

## Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25—40

By Peter J. Kearney

(Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 20064)

An attempt to discern priestly redaction in Ex 25—40 can begin with the simple observation that the first large P section, Ex 25—31, divides into seven speeches, each with its own introduction, »The Lord said to Moses«, slightly altered for the fifth and seventh speeches (see Ex 25 1 30 11 30 17 30 22 30 34 31 1 31 12). The first six speeches (25 1—31 11) contain the divine instructions for the building of the desert sanctuary and for the establishment of its cult. The seventh speech (31 12-17), a command to observe the sabbath, slightly changes the tone of the previous six, for it says nothing directly about a place of worship or about cult itself. However, it gives a clue to understanding the framework of all seven speeches. Its final words refer directly to the seven days of creation: » . . . in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, but on the seventh day he rested at his ease« (31 17, NAB). A more detailed examination of Ex 25—31 shows that each of the seven speeches alludes to the corresponding day of creation in Gen 1—2 3.

### *Relationship between Ex 25—31 and Gen 1—2 3*

The first speech (Ex 25 1—30 10), in relation to the subsequent six, is disproportionately long. Most of it separates readily under two general headings: the Dwelling and its furnishings (25 8—27 19) and the priesthood of Aaron (27 20—29 42). One clear distinction between these two parts is in the name for the sanctuary: *miškan* (»Dwelling«) in the first and *'ohel mō'ed* (»Tent of Meeting«) in the second. »Tent of Meeting« is an apt name in this second section, where the redactor builds climactically towards a continuous sequence of cultic »meetings« with God (cf. 29 38-43). The divine establishing of the Aaronide priesthood is a proximate preparation for these »meetings« and, most significantly, at the beginning and within the conclusion of this second part, there is mentioned Aaron's care of the lamps (27 20-21 30 7-8). This »inclusion« was of major importance to the redactor, for he allowed abrupt transitions in the text in order to achieve it. He has oriented this complex first speech to the first day of creation by inserting 27 20-21 as a preface to his treatment of Aaron. As God brought *'ôr* (»light«) into darkness (Gen 1 2-3), so Aaron causes *ma'ôr* (»light«) to shine throughout the night. The redactor then placed the passage about the incense altar (30 1-10) at the conclusion of the speech. It appears to be out of place, but is very much to his purpose. It is likely that an older description of the incense altar comprised only Ex 30 1-6, par-

allel to the description of the altar of holocausts in 27 1-8, devoid of any ritual directives. The redactor then added 30 7-10 in order to resume mention of Aaron and the theme of light, thus rounding off his allusion to the first day of Gen 1<sup>1</sup>. Further, by associating the theme of light specially with the institution of the Aaronide priesthood and with the name »Tent of Meeting«, the redactor begins to suggest that the enactment of cult is an experience of the creative power of God.

The abrupt sequences caused by the positioning of 27 20-21 and 30 1-10 make it likely that the redactor is working with older blocks of material concerning the garments of Aaron (ch. 28) and his priestly ordination (ch. 29). The prior section on the Dwelling also appears to be a distinct source<sup>2</sup>, especially because the name »Dwelling« does not recur in ch. 25—31 after 27 19. The redactor has strengthened the link between his two major sections on the Dwelling (ch. 25—27) and on Aaron (ch. 28—29) by means of a »false conclusion« (29 42c-46), which seems to draw the first speech to a close. Here the mention of Aaron, the altar (of holocausts) and the Tent of Meeting is joined with God's promise to »dwell« (*škn*) among the Israelites. The redactor thus alludes to the »Dwelling« of ch. 25—27, thereby drawing together all that has preceded in the first speech; however, he does not finish before he adds the pericope on the incense altar, this time coming to a genuine conclusion through his reintroducing the theme of light.

The second speech (30 11-16) is out of place inasmuch as it anticipates a census which is not mandated until Num 1. Also, the census tax which God enjoins is designated for the *'abodāt 'ohæl mō'ed* (»service of the Tent of Meeting«, 30 16), an expression which occurs elsewhere only in Num (4 30 7 5 8 24 18 6. 21. 23) and clearly refers to maintenance of the sanctuary after its construction and not to the construction work itself. Nonetheless, the speech has some connection with its present context through its continuation of the atonement theme previously expressed in 30 10 and through its provision for the exercise of cult, a concern which the redactor already manifested by his change of mood in 27 20-21. However, the positioning of this second speech is not clarified without observing its extrinsic yet discernible link to the second day of creation (Gen 1 6-8). Then, God's activity consisted in dividing upper from lower; the dome separated the waters below from those *me'āl* (»above«); similarly, God's second

<sup>1</sup> The Samaritan Pentateuch places Ex 3 1-10 after mention of the lampstand in Ex 26 35, but the above explanation shows that this positioning must be secondary to the MT. Perhaps the Samaritan text harmonizes in imitation of the sequence in Ex 30 27 and 31 8.

<sup>2</sup> F. Cross (Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 1973, 321) refers to »the Tabernacle document« as the basis for Ex 25—27.

speech establishes a division into upper and lower which reaches through all Israel, rich and poor. Those below the age of twenty are exempt from the tax, but it must be paid by all who are twenty *wama'elā* (»and above«).

The third speech (30 17-21) concerns the making of the bronze laver; the association between this object and the third day of creation (Gen 1 9-10), when God created *jāmmîm* (»seas«), is made obvious through I Reg 7 23, where the bronze laver is called *hājjam* (»the sea«)<sup>3</sup>. Thus the redactor employs an intermediary text (I Reg 7 23) in order to form an association between the third speech and the corresponding day in Gen 1; he will proceed likewise in the fourth and sixth speeches.

The fourth speech (30 22-33) gives instructions for the manufacture and use of *šæmæn mišhāt qodæš* (»holy anointing oil«). The three Hebrew roots in this name occur together previous to P<sup>4</sup> in only one biblical text, Ps 89 21, towards the beginning of a divine oracle in which God promises permanence to the dynasty of David: *bēšæmæn qādšî mēšāhtîw* (»with my holy oil I have anointed him«). Throughout this oracle, God offers repeated assurances that the Davidic line shall endure, saying finally, » . . . his throne shall be like the sun before me, like the moon which remains forever — a faithful witness in the sky . . . « (v. 37-38). Thus, Ps 89 supplies the link by which the redactor could associate the »holy anointing oil« with God's activity on the fourth day, the creation of the sun and moon (Gen 1 16).

The fifth speech (30 34-38) provides for the making of the sacred incense and also offers the redactor a small but sufficient ingredient for sustaining his pattern of allusions to creation. One of the substances to be used is *šēhelæt* (»onycha«), made by grinding the operculum of a marine mollusk into a powder which gives off a pungent odor when burned<sup>5</sup>. This mollusk provides an association with the fifth day, when God made »all kinds of swimming creatures with which the water teems« (Gen 1 21)<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> In effect, I offer a modification of K. Koch's view that the P author kept the laver separate from other items listed in Ex 25—27 in order to neutralize its mythological association with the cosmic sea of creation myths (Die Priesterschrift von Exodus 25 bis Leviticus 16, 1959, 34—35). Rather, the redactor makes a restrained use of this symbolism.

<sup>4</sup> I have been able to find only one other Hebrew text which combines these three roots in a single verse: Sirach 45 15. Curiously, in this same verse, Ben Sirach makes an association similar to the one I am arguing was intended by the P redactor, that is, a link between the themes »holy oil« and »permanence of the heavens«.

<sup>5</sup> E. Cothenet, Parfums, in: DBSup 6, 1309.

<sup>6</sup> Josephus (JW 5. 5, 5) offers a striking parallel in his reflection on the cosmic meaning of the incense altar and its »sweet smelling spices with which the sea replenished it«.

The sixth speech (31 1-11) designates those who will supervise and carry out the manufacture of the tent and its appurtenances. As in the case of the third speech, concerning the bronze laver, so also here it is a text from I Reg concerning the Jerusalem temple which provides the nexus with the corresponding day of Gen 1. In I Reg 5 30, the 3300 overseers of the temple construction are described as *harōdīm* (»supervising«) in a situation parallel to that envisioned in the sixth speech. On the sixth day, God wishes to create man *wēyirdū* (»and let them have dominion«, Gen 1 26) and later commands man and woman *ūredū* (»and have dominion«, Gen 1 28)<sup>7</sup>. That the redactor had I Reg in mind while formulating the sixth speech is further supported through his description of Bezalel, the chief supervisor. Bezalel is said to possess the identical qualities which had been attributed to the craftsman Hiram who worked on the Jerusalem temple: *ḥākmā, tēbūnā, dāʿāt* (»skill, understanding, knowledge«, Ex 31 3 and I Reg 7 14). The Ex redactor has expanded on the notice in I Reg, however. Hiram possessed these qualities for work in bronze, but Bezalel was skilled in all types of craftsmanship. Further, the redactor adds that Bezalel was filled with the *rūḥ ʿelohīm* (»spirit of God«), an expression used in P only to describe Bezalel (see also Ex 35 31) and to narrate the beginning of creation, when the *rūḥ ʿelohīm* swept over the waters (Gen 1 2)<sup>8</sup>. Thus the redactor alludes once more to Gen 1.

Finally, as if to suggest the sabbath rest itself, the seventh speech (Ex 31 12-17) effortlessly recalls the seventh day of creation by prescribing the day of rest, to be observed because of what God had done that seventh day (Ex 31 17).

#### *Relationship of Ex 25—31 to Subsequent Chapters of Ex*

##### a) *Ex 35—40*

The hand of the redactor who edited Ex 25—31 is very soon evident in ch. 35. Only the first and seventh speeches of God had begun with the injunction that Moses should speak to the Israelites (Ex 25 2 31 13). In chiasmic order, the first two speeches of Moses comply with this divine command<sup>9</sup>. Moses' first address (35 1-3), con-

<sup>7</sup> Allusion to older texts as a structural device, such as I have argued can be found in the third, fourth, and sixth speeches, was a technique already employed extensively in Deuteronomy, as C. Carmichael has shown (*The Laws of Deuteronomy*, 1974).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. J. Vink (*The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament*, OTS 15, 1969, 106) for the association between Ex 31 1 and the P creation story.

<sup>9</sup> Commentators have discerned other chiasmic patterns binding Ex 25—31 to ch. 35—40. B. Levine has noted the sequence »ark-Dwelling; Dwelling-ark« in ch. 25—26 and 36—37 (*The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch*, JAOS 85, 1965, 308); U. Cassuto cites »articles-Tabernacle; Tabernacle-articles« (*A Commentary*

cerning the sabbath, echoes God's seventh, and Moses' second address (35 4-19), opening with the directive concerning free-will offerings, echoes God's first speech. Paradoxically, Moses introduces his first very brief speech with »These are the words« (35 1) and gives the following longer, more complex speech the simpler heading »This is the word« (35 4). The redactor is here mindful of the disproportionate length of God's first speech and restores the balance somewhat by entitling Moses' version of God's first speech merely as »word«<sup>10</sup>.

Despite his use of Ex 25—31 in order to structure Ex 35, the redactor does not adhere consistently to the order of the items as listed in those earlier chapters. He also relinquishes the general pattern of Ex 25—31 by allowing material from God's first six speeches, except the one about the census tax (30 11-16), to appear within Moses' second speech (35 4-19)<sup>11</sup>. It is thus clear that the seven-speech structure and, with it, the theme of creation have become less important, as was indeed apparent in Moses' first speech, where the directive for the sabbath makes no mention of creation (35 1-3; contrast 31 13-17).

The allusion to God's sixth speech is made in Moses' reference to skilled workers (compare 31 6 and 35 10); the mention of Bezalel and Oholiab by name, however, is reserved for a third speech of Moses (35 30-35), as a fitting introduction to a long section about the actual labor of construction and manufacture (36 1—38 20 39 1-32). This lengthy passage is interrupted by an inventory of the metals used (38 21-31); the work of the redactor is specially evident in 38 25, where reference is made to the silver of the census tax as already collected, even though the census had not yet been taken. Thus, the only speech of God which had not yet been mentioned in Ex 35ff., the rules for the census tax (31 11-16), is here regarded as a command that has been fulfilled. The redactor blends the silver of the census tax, which was to be used for the maintenance of a permanent cult, together with the silver of the contributions for construction of the sanctuary (35 24)<sup>12</sup>, much as he had incongruously located God's directives for

---

on the Book of Exodus, 1967, 462). I would add that the altar of holocausts is treated prior to the incense altar in Ex 27 and 30, while the reverse is true in ch. 37—38. Cf. the further discussion of Ex 35—40 for the chiasm involving the Levites and Aaronides.

<sup>10</sup> This technique, as well as that of the »false conclusion« in Ex 29 42c-46 discussed above, is analogous to the »off-balance symmetry« which S. McEvenue has analyzed in a number of P texts (*The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*, 1971).

<sup>11</sup> Such a listing may be more primitive than the sequences established in Ex 25—31. B. Levine (*Descriptive Texts* 309) argues for the archival character of Ex 35—39 by noting similarities between these chapters and I Reg 6—8.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. 308.

the census tax in the midst of instructions for building the sanctuary in Ex 25—31. This lack of concern for chronological sequence in the matter of the census tax in both 30 11-16 and 38 25 reenforces the »timeless« quality of the P liturgical directives, which are intended to establish a permanent system of worship. A further sign of the redactor's work in 38 21-31 is yet another implicit connection with God's second speech (31 11-16). The census tax was there designated for the »service of the Tent of Meeting« (30 16). Every other occurrence of this expression relates it to the service performed by the Levites (Num 4 30 7 5 8 24 18 6. 21. 23). The inventory of the metals is said to be compiled by the Levites (Ex 38 21). Thus the redactor considers the role of the Levites in both Ex 30 11-16 (implicitly) and 38 21-31 (explicitly), but only to have them overshadowed by the Aaronide priests. The treatment of the Levites is bracketed by two long passages on the Aaronides (Ex 27 20—31 10 and ch. 39); it is likely that a desire to place the two groups in contrast has partially accounted for the incongruous positioning of the two sections about the Levites, particularly the second one (38 21-31). The timeless quality of the cultic order here established bespeaks the permanent superiority of Aaron.

With mention of the inventory (38 21-31), the redactor has in Ex 35ff. finally alluded to all seven of God's speeches and now resumes his description of what must be manufactured for the sanctuary. All that remains are the priestly vestments of Aaron and his sons. Here the redactor begins to evoke God's seven speeches in a new way. The section on the vestments (39 1-31) contains seven repetitions of the refrain »as the Lord had commanded Moses« (v. 1. 5. 7. 21. 26. 29. 31)<sup>13</sup>. The phrase recalls both God's seven speeches in Ex 25—31 and Moses' description of them as »the word(s) which the Lord commanded« (Ex 35 1. 4). Thus the creation theme is recalled particularly with reference to the Aaronide priesthood; the redactor shows an interest in Aaron parallel to that expressed in God's first speech, where the section on Aaron and his sons was framed with the theme of light (Ex 27 20 30 7-8).

After all the manufacturing work is completed (39 32), special place is given to the mediation of Moses. All the articles are presented to him (39 33-41); Moses inspects them and blesses the people (39 42-43). In the only speech of God within Ex 35—40, God instructs Moses about the various tasks for erecting the sanctuary and Moses complies (40 1-16). The redactor then details how Moses alone puts everything

<sup>13</sup> An association between creation and the garments of Aaron was later expressed in a different way by Pseudo-Solomon: »For on his full-length robe was the whole world« (Wisdom 18 24).

in place (40 17-33). His carrying out of the instruction he has just received from God makes a final allusion back to the seven speeches he had heard in Ex 25—31: »as the Lord had commanded Moses« is repeated seven times again (v. 19. 21. 23. 25. 27. 29. 32). The final repetition (v. 32) is associated with the repeated washings of Moses and Aaron and his sons whenever they came to the tent and approached the altar and thus goes beyond the single action of washing mandated for the ordination ceremony (40 12); once more the redactor has emphasized the special share of Aaron in the timeless, perduring quality of God's creative action. The abrupt conclusion of this passage (»and Moses finished the work«, 40 33) contrasts with the fuller, more solemn conclusion of the previous passage about the cooperation of the people (39 42-43) and by its very brevity creates a tension which is broken by the glory of the Lord filling the Dwelling, a sign that the new »creation« has been achieved.

As the washing of Moses and Aaron and his sons was transformed from a single act to a perduring practice, so the redactor, in a concluding note, presents the cloud as manifesting an abiding presence of God (40 36-38). A similar passage about the cloud as a sign for breaking or pitching camp (Num 9 15-23) mentions the constant visibility of the cloud (v. 16-17) and then develops at length the marking out of the stages on the journey (v. 17-23). In Ex 40 36-38, on the other hand, the permanent presence of the cloud is rather the closing than the opening theme, strengthening the redactor's emphasis on the archetypal character of the events just narrated.

The presence of the creation theme as a structural element in Ex 25—40 gives the impression that these chapters are a self-contained unit. However, the theme is merely echoed in ch. 35—40, in contrast with its major structural role in ch. 25—31. The lists of sanctuary furnishings in ch. 35—40 show no attempt to sustain the sevenfold pattern of ch. 25—31. The difference between these two large blocks of P material prompts the question whether the structure of ch. 25—31 has some relationship to the JE traditions in Ex 32—34. The following examination of these chapters, carried out merely within the scope of this question, suggests that such is the case.

#### b) *Ex 32—34*

The largest P section within these chapters concerns Moses' descent from Sinai with his face radiant (34 29-35). This passage has been situated in order to effect a balance between the words of God (Ex 25—31) and those of Moses (Ex 35 1-19): just as God manifested himself in awesome fashion and then called Moses to himself (24 15b-18a) as a prelude to the seven divine speeches, so now Moses delivers the

instructions from God only after summoning to himself the Israelites, frightened by the reflected light shining on his face (34 30-32)<sup>14</sup>. Similar balanced structuring or »panel-writing«<sup>15</sup> in fact governs the P editing throughout Ex 32—34 and can be discovered in the P notations about the *šēnē luhot ha'edut* (»two tablets of the commandments«, NAB) in the hand of Moses (Ex 32 15 aβ and 34 29). It is specially clear from the latter example that P's interest in the stones is primarily literary and structural, for they play no role within the passage Ex 34 29-35 itself. In both 32 15 aβ and 34 29, the two tablets are mentioned in immediate proximity to a notice of Moses' descent from the mountain; P has clearly intended to parallel the two descents, one dramatizing the breaking of covenant and the other leading to restoration. In so doing, he merely highlights a sequence which had been already established at a prior stage of editing, most likely by the JE redactor (cf. Ex 34 1)<sup>16</sup>. The only other P addition to these chapters is a parenthetical note that the tablets were written by God on both sides (32 15 b-16)<sup>17</sup>. Such a description was thought necessary in order to account for the greatly enlarged content which P has placed on the stones. They are understood to contain no longer the cultic commandments of the JE redaction (Ex 34 10-28, excluding »the ten commandments«)<sup>18</sup>, but rather the seven speeches of Ex 25—31, a change effected through P's insertion of the phrase »two tablets of the commandments« into the older passage which now concludes those seven

<sup>14</sup> K. Koch, *Priesterschrift*, 38.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. »Index of Stylistic Techniques« in S. McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 217.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. J. Loza, *Exode XXXII et la redaction JE*, VT 23 (1973), 31—55. J. Loza attributes several passages in Ex 32—34 to the authorship of the JE redactor, noting both his affinities to the language of Isaiah as well as his support for the reforms of Hezekiah. In addition to J. Loza's arguments, I would suggest that Ex 32 12-17, interweaving the themes of God's presence with the people and his knowledge of Moses by name, is the JE redactor's attempt to explain the meaning of the name given to Hezekiah by God through Isaiah: Immanuel (»God is with us«, Jes 7 14). Further, the prominence given to the feast of Unleavened Bread in JE's legislation (cf. Ex 34 18-24) is well explained if one accepts the arguments of H. Haag that this feast, rather than Passover, is the one around which Hezekiah's reform centered (*Das Mazzenfest des Hiskia*, in: *Wort und Geschichte*, K. Elliger Festschrift, 1973, 87—94).

<sup>17</sup> S. Lehming, *Versuch zu Ex. XXXII*, VT 10 (1960), 36. S. Lehming, however, attributes to a P redactor other material in Ex 32—34 which I would not. M. Noth's suggestion that the hand of P in 32 15 is confined to the expression »of the testimony« does not face the problem that the resultant phrase »the two tables« occurs in this short form nowhere (*Exodus*, 1962, 248—249).

<sup>18</sup> I would prefer to leave open the question whether this deuteronomistic addition (»the ten commandments«) already lay before the eyes of the P redactor. Even if these words were already in the text, he has not himself made any association between the decalog and the tablets.



speeches (31 18). Thus, with a few deft touches, P has sharpened still further the contrast between Moses' two descents from the mountain and has related Ex 32–34 closely to the preceding seven speeches. The general purpose of such editing, with its emphasis on the creation theme in Ex 25–31, appears to be the formation of a sequence »creation—fall—restoration« as the unifying framework of Ex 25–40. What the P editor had already done in structuring the J and P passages of Gen 1–9 17, with respect to the creation, fall, and restoration of mankind in general, he now repeats in terms of Israel's cult. He accepted the JE treatment of Aaron, but neutralized it by incorporating it into an archetypal pattern, culminating in the definitive »restoration« of a liturgy to be entrusted to the priesthood of Aaron and his sons.

The details of the P editor's project can be observed in the contrasts which emerge from confronting Ex 32–34 with Ex 25–31, 35–40. The fault of Aaron was purged through the zeal of the Levites, which led to the conferral of priesthood on them as a reward (32 39); however, for P, the Levites are subtly but effectively reduced in rank below Aaron; P alludes to them (»service of the Tent of Meeting«, Ex 30 16) immediately after his extended treatment of Aaron in the first divine speech and later mentions them briefly (Ex 38 21), just before his climactic description of Aaron's priestly garments. The Levites nearly disappear in the shadow of Aaron, to whom alone priestly ordination now belongs (Ex 28 41 29 29).

The people too are absorbed into the general pattern. All had been involved in making the golden calf, inasmuch as all brought golden earrings to Aaron (32 3); the P editor's frequent repetition of *kol* (»all, every«) in describing the generosity of each Israelite (35 21–29) appears intended to overcome the universality of their guilt; further, they bring a much greater abundance and variety of gifts than the mere golden earrings they had presented to Aaron, even to the extent that they must eventually be instructed to stop giving (36 5–7). The new cult is not instituted in Moses' absence (see 31 1) but rather with his complete supervision (39 42–43) to the point that the actual construction work is totally attributed to him (ch. 40). Of course, with the people now totally accepting the new order (39 42–43), there will be neither worship based on revelry nor the offering of sacrifice by the people themselves (cf. Ex 32 6).

Finally, the P redactor counterbalances the Tent of Meeting in the midst of the community with the older Tent of Meeting outside the camp (Ex 33 7–11). Both for the JE redactor and for P, this latter tent had become a symbol for the distance of God from his people. Following upon the mention that the Israelites removed their ornaments because of God's anger (33 5–6), the placing of the tent outside the

camp suggests for JE a divine withdrawal which P heightens by associating the tent itself with the revelrous cult which had caused God's anger (Ex 38 8). God is not within this tent, nor is there mention of any cult object in it, not even the ark. One must wait there for the column of cloud to »come down« intermittently (33 9). There is no priesthood explicitly associated with this tent<sup>19</sup>; indeed, for P, it would have no special holiness of itself, in that anyone was free to approach it (33 7). On the other hand, the tent of P is a cultic center and the ark within it receives first mention among the furnishings (Ex 25 10). This tent is a sign of God's presence: after its construction, God's glory so fills it that not even Moses can enter it (Ex 40 35)<sup>20</sup>. God's presence is permanent, as implied in his act of »dwelling« (*škn*) there. Thus, even though the cloud may lift above the tent as the Israelites journey in the desert (Ex 40 36), God does not depart from the tent, for the cloud is always visible over it (40 38). A »meeting« with the Lord at this tent implies no withdrawal of God, for in P the cloud is not said to »come down« (*jrd*) and the cultic »meetings« with God, in a tent now properly fitted with apparatus for cult and properly supervised by the Aaronide priests, are founded on the more basic reality of his permanently »dwelling« there (cf. Ex 29 42-45)<sup>21</sup>.

*Conclusion: Brief Summary and Final Note on the Nature of P*

Temple-building consequent upon the divine act of creation is a motif known in the literature of Egypt and Babylon<sup>22</sup>. This study has proposed that a P editor adapted this ancient theme in a remarkable new way, fashioning a unity of Ex 25—40 by way of the sequence: creation (ch. 25—31), fall (ch. 32—33) and restoration (ch. 34—40)<sup>23</sup>. The principal argument favoring such a pattern is the

<sup>19</sup> On the JE Tent of Meeting, cf. R. Schmitt, *Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft*, 1972, esp. 185. 209—210. 212—213. 274. 306—307.

<sup>20</sup> The dependence of God's third and sixth speeches (Ex 30 17-21 31 1-11) upon texts in I Reg supports the view that Ex 40 35 was written in imitation of I Reg 8 11.

<sup>21</sup> R. Schmitt argues that some recent studies of *škn* have so stressed the nomadic origins of the word as to overlook the permanence of dwelling that it connotes within P (*Zelt und Lade* 217—218). For the contrast between the two tents of JE and P, as well as the predominance of the theme »permanent dwelling« in P, cf. *ibid.* 219—220. 222—223. 226—227. 309—310.

<sup>22</sup> For Egypt, cf. The Instruction for King Meri-ka-re, ANET 417: »... he repelled the water monster. He made the breath of life (for) their nostrils ... He has erected a shrine around about them ...« For Babylon, cf. tablets 4—6 of The Creation Epic, ANET 67—69.

<sup>23</sup> This sequence modifies that proposed by F. Cross (Canaanite Myth 84 n. 15) as the framework intended by the P editor: the covenant formula, extending from Ex 6 2 till Lev 26 45.

seven-speech structure of Ex 25—31, wherein each set of divine instructions parallels the corresponding day of creation in Gen 1—2.3. This framework of Ex 25—31, only faintly echoed in Ex 35—40, was fashioned in order to incorporate the JE traditions in Ex 32—34.28, in which the sequence »fall—restoration« had already been expressed. The P editing placed the JE material within an archetypal pattern, thus further neutralizing the older tradition of Aaron's fault as well as removing the superior position of the Levites: now the temple cult under the supervision of the Aaronide priesthood was established with a guarantee as firm as creation itself.

This study has avoided explicit reference to the currently debated question concerning the nature of P, whether it was originally an independent history or is rather to be understood as a supplement to JE, never existing as a self-contained history apart from this older tradition<sup>24</sup>. In either case, the above exposition can be defended. If P was always a supplement to JE, the proposed structure would have been achieved in the original composition of P; if P ever existed as an independent history, a later P edition would have effected the combination. The evidence in Ex 25—40 is not sufficient to draw a conclusion for the entire P corpus; however, it does favor the view that P never existed independently. Once the comprehensive pattern of Ex 25—31 is grasped, the abrupt transitions, which appear to call for various levels of editing, become understandable within a single primary level, involving the combination of disparate blocks of material. Since the most likely purpose for this structure is the incorporation of the JE elements within Ex 32—34, P itself is better understood as a supplement to JE. The view favoring an independent P commonly removes the requisites for this pattern in Ex 25—31 by postulating a single divine speech ending at 29.46 and by regarding almost all Ex 30—31 as a later addition<sup>25</sup>. However, such a view must face the difficulty that the resultant Ex 25—29 contains a description of the Dwelling that has been strongly influenced by the design of the Jerusalem temple<sup>26</sup> but has been deprived of essentials for the cult, especially the incense altar (30.1-10) and the bronze laver (30.17-21). It appears more sound to view the original P author as having in mind ch. 30—31 even as he was proceeding through his technical description of the Dwelling in Ex 25—27, for even in these early chapters he has begun his allusion to Gen 1—2.3. Just as the

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the summary in F. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 293—295.

<sup>25</sup> K. Elliger, *Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung*, in: *Kleine Schriften zum Alten Testament*, 1966, 175 (= ZTK 49, 1952, 121); cf. the general survey in J. Vink (*Date and Origin* 99—100).

<sup>26</sup> M. Haran, *Shiloh and Jerusalem. The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch*, JBL 81 (1962), 14—17; R. Schmitt, *Zelt und Lade*, 219—220. 225. 241. 248.

original creation followed a sequence of establishing limits (first three days, approximately) and then filling the defined areas with living beings (next three days), so the P author imitates such a development by detailing the arrangements for sacred space (Ex 25—26 19) and then moving into proximate preparation for the actual exercise of the cult: establishment of the Aaronide priesthood (Ex 26 20—30 10) and dispositions for further elements necessary for cult, all of which are explicitly related to repeated cultic practice and/or the person of Aaron (30 11—31 11)<sup>27</sup>.

If all this work can be regarded as the product of the original P author<sup>28</sup>, apart from some possible expansions<sup>29</sup>, then there is no difficulty in accepting an exilic date for the composition of Ex 25—40<sup>30</sup> as an expression of hope for a restored Jerusalem cult, similar to the longing in exile expressed by Second Isaiah, who proclaimed »the cosmogonic refounding of Zion and the temple as the center of the new creation«<sup>31</sup>.

Tempelbau nach dem göttlichen Schöpfungsakt ist ein altes Thema, das in Ex 25—40 in neuer Weise verwendet wird. Ein P-Redaktor hat die Einheit der Kapitel auf folgende Weise hergestellt: Schöpfung (25—31) — Fall (32f.) — Wiederherstellung (34—40). Wichtigster Grund für diese Annahme ist die Sieben-Reden-Struktur von Kap. 25—31, worin jede Gruppe von göttlichen Anordnungen dem entsprechenden Schöpfungstag von Gen 1—2 3 parallel ist. Diese Struktur wurde geschaffen, um die JE-Überlieferungen in Ex 32—33 28 zu inkorporieren, in denen die Aufeinanderfolge Fall — Wiederherstellung schon zum Ausdruck kam. Die P-Redaktion versetzte die JE-Überlieferungen in ein archetypisches Schema, neutralisierte dadurch die ältere Überlieferung von Arons Vergehen und beseitigte die überlegene Stellung der Leviten. Nunmehr wurde der Tempelkult unter der Leitung der aronidischen Priesterschaft mit einer Garantie eingesetzt, die so beständig wie die Schöpfung selbst war.

Construction du temple comme acte consécutif à un acte créateur de la divinité est un vieux thème qui est utilisé en Ex 25—40 dans un sens nouveau. Un rédacteur P

<sup>27</sup> A change of mood within Ex 25—31 from static to dynamic, reflected in the change of name from »Dwelling« to »Tent of Meeting«, has already been noted by E. Galbiati (*La Struttura letteraria dell'Esodo*, 1956, 282) and M. Görg (*Das Zelt der Begegnung*, 1967, 36. 44).

<sup>28</sup> F. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 321.

<sup>29</sup> Because the analysis of Ex 35—40 concerned mostly its general framework, the fullness of repetition in these chapters may in some cases be due to later expansion. However, the intelligibility of the framework as a whole, as well as the fondness of P for such repetitions (cf. S. McEvenue, *Narrative Style*, 217) removes the need for postulating such additions.

<sup>30</sup> F. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 323—325.

<sup>31</sup> T. Ludwig, *The Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah*, *JBL* 92 (1973), 357.

a réalisé de la manière suivante l'unité de ces chapitres: création (25—31) — chute (32s.) — restauration (34—40). Le principal argument en faveur de cette hypothèse est l'existence d'une structure de sept discours en ch. 25—31, chaque groupe d'instructions divines correspondant aux différentes journées de la création d'après Gen 1—2 a. Cette structure fut créée afin d'incorporer les traditions JE d'Ex 32—33 28, où la séquence chute-restauration se trouvait déjà exprimée. La rédaction P a transposé cette tradition JE sur un plan archétypal, neutralisant de la sorte la tradition sur l'inconduite d'Aaron et écartant la présentation d'une position prédominante des lévites. Le culte du Temple, sous la direction du sacerdoce aaronide, apparut ainsi comme ayant été institué avec une garantie tout aussi forte que celle de la création elle-même.

## An Interpretation of Sacrifice in Leviticus

By Douglas Davies

(Dept. of Theology, Nottingham University)

From the time of W. Robertson Smith in the late 19th century until the present little advance has been made in our theoretical understanding of the phenomenon of sacrifice in ancient Israel. Throughout this period W. Robertson Smith's »Religion of the Semites«, which represents his Burnett Lectures of 1888—1889 has exerted a steady influence on all theological works concerning sacrifice both in the Old Testament and in general<sup>1</sup>. By 1899 his analysis of the subject and its formulation in the famous Communion Theory was widely accepted and was even considered in a debate on Christian priesthood and sacrifice held at Oxford by men as eminent as Fairbairn, Sanday, Moberly and Moule as well as Gore and Forsyth<sup>2</sup>. Later works by G. B. Gray, E. O. James, H. H. Rowley and to a certain extent R. de Vaux, all favour W. Robertson Smith's analysis even though they each offer mild criticism of the thesis, which asserted that in a meal following the sacrifice of a totemic victim the sacrificers were united in a holy bond of fellowship which included the god of that particular community. These notions of sacrifice and totemism were developed by other scholars, particularly F. B. Jevons of Durham, and influenced many more including S. Freud, before being abandoned by modern anthropology<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> W. Sanday (Ed.), *Priesthood and Sacrifice*, 1900.

<sup>3</sup> G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, 1925; E. O. James, *Origins of Sacrifice*, 1933; H. H. Rowley, *The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, BJRL 33 (1950); R. de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*, 1964; F. B. Jevons, *Introduction to the History of Religion*, 1902; S. Freud, *Totem and Taboo*, 1920. For modern anthropological studies concerning sacrifice see: E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Nuer Religion*, 1967; G. Lienhardt, *Divinity and Experience*, 1961.