 n. 160, 491	9:4–6	142, 493
8:5	129 n. 77, 141, 169, 173, 491, 499	9:5–6	142
8:6–12	490–91	9:6	94
8:7	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 125	9:7	24, 85, 114, 119, 127, 136, 142–43, 145, 147–48, 151, 492, 495–97, 499–500, 506, 509, 512–13
8:10	491	9:8–17	14 n. 53, 132, 143, 313, 342, 490, 493
8:12	491	9:9–10	492
8:13	48 n. 243, 66 n. 329, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 110, 115, 117, 125, 138, 141, 166, 170–71, 173, 490–91, 499, 544, 547	9:11	173, 492
8:13–14	169	9:12	492
8:14	123, 125, 141, 173, 490–91, 499	9:13	166 n. 148
8:14–19	48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 169, 490 n. 60	9:13–14	115, 117
8:15–17	142, 492	9:13–15	342
8:15–18	167	9:13–17	21, 128
8:15–19	173	9:15	136
8:16–17	496, 499	9:15–16	492, 492
8:17	24, 491	9:16	136, 143–44, 166 n. 148
		9:16–17	143
		9:18–19	488
		9:27	367
		9:28	494 n. 72, 495

*Genesis (cont.)*

- 9:28–29 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 141, 493, 494  
 10 26, 47 n. 237, 104 n. 463, 111–12, 113 n. 15, 118–19, 125, 127, 129–30, 139, 143, 144 n. 100, 169, 173, 495, 497, 499, 508  
 10–11 107–8, 132  
 10:1 110, 150 n. 121, 495 n. 75, 508  
 10:1–7 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 488  
 10:1–11:26 ix, 457, 487–88  
 10:2–7 495 n. 75  
 10:8–19 488  
 10:20 48 n. 243, 488, 495 n. 75  
 10:21 488  
 10:22–23 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 488, 495 n. 75  
 10:24–30 488  
 10:31–32 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 144 n. 100, 488, 495 n. 75  
 11 132, 136, 139, 143–44  
 11–50 107, 126, 137, 139, 436, 438 n. 571, 457–58, 460–61  
 11:10 110, 125, 150 n. 121, 508  
 11:10–11 144 n. 100  
 11:10–26 122, 488, 495–97, 499, 508  
 11:10–27 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 495  
 11:26 26, 144  
 11:27 ix, 110, 143–44, 147 n. 110, 150 n. 121, 215, 453, 457–58, 461, 474, 487, 508  
 11:27–32 132  
 11:27–16:16 132, 136, 137 n. 83, 144, 474  
 11:27–25:10 461  
 11:27–50:13 ix, 458, 466  
 11:27–50:26 122  
 11:28–30 488  
 11:31–32 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 468  
 11:31–16:16 461  
 11:32 147 n. 110  
 12 129 n. 77  
 12–15 92 n. 422  
 12–50 26, 35, 108, 127, 132, 136, 138  
 12:1–3 509  
 12:1–4 459, 467  
 12:2–3 468  
 12:3 468  
 12:4 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464  
 12:4–5 459, 468  
 12:5 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 149  
 12:6–9 459, 467  
 12:7 430, 438–39, 467, 468, 509  
 12:10–13:1 460 n. 10  
 13:5 459  
 13:6 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 149, 459, 464, 468, 472  
 13:7 468  
 13:7–13 459  
 13:11 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 459, 464  
 13:11–12 149, 459  
 13:12 26, 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 459 n. 5, 464  
 13:14–17 468, 509  
 13:16 260  
 15 92 n. 422, 93, 119, 459 n. 4, 461 n. 10, 469, 509  
 15:1–6 469  
 15:7 469  
 15:7–18 469  
 16:1 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 459, 460 n. 10, 468  
 16:1–2 459, 460 n. 10, 468  
 16:3 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 459, 460 n. 10, 468  
 16:4–14 459, 460 n. 10, 468  
 16:10 459 n. 4  
 16:15 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 459, 460 n. 10, 468  
 16:15–16 147 n. 110  
 16:16 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464  
 17 8, 14 n. 53, 15, 17, 40, 50, 111, 118–19, 123–25, 127, 130, 132, 137 n. 83, 140, 144, 146 n. 103, 147,

- 204, 313, 342, 439–40, 456, 459 n.  
4, 461 n. 10, 468–69, 474, 495
- 17:1 17, 17, 145, 438, 441, 457, 469,  
471
- 17:1–6 114
- 17:1–8 145, 147 n. 107, 458, 464
- 17:1–27 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464, 461
- 17:2 118, 120, 123, 145, 147–48, 151,  
441 n. 579, 496, 509, 512
- 17:2–6 509
- 17:4 118
- 17:4–6 148, 151, 441 n. 579, 496
- 17:5 510
- 17:6 114, 118, 120, 145, 147, 472,  
509, 512
- 17:7 19, 127, 129, 144, 146, 154,  
173, 439, 497, 546
- 17:7–8 13, 22, 45 n. 228, 47, 48,  
49, 50, 117, 130, 146, 152, 441, 468,  
482, 509, 518
- 17:8 64, 73, 81, 118, 120, 144,  
146–49, 154, 158, 390, 430, 438–  
39, 448, 466, 468, 479, 497, 509,  
544, 546, 548
- 17:9–14 145
- 17:15–19 459
- 17:15–21 464
- 17:15–22 144, 468
- 17:16 123
- 17:16–21 469
- 17:20 459 n. 4
- 18:1–15 459, 469
- 19:1–28 459 n. 5, 460 n. 10, 468
- 19:29 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464, 135 n. a, 144, 459 n. 5, 468,  
474
- 20 460 n. 10
- 21–50 132, 136
- 21:1 459, 469
- 21:1–5 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464, 148, 462, 464–65, 469
- 21:3–5 459
- 21:6–7 459, 469
- 21:8–20 460 n. 10, 468 n. 23
- 21:8–21 470 n. 27
- 21:21 48 n. 24, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464,  
458, 464, 470, 509
- 21:21–23:20 462
- 21:22–34 460 n. 10, 470 n. 27
- 22:1–19 460 n. 10, 470 n. 27
- 23 26, 47 n. 237, 148–49, 460 n. 10,  
465
- 23:1–20 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464, 462
- 23:4 149
- 23:9 149
- 23:19 148
- 23:19–20 479
- 23:20 149
- 24 459, 460 n. 10, 470
- 24:24 470
- 25:7–10 462, 465–65
- 25:7–11 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464
- 25:8 80 n. 380, 401 n. 521
- 25:9–10 47 n. 237, 460 n. 10, 469,  
479
- 25:11 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464, 462, 464, 470, 497, 509
- 25:12 110, 150 n. 121, 458 n. 2, 463  
n. 15
- 25:12–16 144
- 25:13–16 458 n. 2
- 25:12–17 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464, 462
- 25:12–26 462
- 25:12–35:29 462
- 25:16–17 26
- 25:19 110, 150 n. 121, 463 n. 15
- 25:19–20 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
464, 144, 459, 462
- 25:20 460 n. 10
- 25:21–26 459
- 25:26 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 144, 459,  
462
- 25:29–34 460 n. 10, 470
- 26 460 n. 10, 463 n. 14, 470
- 26:3 430
- 26:34 459, 460 n. 10, 470, 471



*Genesis (cont.)*

- 26:34–35 36, 40 n. 213, 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 148, 462
- 26:34–33:18 462
- 27:1–45 36, 459, 460 n. 10, 470
- 27:27–29 471
- 27:41–45 470
- 27:46–28:5 459, 460 n. 10, 470
- 27:46–28:9 17, 36, 40 n. 213, 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 148, 462
- 28:1–4 471
- 28:1–5 150
- 28:3 118, 120, 123, 130, 145, 151
- 28:3–4 146–47, 465 n. 19
- 28:4 48, 73, 149
- 28:6–9 471
- 28:10–22 459, 461 n. 10, 471, 510
- 28:13 233 n. 45, 267 n. 145, 429, 430, 437–39, 471
- 28:13–14 471
- 28:14 260
- 28:17 471
- 28:19 471
- 29:1–30 471
- 29:1–31:18a, 19–55 471
- 29:31–30:24 460 nn. 7 and 10, 472
- 31:18 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 149–50, 460 n. 7, 462, 471
- 31:37–33:20 460 n. 7
- 32:1–21 471
- 32:22–32 459, 461 n. 10, 471, 510
- 32:28 471
- 32:29 471
- 33:1–17 471
- 33:18 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 460 n. 7, 462, 471
- 35:6 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 460 n. 7, 462, 465, 471
- 35:9 497, 513
- 35:9–13 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 459, 461 n. 10, 462, 465, 471, 475
- 35:10 459 n. 7, 473, 476
- 35:10–12 146–47
- 35:11 114, 118, 120, 123, 130, 145, 151, 438, 471–72, 513
- 35:11–12 458, 471
- 35:12 48, 118, 120, 438 n. 572, 466, 472
- 35:15 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 459, 461 n. 10, 462, 471
- 35:16–18 472 n. 32
- 35:16–22 460 nn. 7 and 10, 466 n. 20
- 35:21–22 367
- 35:22–26 148, 150, 163, 460 nn. 7 and 10, 462, 465–66, 473, 476, 477, 479, 514, 546, 560
- 35:22–29 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464
- 35:27–29 148, 462, 464–65
- 35:29 80 n. 380
- 36:1 110, 150 n. 121, 463 n. 15
- 36:1–5 144, 148
- 36:1–14 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 462
- 36:1–41:46 462
- 36:1–50:13 462
- 36:6–7 149
- 36:6–8 26, 144, 150, 460 n. 10, 464, 472
- 36:7 472
- 36:9 150 n. 121, 463 n. 15
- 36:9–13 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464
- 36:9–14 144, 148
- 36:43 26
- 37 460
- 37:1 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 150, 472
- 37:1–2 462
- 37:2 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 110, 114, 144, 148, 150 n. 121, 460, 463 n. 15, 472
- 37:3–45:28 472
- 41 246 n. 87
- 41:8 246 n. 87
- 41:46 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464, 462, 472
- 46:1–5 460, 472

- 46:6 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464  
 46:6-7 149-50, 460, 462, 472, 473  
 46:7 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464  
 46:28-47:27 460, 472  
 47:27 26, 29, 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411,  
 104 n. 464, 123-24, 130, 148, 150,  
 151, 460, 462, 465-66, 472  
 47:28 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
 464, 148, 150, 462  
 47:29-31 473  
 48:1-2 473  
 48:3 145  
 48:3-4 147, 463, 465, 473, 475  
 48:3-6 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
 464  
 48:4 48, 73, 118, 120, 123, 130, 146,  
 151, 475  
 48:5 460, 476  
 48:5-6 148, 463, 465, 473, 477, 479,  
 514  
 48:7 472  
 48:8-20 460, 473  
 48:21 473  
 48:29-32 460 n. 10  
 49:1 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n. 464,  
 148, 463, 473  
 49:1-27 460 n. 10  
 49:2-27 476  
 49:29-32 469, 473, 479  
 49:29-33 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
 464, 148, 460, 463  
 49:30 149  
 49:31 47 n. 237, 465  
 49:33 150  
 50 99 n. 444, 144 n. 101  
 50:1-11 460, 473  
 50:12-13 48 n. 243, 89 n. 411, 104 n.  
 464, 144, 148, 150 n. 120, 460, 463,  
 469  
 50:13 47 n. 237, 149, 460, 479  
 50:24-26 99 n. 444  
 50:26 312
- Exodus  
 1 49, 93-94, 98, 99 n. 444, 107, 116,  
 126-27, 170, 217-18, 426, 453, 458  
 n. 3, 498-500, 504, 560  
 1-6 214  
 1-7 41, 107, 125, 451  
 1-14 49, 53, 54, 112 n. 13, 113, 115,  
 164  
 1-15 292 n. 180  
 1-40 viii, 83, 117, 126, 133, 166-70,  
 172, 214, 447, 448 n. 594, 450-52,  
 487, 498, 559-61  
 1:1 121-22, 150 n. 121, 476  
 1:1-5 ix, 49, 53, 89, 104, 121, 130,  
 144, 150-51, 156 n. 127, 163, 170,  
 388, 457-58, 463, 466-67, 472-73,  
 473-74, 476-77, 479, 485, 512-14,  
 546, 560  
 1:1-7 49, 53, 121 n. 41, 133, 138-39,  
 144  
 1:1-8 49 n. 247, 93  
 1:1-7:7 426, 428  
 1:2-5 476  
 1:6 49, 53, 93 n. 425  
 1:7 ix, 26, 29, 49, 89, 94, 104, 111,  
 113 n. 15, 114-16, 118-19, 121,  
 123-24, 127, 129-30, 139, 144,  
 148, 150-51, 152, 156 n. 127, 163,  
 170, 215, 388, 441 n. 579, 453, 455,  
 457-58, 463, 466-67, 472-77, 479-  
 80, 485, 497, 508, 512-14, 546, 560  
 1:9 473  
 1:9-11 93, 428  
 1:9-12 92 n. 422, 428, 458, 461  
 1:9-22 49 n. 247, 92  
 1:12 428  
 1:13 114-16, 133, 136-37, 139-40,  
 164, 181, 214, 455, 457, 474-76, 487  
 1:13-14 49, 53, 89, 104, 114,  
 118, 121, 137 n. 85, 151, 166, 218,  
 426-28, 515-16  
 1:13-2:25 133, 136 n. 82, 139 n. 189,  
 151, 153  
 1:13-7:7 viii, ix, 133, 151, 218, 447,  
 456, 498, 515, 531

*Exodus (cont.)*

1:13-14:29	114	3:19-20	431, 435, 445
1:13-40:24	137	3:19-22	432
1:14	428	3:20	430, 439, 440 n. 576
1:15-22	92 n. 422, 93	4	94 n. 427
1:20	473	4:1	95, 431-35, 443, 443-44
2	204	4:1-9	94 n. 427
2:1-10	94 n. 426	4:2-3	252
2:23	94 n. 427, 151 n. 123, 428, 429-30	4:2-4	94, 241-42, 245, 252
2:23-25	38, 50, 53, 89, 104, 121, 151, 218, 426-29, 515-16	4:2-9	431, 433, 436
2:24	114, 124, 136, 151, 342, 428-29, 438	4:6-7	242 n. 72
2:24-25	114	4:9	94, 241-42, 255-56
2:25	151, 429	4:10	163 n. 144, 431-33, 435, 443-45
3-4	95-98, 99 n. 444, 430, 431 n. 558, 432-36, 443, 445	4:10-16	432
3:1-15	432	4:11-12	431, 433, 436
3:1-4:17	90 n. 413, 92-96, 163 n. 144, 431-32, 433 n. 561, 434-36, 438, 443-44, 450 n. 596, 515-16	4:12	96, 431, 433-35, 444-45
3:6	98, 430, 434, 437, 440 n. 576	4:13	431-33, 435, 443-45
3:7	94 n. 427, 429-30, 434, 440 n. 576	4:13-16	96
3:7-8	434 n. 562, 438 n. 570	4:14	332, 335 n. 342
3:7-9	431	4:14-15	335
3:8	430, 434, 438-39, 440 n. 576	4:14-16	335-36, 431-32, 435-36, 444
3:9	94 n. 427, 429-30, 434, 440 n. 576	4:14-17	433
3:9-10	434 n. 562	4:15	445
3:10	431-34, 443	4:15-16	431, 435
3:11	431, 433, 435, 443	4:16	445
3:12	96, 431, 433, 436	4:21	431, 445
3:13	431, 433, 435, 443	4:29	335
3:13-15	431	4:30-31	430, 443
3:14-15	433-34, 436	4:31	434, 443
3:15	98, 437, 438 n. 570, 440 n. 576	5	443 n. 585
3:15-16	430	5:1-3	335, 429 n. 553, 431
3:16	430, 434, 439	5:1-23	429 n. 553
3:16-17	431-34	5:2	267, 431
3:16-18	432, 434 n. 562, 435	5:9	443 n. 585
3:16-4:17	432 n. 560	5:11	443 n. 585
3:17	430, 434, 438-39, 440 n. 576	5:19-23	429 n. 553
3:18	95, 430-35, 443-44	5:20	335
		6	127, 448, 451
		6-14	152
		6-16	81-83
		6-40	450, 558
		6:2	55-56, 59 n. 292, 90 n. 413, 152, 154, 427, 429-30, 437, 440, 517, 524
		6:2-3	152, 288, 429 n. 554, 437, 441, 446, 469

- 6:2-4 24  
 6:2-5 431, 433-34  
 6:2-8 20 n. 89, 29, 38, 44, 45 n. 228,  
 46-47, 49-50, 64, 114, 118, 121,  
 123-24, 133, 136 n. 82, 139 n. 89,  
 146, 151, 153-54, 218, 427-28, 429  
 n. 556, 430 n. 556, 431 n. 559, 433,  
 436-37, 440, 442, 458, 475, 486,  
 517, 530  
 6:2-9 432-33, 436  
 6:2-12 50, 53, 89, 90 n. 413,  
 93-96, 104, 153, 218, 426-31, 433,  
 435-36, 446, 515  
 6:2-13 431 n. 558  
 6:2-7:7 133, 153, 516-17  
 6:3 35, 41-42, 50, 145, 430, 436, 440,  
 441 n. 580, 517  
 6:3-5 442  
 6:4 22, 73, 81, 118, 120, 130, 152,  
 158, 388, 390, 430, 438-40, 446,  
 448, 480, 517  
 6:4-5 438, 516  
 6:5 124, 136, 151, 342, 428, 430, 438,  
 440  
 6:5-6 428-29  
 6:5-7 427  
 6:6 152, 427-31, 434, 437, 439-40,  
 442, 445, 517, 524  
 6:6-7 153, 158, 440, 482, 517, 530,  
 533  
 6:6-8 427, 429 n. 556, 431-34, 439,  
 441 n. 580, 443, 446  
 6:6-12 432  
 6:7 13, 19, 33, 55-56, 59 n. 292, 117,  
 127, 128-30, 146 n. 106, 152, 154,  
 154, 155, 167, 427, 429-30, 436-  
 37, 439-40, 442, 443 n. 585, 446,  
 449, 451, 482, 517, 523, 524, 544,  
 546  
 6:8 22, 32-33, 55-56, 59 n. 292,  
 73, 76, 81, 118, 152, 154, 158, 427,  
 429-30, 434, 437, 439-40, 442, 443  
 n. 585, 446, 448, 480, 517, 524  
 6:9 133, 251 n. 105, 427, 427, 430,  
 432-35, 443, 450 n. 596  
 6:10 163 n. 144, 450 n. 596  
 6:10-11 133, 427, 431-34, 443-44  
 6:10-12 218, 427, 432-33, 443, 447,  
 517  
 6:10-7:7 133, 432 n. 560  
 6:11 431, 445  
 6:12 95-96, 133, 163 n. 144, 402  
 n. 523, 427, 431-35, 443-45, 450 n.  
 596, 544  
 6:13-30 432 n. 560  
 6:14-25 332 n. 331  
 6:15 56  
 7 107, 214, 218, 446-47  
 7-8 448  
 7-9 246 n. 97  
 7-11 viii, 39 n. 204, 76, 107, 214,  
 217, 218-19, 234, 240-41, 249, 271  
 nn. 150-151, 272, 277, 279-81,  
 283-89, 291-92, 393, 427, 435,  
 444-46, 448 n. 595, 451, 497,  
 527-29  
 7-14 viii, 81, 102-3, 107-8, 152,  
 154, 158, 167, 170, 214, 218-19,  
 291-93, 413, 426-28, 436, 443,  
 445-48, 450-51, 456, 478-82,  
 484-87, 497-98, 529-31, 533-34,  
 540 n. 17, 544, 546-47, 549, 551,  
 553-54, 558-60  
 7-16 61, 161  
 7-40 558  
 7:1 90 n. 413, 246 n. 84, 260 n. 132,  
 261, 521  
 7:1-2 93, 96, 245 n. 81, 427, 431-33,  
 444, 515  
 7:1-5 39 n. 204, 133, 153, 427-28,  
 431 n. 558, 434-35, 444, 446  
 7:1-6 50 n. 253  
 7:1-7 50, 153, 218, 426-31, 433,  
 435-36, 443, 446-47, 517  
 7:1-13 53, 89, 104  
 7:2 39 n. 204, 245 n. 81, 431  
 7:3 51 n. 257, 153, 218, 234,  
 241 nn. 68-69, 248-50, 251 n. 103,  
 265, 272, 281, 284, 286, 427, 445,  
 526, 528

*Exodus (cont.)*

7:3-4 52, 251, 255, 262-63, 271 n.  
 151, 445, 523  
 7:3-5 135 n. b, 153, 218, 281, 291,  
 427, 431-33, 444-45, 516, 517, 519  
 7:3-7 515  
 7:4 153, 218-19, 235 n. 52, 237, 251,  
 281, 428, 431, 435, 439, 444, 450 n.  
 596, 516, 521, 524  
 7:4-5 430  
 7:5 153-54, 219, 267, 274, 277, 281,  
 428, 445, 447  
 7:6 83, 163, 168, 245 n. 81, 431,  
 450  
 7:6-7 133, 245 n. 81, 428, 434-35,  
 445, 516  
 7:7-8 39 n. 204  
 7:8 245, 252, 255 n. 118  
 7:8-9 243, 245  
 7:8-10 282, 284  
 7:8-13 50, 52, 94, 94 n. 427, 97, 219  
 nn. 6-7, 241, 247 n. 90, 249 n. 91,  
 252, 267 n. 142, 282, 284-85, 287,  
 289-90, 527-28  
 7:8-9:12 50  
 7:8-10:27 247 n. 90  
 7:8-11:10 50, 52, 97, 134, 218, 248,  
 284, 519, 520, 524  
 7:8-14:29 ix, 134, 135 n. b, 151, 153,  
 218, 444-45, 456, 519  
 7:9 252, 262, 266  
 7:9-10 284, 286  
 7:10 83, 163, 168, 243, 246-47, 253,  
 266, 450  
 7:11 247  
 7:11-12 243, 246, 253, 282, 284  
 7:12 254, 262, 266, 284, 286  
 7:13 218, 243, 248-50, 255, 267 n.  
 146, 272, 281, 284  
 7:14 244 n. 79, 248 n. 93, 249 n. 97,  
 251, 267, 272, 273 n. 158  
 7:14-18 97, 241, 242 n. 73, 243 n.  
 77, 249 n. 97, 255-56  
 7:14-24 94, 94 n. 427  
 7:15 245

7:16 51 n. 256, 245 n. 81, 251 n.  
 104  
 7:17 51 n. 256, 233 n. 45, 245, 249 n.  
 97, 267, 273, 273, 429, 437  
 7:19 89, 104, 219 nn. 6-7, 240  
 n. 66, 51 n. 256, 241 n. 68, 243, 245,  
 255-56, 258, 262, 266, 282, 284,  
 284, 286-87  
 7:19-20 50, 52-53, 97, 241, 282, 284  
 7:20 83, 89, 104, 163, 168, 219 nn.  
 6-7, 241 n. 68, 242 n. 73, 243, 245,  
 246-47, 255, 262, 282, 284, 287,  
 450  
 7:20-21 97, 241, 243 n. 78, 249 n.  
 97, 255-56  
 7:21 240 n. 66, 241 n. 68, 242  
 n. 73, 243, 246-47, 255-56, 262,  
 282, 284, 287  
 7:21-22 50, 52-53, 89, 97, 104, 219  
 nn. 6-7, 241  
 7:22 218, 241 n. 68, 243, 246-50,  
 255, 257, 267 n. 146, 272, 281-82,  
 284, 287  
 7:23 244 n. 79, 250, 273  
 7:23-24 97, 241, 242 n. 73, 244 n.  
 79, 249 n. 97, 255-56  
 7:26 245 n. 81  
 7:26-29 97, 241, 242 n. 73, 243 n.  
 77, 257-58  
 7:27-29 258  
 7:28 258  
 8:1 240 n. 66, 243, 245, 258, 282,  
 284  
 8:1-2 258, 284, 286  
 8:1-3 50, 52-54, 89, 97, 104, 219 nn.  
 6-7, 241, 257, 282, 284, 287  
 8:1-4 241, 242 n. 73, 243 n. 77, 257  
 8:2 243, 246, 282, 450  
 8:2-3 247  
 8:3 243, 246-47, 258-59, 282, 284  
 8:4 51 n. 256  
 8:4-11 97, 241, 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79,  
 257  
 8:5 240 n. 66, 243, 245, 258, 282, 284  
 8:5-6 258, 284, 286, 336

- 8:5-7 50, 52, 97, 241, 257, 282, 284,  
287
- 8:6 51 n. 256, 83, 163, 168, 240  
n. 66, 243, 246, 249 n. 97, 267, 273,  
282, 450
- 8:6-7 247
- 8:7 243, 246, 247, 259, 282, 284
- 8:8 51 n. 256, 335
- 8:8-15 241, 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79, 257
- 8:9-11 336
- 8:10 249 n. 97, 258, 267, 273-74
- 8:11 50, 51 n. 255, 52, 97, 218,  
241, 243, 244 n. 79, 248-50, 257,  
259, 267, 272, 273 n. 158, 274, 281,  
287
- 8:11-15 54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6-7,  
282, 284
- 8:12 240 n. 66, 243, 245, 282, 335
- 8:12-13 259, 284, 286
- 8:12-15 50, 52, 97, 242, 259, 287
- 8:13 240 n. 66, 246, 282, 450
- 8:13-14 247, 258
- 8:14-15 243, 246-47, 282, 284
- 8:14 260
- 8:15 50, 52, 97, 218, 241, 243, 244  
n. 79, 248-50, 257, 259-61, 267,  
267 n. 146, 272, 273 n. 158, 274,  
281-82, 284, 287-88, 290, 292
- 8:15-19 241 n. 68, 282, 284
- 8:16 240 n. 66, 243, 245, 282, 527-28
- 8:16-17 259, 284, 286, 336
- 8:16-19 50, 52, 97, 242, 242 n. 73,  
243 n. 77, 259, 287
- 8:16-28 97, 242, 259
- 8:17 83, 163, 168, 240 n. 66, 243,  
246, 260, 282, 450
- 8:17-18 247
- 8:18 51 n. 256, 247, 260, 267, 273-74
- 8:18-19 243, 246-47, 282, 284
- 8:19 218, 243, 248-50, 267  
n. 146, 272, 281-82, 284, 288, 290,  
292, 336, 527-28
- 8:20 243 n. 78, 245 n. 81, 246, 260-  
61
- 8:20-21 259
- 8:20-23 242 n. 73, 243 n. 77
- 8:20-32 242, 259
- 8:21 51 n. 256, 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79,  
260
- 8:22 273-74
- 8:23 249 n. 97
- 8:24 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79, 246, 260
- 8:25 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79, 335
- 8:25-28 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79
- 8:28 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79, 244 n.  
79, 248 n. 93, 249 n. 97, 25-51, 267,  
272, 273 n. 158, 274
- 8:29-32 242 n. 73, 244 n. 79
- 8:32 244 n. 79, 248 n. 93, 249 n. 97,  
250-51, 267, 272, 273 n. 158, 274
- 9:1 245 n. 81
- 9:1-4 243 n. 77
- 9:1-7 242 nn. 72-73
- 9:5-6 243 n. 78
- 9:6 246
- 9:7 244 n. 79, 244 n. 79, 248 n. 93,  
249 n. 97, 250 n. 99, 251, 267, 272,  
273 n. 158
- 9:8 245, 286
- 9:8-9 243, 261
- 9:8-10 282, 284, 336
- 9:8-12 50, 52, 54, 89, 97, 104, 219  
nn. 6-7, 241 n. 68, 242, 261, 282,  
284, 287, 448
- 9:10 83, 163, 168, 243, 246, 282, 286,  
450
- 9:11 243, 246-47, 282, 284
- 9:12 51 n. 257, 218, 243, 248-50,  
262, 267 n. 146, 272, 281, 284, 286,  
526, 528
- 9:14 51 n. 256
- 9:22-23 51-52, 97, 242 n. 73
- 9:27 51 n. 256, 335
- 9:29 51 n. 256
- 9:34 244 n. 79
- 9:35 51-52, 97, 242 n. 73, 251 n.  
106
- 10:1-2 97 n. 437
- 10:2 51 n. 256
- 10:3 51 n. 256, 335

*Exodus (cont.)*

10:8	51 n. 256	12:3–20	52
10:12–13	51–52, 97, 242 n. 73	12:4	222
10:16	51 n. 256, 335	12:5	222, 232
10:20	51–52, 97, 242 n. 73	12:6	85, 222, 226, 232, 381
10:21–22	51–52, 97, 242 n. 73	12:7	226, 230–31
10:21–27	97 n. 437	12:8	222–23, 228 n. 36, 231–32
10:27	51–52, 97, 242 n. 73	12:8–10	231
11:1–8	198	12:9	223 n. 19, 231–32
11:4–6	227	12:10	222, 231–32
11:4–8	233–34, 242 n. 71	12:11	227–28, 230, 232
11:9	218, 249, 251 n. 103, 523	12:12	53, 56, 76, 153, 154, 167, 219, 219, 225–27, 233–34, 237, 240, 260 n. 130, 279, 282–83, 289–92, 393, 397, 410, 413, 427, 439, 445, 448– 49, 451, 524, 527, 529, 533
11:9–10	51–52, 54, 89, 97, 104, 218, 219 n. 5, 219 nn. 6–7, 234, 241 n. 68, 251, 262–63, 281, 291 n. 179	12:12–13	226, 232–32, 234, 240, 282–84, 289, 291–92, 446 n. 592, 520, 527
11:10	245 n. 81, 248, 250–51, 265, 267 n. 146, 271 n. 151, 272, 284, 286, 526, 528	12:13	26, 228 n. 35, 233–34, 236, 240, 289, 292, 524, 527, 529
12	viii, 17, 39, 70 n. 349, 85, 134, 217, 218, 219–20, 224, 251, 277, 287 n. 175, 291 n. 179, 428, 444– 45, 448 n. 595, 478, 520, 526, 528, 529	12:14–20	46, 52–53, 221, 225, 239 n. 65
12–15	292 n. 180	12:14–27	198 n. 126
12:1	52–54, 61 n. 305, 85, 89, 107, 199 n. 133, 214, 217, 219–23, 225– 29, 236–38, 239 n. 65, 240, 271 n. 151, 279–82, 289, 291, 336, 426, 446 n. 592, 451, 520, 523, 525	12:17	219 n. 4
12:1–13	39, 53, 66, 68, 103, 221, 224, 239 n. 65, 240 n. 65	12:21	226, 230
12:1–20	52–53, 221 n. 12, 224 n. 27, 225 n. 30	12:21–22	226, 230, 232
12:1–28	198	12:21–23	223–30, 232, 237, 524
12:1–41	218–19	12:21–27	221–25
12:1–13:5	221	12:22	226, 228, 230–31, 236
12:2	53 n. 268, 236	12:23	225–27, 231–34, 524
12:3	53 n. 268, 85, 222, 230, 232	12:24	223 n. 20, 224
12:3–4	223, 226	12:24–27	224
12:3–11	229, 236, 520	12:27	223–30, 232, 235, 237, 520
12:3–13	52–54, 85, 89, 104, 107, 199 n. 133, 214, 217, 219–23, 225– 30, 237–38, 239 n. 65, 240, 271 n. 151, 279–82, 289, 291, 426, 446 n. 592, 451, 523, 525	12:28	39, 39 n. 204, 54, 66, 68, 89, 104, 217, 219–23, 225–28, 235–38, 239 n. 65, 240, 271 n. 151, 279–82, 289, 291, 426, 451, 523, 525
		12:29	227, 232–34, 524
		12:29–30	227
		12:29–36	198
		12:29–39	222–30, 232, 233 n. 47, 234, 236–38, 242 n. 71, 520, 525 n. 9
		12:30–34	228
		12:31	229–30



12:31–34	232	14:10	53 n. 269, 267, 269, 410
12:31–38	227	14:10–14	274
12:33	227, 228 n. 35, 229–30	14:11–12	270
12:33–34	228	14:11–14	267
12:34	228 n. 36, 231	14:13–14	275
12:39	227–28, 230–32	14:15	53 n. 269, 54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267 n. 143, 269, 282, 284
12:40–41	39, 53–54, 68, 89, 104, 114, 154, 217, 219 n. 6, 220–23, 226–29, 234–38, 239 n. 65, 240, 271 n. 151, 279–84, 289, 291–92, 426–27, 446 n. 592, 451, 523, 525, 527, 529	14:16	123, 268, 269, 275–76, 284, 286
12:41	116, 219, 219, 228, 237, 271	14:16–18	54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267 n. 143, 269, 282, 284
12:51	219 n. 4	14:17	14 n. 53, 15, 154–55, 248 n. 93, 267, 271–72, 275, 277, 284, 286, 451, 533
13:3–10	221	14:17–18	269, 272, 274, 278, 284, 288, 363 n. 440
13:3–16	224–25, 238	14:18	14 n. 53, 15, 56, 154–55, 219, 240, 248 n. 93, 267, 72–74, 283, 292, 427, 449, 451, 482, 527–28
13:21–22	270, 358 n. 426	14:19–20	267, 270
14	viii, 19, 33, 53 n. 269, 107, 117, 120, 125, 127–28, 131, 134, 137, 137 n. 85, 138, 154, 165–66, 167, 170, 171, 214, 217, 240–41, 267, 267 n. 144, 268–71, 272, 274–75, 278–92, 381–82, 393, 413, 427–28, 444–45, 448–49, 451, 478–79, 497, 520, 526, 528–29, 544, 547, 559	14:21	54, 83, 89, 104, 163, 168, 219 nn. 6–7, 240, 267–69, 275, 282–84, 286, 450
14:1	95 n. 429	14:21–22	165, 240, 276, 497
14:1–4	54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267 n. 143, 268, 282, 284	14:22	123, 269, 275, 283
14:1–29	219, 219	14:22–23	54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267 n. 143, 269, 282, 284
14:2–3	268, 271	14:23	271, 284
14:3	410	14:24	358 n. 426
14:4	14 n. 53, 15, 56, 154–55, 219, 240, 248 n. 93, 267–69, 271–75, 277–78, 283–84, 286, 288, 290, 292, 363 n. 440, 427, 449, 451, 482, 527–28, 533	14:24–25	267, 275
14:5	271	14:26	54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267 n. 143, 269, 275, 277, 282, 284, 286, 497
14:5–7	267, 269	14:26–28	166, 284
14:8	54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267 n. 143, 269, 271–2, 275, 282, 284, 286, 290, 528	14:27	54, 83, 89, 104, 163, 168, 219 nn. 6–7, 267, 269–70, 275, 282, 284, 286, 450, 497
14:8–9	268–69	14:28	269–70, 275, 277, 282, 284, 497
14:9	54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267, 267 n. 143, 269, 282, 284, 358 n. 426	14:28–29	54, 89, 104, 219 nn. 6–7, 267 n. 143, 277
		14:29	123, 165, 240, 269, 275–76, 283, 497
		14:30	270
		14:30–31	267
		14:31	274

*Exodus (cont.)*

15 ix, 58, 267 n. 144, 270 n. 148, 275 nn. 162–163, 276 n. 163, 531  
 15–16 54  
 15:1 275 n. 162  
 15:1–18 267 n. 144  
 15:3 275 n. 162  
 15:6 275 n. 162  
 15:7 276 n. 163  
 15:8 270 n. 148, 276 n. 163  
 15:9 270 n. 148  
 15:10 270 n. 148, 275 n. 162, 276 n. 163  
 15:13–17 276 n. 163  
 15:20 335 n. 342  
 15:22 54, 58, 89, 104, 134, 137 n. 84, 154, 480, 531  
 15:22–25 375–76, 399 n. 519  
 15:24 375, 378  
 15:26 233 n. 45, 267 n. 145, 429, 437  
 15:27 54 n. 271, 58, 89, 104, 134, 137 n. 84, 154, 480, 531  
 16 viii, 14–15, 31, 33, 54, 55 n. 274, 56 n. 279, 58, 68, 81–83, 85, 97, 98, 107–8, 115, 120, 123, 131 n. 81, 134, 143, 152, 154, 159–62, 164, 167–68, 204, 214, 217–218, 294, 374–78, 380–84, 385 n. 486, 387, 391, 397–401, 402 n. 526, 405–9, 411–12, 414–25, 427–28, 437, 446–47, 449–52, 456, 479–84, 497–98, 531, 540 n. 17, 544, 546, 548 n. 23, 549–54, 556–58  
 16–40 166 n. 148, 484–87, 559  
 16:1 54 n. 271, 58, 72, 74, 89, 104, 114, 116, 137 n. 84, 154, 294 n. 183, 294, 375 n. 472, 480, 531  
 16:1–3 55  
 16:2 76, 77 n. 375, 336, 378, 413  
 16:2–3 54–56, 58, 81, 89, 104, 159 n. 134, 294 n. 183, 375 n. 472, 377–78, 380, 383, 398, 401, 406, 412–14, 420, 532  
 16:2–5 82, 162 n. 141, 168  
 16:2–15 54, 56

16:3 55, 159, 375, 378–80, 401, 409–11, 413, 416, 420, 551–52  
 16:4–5 54, 58 n. 287  
 16:6 55, 336, 380, 382, 409, 411, 416, 552  
 16:6–7 54–56, 58, 82, 89, 104, 117, 154, 159 nn. 134–135, 162, 168, 294 n. 183, 375 n. 472, 377–80, 383, 392, 399 n. 518, 407, 413–14, 416, 418, 419 n. 541, 420, 420, 532, 556–57  
 16:7 355, 360, 362, 374, 376, 377–80, 410, 412, 451, 532, 552  
 16:7–8 377, 392, 409  
 16:9 162, 168, 376, 377–80, 420, 420, 556–57  
 16:9–10 377, 414  
 16:9–12 55  
 16:9–13 55  
 16:9–15 54–56, 58, 89, 104, 294 n. 183, 375 n. 472  
 16:10 33 n. 175, 64 n. 318, 82, 117, 155, 159 n. 134, 160, 161, 162 n. 141, 168, 355–56, 358–63, 371–72, 374, 377, 380, 383, 393, 398, 406, 409–10, 412–14, 417, 420–21, 451, 533, 551, 552  
 16:10–11 79  
 16:10–12 164, 379  
 16:11 378  
 16:11–12 54, 82, 82, 159 n. 134, 162, 168, 363, 377, 380, 383, 398, 406, 413, 416, 420–21  
 16:12 55, 57, 154, 155, 159, 168, 376, 379–81, 398 n. 516, 406 n. 528, 409–10, 412, 414, 420–22, 427, 443, 449, 451, 533, 546, 552–53  
 16:13 376  
 16:13–14 56  
 16:13–15 56, 82, 159 n. 134, 162 n. 141, 168, 377, 381, 383, 399, 406, 413–14, 420–21, 532  
 16:14 58  
 16:14–15 58  
 16:15 56–58, 123, 162, 168, 381, 420, 420, 533, 556–57

16:16	54, 57, 68	19-34	95 n. 430
16:16-18	57	19-40	70, 107, 152, 164, 403 n. 526,
16:16-20	58 n. 289		425, 427, 449-50, 451
16:16-21	56-57	19:1	54 n. 271, 58, 66, 71-72, 74, 89,
16:16-27	56		104, 116, 134, 137 n. 84, 155, 157,
16:16-36	56, 58		294 n. 183, 480, 534
16:19-20	57	19:2	54 n. 271, 58, 71, 89, 104, 137
16:21	57-58, 89, 104, 154, 294 n.		n. 84, 155, 294 n. 183, 480, 534
	183, 375 n. 472, 377, 381, 383, 399,	19:9	358, 534
	406, 532-33	19:16	358-59, 534
16:22	57	19:18	359, 361, 535
16:22-23	54	19:20	535
16:22-27	56-57	19:24	335
16:22-28	58 n. 287	20:2	233 n. 45, 267 n. 145, 429, 437
16:22-30	58 n. 287	21-24	535
16:23	57, 58 n. 287, 68	23:14-18	221
16:27	57	23:18	221, 222 n. 15
16:28	58 n. 287	24	viii, 294, 372, 374, 408-9
16:28-30	56	24-29	165, 478, 481, 484
16:30	56	24-40	134, 155, 165, 479, 544-47,
16:30-34	56		549, 551-54, 556-58, 560
16:31	58	24:1	335
16:32	68	24:9	335
16:32-34	56, 58	24:12	59
16:35	56-58, 85, 89, 104, 154, 294 n.	24:12-15	59
	183, 375 n. 472, 377, 381, 383, 399,	24:14	335
	406, 532-33	24:15	117, 356, 358-59, 544
16:36	56	24:15-16	59, 117, 372
17:1	54 n. 271, 58, 71-72, 89, 104,	24:15-18	14 n. 53, 15, 21, 58, 66, 71,
	134, 137 n. 84, 155, 294 n. 183, 399-		89, 104, 120, 128-29, 134, 155-56,
	400, 534		294, 294 n. 183, 361, 534, 545
17:1-2	400 n. 520	24:16	124, 127 n. 63, 165, 171 n.
17:1-7	77, 78 n. 375, 79, 93 n. 422,		154, 355-56, 358-59, 362, 367,
	375-76, 399, 404-6, 554		369, 371, 374-75, 409, 416-17,
17:3	78, 375, 378, 400-1, 532, 555		426, 543, 545, 552
17:4	400-1	24:16-17	33 n. 175, 155, 360, 451
17:5	78, 404	24:16-18	115, 120
17:5-6	400, 402	24:17	155, 361, 365, 372
17:6	78, 400, 402, 555	24:18	356, 358-59
17:7	404	25	15, 322, 323 n. 303, 341, 374,
17:10	335		545
17:12	335	25-26	323 n. 303, 341 n. 359
18	98	25-27	61, 201 n. 144, 295-96, 320-
18:12	335		21, 322-26, 538
19-24	95	25-28	67 n. 334

*Exodus (cont.)*

- 25-29 viii, 59, 59, 60, 64-66, 134,  
 155, 165-66, 214, 217-18, 294, 301  
 n. 204, 313 n. 260, 314 n. 270, 371-  
 72, 374, 408-9, 535, 538, 545  
 25-30 44  
 25-31 13 n. 45, 14 n. 53, 58, 59, 65,  
 313 n. 270  
 25-40 15 n. 59, 19, 86, 127, 128, 137,  
 167, 214, 301 n. 204, 427  
 25:1 58-60, 337, 423, 538  
 25:1-2 25 n. 120, 61, 65, 71, 89, 104,  
 294 nn. 183-84, 301  
 25:1-9 171, 358, 424, 426  
 25:1-27:19 62  
 25:2 60, 309 n. 240, 538  
 25:2-7 60  
 25:4-5 309 n. 240  
 25:6-7 60  
 25:8 64 n. 317, 65, 156, 294, 297,  
 299, 321, 349, 355, 357, 367-69,  
 371-72, 483, 537-38, 543  
 25:8-9 13 n. 45, 59-61, 65, 71, 89,  
 104, 294 nn. 183-84, 301, 303, 370  
 25:9 60-61, 120, 155, 295 n. 187, 299  
 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388  
 25:10 316  
 25:10-16 310, 312, 320  
 25:10-22 297, 538  
 25:10-40 60-61, 65, 71, 89, 104, 294  
 nn. 183-84, 301  
 25:10-27:19 535  
 25:11-13 307  
 25:12-13 296 n. 189  
 25:12-15 310  
 25:16 311, 313-14  
 25:17 316  
 25:17-18 307  
 25:17-19 316, 321  
 25:17-22 315  
 25:18 316 n. 275  
 25:18-20 313  
 25:19 316 n. 275  
 25:20 316 n. 275  
 25:21 311-14, 316 n. 275  
 25:22 156, 160, 294, 297, 299, 304,  
 313-14, 316, 318, 353 n. 411, 356-  
 57, 366, 370-71, 483, 537, 537, 543  
 25:23 324  
 25:23-26 304  
 25:23-30 297, 309, 321  
 25:23-40 539  
 25:26-28 310  
 25:27-28 296 n. 189  
 25:28-29 322  
 25:31-36 302, 309  
 25:31-39 321  
 25:31-40 309, 322 n. 300  
 25:33-35 322  
 25:40 60, 120, 155, 295 n. 187, 538  
 26 60, 65, 296, 321-22  
 26-27 539, 540 n. 16  
 26:1 299 n. 197, 305, 308-9, 321 n.  
 294, 348 n. 388  
 26:1-29 13 n. 45  
 26:1-30 60  
 26:1-37 61, 65, 71, 89, 104, 294 nn.  
 183-84, 301 n. 206, 302  
 26:6 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348  
 n. 388  
 26:7 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348  
 n. 388  
 26:7-10 322 n. 300  
 26:12 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294,  
 348 n. 388  
 26:13 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294,  
 348 n. 388  
 26:15 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294,  
 348 n. 388  
 26:16 306  
 26:17 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294,  
 348 n. 388  
 26:18 299 n. 197, 305, 306, 321 n.  
 294, 348 n. 388  
 26:19 308 n. 234  
 26:20 299 n. 197, 305, 306, 321 n.  
 294, 348 n. 388  
 26:22 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294,  
 348 n. 388  
 26:22-23 307

26:23	299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388	28:3	87
26:26	299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388	28:3-5	62
26:27	299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388	28:4-5	62
26:30	13 n. 45, 60, 120, 155, 295 n. 187, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388, 538	28:6	62 n. 308
26:31	303, 308-9	28:6-14	340-41
26:31-37	60-61	28:6-38	340, 346
26:32	308 n. 234	28:6-39	541
26:33	306	28:6-41	62, 65, 71, 89, 104, 294 nn. 183-84, 301 n. 206
26:33-34	306, 349	28:9-11	342, 560
26:33-35	61, 323 n. 303	28:9-12	477
26:34	310, 315, 316 n. 275	28:9-13	541
26:35	313, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388	28:9-14	342
26:36	303	28:10	388
26:37	308 n. 234	28:11-12	328
27	60	28:12	342, 423
27:1-8	61, 65, 304, 309, 321	28:14	340
27:1-19	61, 65, 71, 89, 104, 294 nn. 183-84, 301 n. 206, 302	28:15	343
27:4	296 n. 189	28:15-30	340, 343
27:4-7	310	28:17-20	343
27:6-7	296 n. 189	28:17-21	477
27:8	60, 120, 155, 295 n. 187, 538	28:21	328, 388, 423, 560
27:9	299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388	28:22	340
27:9-19	61, 306, 321	28:22-28	343
27:16	308 n. 235	28:29	343, 344 n. 368, 477, 541
27:19	296, 299 n. 197, 305, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388	28:29-30	328, 423
27:20-21	61	28:30	344-45, 542
28	61, 326, 339, 352, 374, 424, 426, 477, 545, 557	28:31	340
28-29	65, 202 n. 144, 295, 321, 326-27, 335, 337, 338 n. 345, 405, 409, 420, 540	28:31-34	340
28:1	62, 339	28:31-35	345
28:1-2	65, 71, 89, 104, 294 nn. 183-84, 301 n. 206	28:33-35	341, 345
28:1-29:35	536, 540	28:35	345
28:1-29:42	61	28:36	340, 346, 423
28:2	62, 339	28:38	346
28:2-40	339	28:39	340
		28:39-40	339
		28:40	339, 541 n. 18, 542
		28:41	62-63, 338, 338 n. 345, 339, 348-49, 350 n. 398, 352 n. 408, 409
		28:42-43	62
		28:43	321 n. 294
		29	7 n. 16, 62, 67, 68 n. 335, 127, 142, 199 n. 133, 338 n. 345, 348 n. 388, 540 n. 16, 542
		29:1	338, 349

*Exodus (cont.)*

- 29:1–20 63, 65, 71, 89, 104, 294 nn.  
 183–84, 301 n. 206  
 29:1–35 62–63, 338 n. 345, 338 n.  
 345  
 29:4 296, 298, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388  
 29:5–6 348  
 29:6 346  
 29:7 62 n. 308, 63, 338, 349, 350 n.  
 398  
 29:9 338, 349  
 29:10 296, 298, 321 n. 294, 348 n.  
 388  
 29:11 296, 298, 321 n. 294, 348 n.  
 388  
 29:20 63  
 29:21 63, 350 n. 398  
 29:22–25 63  
 29:22–26 63, 65, 71, 89, 104, 294 nn.  
 183–84, 301 n. 206  
 29:26 63  
 29:27–28 63  
 29:27–30 63  
 29:29–30 63  
 29:30 63, 296, 298, 321 n. 294, 348  
 n. 388  
 29:31–32 63, 65, 71, 89, 104, 294 nn.  
 183–84, 301 n. 206  
 29:32 296, 298, 321 n. 294, 348 n. 388  
 29:33–34 63  
 29:35 63, 65, 71, 89, 104, 165, 294  
 nn. 183–84, 301 n. 206, 338, 349,  
 544  
 29:36–37 63  
 29:38–42 63, 65 n. 320  
 29:38–46 45 n. 228  
 29:42 64 n. 320, 296, 298, 321 n.  
 294, 348 n. 388  
 29:42–46 14 n. 53, 15, 64 n. 318  
 29:43 33 n. 175, 60, 66, 68,  
 81 n. 380, 155, 156, 160–61, 294,  
 298, 354–55, 356–57, 359–60, 362,  
 366, 368 n. 460, 370–71, 395, 409,  
 415–17, 426, 483–84, 537, 550,  
 551–52  
 29:43–44 64–65, 67 n. 330, 201 n.  
 144, 295 n. 186, 302 n. 207, 543  
 29:43–45 544  
 29:43–46 44, 46, 59 n. 292, 60,  
 64, 65, 68, 71, 89, 104, 155, 294 nn.  
 183–84, 301 n. 206, 409, 416, 537,  
 543, 553  
 29:44 63, 65, 202 n. 144, 295 n.  
 186, 296, 298–99, 321 n. 294, 338,  
 348 n. 388, 349, 354 n. 415  
 29:45 544–45  
 29:45–46 13, 19, 33, 59, 60 n. 299,  
 64–65, 117, 124, 127–28, 129–30,  
 156, 159–60, 294, 297, 299, 355,  
 357, 367–72, 392, 409, 415–17,  
 423, 425, 427, 449, 483, 552  
 29:46 64, 156, 355, 409, 411, 416,  
 423, 427, 443, 449, 451, 537, 547,  
 552  
 30–31 59  
 30:1–10 59 n. 292, 60 n. 300  
 30:6 316 n. 275  
 30:11–16 70  
 30:28–29 63  
 31:1–11 62  
 31:3 87, 120  
 31:18 59, 313 n. 263  
 32 36–37, 331 n. 327, 332, 334–36,  
 536  
 32–34 59  
 32:1–6 332, 333 n. 338, 335, 537  
 32:4 332 n. 333  
 32:6 333  
 32:7–14 333 n. 338  
 32:15 332  
 32:15–16 59  
 32:19–24 332  
 32:20 333 n. 336  
 32:21–24 333 n. 338, 335, 537  
 32:25–29 331 n. 327, 333–34, 537  
 32:26–29 333 n. 338  
 32:29 331 n. 327, 333, 349  
 32:30–34 332, 333 n. 336  
 33:7 357 n. 420  
 33:7–11 298, 299 n. 198, 356, 536

- 33:9 357–58, 365  
 33:10 534  
 33:18 364 n. 445  
 33:18–23 361 n. 433  
 33:20 364 n. 445  
 34 535  
 34:18 221  
 34:25 221, 222 n. 15  
 35–40 14 n. 53, 58, 59, 65–67, 301,  
 301 n. 205  
 35:22–23 25 n. 120  
 35:25 25 n. 120  
 35:31 87, 110  
 36:8–13 25 n. 120  
 37:9 316 n. 275  
 38:25–26 70  
 39–40 viii, 127, 134–35, 155,  
 165, 165–66, 214, 217–18, 294, 301  
 n. 204, 315, 371–72, 374, 408–9,  
 478, 481, 484, 538, 545, 557  
 39:32 27, 66–68, 71, 83, 86,  
 89, 104, 109–10, 115, 117, 120, 124,  
 138, 163, 165–66, 168, 171, 201 n.  
 144, 294 nn. 183 and 185, 295 n.  
 186, 301 n. 206, 302, 323, 420, 423,  
 424, 426, 450, 535, 544, 557  
 39:35 316 n. 275  
 39:42 43 n. 324, 110  
 39:43 66–68, 71, 86, 89, 104, 110,  
 115, 117, 120, 124, 138, 165, 171,  
 201 n. 144, 294 nn. 183 and 185,  
 295 n. 186, 301 n. 206, 302, 323,  
 420, 423–24, 426, 450, 535, 544,  
 557  
 40 7 n. 16, 18, 19 n. 81, 32, 126, 129  
 n. 77, 448, 501  
 40:2 110  
 40:16 59, 43 n. 324  
 40:16–33 201 n. 144  
 40:17 25 n. 120, 43 n. 324, 59,  
 66–68, 71, 89, 104, 115, 117, 127 n.  
 63, 138, 157, 165–66, 170–71, 201  
 n. 144, 294 nn. 183 and 185, 295 n.  
 186, 301 n. 206, 302, 323, 535, 544  
 40:20 316 n. 275  
 40:33 27, 59, 66–68, 71, 83, 86, 89,  
 104, 109–10, 138, 163, 165, 168,  
 201 n. 144, 202 n. 144, 294 nn. 183  
 and 185, 295 n. 186, 301 n. 206,  
 302, 323, 337, 338 n. 345, 352 n.  
 408, 409, 420, 423, 424, 426, 450,  
 535, 544, 557  
 40:33–34 120  
 40:33–38 15  
 40:34 19, 25 n. 120, 26, 59, 66–69,  
 71, 89, 104, 115, 117, 127, 129–30,  
 155–56, 160–61, 184 n. 46, 201  
 n. 144, 294 nn. 183 and 185, 295  
 n. 186, 296, 298, 301 n. 206, 302,  
 323, 355–56, 358–62, 363, 365–66,  
 369, 371–72, 374–75, 409, 416–17,  
 423, 426, 449, 483, 537, 540 n. 16,  
 544–45, 552  
 40:34–35 19, 20–21, 33 n. 175, 43 n.  
 324, 124, 128–29  
 40:35 21, 67–69  
 40:36–37 72
- Leviticus  
 1 88, 338 n. 345  
 1–3 20, 68 n. 335, 69  
 1–9 20, 128  
 1–10 14 n. 53, 15 n. 59  
 1–16 11 n. 32, 22, 44, 69, 126  
 3 88  
 4 338 n. 345  
 6:2 129  
 6:12–13 129  
 8 67, 69, 338 n. 345  
 8–9 20, 68 n. 335, 201 n. 144, 202 n.  
 144  
 8:10 201 n. 144  
 8:10–11 201 n. 144, 202 n. 144  
 9 7 n. 16, 12 n. 37, 14, 63 n. 310, 67–  
 69, 113  
 9:1–24 115  
 9:6 68  
 9:22–24 15  
 9:23 21, 33 n. 175, 67 n. 332, 68–69,  
 115, 117, 120

*Leviticus (cont.)*

9:23-24	21, 66 n. 330, 128-29, 130	10:11-12	58, 72, 114, 137 n. 84
n. 79		10:11-13	74, 84, 104, 135, 155-56, 548
9:24	114	10:11-20:13	72
10	200 n. 136	10:11-27:14	72
11-16	20-21, 69, 128	10:12	54 n. 271, 72, 89, 116, 480, 548
11-25	200 n. 136	10:12-13	157
11-26	14 n. 53, 15 n. 59	10:13	72, 89, 548
11:9-12	258	10:33	311 n. 245, 312
13:18-23	262	10:35-36	310-11, 536
16	7 n. 16, 10, 19, 21, 69, 126-28, 130 n. 79	11	98 n. 440, 536
16:2	128, 316 n. 275	11:4	98, 376 n. 474, 378
16:12	262 n. 135	11:4-6	98, 375-78, 381-82, 531
16:12-13	128	11:4-35	98 n. 440
16:14	316 n. 276	11:5	375
16:15	316 n. 276	11:6	376 n. 474
17-26	5 n. 10, 14 n. 53, 43-46, 69 n. 341	11:10	98, 375-78, 381-82, 531
22:32	80 n. 380	11:13	98, 375-77, 379, 381-82, 531-32
23	26, 69 n. 341	11:16-17	298, 356
23:5-8	53, 221, 222 n. 15	11:17	357, 358 n. 425, 365
25	25-26, 69 n. 341	11:18	375-76, 378-80

*Numbers*

1	26, 77, 156 n. 127, 477 n. 39	11:18-20	98, 376-77, 379-80, 532
1-2	70-71, 151 n. 122, 156 n. 127, 477 n. 40	11:18-23	98, 375-77, 381-82, 531
1-10	14 n. 53, 70	11:19-20	380
1:1	156 n. 127	11:20	98 n. 441, 375, 378-79, 532
1:1-10:10	58, 70	11:23	377
1:27	157 n. 127	11:21-22	532
1:46	70	11:21-24	98, 376 n. 474, 377, 381
1:50	314	11:24	98, 375-77, 381-82, 531
1:53	314	11:24-26	298, 356
2:3-9	156 n. 127	11:25	357-58, 365, 534
3-4	327 n. 317, 331 n. 229	11:31	376
7:89	316 n. 275	11:31-32	98, 376 n. 474
8	327 n. 317, 331 n. 229	11:31-34	98, 375-77, 381-82, 531
9	125	11:33-34	98 n. 441
9:1-14	70	12	536
9:15	314	12:1-16	335-36
9:15-23	72, 358 n. 426	12:4-5	298, 356
10	15	12:4-8	536
10:11	72, 89, 114, 116, 157, 314, 548	12:5	356-58, 365, 534
		12:9-10	357
		12:10	298, 356-57, 450, 536
		13	13, 75, 125, 383-84, 387





*Numbers (cont.)*

- 14:8 77 n. 371, 81 n. 382  
 14:9 75–76, 77 n. 371, 79, 81, 83–84,  
 89, 104, 159–60, 383–85, 391–93,  
 396, 407, 409–13, 415–19, 449,  
 484, 549, 551–53, 556–58  
 14:10 33 n. 175, 64 n. 318, 68, 75,  
 79–80, 81 n. 382, 82–84, 89, 104,  
 115, 156, 158–61, 164, 166 n. 148,  
 168, 355, 359–60, 362–63, 365–66,  
 371–72, 374, 383–85, 391–93, 396,  
 398, 406, 409–10, 412–17, 419, 421  
 n. 543, 449, 481, 483–85, 550–53,  
 558  
 14:10–22 74 n. 363  
 14:10–38 135, 137  
 14:11 81 n. 380, 394–95  
 14:11–12 394  
 14:11–25 384–85, 393, 394 n. 509,  
 395 n. 511, 396  
 14:21 394  
 14:21–23 395  
 14:22–23 394  
 14:23 394–95  
 14:23–24 74 n. 363  
 14:23–25 394 n. 509  
 14:24 394, 396  
 14:25 74 n. 363, 74 n. 363, 394, 495  
 n. 512, 396  
 14:26 62 n. 305, 77 n. 372, 336, 394  
 14:26–28 75, 79, 83–84, 89, 104,  
 160, 164, 363, 383 n. 483–85, 396,  
 419, 550  
 14:26–29 82, 159 n. 134, 383, 398,  
 406, 413  
 14:26–30 74 n. 363  
 14:26–35 80, 156, 161, 168  
 14:26–37 483  
 14:26–38 71 n. 354, 77, 124, 393  
 14:27 394–95, 414, 549  
 14:28 167, 394–95, 402, 406 n. 528, 550  
 14:28–29 414, 420  
 14:28–35 88, 398 n. 516  
 14:28–37 484  
 14:29 75–77, 79, 83–84, 89, 104,  
 160, 164, 167, 363, 383 n. 483–85,  
 393–96, 401 n. 521, 419, 550  
 14:30 74 n. 363, 77 n. 374, 394 n. 510  
 14:30–34 77  
 14:31 75, 760, 77 n. 374,  
 79, 82–84, 89, 104, 159 n. 134, 363,  
 383–85, 393–96, 398, 406, 413, 414  
 n. 535, 419, 550  
 14:31–35 74 n. 363  
 14:32–34 77 n. 374  
 14:35 76, 82, 159 n. 134, 160, 164,  
 167, 363, 383–85, 393–95, 398, 400–  
 402, 406, 409–10, 412–13, 416, 418–  
 20, 449, 484, 550–52  
 14:35–38 75, 79, 83–84, 89, 104, 383  
 n. 483, 396  
 14:36 160, 396, 553  
 14:36–37 74 n. 363, 81 n. 382, 86,  
 157, 159 n. 134, 160, 166, 448, 481,  
 485, 554  
 14:36–38 82, 168, 383–85, 396, 399,  
 406, 413  
 14:37 167, 394, 401, 418, 420, 555  
 14:38 74 n. 363, 167, 173, 394, 414 n.  
 535  
 14:39 74 n. 363  
 14:39–45 384–85, 396, 396  
 14:40–45 74 n. 363  
 14:44 310–12, 536  
 16:5 57 n. 285  
 16:22 88  
 17:22 314  
 17:23 314  
 17:25–26 78  
 17:27–28 401 n. 521  
 18:2 314  
 18:15–25 221  
 20 viii, 6, 23, 33, 71–72, 88 n. 409,  
 93, 103 n. 462, 112–13, 115, 131  
 n. 80, 143, 167–68, 204, 217, 294,  
 374–75, 410–11, 427, 443, 447, 448  
 n. 594, 450, 554, 556–58, 561  
 20:1 54 n. 271, 77, 83–84, 89, 104,  
 114, 116, 135, 137 n. 84, 160, 399,  
 404 n. 526, 480, 554

- 20:1-12 72-75, 81-83, 399, 409,  
420, 422-24, 450
- 20:1-13 71 n. 354, 75, 77, 78 nn.  
376-377, 79, 80 n. 380, 80 n. 380
- 20:2 77-80, 82-84, 89, 104, 162  
n. 141, 168, 398-400, 404 n. 526,  
405-6, 418, 420, 554-55
- 20:2-12 62 n. 305, 79-80, 83, 135,  
160-64, 167-68, 336, 375-76, 383,  
398-400, 403 n. 526, 404 n. 526,  
406-9, 411, 417-19, 423, 484, 484,  
487
- 20:2-13 78 n. 375, 418
- 20:3 77-80, 82-84, 89, 104, 162 n.  
141, 168, 398, 400-1, 404 n. 526,  
405-6, 418, 420, 554-55
- 20:3-4 76 n. 370, 78, 400, 403, 420,  
422 n. 545
- 20:4 77-80, 82-84, 89, 104, 162 n.  
141, 168, 398, 400-1, 404 n. 526,  
405-6, 418, 420, 554-55
- 20:5 78-79, 80 n. 380, 405
- 20:6 33 n. 175, 77, 79-80, 82-84, 89,  
104, 115, 160-62, 166 n. 148, 168,  
355, 359-60, 362-63, 365-66,  
371-72, 374, 392, 398, 400-3, 404  
n. 526, 405-6, 409-10, 412, 419-  
21, 554-55
- 20:6-7 483
- 20:6-8 156
- 20:7 77, 79-80, 82-84, 89, 104, 160-  
61, 162 n. 141, 168, 363, 398, 401-  
2, 404 n. 526, 405-6, 419-21, 554
- 20:7-8 168, 402
- 20:8 77-80, 82-84 89, 105, 160-  
61, 162 n. 141, 168, 363, 398 nn.  
515-516, 400-2, 404 n. 526, 405,  
406 n. 528, 419-22, 483, 554-55
- 20:9 78-79, 80 n. 380
- 20:10 77, 80, 82-84, 89, 105, 135,  
160-62, 168, 398 n. 515, 399-400,  
402, 403 n. 526, 404-5, 405-7,  
409-10, 412, 417, 419-22, 554-55,  
556-57
- 20:11 77-80, 82-84, 89, 105, 160,  
162 n. 141, 168, 398 n. 515, 399-  
400, 402, 403 n. 526, 404, 405-6,  
419-21, 483, 554
- 20:12 77-80, 82-84, 89, 105, 135,  
160-63, 168, 392, 398 n. 515, 399-  
400, 402-6, 419-20, 422, 483, 554
- 20:12-13 80 n. 380
- 20:13 78, 80 n. 380
- 20:22 83-84, 89, 104, 114, 116,  
135, 137 n. 84, 163, 398-400, 402,  
404-6, 480
- 20:22-29 71 n. 354, 328, 400, 406-9,  
411, 417, 418-20, 422-24, 450,  
554-55
- 20:22-27:14 83
- 20:23 83-84, 89, 105, 163, 398-400,  
402, 404-6, 487, 499
- 20:23-29 88 n. 408, 135, 167, 173
- 20:25-26 560
- 20:25-28 112 n. 13, 163, 352 n. 408
- 20:25-29 83-84, 89, 105, 163, 169,  
398-400, 402, 404-6, 487, 499
- 20:26 409-10, 412, 420, 452, 557,  
559 n. 25
- 20:27 405, 412
- 20:28 409-10, 412, 420, 452, 557,  
559 n. 25, 560
- 21:4 84
- 21:4-9 375-76
- 21:5 375, 378, 532
- 22:1 54 n. 271, 83-84, 89, 105, 135,  
137 n. 84, 163, 554
- 24:2 367
- 24:5 299, 305, 367
- 26-35 168
- 26-36 70
- 27 viii, 6, 10, 14, 32, 71-72, 87,  
88 n. 409, 93, 103 n. 462, 105,  
107-8, 132, 136, 140, 170, 181 n. 31,  
214, 217-18, 293-94, 374, 425-28,  
437, 443, 446-47, 448 n. 594, 450,  
453, 456-57, 479-80, 481 n. 48,  
482-83, 486, 497-500, 531, 554,  
556-58, 560
- 27:12-13 71 n. 354

*Numbers (cont.)*

27:12-14	83-84, 88-89, 105, 135,	24:8	331
137, 169, 398-400, 402, 404-9, 411,		31:1-8	87
417-20, 422-24, 450, 487, 499, 554-		31:9	331
55, 561		31:26	311
27:14 ix, 133, 136-37, 139, 164, 455-		33	476
57, 474-76, 481 n. 48, 487, 488 n.		33:8	331, 344
51		33:8-11	329, 331
27:15	88	34	6, 7 n. 15, 10, 11 n. 30, 12-13,
27:15-23	87-88		22-23, 24 n. 116, 28 n. 146, 32, 84,
28-29	202 n. 146		87, 113, 116, 121-22, 125-26, 129
28:16-28	222 n. 15	n. 77	
30:2	57 n. 285	34:1	86-87
31:16	88	34:1-3	87
32	9	34:4	87
33:50-34:29	9	34:7-9	86-87
35:9-15	9	34:8	86
35:33	256	34:9	87-88, 114-16, 125
		34:10-12	87

*Deuteronomy*

1:19	388 n. 494
1:19-33	388 n. 492
1:46	388 n. 494
3:23-29	87
5:15	194
9:9-21	333
9:20	333
9:25-29	333
10:1-5	311-13, 315, 536, 539
10:8	331
16	103 n. 460
16:1	222-23, 230
16:1-7	520
16:1-8	220 n. 8, 221-23, 226 n. 31,
231	
16:2	222-23, 230
16:3	222-23, 228 n. 36, 230-31
16:4	222-23, 230-31
16:5-7	222-23, 230
16:6	222, 230
16:7	222-23, 231
17:9	331
17:18	331
18:1	331
21:5	331

*Joshua*

1:1-2	87
3-4	268 n. 147
3:16-17	268 n. 147
4:9	27 n. 138, 109 n. 2, 110 n. 5
4:19	9, 27, 28 n. 146, 84-86, 109 n. 2,
	179 n. 23
4:22-24	268 n. 147
5:9-12	27
5:10-12	9, 27 n. 138, 28 n. 146, 84-
	86, 109 n. 2, 110 n. 5, 179 n. 23,
	221, 222 n. 15
5:11	85 n. 394
5:12	84 n. 393, 85
7:13	349
9:15-21	9, 27 n. 138, 109 n. 2
11:15	27 n. 138, 109 n. 2
11:20	27 n. 138, 109 n. 2
12-19	9
14:1	27, 28 n. 146, 84 n. 393, 85 n.
	393, 110 n. 5, 179 n. 23
14:1-2	85-86
14:1-5	27 n. 138, 109 n. 2
14:2	27, 28 n. 146, 110 n. 5, 179
n. 23	
18	25

18:1	25, 27–32, 84–86, 109 n. 2, 110,	15:1	350
	179 n. 23, 299 n. 199	15:17	350
19	24	15:27	345
19:51	27–28, 84–86, 109 n. 2, 110,	16:3	350
	179 n. 23, 299 n. 199	16:5	349
21	9	16:12–13	350
21:1–8	27 n. 138, 109 n. 2	16:13	349
22:10–34	27 n. 138, 109 n. 2	18:4	345
22:16–17	88	21:2	329
24:33	27 n. 138, 109 n. 2	21:9	341
27:15–23	88	22	329, 331
		22:18	341
Judges		22:20	329 n. 321
1	6 n. 14	22:20–21	329
5:17	367	23:9–11	341
8:27	341–42	24:5	345
17:5	329, 341, 349	24:11	345
17:7–13	329, 331	28:6	344
17:12	349	30:7–8	341
18:14	341		
18:17	341	2 Samuel	
18:18	341	1:10	346
18:20	341	2:4	350
		2:7	350
1 Samuel		3:39	350
1	536	5:2	88
1–3	86, 329, 331	5:3	350
1:7	298, 299 nn. 198–199	5:17	350
1:9	298, 299 nn. 198–199	6	310–11
1:24	298, 299 n. 199	6:2	310–11, 317, 353, 356
2:18	341	6:14	341
2:19	345	6:17	298–99, 536
2:27–36	330 n. 322	7:6	298, 536
2:28	341	7:6–7	299
3:15	298, 299 nn. 198–199, 536	7:10	367, 368 n. 461
4	331	8:17	329, 330 n. 322, 331
4–6	310–11	8:17–18	331
4:4	310–12, 317, 353, 356, 536	8:18	329, 331
4:21–22	310, 362 n. 436	12:7	350
7:1	349	18:27	330 n. 325
9:16	350	18:36	330 n. 325
10:1	350	20:25	329 n. 321, 331
14:3	329, 341	20:25–26	329
14:36–42	341	20:26	331
14:41–42	344		

1 Kings		8:6	301, 304 n. 221, 310–11, 313, 536
1:39	350	8:6–7	317 n. 279
2:26–27	330	8:6–11	310 n. 244, 312 n. 252
2:30	300	8:9	312 n. 252
4:2	330	8:12–13	304 n. 221, 368
4:2–4	330	8:23–28	536
5–7	301 n. 205	8:62–64	304 n. 221, 328
5–8	305	8:64	306, 309
5–9	301 n. 205	12:25–33	332
6–7	301, 304 n. 221, 306 n. 226,	12:28	332 n. 333
535, 540		13:33	349
6–8	304–6	19:15	350
6:1	304 n. 221	19:16	350
6:2	306	22:17	88
6:3	306		
6:5–6	306	2 Kings	
6:10	306	2:4	330 n. 323
6:11–13	304 n. 221	9:3	350
6:16	306	9:6	350
6:17	306	9:12	350
6:19–20	306	11–12	330
6:20–22	307	11:12	346, 350
6:23–28	311, 313, 315	12:9–11	312
6:28	307	12:11	327
6:29	309	12:22–23	327
6:30	307	16:12–13	328
6:32	307, 309	16:14	309
6:35	307, 309	19:15	311 n. 249, 317, 353, 356
6:36	306	23:21–23	221, 223 n. 19
7:12	306	23:30	350
7:18	345		
7:20	345	1 Chronicles	
7:23–26	309	6:1–15	330 n. 326, 332 n. 331,
7:23–29	307		337 n. 344
7:38	309	11:12	88
7:42	345	15:4	337 n. 344
7:45	309	22:18	86
7:48	309	23:28	337 n. 344
7:48–49	539	23:32	337 n. 344
7:48–50	307	28:11	310 n. 241, 316
7:49	309		
8	311 n. 248	2 Chronicles	
8:1	304 n. 221	18:16	88
8:2	304 n. 221		
8:3–5	310 n. 244, 312 n. 252		

Job		96	360
7:12	253	96:6	339
		96:7–8	360, 535
Psalms		96:10	360
11:4	368	97	360–61
14:2	368	97:1	360
14:7	368	97:2	361
18:8	361, 535	97:2–3	358–59, 534
20:2	368	97:3	361
20:3	368	97:6	360–61, 535
20:6	368	99:5	312
20:7	368	102:28	367
24	361	102:29	367
24:7–10	360, 535	104:3	358, 534
26:8	339, 360, 362	105:39	358 n. 426
27:13	361 n. 433	132:5	299 n. 197, 305, 367 n. 459
29	360	132:7	299 n. 197, 305, 312, 367 n.
29:1	360	459	
29:1–2	339	132:18	346
29:2	360	135:21	368
29:3	360–61, 535, 535	145	360
29:9	360	145:1	360
29:10	360	145:5	360, 535
31:14	389 n. 497	145:11	360, 535
37:27	367	145:12	360, 535
37:29	367		
43:3	305, 367 n. 459	Isaiah	
46:4	299 n. 197, 305, 367 n. 459	6:3	360, 362, 535
46:5	299 n. 197, 305, 367 n. 459	6:3–4	361, 535
49:11	367 n. 459	6:8	360, 535
49:12	367 n. 459	8:18	368
50:2	362, 366	9:1	358
63:3	361 n. 433	17:4	364 n. 445
68:4	358, 534	18:3	367, 368 n. 461
68:16	368	22:16	367 n. 459
68:17	368	22:21	339
72:19	360, 362	34:17	367, 368 n. 461
74:7	305, 367 n. 459	37:2	327
74:13	253	37:16	353, 356
78:14	358 n. 426	40–55	102
78:60	298–99, 305, 367 n. 459, 536	40:12	260
80:2	362, 366	51:9	253
84:1	299 n. 197, 305, 367 n. 459	54:2	305, 367 n. 459
84:2	299 n. 197, 305, 367 n. 459	61:1	350 n. 399
89:40	346		

## Jeremiah

1:1	330 n. 323
1:18	96
3:16–17	311 n. 249
20:10	389 n. 497
30:18	305, 367 n. 459
46:14	271
51:34	266
52:22–23	345

## Ezekiel

10:2	262 n. 135
20:5	436 n. 565
20:5–8	430 n. 556
20:42	429 n. 556, 430 n. 556, 439 n. 575
21:26	339
29:3	255, 266, 285
29:10	271
30:6	271
32:2	255, 266, 285
36:1–15	103, 157 n. 130
36:3	389 n. 497
36:13	389
36:13–14	76
40–48	327 n. 317, 331, 334
40:45–46	334
43:19	332 n. 331, 334
44:10–16	327 n. 317
44:15	332 n. 331
44:15–16	334
48:11	327 n. 317, 334

## Hosea

12:9	233 n. 45, 267 n. 145
13:4	233 n. 45, 267 n. 145

## Zechariah

10:2	88
------	----



## INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Achenbach, Reinhard 5 n. 10, 70 n. 348,  
71 n. 354, 74 n. 363, 563
- Ackroyd, Peter 8 n. 17, 11 n. 32, 100 n.  
449, 563
- Ahuis, F. 224 n. 26, 563
- Artus, Olivier 75 n. 366, 75 n. 368, 77  
nn. 374–75, 379 n. 378, 399 n. 519,  
563
- Auld, A. Graeme 5 n. 10, 9 nn. 20–21,  
563, 578
- Baden, Joel S. 3 n. 7, 4 n. 8, 6 n. 15, 35 n.  
182, 43 n. 221, 45 n. 230, 46, 52 nn.  
263–64, 53 n. 266, 54 n. 274, 56 n. 282,  
57 nn. 285–86, 69 n. 341, 76 n. 368,  
90–91, 239 n. 65, 563, 579
- Balentine, Samuel 401 n. 523, 563
- Bar-On, Shimon 224 n. 21, 563
- Bauks, Michaela 3 n. 7, 7 n. 16, 8 n. 17,  
19 n. 81, 20 n. 89, 175 n. 2, 184 n. 46,  
201 n. 143, 247 n. 90, 266 n. 142, 563
- Bergant, Dianne 237 n. 57, 238 n. 60,  
239, 564
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph vii, 3 n. 7, 6  
n. 14, 8 n. 17, 27, 28, 33, 35 n. 186, 36  
n. 189, 84, 85 n. 393, 92 nn. 421–22,  
10 n. 449, 101 n. 451, 106 n. 467, 109,  
110, 164 n. 146, 175 n. 3, 176, 184–90,  
196 n. 115, 197 n. 120, 203, 206 n. 159,  
207, 209, 327 n. 317, 329 n. 320, 330  
nn. 325–326, 331 n. 328, 332 n. 334,  
334 n. 339, 337 n. 344, 349 n. 397, 350  
n. 401, 351 n. 405, 564
- Blum, Erhard vii, 1 n. 5, 3 n. 7, 6 n.  
13, 7 n. 15, 8 n. 17, 10, 14–15, 19, 33,  
36 nn. 188 and 190, 37 n. 193, 38 n.  
202, 40 n. 209, 41–42, 45–46, 47 n.  
237, 48 n. 242, 50 nn. 250–251, 59 n.  
292, 60 n. 298, 64 nn. 317 and 319, 69,  
86 nn. 396 and 398, 92 n. 421, 97, 98 n.  
439, 102 nn. 455 and 457, 106 n. 467,  
119–21, 124, 131, 142 n. 98, 145 n.  
102, 157 n. 127, 164 n. 146, 171 n. 155,  
172 n. 159, 175 n. 2, 176, 180–83, 184  
n. 46, 186–87, 189, 196 n. 116, 203–4,  
205 n. 156, 207 n. 168, 208, 463 n. 14,  
564
- Boase, Elizabeth 463 n. 14, 564
- Boorer, Suzanne 2 n. 7, 7 n. 15,  
8 n. 17, 23, 25, 45 n. 231, 55 n. 276, 71  
n. 355, 75 n. 365, 78 n. 375, 82 n. 385,  
83 n. 386, 85 n. 393, 89 n. 410, 125 n.  
54, 142 n. 97, 146 n. 105, 149 n. 115,  
158 n. 131, 159 n. 136, 163 n. 145, 164  
n. 146, 172 n. 158, 220 n. 9, 221 nn. 11  
and 13, 222 nn. 15–16, 223 nn. 19–20,  
224 nn. 22 and 25, 241 nn. 28–30,  
226 n. 32, 227 n. 34, 234 n. 47, 238  
n. 58, 332 n. 332, 333 n. 337, 384 n.  
485, 386 nn. 488 and 490, 387 n. 491,  
392 n. 504, 394 n. 509, 401 n. 521, 403  
n. 525, 413 n. 532, 418 n. 539, 448 n.  
594, 565
- Bray, Jason S. 149 n. 115, 565
- Brettler, Mark Z. 87, 578
- Brown, William 106 n. 467, 489 n. 59,  
507 n. 6, 565
- Brueggemann, Walter 2 n. 7, 7 n. 15,  
8 n. 17, 10 n. 27, 24–25, 29 n. 149, 149  
n. 115, 266, 273 n. 154, 293 n. 182, 480  
n. 45, 565

- Buckley, Jorunn 233 n. 46, 565
- Budd, Philip 75 n. 366, 76 n. 371,  
77 nn. 373–374, 98 n. 440, 159 n. 133,  
161 n. 139, 162 n. 142, 298 n. 196, 335  
n. 341, 391 n. 503, 493 n. 507, 399 n.  
519, 404 n. 526, 565
- Campbell, Antony F. 3 n. 7, 34  
n. 181, 36 n. 188, 48 n. 243, 49 n. 244,  
52 n. 260, 53 n. 269, 304 n. 221, 310 n.  
244, 312 n. 252, 317 n. 279, 566
- Carr, David vii, 1 n. 4, 3 n. 7, 4 n. 8, 6 n.  
14, 8 n. 17, 9 n. 24, 18, 34 nn. 180–81,  
35 nn. 182–83 and 185–86, 36 nn.  
187–89, 37, 38 nn. 196 and 199–200,  
39, 40 nn. 208 and 210, 43 n. 220 and  
222, 45, 47 n. 237, 48 n. 243, 51 nn.  
255 and 257, 52 n. 263, 53 n. 267, 74  
n. 364, 90 nn. 412–13, 91–94, 96–98,  
99 nn. 444–46, 100 n. 449, 101, 119 n.  
459 and 463, 104 n. 463, 106 n. 467,  
107 n. 468, 119 n. 30, 121–23, 138 n.  
88, 139 n. 89, 141 n. 92, 144 nn. 100–  
101, 147 n. 107, 148 n. 112, 149 nn.  
115–16, 150 nn. 119 and 121, 175 n.  
3, 176, 186–88, 189 n. 77, 203, 207–9,  
212 n. 174, 213, 226, 236, 460 n. 9, 461  
nn. 11–12, 463 n. 14, 465 n. 18, 467 n.  
21, 469 n. 24, 470 n. 28, 471 n. 30, 480  
n. 46, 488, 489 n. 56, 490 n. 61, 491 n.  
63, 493 n. 71, 494 n. 73, 495 n. 76, 566
- Childs, Brevard 49 n. 246, 50 n.  
254, 51 n. 258, 52 n. 260, 53 n. 269, 55,  
56 n. 282, 81 n. 384, 93 n. 425, 95 n.  
429, 97 n. 435, 190 n. 83, 218 n. 1, 219  
nn. 3 and 5, 221 n. 12, 223 n. 20, 227  
n. 34, 229 n. 38, 234 nn. 47 and 49, 237  
n. 57, 243 n. 75, 244 nn. 79–80, 246  
nn. 85 and 87, 247 n. 90, 249, 250 n.  
98, 251 n. 103, 252 n. 107, 267 n. 144,  
268 n. 147, 270 n. 149, 271 n. 150, 273  
n. 157, 274 n. 160, 276 n. 163, 287 n.  
174, 295 n. 187, 298 n. 196, 332 n. 332,  
333 n. 337, 376 n. 474, 380, 399 n. 519,  
400 n. 520, 431 nn. 558–559, 441 nn.  
578–581, 444 n. 587, 474 n. 34, 566
- Clements, Ronald E. 7 n. 15, 8 n. 17,  
27, 33, 100 n. 449, 300 n. 203, 566
- Clifford, Richard J. 190 n. 83, 195 n.  
111, 295 n. 187, 297 n. 193, 566
- Coats, George W. 50 n. 254, 51 n.  
258, 52 n. 260, 53 n. 269, 54 nn. 271  
and 274, 55, 56 n. 282, 75 n. 366, 76  
nn. 367–68, 77 nn. 373–75, 97 n. 438,  
98 n. 440, 236 n. 55, 243 n. 75, 267 n.  
144, 268 n. 147, 271 n. 150, 376 n. 474,  
378 n. 478, 389 n. 498, 391 nn. 502–3,  
392 n. 505, 399 n. 519, 400 n. 520, 567,  
572
- Cody, Aelred 329 n. 320, 330 nn. 322  
and 324, 333 n. 335, 567
- Cortese, E. 7 n. 15, 567
- Crawford, Cory D. 304 n. 222, 307 n.  
231, 309 nn. 237 and 240, 567
- Cross, Frank M. 4 n. 9, 6, 7 n.  
15, 8, 9 n. 24, 11, 12 n. 33, 26, 38–39,  
40 n. 209, 69, 71, 95 n. 429, 190 n. 83,  
192 nn. 92–93, 295 n. 187, 296 n. 189,  
297 nn. 193–94, 299, 300, 305 n. 224,  
320, 354 n. 414, 356 n. 418, 367, 369,  
370 n. 466, 567
- Crüsemann, Frank 4 n. 9, 8 n. 17, 16–17,  
567
- Currid, John D. 254, 266 n. 142, 567
- Dalley, Stephanie 195 n. 111, 567
- Damrosch, David viii, 106 n. 467, 188–  
89, 190 n. 83, 191–92, 195–97, 199–  
201, 203–5, 206 nn. 159–60, 209–10,  
238, 567
- Davies, Eryl W. 76 nn. 367 and 371, 77  
n. 373, 98 nn. 440–41, 159 n. 133, 161  
n. 139, 335 n. 341, 376 n. 474, 387 n.  
491, 388 n. 495, 389 nn. 496 and 498,  
391 n. 503, 392 n. 505, 393 n. 507, 395  
n. 512, 404 n. 526, 567
- Davies, Graeme I. 3 n. 7, 8 n. 17, 34 n.  
181, 35 n. 186, 36, 37 n. 191, 38 n. 197,  
40, 42 n. 216, 54 n. 271, 255 n. 29, 567
- Dozeman, Thomas 3 n. 7, 4 n. 9, 8  
n. 17, 42 n. 219, 51 nn. 256 and 258,  
53 n. 269, 55 n. 278, 56 n. 282, 72 n.

- 356, 84 n. 389, 85 n. 393, 90 n. 412, 92 n. 421, 94 n. 427, 95–98, 99 n. 444, 100 n. 448, 319 n. 3, 222 n. 18, 223 n. 20, 231 n. 42, 233 n. 46, 236 n. 54, 243 n. 75, 244 n. 79, 245 n. 83, 247 n. 88, 251 n. 105, 253 n. 108, 254 n. 112, 256 nn. 120–121, 258 nn. 126–27, 260 nn. 130–31, 262 nn. 135 and 137, 264 n. 139, 266, 268 n. 147, 271 n. 150, 274 n. 161, 276 n. 165, 278 n. 166, 279 n. 168, 286 n. 173, 293 n. 181, 295 n. 187, 298 n. 196, 307 n. 229, 309 n. 236, 311 n. 247, 312 nn. 250 and 253, 314, 317 n. 281, 318 nn. 284 and 288, 321, 324 n. 309, 325, 332 n. 332, 333 n. 338, 339 nn. 349 and 352, 341 n. 361, 343 nn. 363 and 365, 344 n. 371, 346 nn. 381–85, 347 n. 387, 348 n. 388, 349 n. 394, 350 n. 403, 354 nn. 413–14, 364 n. 443, 365 n. 452, 367 n. 458, 387 n. 491, 388 nn. 492 and 495, 389 n. 496, 390 n. 500, 391 n. 503, 392 n. 505, 404 n. 526, 432 n. 560, 435, 436 nn. 565 and 567, 441 n. 580, 445 n. 589, 568
- Durham, John I. 271 n. 150, 441 n. 580, 568
- Edelman, Diana 229 n. 38, 568
- Elliger, Karl 1 n. 3, 2 n. 7, 7 n. 15, 10 n. 27, 22, 23 n. 108, 25, 47 n. 237, 49 n. 244, 53 n. 269, 68 n. 336, 72 n. 357, 74 n. 362, 75 n. 366, 76 n. 368, 77 nn. 373–75, 81 n. 383, 84 n. 389, 87 n. 404, 103 n. 462, 149 n. 115, 175 n. 2, 177, 568
- Elnes, Eric E. 164 n. 146, 568
- Emerton, J. A. 3 n. 7, 34 n. 181, 35 n. 183, 47 n. 237, 568
- Fishbane, Michael 96 n. 432, 164 n. 146, 171 n. 154, 568
- Fleming, Daniel 297, 345 n. 374, 346 n. 381, 350, 368
- Fohrer, George 51 n. 258, 568
- Frankel, David 55 n. 275, 72 nn. 357–58, 78 n. 376, 387 n. 491, 401 n. 521, 404 n. 526, 418 n. 540, 568
- Fretheim, Terence E. 7 n. 15, 8 n. 17, 11 n. 32, 100 n. 449, 229 n. 38, 235 n. 51, 238, 242 n. 72, 255 n. 117, 257 n. 123, 262 n. 138, 266 nn. 141–42, 267 n. 144, 268 n. 147, 276 n. 165, 278 n. 166, 287 n. 175, 292 n. 180, 300 n. 200, 320, 354 n. 414, 370 n. 466, 568
- Frevel, Christian 3 n. 7, 7 n. 15, 8 n. 17, 24 n. 116, 58 n. 291, 59 n. 293, 60–63, 64 n. 317, 66 n. 324, 67 n. 333, 69 n. 340, 70 n. 451, 72 n. 356, 569
- Friedman, Richard E. 307 n. 230, 356 n. 418
- Fritz, Volkmar vii, 2 n. 7, 8 n. 17, 77 n. 373, 98 n. 441, 106 n. 467, 176, 182–83, 184 n. 46, 186, 204, 207 n. 168, 213 n. 177, 376 n. 474, 569
- Garr, W. Randall 441 n. 580, 569
- George, Mark K. 50 n. 254, 51 n. 258, 53 n. 269, 54 n. 271, 55, 61 n. 303, 76 n. 367, 236 n. 55, 267 n. 144, 296 n. 188, 301 n. 204, 302 nn. 208 and 211, 303 n. 212, 304 n. 219, 306 n. 227, 310 n. 243, 314, 318 n. 286, 321 nn. 292–93, 322 n. 297, 324 n. 309, 325–26, 348 n. 390, 569
- Gertz, Jan 5 n. 10, 50 n. 254, 52 n. 258, 92 n. 421, 97 n. 437, 224 nn. 24 and 26, 225 n. 29, 567, 569
- Gilders, William 5 n. 10, 43 n. 220, 239 n. 65, 569
- Gorman, Frank viii, 106 n. 467, 175 n. 2, 176, 197, 201–3, 209–10, 212–14, 238, 295, 323–24, 326, 545, 569
- Grabbe, Lester 329 n. 320, 337 n. 343, 569
- Greenstein, Edward L. 235 n. 53, 569
- Guillaume, Philippe 2 n. 5, 3 n. 7, 4 n. 8, 6 nn. 11 and 14, 8 n. 17, 24–25, 49 n. 244, 53 n. 269, 58 n. 291, 59 n. 295, 60 n. 299, 64 n. 317, 66 n. 324, 67 nn. 332–33, 69, 70 n. 351, 72 n. 356, 90 n. 412, 129 n. 77, 164 n. 146, 570
- Ha, John 92 n. 422, 570
- Habel, Norman 86 n. 395, 146 n. 105, 570

- Haran, Menahem 3 n. 7, 7 n. 17, 296 n. 189, 299, 300 n. 200, 305 n. 224, 307 n. 229, 308, 309 n. 240, 312 n. 250, 315 n. 273, 317 n. 281, 320, 324 n. 309, 329 n. 320, 331 n. 330, 340, 346 n. 385, 356 n. 418, 570
- Hollaway, S. W. 165 n. 146, 570
- Homan, Michael M. 297 n. 193, 298 n. 195, 300 n. 202, 305 n. 225, 307 n. 230, 570
- Hundley, Michael B. 303 nn. 212–213 and 215–217, 304 n. 218, 318 n. 288, 338 n. 345, 353 nn. 409 and 411, 357 n. 419, 358 n. 426, 359 n. 427, 362 n. 439, 364, 365 nn. 452–453, 366 n. 457, 367 n. 458, 369 n. 464, 370 n. 467, 372 n. 468, 570
- Hunt, Alice 329 n. 320, 330 n. 325, 570
- Hurowitz, Victor 65 n. 324, 66 nn. 325 and 327, 297 n. 190, 301 nn. 204–205, 302 n. 207, 306 nn. 226 and 228, 570
- Hurvitz, Avi 7 n. 17, 235 n. 53, 571
- Hutton, Jeremy M. 304 n. 222, 329 n. 320
- Hyatt, J. Philip 167 n. 150, 571
- Janowski, Bernd vii, 65 n. 322, 106 n. 467, 165 n. 146, 176, 181–83, 184 n. 46, 186, 204, 571
- Jenson, Philip 1, 2 n. 6, 6 n. 11, 47 n. 237, 49 nn. 244 and 246, 53 n. 269, 58 n. 291, 60 n. 299, 68 n. 336, 72 n. 357, 75 n. 366, 76 n. 368, 77 nn. 373–375, 84 n. 389, 87 n. 404, 571
- Kamlah, Jens 303 n. 213, 316 n. 273, 571
- Kawashima, Robert 357 n. 423, 364, 365 n. 452, 571
- Keel, Othmar 315 n. 273, 571
- Kegler, Jürgen 266, 571
- Kitchen, Kenneth 298 n. 195, 571
- Klein, Ralph W. 2 n. 7, 8 n. 17, 17–18, 100 n. 449, 104 n. 463, 571
- Knauf, Ernst A. 6 n. 14, 572
- Knierim, Rolf 76 n. 367, 77 n. 374, 98 n. 440, 157 n. 127, 335 n. 340, 391 nn. 502–3, 392 n. 505, 572
- Knohl, Israel 4 n. 9, 7 n. 17, 42–50, 52, 53 n. 265, 54 n. 274, 64, 70, 71 n. 354, 74 n. 363, 572
- Koch, Klaus 2 n. 7, 34 n. 181, 35 n. 185, 572
- Köckert, Matthias 7 n. 16, 20 n. 89, 73 n. 360, 572
- Kohata, Fujiko 50 n. 254, 52 n. 258, 97 n. 437, 243 n. 75, 572
- Kok, J. Lim Teng 399 n. 519, 404 n. 526, 572
- Konkel, Michael 333 n. 338, 573
- Kratz, Reinhard 7 n. 16, 90 n. 412, 573
- Kugler, Robert 341 n. 361, 344 n. 370, 574
- Lee, Won W. 404 n. 526, 573
- Lemmelijn, Benedicte 256 n. 119, 573
- Leuchter, Mark 304 n. 222, 329 n. 320, 573
- Levine, Baruch A. 76 n. 371, 98 n. 40, 159 n. 133, 335 n. 341, 387 n. 491, 393 n. 507, 573
- Levenson, Jon D. 164 n. 146, 573
- Liss, Hanna 213 n. 179, 317 nn. 279–280, 325 n. 310, 573
- Lohfink, Norbert vii, 1 n. 3, 2 n. 7, 3 nn. 7–8, 6 n. 14, 8 n. 17, 28–31, 33, 34 nn. 178 and 181, 35 n. 186, 36 nn. 189–90, 38 n. 199, 39 n. 207, 40 n. 210, 47 n. 237, 49 n. 244, 52, 53 n. 269, 54 n. 271, 55 n. 278, 58 nn. 290–91, 59 n. 293, 60–63, 64 n. 317, 67 n. 333, 68 n. 336, 70 n. 344, 72 n. 357, 75 n. 366, 76 n. 368, 77 nn. 373–75, 81 nn. 380–81, 84, 85 n. 393, 87 n. 404, 90 n. 412, 103 n. 462, 104 n. 463, 106 n. 467, 110–13, 116 n. 18, 129, 130 n. 78, 142 nn. 95–96 and 98, 157 n. 129, 158 n. 130, 162 n. 143, 164 n. 146, 172 n. 158, 175 n. 3, 176–90, 197 n. 120, 198 n. 125, 202 n. 146, 203–4, 205 n. 156, 206 n. 163, 207–9, 389 n. 497, 441 n. 580, 476 n. 35, 573
- Lust, Johan 4 n. 9, 224 n. 26, 429 n. 556, 431 n. 559, 574

- Magonet, Jonathan 440 n. 577, 444 n. 583, 574
- Maiburger, P. 54 n. 274, 56 n. 279, 57, 97, 98 n. 439, 574
- Mann, Thomas W. 239, 574
- Margaliot, Meshullam 404 n. 526, 574
- McCarthy, Dennis J. 247 n. 91, 574
- McEvenue, Sean 2 n. 7, 3 nn. 7–8, 7 n. 15, 8 n. 17, 36 n. 189, 47 n. 237, 75 n. 366, 76 n. 368, 77 nn. 373–74, 90 n. 412, 112 n. 13, 142 n. 95, 149 n. 115, 158 n. 130, 160 n. 137, 164 n. 146, 387 n. 491, 388 n. 492, 390 n. 499, 395 n. 512, 396 n. 513, 480 n. 44, 574
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. 299 n. 197, 300 n. 203, 305 n. 223, 310 n. 242, 312 n. 250, 315 nn. 272–73, 316 n. 274, 317 nn. 281–82, 318 nn. 284–85, 353 n. 412, 354 nn. 413–414, 355 n. 416, 357 nn. 419 and 422–23, 360–62, 364, 365 nn. 452–54, 366–68, 369 n. 463, 574
- Meyer, Carol 309 n. 236, 341 nn. 360–61
- Milgrom, Jacob 5 n. 9, 7 n. 17, 42 n. 219, 43 n. 220, 44 n. 228, 47 n. 238, 49, 52 n. 263, 58 n. 287, 64, 65 n. 324, 66 n. 326, 76 n. 367, 235 n. 53, 262 n. 138, 338 n. 345, 389 n. 498, 404 n. 526, 574
- Mowinckel, Sigmund 5 n. 10, 9, 198 n. 122, 575
- Nelson, Richard D. 329 n. 320, 575
- Nicholson, Ernest W. 3 n. 7, 34 n. 181, 35 nn. 182 and 185, 38 nn. 199–201, 39 n. 207, 575
- Niditch, Susan 165 n. 146, 575
- Nihan, Christophe 1 n. 2, 3 n. 7, 5 n. 10, 6 n. 10, 7 n. 16, 8 n. 17, 10, 19–22, 32 n. 173, 35 nn. 181–182, 36 n. 189, 37, 43 nn. 220–222, 45 nn. 229–230, 46, 48 n. 242, 50 nn. 250–52, 52 n. 263, 53 nn. 266–67, 57, 58 n. 287, 59–63, 64 nn. 316–17 and 319, 65 nn. 320 and 322–324, 66 nn. 329–30, 67 nn. 332 and 334–335, 68 nn. 336–37, 69–70, 71 n. 354, 72 n. 356, 73 nn. 359–361, 74 n. 363, 80 n. 380, 87 nn. 399 and 403, 88 nn. 406 and 409, 100 n. 449, 102 n. 457, 126–29, 138 n. 86, 142 n. 97, 156 n. 125, 164 n. 146, 206 n. 159, 298 n. 196, 311 n. 246, 312 n. 256, 313 nn. 260 and 262, 314, 316 nn. 276–77, 317 n. 281, 318 nn. 284 and 287, 349 n. 392, 354 n. 415, 575
- Noegel, Scott B. 253, 254 nn. 113–114, 255 n. 117, 257 n. 123, 575
- Noort, Ed 6 n. 15, 71 n. 355, 575
- Noth, Martin 2 n. 7, 4 n. 8, 7 n. 15, 9–12, 13 n. 45, 37 n. 195, 47–50, 51 nn. 255 and 258, 52–53, 54 nn. 270–74, 56 n. 282, 58 n. 290, 59 nn. 292–93, 61 n. 304, 62, 63 nn. 313–14, 64 nn. 316–17, 66 n. 324, 67 nn. 331–34, 68 n. 336, 70 n. 344, 72 n. 357, 75 nn. 365–66, 76 nn. 367–68, 77 nn. 371–72 and 374–75, 83 n. 388, 84 nn. 389 and 391, 87, 88 n. 407, 89, 90 n. 413, 93 n. 425, 97 nn. 435 and 438, 98 n. 440, 100 n. 449, 104, 148 n. 111, 150 nn. 117 and 120, 155 n. 124, 223 n. 20, 242 n. 70, 243 n. 74, 244 n. 79, 252 n. 107, 258 n. 127, 271 n. 150, 275 n. 162, 298 nn. 196–97, 199 n. 197, 305 n. 223, 307 n. 229, 311 n. 249, 335 n. 341, 339 nn. 350 and 353, 343 nn. 364 and 366, 344 n. 369, 345 nn. 372 and 377, 346 nn. 380–81 and 383 and 385, 349 n. 397, 350 n. 401, 354 n. 414, 370 n. 466, 387 nn. 491–92, 388 nn. 494–95, 389 n. 498, 393 n. 507, 399 n. 519, 400 n. 520, 431 n. 558, 441 n. 579, 458 n. 2, 459 n. 5, 460 n. 8, 471 n. 31, 472 n. 33, 488 n. 52, 490 n. 60, 495 n. 75, 575
- Nurmela, Risto 329 n. 320, 330 n. 324, 334 n. 339, 576
- O'Brien, Mark 48 n. 243, 49 n. 244, 52 n. 260, 53 n. 269, 304 n. 221, 310 n. 244, 312 n. 252, 317 n. 279, 566
- Oden, Robert 175 n. 4, 195 n. 111, 197 n. 118

- Olson, Dennis 161 n. 139, 162 n. 142, 390 n. 499, 391 n. 503, 403 n. 526, 404 n. 526, 576
- Olyan, Saul M. 8 n. 17, 47 n. 238, 576
- Otto, Eckart 5 n. 10, 7 n. 16, 8 n. 17, 43 nn. 220–22, 71 n. 354, 74 n. 363, 92 n. 421, 576
- Owczarek, Susanne 59 n. 293, 314, 576
- Pedersen, Johannes 292 n. 180, 320 n. 290, 576
- Perlitt, Lothar 2 n. 7, 87 n. 403, 89 n. 410, 576
- Pitkänen, Pekka 311 n. 247, 312 n. 251, 315 n. 271, 365 n. 452, 366 n. 455, 576
- Pola, Thomas 1 n. 5, 3 n. 7, 7 n. 16, 8 n. 17, 18 n. 77, 25 n. 120, 32–33, 52, 59–60, 66 n. 324, 67 n. 332, 70, 576
- Propp, William H. 50 n. 254, 51 n. 258, 52 n. 260, 55 n. 278, 56 n. 282, 90 nn. 435 and 438, 167 n. 150, 220 n. 8, 223 n. 20, 239 n. 65, 242 n. 72, 261 n. 134, 262 n. 136, 298 n. 196, 303 n. 216, 304 n. 219, 306 n. 227, 307 n. 230, 309 n. 236, 312 nn. 250 and 254, 315 n. 273, 316 n. 276, 317 n. 281, 324 n. 309, 338 n. 345, 339 nn. 346 and 353, 341 n. 361, 343, 345 nn. 375–376, 346 nn. 378 and 381–82 and 384–85, 347 n. 386, 348 n. 389, 349, 350 n. 403, 351 n. 404, 404 n. 526, 428 n. 551, 441 n. 580, 444 nn. 586 and 588, 445 n. 589, 576
- Prosic, Tamara 220 n. 8, 221 n. 13, 756
- Pury, Albert de 3 n. 7, 4 n. 9, 7 n. 16, 8 n. 17, 18–20, 35 n. 182, 59 n. 295, 92 n. 421, 100 n. 449, 126, 577
- Rad, Gerhard von 11 n. 32, 47 n. 237, 181 n. 29, 262 n. 138, 298 n. 197, 311 n. 249, 316 n. 273, 317 n. 279, 354 nn. 413–414, 356 n. 418, 370 n. 466, 577
- Rendtorff, Rolf 4 n. 9, 5 n. 9, 6 n. 12, 38 n. 202, 577
- Ricoeur, Paul 212 nn. 175–76, 577
- Roberts, J. J. M. 190 n. 83, 193 n. 100, 577
- Robertson, Amy H. C. 302 n. 211, 321–24, 325 n. 310, 326 n. 316, 340 n. 358, 341 n. 359, 342 n. 362, 343, 344 n. 368, 345 n. 373, 347 n. 388, 348 n. 391, 352 n. 407, 374 n. 470, 545 n. 21, 577
- Römer, Thomas 3 n. 7, 5 n. 10, 6 nn. 14–15, 7 n. 16, 8 n. 17, 18 n. 77, 35 n. 185, 43 n. 221, 46, 50 n. 251, 51 n. 254, 53 n. 269, 64 n. 317, 68 n. 336, 69–70, 71 n. 354, 73 nn. 360–61, 74 n. 363, 85 n. 393, 87, 92 n. 422, 93 n. 422, 98 n. 440, 243 n. 75, 246 nn. 86–87, 247 nn. 88–89, 253 n. 110, 257 n. 122, 260 nn. 131–132, 276 nn. 164–65, 279 n. 168, 298 n. 196, 335 n. 341, 430 n. 556, 436 n. 565, 438 n. 571, 439 nn. 573 and 575, 440 n. 577, 577
- Rooke, Deborah W. 328 nn. 318–319, 329 nn. 320–321, 330 n. 322, 341 n. 360, 344 n. 369, 345 n. 376, 346 nn. 378–379 and 385, 578
- Ruprecht, Eberhard 54 n. 274, 56 n. 279, 57 n. 283, 97, 98 n. 439, 452 n. 598, 578
- Sabourin, Leopold 329 n. 320, 332 n. 334, 578
- Sakenfeld, Katherine D. 76 n. 369, 77 n. 375, 404 n. 526, 578
- Schart, Aaron 54 n. 274, 56 n. 279, 57 n. 283, 75 n. 366, 76 n. 368, 77 n. 374, 78 n. 375, 97, 98 n. 439, 399 n. 519, 404 n. 526, 414 n. 533, 578
- Schmid, Konrad 3 n. 7, 8 n. 17, 22 n. 100, 35 n. 185, 49 n. 247, 92 nn. 421–422, 93–95, 431 n. 558, 436 n. 567, 578
- Schmidt, Ludwig 1 n. 5, 3 n. 7, 4 n. 8, 7 n. 15, 8 n. 17, 9, 32–33, 34 n. 181, 47 n. 237, 50 n. 254, 52 n. 258, 55 n. 275, 56 n. 279, 57 nn. 283–84, 58 n. 288, 71 n. 355, 75 n. 365, 76 nn. 368 and 370, 77 nn. 371 and 373–75, 78 n. 376, 79 n. 378, 83, n. 387, 90 n. 412, 97, 98 nn. 439 and 441, 100 n. 449, 162 n. 142, 242 n. 72, 247 n. 90, 260 n. 129, 376 n. 474, 378 n. 477, 451 n. 597, 579

- Schmidt, Werner H. 50 n. 254, 246 n. 85, 248 n. 91, 265 n. 140, 579
- Schwartz, Baruch J. 3 n. 7, 4 n. 8, 5 n. 10, 7 n. 17, 17, 34 n. 181, 36 n. 186, 43 n. 220, 55 n. 278, 57, 90, 91 n. 416, 97 n. 438, 354 n. 414, 365 n. 452, 579
- Seebass, Horst 75 n. 366, 76 n. 368, 77 n. 375, 579
- Shectman, Sarah 3 n. 7, 5 n. 10, 6 nn. 10 and 15, 43 n. 220, 45 n. 229, 69 n. 341, 239 n. 65, 579
- Seow, C. Leon 311 n. 247, 312 nn. 250 and 257, 313 nn. 261 and 263, 315 n. 273, 317 n. 281, 318 nn. 284 and 288, 354 n. 413, 579
- Ska, Jean-Louis 3 n. 7, 4 nn. 8–9, 6 n. 15, 8 n. 17, 9 n. 24, 32–33, 37 n. 193, 38 n. 199, 69 n. 341, 71 n. 355, 73 n. 359, 74 n. 362, 81 n. 383, 86 n. 397, 87 n. 402, 90 n. 412, 100 n. 449, 101 n. 451, 103 n. 459, 123–24, 130 n. 78, 131, 164 n. 146, 363 n. 442, 404, 405 n. 527, 417 n. 536, 431 n. 559, 579
- Smith, Mark 157 n. 128, 489 n. 57, 580
- Sommer, Benjamin 100, 353 n. 411, 357 n. 421, 363 n. 441, 365 n. 452, 366 n. 457, 369 n. 463, 580
- Stackert, Jeffrey 5 n. 10, 43 n. 220, 70, 580
- Steck, Odil 118–20, 124, 131, 178 n. 15, 580
- Strba, Blazej 404 n. 526, 580
- Struppe, Ursula 363 n. 441, 580
- Tengström, Sven 4 n. 9, 580
- Thompson, Thomas L. 190 n. 83
- Van Seters, John viii, 4 n. 9, 6 nn. 12 and 14, 8 n. 17, 18 n. 77, 32 n. 173, 39 n. 204, 40 nn. 209 and 211, 47 n. 237, 51 n. 258, 54 n. 272, 57 n. 285, 97 nn. 435 and 437, 102 n. 457, 106 n. 467, 149 n. 115, 175 nn. 1–2, 176, 188–89, 190 n. 83, 191–99, 203–10, 212 n. 174, 224 nn. 21 and 27, 244 n. 79, 248 n. 93, 252 n. 107, 272 n. 153, 273 n. 157, 333 n. 335, 580
- Vaux, Roland de 299 n. 197, 300 n. 203, 305 n. 224, 311 n. 249, 315 n. 271, 329 n. 320, 330 n. 324, 344 n. 369, 346 nn. 380 and 382, 350 n. 401, 581
- Veijola, Timo 221 n. 11, 222 n. 16, 223 n. 19, 581
- Vink, J. G. 8 n. 17, 11 n. 32, 102 n. 457, 198 n. 122, 581
- Vervenne, Marc 4 n. 9, 50 n. 254, 224 n. 26, 429 n. 556, 581
- Wagenaar, Jan 221 n. 13, 222 nn. 16–17, 581
- Weimar, Peter 2 n. 7, 7 n. 15, 8 n. 17, 13, 14 n. 48, 35 n. 184, 58 n. 291, 60 n. 299, 68 n. 336, 110 n. 6, 116–18, 121, 156 n. 125, 164 n. 146, 171 n. 154, 224 n. 26, 428 n. 552, 429 n. 555, 442 nn. 583–84, 581
- Weinfeld, Moshe 7 n. 17, 101, 103 n. 460, 354 n. 414, 357 nn. 421–22, 358 n. 426, 359 n. 427, 360 n. 428, 361 nn. 431 and 435, 362 n. 437, 364, 365 n. 452, 367 n. 458, 581
- Wellhausen, Julius 101 n. 453, 319, 582
- Wenham, Gordon 149 n. 115, 582
- Westermann, Claus 47 n. 237, 142 n. 95, 146 n. 103, 149 n. 115, 582
- Wilson, Robert R. 243 n. 75, 244 n. 79, 245 n. 82, 248–49, 250 n. 101, 251 n. 105, 273 n. 159, 582
- Zenger, Erik 1 n. 4, 2 n. 7, 7 nn. 15–16, 12–13, 16, 34 n. 181, 35 n. 184, 68 nn. 336–37, 113–18, 121, 143 n. 99, 164 n. 146, 166 n. 149, 171 n. 154, 582
- Zevit, Ziony 7 n. 17, 256 nn. 119–21, 257 n. 121, 258 n. 127, 260 n. 130, 262 n. 138, 582
- Zimmerli, Walter 8 n. 19, 38 n. 201, 233 n. 45, 267 n. 145, 429, 430 n. 557, 437 nn. 568–69, 441 n. 579, 442 n. 582, 582

