

**A SANCTUARY IN TIME:  
EXPLORING GENESIS 1's MEMORY OF CREATION**

by

**KYLE R.L. PARSONS**

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Master of Arts in Biblical Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

.....  
Dr. Craig C. Broyles, Ph.D.; Thesis Supervisor

.....  
Dr. Dirk L. Büchner, D.Litt.; Second Reader

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY April 2016

© Kyle R.L. Parsons

## ABSTRACT

Since the days of Wellhausen, pentateuchal scholarship has essentially agreed that Gen 1 and Gen 2 are from two distinct sources. Furthermore, they agree that Gen 1 was added in front of Gen 2 at a relatively late period during the pentateuch's compositional history. Moving beyond these agreements, this thesis asks *why* Gen 1, and its cultural memory of creation, was added in front of Gen 2? In other words, what motivated a later group to come along and add Gen 1?

To address this question, this thesis approaches Gen 1 methodologically as a cultural memory. A cultural memory is an authoritative representation of the past that is formed by the needs, concerns, and hopes of a particular group and also formative in constructing that group's collective identity. But as a memory, it is interpreted as much as it is recalled through the context of the present. That is, the present circumstances, hopes, concerns, needs of the group shape and colour the way the past is remembered and therefore, the way the past is described.

As such, this thesis argues that Gen 1 was intentionally added in order to primarily elevate the Sabbath to a position and status equal to the Temple/Tabernacle. In mnemonic terms, then, Gen 1 is a countermemory that resulted in a shift away from sacred *space* toward sacred *time*. A mnemonic shift from the sanctuary in Jerusalem to a sanctuary in time.

With this countermemory and its resulting mnemonic shift from space (i.e. Temple) to time (i.e. Sabbath), exilic Israelites were provided with a much needed legitimization for Sabbath practice in a foreign land without their temple. The Holiness Group (H), not the Priestly Group (P), was much more motivated to shift the focus from sacred space to sacred time; and therefore, are the likeliest group to have added Gen 1 to the beginning of the Pentateuch.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
CONTENTS	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
QUESTIONS	1
OUTLINE	3
<b>CHAPTER 1: APPROACHING GENESIS 1 AS A CULTURAL MEMORY</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1.1. Outline	7
1.1.2. Benefits of Approaching Genesis 1 as a Cultural Memory	7
1.2. MEMORY IS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON	8
1.3. MEMORY IS ACCESSED THROUGH SOCIAL FRAMEWORKS	9
1.3.1. Spatial Frameworks	10
1.3.2. Temporal Frameworks	11
1.3.3. The Textualization of Memory as an Act of Preservation	12
1.3.4. Losing a Framework	14
1.4. COUNTERMEMORIES	14
1.4.1. Cultural Memory is Powerful at Forming Collective Identity	14
1.4.2. Cultural Memory is Reconstructed	16
1.4.3. Countertermemory: A Definition	18
1.5. MYTH, MYTHMAKING AND MEMORY	19
1.5.1. Myth: A Definition	19
1.5.2. Myth and History	21
1.5.3. Mythmaking	23
1.5.4. Myth and Memory	25
1.6. CONCLUSION	26
<b>CHAPTER 2: GENESIS 1 IS FOCUSED ON TIME: A CLOSE READING OF GENESIS 1'S STRUCTURE</b>	<b>29</b>
2.1. INTRODUCTION	29
2.2. PROPOSED STRUCTURES FOR GENESIS 1	30
2.3. ASSUMPTIONS FROM PROPOSED STRUCTURES	31
2.3.1. תהו and בהו Refers to Two Distinct Primordial Conditions	31
2.3.3. תהו and בהו is the Only Primordial Condition in Need of Remedy	33
2.3.4. Seventh Day is Unconnected to the Previous Six Days	34
2.4. GENESIS 1'S FOCUS ON TIME	36
2.4.1. Day One	36

2.4.2. Day Four	38
2.4.3. Day Seven	40
2.5. A PROPOSED STRUCTURE THAT IS FOCUSED ON TIME	42
2.5.1. Building on Peter Weimar's Time-Focused Structure	43
2.5.2. Conclusion and this Thesis' View of Genesis 1's Structure	45
<b>CHAPTER 3: GENESIS 1 WAS ADDED AS A COUNTERMEMORY TO GENESIS 2: A COMPARATIVE READING WITH GENESIS 2</b>	<b>47</b>
3.1. INTRODUCTION	47
3.1.1. Creation Myths as Grande Memories	48
3.1.2. Plan of the Chapter	49
3.2. GENESIS 1 WAS ADDED	50
3.2.1. The Different Names of the Deity	50
3.2.2. The Editorial Hinge in 2:4a	53
3.2.2.1. Temporal Clauses	54
3.2.2.2. Ancient Translations of 2:4	54
3.2.2.3. The Tôlêdôt Heading	57
3.3. WHY RETAIN GENESIS 2?	59
3.3.1. The Creation of Humanity	62
3.3.2. The Purpose of Humanity	66
3.3.3. The Identity of Humanity	67
3.4. GENESIS 1 AS A COUNTERMEMORY TO GENESIS 2	70
3.4.1. The Opening in 1:1	71
3.4.1.1. Beginning in the Beginning	72
3.4.1.2. The Inversion of Heaven and Earth	73
3.4.1.3. Created not merely Made	74
3.4.2. Aetiological Concerns	75
3.4.2.1. The Sabbath	76
3.4.2.2. The Calendar	77
3.4.2.3. Animal Taxonomy	79
3.5. CONCLUSION	80
<b>CHAPTER 4: GENESIS 1 COMMUNICATES A SHIFT FROM SACRED SPACE TO SACRED TIME: A COMPARATIVE READING WITH OTHER CREATION MYTHS</b>	<b>82</b>
4.1. INTRODUCTION	82
4.1.1. Countermemories Imitate What Came Before	83
4.1.2. Countermemories are Understated and Subtle	84
4.2. COMPARISON WITH ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN CREATION MYTHS	87
4.2.1. Biblical Creation Myths	87
4.2.1.1. Psalm 74:12–17	88
4.2.1.2. Psalm 104:5–9	90
4.2.1.3. Psalm 89	93

4.2.1.4. Other Biblical Creation Memories	94
4.2.2. Non-Biblical Creation Myths	95
4.2.2.1. Overview of <i>Enuma Elish</i>	95
4.2.2.2. Similarities and Differences Concerning the Mechanics of Creation	97
4.2.2.3. Similarities and Differences Concerning the Earth's Primordial Conditions	99
4.2.3. The Mainstream Memory of Creation and Genesis 1	102
4.2.4. Conclusion	104
4.3. TEMPLE AND CREATION	105
4.3.1. Temple Myths	105
4.3.2. Temples and Creation	109
4.4. GENESIS 1 AND ENUMA ELISH	113
4.4.1. <i>Enuma Elish</i> was Accessible to the Audience of Genesis 1	113
4.4.2. Connections Between Genesis 1 and <i>Enuma Elish</i> in the Sequence of Events	115
4.4.3. Genesis 1 and <i>Enuma Elish</i> Conclude Differently	117
4.4.4. Addressing Walton's Argument that Genesis 1 is a Temple Building Myth	119
4.4.4.1. Walton's Argument for Divine Rest from Enemies	120
4.4.4.2. Response to Walton's Argument	121
4.4.4.3. Problems with Walton's Evidence: Psalm 132 and Exodus 20:11	124
4.4.4.4. Conclusion on Walton's Argument	126
4.5. THE SABBATH WAS PRESENTED AS A TEMPLE IN TIME	127
4.5.1. Using the Genre of Creation	128
4.5.2. Echoing Solomon's Temple and Moses' Tabernacle	129
4.5.3 The use of קדש	131
4.6. CONCLUSION	133
<b>CHAPTER 5: WHO ADDED GENESIS 1? THE NARRATIVE EVIDENCE FOR H AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>135</b>
5.1. INTRODUCTION	135
5.1.1. The Distinction between P and H	136
5.1.2. Strata within H	137
5.1.3. H's relationship to P and D	138
5.1.4. Is H the Pentateuchal Redactor?	141
5.1.4.1. Stackert's View that H is not the Pentateuchal Redactor	141
5.1.4.2. Arguments for H being the Pentateuchal Redactor	142
5.1.5. Stackert's Strategy to Leave History in the Past	144
5.1.6. Summary of The Source Critical Situation	146
5.1.7. Additional thought: H and Ezekiel	146
5.2. NARRATOLOGICAL REASONS FOR ASCRIBING GENESIS 1 TO P	148
5.2.1. P's Narrative Character Compared to J	149
5.2.2. H's Narrative Relationship with P	149

5.2.3. A Closer Look at P's Narrative Characteristics	150
5.2.3.1. P's Focus on Lawgiving only at Sinai	151
5.2.3.1.1. H's Redaction of the Flood Narrative (Gen 6–9)	154
5.2.3.1.2. Conclusion on Baden's View of Sinaitic Exclusivity	157
5.2.3.2. P's Focus on Lawgiving only to the Israelites	158
5.2.3.2.1. Non-P Uses Parenthesis	159
5.2.3.2.2. H Also Uses Parenthesis	159
5.2.3.2.3. Aetiologies with P and H	160
5.2.3.2.4. Baden's Argument that Gen 2:1–3 is not an Aetiology	161
5.2.4. The Beginning of the Priestly Narrative in Genesis 5:1–3	163
5.3. CLOSE PARALLELS BETWEEN GEN 2:1–3 AND P'S TABERNACLE	165
5.3.1. The Differences Between Genesis 1 and Exodus 39–40	167
5.3.2. Additional Thoughts on P's Focus on Sacred Space	168
5.4. CONCLUSION	168
 <b>CHAPTER 6: WHO ADDED GENESIS 1? THE LEXICAL AND THEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR H AUTHORSHIP</b>	 <b>171</b>
6.1. INTRODUCTION	171
6.1.1. Genesis 1 is Priestly	172
6.1.2. The Distinction between P and H	173
6.2. ANIMAL TAXONOMY AND DIET IN GENESIS 1 AND LEVITICUS 11	176
6.2.1. Leviticus 11	176
6.2.2. Interpolations Already Ascribed to H: Lev 11:39–40 and 11:43–45	180
6.2.3. An Interpolation Not Yet Ascribed to H: Lev 11:46–47	183
6.2.3.1. Verses 46–47 Belong Together	183
6.2.3.2. Lexical Connections between Lev 11, Gen 1, and the HC	184
6.2.3.3. Lev 11 and Its Connections to the HC's Lev 20:25	186
6.2.4. Meshel's Argument that H was not the Last Hand to Redact Lev 11	187
6.2.4.1. Connections between Leviticus 11 and Genesis 1	190
6.2.4.2. Connections Between Genesis 1, Genesis 6–9, Leviticus 11, and H.	191
6.2.4.3. The Big Picture Between Genesis 1 and Leviticus 11	193
6.3. CALENDARS	195
6.3.1. Genesis 1 and Time	195
6.3.2. H's concern for Time and P's Lack of Concern for Time	196
6.3.3. Numbers 28–29 and Leviticus 23	198
6.3.3.1. Connections between Genesis 1:14 and Leviticus 23	199
6.3.3.2. The Importance of H's Calendar in (Post) Exilic Times	202
6.4. THE SABBATH IN THE HOLINESS CODE	204
6.4.1. The Centrality of the Sabbath in the HC	205
6.4.1.1. The Abundance of Sabbath References in the HC	206
6.4.1.2. The Position of the Sabbath in the HC	207
6.4.2. The Sabbath of the Land	209
6.5. THE SABBATH BEYOND THE HOLINESS CODE	212

6.5.1. Non-Priestly Sabbath Pericopes	212
6.5.2. Priestly Sabbath Pericopes	214
6.5.2.1. Exodus 16	214
6.5.2.1.1. Redactional Activity	214
6.5.2.1.2. Exodus 16:4–5 and 22–30 are H	215
6.5.2.1.3. Schwartz’s Disagreement	216
6.5.2.1.4. Narrative Connection to Genesis 1	218
6.5.2.2. Exodus 20:11	219
6.5.2.2.1. Redaction in Exodus 20:8–11	219
6.5.2.2.2. Exodus 20:11 is H via Genesis 1	219
6.5.2.3. Exodus 31:12–17 and 35:2–3	222
6.5.2.3.1. Oylan’s Proposal	223
6.5.2.3.2. Stackert’s Proposal	226
6.5.2.3.3. This Thesis’ View	227
6.5.2.4. Numbers 15:32–36	231
6.5.2.5. Numbers 28:9–10	232
6.5.2.6. Conclusion on the Survey of Sabbath Pericopes	233
6.5.2.7. Israel Knohl’s Ascription of Genesis 2:1–3 to P	234
6.6. A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SABBATH AND THE SABBATICAL CALENDAR	235
6.6.1. The 364-Day Year Calendar	238
6.6.2. The Origin of the 364-Day Year Calendar	241
6.7: CONCLUSIONS	245
CONCLUSION	248
BIBLIOGRAPHY	252

## ABBREVIATIONS

ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
AB	Anchor Bible Commentary Series
AfOB	Archiv für Orientforschung: Beiheft
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
ANEP	The Ancient Near Eastern in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. 2d ed. Princeton, 1969
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. 2d ed. Princeton, 1969
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ARM	Archives Royales de Mari. Paris, 1950ff.
ASR	American Sociological Review
ATM	Altes Testament und Moderne
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
AUSS	Andrews University Seminary Studies
BA	The Biblical Archaeologist
BAR	Biblical Archaeological Review
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BBVO	Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderer Orient Texte
BDB	Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon. Edited by Brown, Francis, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (ed. K. Elliger et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967)
BI	Biblical Intersections
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation
BJS	Brown Judaic Series
BR	Biblical Research
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAL	Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project (Online)
CBC	The Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CDL	Cuneiform Digital Library
COS	The Context of Scripture. Edited by W. W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden, 1997–2003
CT	Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum
DCH	Dictionary of Classical Hebrew



DJD	Discoveries in the Judaeian Desert
ETL	Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
HALOT	The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Edited by Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994–1999
HR	History of Religions
HS	Hebrew Studies
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
ICS	International Conference on Information Systems
Int	Interpretation
JANES	Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal Of Biblical Literature
JBS	Jerusalem Biblical Studies
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JQR	The Jewish Quarterly Review
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
JSOT	Journal For The Study Of The Old Testament
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
NABU	<i>Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires</i>
NGTT	Nederduitse Gereformeerde Theologische Tydskrif
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NEA	Near Eastern Archeology
NETS	A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally included under that Title. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007
NIB	<i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i> . Edited by Leander E. Keck. 12 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994-2004
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OTE	Old Testament Essays
QMHSS	Quantitative Methods in the Humanities and Social Sciences
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature Press
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature

SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SOTS	Society for Old Testament Study
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SJ	Studia Judaica
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WC	Westminster Commentaries
WO	Die Welt des Orients
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZABR	Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ANE	Ancient Near Eastern
D	Deuteronomic source
E	The Elohist/“Elohistic” source
H	The Holiness Group (as distinct from P)
HC	The Holiness Code (Lev 17–26)
H <sub>R</sub>	The Holiness Redactor (Exilic)
HB	Hebrew Bible
J	The Yahwist/“Yahwistic” source
LXX	The “Septuagint” as referring to the Greek Translation of the Pentateuch/Torah
MT	Masoretic Text/Tradition
P	The Priestly Source (as distinct from H or the HC)
SP	The Samaritan Pentateuch

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To everyone who helped me through this ... well whatever this is called when you spend some of the prime of your life writing a large work of non-fiction which will be read by, let's face it, only two other people, both of whom are probably your own relations:

I thank you.

Sincerely and with the utmost respect,  
Kyle Parsons

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

### Questions

This thesis comes to Gen 1<sup>2</sup> with three primary questions. First, why was Gen 1 placed before Gen 2?<sup>3</sup> Second, why does Gen 1 conclude with a Sabbath aetiology, rather than end with a temple aetiology, as many ANE creation myths do? And third, who was motivated to add Gen 1 to the Pentateuch?

In response to the first question, it will be shown that Gen 1 was placed at the very beginning of the Pentateuch, in front of the Yahwist's older creation myth (J), in order to be a countermemory: a countermemory that shifts the focus from sacred space to sacred time.

In response to the second question, it will be shown that the Sabbath was placed where the temple was expected to be in order to elevate the Sabbath to a position equal to the Temple or the Tabernacle. In ANE creation myths, especially *Enuma Elish*, the myth culminates with the building of a sacred space (i.e. a temple). This thesis will demonstrate that the author of Gen 1 used this genre, along with this expected conclusion, in order to subvert it. That is, the author used the audience's expectation for a temple building and instead gave them the Sabbath,

---

<sup>1</sup> All Hebrew text throughout this thesis is taken from BHS, unless noted otherwise. All translations are my own, unless noted otherwise.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this thesis, "Gen 1" refers to Gen 1:1–2:4a. Also,

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this thesis, "Gen 2" refers to Gen 2:4b–3:24.

resulting in the audience thinking temple but hearing Sabbath. In this way, the two become equated, albeit subliminally. This placement of the Sabbath where a sacred space was expected to be is the primary example of Gen 1's purpose to bring about a socioreligious shift from space to time. Another is the focus Gen 1 places on the calendar in its fourth day.

And lastly, in response to the third question, it will be shown that H was far more motivated to add Gen 1 and, thus, more likely to shift the focus from space to time than P would have been. Moreover, it will be shown that H and its legislation benefited much more from Gen 1's inclusion in the Pentateuch than P did. Of course, this is contrary to the majority of scholarship who is confident that P is the author of Gen 1, not H.

Therefore it will be argued that H, not P, altered and revised Israel's memory of creation by adding Gen 1 in front of Gen 2. This was done by H in order to bring about a socioreligious shift from sacred space to sacred time—a shift from focusing on the Temple in Jerusalem to focusing on a temple in time.

Therefore, this thesis hopes to show that this socioreligious shift, this countermemory from space to time was a matter of religious survival for an exilic Israel who were temple-less and homeless. With the loss of their sacred spaces, the natural shift was toward traditions and rituals that are not anchored to a specific location. Temples can be torn down, but time cannot be conquered. It always is. It is always available and accessible, no matter what foreign land your children find themselves in. It is a sanctuary in time.

## Outline

Chapter 1 will introduce the methodological approach of cultural memory. A cultural memory is an authoritative representation of the past that is formed by the needs, concerns, and hopes of a particular group and also formative in constructing that group's collective identity. This chapter will demonstrate that approaching Gen 1 as a cultural memory is a great way pursue the aforementioned questions. Additionally, cultural memory relies on Maurice Halbwachs theory of collective memory, which theorizes that societies access their memories through social frameworks—two of which are spatial frameworks and temporal frameworks. The Temple in Jerusalem is a great example of a spatial framework while Israel's calendar and the Sabbath are great examples of temporal frameworks. So when one of these frameworks is removed, the result is a rupture that forces a shift from the one that was lost to those that remain. Therefore, when the Temple was destroyed by the Babylonians, when Israel's sacred space along with all of their spatial frameworks were destroyed, the group in exile (adapted and) shifted their focus to temporal frameworks.

Chapter 2 will provide a close reading of Gen 1 which will show that Gen 1 is structurally focused on time with its *raison d'être* the Seventh Day (Sabbath). In other words, Gen 1, as compared to other creation myths, shifts the focus away from sacred space toward sacred time.

Chapter 3 will compare Gen 1 with Gen 2 in order to show two things. First, it will show that Gen 1 was deliberately added to Gen 2 so as to become (a significant) part of Israel's cultural memory of creation. And second, chapter 3 will show that Gen 1 was added because Gen 2 was deemed incomplete and inadequate as Israel's memory of

creation for three aetiological reasons: Gen 2 does not adequately prepare the audience for the dietary prescriptions in Lev 11, it is incomplete in that it does not establish a calendar specific to Israel or YHWH, and it does not have a Sabbath aetiology. It will be concluded that Gen 1 is a countermemory to Gen 2.

Chapter 4 will continue investigating Gen 1 as a countermemory and compare it with other creation memories such as *Enuma Elish* and Psalms 74 and 104. This does two things. First, it continues to demonstrate the ways in which Gen 1 is a countermemory to other memories of creation. Second, it demonstrates how Gen 1 persuasively communicates this countermemory to its audience. That is, it demonstrates that the author of Gen 1 used the well-known genre of creation myth in order to subvert the temple with the Sabbath, to bring about a shift from sacred space to sacred time.

Chapters 5 and 6 both concern the question about which pentateuchal group likely composed and added Gen 1 to the Pentateuch. This is an important question to pursue since the group and their characteristics provides more information in understanding why Gen 1 was added. This thesis argues that it is not P who added or composed Gen 1, but rather another priestly group—H. P's collective identity is not such that they would have been motivated to add Gen 1, nor does their legislation benefit from its inclusion. Whereas H's collective identity matches Gen 1. Chapter 5 investigates this question from a narrative perspective.

Chapter 6 then focuses on the lexical (and theological) connections between Gen 1 and P or H. Here is demonstrated that the three main aetiological aspects of Gen 1—dietary law, calendar/appointed times, and Sabbath—are much more the concern of H than they are of P. In other words, H has a motive to compose and add Gen 1 to the Pentateuch, whereas P does not.

Beginning with the dietary law in Lev 11, it will be demonstrated that H was involved in its redaction, and thus responsible for its final form. Next, the two priestly calendars (P's Num 28–29 and H's Lev 23) will be compared in order to determine which calendar Gen 1 is meant to be an aetiology for. It will be demonstrated that the reckoning of time in H's calendar in Lev 23 is much more related to Gen 1's time reckoning. And lastly, the Sabbath is discussed. Not only will it be shown that the Holiness Code (HC: Lev 17–26) is chock-full of Sabbath references, thus demonstrating that the Sabbath is very important to H, but also that other Sabbath interpolations in Exodus and Numbers can also be shown to be edited by an H redactor. This is further evidence that the Sabbath is important to H, but not to P.

Moreover, this is evidence that sometime late in the Pentateuch's composition, an H redactor added Sabbath interpolations in key positions throughout the Pentateuch; two of them as addenda to the Tabernacle (Exod 31:12–17 and 35:1–3). Altogether, this is strong evidence that H, in addition to adding Gen 1, were involved throughout the Pentateuch in making redactions and interpolations that saw the Sabbath or sacred time elevated.



## CHAPTER 1: APPROACHING GENESIS 1 AS A CULTURAL MEMORY

### 1.1. Introduction

This thesis approaches Gen 1 as a cultural memory. It was first posited in a systematic way by Maurice Halbwachs<sup>4</sup> back in the early 20th century and since then, it has been increasingly applied to many other disciplines. For example, Egyptologist Jan Assman expanded on Halbwachs' concept of memory and applied it to history, which he called *mnemohistory*.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, more and more scholars have been applying Halbwach's theory of memory to areas of the HB. For example, this has been done by Marc Zvi Brettler,<sup>6</sup> Mark S. Smith,<sup>7</sup> and Ron Hendel.<sup>8</sup> However, to the best of this author's recollection, Gen 1 has not been read through the lens of cultural memory.

---

<sup>4</sup> Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*. Edited and Translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. This volume combines two of Halbwachs works: *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Mémoire* ([1925] 1952) and *La Topographie Légendaire des Évangiles en Sainte-Terre* (1941).

<sup>5</sup> Jan Assmann. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Harvard University Press, 1997. It should be noted that Halbwachs did apply memory to history as well, just not as systematically as Assmann has.

<sup>6</sup> Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).

<sup>7</sup> Mark S. Smith, *The Memoirs of God: History, Memory and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

<sup>8</sup> Ronald Hendel, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

### 1.1.1. Outline

What follows is a discussion on what cultural memory is. It will be shown that memory is a social phenomenon where entire cultures have shared memories that both shape them and are shaped by them. Next, it will be discussed that these cultural memories are accessed by the group through various social frameworks. This is followed by a discussion on *countermemory*. A countermemory is a deliberate recasting of a memory of the past. Because this act of reconstructing a memory of the past is very similar to the idea of mythmaking, and because Gen 1 is, after all, a creation myth, myth and mythmaking will then be discussed. It will be concluded that myth and the process of mythmaking are compatible with cultural memory. This chapter will conclude with an explanation of how the following chapters throughout the thesis will involve cultural memory.

### 1.1.2. Benefits of Approaching Genesis 1 as a Cultural Memory

Before moving on to defining cultural memory, some benefits of approaching Gen 1 as a cultural memory should be highlighted. The first benefit for approaching Gen 1 as a cultural memory is that the book of Genesis, also the entire HB, can be seen as a complex textualized anthology of ancient Israel's shared and authoritative memories. After all, The book of Genesis is, in the diction of the Palestinian Targums, a "Book of Memories." Understanding the Hebrew Bible this way opens up many fascinating avenues of inquiry.

Second, cultural memory is very efficient at bringing together multiple methods and disciplines in an organized way. This thesis involves redaction criticism, source criticism, rhetorical criticism, tradition criticism, comparative religions; all with the purpose of thoroughly

investigating Gen 1. Like the scope of memory itself, the method of attending to the memory of Genesis 1 is multifaceted. And with cultural memory, all these questions and threads of inquiry can be brought together and made into a single fabric.

Third, cultural memory focuses on the memory itself rather than the event it remembers. In other words, this thesis is not trying to examine the event of creation or Gen 1's historicity, rather, it is trying to understand why this particular version of creation was both remembered and added.

## **1.2. Memory is a Social Phenomenon**

Halbwachs observed that memory is a social phenomenon. It is not exclusive to individuals, nor is it something free from the influences and circumstances of others.<sup>9</sup> Memories, as he noted: “reconstruct an image of the past which is in accord, in each epoch, with the predominant thoughts of the society.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, individuals remember collectively, influenced by the concerns and interests generated by whatever community they exist in (family, town, country, race, etc.), and through these communities one is able to localize and recall the past.<sup>11</sup> Eviatar Zerubavel adds to this:

The extent to which our social environment affects the way we remember the past becomes even clearer when we realize that much of what we ‘remember’ is actually

---

<sup>9</sup> As memories become shared with others, whether they experienced the same event or not, the memory becomes shaped and cemented into a stable form. The more the past is retrieved and told the more stable and available it becomes to both the communicator and the recipients.

<sup>10</sup> Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 40.

<sup>11</sup> Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 38. See also the excellent introductory essay, “Social and Cultural Memory” by Alan Kirk in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Alan Kirk, Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 1–24.

filtered (and therefore inevitably distorted) through a process of interpretation that usually takes place within particular social surroundings.<sup>12</sup>

Members of a cultural group, especially children, are acculturated by being immersed in these memories through acts of commemoration such as hearing them in narrative form (myths) or actualizing these stories or myths in rituals.<sup>13</sup> These commemorative narratives and rituals are a blend of historical details, imaginations and embellishments, all subservient to the needs and concerns of each successive generation. Thus the memories are subjective and at best incomplete; yet, they are foundational to a culture's view of itself, to its very identity.

Thus, the working definition of cultural memory for this thesis is: a shared and authoritative representation of the past that has been interpreted as much as it has been recalled through the context of the group's present. Therefore, the past is formed by the group's current needs, concerns, and hopes, as well as formative for determining what those needs and hopes are.

### 1.3. Memory is Accessed Through Social Frameworks

Maurice Halbwachs, in *Legendary Topography*,<sup>14</sup> further introduced the concept of *frameworks of memory*. By this, he argued that the past is perceived and filtered through various

---

<sup>12</sup> Eviatar Zerubavel, "Social memories: Steps to a sociology of the past," *Qualitative Sociology* 19: 3 (1996): 285. Also note this example: "To appreciate the extent to which our social environment affects the 'depth' of our memory, consider, for example, the official 1990 ruling by the Israeli broadcasting authorities forbidding television and radio announcers to refer to current places in Israel by their old Arab names (p. 286)."

<sup>13</sup> Zerubavel, "Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past," 290. Moreover, being a part of a community assumes both the necessity and involuntariness of experiencing events that had happened to one's group long before joining in such a way that it is as though the member experienced it him or herself. Consider the Passover where Jews recite something along the lines of: "we were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt, and God brought us out of there with a mighty hand." And also recite the following passage from the Haggadah: "In every generation, a man should see himself as though he had gone forth from Egypt. As it is said: you shall tell your son on that day, it is because of what God did for me when I went forth from Egypt." The passover ritual is about preserving a cultural memory as though it was the participant's own.

<sup>14</sup> Maurice Halbwachs, "The Legendary Topography of the Gospels in the Holy Land." Pages 191-93 in *On Collective Memory*. Edited and translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

social frameworks. Generally speaking, social frameworks are all the various ‘groups’ that any one individual can belong to simultaneously; such as nation, religion, ethnic group, and class. Halbwachs notes that “[f]or each group, cultural memory provides a sense of identity, stability, and cohesion.”<sup>15</sup> Within one’s social group, the frameworks by which one perceives the past can be further broken down into spatial and temporal frameworks.

### 1.3.1. Spatial Frameworks

Spatial frameworks consist of locations or sites, cities and the buildings. “The space within which memory is plotted is a social framework because space is conceptualized, organized, and shaped by the group inhabiting it.”<sup>16</sup> Just like when one visits a place from the past and memories from that moment are immediately brought to mind, so too individuals of any particular culture can have past cultural memories brought to mind simply by just being in a particular location where it has been collectively commemorated.<sup>17</sup> Take for example the Vimy Ridge memorial. It stands in a place that once visitors go there, they are immediately caused to remember the event for which the place now commemorates.

The Solomonic Temple for ancient Israelites would have functioned as, for all intents and purposes, a main mnemonic framework. It was “a spatial icon of Israelite hopes for divine presence and blessing.”<sup>18</sup> “For ancient Israel, the Temple of Solomon—indeed, the Temple Mount

---

<sup>15</sup> Ronald Hendel, “Cultural Memory,” in *Reading Genesis: Ten Methods*, ed. by Ron Hendel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 30.

<sup>16</sup> Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 3.

<sup>17</sup> For example, Gettysburg is a location to remember both the Battle of Gettysburg and the entire American Civil War, but it is also the site to remember Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, which symbolizes the end of slavery. Thus, Gettysburg becomes a symbol, a mnemonic site for remembering the end of slavery. To visit the location is to, in one way or another, remember Lincoln’s address.

<sup>18</sup> Smith, *Memoirs of God*, 86.

and all Jerusalem—was a symbol as well as a reality, a mythopoeic realization of heaven on earth, Paradise, the Garden of Eden.”<sup>19</sup> The iconography therein conjures up images of the original garden, the divine abode. The Temple “linked heaven and earth (as *axis mundi*); from here order was established at creation and was continually renewed and maintained through rituals and ceremonies.”<sup>20</sup> The master narratives of the group were recited in this location, sins forgiven, and festivals performed and celebrated. All these memories are brought to mind the moment one lays eyes on it, indeed, the moment even thinks about it. “These symbolic meanings were encoded in the Temple's very construction.”<sup>21</sup>

### 1.3.2. Temporal Frameworks

Temporal frameworks consist primarily of the organization and implementation of the community's calendar. When one wakes up to a specific day in the culture's calendar, that day is set apart and is thus commemorating some time or event in the past. “A community organizes its calendar in accordance with group-specific commemorative concerns and activities, and so fills it with religious, political, and social meanings.”<sup>22</sup> Thus, how a calendar is organized constitutes a collective identity among the community members who tell and retell the events of the

---

<sup>19</sup> Lawrence E. Stager, “Jerusalem as Eden,” *BAR* 26: 3 (May/June 2000): 37.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> Smith, *Memoirs of God*, 86–87.

<sup>22</sup> Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 3. See also Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (New York: Harper & Row Colophon Books, 1980), 88–89. Like the Jewish festival calendar moving through the agricultural seasons, which at first were likely attached to the simple events of springtime seeding, summertime blooming, and autumn harvest, but then had formative (remembered) events anchored into the cyclical calendar, ensuring the memory of such events beginning with the Exodus out of Egypt (Passover) in the springtime to note the new life of freedom, the giving of the Torah at Sinai (Pentecost) seven Sabbaths later corresponding a chronology to the time from Egypt to Sinai, and the shelter God offered the Israelites while wandering in the desert (Tabernacles).

remembered past.<sup>23</sup> As an example, Christmas commemorates the birth of Christ. Or, more culturally specific, for Jews Passover commemorates their deliverance from bondage in Egypt. Thus attaching memories to specific times allows those memories to be periodically retrieved by members of the group.<sup>24</sup>

### 1.3.3. The Textualization of Memory as an Act of Preservation

Though cultural memories are accessed in specific locations and during specific times, they are also accessed by groups in text form. This provides a cultural memory great longevity. The transfer of a memory from orality to text indicates a serious desire to protect the memory's vitality. This can take place at anytime but the impetus for such preservation is perhaps strongest when it is just following a time of cultural crisis (or trauma) when societal changes suddenly problematize the connections a group has with its past. In such a traumatic situation, a society or community turns to a more stable and lasting form of preserving the memory of the past, one that does not require the survival of the persons carrying the memory of the past. "[W]hatever is written, and more generally whatever is inscribed, demonstrates, by the fact of being inscribed, a will to be remembered."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Zerubavel, "Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past," 294. Members of a society "co-remember" the past "by associating them with holidays and other "memorial days" which are jointly celebrated on a regular annual basis. Fixed in a mnemonic community's calendar, such days ensure members' synchronized access to their collective past. Indeed, keeping certain past events in our collective memory by ensuring their annual commemoration is one of the main functions of the calendar." (294)

<sup>24</sup> See Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 134–140, and 157.

<sup>25</sup> Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember: Themes in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 102. See also same quote in Kirk, "Social and Cultural Memory," 9.

The past is no more memorable and accessible than when it is transferred into narratives (or myths).<sup>26</sup> Paul Ricoeur says that narratives are an essential form of memory both personal and collective.<sup>27</sup> “Recounting the past involves the forms and practices of narrative, which dramatize the details and events of cultural memory.”<sup>28</sup> Narrative here does not mean that which is distinct from poetry (prose), rather it means representing an event or memory of an event in such a way as to conform it to an overarching set of goals and values. It is a meaning making process. Poems, then, under this definition are also considered to be narratives. The advantage of narratives is that they simplify complex events by foregrounding temporal plots of conflict and resolution.<sup>29</sup> Since “stories recount memories” they, by doing so, “constitute memories, for they organize the past in narrative temporality and form, which makes the past memorable.”<sup>30</sup> To paraphrase Michael Schudson, the past that comes to be known by anyone anywhere is the one made into stories.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Myth and mythmaking will be discussed further below.

<sup>27</sup> Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 3.

<sup>28</sup> Hendel, “Cultural Memory,” 32.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 33. For example, the Passover Seder is a ritual (e.g. blessings spoken, washing hands, breaking and dipping matzo), but it is also remembered in a narrative framework (e.g. reciting the plagues, re-experiencing the crossing of the *Red Sea*). Consequently, the narrative acts as the source from which the ritual arose, and the source from which the story is recited and recalled.

<sup>31</sup> Paraphrased from “The past that comes to be known or known at all is ... the one made into stories.” Michael Schudson, “Dynamics of Distortion in Collective Memory,” in *Memory Distortion: How the Minds, Brains, and Societies Reconstruct the Past*, ed. D.L. Schacter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 358. Or as Mark Allen Powell said, “Revelation is given through story, which remains with us today. We are, in fact, in a privileged position, for the story interprets the events for us in ways that we might never have grasped if we had been there to witness them transpire in history.” M.A. Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 99.



#### 1.3.4. Losing a Framework

It is important to understand that since memory is a social phenomenon, it requires social frameworks to make the past memorable, meaningful, and therefore relevant. Without these social frameworks, memories would eventually be forgotten. So what happens when one framework is removed? It could be said (or imagined) that there is a shift away from the one lost to the one that remains. For ancient Israel, the loss of the temple caused two shifts: (1) memories anchored to spatial frameworks shifted to temporal frameworks; and (2) the fear of losing access to the past prompted the textualization of the memories of the past—the Scriptures. Since memory attaches itself “to places and landscapes, and likewise survives, erodes, or perishes along with them,”<sup>32</sup> transferring the memory to text form ensured its survival.<sup>33</sup>

### 1.4. Countermemories

Now what follows is a discussion on what countermemories are. To understand countermemories, one first needs to understand two aspects of cultural memory: (1) it is powerful in forming and maintaining the collective identity of a group; and (2) it is reconstructed *through* and *for* the present.

#### 1.4.1. Cultural Memory is Powerful at Forming Collective Identity

The collective identity of a group is determined quite extensively by the group’s shared memories. Cultural memories “define a group, giving it a sense of its past and defining its

---

<sup>32</sup> Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 2–3.

<sup>33</sup> This all makes cultural memory very interesting when considering this thesis’ main argument that Gen 1 is a shift from sacred space to sacred time. With the loss of the Temple, exilic Israel would have been looking to anchor memories previously associated with the Temple to something temporal.

aspirations for the future.”<sup>34</sup> Certain events or memories of the group’s past are marked out and set apart as constitutive. These are memories of the community’s origins, the events that set them apart from everyone else’s founding myths. It is the difference that makes them *them* and everyone else *everyone else*.

These memories are embedded in the individual’s consciousness, creating what Eviatar Zerubavel calls an “existential fusion” of one’s own personal story with the shared corporate history of the group to which one belongs.<sup>35</sup> Incorporating new members by familiarizing them with the acts of commemoration which connect past memories with the present collective consciousness is essential to forming the community. These memories are told and retold by the community, embedding them more and more into the collective consciousness of the community.<sup>36</sup> The community’s cultural memory guides, determines, and defines the identity of the group. In other words, the group’s ideologies, its morality and ethics, its fears and longings, its worldview is deeply shaped by its cultural memory. Remembering the past among one’s group, practicing the rituals and recalling the events of the past through recital and acts of commemoration, is both formative and normative. Hendel elaborates:

Just as personal memories are the foundation of one’s sense of self, the performance of cultural memories creates and refashions the identity of a people. Along with other features such as common language, common cuisine, shared body habits and other practices, a shared memory of the past is a constitutive feature of ethnic and national identity.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory: New Perspectives on the Past* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992), 25. See also Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 5.

<sup>35</sup> Zerubavel, “Social Memories,” 290.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 289.

<sup>37</sup> Hendel, “Exodus and the Poetics of Memory,” 88.

### 1.4.2. Cultural Memory is Reconstructed

Halbwachs noted that remembering the past is not as much ‘retrieving’ (*retrouver*) the past but is actually more about ‘reconstructing’ (*reconstruire*) the past.<sup>38</sup> The activity of memory, then, is not *static*, rather the “activity of memory in articulating the past is *dynamic*, unceasing, because it is wired into the ever-shifting present.”<sup>39</sup>

Take for example the memory of King David. In the Deuteronomistic history, he is presented in a paradoxical way as both the great King of Israel, slayer of giants, a chivalrous warrior (sparing the life of Saul when God himself delivered him into his hands) and the victorious general charmed by God’s presence; while conversely as a not-so-great-king, murderer, liar, adulterer, and even likely a traitor to Israel (fights with the Philistines against Saul).<sup>40</sup> Then take the memory of David as (re)constructed by the Chronicler where the moral tension between ‘David the man after God’s own heart’ and ‘David the not so godly man’ is unwrinkled by a memory of David that is, for all intents and purposes, deliberately amnesiac of those not-so-godly attributes.<sup>41</sup> Which is to say, the Chronicler found the less-flattering picture of David not useful for his current situation and audience. For the Chronicler(s), “The past is appropriated to *legitimize* particular sociopolitical goals and ideologies and to *mobilize* action in accord with these goals.”<sup>42</sup> The attitude toward kingship between the priestly chronicler and the

---

<sup>38</sup> See Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 40.

<sup>39</sup> Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 10. Italics mine.

<sup>40</sup> See Baruch Halpern’s *David’s Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2001).

<sup>41</sup> When the past does not serve the needs of the present, it slips away. Remembering is regulated by social rules of remembrance that communicate specifically what should be remembered and what can or must be forgotten. Mark S. Smith calls this ‘cultural amnesia,’ the purposeful forgetting of the (usually embarrassing, but certainly no longer relevant) past (See “Remembering God: Collective Memory in Israelite religion,” in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002): 640–644, 649–51).

<sup>42</sup> Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 11–12.

deuteronomist is different. Both remember the past, but that memory of the past is contextualized by the present. Memory “becomes a social fact as it is made and remade to serve changing societal interests and needs.”<sup>43</sup>

This is not to say that the history the Chronicler(s) describe is entirely fabricated. It is not fabricated at all, actually. The present ideological interests of a society still work with, at the very least, fragments of the past in order to construct their memories of the past. Each construction might be different from the others, since they are constructed focusing on different fragments from one another. Regardless of the differences, “the past supplies the materials and thus sets some limits and terms for its appropriation.”<sup>44</sup>

Consequently, tensions arise and struggles emerge over how the past ought to be described and interpreted. Since individuals are part of numerous groups and sub-groups and because some of these sub-groups are inevitably in conflict with each other, cultural memories are always numerous, varied, and in potential conflict.<sup>45</sup> Thus “commemorative efforts,” such as

---

<sup>43</sup> Barry Schwartz, “Memory as a Cultural System: Abraham Lincoln in World War II” in *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, No. 5 (Oct., 1996): 909.

<sup>44</sup> Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 14. Within this aspect of cultural memory, some have theorized what has been dubbed ‘the invention of tradition.’ That since the past is constructed, and commemorated through rituals and narrative fiction (which at best could be described as ‘historical fiction’), these theorists, like minimalists, see all versions and representations of the past as invention. Obviously there is not a simple line one crosses over to being one, in a way it is a spectrum that all historians find themselves on. Some lean more to the notion that the past is invented than others would. Certainly some aspects of how the past is remembered are fabricated.

However, others have argued that these ‘minimalists’, who believe that all traditions of the past are invented, “have difficulties delivering a satisfactory account of how a society establishes the *continuity* indispensable to its cohesion and survival as it traverses time.” (Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 14) Or as Yael Zerubavel notes: “invented tradition can be successful only as long as it passes as tradition.” (Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1995), 232.) In memories, there is a presence of the past. As Hendel says: “there are constraints on how far cultural memory can swerve from history.” (Hendel, “Cultural Memory,” 32.)

<sup>45</sup> Hendel, “Cultural Memory,” 30.

narratives and calendars, “are often punctuated as much by conflict as consensus.”<sup>46</sup> Therefore, these conflicts produce *countermemories*.

### 1.4.3. Countermemory: A Definition

A countermemory is a “deliberate recasting of memories of the past.”<sup>47</sup> The different representations of any particular figure between books (e.g. David in 1–2 Samuel and then 1 Chronicles) or within a book (Abraham or YHWH between the Priestly sources and non-Priestly sources), or the reason behind a command (e.g. the Sabbath command in Exodus is in memory of creation but in Deuteronomy it is in memory of the exodus from Egypt) may reflect either a temporal or regional difference or a conscious opposition to prior representations.<sup>48</sup>

Hendel posits that the purpose of constructing a countermemory is “to refute, *revise*, and replace a previously compelling or accepted memory of the past.”<sup>49</sup> The emphasis for this thesis

---

<sup>46</sup> Kirk, “Social and Cultural Memory,” 8. Consider Halbwachs’ words: “just as people are members of many different groups at the same time, so the memory of the same fact can be placed within many frameworks, which result from distant collective memories.” (*On Collective Memory*, 52). This was first read in Hendel, “Cultural Memory,” 30. See also, Zerubavel, “Social memories,” 295, where he states: “[t]he most common mnemonic battles are the ones fought over the ‘correct’ way to interpret the past.” See also Mark S. Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 164; where he states that Cultural memory focuses on how cultures generate and maintain representations of the past; where “differing versions of the past involve struggles in the present.” Smith continues: “In other words, what is present often affects the understanding of the past; versions of the past may exercise power over the present. Collective memory commonly shows cultural and societal shifts over time, especially with changes in the institutions and other sites in society that produce and transmit representations of the past.”

<sup>47</sup> Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, 41. Hendel is drawing on both Michael Foucault and Amos Funkenstein. The term was used by Foucault (see *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. D.F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 160), where he describes his own writing as a counter-memory against the traditional historiography. And he purposefully draws on the new historicists’ use of counterhistory as described by Amos Funkenstein in *Perceptions of Jewish History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 36. This connection can be further identified in Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt’s *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 52. See also n.43 on pg. 134 in Hendel’s *Remembering Abraham*.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid. The source critical layers in the Pentateuch are a prime example of such opposition to representations. Whether they were purposefully oppositional is sort of beside the point, since once they are placed in a writing together, they naturally become counter to one another unless the audience strategically fuses them.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 31. Italics mine. Hendel uses Deuteronomy as a prime example of a biblical countermemory, since, as Hendel puts it, it is “designed to retell a major chapter of the past with a deliberately revisionist agenda.”

as far as Gen 1 is concerned with Gen 2 is on the *revise* portion of Hendel's purpose.<sup>50</sup> However, Gen 1 can be seen as refuting and replacing many aspects of the ANE memories of creation particularly in *Enuma Elish*.

### 1.5. Myth, Mythmaking and Memory

The more obvious approach to examining Gen 1 would be from the perspective of myth or mythmaking. However, cultural memory allows the same aspects that myth and mythmaking bring to the table, plus more as this thesis also looks into Gen 1's literary rhetoric and into the group who added it. So what this section seeks to do is to explain what myth is, what mythmaking is, and then how those aspects of Gen 1 are incorporated by cultural memory.

#### 1.5.1. Myth: A Definition

An overarching definition of myth is difficult to produce. It seems there is a different one for each discipline as well as for each sub-discipline therein. Andrew Von Hendy has demonstrated that contemporary definitions of myth have tried to understand the relationship between science and religion.<sup>51</sup> Smith summarizes Von Hendy's survey of modern definitions of myth, saying, "we should be skeptical about discovering some relatively neutral definition of

---

<sup>50</sup> Within the HB, it may be an overstatement to claim that differing memories of the past are meant to refute or replace previous ones. The fact of their existence side-by-side would suggest that for the redactors they were seen as complimentary.

<sup>51</sup> Mark S. Smith, "Is Genesis 1 a Creation Myth?: Yes and No," in *Myth and Scripture: Contemporary Perspectives on Religion, Language, and Imagination*, ed. Dexter E. Callender (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 73. See also Andrew Von Hendy, *The Modern Construction of Myth* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002).

myth beyond the basic (and arguably banal) definition of myth as religious stories.”<sup>52</sup> However, with this basic definition not only is Gen 1 a myth but the majority of all religious writings are myth; since they are typically about the supernatural realm.

A good example of how myth tends to defy simple definitions comes from the basic assumption that myths are stories meant to explain the origins of a tradition or a people, and these are, subsequently, set in the past.<sup>53</sup> This was a main point for Mircea Eliade who argued that the purpose of myth is to evoke or reestablish “the creative era.”<sup>54</sup> Now this assumption is not without reason. Many myths are indeed set in the past (e.g. *Enuma Elish*, which begins describing a time *before* the gods had names). However, many myths are merely assumed by readers to be set in the past.<sup>55</sup> For example, Smith notes that the Ugaritic *Baal Myth* is often assumed to be set in primordial times. However, this is not indicated in the text, and so this myth could be describing a present (or future) reality for the audience, and not the salient past.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, Robert Segal posits that myths can be set in the past, present, and even the future.<sup>57</sup> An example of this is the biblical apocalyptic works of Daniel 7–12 and the book of Revelation, where the future is the setting but the imagery and narrative plot points are quite mythic.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Smith, “Is Genesis 1 a Myth?,” 74. Smith adds that Von Hendy’s work also portrays another reality about defining myth, namely that each definition reflects the concerns of the particular field, “It is not uncommon that scholars define myth in the image and likeness of their own disciplines.”

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 77.

<sup>54</sup> Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths*, (London: Penguin, 1974), 63–64; as quoted in Smith, “Is Genesis 1 a Myth?,” 77.

<sup>55</sup> Perhaps the author left it intentionally ambiguous at times, so as to allow the audience control to make it what they will.

<sup>56</sup> Smith, “Is Genesis 1 a Myth?,” 77.

<sup>57</sup> Robert A. Segal, *Myth: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 5. Smith quotes this as well in “Is Genesis 1 a Myth?,” 77.

<sup>58</sup> Smith, “Is Genesis 1 a Myth?,” 77. Smith observes that both biblical and non-biblical apocalyptic literature “ostensibly predict future events, yet they arguably qualify as myth, especially given their mythic imagery.”

Despite all this, for the purposes of Gen 1 and this thesis, myth is defined as a religious story involving the divine realm, which is meant to both explain the origin of a tradition, practice, or thing, so it is set in the distant past, and to legitimize the tradition, practice, or thing since it is placed in the realm of the divine. This is not a universal definition of myth, but a specific one for the purposes of this study. Because of this definition, there are two other aspects of myth then that need to be discussed: narrative and aetiology.

Myths, like Gen 1, are narratives about the divine set in the (distant) past so as to explain the author's own present. They "explore reality" and "narrate it," presenting causes (*aetia*) that "evoke the basic realities that humans face."<sup>59</sup> Aetiology is, in many respects, the *telos* of myth; and narrative is a means to this end.<sup>60</sup> Alan Dundee defines myth as a "sacred narrative of how the world or mankind came to be in their present form."<sup>61</sup> Anthropologist Paul Radin adds that "Myths deal with metaphysical topics of all kinds, such as the ultimate conceptions of reality."<sup>62</sup> Smith adds: "myths map reality in the form of narrative sequence."<sup>63</sup> Myth is, like memory, a version of the past deeply influenced by the present.

### 1.5.2. Myth and History

For the most part, *myth* is a classification that functions as an aid to modern scholarship, allowing particular narratives with content of a more fanciful nature to be distinguished from

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 87.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid. See also Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths*, 53, 59.

<sup>61</sup> See Alan Dundee, "Madness in Method Plus a Plea for Projective Inversion in Myth," in *Myth and Method*, ed. Laurie L. Patton and Wendy Denier (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996), 148. First found in Smith, "Is Genesis 1 a Myth?," 77.

<sup>62</sup> Smith, "Is Genesis 1 a Myth?," 87–88, n. 36.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.



content with a more plausible nature — to separate fact from fiction.<sup>64</sup> But this notion reflects modern sensibilities more so than it does ancient ones.<sup>65</sup> Myths concerning the primordial past were likely taken as true; they were taken to be descriptions of the past just as any other type of description of the past would be.<sup>66</sup> In other words, the line between myth and history for the author of Gen 1 was, at the very least, muddy if not translucent.

Fishbane provides an example of this in Psalm 77 and argues that the mythic images of the divine hand and sea monsters “partake of a mythic realism whose facticity the speaker hardly doubts.”<sup>67</sup> Fishbane elaborates, “[t]his is, in fact, a core element of the psalmist’s hope that God will re-actualize His ancient acts of victory for him in the present ... the victory myth is not

---

<sup>64</sup> Smith, “Is Genesis 1 a Myth?,” 73. See also Gregory Nagy, “Can Myth be Saved?” in *Myth: A New Symposium*, ed. G. Schrempp and W. Hansen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 240–48, 241. Nagy describes a semantic shift where *mythos* came to mean untrue as it became opposed to *alētheia* (“true”).

<sup>65</sup> Obviously ancient historians, like Herodotus, engaged in the methodological underpinnings of dealing with what it means to write a *history* or an account of what happened. However, like Virgil’s *Aeneid*, mythic tropes were mixed in yet the entire work as a whole is deemed to be a history. Perhaps the ancient people believed them to be factual. At the very least, Virgil believed it important and likely persuasive to include mythic portions so as to legitimize Augustus’ power. Though this is a guess, it is a logical one, what mythic portions exist were likely intended to carry a useful meaning.

<sup>66</sup> Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Myth and Rabbinic Mythmaking* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 58–59. “Hence whereas myths derive their effect precisely because they narrate something ancient and believed true, these mythic metaphors open up an ironic space between the image (the dragon or the sea) and its vehicle (the person or the nation) and are effective precisely because they are perceived to be both true and not true at the same time.”

<sup>67</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical Myth*, 41.

simply an event long ago, *in illo tempore*, but a reality that can and may be realized in the present.”<sup>68</sup>

Consequently, myth is a story of origins that is both narratological and aetiological. It is also historical in the sense that the audience, and probably the author as well, believed that the events did transpire. That is to say, the modern distinction between history and myth is not an ancient one.

### 1.5.3. Mythmaking

Mythmaking, simply put, is the investigation of *how* myths are made and *why* they are made. What did the author of Gen 1 intend to achieve with his particular rendition of creation? And did he believe it to be an actual representation of the past? Fishbane captures the gravity of this form of inquiry into myths:

The dramatic depiction of God's deeds and emotions in terms of a stark and concrete mythic realism raises the question of how the biblical authors themselves understood these accounts. The answer is not an easy one, but it is of very great importance, since whether certain images are to be construed on the actual or on the figurative plane has

---

<sup>68</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical Myth*, 41, 47. There is a fascinating discussion around whether Gen 1 is a historicizing of the myth of creation or whether it remains a myth. This is based on the observation that Gen 1 is not poetry, as most myths are, but rather prose. Dennis Pardee notes that Ugaritic prose is “an extremely rare feature of texts of a mythological nature” (see *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit* (ed. by Theodore J. Lewis. SBLWAW 10. Atlanta: SBL, 2002), 171.). But prose is not completely omitted from ANE myths. For example, Andrew R. George observed that tablet XII of the Gilgamesh Epic is believed to be prose, which was added by an editor to bring the Akkadian closer to the known Sumerian version. See Andrew George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* 2 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 1:47–54). Furthermore, Smith points out that poetry seems to function in the HB differently than it does in ANE myths. Regarding the poems of Judges 5 and Exodus 15, Smith observes: “it seems that they function in context to link the older world of the events being described. These poems are written in an older Hebrew relative to their contexts, composed in prose, which are linguistically closer to the world of the human audience of the narrative. As a result, the older poetic pieces evoke that distant past of the purported events, and they are linked to—and interpreted for—the world of the audience’s present via the prose accounts” (Smith, “Is Gen 1 a Myth?,” 93, n.46). He concludes in this same footnote: “So poetry in the longer narratives of the [HB] may have a very different function than the long poetic myths of the ancient Near East.”

considerable bearing on the way we may now penetrate the living theology and mentality of ancient Israel.<sup>69</sup>

Myths are not created *ex nihilo*. The process of making myths is a “feature of cultural tradition—not simply some archaic component of consciousness or creativity.”<sup>70</sup> A myth-maker must work with the myths that already exist and are already accepted in order for the myth to find legitimization, even with a new audience. There are parameters and limits to a myth, both present ones as it has to correlate to the author’s own present experiences and past ones as it must correspond to already established norms and therefore accepted myths. Fishbane explains:

Myths arise and develop within spheres of culture, and attest to this repeatedly, through what is received, revised, or rejected. The ‘work’ of myth, so-called, is thus as much a matter of deliberation as of spontaneous intuition; as much a product of fixed genres and phraseology as of innovative combinations or mixed forms (the so-called *Mischgattungen*).<sup>71</sup>

Myths build atop one another. As Smith observes: “texts may represent narrative agglomerations drawing on other cultural material as well as diverse textual traditions and texts.”<sup>72</sup> Mythmaking, then, is an inter-cultural process of adaptive renewal.

Additionally, this process of acculturation must be extended from an inter-cultural aspect to an inner-cultural one. For example, within ancient Israel there are multiple (sub)cultures. For instance, this can be exemplified by the multiple sources involved in the Pentateuch’s

---

<sup>69</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical Myth*, 81.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>72</sup> Smith, “Is Genesis 1 a Myth?,” 85. He adds, “Indeed, sometimes agglomeration with various sorts of material even involved translation and migration, whether from Sumerian into Akkadian, or West Semitic into Hurrian-Hittite (Elkunirsa [COS 1.149]) and Egyptian (for example, the Legend of Astarte and the Tribute of the Sea [COS 1.35]), or Akkadian into Hebrew (Gen 6–8). This textual flexibility may represent one hallmark of ancient Near Eastern myth.”

composition (e.g. Priestly and non-Priestly). The mythic *topos* in one source or traditional stratum may need to be changed extensively to fit the other's different context or perspective.

Mythic topics that reappear in subsequent traditions, whether Sumerian into Akkadian or Akkadian into Hebrew, "should be assumed to have the same literary effect or value (whether literal or figurative) in all its various occurrences unless there is marked reason for thinking otherwise."<sup>73</sup> Although, "every new occurrence of a mythic topic (in its new context) produces a new myth overall, insofar as the concerns and purposes of the latter varies."<sup>74</sup>

#### 1.5.4. Myth and Memory

Myth then functions as a memory of the past just as any other type of memory of the past does. Myths are essentially cultural memories. They function in the minds of the audience just as any other version of the past does. As Assmann notes:

If "We Are What We Remember," we are the stories that we are able to tell about ourselves ... The same concept of a narrative organization of memory and self-construction applies to the collective level. Here, the stories are called "myths." They are the stories which a group, a society, or a culture lives by. Myths in the sense of traditional narratives play a very important role in the formation of ethnic identities.<sup>75</sup>

Cultural memories are also constructed, leading to differing versions of the past just as there are differing myths. The notion of calling Gen 1 a counter-memory could just as easily be changed to counter-myth. The process of myth making demonstrates that myths are constructed and reconstructed very similarly to how memories are constructed and reconstructed.

---

<sup>73</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical Myth*, 17. This is called the *principle of parsimony*.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 18. For example, Gen 1 is both a new myth, as it is composed and read during a particular context, and it is a borrowed myth, as it pulls from multiple preexisting and already well-established myths (the more established the myth one pulls from the more legitimate their new myth can be viewed).

<sup>75</sup> Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian*, 14–15.

Additionally, myths, like cultural memories, are formative for group identity. Anthony Smith explains:

In many ways the *sine qua non* of ethnicity, the key elements of that complex of meanings which underlie the sense of ethnic ties and sentiments for the participants, myths of origins and descent provide the means of collective location in the world and the charter of the community which explains its origins, growth and destiny.<sup>76</sup>

As Anthony Smith concludes: “*Ethnie* are nothing if not historical communities built up on shared memories.”<sup>77</sup> Myths are the very definition of a shared memory of the past, usually in a storied form whether it be in prose or poetry.

### 1.6. Conclusion

It is no mistake that the Palestinian Targums call the Book of Genesis “the book of memories.”<sup>78</sup> These memories are *enframed* textually, communicated as a narrative (myth) to provide every Israelite man, woman, and child a memory that can be accessed collectively. Approaching the first chapter of this ‘book of memories’ as a cultural memory, then, allows attention to be given to its literary, mythic, and socioreligious features simultaneously. This is an interdisciplinary and multifaceted examination of Gen 1, therefore it requires an approach that is equal to the task. As such, the following chapters will all focus on three particular aspects of cultural memory: (1) Gen 1 as a countermemory; (2) the poetics of memory (or how Gen 1’s

---

<sup>76</sup> Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Malden, MA.: Blackwell Publishing, 1988), 24.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>78</sup> See Exodus 12:42 in Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan. I was made aware of this from reading: Hendel, “Cultural Memory,” 29. In Targum Neofiti it reads בספר דוצרניא. It is also fascinating little midrash on creation here in Exodus 12:42, where the creation story is connected with the passover.

countermemory is communicated to its audience); and (3) the formative power of a countermemory to redefine the identity of the group.

First, since memories are constructed, approaching Gen 1 as a countermemory allows for engaging what Yariah Amit sees as “one of the most striking characteristics of biblical literature,” which is “its polemical tendency.”<sup>79</sup> There are competing memories of events (e.g. creation) within the HB as well as between the HB and other ANE memories (e.g. *Enuma Elish* and Gen 1). Cultural memory assumes that each memory is reconstructed for a purpose, a purpose that is based heavily on current needs and concerns. For this reason, the next chapter in demonstrating what Gen 1’s memory communicates, also demonstrates that it communicates a different version of creation than what is typical among ANE creation myths. The third chapter compares Gen 1 with Gen 2, showing that Gen 1 was deliberately added and that it was added in order to revise and update Gen 2. The fourth chapter then compares Gen 1’s memory with other creation myths outside the Pentateuch. Altogether, this all demonstrates that Gen 1 was added as a countermemory in order to shift the focus of creation away from sacred space to sacred time.

Second, the literary and rhetorical aspect of Gen 1’s countermemory will be focused on; what Hendel calls ‘the poetics of memory.’ In describing its primary function, he says that it “focuses on the literary forms and strategies whereby the text transforms the remembered past into narrative discourse.”<sup>80</sup> The following chapter begins this process by looking at the overall communication of Gen 1 on its own with a close reading of its text. The poetics of Gen 1’s

---

<sup>79</sup> Yairah Amit. *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, trans. by Jonathan Chipman (Leiden: Brill, 2000), she goes on to write, “An understanding of the Bible as representing a culture in the process of formation and struggling over its new and unique identity will help to clarify the flowering of polemics, expressing a variety of ideological struggles which were gradually transformed into a force shaping the everyday life of the Israelite (pg. 3).”

<sup>80</sup> Hendel, “Cultural Memory,” 33.

countermemory is further examined when Gen 1 is compared with other myths, beginning in chapter 3 with Gen 2's Garden of Eden myth, and furthermore in chapter 4 with other biblical creation myths like Psalms 74 and 104, as well as non-biblical myths such as *Enuma Elish*. This comparative reading will reveal how the countermemory was communicated and ultimately persuasive enough to shift the socioreligious focus of exilic Israel from space to time.

Third, cultural memory pays close attention to the group that produced the memory. Shared memories of the past influence the group's collective character, hopes and aspirations, and they are influenced by the group's concerns and needs. Consequently, the version of the past that a group goes through the trouble to produce, especially the ones preserved in textual form, reveals a great deal about who they are and who they wish to be. This presents a helpful window for looking into the likeliest (pentateuchal) group who composed and added Gen 1. The fifth and sixth chapters will explore this question in more detail by reassessing the source critical discussion of Gen 1 based on the concerns expressed in Gen 1 (e.g. indirectly dietary concerns and more directly calendar and Sabbath concerns) and comparing that with P and H in order to see which of the two groups has the same concerns and interests. In short, which group would have been more motivated to add Gen 1.

CHAPTER 2:  
GENESIS 1 IS FOCUSED ON TIME:  
A CLOSE READING OF GENESIS 1'S STRUCTURE

**2.1. Introduction**

Just like the nature of the creation it describes, Gen 1 is well-organized and strategically communicated. Purpose drips from every word. As Gerhard von Rad notes: “Nothing is here by chance.”<sup>81</sup> William Brown similarly notes that “[n]o other text is so densely structured in the Hebrew Bible; every word seems to bear the mark of extensive reflection.”<sup>82</sup> As Mark Smith discerns, “No other creation account in the Bible, or more broadly speaking, in the ancient Near East, uses this structure.”<sup>83</sup> It is unique; and that uniqueness is not coincidental, it is intentional. Thus, a close-reading of Gen 1 will be done. The goal of this close-reading is to learn what Gen 1, as a whole, is communicating via its overall structure.

Since the next two chapters compare the memory in Gen 1 with the memory from Gen 2 (chapter 3), as well as the memories from beyond the Pentateuch (chapter 4), this chapter's close reading of Gen 1 will provide the required background for understanding the next two chapters.

---

<sup>81</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 47.

<sup>82</sup> William P. Brown, *Structure, Role and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1–2:3* (SBLDS 132, Atlanta: SBL, 1992), 249.

<sup>83</sup> Mark S. Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 87.



## 2.2. Proposed Structures for Genesis 1

Many commentators understand the structure of Gen 1:1–2:3 as a parallel between days 1 and 3 and days 4 and 6; with day 7 sitting outside the parallel structure. Often the first three days are deemed to be about separating space and the subsequent three days about filling that space. This structure is based largely, if not entirely, on the primordial condition of the earth in Gen 1:2 being *תהו ובהו* (formless and void). For example, William P. Brown suggests that *תהו* (formless) is remedied by the first three days and *בהו* (empty) is filled by latter three days.<sup>84</sup>

Brown's basic structural schema for Gen 1 is followed in large part by both Nahum Sarna and Mark Smith. Though there are differences in what they propose, there is still a sense where days 1-3 correspond to days 4-6; which leaves the seventh day on its own. Here is the proposed structure by Nahum Sarna:

Group I: The Resource	Group II: The Utilizer
Day 1: Light	Day 4: The luminaries
Day 2: Sky, leaving terrestrial waters	Day 5: Fish and fowl
Day 3: Dry land	Day 6: Land creatures
Vegetation	Humankind
(lowest form of organic life)	(Highest form of organic life) <sup>85</sup>

And Mark Smith:

Day 1: Light	Day 4: bodies of light
Day 2: heavens and water	Day 5: creatures of heaven and water
Day 3: land and vegetation	Day 6: land creatures, vegetation, and humanity.
Day 7: God resting from work <sup>86</sup>	

<sup>84</sup> William P. Brown, *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1999), 37–39. Gordon J. Wenham agrees with this proposal as well, making little to no alterations. See, Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15: WBC* (Nashville, TN: Word, 1987), 6.

<sup>85</sup> Nahum Sarna, *Genesis: The JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1989), 4.

<sup>86</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 89.

Though this parallel form of structuring Gen 1 is common, the notion of the days being parallel to one another is not quite accurate. For example, the lights which were summoned on day four were placed in the heavens on that same day, but the heavens were named on day two, not day one as one would expect if they are to be parallel to one another. Additionally, the creatures of the water on day five are supposed to be in parallel to day two, but the waters are not named “seas” (ימים) until day three.

### **2.3. Assumptions from Proposed Structures**

In addition to the issue of the days not being in parallel, there are three other presumptions at work. Though Brown’s structure for Gen 1 is shared by Sarna and Smith, his structure is the main focus here. First, there is Brown’s view that Gen 1’s structure relies on the two terms תהו and בהו referring to two distinct primordial conditions (i.e. one part formlessness and the other part emptiness). Second and relatedly, Brown’s view relies on תהו and בהו being the only description of the primordial condition of the earth. And third, Brown’s structure for Gen 1 relies on the seventh-day being somehow outside the structure and unconnected to the previous six days.

#### **2.3.1. Assumption One: תהו and בהו Refers to Two Distinct Primordial Conditions**

The first assumption misses the possibility that the two terms refer to only one primordial condition of the earth, not two. Jack M. Sasson calls the two terms “a farrago, wherein two

usually alliterative words combine to give a meaning other than their constituent parts.”<sup>87</sup> In this way, even though the two terms have different meanings from one another, when they are used together their meanings combine into one. Like, for instance, the words *hodgepodge* or *willy-nilly*.

To demonstrate this alternative possibility, the two terms will be explored further. Beginning with *בהו*, its frequency throughout the HB is seldom.<sup>88</sup> It only appears three times in the HB and every time it appears with *תהו* (Gen 1:2; Isa 34:11; and Jer 4:23). This makes its meaning quite difficult to fix.<sup>89</sup>

The term *תהו*, on the other hand, appears frequently in comparison, most often in the sixth-century CE work of Second Isaiah (40–55). In Second Isaiah, *תהו* is used to connote ‘emptiness’ of various things (e.g. of idols). In this way, the term is used to refer to the uselessness or powerlessness of a thing or person. For example, Isa 45:18 claims that God did not create the earth to be *תהו* for humanity, rather the earth was created to be habitable for humans.<sup>90</sup>

In many other passages, *תהו* connotes desolate places. For example, in Isa 24:10 the term is used to describe a destroyed city. In Deut 32:10, the term is used in parallel with *מדבר*

---

<sup>87</sup> Jack Sasson, “Time ... to Begin,” in *‘Sha’arei Talmon’: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. by M. Fishbane and E. Tov (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 183–94, esp. 188.

<sup>88</sup> Only appears three times and every time it is with *תהו*: Gen 1:2; Isa 34:11; and Jer 4:23. In Isa 34:11, *בהו* is translated by the NRSV as “chaos.” Moreover, in Jer 4:23, the two terms appear together (*תהו ובהו*) like they do in Gen 1:2, yet the NRSV translates it as “waste and void.”

<sup>89</sup> In Isa 34:11, *בהו* is translated by the NRSV as “chaos.” Moreover, in Jer 4:23, the two terms appear together (*תהו ובהו*) like they do here in Gen 1:2, yet the NRSV translates it as “waste and void.”

<sup>90</sup> See Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 49–59. See also in Isa 45:19, where the very next verse equates *תהו* with “the land of darkness” and equates both with that which is apart from God. Another sixth-century CE text, Job, uses *תהו* similarly. In Job 26:7 it refers to emptiness or desolation, the NJPS translation renders the term “chaos” like how the NRSV renders *בהו* in Isa 34:11.

(wilderness). The two terms are used together only two other times in the HB. First, Isa 34:11 uses the two terms in parallel lines, together they emphatically describe a wasteland. And second, Jer 4:23 employs the two terms the same way Gen 1 does.

Therefore, it is just as possible that the two terms in Gen 1:2 are either a farrago, where they are meant to combine together into one meaning, or, since *בהו* never occurs independently in the HB from *תהו*, it is unlikely that it would carry a meaning distinct from *תהו*. Either way, there is reason enough to view *תהו ובהו* as communicating one aspect of the earth's primordial state. Together, then, these two terms connote the inhospitality and uselessness of the earth in an emphatic way. In other words, together *תהו* and *בהו* depict the emptiness of living things and the earth's inability to foster that life.<sup>91</sup>

### 2.3.2. Assumption Two: *תהו* and *בהו* is the Only Primordial Condition in Need of Remedy

The second assumption is that Brown's proposed structure for Gen 1 only remedies the primordial condition(s) of the earth being *תהו ובהו*. Sarna and Smith follow this as well since they, along with Brown, do not mention the other primordial conditions of the earth; which are the *תהום/מים* (waters or the deep) and the *חשך* (darkness), both of which are said to be covering the face of the earth. It is significant that these two neglected preexisting entities are the very ones

---

<sup>91</sup> Though in the context of Gen 1 it is not a literal emptiness since the earth is filled with water and darkness. Perhaps this utter emptiness refers to something a little bit more symbolic. In my opinion, Jer 4:23 may have been the source the author of Gen 1 used (the beginning of Jeremiah is poetry and taken to be older than the rest of the book of Jeremiah). Thus, the symbolic meaning of *תהו ובהו* in Gen 1:2 is the Babylonian destruction of the Jerusalem Temple and the subsequent exile of the people to Babylon. Perhaps by employing the terms here in Gen 1, the author hoped to convey the terms in a more hopeful aspect compared to their use in Jer 4:23. In other words, where Jeremiah used them to predict the doom and gloom of the *coming* destruction of Jerusalem, the author in Gen 1 uses them to predict the coming reversal of the current state of affairs – a return from exile. Thus, through the week of creation those primordial conditions prior to creation are being reversed. See Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 49–59.

named in v. 5 and 10.<sup>92</sup> This suggests that the author had these other primordial entities from Gen 1:2 in mind. For example, חשך is named לילה (night) on the first day (1:5) and the primordial waters (מים) are separated<sup>93</sup> on the second day by the רקיע, which is named שמים, and then on the third day, those waters (below) are gathered together and named ימים (seas). The primordial conditions of darkness and water covering the earth require remedy just as much as the condition of תהו ובהו.

Thus, a structure of Gen 1 must deal with all three primordial conditions of the earth. Such a structure will be proposed momentarily. But first, the third assumption needs to be discussed.

### 2.3.3. Assumption 3: Seventh Day is Unconnected to the Previous Six Days

The third assumption is that the seventh-day is outside the basic structural schema of Gen 1. Put another way, in the above structures posited by Brown, Sarna, and Smith, the seventh day is isolated in a state of ongoing-calm. Based on the significance that Gen 1 affords the seventh day, would they simply just tack it on to the end?

The significance afforded to the seventh day can be shown with three observations. First, the seventh day is the only day that is sanctified (made holy). Second, the seventh day is further distinguished by there being no refrain of evening and morning, which all previous six days have. And third, the seventh day, not the sixth day, is positioned as the week's ultimate

---

<sup>92</sup> Thanks to Craig Broyles for pointing this out to me.

<sup>93</sup> It is interesting to note that the waters above the dome (רקיע) are not named. Also, the waters that are not gathered below are also not named. These waters below are likely still the תהום or the deep. Thus, the threat of the reversal of creation is always a present-day danger. This also indicates that the author of Gen 1 was aware of the flood narrative, where such a reversal of creation happens. Narratively then, these waters above and the deep below (if it is indeed the deep and not just waters below) are not conquered, so to speak, until the conclusion of the flood narrative with the promise to never again flood the earth.

culmination. Since Gen 1 presents the seventh day as the most significant and unique day, a structure for Gen 1 ought to regard this facet of Gen 1's structure.

Granted, the aforementioned structures with the seventh day placed out on its own does not, necessarily, lessen its importance. Sarna and Smith are likely not attempting to lessen the importance Gen 1 gives the seventh-day. It could be stated that by being left out in a state of ongoing calm, the seventh day is communicated as never really ceasing, at least a recurring perpetual seven-day cycle. This has the rhetorical effect of subtlety implying that God's rest on the seventh day is an everlasting institution, one with no end. It is no mistake that the priestly Sabbath command in Ex 31:17<sup>94</sup> makes it clear that the Sabbath is a sign forever (אֶת לְעֹלָם) between YHWH and the people of Israel. The interpretive theological reasoning for presuming that the Sabbath is an institution that is an everlasting sign, throughout Israel's generations (Ex 31:13), and an everlasting covenant (v. 16), likely stems from Gen 1 and its seventh-day ongoing calm.

However, the seventh day loses no significance by being pulled into the structural whole of Gen 1 either; neither does it lose its rhetorical expression of an unending seventh day. Leaving it disconnected from the other six days is based on the aforementioned assumptions that תָּהוּ וּבְהוּ is the key to understanding the structure of Gen 1. However, as just discussed, it can be counted as one among three primordial conditions of the earth that require remedy.

So how, then, is the seventh day connected to the other six days? In short, the answer is time. Days 1, 4 and 7 are all connected with one another as they deal with the concept of time. But they are also connected in that they all relate to the primordial condition of darkness. For

---

<sup>94</sup> I will argue in chapter 5 that Exod 31:17 is H, not P.

example, day 1 introduces light (אור) which is used to separate light from darkness. Then on the fourth day there are luminaries set in the heavens to give light on the earth, even the lesser light is given dominion over the night. Taken together, it is possible that darkness is slowly being brought to heel. Then on the seventh day, there is no mention of evening and then morning. There is no mention of a period of darkness. Thus, it could be said that the seventh day is meant by the author (or redactor) of Gen 1 to communicate the Seventh Day's triumph over darkness. This may sound a little as an overreach, but this does explain why the seventh day has no refrain: ויהי ערב ויהי בקר. It also can explain what specifically the different sub-structure of the seventh day communicated to its audience by being different from the other previous six days; and that is, the Seventh Day overcomes darkness and all that darkness represents.

## 2.4. Genesis 1's Focus on Time

The focus on time is embedded throughout Gen 1. It bookends the structure of the myth with the first and seventh days, and it sits right in its very heart (centre) on the fourth day.

### 2.4.1. Day One

Beginning with the first day, Elohim summons, “יהי אור” (“let there be light”). The darkness (חשך) is separated from the light (אור). Then this darkness is named *night* (לילה) and the light is named *day* (יום). These events are familiar to everyone acquainted with the story of Gen 1; however the function of all this can be missed. The result of summoning light, its separation with darkness, and the subsequent nomenclature of the distinguished parts, is the possibility of

measuring time. That is, the means to distinguish time. It is no wonder that after these activities, there was evening and there was morning, one day. Time is now measurable.<sup>95</sup>

Additionally, this refrain—“there was evening, there was morning”—should not be overlooked. Genesis 1 suggests that a day literally lasts as long as there is light. It is not an empirical unit of time (i.e. hours), as long as there is light there is day. Though this is definitely true for v. 1:5a, it may seem like it is not so for v. 1:5b where *יום* seems to include the evening/night as well. However, the expression *ויהי ערב ויהי בקר* could be read as describing a period of darkness.<sup>96</sup> From evening (*ערב*) to morning (*בקר*) is, after all, a period of darkness. For example, both P and the HC can be seen as defining a passage of time that includes daylight going from evening to evening.

#### Exodus 12:18 (P)

In the first month, from the evening of the fourteenth day until the evening of the twenty-first day, you shall eat unleavened bread (NRSV).

בראשן בארבעה עשר יום לחדש בערב תאכלו מצת עד יום האחד ועשרים לחדש בערב:

#### Leviticus 23:32 (HC)

It shall be to you a sabbath of complete rest, and you shall deny yourselves; on the ninth day of the month at evening, from evening to evening you shall keep your sabbath (NRSV).

שבת שבתון הוא לכם ועניתם את־נפשתיכם בתשעה לחדש בערב מערב עד־ערב תשבתו שבתכם:

<sup>95</sup> Jack Sasson observed that Elohim created time on day 1 and space on day two (see Sasson, “Time,” 191–93).

<sup>96</sup> This phrase only appears here in Gen 1, but the two terms *ערב* and *בקר* appear in Dan 8:14: *בקר עד ערב בקר* ויאמר אלי עד ערב בקר (And he said to him, “Until two-thousand and three-hundred evening/morning, the sanctuary will then be restored”).



Thus, it can be seen that priestly sources tend to speak of a solar-day, by that it is meant approximately a 24-hour period, as an evening through to the next evening. Moreover, Num 9:21 explains that the expression—from evening to morning—does not include daylight.

Sometimes the cloud would remain from evening until morning; and when the cloud lifted in the morning, they would set out, or if it continued for a day and a night, when the cloud lifted they would set out (NRSV)

ויש אשר־יהיה הענן מערב עד־בקר ונעלה הענן בבקר ונסעו או יומם ולילה ונעלה הענן ונסעו:

This demonstrates that the expression of a period of time from “evening” to “morning” is distinct from a day. Therefore, in Gen 1, when the expression ויהי ערב ויהי בקר is used, it can be read as referring to a period of darkness; a period that יום is not referring to.

Regardless, the care with which Gen 1 defines the duration of a day “reflects the importance of time and the measure of time which constitutes the theme of the first, fourth, and seventh days.”<sup>97</sup>

#### 2.4.2. Day Four

The purpose of why measuring time is significant is made plain on the fourth day, which happens to be the very centre of the myth structurally speaking. Elohim summons, “Let there be lights in the dome of the heavens to separate the day from the night; and let them be for signs (אֹתֹת) and for appointed-times (מוֹעֲדִים) and for days and years (Gen 1:14).” The fourth day demonstrates that all the luminaries in the heavens – the sun, moon, and stars – are there to indicate what time it is. They are, in a sense, the cosmic clock. Time, however, is not just arbitrary. It is not just a question of what hour of the day it is. It is a matter of knowing when

---

<sup>97</sup> Philippe Guillaume, *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18* (New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 38.

YHWH's appointed times (מועדים) are. When is Israel to observe the Passover festival? When is the Day of Atonement? The use of the term, מועד, provides a direct link to the priestly calendars in Num 28–29 and Lev 23.<sup>98</sup> The fourth day, then, is an aetiology for the priestly calendar. A legitimization that the appointed times are fixed by none other than YHWH himself.

As Philippe Guillaume observes, “The centrality of day four, thematically and structurally, is underlined by the luminaries which are granted the most elaborate discussion of their purpose, more so than humanity’s.”<sup>99</sup> Consider the fourth day’s structure based on the use of the preposition ל (“to” or “for”) plus (usually) the infinitive construct:<sup>100</sup>

- A to separate day and night (v. 14a)
- B to (indicate) signs, the appointed times, the days, and the years (v. 14b)
- C to give light on the earth (v. 15b)
- D to rule the day ... to rule the night (v. 16)
- C to give light on the earth (v. 17)
- D to rule the day and the night (v. 18a)
- A to separate the light and the darkness (v. 18b)

According to the structure on the fourth day, the only part that has no repeat is B. There are seven functions listed between vv. 14–18. The function of separating is listed twice (A), the function of giving light is listed twice (C), the function of ruling is listed twice (D); but the function of indicating the appointed times, the days, and the years (notice the absence of months) is uniquely only listed once (B).<sup>101</sup>

<sup>98</sup> A comparison between the two priestly calendars will be done in chapter 5. I argue that Gen 1:14 is more connected to Leviticus 23 than it is to Number 28–29.

<sup>99</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 38.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid. See also Walter Vogels, “The Cultic and Civil Calendars of the Fourth Day of Creation (Gen 1,14b),” in *SJOT 11* (1997): 172–73.

<sup>101</sup> Though this could also indicate the reverse, namely that because it is not emphasized it is not as important, it is the only part that is not repeated. Therefore, it stands out structurally.

There is also a distinction to be made between the light (אור) summoned on the first day and the lights (מאורה<sup>102</sup>) summoned on the fourth day. The light summoned on the first day is אור, which is a generic term for light.<sup>103</sup> Whereas the term מארה refers to a special light.<sup>104</sup> The term is exclusively used throughout the rest of the Pentateuch in reference to the sanctuary lamp in the Tabernacle.<sup>105</sup> Thus, the shift from the first day to the fourth is not that אור is light and מארה is the source or utilizer of light, as Sarna and Smith's structures imply, but rather an increase in weight and significance. The first day made time a measurable and distinguishable thing, now the fourth day reveals the significance of being able to measure time – the ability for everyone, not just the priesthood, to know the all-important מועדים יהוה, the appointed-times of YHWH (Leviticus 23:1).

#### 2.4.3. Day Seven

The myth now culminates with the Sabbath day, though not named as such.<sup>106</sup> This day, which does not end as if to indicate that the institution to which it is an aetiology for will also never end,<sup>107</sup> is not only blessed (ברך) but it is also sanctified (קדש). With this act of hallowing,

<sup>102</sup> The root exists in a few ways: מאורה/מארה/מאור/מאר. See HALOT.

<sup>103</sup> HALOT, vol. 1, pg. 24. Also, it may be worthy to note that אור is also the root for firelight or flame.

<sup>104</sup> HALOT, vol. 2, pg. 539. See and compare Gen 1:15 with Exodus 25:37: "You shall make the seven lamps for it; and the lamps shall be set up so as to give light (hifil of אור) on the space in front of it (NRSV)."

<sup>105</sup> Wenham, *Genesis 1–11*, 22. This is a limited search to just the boundaries of the Pentateuch. The term is used also in the Psalms and in Proverbs.

<sup>106</sup> Just as Elohim is not called YHWH yet, so too the author avoids revealing the name *Sabbath* until later in the narrative. See chapter 5 for more details on this. For now, the name *Sabbath* first appears, diachronically speaking, in Ex 16.

<sup>107</sup> It should be noted that the seventh day is called a "day," which in Gen 1 is defined as the same period of time as the previous six days. The narrative need not be read as saying that YHWH is still resting, instead by having the last day called the seventh-day, it is clear that the day is intended to have an end. The rhetorical effect of not stating evening and morning is to (1) distinguish it further from the previous six days, and (2) to infer that this practice of Sabbath-keeping is for all of time. See Ex 31:12–17, esp. v. 17.

Elohim elevates this day above all previous six days that came before it. It is here that Elohim finishes (כלה) the heavens and the earth (all his work).<sup>108</sup> It is no accident that the very first thing to be sanctified comes on the very last day of the week. Time is the first thing in the Pentateuch, in the entire HB, to be sanctified; not a people, not a temple, nor a city, but time.<sup>109</sup> In fact, the priestly passage, Ex 31:13–14, presumes that Israel’s holiness stems from their obedience to keep the seventh day holy. With v. 17, and presuming one can take Ex 31:12–17 as a whole source (critically speaking) this theological concept of Israel’s holiness coming from Sabbath-keeping finds its legitimization in Gen 2:2–3.

As an aetiology for Sabbath-keeping, the seventh-day is integrally linked to the fourth day. The calendar for the appointed-times in Lev 23 relies heavily on the Sabbath for measuring time (see Lev 23:11 and 15). Consequently, the appointed times can be known by the people of Israel if they keep YHWH’s Sabbaths. As Guillaume summarizes: “The first, middle, and last days of the heptameron deal specifically with the creation of time units. Hence, Gen 1 is a sabbatogony more than a cosmogony.”<sup>110</sup>

Therefore, time is significant to the structure of Gen 1. These three days that focus on time can also be seen as building in anticipation, leading up to the final seventh day. Throughout the myth, the refrain, “there was evening and there was morning,” propels the myth forward. Like a rhythmic chorus, it repeats, again and again, that time is moving toward something

---

<sup>108</sup> This is, of course, assuming that the LXX’s rendition of the work being finished on the sixth day is a later interpretive harmonization, and it does not come from an earlier *vorlage*.

<sup>109</sup> The seventh and fourth days are connected via Ex 31:17 where the Sabbath, the seventh day rest, is called an everlasting sign (אֵימָת). One of the functions of the luminaries is to be for signs (אֵימָת).

<sup>110</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 42.

special.<sup>111</sup> And then ... rest. There is no “and then there was evening and there was morning.”

That is, there is no darkness since Gen 1 suggests that a day lasts as long as there is light.

Evening never comes. Thus, by arriving on the seventh day, one is brought into a state of calm.

Rhetorically, this may symbolize the movement one goes through as one approaches a sacred space, like Ezekiel’s vision of the future grand Temple.<sup>112</sup>

With time as a focus, the seventh day is brought into the structural whole. And moreover, it plays a vital role in it. Next a structure from Peter Weimar that focuses more so on time will be presented and then built on as this thesis presents its view of Gen 1’s structure.

## 2.5. A Proposed Structure that is Focused on Time

Peter Weimar proposes an alternative structure as compared with the more common ones represented by the structures discussed above. Though Weimar’s schema is based on a form-critical perspective, where he sees the first four days as one source and the latter three days as a separate source,<sup>113</sup> his structure is intuitive for recognizing Gen 1’s focus on time.

- Day 1: *Zeit* (time)
- Day 2: *Schöpfungswelt* (world creation)
- Day 3: *Schöpfungswelt* (world creation)
- Day 4: *Zeit* (time)
- Day 5: *Lebewesen* (living things)
- Day 6: *Lebewesen* (living things)
- Day 7: *Zeit* (time)

---

<sup>111</sup> In fact, this refrain happens on each day, making time influential or at least a part, however small, on each day. Time is the overseer of creation in Gen 1.

<sup>112</sup> See Ezek 46:1, where YHWH says of Ezekiel’s future temple: “The gate of the inner court that faces east shall remain closed on the six working days; but on the sabbath day it shall be opened (NRSV).”

<sup>113</sup> Peter Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, 2008), 126–28.

### 2.5.1. Building on Peter Weimar's Time-Focused Structure

Now, Weimar's structure will be built upon in three ways. First, as already discussed, time (*zeit*) is the focus for days 1, 4, and 7. Apart from the priestly concerns with time (e.g. the aetiology of Israel's calendar on the fourth day and the aetiology of the Sabbath on the seventh day), these days also communicate something hopeful regarding the primordial condition of חֹשֶׁךְ (darkness).

In the Gen 1 myth, the earth's precondition of being covered in darkness is the first primordial condition to be solved. Light is summoned and distinguished from the darkness, and then both are named. As a result, darkness is made useful for measuring time. The fourth day builds on this and states that lights are placed in the heavens as signs of the appointed times. Importantly here, a lesser light is placed there as well for light during the nighttime or לילה. Then this darkness is completely doused on the seventh day. Note that there is no evening and then morning on the seventh day; there is no darkness or night; just daylight. Thus, with the seventh-day rest, Elohim brings darkness to heel.

Narratively, this darkness does not return to the Pentateuch's large narrative until the plagues in Egypt, where YHWH exercises control over this darkness, as evidenced by his limiting it to just the land of Egypt for only a period of three days.<sup>114</sup> But more significantly, many of the prophets speak of חֹשֶׁךְ as a representation of the coming destruction and exile of Jerusalem and her people.<sup>115</sup> Interestingly, the term חֹשֶׁךְ appears nowhere more times than the

---

<sup>114</sup> The J source records that YHWH asks Moses to stretch out his hand to the heavens so that a darkness would descend over the land of Egypt (Ex 10:21). Moses obeys and the text records that the darkness over the land of Egypt lasts three days (v. 22). In the exodus narrative, darkness is an element controlled by YHWH.

<sup>115</sup> See Isa 13:10; 29:18; 45:3, 7, and 19; 47:5; 49:9; 60:2; Jer 13:16; Ezek 8:12; 32:8; Joel 2:2, and 31; Amos 5:8, 18, and 20; 8:9; Mic 3:6; 7:8; and Zeph 1:15.

exilic book of Job (26 times),<sup>116</sup> and nowhere as densely.<sup>117</sup> With the implication that light is present on the seventh day in full, and with all the passages that describe the prophets blaming the exile on the Israelites constant Sabbath-breaking, the hopeful message communicated by Gen 1 is that through Sabbath-keeping, the חשך of the exile can be reversed and that there can ultimately be a return to the land.<sup>118</sup>

Second, Weimar's *Schöpfungswelt* for the second and third days is not about forming the formlessness (תהו). That is, it has little to do with forming living spaces for the living things. Rather, the second and third days are about solving the primordial condition of the waters (מים) and the deep (תהום) covering the earth. This is clear by Elohim's actions on the second day, where he summons a dome (רקיע) to appear in-between the waters thus separating them into two: the waters above and the waters below. On the third day, the dry land appears and that is named ארץ. Thus, the primordial condition of an earth submerged in water is dealt with.

Now it is important to note these waters are not named in Gen 1. On the third day, the waters below, and perhaps it is all of them, are gathered and they are called ימים (seas). But certainly, the waters above the heavens are never named. This is because narratively, those waters above are brought down to flood the earth in Gen 6–9.<sup>119</sup> At the conclusion of the flood

---

<sup>116</sup> It occurs 16 times in Isaiah and 14 times in the Psalms.

<sup>117</sup> 2.07 times per thousand words. Compare with 0.62 times per thousand (Isaiah) and 0.47 times per thousand (Psalms).

<sup>118</sup> See Lev 26:34 and v. 43, where H understands that the land of Israel will enjoy its Sabbaths while the people who broke it will be in the land of their enemies. See also the prophets regard the breaking of Sabbath as a reason why the exile occurred: Isa 1:13; 56:6; 58:13; Jer 17:21–22, and esp. v. 27; Ezek 20:12–13, 16; 20–21, 24; 22:8; 23:38; 44:24 where the breaking of YHWH's appointed times and his Sabbaths are together indicated as grounds for being deemed holy; Hos 2:11; and Amos 8:5.

<sup>119</sup> The waters above the heavens are mentioned often in the flood narrative while the deep or the תהום is mentioned far less. See Gen 7:11 and 8:2; these are the only times תהום is mentioned in the flood narrative. Whereas מים appears throughout.

narrative, Elohim declares in Gen 9:11: “I establish my covenant with you, that never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters (מים) of a flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth (NRSV).” Thus, it is not until Gen 9 that the waters above and the (presumably) un-gathered waters below are brought to heel.

Third, the earth’s primordial condition of emptiness, which תהו ובהו describes, is remedied in days 5 and 6. On these days, the seas and the earth are filled with living things, chief of which is humanity.<sup>120</sup>

## 2.5.2. Conclusion and This Thesis’ View of Genesis 1’s Structure

The structure proposed here, then, is one that is focused on the three primordial conditions of the earth and their resolution.

*Day 1: Darkness (חשך) and Time (light and dark are distinguished)*

Day 2: Waters (מים and תהום) and Creation of Heaven.

Day 3: Waters (מים and תהום) and Creation of Earth and the Seas.

*Day 4: Darkness (חשך) and Time (the night is lit now via the lesser light).*

Day 5: Emptiness (תהו ובהו) filled with Living things.

Day 6: Emptiness (תהו ובהו) filled with Living things.

*Day 7: Darkness (חשך) and Time (no darkness, just light).*

The problem of darkness is dealt with, first with day one when light is brought into existence and this light separates day from night. Now there a period of time when there is light. Next, day four

---

<sup>120</sup> Perhaps the end of day three is also concerned with remedying תהו ובהו since the vegetation is a key component for making the earth habitable for living things (since תהו typically means, at least in Second Isaiah, uninhabitable).

Another facet that should be of concern is the notion of dominion. The luminaries on day 4 have dominion (משל) over day 1’s made things (day and night). The humans of day 6 have dominion over the living things from days 5 and 6. Furthermore, the latter end of the week’s focus on blessing is worth noting. Days 5 to 7 contain divine blessing. This combined with the seventh day’s sanctification presents a temple-like picture, with the Sabbath representing the sacred space and humanity functioning as the priesthood, imitating the divine and exercising rulership over all the living things under the heavens. Elohim is more involved with his creation than many commentators note. He even blesses the living things, including humanity, himself as opposed to relying on a mediator like a priest to do it for him. The contrast made between Gen 1 representing an aloof god and Gen 2–3 representing an intimate god is more imagined than real. Gen 1 portrays the deity intimately involved with his creation, albeit in a more priestly manner than is the case in Gen 2–3.



sees the placement of lights in the heavens, a great light for the daytime and a lesser light for the nighttime. Thus, even at night, there is still some light. But it is the seventh day that the audience discovered that YHWH, or Elohim, has complete control over darkness. On the seventh day, there is no evening and then morning, there is no passage of time in darkness. The day just is, and it continues to be. The act of resting on the seventh day overcomes darkness. It is a great light.

CHAPTER 3:  
GENESIS 1 WAS ADDED AS A COUNTERMEMORY TO GENESIS 2:  
A COMPARATIVE READING WITH GENESIS 2

**3.1. Introduction**

When anyone begins to read the opening chapters of *Genesis* it is odd that one finds two creation myths. Why are there two beginnings?<sup>121</sup> A cursory reading allows for the two narratives to be read harmoniously, with the first logically followed by the second. It is simply a matter of perspective. Genesis 1 (Gen 1:1–2:3)<sup>122</sup> is from a perspective far away, presumably from the heavens, concerned with explaining the big picture of the cosmos. Whereas Gen 2 (Gen 2:4b–3:24)<sup>123</sup> zooms-in and focuses in on the actions of a specific day.

A closer look at the two narratives, however, reveals discrepancies. This renders the theory (or belief) that these two creation narratives are from the same authorial hand – namely Moses—as improbable. Two examples should sufficiently demonstrate this for now, as more will follow. First, Gen 2 claims that the man was formed to work and till the ground in order to

---

<sup>121</sup> One could also add there Flood Narrative (Gen 6–9) into the mix, since the language in 6:13–21; 7:11; and 8:13–14 are connected to Gen 1 (see Bernard M. Levinson, “A Post-Priestly Harmonization in the Flood Narrative,” in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* [eds. Federico Giuntoli and Konrad Schmid [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015]] pp. 113–123). See esp. 7:11 which reverses creation and renders the flood as a sort of re-creation (cf. Gen 1:6–7).

<sup>122</sup> Throughout I will refer to Genesis 1:1–2:3 as simply “Gen 1.”

<sup>123</sup> Throughout I will refer to Genesis 2:4b–3:24 as “the second creation narrative” or “Genesis 2–3,” or even as the “Garden of Eden.”

produce vegetation (2:5–9) whereas Gen 1 posits that the deity created all the vegetation on the third day (1:11–13), three days before humanity was created. There is an obvious discrepancy concerning when the vegetation came into being. Second, in Gen 2 humanity arrived on the scene before the animals (2:18–25) whereas animals preceded humanity, especially the woman, in the first narrative (1:24–27). There is also an obvious discrepancy as to when man and woman were made.

### 3.1.1. Creation Myths as Grande Remembrances

When it comes to a culture's past, creation myths or stories are powerful and indelibly etched upon a group's collective memory. They are grand remembrances. Even in current times, the ideological and theological claims of the first creation myth (though many would not call it *myth*) hold a power that is unassailable to a western mindset.<sup>124</sup> The placement of this myth at the head of the HB made the question of which biblical creation version would win out as the standard one became merely a question of *when* not *if*. It was only a matter of time until Gen 1 became the *de facto* creation account for not only exilic and post-exilic Israel, but for Second Temple Judaism and Christianity.<sup>125</sup> All other creation narratives that follow Gen 1 in the HB are now subordinate to it and in many respects interpreted through it.

---

<sup>124</sup> Mark S. Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 137. "Genesis 1 thus emerges in several respects as the one set above and before other texts; and so it has remained the standard up into our own time. It is 'the' creation story that readers first think of from the Bible." Just track current evolution versus creation debates and notice the difficulty evolutionary scientists have in dealing with this powerful memory as it manifests itself in contemporary theories of creationism.

<sup>125</sup> Consider the beginning of Jubilees for the impact Gen 1 had on Second Temple Judaism and the beginning of the Gospel of John for Gen 1's impact on early Christianity.

### 3.1.2. Plan for the Chapter

This chapter furthers the argument of this thesis – that Gen 1 was intended to be a countermemory – by demonstrating that Gen 1 was added before Gen 2 by a redactor<sup>126</sup> who intentionally set out to both compliment and supplement the Garden of Eden narrative, these supplements were intended to revise Israel’s memory of creation. Bill T. Arnold agrees positing that Gen 1 was placed before Gen 2–3 deliberately to “compose an entirely new creation account for ancient Israel, intended precisely to supplement, nuance, and to some degree, correct the older and greatly venerated account of Gen 2.”<sup>127</sup> With the addition of Gen 1, the redactor not only countered Gen 2, he also appropriated it for his group’s current needs and concerns.

This will be demonstrated by looking first at Gen 1 as an added text. Special attention will be given to the hinge between the two creation myths, located in Gen 2:4. Second, the intentionality of this addition will be examined. This will demonstrate that (1) Gen 1 was intentionally added and (2) why the author felt the need to add it.

---

<sup>126</sup> Though there is no way to prove that the redactor responsible for Gen 1’s presence in the book of Genesis was also the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a, it really makes no difference as to whether Gen 1 is a countermemory. Even if the author who wrote it did so years earlier and had no idea it would be added in front of Gen 2, the author was aware of other creation memories and myths such as *Enuma Elish* (see chapter 3 for more details) and likely the Garden of Eden. Additionally, the audience hearing Gen 1 were familiar with other creation memories and would have compared it to them. Moreover, the redactor and the group from which he hailed from would have been aware of Gen 2 and maybe even some of the older poetic myths of creation, like Psalm 74:12ff.

<sup>127</sup> Bill T. Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” in *Let us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Iain Provan and Mark J. Boda, *Vetus Testamentum Supplements*, 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 333.

### 3.2. Genesis 1 was Added

So, *why are there two creation stories?* The likeliest and simplest explanation is that one of them was added to the other.<sup>128</sup> Many scholars view Gen 1 as the one that was added. Mark Smith explains: “For although Genesis 1 came at a later point in the order of historical composition (compared with many other creation accounts), it was given pride of first place in the Pentateuch, in what its compilers regarded as more properly reflecting the order of reality.”<sup>129</sup>

There are two aspects that deserve careful consideration for demonstrating that Gen 1 was added to Gen 2 by a different author. First, the different names of the deity demonstrate not only that Gen 1 was added, but that it was added by a redactor who wished the two separate narratives to be read together. Second, what Smith dubs the “editorial hinge” between the two creation myths in Gen 2:4a also suggests that Gen 1 was added to Gen 2.<sup>130</sup> In other words, efforts were made by the redactor to retain Gen 2. Which raises the question: *Why not replace Gen 2 completely?*

#### 3.2.1. The Different Names of the Deity

Further evidence that Gen 1 was intentionally added to Gen 2 is the different names used in reference to the deity. In Gen 2 the name of the deity is יהוה אלהים; whereas in Gen 1 it is

---

<sup>128</sup> A consensus exists in scholarship that Genesis 1 was an addition to the Genesis 1–11 pericope. Though this will be discussed further down, see Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 117–38; Bill T. Arnold, *Genesis, NCBC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 30; David M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 73–35; Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 301–2.

The source critical theory that the Priestly Torah was added to the Jawist account could also explain this situation of two creation accounts. A consensus of scholarship agrees that the first creation story is from the Priestly camp whereas the second is from J (or at least not P).

<sup>129</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 136.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 129.

אלהים. This wrinkle in the text (though one could see it as a rip as Wellhausen did) is hidden from sight in ancient translations. The LXX renders both יהוה אלהים from Gen 2–3 and אלהים from Genesis 1 as ὁ θεός.<sup>131</sup> The reason for this difference, as is well attested in scholarship, particularly source-critical scholarship, is that Gen 1 is Priestly and Gen 2 is non-Priestly.<sup>132</sup> Within the P narrative within the Pentateuch, the name יהוה is not revealed to humanity until it is revealed to Moses in Exodus 6:2. Thus for the Priestly group, using יהוה before this moment would be, to a certain extent, anachronistic.<sup>133</sup>

Von Rad has suggested that the editor responsible for adding Gen 1:1–2:4a also added אלהים throughout Gen 2.<sup>134</sup> If this observation is correct, then the editor imported an element of his own tradition into a preexisting text that he transmitted and modified. This is not only a sign of multiple authors and a sign that Gen 1 was meant to be added to Gen 2, but it is also a definite sign of countermemory. There are two quick observations that can help demonstrate the plausibility of this.

---

<sup>131</sup> Interestingly, Targum Onkelos uses “Lord” (יְי) for the first creation narrative and “Lord God” for the second (יְי אלהים).

<sup>132</sup> Arnold, *Genesis*, 29.

<sup>133</sup> Within the Priestly materials, ‘God’ is referred to as אלהים or אל and then in Exodus 6:2 the deity reveals his name to Moses as יהוה. Thus one could also argue that יהוה was a special name given to the Israelites. All other people when they refer to their gods are actually referring to אלהים, who, as it turns out, is revealed as one god, that is, *the* God: YHWH. The use of אלהים as opposed to אל might be to subvert other nations’ use of their own pantheons.

<sup>134</sup> See von Rad, *Genesis*, 77. See also Ephraim Speiser, *Genesis. AB* (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 15–16. Speiser remarks, “Critical opinion inclines to the assumption that the original version [of the second narrative] used ‘Yahweh’ throughout, in conformance with J’s normal practice, the other component being added later under the influence of the opening account (by P).”

First, throughout the book of Genesis, the compound name יהוה אלהים does not appear anywhere else throughout Genesis,<sup>135</sup> and only once in the entire Pentateuch.<sup>136</sup> The typical designation for the deity in J is יהוה, whereas for P it is אלהים or אל with various modifiers (e.g. אל שדי). This is the case for P until Exodus 6:2 where אל reveals his personal name to Moses as יהוה. So it is odd that this compound name is present here, since neither J nor P use this compound name.

The differences between the divine names in each account point to an obvious seam between the two narratives. It is plausible that אלהים was added by the editorial group to the second narrative so that a more harmonious reading between them could be arranged. What could have been read as two completely separate deities and thus two completely separate accounts of creation is now stitched together and read together. Thus, the author/redactor of Gen 1 sought to add Gen 1 *to* Gen 2–3, not *over* it.

Second, the two creation myths are connected via the use of אלהים in the second myth. The two myths would appear very different if the deity went by two completely different names. As it is with אלהים present, the two narratives have much more cohesion. As Arnold observes: “The synoptic reading produced by the editor quite naturally causes us to identify the God of Gen 1 with the Yaweh God of Gen 2–3.”<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 56.

<sup>136</sup> See Exodus 9:30, though it is textually disputed. There are other uses of the two terms together in the Pentateuch, though אלהים is used as a modifier, not part of a proper name like the compound name יהוה אלהים is used here in Gen 2.

<sup>137</sup> Arnold, *Genesis*, 56.

### 3.2.2. The Editorial Hinge in 2:4a

The most obvious evidence of Gen 1 being a later composition from a distinct author, and that Gen 1 was added in front of Gen 2 is here in Gen 2:4; especially in the first half of 2:4 (2:4a) which can be seen as the editorial hinge that connects the myth of Gen 1 to the myth of Gen 2.

Genesis 2:4a reads as:

אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם

These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created

This is affixed to the beginning of Gen 2, which begins its myth in 2:4b:

ביום עשות יהוה אלהים ארץ ושמים

In the day when YHWH God made earth and heavens.

In opposition, Nahum Sarna posits that this editorial hinge is actually a *chiasm*, and as such, Gen 1–3 is a literary whole.<sup>138</sup> In other words, Gen 2:4 was composed by one author, not 2:4a by one and 2:4b by another. However, this so called *chiasm* in 2:4 overlooks significant differences between the two parts of 2:4. For instance, Gen 2:4a uses the definite article twice (השמים והארץ) whereas 2:4b does not (ארץ ושמים). This inversion is not best understood as a *chiastic inversion*, as Sarna would argue, but rather as an *polemical inversion*, or at the very least, an inversion made as a result of a redactor stitching the two narratives together.<sup>139</sup>

Three reasons will be offered as to why Gen 2:4a is the work of a distinct author and that it is meant to hinge Gen 1 with Gen 2. First, the temporal clauses show two distinct narratives, one that goes from Gen 1:1–2:3 and one that goes from 2:4b–3:24. Second, ancient versions of Gen 2:4 reveal a desire to make Gen 1–3 a literary whole, which suggests that these versions, or

<sup>138</sup> See Nahum Sarna, *Genesis: JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1989), 16.

<sup>139</sup> The wording in Gen 1:1 is much more similar to 2:4a, more so than it is to 2:4b. The differences between 1:1 and 2:4a are small (i.e. the direct object marker is used in 1:1 but it is lacking in 2:4a). This could suggest that the author and the redactor of Gen 1 are the same, perhaps not the same person, but certainly from the same tradition.



translations (the Septuagint and Targums are translations, while the Samaritan Pentateuch is not a translation), noticed a difference between Gen 1 and Gen 2. And third, Gen 2:4a is one of ten *tôlēdôt* headings used throughout Genesis to introduce new sections. Since it is used here by the author of Gen 1 to introduce Gen 2's section, it means that Gen 1 and Gen 2 are meant to be two distinct sections or *chapters* in the book of Genesis.

### 3.2.2.1. Temporal Clauses

The temporal clause that begins the second creation myth is quite different from the one that begins the first; but both introduce the narrative.<sup>140</sup> Gen 2:4b's temporal clause is connected to its main clause; which is Gen 2:5–6. Gen 2:4b–6, then, introduces the second creation myth whose verbal sequence begins in Gen 2:7 with its *vav*-consecutives. Gen 1's temporal clause in 1:1 is connected to its main clause in 1:2. So Gen 1:1–2 introduces the first creation myth whose verbal sequence begins in 1:3 with its *vav*-consecutives. This means then that 2:4b and 1:1 are both temporal clauses introducing their narrative sequences,<sup>141</sup> which further means that there are two distinct narratives here, not one literary whole spanning Gen 1–3.

### 3.2.2.2. Ancient Versions of 2:4

In the MT text, the two parts of Gen 2:4 are quite different from one another. Genesis 2:4b reads, “ביום עשות יהוה אלהים ארץ ושמים” (“In the day when YHWH God made earth and heaven”), and Genesis 2:4a reads, “אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם” (these are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created”). The order in which ארץ and שמים appear is

<sup>140</sup> The differences between 1:1 and 2:4a are slight (i.e. the direct object marker is used in 1:1 but it is lacking in 2:4a).

<sup>141</sup> This is demonstrated by the series of *vav*-consecutive running from 1:3–2:3 in the first myth and from 2:7–9 (the bit on the four rivers of Eden in 2:10–14 break from the *vav*-consecutive sequence) and 2:15–25.

different; as well as the use of the definite article is different since Gen 1 uses it and Gen 2 does not. Additionally, the use of יהוה in 2:4b is quite different since it is a term that does not appear in Gen 1, and Gen 1 uses the noun יום to mean a single day, which is different from Gen 2's use of יום which denotes an undetermined period of time.

Therefore, the MT text retains many differences between the two halves of 2:4. This suggests that 2:4 is authored by two distinct authors. So by looking at the ancient translations of Gen 2:4, it will be shown that they too saw 2:4 as suggesting two authors, much to their chagrin since they would rather Gen 1–3 to be a literary whole, and this is, of course, assuming that the MT is the text that is older as compared to the other versions.

The ancient versions from the Greek Septuagint (LXX), the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), and the Aramaic Targums all struggled with this so-called *chiasm*. Each one attempted to harmonize the reading between Gen 1 and Gen 2.<sup>142</sup> Why would they need to harmonize something, or change the MT text, if it was obvious that Gen 2:4 was a literary whole (authored by a single author)? It is argued here that because they seek to change what appears in the MT, and that these changes are to the end of harmonization, the MT text is obviously suggesting that there are two distinct authors in 2:4. For example, the LXX:

Αὕτη ἡ Βίβλος γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ἡμέρα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν

This is the book of the origin of heaven and earth, when it originated, on the day that God

---

<sup>142</sup> The translation of the NRSV and the ESV both read: "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created; In the day that the LORD God made the heavens and the earth." These translations make it look like there is a chiasm by translating both שמים and ארץ as though the article ה is there. So this need to harmonize is also a modern concern among translators.

made the heaven and the earth.<sup>143</sup>

Questions concerning the use of βίβλος aside,<sup>144</sup> there are three additional observations that show the LXX's desire to harmonize the MT. First, the articles are reversed. Genesis 2:4a lacks the articles whereas 2:4b contains them. Second, both 2:4a and 2:4b use *heaven* and *earth* in the same order. And third, only the term θεός is used, as though יהוה is not there. These are obvious signs of harmonization. It would seem that Gen 2:4 was not understood as a *chiasm* by the LXX, but it sought to make it seem like one.

Another example comes from the SP:

אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם ביום עשות יהוה אלהים שמים וארץ  
These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day  
when YHWH God made *heaven and earth*.<sup>145</sup>

Here the articles are the same as the MT's reading, however the inversion that the MT has is harmonized by שמים וארץ being used in the same order in 2:4b as in 2:4a. Like the LXX's translation, this reading is a harmonization.

One last example is from the Targum Onkelos:

אליו תולדת שמיא וארעא כד אתוריאו ביומא דעוד יוי אלהים ארעא ושמיא  
These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the  
day when YHWH God made *the* earth and *the* heavens.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup> The Greek text is taken from Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*. The English is from *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Genesis, translated by Rob Hiebert. See Rob Hiebert, "Introduction and Translation: Genesis," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>144</sup> It is a further sign of harmonization since the translator is harmonizing the heading in Gen 5:1, where ספר is uniquely used, with the heading here in Gen 2:4.

<sup>145</sup> Samaritan Pentateuch text taken from Accordance module. Translation my own, as are the italics.

<sup>146</sup> Aramaic text from the Accordance module on *Targum Onkelos*.

Here in this translation the inversion of heaven and earth is retained. However, the articles are added to 2:4b giving a more harmonious reading. Apart from demonstrating that the ancient translators did not regard MT's version of 2:4 as chiasmic,<sup>147</sup> these ancient translations also demonstrate that both the order of ארץ and שמים as well as the use of the article or lack thereof mattered a great deal – otherwise why harmonize them?

### 3.2.2.3. *The Tōlēdōt Headings*

Throughout the book of Genesis there are these (sub)headings, the majority of which use a grammatical structure similar to “these are the generations of X” (אלה תולדות), this is to indicate the opening of a new section. There are ten in total throughout. The rest of the headings are in 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, and 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1, 9, and 37:2, so there are five before Abraham and five after him. Each of these headings either introduces a new section or concludes a previous one. In other words, their presence suggests a separate *chapter* or section in the overall narrative of Genesis. Because of this, the presence of the *tōlēdōt* heading in Gen 2:4a demonstrates that Gen 1 and Gen 2 are understood as distinct sections.

---

<sup>147</sup> I assume that the MT is the older reading of Gen 1. Qumran would be an excellent place to look as well, however, no evidence is preserved for 2:4. The Qumran evidence for Gen 1–3 is decent, though nothing exists for 2:4, and the evidence that does exist is partial, that is, many missing parts. The evidence from Gen 1–3 available is Gen 1:18–21 and 3:11–14 from 1QGen (1Q1) and then Gen 1:1–27; 2:1–3; 2:6–7; 2:14–19; and 3:1–2 are partially available in various scrolls and fragments found in cave four: 4QGen<sup>b</sup> (4Q2); 4QGen<sup>d</sup> (4Q4); 4QGen<sup>g</sup> (4Q7); 4QGen<sup>h</sup> (4Q8); 4QGen<sup>h2</sup> (4Q8a); 4QGen<sup>h-para</sup> (4Q8b); 4QGen<sup>h-title</sup> (4Q8c); and 4QGen<sup>k</sup> (4Q10).

Frank Moore Cross rightly observes that this heading in 2:4a is not for Gen 1 (1:1–2:3),<sup>148</sup> rather it “stands as a heading to the Yahwistic section.”<sup>149</sup> Additionally, Gen 1:1 and 2:4a have much in common when it concerns the articular use of שמים and ארץ and the use of ברא.

Gen 1:1

בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ

At the beginning, Elohim created the heavens and the earth.

Gen 2:4a

אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם

These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created.

Lexically speaking, this is not strong evidence that they were both authored by the same hand, since writing something with the article in two places falls under the category of coincidence more so than design.<sup>150</sup> Though the use of ברא suggests a similar author. Moreover, the stronger evidence that Gen 1’s author also authored Gen 2:4a is based on imagining the book of Genesis without 2:4a or Gen 1. If this was the case then Gen 2 would be a myth/narrative that comes before the first *tôlēdôt* heading in 5:1. Genesis 2 would appear to be a preface or preamble to the rest of Genesis. But with the new *tôlēdôt* heading added in 2:4a, it shifts Gen 2 from being heard as the preamble or preface to Gen 1 being the preamble or preface. The presence of 2:4a is

<sup>148</sup> Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 302, “Others have tried to make sense of [2:4a] as a subscription to the P creation account. But this view cannot stand in view of ... the awkwardness of designating seven days of creation with ‘generations.’”

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 302. He defines the Yahwistic section as Genesis 2:4b to 4:26. Furthermore, Cross argues that “confirmation” of this lies in the fact that in every case where the *tôlēdôt* formula is used as a heading in Genesis, “it is a superscription to a section” not a “subscription.” However this is overstated since, on closer inspection, 36:9 appears to close off the תולדות of 36:1 and 10:32 (though phrased differently) appears to close off the תולדות for 10:1. Both 36:9 and 10:32 then act as subscriptions. But even if תולדות were to introduce these and all other sections in Genesis, it is not likely that 2:4a follows suite. Were 2:4a prefaced to Gen 1:1, it would spoil “in the beginning” as the beginning! My thanks to Craig Broyles for pointing this out to me.

<sup>150</sup> There is some debate among scholars as to whether or not 2:4a was added by a different author or editor than 1:1–2:3. The difference between 1:1’s “the heavens and the earth” (את השמים ואת הארץ) with 2:4a’s “the heavens and the earth” (השמים והארץ) may be evidence of different authors, but it really is not enough to prove it. Regardless of whether a separate author/editor made the editorial hinge in 2:4a than Gen 1:1–2:3, the fact is that the recently-made second creation myth “takes a second look” at creation now (Arnold, *Genesis*, 55).

required for Gen 1 to be added to the rest of Genesis, and by extension, to the rest of the Pentateuch.

It is worth noting that the grammatical construction of 5:1 (זה ספר תולדות) is very different from the rest (אלה תולדות), namely in the spelling of “generations” and the appearance of ספר (“book” or “document”). This suggests that not all of the *tôlēdôt* clauses are from the same hand and that Gen 5:1 came at an earlier point, and the other *tôlēdôt* headings are based on it.<sup>151</sup> Moreover, the *tôlēdôt* heading in 2:4a is also unique from the rest in that it is the only one to name something other than a person. For example, Genesis 2:4a uses “the heavens and the earth,” rather than “Terah” (11:27) or “Adam” (5:1). This may suggest that 2:4a was the work of a later redactor than the redactor who added the other eight *tôlēdôt* headings (not 2:4a and not 5:1). So, this thesis argues that chronologically, Gen 5:1 was the first *tôlēdôt* heading, followed by a second wave of headings that were based on 5:1 (all but 2:4a), followed by 2:4a.<sup>152</sup>

### 3.3. Why Retain Genesis 2?

One might wonder: *Why not just replace the Garden of Eden with Gen 1 then?* Or put another way, *Why is Gen 2 there at all? Why would the redactors not just leave it out?* Likely, the Garden of Eden narrative held a high level of authority and respect; and as such, it still constituted *a* sacred memory of the past.<sup>153</sup> After all, before Gen 1 was added, Gen 2 was the

---

<sup>151</sup> Arnold, Genesis, 85. Arnold says that 5:1’s *tôlēdôt* תולדות clause being used with ספר marks it out as different from the rest, “which may reflect the most ancient title for such genealogies and suggests that the other *tôlēdôt* clauses in Genesis are derived from this one.”

<sup>152</sup> More detail is discussed on Gen 2:4a’s *tôlēdôt* heading in Chapter 5.

<sup>153</sup> Arnold argues similarly that the second account would “have been unassailable in authority” for the readership of the author of the first creation story. See Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 333.

primary memory of creation in the Pentateuch for Israel. Additionally, as discussed in the first chapter, the Temple of Solomon was constructed to image the sacred Garden of Eden.

Some scholars, such as David Carr, go perhaps too far and posit that Gen 1 “replaced” Gen 2.<sup>154</sup> First of all, much of Gen 2 is maintained by the redactor responsible for Gen 1’s addition, if he wanted to ‘replace’ it why did he not just do that? Why not omit Gen 2? Additionally, if he wanted to replace it, then by leaving certain claims that Gen 2 makes uncommented on implies that the author of Gen 1 not only acknowledges them but even agrees with them.

Second, Gen 1 does convey different points, which will be discussed more below, but these are more subtle. Gen 1 does not contradict Gen 2 blatantly. For example, the addition of a Sabbath on the seventh day corrects an inference made by Gen 2, namely that man is not told to rest so it could be taken to mean that man is to work each and every day. Gen 1 does not disagree that work is a part of the role mankind will play. It does seem to want it known that mankind’s dominion over the created order extends beyond just the vegetation to include all creatures roaming on the earth, flying in the sky, and swimming in the sea. Smith argues correctly that the purpose of Gen 1 is to merely “redirect and refocus the audience’s attention.”<sup>155</sup>

This demonstrates an important and interesting aspect of counteremory generally speaking, and Gen 1’s counteremory specifically: it is not designed to replace their counterpart outright. If they did, one must realize this, there would be no trace of counteremories or fractures or creases or polemics in the biblical text. The fact that one can see a counteremory

---

<sup>154</sup> Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 317.

<sup>155</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis I*, 129.

presupposes that it was not meant to obliterate the other memory. Counter-memories sit quietly, nonchalantly subverting other previous versions of the past. They seek to not look like they are doing what they are doing. It is a subtle art. The counter-memory retains what it wants and alters, amends, and appropriates what it must. In fact, the counter-memory must retain enough of the previous memory, especially one as esteemed as Gen 2, if it is to have any chance at legitimacy. An invented tradition will only catch on so long as it passes as genuine and authentic. That is, it must plausible.<sup>156</sup>

Genesis 2 contains theological claims which are not addressed or countered by Gen 1, such as the union of male and female characterized as “one flesh” (לִבְשָׁר אֶחָד), the serpent, disobedience, and subsequent exile from God’s presence. Many of these claims are necessary to the greater narrative of Genesis; which must be a main concern if Gen 1 was indeed added by the redactor of Genesis. As much as Gen 1 was meant to alter certain claims made in Gen 2, it was also meant to maintain and appropriate the rest of those claims into its own wider narrative.

Yairah Amit explains:

the two stories that open the Book of Genesis may be seen as providing descriptions that, on the one hand, complement one another, due to certain basic similarities regarding several basic approaches connected with Israelite monotheistic faith, and, on the other hand, as opposing sides in a polemic.<sup>157</sup>

The group responsible for Gen 1 did not desire to omit or replace the current creation narrative, which was in all likelihood taken to be their very own. They respected it and only wished to

---

<sup>156</sup> Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1995), 232.

<sup>157</sup> Yairah Amit, *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, trans. Jonathan Chipman (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 15.



amend it minimally so that it could be appropriated to fit their current needs within their current circumstances.

A great example of material from Gen 2 that was mostly retained by Gen 1 is that material concerning humanity. There are a few alterations, here and there, but the lion's share of Gen 2–3's description of humanity is retained by Gen 1. Perhaps a key reason as to why is that the Garden of Eden myth is itself a countermemory to various memories of creation contained in other ANE creation myths, such as *Atra-Hasis*.

### 3.3.1. The Creation of Humanity

Gen 2 has much in common with other ANE creation myths, especially in their depiction of the origins of man. *Atra-Hasis*, describes the creation of man from the clay of the ground. The substance that is combined with the dirt or clay is the flesh and blood of a slain god, which is claimed to contain the god's 'spirit.' In *Atra-Hasis*, the creation of humanity is described when *Enki* speaks to the great gods:

On the first, seventh, and fifteenth days of the month,  
 Let me establish a purification, a bath.  
 Let one god be slaughtered,  
 Then let the gods be cleansed by immersion.  
 Let *Nintu* mix clay with his flesh and blood.  
 Let that same god and man be thoroughly mixed in the clay.  
 Let us hear the drum for the rest of time,  
 From the flesh of the god let a spirit remain,  
 Let it make the living know its sign,  
 Lest he be allowed to be forgotten, let the spirit remain.”(COS 1.130: 206–18)<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> “*Atra-Hasis*,” trans. Benjamin R. Foster (COS 1.130). Foster further points out that *Nin-tu* means “lady who gives birth.” She is the mother-goddess par excellence.

There are also other biblical creation accounts that share these same views of humanity's origins.<sup>159</sup> First is Job 10:9–12:

Remember that you fashioned me like clay;  
and will you turn me to dust again?  
Did you not pour me out like milk  
and curdle me like cheese?  
You clothed me with skin and flesh,  
and knit me together with bones and sinews.  
You have granted me life and steadfast love,  
and your care has preserved my spirit.<sup>160</sup> (NRSV)

Second is Isaiah 29:16:

You turn things upside down!  
Shall the potter be regarded as the clay?  
Shall the thing made say of its maker,  
“He did not make me”;  
or the thing formed say of the one who formed it,  
“He has no understanding”? (NRSV)

Third is Second Isaiah 45:9:

Woe to you who strive with your Maker,  
earthen vessels with the potter!  
Does the clay say to the one who fashions it, “What are you making”?  
or “Your work has no handles”?<sup>161</sup> (NRSV)

And fourth is Trito-Isaiah 64:8:

Yet, O LORD, you are our Father; we are the clay, and you are our potter;  
we are all the work of your hand (NRSV).

---

<sup>159</sup> An Egyptian example comes from *the Instruction of Merikare*, which is a series of (wise) instructions from King *Merikare* to his son and immediate successor. Concerning creation, it contains many similarities to Gen 2–3: “Well tended is mankind — god’s cattle, He made sky and earth for their sake, He subdued the water monster, He made breath for their noses to live. They are his images, who came from his body He shines in the sky for their sake; He made for them plants and cattle, Fowl and fish to feed them. (COS 1.35:134–35)” All translations of *Merikare* are from Miriam Lichtheim, “*Merikare*,” in COS 1.35.

<sup>160</sup> See also Job 33:6.

<sup>161</sup> See the previous verse where ברא is used: (45:8): “Shower, O heavens, from above, and let the skies rain down righteousness; let the earth open, that salvation may spring up, and let it cause righteousness to sprout up also; I the LORD have created it.” (NRSV)

The idea in *Atra-Hasis* of a liquid-like substance and the earth or dirt being mixed to form mankind in the style of pottery is present in Genesis 2:6–7. Man was formed (יצר) from the mud after the whole face of the ground is watered. The word used, יצר, means “to form” and the noun (יצר) means “a potter.” Thus the image given in Genesis 2:7 is one of God acting as a potter moulding the human with his hands.<sup>162</sup> This is also the view in Isaiah and Job. Does Gen 1 counter all of these?

The answer is no. Gen 1 does not detail its description of humanity’s creation. They are created (ברא) in the deity’s image. The author states it presumably expecting the audience to know how it is done. Gen 1’s relative silence on the issue is telling, it is commentary in and of itself. Gen 1, then, is retaining Gen 2’s description of how humanity was made.<sup>163</sup>

It is indeed true that Gen 1 elevates humanity by employing the verb ברא three times in reference to humanity in v. 27. Though this is not in reaction to Gen 2, it is likely meant to ensure that humanity is regarded as the zenith of the deity’s creatures. In other words, the triple use of ברא is meant to to elevate humanity unmistakably higher than the previously created things and beings.<sup>164</sup> This triple use of a specifically used verb, used here all three times in the *Qal*, a use

---

<sup>162</sup> See Edward L. Greenstein, “God’s Golem: The Creation of the Human in Genesis 2” in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, JSOT 319, Henning Graf Reventlow and Yair Hoffman (eds.) (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 219–40. And see Tryggve N.V. Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2–3* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 29. Genesis 2:7 is also echoed in Sirach 17:1, and in 33:13 where the image of God is likened to a potter following the allusion in Sirach 33:10.

<sup>163</sup> The deity in Gen 1 creates humanity in a manner that still retains the same sculptor or potter imagery as Gen 2’s imagery with יצר (since ברא means to make by cutting).

<sup>164</sup> This is further demonstrated by the command given to humanity to subdue all the earth and have dominion over all the creatures (Gen 1:28).

reserved for God's creative activities, points to the high status Gen 1 affords humanity. But Gen 2 also affords humanity a high place in creation.<sup>165</sup>

*Enuma Elish* is also a slight countermemory to *Atra-Hasis*. *Enuma Elish* similarly describes the creation of humanity from the blood of a slain god. Marduk asked the great gods of the assembly "Who was it that made war?" (tablet VI, line 23). And the great gods of the assembly replied "It was *Qingu* who made war." (line 29) Then:

They bound and held [*Qingu*] before *Ea*,  
They imposed the punishment on him and shed his blood.  
From his blood [*Ea*] made mankind.<sup>166</sup> (COS 1.111, tablet VI; lines 31–33)

*Atra-Hasis* makes it sound more like a ritual sacrifice as opposed to a punishment. Also, it says that a goddess *Nintu* is responsible for 'forming' humanity, whereas in *Enuma Elish* it is the male god *Ea*, who is the Akkadian version of the Sumerian *Enki*.<sup>167</sup> *Enuma Elish*'s treatment of humanity is also truncated compared to *Atra-Hasis*. Where *Atra-Hasis* has a detailed and comparatively lengthy description, *Enuma Elish* summarizes it all with one line: "From [*Qingu's*] blood [*Ea*] made mankind."

---

<sup>165</sup> Wellhausen observed this difference as a polemic between Gen 1 and Gen 2–3, "We cannot regard it as fortuitous that in this point Gen. i asserts the opposite of Gen. ii. iii.; the words spoken with such emphasis, and repeated i. 27, v. 1, ix, 6, sound exactly like a protest against the view underlying Gen. ii–iii." See Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), 307; repr. of *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, trans. J. Sutherland Black and A. Enslin, with preface by W. Robertson Smith (Edinburgh: Black, 1885); trans. of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1883).

<sup>166</sup> All translations of *Enuma Elish* (or the Epic of Creation) are by Benjamin R. Foster, in COS 1.111.

<sup>167</sup> This is an interesting bit of countermemory itself: *Atra-Hasis* has *Enki* overseeing the creation of mankind, whereas in *Enuma Elish* it is Marduk, *Ea's* or *Enki's* son. But even though *Enuma Elish* wishes Marduk to be exalted, even above his father *Ea*, they cannot remove *Ea* from the act of creating mankind.

### 3.3.2. The Purpose of Humanity

In the Garden of Eden, the purpose of man in the garden is “to work it” (לעבדה) and “to guard it” (לשמרה).<sup>168</sup> Gen 1 does not disagree with this, work is definitely a purpose of mankind. But Gen 1 wishes to amend Gen 2–3’s view of work in two ways. First Gen 1 wishes to add Gen 1:28 to the purpose of humanity. Gen 1:28 states that humanity is fill the earth and subdue it, to have dominion over the fish and birds and all moving things that move upon the earth. Second, Gen 1 wishes to ensure that work does not occur everyday of the week. That is to say, Gen 1 wishes to make explicit the need for Sabbath-keeping. The presence of the Sabbath before Gen 2–3 ensures that audiences will not understand Gen 2–3 as prescribing work everyday of the week.

For example, the purpose of humanity in *Atra-Hasis* was to alleviate the burdensome toils of the lesser gods (the *Igigi*-gods), imposed on them by the greater gods (the *Annuna*). *Atra-Hasis* begins:

When gods were man,  
They did forced labor, they bore drudgery.  
Great indeed was the drudgery of the gods,  
The forced labor was heavy, the misery too much: (COS 1.130, lines 1–4)

So, the worker gods (*Igigi*-gods) essentially go on strike, burning their tools in protest. Raising the essential problem, who will carry on the work? So the higher gods (*Annuna*) decided:

Let the midwife create a human being,  
Let man assume the drudgery of god. (COS 1.130, lines 190–191)

So they asked “the midwife of the gods, wise *Mami*”:

“Will you be the birth goddess, creatress of mankind?  
Create a human being that he bear the yoke,

---

<sup>168</sup> Genesis 2:15

Let him bear the yoke, the task of *Enlil*,  
Let man assume the drudgery of god. (COS 1.130, lines 192–97)

*Enuma Elish* also echoes this understanding of the plight of humanity. Marduk thinks to himself:

I shall compact blood, I shall cause bones to be,  
I shall make stand a human being, let 'Man' be its name.  
I shall create humankind,  
They shall bear the gods' burden that those may rest. (COS 1.111, tablet VI, lines 5–8)

Gen 2 alters *Atra-Hasis*'s (and by extension, *Enuma Elish*'s) mindset. Gen 2 retains *Atra-Hasis*'s view of mankind working the land for the purpose of producing food. However this labour is not described as a difficult one. The idea of work being a drudgery comes only with the curse after the banishment in Gen 3:17–19.

Gen 1 retains Gen 2's countermemory to *Atra-Hasis* and adds the Sabbath aetiology to ensure that work is not everyday, that is, in violation of the Sabbath law.

### 3.3.3. The Identity of Humanity

The first creation narrative announces:

ויאמר אלהים נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו וירדו בדגת הים ובעוף השמים ובבהמה ובכל־הארץ ובכל־הרמש הרמש על־הארץ: ויברא אלהים את־האדם בצלם אלהים ברא אתו זכר ונקבה ברא אתם:

Let us make humanity (אדם) in our image (בצלמנו), according to our likeness (כדמותנו); ... So God created (ברא) humanity (אדם) in his image (בצלמו), in the image of God he created (ברא) them; male and female he created (ברא) them.” (Gen 1:26–27)

The use of image (צלם) and likeness (דמות) together has a connection with ANE texts where the king is declared to be the image and likeness of a particular patron god.<sup>169</sup> The Aramaic portion of the bilingual Aramaic-Akkadian inscription on the statue found at *Tell Fakhariyah* uses both

<sup>169</sup> Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, trans. J. J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 152–54.

דמות (lines 1, 15) and צלם (line 12 and 16) in reference to the king.<sup>170</sup> W. Randall Garr comments on the functions of the terms ‘likeness’ and ‘image’:

‘Likeness’ is petitionary and directed at the deity; it is cultic and votive. ‘Image’ is majestic, absolute and commemorative; it is directed at the people. Thus, these two Aramaic terms encode two traditional roles of the Mesopotamian ruler—that of devoted worshipper and that of sovereign monarch.<sup>171</sup>

This fits well with the notion of rulership over the world being handed to humanity in v.26: “and let them have dominion (רדה) over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.”<sup>172</sup> Humans, then, are the image of God on earth.<sup>173</sup> They are rulers, not mere workers. In this way, one could think that Gen 1 elevates the status of humanity as compared to Gen 2. However, there are two reasons why this is not the case.

First, both creation accounts agree that humanity is both connected to God and also separate from him. Man is not God, and God is not man. Phyllis Tribble adequately explains it, the terms “God” and “image of God” in the first creation account “establish a similarity in meaning at the same time that the word *the-image-of* stresses the difference between Creator and

---

<sup>170</sup> See the original edition, A. Abou Assaf, Pierre Bordreuil, and Alan R. Millard, *La statue de Tel Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne* (Etudes assyriologiques; Cahiers 10; Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1982), 23–25.

<sup>171</sup> Randall W. Garr, “‘Image’ and ‘Likeness’ in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh,” in *Israel Exploration Journal* (2000): 231–32.

<sup>172</sup> Also see v. 28: “God blessed them, and God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.’”

<sup>173</sup> Consider Ezekiel 1:26–28: “And above the dome over their heads there was something like a throne, in appearance like sapphire; and seated above the likeness of a throne was something that seemed like a human form. Upward from what appeared like the loins I saw something like gleaming amber, something that looked like fire enclosed all around; and downward from what looked like the loins I saw something that looked like fire, and there was a splendor all around. Like the bow in a cloud on a rainy day, such was the appearance of the splendor all around. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD.”

created.”<sup>174</sup> Genesis 2 describes the same thing, where the man is created from dust and divine breath. Man is both divine and connected to the deity as well as terrestrial, dirt, and separate from the deity.

Though this discussion is focusing on the similarities between the two creation memories, there are two differences to note as they concern humanity. First, in Gen 1 אדם (man) is created to "rule" (רדה), and in Gen 2 to "serve" (עבד). There is a difference in how Gen 1 slightly elevates the role of man in relation to the rest of creation.<sup>175</sup> Second, there is a slight difference in how women are portrayed in relation to the deity. In Gen 1, both male and female are described as imaging God; whereas in Gen 2, the woman comes from man, who came from the deity.<sup>176</sup> Therefore, the woman in Gen 2 is not directly associated with the deity, and it is only through man that she is.

Much of Gen 2 is retained by the author/redactor of Gen 1. Calling Gen 1 a countermemory, then, does not mean that Gen 2 was thought to be useless and in need of replacement. Far from it. However, there had to be something about Gen 2 that was deemed inadequate as a memory of creation. Otherwise, there would be no need to add an additional memory of creation to Israel's creation tradition.

---

<sup>174</sup> Phyllis Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1978), 20–21.

<sup>175</sup> Although, Gen 2 can also be understood as exercising dominion over the animals through the act of naming them. Similar to how Elohim names things in Gen 1, the act of naming something can be taken to be a sign of exercising dominion over that which is named. Additionally, it is quite possible that the Garden of Eden narrative is describing humanity royally. The man and the woman in the garden could be a metaphor for kingship since gardens are often associated with royal palaces and the keeping of the garden can be symbolic for the state of the kingdom. For more on this see Francesca Stavrakopoulou, "Exploring the Garden of Uzza: Death, Burial and Ideologies of Kingship," *Biblical 87:1*, (2006): 1-21.

<sup>176</sup> Additionally, the position of women is greatly improved from coming from man to also coming from the deity. In the second narrative, the woman comes into the picture only after the man cannot find a suitable helper among the animals. The breath of the deity is given to man, the woman and the deity do not have a direct connection, their connection is mediated by the man. Whereas in the first account, women are created with men and both together are a likeness of the deity.



### 3.4. Genesis 1 as Countermemory to Genesis 2

Prior to the emergence of Gen 1 in its final form, many creation narratives both within the HB and outside of it were already established within the cultural memories of ancient Near Eastern cultures.<sup>177</sup> Consequently, the group responsible for Gen 1 was aware that theirs was not the first word on creation. Adding Gen 1 as the first-word on creation, then, was no accident, it is a claim to be “*the* narrative on the topic of creation, in fact *the* standard account.”<sup>178</sup> Consequently, the placement of Gen 1 is just as important as its content for conveying or revealing its purposes.

With the hinge at 2:4a, Gen 1 is (now) positioned to be the book of Genesis’ “preamble,” as Bill Arnold puts it.<sup>179</sup> Mark Smith states that verse 2:4a “indicates that what came before serves as prologue to what comes after.”<sup>180</sup> Subsequently, Gen 1’s function concerning the literary whole of Genesis is a prologue, *prologue* taken here literally, meaning ‘the very first word.’ Arnold concludes that “The older authoritative epic account of human origins has been absorbed and supplemented by the more comprehensive priestly account in Gen 1.”<sup>181</sup>

What follows is two instances that will demonstrate that Gen 1 was added, and that it was added in order to revise the Garden of Eden’s view of creation. Put another way, these instances

---

<sup>177</sup> For example, non-biblical creation narratives being *Atra-hasis* and *Enuma Elish*; and biblical ones being Gen 2 and various psalms such as Psalm 74, 89, and 104.

<sup>178</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 137. See also Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 333.

<sup>179</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble.” Though this gets discussed a little further down, it is important to briefly mention it here. The heading in 5:1 was probably the original first heading. This is because it was the only heading, this is evidenced by its unique syntax, not repeated throughout Genesis. This made Genesis 2–4 the original prologue before 5:1 says “This is the book of generations ...” With the addition of 2:4a, what comes before it is now the prologue (Gen 1).

<sup>180</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 129.

<sup>181</sup> Arnold, *Genesis*, 55.

will make *explicit* what Mark Smith calls “an implicit sort of ‘commentary.’”<sup>182</sup> (Important note: this is not to say that Gen 1 was trying to elevate itself in comparison to Gen 2 as much as to say that Gen 1 elevates itself so its claims would be taken as legitimate.) First there is the elevation of Gen 1 made by 1:1 directly commentating on Gen 2’s opening in 2:4b. Second, there are three aetiological concerns both the author and the redactor had with Gen 2, these concerns prompted the need to compose Gen 1 in the first place.

### 3.4.1. The Opening in 1:1

Many commentators have noted a verbal connection between 1:1 and 2:4b. David Carr correctly argues that the differences between 1:1 and 2:4b are intentional: “Certainly one verse seems to have been formed in light of the other ... Gen. 2:4b appears to have been the model for 1:1, and 1:1 in turn was originally meant to stand separately from the verse on which it was modelled, as a distinctly different beginning.”<sup>183</sup> Ephraim Speiser agrees adding that this “difference is by no means accidental.”<sup>184</sup>

There are three ways Gen 1:1 intentionally commentates on Genesis 2:4b so as to elevate itself, albeit ever-so-slightly. First, the placement of Gen 1 before Gen 2 is further teased out by the use of *ראשית* instead of Gen 2:4b’s use of *יום*. Second, the Gen 1 inverts the terms *heaven* and *earth*. And third, Gen 1 uses the more lexically loaded term *ברא* instead of the more benign *עשה*.

---

<sup>182</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis I*, 131.

<sup>183</sup> Carr, *Reading the Fractures*, 66 n.34.

<sup>184</sup> Speiser, *Genesis, AB*, 18.

### 3.4.1.1. *Beginning in the Beginning*

Genesis 1:1 is an intentional polemic because it purposely begins in the beginning. Gen 1:1 both copies the grammatical structure (ב + temporal noun) of 2:4b,<sup>185</sup> but changes the term from יום to ראשית. Instead of *the day*, Gen 1:1 uses *the beginning*.<sup>186</sup> This is no accident.

The opening line in Gen 1:1: “בראשית ברא אלהים” (“In the beginning when God created”).<sup>187</sup>

The opening line in the second creation myth: “ביום עשות יהוה אלהים” (in the day when YHWH God made”).

Why might the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a choose ראשית? Smith claims that it was “to provide a more profoundly grand perspective” so the author “selected the word [ראשית] for Genesis 1:1 because of its primordial and cosmic connotation, as seen in other cosmically oriented biblical texts.”<sup>188</sup>

The other cosmically oriented texts that Smith speaks of also speak to the sort of authority asserted when something is claimed to have begun in the beginning. Proverbs 8:22 says, “YHWH purchased me [wisdom] at the beginning (ראשית) of his journey.”<sup>189</sup> This verse elevates the status of wisdom by placing its inception in the very beginning of time. Before such

---

<sup>185</sup> Thus a temporal clause is formed (in the X when ...).

<sup>186</sup> Note also that in Gen 10:10, like its use in Jer (26:1; 27:1; 28:1; 49:34), it refers to kingdom or reigns. Also note that it is used to refer to the firstborn (Genesis 49:3; Deuteronomy 21:17; Psalms 78:51; and 105:36), and in priestly circles, including especially the holiness code, for first-fruits or the choicest fruits for sacrifices (Lev 2:12; 23:10; Ezek 20:40; 44:30; and 48:14 in relation to land). See HALOT.

<sup>187</sup> Another way ראשית could be translated is “first.” So בראשית could be translated, as Mark Smith does, as “When at first.”

<sup>188</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 132. The other cosmically oriented texts that Smith is speaking of are Proverbs 8:22 and Job 40:19. Also, the reason for the use of אחד at the end of the first day may also relate to this. It could be an emphatic statement that this creation story is beginning right at the beginning of time, in fact, on the first day, it is *time* itself that comes into being (see 1:3–5).

<sup>189</sup> My translation. The word behind “purchased” is קנה (to buy) while the word behind “journey” is דרך (way, path, road, trail, journey).

and such, wisdom was. Likewise, Job 40:19 states the same status for the *Behemoth*, “It is the chief (ראשית) of the acts (דרכ) literally “ways” or “paths”) of God, only its Maker can approach it with the sword.” Both wisdom (Proverbs 8:22) and the *Behemoth* (Job 40:19) were elevated by being placed in the beginning.

So why begin in the beginning? It is because “placement constitutes purpose, and the purpose in this case was to distinguish Genesis 1 from the various creation accounts.”<sup>190</sup> In short, the purpose was to reconstruct the memory of creation. This act of countermemory is aptly described by Smith “as one of the Bible’s greatest acts of commentary.”<sup>191</sup> If the group who added Gen 1 was satisfied with the *previous* creation myth (i.e. the Garden of Eden), there would be no need to make another, let alone add one. The placement of Gen 1 in front of the Garden of Eden myth suggests that the author intended Gen 1 to be read first.<sup>192</sup>

#### 3.4.1.2. *The Inversion of Heaven and Earth*

The second account then appears to be localized to the earth, and more specifically, in the garden. “Genesis 1:1 informs its audience that the initial moment of creation is located in the ‘heavens’; it is cosmic in its orientation.”<sup>193</sup> The author “switched the order of these words, giving a different emphasis to mark the whole of the passage.”<sup>194</sup> Bill Arnold notes that the scope

---

<sup>190</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 137.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>192</sup> Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1979), 150. Childs argues that the two creation stories differ “strikingly” from one another. Further he adds that with the final form, the second story is subordinate to the first.

<sup>193</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 131.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., 131.

of Gen 2 “is nothing like the universal perspective of Gen 1’s ‘the heavens and the earth.’”<sup>195</sup> Mark Smith concludes that “Genesis 1:1 represents a deliberate comment on 2:4b.”<sup>196</sup> By this logic, the first account holds an advantage in authority, albeit a slight one. This is not an overpowering sort of polemic, rather it is subtle and gentle. It is done implicitly.

### 3.4.1.3. *Created not merely Made* (עשה not ברא)

The third way that Gen 1:1 counters Gen 2:4b is with the use of the verb ברא. This term is commonly overloaded theologically by commentators that it ceases to be an ancient Near Eastern term. Theological conclusions such as *creatio ex nihilo* are supposedly proven wholesale by this one mere term, and as Arnold points out: “this is entirely too much for our little verb to bear.”<sup>197</sup>

Still though, the use of the verb in Gen 1:1 is in the *qal* form, and God is consistently the subject of the verb in this form (e.g. Numbers 16:30; Psalm 51:12; Isaiah 42:15, 43:1, 45:18). This is contrary to the second verb עשה which is used for both divine actions as well as human actions. “It is no doubt that this creative activity in 1:1–2:3 is clearly reserved for the domain of the sovereign God of Israel. Creating in this way is something that only God can do.”<sup>198</sup>

Westermann concludes that it was the author’s “intention to use a special theological word for creation by God.”<sup>199</sup> Mark Smith highlights the significance of the term saying its use “makes a

<sup>195</sup> Arnold, *Genesis*, 55.

<sup>196</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 131. In regard to seeing Genesis 1 as making more universal and cosmic claims, Smith argues that it is possible that the first account borrows the notion of a damp face of the earth from the second account (2:5–6) and puts it on a grander (cosmic) scale describing the entire surface (פני) as covered in cosmic water. See pp. 133–134.

<sup>197</sup> Arnold, *Genesis*, 36.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., 37.

<sup>199</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 99–100.

commentary about the cosmic profile of the deity. In other words, this creation is a particular activity of the deity unlike what humans do when they make things.”<sup>200</sup> Smith further notes that the use of עשה in the first creation story, a term used repeatedly in the second account, marks its attempt to still combine it with the second account while also emphatically elevating the first account through the use of this theologically loaded term ברא.<sup>201</sup>

Gen 1:1 does more than just begin the narrative about God’s creative week, it also creates an implicit commentary for the Garden of Eden narrative. In their opening seven words the authorial group inverts the terms ארץ ושמים to ארץ והשמים, they use the more precise and definitive point in time, and lastly, God’s creative activity is described by the more specialized term ברא as opposed to the more common עשה. Each of these moves implicitly work together to elevate the influence and authority of the first narrative above that of the second. In short, Gen 1:1 is a subtle, although intentional, act of countermemory.

### 3.4.2. Aetiological Concerns

The greatest indicator of countermemory is found in the content of Gen 1 as compared to the content of Gen 2. Creation myths tend to provide aetiological explanations for why certain experiences are the way they are. Gen 1 and 2 are no exception to this rule. However, the author and redactor of Gen 1 was dissatisfied with three things that were missing in Gen 2’s treatment of creation (as well as other biblical and non-biblical creation myths, but the focus for now is on

---

<sup>200</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 132.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid., 132.

Gen 2).<sup>202</sup> In the order of that which was most important to the author/redactor, the missing aetiologies were the Sabbath, a calendar for Israel, and a complete animal taxonomy.<sup>203</sup>

### 3.4.2.1. *The Sabbath*

The Sabbath is the most important theme for the author of Gen 1.<sup>204</sup> This is evidenced by the fact that the seven-fold structure of Gen 1 is structured after Gen 2:2–3’s Sabbath aetiology. The entire narrative, then, is emphatically stating ‘Sabbath.’ Consequently, the Sabbath is an essential part of this author/redactor’s socioreligious identity. Gen 2 does not provide an adequate explanation for the Sabbath’s origins. The infinitive constructs of purpose in Gen 2:15 (“to till it” and “to work it”) “outline the *raison d’être* for humanity’s existence but with no foundation for the cessation of work.”<sup>205</sup> The only prohibition is one against eating the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil (Gen 2:16) and after this is transgressed the human is condemned to work the soil as his only option for sustenance (Gen 3:17–19). Mark Smith observes that without the qualification of resting one in every seven days, “work might be implicitly seen as mandated in the garden of Eden seven days a week.”<sup>206</sup> This is not adequate to prepare the reader for the importance of the Sabbath as found later in (Holiness) texts such as Exodus 31:12–17 and 35:2–3. A new introduction, then, “was necessary” so that YHWH himself

---

<sup>202</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 333.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid., 334.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid.

<sup>206</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 136. See also Lev 23:3: “Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is a sabbath of complete rest, a holy convocation; you shall do no work: it is a sabbath to the LORD throughout your settlements (NRSV).”

could be portrayed as *sabbathing*, which legitimizes Sabbath-Keeping and the seven-day pattern that is mandated in many other Sabbath pericopes throughout the Pentateuch.<sup>207</sup>

It is surprising that Sabbath-keeping is not directly commanded to humanity in Gen 1, although Gen 2:2–3 clearly prepares readers for this command in Ex 16, 20, 31, and 35. This aetiology of the Sabbath law “is intended to teach that God is sovereign both over time and over Israel, and that therefore every seventh day, Israelites must renounce their autonomy and affirm God’s dominion.”<sup>208</sup> The author of Gen 1 was content to allow the prohibition against work on the Sabbath to come later in the narrative, such as Exod 16.<sup>209</sup>

#### 3.4.2.2. *The Calendar*

The second aetiological concern Gen 1 had with Gen 2 was that it lacked an explanation of Israel’s calendar. As Arnold notes: “The absence of any references to the creation of time and especially the markers of time (sun, moon, and stars) was an inadequacy of Gen 2 that Gen 1 intentionally sets out to rectify.”<sup>210</sup> So the author of Gen 1 sets out to provide his audience an origin time reckoning, which is something that Gen 2 does not cover.<sup>211</sup>

Calendars are essential to a culture’s identity. Cultural memories such as Passover and cultural rituals such as Yom Kippur are actualized and commemorated year after year. The

---

<sup>207</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 334.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., 334. Arnold is working with Matitiah Tsevat’s work in “The Basic Meaning of the Biblical Sabbath” in *The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies: Essays on the Literature and Religion of the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1980), 39–52, esp. 49. Tsevat writes: “Keeping the Sabbath is acceptance of the sovereignty of God.”

<sup>209</sup> Chapter 5 will discuss Exod 16’s Sabbath pericope in relation to the larger narrative whole that Gen 1 is a part of.

<sup>210</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 339.

<sup>211</sup> This Priestly calendar is either Lev 23 or Num 28–29 that Gen 1 is preparing readers for. Leviticus 23 is from H while Num 28–29 is P. Chapter 6 will deal with this in detail.



calendar is linked to the celestial bodies, which are believed to be up in the heavens with the gods.<sup>212</sup> Arnold explains the significance of calendars and their connection to the heavens:

The functional use of heavenly bodies is similar to that of Mesopotamian cosmogony, in which the creating deities placed them in the skies as signs of the course of time intentionally so humans would observe them and measure time by them, and to direct their lives according to the divine will revealed in them.<sup>213</sup>

Knowing the proper order of time was more than just keeping time accurately, it was linked to the will of the gods. The author of Gen 1 felt that Israel's creation myth had to include the celestial bodies. It had to include an aetiology of their national and religious calendars.

This author is also carefully “side-stepping” the use of the Hebrew word for *sun* (*shemesh* שמש) so as to avoid the association with the proper name of the Babylonian sun god: *Shamash*.<sup>214</sup> “In fact,” Arnold writes, “in light of the fascination with celestial signs in Mesopotamian texts, it seems likely the author of Gen 1 has set out intentionally to distinguish Israel's use of these phenomena as marks of sacred festivals from the Babylonian focus on divinatory readings of the signs.”<sup>215</sup> This means that Gen 1 is not only a countermemory to Gen 2, but also to the Babylonians as well. This will be further addressed in the next chapter.

---

<sup>212</sup> Francesca Rochberg describes how Babylonian texts referred to the sun, moon, and stars metaphorically as “heavenly writings,” and these heavenly writings could be accessed and interpreted by humans. See *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1–3. First read in Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 340.

<sup>213</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 340. See also Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and the Bible* (CBQMS 26; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994), 67–73.

<sup>214</sup> Interestingly, Gen 2 uses *Atra-Hasis* as a source and neither of them provide an aetiology for their culture's respective calendars. Whereas both Gen 1 and *Enuma Elish* do set out to provide an aetiology for their culture's calendar (See *Enuma Elish* iv:138–v:49).

<sup>215</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 340–41. See Benjamin R. Foster, “Epic of Creation” (COS 1.111:390–402; esp. 398–99). See also Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford university Press, 2000), 254–56.

Together with the Sabbath, the inauguration of time in Gen 1:3–5 and the institution of the markers of time in 1:14–18 reveal that the author of Gen 1 is much more concerned with the creation of time than he is with the creation of space.<sup>216</sup> In fact, unlike Gen 2, there is no demarcation of space in Gen 1; that is, there is no temple or garden.

### 3.4.2.3. *Animal Taxonomy*

The third aetiological concern that Gen 1 had with Gen 2 was with its lack of animal taxonomy. The author of Gen 1 was compelled to add Gen 1 so that the reader would be properly prepared for the dietary laws of Lev 11.<sup>217</sup> Genesis 2 lacks in this in one important way.

Genesis 2 does not list any aquatic animals, just birds and land animals. The animal taxonomy in Gen 1 and Lev 11 is very complex.<sup>218</sup> In the interest of brevity, there is as much as a fivefold schema, but as low as three.<sup>219</sup> The three basic categories are land animals, aerial animals, and aquatic animals. Although complex, Richard Whitekettle notes that the Israelites allowed for much latitude when it came to animal taxonomy and categorization.<sup>220</sup> The author of Gen 1 employs the basic schema of three in Gen 1:20–25, 28. However, the schema present in J's Gen 2:19–20 is truncated below the accepted minimum of three to just two. So in the view of the author of Gen 1, Gen 2's animal taxonomy needed revision. Arnold rightly concludes: "Thus the

---

<sup>216</sup> Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 339. See also Walter Vogels, "The Cultic and Civil Calendars of the Fourth Day of Creation (Gen 1,14b)," *SJOT II* (1997): 178–79.

<sup>217</sup> Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 336. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 6.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., 338. See also Richard Whitekettle, "Where the Wild Things Are: Primary Level Taxa in Israelite Zoological Thought," *JSOT* 93 (2001): 17–37.

<sup>219</sup> The fivefold schema is: (1) high carriage land animals; (2) low carriage land animals; (3) two-legged aerial animals; (4) six legged aerial animals; and (5) aquatic animals (See Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 338 and Whitekettle, "Where the Wild Things Are," 31–33).

<sup>220</sup> Whitekettle, "Where the Wild Things Are," 19–20, 27–31.

fuller lists of Gen 1:20–28 were slightly correcting the older creation account of Gen 2, and preparing the reader for the dietary laws of Lev 11.”<sup>221</sup>

Genesis 1 was added as a countermemory to provide three aetiological explanations. The author of Gen 1 felt the need to have these aetiologies included in Israel’s creation tradition, as such, he was dissatisfied with Gen 2 as the beginning. This does not mean that the author of Gen 1 ever intended to replace Gen 2. To the contrary, much of Gen 2 was meant to be retained. Arnold explains it: “By supplementing and framing the older account while still retaining it as authoritative, the Holiness author/redactor has provided a tapestry of creation theology.”<sup>222</sup>

### 3.5. Conclusion

It has been established that Gen 1 was added in front of Gen 2–3 because its author/redactor felt that Gen 2–3 did not adequately prepare the reader for Sabbath law, calendar, and a complete animal taxonomy for dietary laws. That is, Gen 2–3 did not have the required aetiologies the author/redactor of Gen 1 felt necessary to be there.

Gen 1 was connected to Gen 2 via the editorial hinge at 2:4a and the addition of אֱלֹהִים to the name יְהוָה. Much of Gen 2–3 is maintained by the author/redactor responsible for Gen 1, however, there was still a need to add an additional and revised view of creation. The editorial hinge in 2:4a causes Gen 1:1–2:3 to function as a prologue to both the book of Genesis and the Pentateuch. As prologue, that is, as the very first word, Gen 1 becomes the first version of the creation one encounters and as a result, the first one to be remembered.

---

<sup>221</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 338.

<sup>222</sup> Ibid., 333.

Creation myths are the grandest of remembrances. They are the formative memories of a culture that trump and surpass all chronologically subsequent memories of the remembered past. As such, Genesis 1 has become the *de facto* creation story. It became and remains the standard view of cosmological origins specifically for the religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.<sup>223</sup> It is “the” creation story that readers first think of from the Bible.”<sup>224</sup>

---

<sup>223</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 137. “Genesis 1 thus emerges in several respects as the one set above and before other texts; and so it has remained the standard up into our own time.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid.

CHAPTER 4:  
GENESIS 1 COMMUNICATES A SHIFT FROM SACRED SPACE TO SACRED TIME:  
A COMPARATIVE READING WITH OTHER CREATION MYTHS

**4.1. Introduction**

The previous chapter demonstrated that Gen 1 was added as a countermemory to Gen 2, this chapter will continue the inquiry into the nature of Gen 1 as a countermemory and extend the breadth of material of which to compare Gen 1 to beyond Gen 2 to the ANE, both biblical material as well as non-biblical material. This chapter will focus particularly on the Babylonian epic of creation, *Enuma Elish*. Additionally, this chapter will extend beyond the genre of creation myths to also include temple-building myths (such as the *Baal Myth*). These expansions will not only provide a fuller understanding of Gen 1 as a countermemory, they will also explore two important aspects of Gen 1's countermemory: *What is the countermemory (or mnemonic shift<sup>225</sup>) that the author of Gen 1 is attempting to make?* and *How is that shift communicated?* This inquiry into *what* and *how* reflects what Ron Hendel calls the *poetics of memory*.<sup>226</sup>

---

<sup>225</sup> The phrase *mnemonic shift* is borrowed from: Kent Sandoe and Lorne Olfman, "Anticipating the Mnemonic Shift: Organizational Remembering and Forgetting in 2001," in *ICS 1992 Proceedings* (Paper 53, 1992), 127–37. I am indebted to Ryan Schroeder for leading me to this phrase.

<sup>226</sup> Ronald Hendel, ed., *Reading Genesis: Ten Methods* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 33. Hendel states that poetics of memory refers to a focus "on the literary forms and strategies whereby the text transforms the remembered past into narrative discourse."

#### 4.1.1. Countermemories Imitate What Came Before

A culture's origin myths, especially how they are remembered and how they are ritually experienced, constitute one of its most formative and foundational remembrances. And though creation myths are set in the distant past, they are always endowed with a present significance.

Jan Assman explains:

Myths establish and enclose the area in which human actions and experiences can be oriented. The stories they tell of deities are supposed to bring to light the meaningful structure of reality. Myths are always set in the past, and they always refer to the present. What they relate about the past is supposed to shed light on the present.<sup>227</sup>

In other words, even though the story Gen 1 narrates is set in the (most distant) past, what it describes and how it describes it is more informative about the present time of its author who composed and added it than it is about the past it describes.

The motivation for such a shift is the Babylonian exile; where just years previous and undeniably fresh in the collective memory of the exiled Israelites, the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed and the people were removed from their land. This is the presumed *Sitz im Leben* of Gen 1.

Genesis 1's focus on time is very unique among other ANE creation myths; many of which focus on sacred spaces like temples or palaces. By using this genre, the author of Gen 1 knows that his audience expects to hear something specific on the last day. But, that expectation is reversed and the audience hears something else instead. The audience hears of a sanctifying of time, not space; they hear 'Sabbath' instead of 'Temple.' Thus, by utilizing the genre of creation myths, the author has associated Sabbath and Temple in the subconscious of the audience. He has

---

<sup>227</sup> Jan Assman. *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 112.

brought about a mnemonic shift from sacred space to sacred time – from the Temple in Jerusalem to the *temple in time*—the Sabbath.

The best way of going about investigating this is to do a comparative reading of Gen 1 with other ANE creation myths, both biblical and non-biblical, though, the chief myth that Gen 1 will be compared with is *Enuma Elish*. Within the realm of cultural memory, comparative readings will be employed to investigate how the memory of creation constructed in Gen 1 compares with other memories of creation; how Gen 1 *differs from* and how it is *similar to* them.<sup>228</sup> Apart from this comparative reading demonstrating how Gen 1 communicates its mnemonic shift from space to time (its countermemory), it will reveal one thing further: the close connection creation myths have with temples and other sacred spaces.

Before comparing myths a brief word on Yairah Amit's concept of hidden polemics in the HB.

#### 4.1.2. Countermemories are Understated and Subtle

Countermemories are not communicated explicitly, as the previous chapter demonstrated. Rather they are communicated in subtle and even subversive ways. They are understated. Genesis 1 is no exception to this rule. In *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, Yairah Amit illustrates the sort of strategies and procedures biblical authors use in order to present their alternative versions of the past unobtrusively. What this thesis calls countermemories she calls

---

<sup>228</sup> Admittedly, there is great difficulty in determining what memories predated Gen 1, and thus which memories Gen 1 intentionally sought to counter. Add to that the issue of not knowing which creation memories the author was aware of even if they predated his composition of Genesis 1. However, throughout the argument I make here in this chapter, it is clear to me that the type of creation memory the author of Genesis 1 intentionally countered is clear enough. Consequently the evidence that follows is more concerned with how Genesis 1 compares with the types of creation myths as opposed to the specific myths themselves.

hidden polemics. A countermemory or hidden polemic is not sneaky or dishonest, Amit notes, rather it is motivated by the belief they are far more effective in persuading an audience as opposed to simply forcing the issue in the open.<sup>229</sup>

The main motivation for introducing countermemories is a culture's "wish to shape the life of the community of believers and to determine the rules that would guide God's congregation."<sup>230</sup> The cultural struggles for understanding one's past and one's preferred future are not only between biblical and non-biblical cultures (e.g. Babylonian and Israelite) but also between biblical subgroups (e.g. priestly and non-priestly). Amit explains:

On the one hand, there was a struggle with the world within which this literature took shape: that is, a confrontation with internal disagreements among different ideological streams and schools, operating at times alongside one another and at others in the wake of one another, and which in any event wished to leave their impression upon the spiritual and social life of Israel ... On the other hand, there was a struggle with the general culture that surrounded it, which to a large extent served as the cause and motivation for its creation. The continuation of these confrontations along the axis of time, at times for centuries, constitutes the framework for the existence of polemics and polemical writing.<sup>231</sup>

A great example of this, as it pertains to Gen 1, is the dispute the author of Deutero-Isaiah had with the theological claims of Gen 1. Moshe Weinfeld provides three examples where Deutero-Isaiah is polemical to the claims of Gen 1, thus producing a countermemory.<sup>232</sup> First, Gen 1:2's description of primordial chaos leaves the question as to whether YHWH created it unanswered. Thus, Isa 45:7 posits that YHWH "forms light and creates darkness ... I make *shalom* and create woe/evil." Second, Gen 1:26 presents humanity as being in the image of God.

---

<sup>229</sup> Yariah Amit, *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, trans. by Jonathan Chipman (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 4.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid., 2–3.

<sup>232</sup> See Moshe Weinfeld, "God the Creator in Gen. 1 and in the Prophecy of Second Isaiah," *Tarbiz* 37 (1968): 120–32.



This caused concern for the prophet wondered: is man truly in the physical likeness of God? Can that be? Isaiah 40:18, 25; and 46:5 all dispute this notion by asking rhetorically if an appropriate likeness (דמיון) of God can indeed be found.<sup>233</sup> And third, Gen 2:2–3 presents God as resting from all his work. The prophet was not pleased with this, and in Isa 40:28, he contends: “he who creates the ends of the earth shall be neither weary nor tired, there is no limit to his wisdom.”

Michael Fishbane summarizes Weinfeld’s three points stating that the content and language of Deutero-Isaiah is “unquestionably” directed to Gen 1:1–2:3. He continues:

By alluding to Gen 1:1–2:4a in his spiritualization of it, a hermeneutical tension is posed. Deutero-Isaiah could not accept the received creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4a as it was—in light of his theological attitudes and the challenge of the ideological milieu. Particularly sensitized by the latter, one may presume, he *exegetically reappropriated* Gen 1:1–2:4a and transposed it into a new theological key.<sup>234</sup>

However, Benjamin Sommer argues for more of a polemical stance (as Weinfeld does) as compared to Fishbane’s view of it being more of a hermeneutical tension. As Sommer puts it, “Deutero-Isaiah’s point was not to have people read Genesis 1 differently, but to have them believe his own ideas instead of those in Genesis 1.”<sup>235</sup>

What this example between Deutero-Isaiah and Gen 1 shows is that each new version or new interpretation of the past becomes a countermemory to the memory that preceded it. Thus, Gen 1 is a countermemory to *Enuma Elish*, Gen 2–3, Ps 74, and Ps 104; just as Deutero-Isaiah is

---

<sup>233</sup> Additionally, the notion that God was with a council of other beings is also disputed by the prophet. Isaiah 40:13–14 claims that YHWH alone created everything and he did not consult anyone. Evidently, the prophet did not appreciate the theological implications of “let us make man in our image.”

<sup>234</sup> Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 326.

<sup>235</sup> See Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), 216, n. 87.

a countermemory to Gen 1.<sup>236</sup> What follows is a comparison of Gen 1 with these and other ANE creation myths. The goal will be to determine what Gen 1's countermemory was and what it was against; as well as how it was communicated in an understated or hidden manner.

## 4.2. Comparison with Ancient Near Eastern Creation Memories

This section will compare Gen 1 with other *biblical* creation memories,<sup>237</sup> and it will also compare Gen 1 with *non-biblical* creation myths, especially *Enuma Elish*. This comparative reading will demonstrate that Gen 1 is, generically speaking, a creation myth.

### 4.2.1. Biblical Creation Myths

For ancient Israel, and their scriptures, there is no such thing as *the* myth of creation; rather there are many. Consequently Israel's memory of its origins is not simply a matter of reading one account. Instead, there are many competing and differing versions of creation. How could one of these myths simply represent the whole? Obviously, the answer is that no one myth can possibly be *the* myth. Creation memories exist throughout the HB. There are memories preserved in the prophets (Amos 4:13; 9:6; Jer 10:12; and Zech 12:1), in wisdom literature (Prov 8:22–31; Job 26:7–13; 38:1–11, Sir 24:3–9) in Israel's temple worship (Psa 8:3–7; 19:4; 24:2;

---

<sup>236</sup> In fact, any unique memory of creation is a countermemory to any other memory of creation that becomes known to the audience. Deuteron-Isaiah's view of creation, as an example, is a countermemory to Gen 1 since Gen 1 came first. However, the reverse is also true if an audience knows of Gen 1 first and then after learns of Deuteron-Isaiah's memory of creation. Which is likely the case to many readers of the Bible nowadays, since Gen 1 is very well-known and the polemic in Deuteron-Isaiah against Gen 1 is not.

<sup>237</sup> By "creation memories" I mean any and every representation of creation within a culture's past. This could be achieved by full narratives, like Gen 1, or allusions to narratives (regardless of whether that narrative is extant in a written biblical form or is part of the culture's oral traditions) like Isaiah 42:5.

29:1–11; 33:6–9; 65:6–8; 68:32–35; 74:13–16; 78:69; 89:9–11; 90:2; 104:1–35; 148; and 150:1–2), and of course in the Law (Gen 1–11; Ex 20:8–11).

However, in all of these memories only a few can be called creation myths in their own right. That is to say, only a few present a self-contained explanation of creation. The rest, and the lion's share of the whole, are allusions to previous creation myths, some extant and some likely not. With Gen 2 already discussed in the previous chapter, there are, in particular, two psalms that remain to be discussed: Psa 74:12–17 and Psa 104:5–9.<sup>238</sup>

#### 4.2.1.1. Psalm 74:12–17

With the temple's destruction Israel's poets and prophets often recalled the creation of the universe in a way that provided hope for the people. This is especially the case for Psa 74. The temple's destruction was likened to the world falling back into a primordial state (other psalms speak of a return to the antediluvian period). Consequently, YHWH must be summoned to

---

<sup>238</sup> Mark S. Smith categorizes all creation myths in the HB into three groups in his work: *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*. The three categories are: divine might, divine wisdom, and divine presence. See, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 35–77. However, many of the texts that Smith discusses as creation myths are far from certain. For example, Psalm 89, one Psalm that Smith posts is a creation myth, is more about the legitimacy of the davidic ruler than it is about creation. Though it does echoes creation, it is not a creation myth. Another weakness to Smith's categorization is that the Garden of Eden creation myth does not fit in any of them very well (thanks to Craig Broyles for pointing this one out to me). Though it should be noted that Smith admits that the categorization is designed to serve as an aid to sifting through all the material, not to function empirically.

For example, Smith does not think these are the only three categories in the HB, rather the three represent the majority. He allows, for example, divine procreation, a very common creation motif in Egyptian creation accounts and in other ancient Near Eastern creation narratives. However Genesis 1 does not do this. The living creatures that are created are to multiply. But the universe itself is described as quite naturalistic, or at least devoid of personalized nature. Smith thinks that the Hebrew Bible in general downplays this procreative aspect of creation. See, as an example, Genesis 27:28 and 49:25.

Contrarily, Othmar Keel sees the ancient Near Eastern motif of creation by divine procreation so much that he, and others, argue that 'earth' in Genesis 1:2 is a "mother earth figure." (Keel, *Goddesses and Trees: Ancient Near Eastern and Yahweh: Ancient Near Eastern Art and the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 52.). See also, Othmar Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (translated by Timothy J. Hallett; New York: Crossroad, 1985) 30–31, 36; and Frank Moore Cross, "The 'Olden Gods' in Ancient Near Eastern Creation Myths and in Israel," in Frank Moore Cross. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 72–83.

reprise the situation. Since he divided the sea and broke the heads of the sea dragons and *Leviathan* at the beginning, he could do so again and thereby rectify the situation and reestablish his temple. Israel summons this memory of creation as a way of saying: What YHWH did once long ago, he can and will do again now.<sup>239</sup> Thus, recalling the memory of creation is coloured and shaped by the direct pressures of the present.

Thus, after Psa 74 opens with a lament over the destruction of the Temple, the psalmist challenges in v. 10: “How long YHWH is the foe to scoff?” Then in vv. 12–17:

Yet God my King is from of old,  
     working salvation in the earth.  
 You divided the sea (ים) by your might;  
     you broke the heads of the dragons (תנינים) in the waters.  
 You crushed the heads of Leviathan<sup>240</sup> (לויתן);  
     you gave him as food for the creatures of the wilderness.  
 You cut openings for springs and torrents;  
     you dried up ever-flowing streams.  
 Yours is the day (יום), yours also the night (לילה);  
     you established the luminaries (מאור) and the sun (שמש).  
 You have fixed all the bounds of the earth;  
     you made summer and winter.<sup>241</sup>

ואלהים מלכי מקדם פעל ישועות בקרב הארץ:  
 אתה פוררת בעוז ים שברת ראשי תנינים על־המים:  
 אתה רצצת ראשי לויתן תתננו מאכל לעם לציים:  
 אתה בקעת מעין ונחל אתה הובשת נהרות איתן:  
 לך יום אף־לך לילה אתה הכינות מאור ושמש:  
 אתה הצבת כל־גבולות ארץ קיץ וחרף אתה יצרתם :

The remainder of the psalm is a call to action, a call for YHWH to “rise up” and remember his mighty deeds of creation and to put an end to those who scoff at him all day long (Ps 74:22).

<sup>239</sup> See Craig Broyles, *New International Biblical Commentary: Psalms*. (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999,) 308.

<sup>240</sup> The destruction of Leviathan has an echo in the Ugaritic *Baal Myth* where Baal smote Leviathan.

<sup>241</sup> NRSV.

Psalms 74 presents YHWH as a divine warrior king. In this type of creation myth, the focus or purpose is to portray the power and might that the deity wields over his enemies. The Sea (ים), *Tanninim* (תנינים), and Leviathan (לוייתן) are all YHWH's opponents; and they are understood as threats to his rule.

It should be noted, however, that Psalms 74:12–17 is not just a creation myth. That is to say, the purpose of the psalm is not to describe creation, like how both Gen 1 and Gen 2 do; rather, the purpose is to appropriate the memory of creation, the memory of YHWH as conqueror over the agents of chaos, so that he can be petitioned to do it once again. Thus, Psalm 74 is really an echo of a previous creation myth, albeit an elaborate echo or allusion as compared to other biblical creation allusions.

#### 4.2.1.2. *Psalms 104:5–9*

Psalms 104 is unique compared to the divine might creation myths. Like Gen 1, it too deviates from the theme of conflict. The creator is presented as an architect or an artist, as opposed to a divine warrior.<sup>242</sup> Mark Smith categorizes this psalm as creation through divine wisdom. Evidence for this comes primarily from v. 24: “YHWH, how great your works are, all of them you have made in wisdom.” Then again, Psalm 104 could be, perhaps, better characterized as a creation hymn, akin to the Egyptian *Hymn to Aton*.<sup>243</sup> Regardless of how one categorizes Psalm 104, it represents another version of the biblical memory of creation; and subsequently, it must be examined.

---

<sup>242</sup> See Job 28:25–27; 38:4–6.

<sup>243</sup> See ANET, 369–71; COS 1.28. Thanks to Craig Broyles for pointing this out.

Psalm 104 presents creation as a well ordered and intricately designed system. Emphasis is placed on the ways certain parts of creation enhance or affect other parts of creation. This is communicated via Ps 104's overall structure. For example, after the waters standing above the mountains are rebuked and flee (Psa 104:6–7), the author demonstrates the order of YHWH's creation by showing that the waters are not just sent away, as one would expect in a divine might style of creation memory. Instead, the water is sent to its predestined place: the valleys where they then become rivers (104:8). Rivers are essential to life; and so the author continues to demonstrate the intricate organization of YHWH's creation by showing that these rivers then provide sustenance for the animals on the earth (104:11) and the birds in the air (104:12). Then it becomes clear why the psalmist described YHWH setting up his abode high in the heavens in the first place (vv. 2–3);<sup>244</sup> it is for the purpose of providing rainfall to the mountains (v. 13) – that tricky area where rivers cannot reach.

This rainfall from the heavenly abode causes the grass, plants, and trees to grow, which again becomes food for cattle and humanity (not to mention wine for a glad heart, oil for a shiny face, and bread for a strong heart; see Psa 104:14–16). Those trees are the homes where the birds build their nests (v. 17), and the mountains are a habitation for the wild goats (v. 18). The moon marks the appointed times (מוֹעֲדִים) and in this darkness and passage of time, the creepy things know when to come out and creep and the young lions know when to go hunting for food; and when the sun comes up, they know when to withdraw (104:19–22). This sequence informs humanity when it is time to work and when it is time to not (104:23). Everything about YHWH's creative order is the result of careful planning.

---

<sup>244</sup> See and compare Jer 10:12; Amos 4:13; 9:6.

Throughout this psalm, creation is described as intricately designed and executed. Nothing is disconnected or accidental. The sheer genius of YHWH's creation is celebrated in this hymn.<sup>245</sup>

Psalm 104 and Gen 1 share some similarities. Chief of which is how both describe creation as well ordered and intricately planned. Gen 1 portrays *Elohim* as following a plan where he fills on days 5 and 6 the space he formed on days 2 and 3. The vegetation that springs up on day 3 is for the living things, including humanity, on day 6. The structure of Gen 1 conveys this well-ordered and well-planned creation.

Another similarity is Psalm 104's subtle depiction of *Leviathan* who is described as being in the sea (יָם), but not explicitly as a threat or enemy. Instead, it appears to be YHWH's ocean plaything, or a pet for his amusement. Similarly, Gen 1:21 presents the great *Tanninim* (sea monster) as created specifically by Elohim. In fact, the verb בָּרָא is used for its description of origin. And just as Gen 1 portrays a danger-free cosmos (mostly), Psa 104 does so as well. Where Gen 1 leaves the waters (*tehom*) above and below unnamed, and thus unordered until Gen 9, so too does Psa 104 describe the *tehom* and the waters above the mountains as in need of a thunderous rebuke (vv. 6–7).<sup>246</sup>

Differences between Gen 1 and Psa 104 also exist. The main difference between them is in their view of humanity and their place among the cosmos. Gen 1 presents humanity as high in the order of creation, much like Psa 8 does, exercising dominion and endowed with blessing. While Psa 104 gives the impression that humanity is just one among many living things that rely

---

<sup>245</sup> Broyles, *Psalms*, 398.

<sup>246</sup> See Broyles, *Psalms*, 399.

on YHWH's providential provision (Psa 104:29–30).<sup>247</sup> Humanity is not the pinnacle of creation, nor are they given authority over creation.

Another difference is in how Ps 104 describes the purpose of the moon and sun. This psalm places the moon before the sun (v. 19). And then the next verse presents a striking contrast to Gen 1: “You make darkness, and it is night (v. 20).” As Craig Broyles notes, this phrase “lays explicit claim to Yahweh’s creation of darkness.”<sup>248</sup> This is akin to Isa 45:7’s claim that YHWH created darkness. Together then, Ps 104 and Is 45:7 represent a countermemory to Gen 1:2’s version of the past where darkness is a primordial condition, not created by Elohim/YHWH.

#### 4.2.1.3. Psalm 89

Strongly connected to the notion that the deity at creation is a warrior is the notion that the earthly king is an earthly representative of the warrior deity. Psalm 89 exemplifies this notion that ‘as with the heavenly ruler so too with the earthly ruler.’ Verses 5–18 describe the deity’s victory over chaos and the other cosmic enemies (in this case it is *Rahab*<sup>249</sup> and *Yam*) and his creating (ברא) of “*Zaphon* and *Yammin* (the seas).”<sup>250</sup> The psalm transitions smoothly in v. 19,

<sup>247</sup> See Ps 104:23 as further evidence of the contrast between Gen 1 and Ps 104 in their view of humanity. In 104:23, humanity is mentioned at the end of a list of creatures that rely on YHWH’s providence.

<sup>248</sup> Broyles, *Psalms*, 399.

<sup>249</sup> *Rahab* here denotes the sea monster of chaos *Leviathan*. See Job 3:8; 9:13; 26:12; Psalm 74:14; 104:26; and Isaiah 27:1. Also see Broyles, *Psalms*, 356.

<sup>250</sup> The NRSV reads “The north (צפון) and south (ימין) – you created them.” The two Hebrew terms for *north* and *south* could be read as “*Zaphon*” and “the seas.” The context suggests that they be read this way as it is more likely to read צפון and ימין as objects rather than abstract ideas like directions on a compass. The LXX translates ימין as θαλάσσης (seas). As far as צפון is concerned, it can mean north or the mountain *Zaphon* in the modern day Syria. Since it was the most prominent mountain visible anything heading that direction can be described as heading zaphon-ward, or north in English. Relatedly, it is best to read *Zaphon* here since it is also where the Canaanites believed the dwelling of *Baal* to be. Many Psalms claim *Zion* as the mountain of God, as the true mountain of God (Ps 48:1–8). *Zion* and *Zaphon* are similar in sound and likely represent yet another countermemory the Israelites utilized to replace the Canaanite religious focus away from *Zaphon* in the North to *Zion* in the South. See Broyles, *Psalms*, 356 and 218.



shifting the focus from the deity and his long ago cosmic battle to his earthly representative the king, and the terrestrial battle with Israel's human enemies. The all-victorious YHWH bestows protection and support to his anointed one – specifically David but by extension all subsequent Davidic rulers. Then in v. 25 the deity passes his strength and might on to David announcing: “I will set his hand over sea (ים), his right hand over the rivers (נהרות).”<sup>251</sup> The same cosmic strength that YHWH exercises presently and, in the beginning, is now being passed on to David presumably to be used on Israel's current enemies. Psalm 89 is an example of alluding to creation in order to legitimize something in the present.

#### 4.2.1.4. Other Biblical Memories of Creation

The subduing of the cosmic waters is a common motif for creation memories in the ANE, as well as in the HB.<sup>252</sup> Many other psalms (Psa 29 and 65:5–7), and other biblical books (Job 26:10; 38:8; Jer 31:35; Isa 66:1–2; and Amos 5:8–9) echo this notion of creation by divine might. Creation myths that focus on the deity as a warrior may extend to some of the most ancient memories available. Even Exod 15, *The Song of the Sea*, though not a creation memory, alludes to creation with the mention of the deeps (תהום) covering Pharaoh's army in v. 5, and in v. 8: “the deeps (תהום) congealed in the heart of the sea (ים).” Exodus 15 uses this mythic symbol of *tehom* to portray YHWH's power over the primordial cosmic forces and his ability to employ them for his own purposes, and on behalf of his own people.

---

<sup>251</sup> This recalls the Baal Myth where Baal defeats his enemy Yammu (sea), who also goes by the name Naharu (river). See the *Baal Epic* (*Balu Myth COS I.86*).

<sup>252</sup> A good example of this is Job 26:7–13. It proclaims in v. 12 that by “His power he stilled the Sea (ים)” and by “his understanding he struck down *Rahab*.” *Rahab* is sometimes used as a derogatory substitute for Egypt (See Broyles, *Psalms*, 308). Compare with Psalm 87:4; Isaiah 30:7: “For Egypt's help is worthless and empty, therefore I have called her, “*Rahab* who sits still.”

#### 4.2.2. Non-Biblical Creation Myths

The ANE is replete with creation myths; and perhaps the most comprehensive one is the Akkadian epic, *Enuma Elish*.<sup>253</sup> What follows is a brief survey of non-biblical ANE creation memories and how they are similar and different as compared to Gen 1. An overview of the narrative of *Enuma Elish* will be given so as to acquaint the reader with a typical ANE (specifically Mesopotamian) creation myth. Then the similarities and differences will be highlighted between *Enuma Elish* and Gen 1, as well as other ANE non-biblical creation myths. A brief conclusion will then be close out this section, followed by a closer comparison of Gen 1 and *Enuma Elish* in the following section.

##### 4.2.2.1. Overview of *Enuma Elish*

*Enuma Elish* begins with the mingling of *Apsu* (sub-terrestrial waters) and *Tiamat* (ocean water), out of which many new gods come forth.<sup>254</sup> These new gods turn out to be too noisy for *Apsu* who resolves to destroy them.<sup>255</sup> Happening to come across *Apsu's* plans, the gods are shocked into worrying.<sup>256</sup> One of these shocked gods is the wise and resourceful god, *Ea*, who gets started on counter-plan to *Apsu*.<sup>257</sup> *Ea* casts a spell over *Apsu* thus incapacitating him. *Ea*

---

<sup>253</sup> See COS 1.111. All translations of *Enuma Elish* (or the Epic of Creation) are by Benjamin R. Foster, in COS 1.111. John Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), 46. It should be noted that *Enuma Elish* is the most comprehensive among those that have survived.

<sup>254</sup> COS 1.111, tablet I, lines 5–9.

<sup>255</sup> COS 1.111, tablet I, lines 25–35

<sup>256</sup> COS 1.111, tablet I, line 41–47.

<sup>257</sup> COS 1.111, tablet I, lines 59–62.

then takes *Apsu*'s kingship and kills him.<sup>258</sup> Victorious, *Ea* then founds a sanctuary atop *Apsu* and rests. The sanctuary is named 'Apsu,' which is defined as "They Recognize Sanctuaries."<sup>259</sup>

Now *Tiamat* is, as one might imagine, is enraged by her husband's defeat and death and, being easily convinced to wage war on *Ea* and the other gods, seeks retribution.<sup>260</sup> *Ea*'s royal court becomes afraid of *Tiamat*'s intent on war. This fear worsens as god after god fails to thwart *Tiamat*'s forces.<sup>261</sup> At long last, *Ea*'s son, *Marduk* heeds the call and accepts the challenge. Before doing so, he negotiates a cost for his services. *Marduk*'s condition for defeating *Tiamat* and her forces is sole kingship over all the gods.<sup>262</sup> The gods acquiesce. In the battle, he overwhelms *Tiamat* and emerges triumphant.<sup>263</sup> He then divides *Tiamat*'s body and fashions the (present) recognizable world from her two halves.<sup>264</sup> Out of *Qingu*, *Tiamat*'s chief general during the war, *Ea* fashions humanity to alleviate the toilsome labour of the gods.<sup>265</sup> The gods repay *Marduk* by offering to build him a temple. *Marduk* agrees and *Esagila* is constructed.<sup>266</sup> After the temple is constructed, this creation myth concludes with the hymnic recitation of the fifty glorious names of *Marduk*.<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>258</sup> COS 1.111, tablet I, lines 64–69.

<sup>259</sup> COS 1.111, tablet, lines 71–77.

<sup>260</sup> COS 1.111, tablet I, lines 110–144.

<sup>261</sup> COS 1.111, tablet II, lines 1–124.

<sup>262</sup> COS 1.111, tablet II, lines 125–163.

<sup>263</sup> COS 1.111, tablet III.

<sup>264</sup> COS 1.111, tablet IV, lines 137–140.

<sup>265</sup> COS 1.111, tablet VI, lines 1–36.

<sup>266</sup> COS 1.111, tablet VI, lines 48ff.

<sup>267</sup> COS 1.111, tablet VII.

#### 4.2.2.2. Similarities and Differences Concerning the Mechanics of Creating

*Enuma Elish* and Gen 1 are similar in their descriptions of the mechanics of creation.

Both describe the act of creating new elements by means of separating one element from another.

Genesis 1:4 describes *Elohim* separating light from darkness, which results in day and night. And

in vv. 6–7, *Elohim* separates the waters above from the waters below resulting in the creation of

the heavens. *Marduk* similarly creates heaven by separating the primordial waters: the goddess

*Tiamat*.

Then the Lord [Marduk] was inspecting her carcass, that he might divide the monstrous lump and fashion artful things. He split her in two, like a fish for drying, half of her he set up and made as a cover, heaven. He stretched out the hide and assigned watchmen, and ordered them not to let her waters escape. (IV:135–140)<sup>268</sup>

This parallel is made even more explicit when one considers that *Tiamat* is the personified waters

and is cognate with the Hebrew term, *tehom* (תְּהוֹם),<sup>269</sup> which is translated typically as “the deep”

(Gen 1:2).<sup>270</sup> Another similarity in the mechanics of creation between the two myths is the result

of the separation of *Tiamat/Tehom*. In both myths, the result is the heavens and this

‘cover’ (*Enuma Elish*) or ‘dome’ (Gen 1) holds back the waters above; presumably from flooding

the earth and thus reverting the earth back to its primordial useless condition—a chaos. However,

---

<sup>268</sup> All quotations from *Enuma Elish* are translated by Benjamin R. Foster in William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger’s *The Context of Scripture: volume 1: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (Leiden; New York: Brill), 1997. John Walton fails to notice that separating is an act of creation here in *Enuma Elish*. See his work *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 19–24.

<sup>269</sup> See Wayne Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1998), 301–6. David Tsumara made similar observations but concluded differently than Horowitz. He concluded that תְּהוֹם does not represent the demythologized *Tiamat* since תְּהוֹם is a Hebrew word, not an Akkadian loan word. See David Tsumara, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation* (JSOTSup 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 45–83, 156–59. Sparks disagrees with Tsumara, arguing that there “is nothing whatsoever to preclude a Hebrew author using his own term תְּהוֹם in a polemic against the obviously related cognate term *Tiamat*.”

<sup>270</sup> That *Tiamat* and *Tehom* are cognate terms designating the primeval sea has been carefully argued by Horowitz, see “Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography,” 301–6. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, *tehom* typically refers to the oceans, which were understood to be leftover waters from creation.

Gen 1 does not personify *tehom* as *Enuma Elish* had done with *Tiamat*. Arguably, one could say that Gen 1 intentionally avoids personifying any aspect of creation.<sup>271</sup>

Beyond *Enuma Elish*, there are other Mesopotamian creation myths that speak of separation as a mechanic of creation. For example, there is the Sumerian *Song of the Hoe*. *Enlil* is described here as the deity responsible for making “the world appear in its correct form.”<sup>272</sup> He did this by separating “heaven from earth and earth from heaven.”<sup>273</sup> The result of which is the possibility and eventual actuality of a place where humans can grow, a place called: “Where the flesh sprouts.”<sup>274</sup> Another Sumerian text, *The Huluppu Tree (Gilgamesh, Enkidu and the Netherworld)*, describes the beginning of time as “the days of yore ... when the heavens had been separated from the earth, when the earth had been delimited from the heavens” (lines 4, 8–9). The notion of the separation of the heavens from the earth is a popular motif in Mesopotamian cosmologies.

---

<sup>271</sup> Moreover, it must be argued that Gen 1 is not describing the deity as fashioning ‘artful things.’ This is, perhaps, jumping ahead slightly as the next chapter will begin discussing the source critical aspects of Gen 1, but the consensus among scholarship holds that Gen 1 is priestly (P or H). This thesis does not dispute that sentiment (just that Gen 1 is more accurately assigned to the hand of H as opposed to the hand of P). All this to say that since the author is from a priestly school or tradition, the separating of the primordial sea (*tehom*) with the dome (which is immediately called ‘heaven’) and the separating of the primordial darkness with light are less about fashioning artful things and more about distinguishing between holy and pure or clean and unclean. In other words, Gen 1 describes the deity as performing the duties expected of a priest (e.g. separating, blessing, sanctifying). Mark Smith claims that “God is presented as the ultimate priest,” that “Genesis 1 understands the universe in terms of a divine temple, with God serving in the role of its priest.” (Mark S. Smith. *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 67.)

<sup>272</sup> COS 1.157. Line 1–2.

<sup>273</sup> COS 1.157. Lines 3–5.

<sup>274</sup> COS 1.157. Lines 6–7

However, Egyptian cosmologies are different from Gen 1 and other Mesopotamian creation myths in this respect.<sup>275</sup> Egyptian deities, beginning with the very first one, are described as adjoining or uniting (usually sexually) instead of separating.<sup>276</sup>

#### 4.2.2.3. Similarities and Differences Concerning the Earth's Primordial Conditions

Genesis 1:2 describes the earth's primordial state as one that is "formless and void" and one that is covered in darkness and in *tehom*/waters. *Enuma Elish* echoes this idea of a primordial earth covered in waters (though the waters are personified):

When on high no name was given to heaven,  
Nor below was the netherworld called by name,  
Primeval *Apsu* was their progenitor,  
And matrix-*Tiamat* was she who bore them all,  
They were mingling their waters together, (COS 1.111, I, lines 1–5)

Furthermore, the primordial condition that *Enuma Elish* describes is a nameless and functionless one. *Enuma Elish* is concerned with naming the gods and the setting of their

---

<sup>275</sup> This is contrary to John Walton's view that Egyptian cosmologies uniquely convey the idea of creation through separation. There is very little evidence to support this claim. On the contrary, the gods in Egyptian cosmologies tend to evolve from one another. For example *Atum* evolves on his own and does not separate anything, rather the gods that issue from *Atum* are procreated by himself with himself (See COS 1.5 – 1.12). This appears to be quite the opposite of separating one thing from another, which one finds in Gen 1 and in other Mesopotamian creation myths. Walton argues that Akkadian and Sumerian texts do not reflect the notion of creating by separating. Though he distinguishes the act of separating heaven and earth as not the same thing as creating by separating. He specifically cites COS 1.9 and 1.10 (Coffin Text 335 and Papyrus Bremner-Rhind respectively) as evidence for this. See *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 17. His work seems to be geared toward trying to establish an Egyptian primacy for the tradition that Gen 1 is based on.

However, Gen 1's third day (Gen 1:9–10) is very reminiscent of Egyptian cosmology. Since the picture of the waters being "gathering together into one place" (יקוו המים מתחת השמים אל-מקום אחד) is one of unification, it shares this in common with Egyptian cosmologies. The very common motif within Egyptian cosmologies of the primeval mound emerging from the waters is directly echoed in Gen 1's third day.

Though Gen 1 shares this with Egyptian cosmologies, it also shares it with Sumerian works, such as *NBC 11108* and *The Disputation Between Ewe and Wheat*. Genesis 1's description of Elohim creating the visible universe through acts of separating one thing from another is well attested in ancient Near Eastern literature. The notion of the chief deity creating by separating is very much an accepted visual by the ancients and very much at home within the ANE's genre for creation myths – regardless of whether the myth is from Egypt or Mesopotamia.

<sup>276</sup> See *From Papyrus Bremner-Rhind* (COS 1.9), esp. COS 1.19; 26, 21–24. A possible exception to this is an instance in *Coffin Text Spell 80* (COS 1.8), *Shu* (god of the air) says that after his father *Atum* evolved from one into three, he "parted" *Geb* (earth) from *Nut* (sky). This creation myth describes this as happening by *Shu* placing himself between *Geb* and *Nut*, resulting in the two deities being parted.

destinies or purposes. Genesis 1 does not state the namelessness of the cosmos explicitly as a primordial condition, though the myth's overall narrative makes sure to both provide names to some of the elements (at least on the first three days) and assign functions (throughout days 1–7) to the created things.<sup>277</sup>

*Enuma Elish* similarly describes the origins of the celestial lights. Marduk establishes the Babylonian calendar by setting the stars in their right places. With these stars, he patterns the days of the year (V: 2–5). After which, Marduk

made the moon appear, entrusted (to him the moon) the night. He assigned to him the crown jewel of nighttime to mark the day (of the month): every month, without ceasing, he exalted him with a crown. “At the beginning of the month, waxing over the land, you shine with horns to mark six days, At the seventh day, the disk as half. At the fifteenth day, you shall be in opposition, at the midpoint of each [month]. When the sun f[ac]es you from the horizon of heaven.” (V: 12–19)<sup>278</sup>

Thus, *Enuma Elish* is also concerned with setting up the foundations for time, planning and patterning it, just as *Elohim* does on the fourth day in Gen 1. A difference exists in how the stars are described. In *Enuma Elish*, the stars have a very prominent role; whereas in Gen 1 they are almost an after-thought and are relegated to a subservient role to the moon (perhaps in usefulness for providing light at night/dark time). Consider Gen 1:16:

God made the two great lights—the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night, and the stars.

---

<sup>277</sup> For example, the creator names light ‘day’ and darkness ‘night’ on the first day, on the second, he names the dome ‘heaven,’ and on the third he names the dry ground ‘earth’ and the gathered waters ‘sea.’ Curiously, the waters above and the waters below are never named, they are just simply the waters above and the waters below.

When it comes to the idea of setting purpose and function to creation, on the fourth day the creator makes the greater light (sun) and the lesser light (moon), and the stars, in order to mark the appointed times, the days, and the years. These lights are to have dominion over the day and the night. Later on day 6, humans are made to have dominion over all living things. And all living things are to be fruitful and multiply in their respective environments. Everything is created with a purpose in mind. Consequently, the cosmos is filled with purpose.

<sup>278</sup> In *Enuma Elish*, the fifth tablet has damages on lines 25–44. It is in this lacuna that the sun is apparently made. Lines 45–46 say, “After he had appointed the days to *Shamash*, And had established the precincts of night and day.” The moon coming first is interesting since the moon is downplayed in the Gen 1 narrative (the lesser light). Also the avoidance of using the term for sun (שמש) is interesting as the Sun is named *Shamash* in *Enuma Elish*.

ויעש אלהים את־שני המארת הגדלים את־המאור הגדל לממשלת היום ואת־המאור הקטן לממשלת הלילה  
ואת הכוכבים:

It can be seen that v. 16 begins by saying that Elohim made two great lights, a greater light and a lesser or littler light, and then stars are tagged on the end. Additionally, the stars are named “the stars” whereas the greater light and lesser light are intentionally missing the nominal forms for sun and moon. Syntactically, each of the two great lights begins with the direct object marker , followed by the noun מאור followed by an adjective, and then followed by an infinitive construct of purpose (Direct Object Marker + מאור + greater/lesser + infinitive construct [ל + מִשַׁל “to rule”]). Thus, the stars are not treated as special in multiple ways, but mostly, they lack any kind of purpose.

Regardless, both *Enuma Elish* and Gen 1 present the primordial cosmos to their audiences as a watery, nameless and functionless cosmos; which is to be remedied through the process of hearing the myth.

Egyptian sources also reflect this situation. An unruly dark watery chaos exists in many of Egypt’s cosmologies (e.g. *The Book of Nut*, COS 1.1; *Coffin Text Spell 714*, COS 1.2). This situation is remedied by *Atum* when he makes his children, *Shu* and *Tefnut*. *Atum* says that they grew “excited in the inert waters in which they were, and brought me my Eye (the Sun) after them.”<sup>279</sup> Obviously, the notion of darkness is present as well since the Eye of *Atum* (the Sun) emerging from the mixing waters provides light to the earth. The notion of a watery darkness covering the cosmos at the beginning is further reflected in the Sumerian text *NBC 11108*, which records:

Earth was in darkness, the lower world was invisible,

---

<sup>279</sup> From Papyrus Bremner-Rhind (COS 1.9), 27, 2–4.



the waters did not flow through the opening (in the earth)  
Nothing was produced, on the vast earth the furrow had not been made.<sup>280</sup>

A dark and water-covered earth is a commonly held view of what the cosmos appeared as before any creative activity commenced.

#### 4.2.3. The Mainstream Memory of Creation and Genesis 1

According to extant material, creation as divine might is the most common type of creation myth available. It may even represent the mainstream memory of creation in the ANE, and the type that all other types of creation myths interact with it, or deviate from it, or are influenced by it. *Enuma Elish* was a formidable memory in the ANE.<sup>281</sup> A cursory reading of *Enuma Elish* reveals that this creation myth is characterized by divine conflict. The known world is remembered culturally to have come forth through conflict, death, and order is maintained by the might of the gods, or, in this case a particular god – Marduk. Humanity is brought into existence in order to alleviate the toilsome labour of the gods. Thus, humanity's role is to serve the gods who maintain order and keep chaos or conflict at bay.

Creation by divine might, or theomachy, may be the most ancient way the origins of the cosmos was understood (as *Enuma Elish* may attest),<sup>282</sup> but it also remained authoritative well beyond the exilic period (see Psa 74). In other words, though antiquated these memories were

---

<sup>280</sup> Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1994), 28.

<sup>281</sup> See Kenton Sparks, "Enūma Elish" and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism," in JBL 126, no. 4 (2007): 630; and Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1951). Disagreeing is W. G. Lambert, who understands *Enuma Elish* to have been more tendentious and obscure, not widespread; See, "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," JTS 16.2 (1965): 287-300.

<sup>282</sup> However, it is unlikely that creation as divine might or theomachy is the most ancient. The Garden of Eden, which is from J (and assuming that J is older than the other sources) is not about divine conflict. Perhaps Atrahasis could be said to be a creation by divine conflict myth, but it is not really about the creation of the cosmos. Instead, it is, like Gen 2–3, about the creation of humanity (it begins: "When gods were man.").

still utilized throughout the entire biblical period. Thus, they still held authority and were still integral in shaping the socioreligious life of the Israelites, particularly those Israelite groups that were chiefly concerned with the temple. Mark Smith explains:

After the monarchy fell in 586, the royal view of creation did not disappear. In biblical texts dating to the postexilic period (from 538 on), the idea of divine conflict was not only a matter set in the primordial past. It also became a way to talk about the future, definitive moment of God's salvation of Israel.<sup>283</sup>

Consider Isa 27:1, which speaks of a day when God will make all things right:

In that day YHWH with his cruel and great and strong sword will punish Leviathan the fleeing serpent, Leviathan the twisting serpent, and he will kill the dragon that is in the sea.

ביום ההוא יפקד יהוה בחרבו הקשה והגדולה והחזקה על לויתן נחש ברח ועל לויתן נחש עקלתון והרג את־התנין אשר בים:

Genesis 1 casts its memory of creation differently than the divine might myths.<sup>284</sup> The deity in Gen 1 does not have enemies that threaten his rule, at least not explicitly. Genesis 1 retains similar generic characters and elements that appear in these divine might creation myths, but it does not describe them the same way. Genesis 1:21, as an example, states that *Elohim* created (ברא) the great *tanninim* (תנינם).<sup>285</sup> Thus, Gen 1 describes, in an understated manner, these sea monsters as no threat since they are merely created by *Elohim*. In fact, dominion over the *tanninim* is (presumably) handed over to humanity on the sixth day.

Another example is in Gen 1:2, where the primordial condition of the earth is described as covered in *tehom* (or the deep). *Tehom*, or the concept of a great deep watery chaos covering

<sup>283</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 21–22.

<sup>284</sup> Genesis 1 is not alone in this. Psalm 104 recasts creation similarly, emptying it mostly of divine conflict or the potential for divine conflict.

<sup>285</sup> Translated as “great sea monsters” in the NRSV. A curious verse since the only other use for the term ברא is for humanity (though it is used emphatically for humanity three times).

the land, is a common aspect of creation myths, both biblical and non-biblical. In *Enuma Elish*, the primordial waters are personified as *Tiamat*. In *Enuma Elish*, she must be defeated so that there can be order and resolution. However, in Gen 1, though *tehom* is there, it seems to be effortlessly dealt with by Elohim when he summons the dome (רָקִיעַ). In Gen 1, the *tehom* is not a threat to cosmic order the same way it is portrayed in Divine Might creation myths, but it is still present and it is an obstacle that requires resolution.<sup>286</sup>

#### 4.2.4. Conclusion

From the Akkadian *Enuma Elish* to the biblical versions of creation, Gen 1 is similar to them all in various ways; and different. Though it must be understood that each ANE myth is different from those that came before it and those that will come after it. There is a drastic difference in Gen 1 that sets it apart as (arguably) the most unique creation myth in the ANE. This difference is not a modest difference, it is unprecedented. It is, of course, the presence of the Sabbath aetiology on the all-important seventh-day.

---

<sup>286</sup> Compare with Psa 148:7 which echoes the use of both these terms using them in parallel: “Praise the LORD from the earth, you *Tanninim* (תַּנִּינִים) and all *Tehomot* (תְּהוֹמוֹת).”

However, a little caution here is required. The waters above the dome, later called ‘heaven’, as well as the waters beyond that were not gathered, are not named in Gen 1. This implies that the primordial waters, or the *tehom*, were not entirely dealt with; at least not in Gen 1. This is the case likely due to narratological considerations. Though this will be discussed more fully in the next chapter, the author/redactor of Gen 1 likely is aware of the flood narrative (Gen 6–9) where these waters above and below return to revert the earth back into a primordial condition (a reversal of creation). At the conclusion of priestly flood narrative, this same Elohim promises: “never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of a flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth (Gen 9:11, NRSV).” Therefore, it is likely that Gen 1 describes Elohim as intentionally not naming the waters above and the waters below.

### 4.3. Temple and Creation

The questions asked at the beginning of this chapter were what is and how does Gen 1 communicate its countermemory. What is the rhetorical strategy? What are the poetics of Gen 1's countermemory? It is clear from this comparative reading that, generically speaking, Gen 1 is a creation myth. And like gravity, genre pulls its audience to preordained outcomes. In the case of Gen 1 and other creation myths, the gravitational pull is toward sacred spaces (i.e. temples, palaces, cities, ziggurats, mountains, etc.). Creation myths are about ordering the physical world that the audience currently occupies. Be it a city (e.g. *Enkidu Genesis*) or a temple (e.g. *Enuma Elish* or *The Song of the Hoe*), creation is intricately linked to the construction of these sacred places. Thus, it is no accident that there is an absence of a temple in Gen 1. This section explores the connections between temple and creation, as well as what that connection means for the seventh day in Gen 1.

#### 4.3.1. Temple Myths

That Gen 1 is a creation myth comes as no surprise. However, Gen 1 also contains many connections to themes found in temple myths. The connections Gen 1 has with temple building motifs will be demonstrated by first looking at a few examples of non-biblical and biblical temple myths. This survey will demonstrate (1) the significance of temple building myths to the people of the ANE, (2) the ways temple-building myths are communicated, and (3) the ways creation myths and temple-myths are interconnected. In the next section, it will be demonstrated how Gen 1 intentionally draws on these temple building themes as a creation myth in order to communicate its countermemory.

Beginning with evidence from among non-biblical creation myths, the examples of temple-building myths where there is no explicit mention of creation are *Enkidu Genesis* and the Ugaritic *Baal Myth*.

After a long lacuna which unfortunately opens *Enkidu Genesis*, *Nintur*, the goddess of birth and the creatrix of humanity, leads humanity back “from their trails” for the purpose of building temples:<sup>287</sup>

May they come and build cities and cult places,  
that I may cool myself in their shade;  
may they lay the bricks for the cult cities  
in pure spots, and  
may they found places for divination  
in pure spots!”

She gave directions for purification, and cries for clemency, the things that cool (divine) wrath, perfected the divine service and the august offices, said to the (surrounding) regions: “Let me institute peace there!” (COS 1.158, lines 7–15)

*Nintur* leads humanity back from their nomadic wanderings so that they can construct sacred spaces, where rituals of purity and cries of clemency can be done and will “cool” the temper of the gods. Thus, the sacred spaces, which in this case are cities where the “pure spots” or sanctuaries can be founded, are essential to the appeasement of the gods.

The Ugaritic *Baal Myth*'s focus is on Baal's temple atop mount *Zapanu*. The myth casts *Baal* as a god in search of a resting place of his own. He defeats *Yammu Naharu*, the god of the sea and river; and in the aftermath, Baal makes a claim to have a palace or temple built in his honour, which had already been done for many of the other gods (KTU 3:4:94–99). He makes

---

<sup>287</sup> Thus, this is not explicitly a creation myth.

this claim again a few more times (KTU 3:5:35–42; KTU 4:1:4–19) until finally his pleading is heeded and his palace is subsequently established.

Fire is placed in the house,  
 flames in the palace.  
 For a day, two (days),  
 the fire consumes (fuel) in the house,  
 the flames (consume fuel) in the palace;  
 For a third, a fourth day,  
 the fire consumes (fuel) in the house,  
 the flames (consume fuel) in the palace;  
 For a fifth, a sixth day,  
 the fire consumes (fuel) in the house,  
 the flames (consume fuel) in the palace;  
 Then on the seventh day,  
 the fire is removed from the house,  
 the flames from the palace.  
 (Voilà!) the silver has turned into plaques,  
 the gold is turned into bricks.  
 (This) brings joy to Mighty *Baal*:  
 You have built my house of silver,  
 my palace of gold.  
 (Then) *Baal* completes the furnishing of [his] house,  
*Haddu* completes the furnishing of his palace.

The building of Baal's temple requires a seven-day process of casting rock into precious metals such as silver and gold. This seven-day process is remarkably reminiscent of Gen 1's seven-day process.

There are also biblical temple-centric myths. One could easily point to the myth of the tabernacle in Exod 25–31 and 35–40. But two others can be pointed to: Exod 15:1–18 and Psa 29. The *Song of the Sea* in Exod 15:1–18 is perhaps the oldest extant memory in the Pentateuch. Its memory is focused on the defeat of the Egyptians and the subsequent establishment of YHWH's sacred space.

You brought them in and planted them on the mountain of your own possession,

the place, YHWH, that you made your abode,  
the sanctuary, YHWH, that your hands have established (v.17)

Additionally, there is Psa 29, which consists of seven instances where the voice (קול) of YHWH causes each successive act. This may correspond to the seven-day process for building *Baal's* temple in *the Baal Epic*.<sup>288</sup> The first use of קול can be seen to echo Genesis 1:2:

The voice of the YHWH is over the waters;  
the God of glory thunders,  
the YHWH, over mighty waters. (29:3)

Though this is not explicitly a creation myth, v. 3 contains an allusion to a creation-myth theme with threat of unruly waters and the need for their containment. Regardless, this psalm moves from this echo of creation to a temple with the seventh use of קול, which is presumably spoken within the sacred space of the temple:

The voice of the YHWH causes the oaks to whirl,  
and strips the forest bare;  
and in his temple all say, "Glory!" (29:9)

Psalm 29 concludes with YHWH reigning over the flood, sitting in his temple enthroned as king now that the chaotic waters, Lebanon, the wilderness, and the oaks and forest are all subdued. Now, "Glory" can be proclaimed in his temple.

These temple myths demonstrate the significance sacred places (i.e. temples) had in the ANE. They were essential to the people's connection to their gods. They were where the gods could be appeased; consequently, temples became the source of all their necessities, the source of blessing for abundant crops which yielded their food and sustenance, blessing of safety for their families. Temples were the very centre of their world.

---

<sup>288</sup> The seven uses of voice might be evidence of the Israelites taking a *Canaanite Baal hymn* and switching the name *Baal* for the Hebrew word *Qol* (קול) which sounds similar. Appreciation to Craig Broyles's *Advanced Old Testament Exegesis Class* where I first heard this.

#### 4.3.2. Temples and Creation

There are also temple-building myths that are (more) explicitly connected to creation. These include the Sumerian *Song of the Hoe*, which has more of an allusion to creation, and *Enuma Elish*.

The *Song of the Hoe* begins with the god *Enlil* separating heaven and earth, which is a creation-myth motif. After this, the main priority is to construct a temple.

... in order to make it possible for humans to grow “where the flesh sprouts,”  
[*Enlil*] first affixed the axis of the world in *Duranki*.” (COS 1.157, lines 1–7)

The name “where the flesh sprouts,” is a sacred place near *Nippur*, and *Duranki* is a sacred place located in the middle of *Enlil*’s temple complex in *Nippur*. The temple and the well-being, even the existence of humanity, are all rooted in *Enlil*’s temple. Furthermore, as far as the title of this creation myth goes – *The Song of the Hoe* – the hoe is considered a special tool because of its use in the construction of temples (see lines 35–58). Another myth that particularly combines creation and temple motifs is *Enuma Elish*. More will be discussed on this below (§4.4.3.).

A biblical example of this creation and temple connection can be pulled from Ps 74. It is concerned with the recent loss of the temple and it employs creation as a call to action for YHWH to do to Israel’s enemies now what he did long ago the cosmic enemies when he established his temple.

Egyptian cosmologies also demonstrate this connection between creation and temple. In many cases, the sacred space is the primeval hill or mound where the moment of creation



occurred. This is because the temple is built on the sacred place where the primeval hill emerged from the primeval waters.

The connection between creation and temple is strengthened even more so when the decor of Egyptian temples are considered. The ceilings therein represent the sky and the floor depicts the earth, the pillars symbolize plants and trees and taken as a whole they can represent a forest.<sup>289</sup> Temples are where the sun rises<sup>290</sup> and where the primeval life-giving rivers flow.<sup>291</sup> Temples are not just the location of creation, they are also symbolize the very moment of creation. Jan Assman explains: “Through a long chain of ongoing renewals,” each Egyptian temple “was the direct descendant of the original sanctuary that the creator god himself had erected on the primeval mound.”<sup>292</sup> Assmann concludes that “Each temple was not only the centre, but also the origin of the world.”<sup>293</sup> So lurking within every creation text in ancient Egypt is the temple that encloses that primeval hill.

The Israelites saw their temple in Jerusalem similarly. Lawrence Stager states: “For ancient Israel, the temple of Solomon – indeed, the Temple Mount and all Jerusalem – was a symbol as well as a reality, a mythopoeic realization of heaven on earth, Paradise, the Garden of Eden.”<sup>294</sup> He goes on to call the interconnectivity of creation, kingship and temple “the indissoluble triad.”<sup>295</sup> The Temple’s entire decor and architecture is reminiscent of the Garden of

---

<sup>289</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 106.

<sup>290</sup> Ibid, 105.

<sup>291</sup> Ibid., 104.

<sup>292</sup> Assmann, *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*, 38.

<sup>293</sup> Ibid, 39.

<sup>294</sup> Lawrence E. Stager, “Jerusalem as Eden,” *BAR* 26:03 (May/June 2000), 37.

<sup>295</sup> Ibid, 39.

Eden, which was either designed with the temple in mind or *vice versa*.<sup>296</sup> Stager contends that Mount Zion “linked heaven and earth (as axis mundi); from here order was established at creation and was continually renewed and maintained through rituals and ceremonies.”<sup>297</sup> Thus, it was a standing three-dimensional memory of creation, part of the spatial frameworks of memory for ancient Israelites.

To illustrate this further, many of the rituals or liturgies that take place within temples were meant to draw the audience’s memory back to creation. Many of the biblical psalms were liturgical and designed to be performed or ritualized within the Temple.<sup>298</sup> Outside biblical literature, there is the *Baal Myth* which presents the construction of *Baal’s* temple as a seven-day process, which perhaps corresponds to a seven-day festival. Part of the *Akitu Festival* is the ritualizing of the origins of the cosmos within the temple *Esagila*, built in *Enuma Elish*.

Benjamin Sommer notes the significance:

Through its rites, the *Esagila* temple, and hence the world, are symbolically razed, purified, and re-created ... Thus the *Akitu* festival also effects a return to the time of creation, which culminated in the enthronement of Marduk and the construction by the gods of Marduk’s temple in Babylon, the *Esagila*.<sup>299</sup>

---

<sup>296</sup> Ibid., 36–47. For example, the garden of Eden faced east and the temple (and tabernacle) faced east; palm trees, pomegranates, lily blossoms, and open flowers were graven in the walls of the temple all of which correspond to the garden; the cherubim were embroidered into the curtains of the temple (tabernacle) and guard the Holy of Holies, the cherubim were also stand on both sides of the bloodstained mercy seat on the ark guarding it just as they guarded the garden of Eden; gold, silver, and precious stones adorned the temple and gold, pearls, and precious stones flowed from the garden of Eden in its rivers.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid., 37.

<sup>298</sup> See temple entry liturgies such as Psalms 5, 15, 24, 26, 28, 36, 52; especially 24, where in 24:1–2 creation is echoed as the moment the “holy place” was established (See Broyles, *Psalms*, pp. 10–13).

<sup>299</sup> Benjamin D. Sommer, “The Babylonian Akitu Festival: Rectifying the King or Renewing the Cosmos?” in *JANES* 27 (2000): 85.

Thus the rituals performed within the *Esagila* temple were meant to make the audience remember and re-experience the founding of the temple, much like some biblical psalms and the decor of the temple itself.

Many creation myths are either centred around or culminate in a temple-building programme (e.g. *Enuma Elish* and Ps 74). As John Walton notes: “This close connection between cosmogony and temple building is present throughout the ancient Near East: temples were considered primordial, and descriptions of cosmic origins frequently included a description of or reference to temple building.”<sup>300</sup> Temples are a prominent feature of ANE creation myths.

Therefore, when the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed, a sacred space was lost; but even more than that, the security of the memory of creation was lost too. A tragic loss like this forced the necessity of committing the tradition of creation to a more lasting and stable form. So the community that survived committed it to text. This loss of sacred space and the loss of the social and spatial framework of memory also allowed the opportunity for a fresh take on creation. This, though one cannot be certain, may explain why there are multiple creation myths in the HB. For example, since the Temple mnemonically featured the Garden of Eden to everyone who happened to enter it, when the Temple was destroyed, it makes sense that the Garden of Eden could be amended with a new memory of creation. In fact, this new memory of creation may not only have been possible, it may have been necessary.

---

<sup>300</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 109. Mark Smith also notes “creation and temple-building are sometimes understood in terms of one another” (*Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 70).

#### 4.4. Genesis 1 and *Enuma Elish*

Leaning on the previous discussions on Gen 1 in comparison to creation myths, and the discussion that creation myths usually feature or are about a temple or sacred space, now Gen 1 will be compared to *Enuma Elish*. This comparison will demonstrate why the countermemory of sacred space to sacred time was made as well as how it was executed. First, a discussion will be given that demonstrates that *Enuma Elish* was accessible by the time the exiled Israelites were in Babylon. Then the connections between Gen 1 and *Enuma Elish* will be demonstrated followed by the key difference.

##### 4.4.1. *Enuma Elish* was Accessible and Known to the Audience of Genesis 1

A common point of contention to this claim that Gen 1 is connected to *Enuma Elish* is whether or not there is any evidence that the author of Gen 1 knew *Enuma Elish*. However, there is evidence that Gen 1 knew of this Mesopotamian creation myth.<sup>301</sup> To begin with, Mesopotamian texts enjoyed an elite reputation, existing in both Egypt and the Levant well before Israel appeared on the scene. Sparks notes:

I suspect that early Israel, taking shape in the highlands of the Late Bronze/Iron I Palestine, did not have much access to Mesopotamian literature. But certainly by the eighth and seventh centuries, as Assyrian imperialism extended its reach into Palestine, this situation changed dramatically, if it had not already done so. It is precisely from this point that we find the influence of Assyrian ideology on the prophecies of Isaiah and the book of Deuteronomy (cf. the Assyrian vassal treaties).<sup>302</sup>

---

<sup>301</sup> Sparks, “Enūma Elish and Priestly Mimesis,” 632.

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., 643. See also Peter Machinist, “Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah,” JAOS 103 (1983): 719–37.

The contact that Israel has with the Mesopotamians only increases as one moves from the pre-exilic era into the exilic one; since they are deported to Mesopotamia.<sup>303</sup> Sparks claims that during this exilic period, Mesopotamian influence on Hebrew literature was “earnest.”<sup>304</sup> He provides three examples that can be traced within biblical literature. First, the influence of Akkadian language on the book of Ezekiel.<sup>305</sup> Second, the influences of Mesopotamian royal inscriptions and Akkadian on Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>306</sup> And third, Mesopotamian theodicies in Job.<sup>307</sup> Additionally, Sparks notes that there are connections between the Exodus myth (narrative) with its two-fold structure: (1) victory and deliverance; and (2) building and dwelling of sacred space.<sup>308</sup>

Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, “Enūma Elish was recited annually by Mesopotamian priests during the Akītū Festival, where its recitation was the last cultic act on day 4 of that New Year event.”<sup>309</sup> Thus Sparks concludes the matter: “In the end, although some

---

<sup>303</sup> Ibid.

<sup>304</sup> Ibid.

<sup>305</sup> See Isaac Gluska, “Akkadian Influences on the book of Ezekiel,” in *An Experienced Scribe who Neglects Nothing: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein* (ed. Y. Sefati, et al.; Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2005), 718–37.

<sup>306</sup> See Shalom Paul, “Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions,” *JAOS* 88 (1968): 180–86; and Peter Machinist, “Mesopotamian Imperialism and Israelite Religion: A Case Study from the Second Isaiah,” in *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age Through Roman Palestina*, ed. by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 237–64.

<sup>307</sup> See Gerald L. Mattingly, “The Pious Sufferer: Mesopotamia's Traditional Theodicy and Job's Counselors,” in *The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature*, ed. W.W. Hallo, et al.; *Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies* 8 (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1990), 305–48.

<sup>308</sup> Sparks, “Enūma Elish and Priestly Mimesis,” 635–42.

<sup>309</sup> Ibid., 632.

scholars dissent, it seems to me that there is good evidence that P knew *Enūma Elish* and adopted it to create his version of Israel's creation story."<sup>310</sup>

#### 4.4.2. Connections between Genesis 1 and *Enuma Elish* in the Sequence of Events

Genesis 1's adoption of *Enuma Elish* is not the first time it has been adopted into a new cultural context. The Assyrians made their own version of the epic, which, with the closeness between the Assyrian and Babylonian cultures' theologies, amounted to very little difference save the substitution of *Marduk* for the Assyrian national god *Assur*.<sup>311</sup> The theological differences between Gen 1 and *Enuma Elish* are more abundant and, as Sparks puts it, "profound."<sup>312</sup> Although, there are still many points of contact.

First of all, the general sequence of events is similar between the two myths. Like *Elohim* in Gen 1, *Marduk* built the firmament (IV:137–139), carved out dry land (V:15–64), marked the appointed times and years (V:3–14), created the stars (V:1–2), the luminaries (V:12–19), and then man was created (though by *Marduk's* father *Ea*) (VI:1–34).<sup>313</sup> The acts performed by both *Marduk* and *Ea*, is described as being performed by *Elohim* in Gen 1. As Alexander Heidel said,

---

<sup>310</sup> Ibid., 631.

<sup>311</sup> W.G. Lambert points out that *Enuma Elish* mimicked the older myth of Anzu. See Wilfred G. Lambert, "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation," in *Keilschriftliche Literaturen*, BBVO 6 (1986): 55–60.

<sup>312</sup> Sparks, "Enūma Elish and Priestly Mimesis," 630.

<sup>313</sup> The order here is slightly misleading. In *Enuma Elish*, the order has the firmament established, followed by the filling of it with the stars and their likenesses, with those he quickly set up the months (three stars each) which made the year and then patterned the days of the year. Then he made the moon and sun and set them on their paths. Similar to Genesis 1 in points of contact as Alexander Heidel notes, but a lightly different order in that Marduk makes the space, and then immediately fills it and assigns the roles. Genesis 1 has the space created, and then later has it filled and purposed. See Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1951).

“The identical sequence of events as far as the points of contact are concerned is indeed remarkable ... There no doubt is a genetic relation between the two stories.”<sup>314</sup>

Zooming in, there are a few points of contact. First, Sparks notes that both are introduced with a temporal clause: *Enuma Elish* with “When on high,” and Gen 1 with “When God began creating.”<sup>315</sup> See or example:

**When on high** no name was given to heaven,  
Nor below was the netherworld called by  
name, Primeval Apsu was their progenitor,  
And matrix–Tiamat was she who bore them  
all, **They were mingling their waters  
together** (I:1–5)

בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ: הָאָרֶץ  
הַיְתָה תְהוֹמָה וְכֶהוּ וְחָשֹׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת  
עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם

**When at first** God created the heavens and  
the earth, and the earth was utterly empty and  
darkness covered the face of tehom, **and a  
wind from God was fluttering over the  
waters.** (Gen 1:2)

Thus, Gen 1 seems to purposely echo this Babylonian creation myth with how it opens. Though, this is also the case with Gen 2, as was discussed in the previous chapter, it is perfectly possible for the author of Gen 1 to echo both the beginning of the Garden of Eden and *Enuma Elish*.

Second, and beyond the temporal clause opening, *Enuma Elish* describes the primordial waters as mingling, which is similar to Gen 1:2’s description of וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם (“and a wind from God was fluttering over the waters”).

<sup>314</sup> Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 130.

<sup>315</sup> Ibid.

Third, both speak of separating the waters which results on one way or another in the appearance of “heaven.” See the example below:

Then the Lord [Marduk] was inspecting [Tiamat’s] carcass, **that he might divide** the monstrous lump and fashion artful things. **He split her in two, like a fish for drying, half of her he set up and made as a cover, heaven.** He stretched out the hide and assigned watchmen, and ordered them not to let her waters escape. (IV:135–140)

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי רָקִיעַ בְּתוֹךְ הַמַּיִם וַיְהִי מִבְּדִיל בֵּין  
מַיִם לְמַיִם: וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָרָקִיעַ וַיִּבְדֵּל בֵּין הַמַּיִם  
אֲשֶׁר מִתַּחַת לָרָקִיעַ וּבֵין הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר מֵעַל לָרָקִיעַ וַיְהִי־כֵן:  
וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לָרָקִיעַ שָׁמַיִם

And God said, “Let there be a dome in the midst of the waters, and **let it separate the waters from the waters.**” So God made the dome and separated the waters that were under the dome from the waters that were above the dome. And it was so. God called the dome **Heaven.** (Gen 1:6–8a)

Both describe the resolution with the waters is to separate or divide them. And both understand that by doing this, the result is heaven. *Enuma Elish* equates the “cover” with “heaven” whereas Gen 1 has Elohim name the *רקיע* as שמים.

#### 4.4.3. Genesis 1 and *Enuma Elish* Conclude Differently

But the next act in *Enuma Elish* is not similar to Gen 1. After Marduk defeats *Tiamat*’s forces, one final thing remains to be done – the temple. In *Enuma Elish*, the creation of the cosmos is finalized with the building of the temple *Esagila*; this is one of *Enuma Elish*’s main aetiological purposes. Marduk is approached by his subjects after he is victorious, they ask:

“Now, Lord, you who have liberated us, What courtesy may we do you? We will make a shrine, whose name will be a byword, Your chamber that shall be our stopping place, we shall find rest therein. We shall lay out the shrine, let us set up its emplacement, When we come (to visit you), we shall find rest therein.” (VI:49–54):



Marduk hears this and, delighted, he replies, “Then make Babylon the task that you requested, let its brickwork be formed, build high the shrine (VI:57–58).” Work was commenced and over one year, the bricks were made, and on the second year:

They raised up Esagila, the counterpart to Apsu, They built the high ziggurat of (counterpart–) Apsu, For Anu–Enlil–Ea they founded his ... dwelling. Majestically he took his seat before them. (VI:62–65)

After the temple is built, the gods come and sit, and the great lord declares, “This is Babylon, your place of dwelling. Take your pleasure there, seat yourselves in its delights!” And then they all have a great feast (VI:70–76) and celebrate Marduk’s victory as creation is now finalized and established.

This is how Enuma Elish describes the next event in the sequence of events. Once everything that needs doing is done, a temple is built and the gods all rest in it. How does Gen 1 describe the deity’s actions after completing all his work? See Gen 2:2-3:

וַיְכַל אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְלָאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וַיִּשְׁבֹּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְכַל־מְלָאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה: וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ כִּי בּוֹ שָׁבַת מְכַל־מְלָאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשׂוֹת:

And in the seventh day God finished the work that he had done, and he rested in the seventh day from all the work that he had done. So God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it God rested from all his work which he created to make (it).

In Enuma Elish, the temple is where Marduk rests after completing all his work and battling. It is the other gods’ “stopping place.” Their ceasing place. But in Gen 2:2 it is not a temple that functions as these things, but a specific time! The Seventh Day is *where* Elohim finishes his work, it is *in* the Seventh Day that Elohim rests. Moreover, it is the Seventh Day that is blessed and sanctified, not a temple. It is not a sacred space that is sanctified; rather, it is a sacred time that is made holy.

Genesis 1, then, by its very nature of choosing the genre of creation has prepared its audience to anticipate a temple building sequence at the end of the myth. Therefore, the audience of Gen 1, well acquainted with the story of *Enuma Elish*, expects a temple. However, a temple is not really presented, instead a sacred time is—the Seventh Day, which is, of course, the Sabbath.<sup>316</sup>

Therefore, this is the powerful way the countermemory of shifting the Israelite's focus from sacred space to sacred time was communicated. The author used the genre of creation myth in order to have the audience subliminally equate sacred space and sacred time together—to equate the Temple with the Sabbath!

Before moving on to discuss how Gen 1 elevates the Sabbath to a temple-like status, John Walton's argument that Gen 1's seventh day communicates a temple, as opposed to the Sabbath, needs to be addressed.

#### 4.4.4. Addressing Walton's Argument that Genesis 1 is a Temple Construction Myth

John Walton argues that Gen 1 is not about the Sabbath in the sense of rest from work but rather in the sense of rest from enemies. However, this is simply not the case for Gen 1. Instead, it will be shown that Gen 1 describes the Sabbath as rest from work. Perhaps Walton's main presumption is that deities in ANE myths rest only in temples.<sup>317</sup> Indeed, this presumption is

---

<sup>316</sup> The Sabbath is not named officially in the pentateuchal narrative until Exod 16, when it is given to the Israelites by YHWH. The main point that Gen 1 makes here is that Elohim, who later reveals his name as YHWH, is observing the seventh day rest, which anyone familiar with the rest of the Pentateuch knows, is the Sabbath. Because Gen 1 is directed to all of humanity, that is, there is no Israel yet, no chosen people, Gen 1 cannot prescribe Sabbath practice here since the Sabbath is a covenant marker between YHWH and Israel (Exod 31:12–17). So Elohim practices it on his own, and later, once Israel is made aware of it and prescribed to do it, Elohim will practice it with the Israelites.

<sup>317</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 110–111. He says: “The location where this rest will be experienced is, of course, the temple, the palace home of the god, where the deity may enjoy leisure, social activity, and rule.”

based on a synthesis of many ANE myths. However, Walton seems to overlook the fact that Gen 1 does not feature a temple and mistakenly reads the myth as though one is there; or rather as one has to be there. His argument for this is basically: if creation myths typically feature a temple, and Gen 1 is a creation myth, then it stands to reason that Gen 1 must also feature a temple.

However, Gen 1, as with any other myth, is free to deviate from the predestined path dictated by the genre. Walton is correct that divine rest takes place within temples, and that rest, particularly in the cases when the Hebrew term *נוח* is used, typically refers to rest from enemies.<sup>318</sup> However, Walton takes the generic similarity that Gen 1 has with both biblical and non-biblical creation memories too far resulting in what could be characterized as a generic overreach. In other words, when it comes to the seventh day, and only the seventh day, Walton conforms Gen 1 into an ANE mould, limiting its potential meaning to what has already been said.<sup>319</sup>

#### 4.4.4.1. *Walton's Argument for Divine Rest from Enemies*

Walton argues that divine rest has nothing to do with resting from work, in the sense of inaction, but rather has to do with rest from enemies, in the sense of security. He explains:

Divine rest generally represents a state that has been achieved through a particular action that was undertaken as a response to a condition or situation that prior to the divine action was usually viewed as unacceptable. The condition in each case represents something that

---

<sup>318</sup> The majority of times that *נוח* is used, the divine rest is from enemies and not from work, except once in Exodus 20:11 where it is clearly used to describe YHWH's rest from his *work* during creation.

<sup>319</sup> In the previous six days of creation Walton seems to be happy to let Gen 1 say something different from the rest of the ANE on the subject of creation. Oddly, when it comes to the seventh day, however, he reads it as conforming to the ANE norms.

prevents rest ... When the situation among the gods or in the larger cosmos is secure, deity may rest.<sup>320</sup>

In his book *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, Walton posits three observations for concluding that Gen 1 is about rest from enemies and not rest from activity.<sup>321</sup> First, he argues that “some have interpreted the rest in Genesis 1 as representing disengagement and the enjoyment of relaxation.”<sup>322</sup> Second, he adds that this “‘disengagement’ form of rest in the ancient Near East is constantly based either in polytheism or in the belief that the gods have humanlike needs and desires.”<sup>323</sup> Third, he posits N. Andreasen’s ‘engagement’ aspect of divine rest in Gen 1, citing him to claim that the Old Testament would not present YHWH as resting or refreshing himself after his creative work since YHWH is not a god who would tire before heavy activities, or be intimidated by other powers-that-be.<sup>324</sup>

#### 4.4.4.2. Response to Walton’s Argument

The problem with Walton’s first claim is that it is not just *some* who have argued that divine rest in Gen 2:2–3 is a sabbath rest where inactivity is a key component, rather there are

---

<sup>320</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 110. In his book *The Lost World of Genesis One*, he states it this way: “In the ancient world rest is what results when a crisis has been resolved or when stability has been achieved, when things have ‘settled down.’ Consequently, normal routines can be established and enjoyed. For deity this means that the normal operations of the cosmos can be undertaken. This is more a matter of engagement without obstacles rather than disengagement without responsibilities.” See Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010), 73.

<sup>321</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 180.

<sup>322</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 179.

<sup>323</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*, 180. Andreasen’s point is quoted by Walton from N.E. Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation*, SBLDS 7 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972), 183.

and have been *many* who argue that Gen 2:2–3 is about just that.<sup>325</sup> At best, Walton downplays (and at worst he ignores) that many scholars read Gen 2:1–3 differently than he does. His position does not have the luxury of possessing a consensus among scholarship.

The problem with Walton's second and third points is the false ultimatums he presents with them. Walton essentially states that if one argues for a disengagement sort of divine rest then one is saying that YHWH is humanlike and merely one among many other gods. Though this is presumably a main theological issue that Deutero-Isaiah had with Gen 2:2–3, along with Exod 31:17, it does not appear to be an issue to the author of Gen 1.<sup>326</sup>

Stating that one is making God into a humanlike being is also troubling since many of the authors in the HB use anthropomorphisms to describe God, either because human observations of deity tend to reflect the observer or it was a common way that the deities of the day were described. If YHWH can be jealous, require a house to dwell in, or have enemies to rest from,

---

<sup>325</sup> Bill T. Arnold, *Genesis, NCBC* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 18; and "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble, in *Let us Go Up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds. Iain Proven and Mark J. Boda (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 333; Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 106; Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 36; Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis*, translated by John H. Marks (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1972; Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1–15: Word Biblical Commentary* (Nashville, TN: Nelson, 1987), 36; Fretheim, Terrence E. "The Book of Genesis" in *The New Interpreter's Bible: Volume 1*, (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1994), 346; Jacob Milgrom, "HR In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah." in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler. *VTSup.* 93 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 36; Arthur Green, "Sabbath as Temple: Some Thoughts on Space and Time in Judaism" in *Go and Study—Essays in Honor of Alfred Jospe*, ed. R. Jospe and S. Fishman (Washington, D.C.: B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, 1980), 296; Yairah Amit, "Who Decided to Open the Torah with the Creation of the Sabbath?" In *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays in Retrospect*. translated Betty Sigler Rozen. (Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 2012), 1; Edwin Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," in *JSTOT* 82 (1999): 110.

<sup>326</sup> Hopefully, Walton is not relying on his reader's theological preconceptions of monotheism in order to frighten them away from rendering God as in need of rest. There is nothing wrong with arguing this, but it should be argued as Walton's personal theological view, not forced onto the text as the theological perspective of the author of Gen 1.

then it should come as no surprise that he would also relax one day in seven. The latter of these examples is not somehow comparably far-fetched.<sup>327</sup>

Unfortunately for Walton's argument, Gen 1 makes no mention of the deity's creative activities being troublesome or tiresome to him.<sup>328</sup> It appears effortless. That Elohim rests on the seventh day due to fatigue is not explicitly stated in Gen 1. Elohim rests on the seventh day because the author of Gen 1 is likely using Elohim as an example for Sabbath-keeping. The sequential rhythm of activity and inactivity, of work and rest, is a rhythm the creator lives by. With this aetiology established, it is a small exegetical leap to infer that Gen 1 intends humanity, those made in this God's image, to follow suit and rest as well.<sup>329</sup> As Mark Smith notes:

Blessing time or a measure of time is not a common biblical notion. As we have seen, blessing generally is pronounced over persons. By implication, the blessing of the Sabbath day suggests that the blessing is for those who keep the Sabbath as commanded.<sup>330</sup>

Yairah Amit adds: "The decision to portray the Sabbath as the conclusion of the creation process, in which the Creator himself serves as a personal example for resting on the seventh day, is something of representative significance, with symbolism and value, adding a dimension of

---

<sup>327</sup> It seems odd to argue that Genesis 1 is just like any other ancient Near Eastern creation myth, and then to say that the author would not say anything of a polytheistic nature about YHWH. Furthermore, Walton also presumes a premise that Sabbath observance is about disengagement whereas many Jewish practitioners of Sabbath see it as disengagement *only* from work for only a day which allows a deeper *engagement* with their God and each other.

<sup>328</sup> This raises the issue of Isaiah 40:28: "Have you not known? Have you not heard? The LORD is the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth. He does not faint or grow weary; his understanding is unsearchable." Regardless of whether this text was composed before Genesis 1 or whether it was composed in response to it, it indicates an issue with Genesis 1's description of the deity resting from work. However it is easy to see when one looks at the ease with which God creates through the creation pericope. The Sabbath rest does not seem to be because God is tired, rather it is where, or should I say when, he is enthroned.

<sup>329</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 127.

<sup>330</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 104. Blessing typically occurs in the Temple. See Ps 24:5; 118:26; 128:5; 129:5–8; 133:3; 134:3.

obligation to the observance of the Sabbath.”<sup>331</sup> This is quite the claim in the context of the ANE. Especially since the popular myth, *Atra-Hasis*, describes the deities resting because the recently created human beings could now do all the work for them. The deity of Gen 1 uniquely invites the recently created human beings to join him by resting from work *with* him, not *for* him.<sup>332</sup>

Resting is an expression of the sacred, and this combination of blessing and sanctifying a period of time, a period of time that YHWH *shabbots* from work, “appears in no other creation account.”<sup>333</sup>

#### 4.4.4.3. Further Problems with Walton’s Evidence: Psalm 132 and Exodus 20:11

Walton employs Exod 20:11 and Psa 132 in support of his argument that the seventh day pericope describes divine rest from enemies rather than divine rest from work. First, he cites Psa 132, noting the use of the Hebrew term נוּחַ:

“Let us go to his dwelling place; let us worship at his footstool.”  
Rise up, O Lord, and go to your *resting* place (מְנוּחָה), you and the ark of your might. (v. 7–8)

For the Lord has chosen Zion; he has desired it for his dwelling place:  
“This is my resting place (מְנוּחָה) forever; here I will dwell for I have desired it.” (v. 13–14)

The Hebrew word used for “resting place” is מְנוּחָה, the root of which is נוּחַ. Walton defines it as “to enter a position of safety, security or stability.”<sup>334</sup> Walton believes this is the sense the author of Gen 1 intended when he used “rest” in Gen 2:2–3.

<sup>331</sup> Amit, *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, 22–23.

<sup>332</sup> See Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 135.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid., 106.

<sup>334</sup> Ibid., 73.

Therefore, Walton concludes that *Elohim* is described in Gen 1 as moving into a position of security, not resting in the typically understood sabbatical way of ceasing work. Walton explains:

Psalm 132 provides a key passage, in which not only is the temple identified as the resting place of Yahweh but we also find rest identified with rule, for in the temple he sits enthroned. In this sense, divine rest is not primarily an act of disengagement but an act of engagement. No other divine rest occurs in the Hebrew Bible than the rest that is associated with his presence in his temple.<sup>335</sup>

Apart from the obvious exception of Gen 2:2–3 to the rule that no other divine rest happens in the HB except in the temple, an even more significant problem cries out from the text itself: the word for “rest” in Gen 2:2–3 is not נָח, but שָׁבַת. Genesis 2:2–3:

And on the seventh day God finished the work that he had done, and he *rested* (שָׁבַת) on the seventh day from all the work that he had done. So God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because on it God *rested* (שָׁבַת) from all the work that he had done in creation.

Walton’s view of divine rest cannot be substantiated here in Gen 2:2–3, since נָח is not present there. The use of שָׁבַת does not refer to doing work, but rather to the cessation of whatever the context dictates, and in the case of Gen 2:2–3, that context is work.<sup>336</sup> Perhaps Walton’s issue with a god who disengages from creation is a purely theological one, and not in fact an issue the author of Gen 1 shared.<sup>337</sup>

The second passage that Walton cites as evidence for his claim is Exod 20:8–11. This comparison is admittedly better than Psa 132, but it still lacks the required evidence. Exodus

<sup>335</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 180.

<sup>336</sup> Or to the cessation of activity in whatever specified capacity mentioned in the context. Leviticus 2:13 uses שָׁבַת to give a direction to not “omit” salt. Num 28:9–10 expresses a regulation for a sacrifice on the sabbath day, which implies that there is work to be done. Though Num 28:9–10 reflects the sabbath observance in the pre-exilic priestly period, most uses of שָׁבַת in relation to the seventh day refer to a cessation of activity.

<sup>337</sup> Craig Broyles, in his Psalms commentary, argues that Psalm 132 echoes “The Song of the Ark” from Numbers 10:33–36, which refers to the “resting place” of the ark. Consequently, the connectivity of this term to creation generally or to Gen 1 specifically is very poor. See Broyles, *Psalms*, 471–73.



20:11 uses נוח for the activity of the seventh day with God as the subject. Walton argues that Exod 20:11 states that God entered a position of safety and security. However, in the context of the entire of Exod 20:8–11, the focus is the working and then the resting from work. Particularly in vv. 9–10: “Six days you shall labor and do all your work. But the seventh day is a sabbath (שבת) to YHWH your God; you shall not do any work.” Exodus 20:1’s use of נוח is still concerned with rest from work, not rest from enemies, and it is characterized as inactivity. Moreover, the meaning of the term נוח as it is used in one place (e.g. Psa 132:7–8) cannot be then used to determine its meaning in another context (e.g. Exude 20:11).

#### 4.4.4.4. *Conclusion on Walton’s Arguments*

In summary, John Walton correctly assesses that “The relationship between cosmos and temple in the Bible and in the ancient world, and particularly the common connection between the two in creation texts suggests that we should think of Genesis 1 in relation to a cosmic temple.”<sup>338</sup> This point of Walton’s work is not disputed here. The audience expected a temple to be built. However, in Walton’s over-zealous assumptions and his eager focus on the genre of ANE creation myths, he neglects the very text before him and misses what is plain to many others: there is no temple in Gen 1.

Walton misses how Gen 1 elevates the position of the Sabbath by placing the Sabbath where the temple was expected to be. His reading of Gen 1 is conformed to match his reading of other creation tradition. This harmonization of Gen 1 comes at the expense of its own

---

<sup>338</sup> Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One*, 87. Though, I do not think *we* should think of Genesis 1 this way, I agree that the echoes in Genesis 1 and the overall flow of it fits the genre where a temple was expected, but Genesis 1 subverts the temple with the Sabbath.

uniqueness. Differences are perhaps the best signs of intentionality. It is the differences between one myth and the others that reveal why that myth was composed in the first place. As Jonathan Z. Smith quips: “It is a familiar chestnut that no matter how many white swans one observes they do not justify the utterance that all swans are white, but the observation of one black swan is sufficient to invalidate the utterance.”<sup>339</sup> For all intents and purposes, Gen 1 appears to be that black swan that is invalidating Walton’s utterance.

#### 4.5. The Sabbath was Presented as a Temple in Time

One of the key differences that Gen 1 has as compared to other ANE myths is the Sabbath. Walton is correct that the audience expected to see a temple in Gen 1; however, the Sabbath is *where* that temple is supposed to be. So, why would a group of Israelites come along and attempt to revise Israel’s cultural memory of creation by adding a countermemory that shifts the focus from sacred space to sacred time? The best answer to this question is the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple and subsequent exile to Babylon. Thus, it is likely that Gen 1 being an exilic text was composed in order to shift the focus of Israel’s religious centre from the no-longer-existing Temple in Jerusalem to an always-existing Sabbath.

There are three examples that demonstrate the author’s intention to shift the focus from sacred space to sacred time, from temple to Sabbath. First, there is the generic connection between creation and temple-building. Second, there are the echoes in Gen 1 to Solomon’s Temple and Moses’ Tabernacle. And third, the Sabbath is elevated to the highest position and a temple-like one with the use in Gen 2:2–3 of שבת. Additionally, though it will not be discussed

---

<sup>339</sup> Jonathan Z. Smith. “Religion Up and Down, Out and In,” in *Sacred Time, Sacred Place: Archeology and the Religion of Israel*, ed. Barry M. Gittlen (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 3.

below as it has already been discussed in chapter 3, the placement of Gen 1 at the very beginning of the HB also testifies to author's desire to elevate the Sabbath. Placement, after all, does constitute purpose.

Before getting into these three examples, a disclaimer needs to be given. By claiming that Gen 1 is shifting the focus from sacred time to sacred space, it is not being stated that sacred space is being replaced. Far from it. The book of Ezekiel is a great priestly example of the Sabbath and temple both being held as sacred. The claim here is that without a temple or a sacred space, or the land of Israel itself, there is a necessity to shift that attention to another thing. Maurice Halbwachs observed that groups remember the past through social frameworks, chief of which are spatial and temporal ones. Cultures remember the past in specific locations, a temple would be a prime example of this. As discussed earlier, the Jerusalem Temple was decorated and designed to remind the audience of creation. With its loss, a breach of tradition occurred. One that saw an increase in scribal activity and the production of texts, the preservation of the culture's traditions. But this traumatic breach also (naturally) made the other main framework of memory – the temporal framework with calendars and the Sabbath – become the main focus by virtue of it being the only one left.<sup>340</sup>

#### 4.5.1. Using the Genre of Creation

*The first way* Gen 1 communicates this shift from space to time is through the genre of creation. As discussed earlier, creation myths have a tendency to culminate with temple building.

---

<sup>340</sup> The Temple was never to be replaced by the Sabbath. Instead, the Sabbath was meant to sit in for the time being. It was meant to be a temporary substitute. But, for the Sabbath to be accepted as on par with the Temple, it had to be elevated to a position that is equal to the Temple. Or at least on the same playing field as the Temple.

However, Gen 1 departs from this by omitting the temple and by adding in its place the Sabbath. By the time the seventh day comes along, the audience anticipates the expected *temple*, but instead they unexpectedly hear the *Sabbath*. The author strategically placed the Sabbath in a position where everyone was expecting the temple to be. Thus, subconsciously the audience hears one thing while expecting another thing. Without stating it explicitly, it gave the Sabbath the same position and authority the temple has in the audiences' subconscious. It was surprisingly subtle.

#### 4.5.2. Echoing Solomon's Temple and Moses' Tabernacle

The second way Gen 1 presents the Sabbath as a temple is by echoing Moses' Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple. The septet pattern is a very common pattern within temple creation myths and it is a pattern that Gen 1 shares with the Temple of Solomon building narrative in 1 Kings.<sup>341</sup> For example, the Temple of Solomon in 1 Kings is said to take seven years to construct (1 Kgs 6:38). After completing it and the required sacrifices are offered, there is a seven-day festival (1 Kgs 8:65). This may be a coincidental connection to Gen 1, but after a further look into the literary connections between the two, it is probably an intentional connection made by the author of Gen 1.

Consider Gen 2:1–3 as it is compared to 1 Kgs 9:1:

וַיְכַלֵּה הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל־צָבָאָם: וַיְכַלֵּה אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם  
הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְלָאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וַיִּשְׁבֹּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְכַל־  
מְלָאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה: וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי  
וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ כִּי בּוֹ שָׁבַת מְכַל־מְלָאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים  
לַעֲשׂוֹת:

וַיְהִי כַכֵּלֹת שְׁלֹמֹה לְבָנוֹת אֶת־בֵּית־יְהוָה וְאֶת־בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ  
וְאֶת כָּל־חֶשֶׁק שְׁלֹמֹה אֲשֶׁר חָפֵץ לַעֲשׂוֹת:

<sup>341</sup> Walton, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, 182.

And the heavens and the earth were **finished**, and all their host. And **God finished** the work that he had done on the seventh day, and he rested on the seventh day from all the work that he had done. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because on it God rested from all his work which he created **to make (it)**.

And then **Solomon finished** building the house of YHWH and the house of the king and all the other desired things which Solomon desired **to make**

Note the similar *piel* use of כלה in both Gen 1 and 1 Kgs 9 as well as the similar infinitive construct of עשה at the end of Gen 2:3 and the end of 1 Kgs 9:1. Therefore, beyond the septet connection, the lexical connections between Gen 1 and Solomon's Temple construction in 1 Kgs 9:1 is less coincidental. Genesis 1 can be seen as deliberately echoing it.

Moses' Tabernacle is also echoed by Gen 1. Compare Gen 2:2–3a with Exod 40:33<sup>342</sup> and 39:43:

וַיְכַל אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וַיִּשְׁבֹּת  
בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִכָּל־מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה: וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים  
אֶת־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי

**And God finished his work** that he had done in the seventh day, and he rested in the seventh day from all the work that he had done. **And God blessed the seventh day.**

וַיְכַל מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַמְּלָאכָה ... וַיֵּרָא מֹשֶׁה אֶת־כָּל־הַמְּלָאכָה  
וַהֲגִיד עָשׂו אֶת־הַכָּזָה כִּי עָשׂוּ וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם  
מֹשֶׁה

**And Moses finished the work** ... And Moses saw that they had done all the work and behold, they did it just as YHWH commanded, thus they did it, **and Moses blessed [the Israelites].**

Note the parallels between the two with the identical use of כלה. Additionally, the similar uses of עשה and מלאכה and ברך in these accounts of sacred space demonstrate that the author of Gen 1 was likely mimicking or imitating, or at the very least, echoing P's tabernacle account with its word choice.

<sup>342</sup> Exodus 40:33 in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint both read “all the work.”

Where Solomon's Temple is finished by Solomon (1 Kgs 9:1) and the Tabernacle is finished by Moses (Ex 40:33), *Elohim* finishes creation by resting on the Sabbath day. This deliberate echo of the Sabbath with sacred space can also be seen in the Tabernacle's account where Moses blesses the people after the Tabernacle is finished (Ex 39:43). Whereas, in Gen 1, *Elohim* blesses the people (Gen 1:28) and the Sabbath (Gen 2:3).<sup>343</sup> It is as though the author of Gen 1 is quietly asking: *Who would you rather be blessed by?*

#### 4.5.3. The use of שָׁבָט

The elevation of the Sabbath beyond the temple can be further seen by the use of שָׁבָט in Gen 2:3: "So *Elohim* blessed the seventh day and sanctified (שָׁבָט) it because on it he rested from all the work *Elohim* had done in creating." *Elohim* not only blesses the seventh day, he also sanctifies it. Or as Philippe Guillaume notes, "Like humankind, the Sabbath is blessed. Unlike humankind, or all other creatures, the Sabbath is also sanctified."<sup>344</sup> And this sanctification is independent of human activity.<sup>345</sup> Thus, priests sanctify space, whereas God sanctifies the Sabbath. With the placement of Gen 1 at the beginning, the first thing the audience hears as sanctified shifts from a place (the mountain in Exod 3:5 where Moses removes his sandals), or a group of people (the people of Israel in Exod 19), to a specific time. Thus as a cultural memory, Gen 1 provides an important authority and legitimacy to the Sabbath alongside the temple, since *Elohim* himself sanctified it before he ever sanctified any other place or people. The picture of

---

<sup>343</sup> Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1951), 10.

<sup>344</sup> Guillaume, 45.

<sup>345</sup> Ibid., 48.

the Sabbath day being sanctified is, to be sure, unprecedented; but it is also communicates that the Sabbath is for all intents and purposes a sacred place that is located in time. In other words, a sanctuary in time.

A significant difference that Genesis 1 subtly claims between sacred time and sacred space is how each one is achieved. The sacredness of the Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon is achieved through *activity*. Whereas the Sabbath achieves sacredness through *inactivity*. Arthur Green notes, perhaps a little too theologically, that this “phenomenon is one of reversal: by doing all these labours in the particular prescribed configuration, one creates sacred space. By refraining from these same acts, in the context of the Sabbath, one creates sacred time.”<sup>346</sup>

This is especially the case among the Tabernacle account. Exodus 25:1–31:11 describes the plans YHWH gives to Moses for constructing the Tabernacle. Then at the very end of these instructions, the Israelites are commanded to keep the Sabbath day’s rest (Exod 31:12–17). Thus, it is communicated to the Israelites that all the work in constructing the Tabernacle, a sacred place, does not negate the need to observe sacred time. In fact, observing the Sabbath is to be observed on pain of death (Exod 31:14 and again in v. 15).<sup>347</sup> When construction of the Tabernacle begins in Exod 35, it begins with a reminder to not work on the seventh day, to not even light a fire in any dwelling (Exod 35:2–3). Fire, it should be noted, is a necessary thing if one is going to make the materials required for constructing the Tabernacle, especially the metals.

---

<sup>346</sup> Green, “Sabbath as Temple,” 294.

<sup>347</sup> These Sabbath interpolations in Ex 31:12–17 and 35:2–3 are considered to be, at the very least, material that is redacted by H. More on this in chapter 5.

Thus, building the Tabernacle could have been mistakenly understood as a full-time endeavour. With these Sabbath commands, one concluding the building instructions from YHWH and the other opening Moses' relaying of YHWH's instructions to the Israelites, it is made clear that work on the Tabernacle does not supersede the requirement to observe the Sabbath. Work, even work of a holy space, does not neglect the obligation to rest. Sacred time is not negated by sacred space.

Genesis 1 quietly presents the origin of the Sabbath and the motivation for observing it. As Yairah Amit notes: "The striking avoidance of the term 'Sabbath' testifies to intention and planning, indicating a situation of defamiliarization. This draws the reader's attention to the phenomenon, suggesting that we are dealing here with a polemic."<sup>348</sup> A clear indication that the author of Gen 1 sets out to "strengthen the sanctity of the Sabbath and to place it on the same level as that of the Temple."<sup>349</sup> The author drew his audience in with these familiar temple motifs, and instead of the Tabernacle or Solomon's Temple on the seventh day, the work of creation was finished and the sanctuary in time was established – the Sabbath.

#### 4.6. Conclusion

It has been demonstrated that the author of Gen 1 intentionally appropriates the authority and legitimacy of creation myths for the benefit of legitimizing the Sabbath. Through a survey of non-biblical and biblical creation myths, it can be seen that the author presents Gen 1 as a typical creation myth. Though that same survey also reveals a key difference, which is, of course, the

---

<sup>348</sup> Amit, *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, 224.

<sup>349</sup> Ibid., 236.



presence of the Sabbath and the absence of a temple. This is how the mnemonic shift of temple to Sabbath is communicated in Gen 1, the Sabbath is placed where the audience expects the temple to be.

It has also been demonstrated that Gen 1 communicated the Sabbath's elevation over the temple in four ways. First, the Sabbath is first. Odd sentence but the Sabbath is described as being the first part of creation to have been sanctified. Second, the Sabbath is placed where the temple is expected to be. Third, God's Sabbath is legitimized along with both Moses' Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple through similar lexemes.

Creation myths are concerned not with what necessarily happened long ago as much as they are concerned with what is happening in the present. Like cultural memory, myths are about appropriating the past for the needs and concerns of the present. So the question can be asked: What life setting best explains why a countermemory of creation would be constructed in order to elevate the Sabbath to a position equal to the temple? A great candidate, and perhaps the only qualified one, is the exile when the temple was destroyed and the people removed from the land. The loss of sacred space is why groups of Israelites living in exile reconstructed a memory of creation, one that shifts the focus from sacred space to sacred time. Time is not bound by space. It is universal. If time could be set apart and made holy, then a meeting with the divine is always available. It would not be a temple in some specific place but one in a specific time; a sanctuary in time.

CHAPTER 5:  
WHO COMPOSED AND ADDED GENESIS 1?  
THE NARRATIVE EVIDENCE FOR H AUTHORSHIP

**5.1. Introduction**

The question driving the next two chapters is: *Which pentateuchal source is responsible for Gen 1's final form and position in the Pentateuch?* Another way of asking it: which pentateuchal source has the most to gain with Gen 1's countermemory? Which group is the likeliest to have the motive to shift the focus from sacred space to sacred time?

The consensus dating back to Wellhausen has been that the priestly source (P) is responsible for Gen 1.<sup>350</sup> However, I will argue two sequential points throughout these next two chapters: (1) that Gen 1 has more in common with the priestly material found in the HC (Lev 17–26) than it does with the priestly material outside of it (Lev 1–16 and Numbers, esp. 28–29); (2)

---

<sup>350</sup> Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1994), 297-308 and 385-91; rep. of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies; Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885); trans. of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (2nd ed.; Berlin: G. Rimer, 1883). Peter Enns traces perhaps the very first source critical question in his article "When Was Genesis Written and Why Does it Matter?" notes how a French professor of medicine and physician to Louis XV, one Jean Astruc, followed his curiosity sparked by why there were two names of God in Gen 1–3. By doing so he began an investigation that was quickly followed by Johann Eichborn, and later Wellhausen. See Enns, "When Was Genesis Written and Why Does it Matter? A Brief Historical Study," in *BioLogos Foundation*. [http://biologos.org/uploads/resources/enns\\_scholarly\\_essay3.pdf](http://biologos.org/uploads/resources/enns_scholarly_essay3.pdf).

Gen 1 has more in common with the exilic stratum of H (what Milgrom calls Hr), than it does with a pre-exilic H (represented, in large part, by the HC).<sup>351</sup>

#### 5.1.1. The Distinction between P and H

Currently spearheading the question of traditional development specifically within the P tradition (since the mid-1990s), is the question of the HC and to what extent it extends beyond Lev 17–26. Scholarly consensus initially was that P incorporated the HC into its own composition and treated both of them as one and the same.<sup>352</sup>

Israel Knohl challenges this status quo convincingly in *The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals*,<sup>353</sup> where he demonstrates that P and H are “two distinct streams with sharply differing theological and ritual conceptions.”<sup>354</sup> And by focusing on Lev 23, he demonstrates further that H represents a later stratum of priestly material. Consequently, P and H should (must) be treated distinctly from one another, rather than as two peas in a priestly pod. Thus, as Knohl concludes, no longer can one cannot speak of just two

---

<sup>351</sup> Though this will be explained further below, it should be stated here at the outset that some scholars think of H as both pre-exilic and exilic simultaneously, that is, they see H as a continuous “School” of thought that began in the 8th century BCE with King Hezekiah’s reforms and continued on through the exilic period. This view is taken by Israel Knohl. Others argue instead that a distinction is necessary and warranted between pre-exilic H and exilic (or post-exilic) H. This view is taken by Jacob Milgrom. Throughout these two chapters, my contention is that Genesis 1 is more connected to the exilic stratum of H than to the pre-exilic stratum. Thus, I follow Milgrom’s view that a 8th century H strata was amended later by a 6th or even 5th century H redactor. Another disclosure that should be given here at the outset is that I am convinced, as is Knohl, Milgrom, and Arnold, that P predates D and may even be contemporaneous with J and that much of P has been edited by H (both the pre-exilic and exilic strata).

<sup>352</sup> Knohl, “Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals,” in *HUCA* (1987): 66. See also Richard E. Friedman, “Torah (Pentateuch),” in *ABD* 6:605-22; John Barton, “Source Criticism,” in *ABD* 6:162-65; and “Redaction Criticism (OT),” in *ABD* 5:644-647; and lastly, Jacob Milgrom, “Priestly (‘P’) Source,” in *ABD* 5:454-61.

<sup>353</sup> Knohl, “Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School,” 65–117.

<sup>354</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

major theological trends within pentateuchal literature (P and D or P and non-P); rather, they must add a third, they must add H.<sup>355</sup>

### 5.1.2. Strata within H

Jacob Milgrom follows Knohl on many points, such as the lateness of H compared to P and that H was active beyond the HC. However, he disagrees with Knohl's understanding of H as a school of thought that continuously operated for over two centuries.<sup>356</sup> Knohl claims that the Holiness School (HS) operated continuously from the 8th century BCE, which is prior to D, through to the exilic period, which postdates D. Milgrom argues instead that H is a one-time, single generation, composition from the 8th century BCE; and posits a later exilic addition to that eighth-century-H material, which he labels as the Holiness Redactor (HR).<sup>357</sup>

Christophe Nihan agrees with Milgrom and Knohl on many points as well, especially that the HC is later than P.<sup>358</sup> And though Nihan also uses the label, *Holiness School*, he differs from Knohl's understanding of it. For Nihan, 'Holiness School' refers to the continuous editorial activity of H that postdates the HC. He dates this editorial stratum to the late 5th century BCE.<sup>359</sup> In other words, Nihan posits a late (exilic) H stratum as distinct from the HC (whereas Knohl sees the Holiness School as *one* continuous group operating from the 8th century all the way

---

<sup>355</sup> Ibid., 67.

<sup>356</sup> Jacob Milgrom, "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, *VTSup. 93: Formation and Interpretation of OT Literature III*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 25.

<sup>357</sup> Milgrom posits that the 8th century H stratum comprises 95% of H's overall material, whereas HR comprises only 5% of the total. See Milgrom, "HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 25.

<sup>358</sup> Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, *FAT 2* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 546.

<sup>359</sup> Ibid., 559-75.

through the 6th). In this way, Nihan's HS has much in common with Milgrom's Hr, though the amount of pentateuchal activity their respective sigla represent differs; but Milgrom rejects both Knohl's and Nihan's notion of "continuous literary activity" on the part of H.

Though the specifics are far from settled, two things have found some agreement among these scholars. First, H operated before and after the exile of 586 BCE.<sup>360</sup> Second, all agree that H was later than P and that it was active outside of the HC. What, then, of the relationship between H and the other pentateuchal sources?

### 5.1.3. H's relationship to P and D

Since H as an exilic stratum is redactional in nature, to what extent and to what purpose does H supplement, revise, and expand the other pentateuchal sources? This is the question Jeffrey Stackert addresses in *The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources*.<sup>361</sup> He posits that H employs different revisionary approaches in its interactions with P as opposed to its interactions with non-priestly sources (JE, and D).<sup>362</sup> In regard to P, H retains and supplements its

---

<sup>360</sup> This is not to imply that there is consensus on an exact date for H, but only that an educated guess is available. Regardless of whether this is continuous literary activity or a one-time redaction in the 8th century followed generations later by another one-time redaction in the 5th or 6th century is still up for debate, but it is agreed that H's final stratum is an exilic one.

<sup>361</sup> Jeffrey Stackert, "The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplementation, and Replacement," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden, *ATANT* 95 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 187-204. See also Jeffrey Stackert, "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath Law: Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3," in *JHS II* (2011): 4. The views of this article were altered slightly in Stackert's new edition of the same argument he makes here in "Compositional Strata ...," see Stackert, "The Composition of Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3 and the Question of Method in Identifying Priestly Strata in the Torah," pages 175-96 in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*. *SBLRBS*, ed. Roy E. Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2014).

<sup>362</sup> Stackert, "The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources," 187.

forefather for the purpose of completing or updating it. As Stackert claims: H extends “the scope of P beyond its original (strongly cultic) focus.”<sup>363</sup>

In regard to non-priestly sources, Stackert argues that it attempts to marginalize by culling selected ideas from them so that it might integrate this borrowed material into a larger priestly corpus (P+H).<sup>364</sup> In other words, for Stackert, H is aware of and influenced by D, but its material tends to differ or revise D in favour of its forebear P.<sup>365</sup>

Nihan similarly posits that H is aware and influenced by D, but where Stackert takes a submissive stance on H’s redaction of P material, Nihan argues a more polemical stance. Nihan argues that “H revises P on many fundamental issues,” and that it “stands in tension with P, and apparently seeks to correct or revise it.”<sup>366</sup> One of the differences between P and H that Nihan cites is their respective views on holiness. For example, P views holiness as isolated to the priesthood (perhaps specifically the vestments that the priests wear) and the tabernacle; whereas H extends that holiness to all of Israel (see Lev 19–20), and consequently it also extends it beyond the tabernacle (or temple) to all the land (see Lev 25:1–7). Thus, H is characterized as a more “popular” form of religion as compared to P’s more cultic perspective, and this can be seen in H’s concern for “brotherly ethics,” as Nihan puts it, as a means for achieving that holiness.<sup>367</sup>

---

<sup>363</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>364</sup> Ibid., 188.

<sup>365</sup> Stackert demonstrates this with Num 18, which is commonly ascribed to H. See Stackert, “The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources,” 189–94. In P, only the Aaronid priests are to enjoy the most holy sacrificial portions in remuneration for their service (Lev 6:10). H maintains this in Num 18, but influenced by Deut 14:22–29, 18:1–8, and 26:12–15, H updates P’s tradition while also remaining tempered by it. This sensitivity to P’s tradition is not the case in H’s treatment of D’s material. For Stackert, H transforms D’s levitical (i.e. laws about the Levites particularly) laws in light of its own ideological and theological goals.

<sup>366</sup> Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 546. Nihan cites as evidence for this the HC’s revision of P’s Lev 7:16–18 in Lev 19:5–8, and the HC’s reinterpretation of Exod 27:20–21 in Lev 24:2–4.

<sup>367</sup> Ibid., 546. Also see Lev 19.

Nihan argues further that H attempts to reconcile D with P, and will even lean away from P in favour of D.<sup>368</sup> This is in contrast to Stackert's view that H is influenced by D, but will alter D in favour of P. For example, in P only the priests and the sanctuary are holy, not all of the Israelites.<sup>369</sup> In Deuteronomy 14:2, the Israelites are considered holy because YHWH chose them from out of the nations. Thus, H takes more of D's approach leaving behind P's notion of limited holiness, agreeing that YHWH set the Israelites apart from the other nations and that they are to be holy to YHWH; that is, they are to obey his commandments.<sup>370</sup> H further reinforces this perspective by adding to D's work YHWH's own words, the direct divine speech: "For I, YHWH, am holy." Since D has Moses conveying the command for Israel's holiness, H strengthens D's claim by having YHWH convey the command for all of Israel's holiness.<sup>371</sup>

Some conclusions can be drawn from H's interaction with P and D. First, H is influenced by D in its redaction of P materials and is, therefore, later than D.<sup>372</sup> Second, H is also later than P and it redacts P's material. Third, H seeks to revise P for its own theological needs based largely on its exposure to D (non-priestly materials) and its cultural context.<sup>373</sup> Though Stackert sees P favoured in H's eyes over D, the fact that H exists at all and is distinct theologically from

---

<sup>368</sup> Ibid., 550-51.

<sup>369</sup> See Exod 29:21 and 33 for priests being holy, though it seems that it is the vestments that make them holy. And see Exod 26:33; 29:37; 30:29; and 40:9 for the Tabernacle's holiness.

<sup>370</sup> One might ask: Why would H side with D? Relevance. Simply put, in an exilic framework where the priesthood, and the tabernacle/temple they serve in are no longer available, then the most relevant interpretation of Israel's holiness between D and P is D's perspective that YHWH requires all of Israel to be holy.

<sup>371</sup> Further examples of this are, for Nihan, seen in H's treatment of P and D sources in Leviticus 26. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 548.

<sup>372</sup> At least the D material that it interacts with.

<sup>373</sup> Milgrom argues that the 8th century BCE Hezekian reforms are in mind for the first strata of H, while the babylonian exile is the context for the Holiness Redactor. In both of these contexts, H's revision of P material is based on these contexts.

P suggests that H is not satisfied with P, otherwise, there would be no need to update, revise, or expand it.<sup>374</sup>

#### 5.1.4. Is H the Pentateuchal Redactor?

This redactional activity by H brings about another question, and one that is still greatly debated among pentateuchal source critics: Is H responsible for the final redaction of the Pentateuch?

##### 5.1.4.1. *Stackert's View that H is not the Pentateuchal Redactor*

Stackert thinks not.<sup>375</sup> Instead, the pentateuchal redactor (what he calls the “compiler”) is an unaligned redactor, that is, an editor who does not belong to any particular pentateuchal group.<sup>376</sup> Though he admits that H looks similar to this non-aligned compiler, since both are interacting with P and D materials,<sup>377</sup> he does not understand why H would place its own legislation alongside D’s legislation, especially since some of it differs from H’s legislation. Additionally, there are no clear (or widely agreed upon) signs of H activity in Deuteronomy.<sup>378</sup>

---

<sup>374</sup> The same goes for H’s treatment of D. That is, if H was content with D’s legislation, then there would be no need to make make pentateuchal redactions.

<sup>375</sup> This is direct objection to much German-speaking pentateuchal scholarship (the *redaktionsgeschichtliche Schule*) which argues that H, or the author of Leviticus 17–26 (HC), was the pentateuchal redactor. See Stackert, “The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources,” 195.

<sup>376</sup> Stackert, “The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources,” 196. See also “Compositional Strata ...,” 4; and *Rewriting the Torah. Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*, FAT, 52 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 165-208.

<sup>377</sup> Stackert, “Compositional Strata ...,” 6.

<sup>378</sup> Though Knohl does posit that Deut 32 is redacted by the HS (see *Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 101-103), Milgrom is less optimistic on this point.



For Stackert, the nail in this issue's coffin is Deut 5:22, which claims that the law was given by YHWH to Moses, "and he did not add (to it)" (ולא יסף). This claim in Deut 5:22 not only delegitimizes E's CC (Exod 20:23–23:19), but also P/H material as well.<sup>379</sup> Though this might be as Stackert argues, evidence that H could not be the pentateuchal redactor because the idea of a compiler adding material that claims itself over and above all subsequent materials is illogical, it misses a very small but significant point. The 'it' in Deut 5:22's assertion could refer specifically to the Ten Words (or the Ten Commandments) just previously covered (Deut 5:6–21).<sup>380</sup> Deuteronomy 5:22 need not refer to the entire book of Deuteronomy.

#### 5.1.4.2. Arguments for H being the Pentateuchal Redactor

Other source critics instead argue in favour of the pentateuchal redactor being H. This view is taken strongly by Israel Knohl who argues that the latest authors within the Holiness School were responsible for the final version of the entire pentateuch.<sup>381</sup> Knohl argues that Deut 32:48–52 is an H interpolation. Consequently, H has redacted D material and is thus responsible for the Pentateuch's final form.<sup>382</sup>

Milgrom, however, is not entirely convinced and requires stronger evidence to be certain that H is also the redactor of Deuteronomy.<sup>383</sup> But he is sympathetic to the notion that H is

---

<sup>379</sup> Note that 2 Chr 5:10, which is thought to be a history from the priestly perspective and a reworking of the deuteronomistic history, claims that the two tablets were placed in the Ark of the Covenant at *Horeb*, not Sinai as one would expect a priestly writer to state. In this, the non-priestly perspective was favoured over the priestly. So as this concerns Stackert, there is evidence that P is not always favoured over non-P in priestly (H's) redaction.

<sup>380</sup> My thanks to Craig Broyles for pointing this detail out to me.

<sup>381</sup> Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 101-103.

<sup>382</sup> *Ibid.*, 101-103.

<sup>383</sup> See Milgrom, "H<sub>R</sub> in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33.

responsible for the final form of the Pentateuch.<sup>384</sup> Milgrom posits that one may only confidently assert that H (Hr for him) redacted Exodus through Numbers; although it could be stated that H redacted Genesis through Numbers based on H's addition of Genesis 1:1–2:4a.<sup>385</sup>

Christophe Nihan also argues that an exilic H stratum is responsible for merging non-priestly (JE, and D) and priestly (P) material together. Following Eckhart Otto, Nihan asserts that H is *a* pentateuchal redactor.<sup>386</sup> Differing from his colleagues, Nihan argues that the Pentateuch's redaction continued after the last H stratum (his *Holiness School*), as evidenced by redactional activity in the book of Numbers that is not H-like.<sup>387</sup> He ascribes this non-H-like material to some additional priestly or priestly-like stratum, or, as he ambiguously puts it, “a Priestly composition in Numbers.”<sup>388</sup> For Nihan, H redacted Genesis through Leviticus and Deuteronomy, but the latest stratum is the priestly redactor of Numbers, who is likely not H.<sup>389</sup>

---

<sup>384</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>385</sup> Ibid., 39–40. See also Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22, AB* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2000), 1443. Here he states that H's activity in Genesis would suggest that there is a possibility that H was the redactor of the entire Pentateuch.

<sup>386</sup> Eckart Otto argues that the HC was composed by the pentateuchal redactor (*Pentateuchredaktor*). See Eckart Otto, “The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch,” in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 135–156. Nihan argues that the HC came before the final H stratum (what he calls the Holiness School), but that final H stratum is the redactor of the Pentateuch. However, before this, Nihan argued that H served as the redactor for only the *Tritoteuch* (i.e. Genesis through Leviticus). See Nihan, “The Holiness Code Between D and P. Some Comments on the Function and Significance of Leviticus 17–26 in the Composition of the Torah,” in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, ed. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 121–22. However, his view more recently is that the redactor of the entire pentateuch is H. See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 559–75.

<sup>387</sup> See Nihan, “The Holiness Code Between D and P,” 115–22; *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 571–72; and more recently, Nihan “The Priestly Covenant: Its Reinterpretations, and the Composition of ‘P’,” in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 87–134.

<sup>388</sup> See Nihan, “The Priestly Covenant,” 87–134. Nihan understands the pentateuchal expansions (P, H, and a possible later P hand in Numbers), all of which expand the notion of *covenant*. He argues that H combined P with the already existing non-priestly material, and that P was originally a separate document before being combined by H. The final level is the priestly redaction of Numbers, who knew and was familiar with H's combination of P and non-P, as well as the work of the Holiness School.

<sup>389</sup> Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 524–26.

Contrary to Stackert's position that H cannot be the pentateuchal redactor due to there being no traces of H within Deuteronomy, Nihan argues that the H redactor relegated D to a secondary position by placing it at the end of the Pentateuch. This is evidenced by the Tetrateuch's legislation (esp. Exodus through Numbers) being conveyed by YHWH, whereas in Deuteronomy, the legislation is conveyed to the Israelites by Moses, who is an important figure, but, importantly, he is not YHWH.<sup>390</sup>

Stackert may place too much stock on H's loyalty to their forebears (P), as opposed to placing it also on H's present needs and concerns. In other words, if D has a perspective on a law that is more relevant to the current situation than P's perspective, perhaps H chooses to go with relevance over loyalty.<sup>391</sup> At the very least, H's relationship to the other pentateuchal sources ought to concern a combination of these two tensions. Those two tensions being that (1) H is concerned with maintaining their traditions as found in P material, but also (2) in updating that tradition based on the changing circumstances they are currently facing; circumstances such as being exiled into a foreign land and the loss of the cultic centre – the Temple.

#### 5.1.5. Stackert's Strategy to Leave History out of the Source Critical Discussion

As a quick aside, Stackert's ahistorical perspective on pentateuchal sources requires some consideration. He asserts that socio-historical situations or contexts should be resisted as

---

<sup>390</sup> Stackert disagrees with Nihan's argument, arguing instead that if Deuteronomy was relegated to a subordinate position, it makes no sense that H would add something that confronts its own legislation. Two points to mention here: (i) Nihan does not regard H as being as contentious with D as Stackert does; (ii) there is support for H retaining material to which it disagrees: the non-P material in the CC (E).

<sup>391</sup> This is of course similar to D's treatment of E material, particularly in the Ten Words and the CC, where D updates E's materials even if that means replacing or nullifying it.

evidence for determining literary source strata due to, as he puts it, “a paucity of available evidence.”<sup>392</sup>

Though a caution in relying heavily on historical reconstructions is laudable, ignoring it entirely is untenable. One can make moderate claims about historical settings without getting bogged down into discussions over its minutia. Stackert’s claim forces his perspective into a narrow literary tunnel, leaving the context a skeleton bereft of its flesh. The notion of H operating in the exilic period is telling, and provides rationale for the sort of redaction. Texts are not composed in vacuums, divorced from the cultural influences that affect writers and the meaning of their words. Redactions, like the ones that occur in the Pentateuch, are not only due to literary dissatisfaction; rather, they are also due to societal changes, brought on by any number of things such as war, calamity, discovery, economic downturns; anything that constitutes a breach of tradition where the past must be reimagined in light of the present as it is no-longer relevant.

Therefore, by ignoring the historical setting, Stackert has no explanation for the motivation behind redacting existent texts with expansions or interpolations. For example, why would H feel the need to update and supplement P’s materials? At the literary level alone there is no holistically plausible answer to this question. The historical setting, regardless of how difficult it is to reconstruct, is still necessary for completing the picture, regardless one’s certainty in the matter.

---

<sup>392</sup> Stackert, “Compositional Strata ...,” 4, n. 6.

### 5.1.6. Summary of The Source Critical Situation

In summary, there are a few takeaways. First, H is widely accepted as later than P, H is distinct from P, and H is active outside the HC. Second, the exilic H stratum (the Holiness School, à la Nihan, or H<sub>R</sub>, à la Milgrom) is both distinct from a previous stratum of H (which is contained mostly in the HC) and a possible final redactor of pentateuchal materials.<sup>393</sup> Third, extending Stackert's observation that H changes the letter of the law while retaining the spirit of the law in P, this sentiment could also be expressed in H's treatment of non-priestly legislation. In other words, it is not clear that H treats P material any different than JE or D material. It seems to depend on the legislation and whether or not it is relevant to H's present needs or circumstances.

### 5.1.7. Additional thought: H and Ezekiel

Before moving forward, a few words about H's connection to Ezekiel are necessary. There are many lexical and theological connections between Ezekiel and the HC; so much so that Karl Heinrich Graf (mistakenly) believed that Ezekiel was the author of the HC.<sup>394</sup> Julius Wellhausen also saw many connections between the HC and Ezekiel, but never went so far as to claim that one was authored by the other.

Lisa Levitt Kohn catalogues a number of connections Ezekiel has with priestly material. There are four examples that demonstrate H and Ezekiel's connectivity to one another. First,

---

<sup>393</sup> Milgrom posits Genesis through Numbers; Nihan posits Genesis through Deuteronomy, but not the final version of Numbers; Stackert argues that H was not the final pentateuchal redactor but did redact material from Genesis to Deuteronomy; and both Knohl and Otto posit the entire Pentateuch was redacted by the author of the HC.

<sup>394</sup> See Karl H. Graf, *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des alten Testaments. Zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen.* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1866), 81-83. On these pages, Graf lists numerous lexical connections between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code. First read in Lisa Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah, JSOT Sup.* 358 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).

Ezekiel does not feature the Tabernacle. Out of all P's terminology for the planning and construction of the Tabernacle in Exod 25–31 and 35–40, Ezekiel only retains one lexeme.<sup>395</sup> Second, the high concentration of Sabbath pericope in Ezekiel and in the HC point to an aligned interest when it comes to Sabbath keeping. The phrase שבתתי (“my Sabbaths”), for example, only appears in the Pentateuch in Exod 31:13 (regarded by some to be H) and three times in the HC (Lev 19:3, 30; and 26:2). Other than that, it only again appears in Ezekiel (Ezek 20:13 and 22:8).<sup>396</sup> There are no other occurrences of this term in the HB.<sup>397</sup> Third, the phrase חלל שם קדשי (“profane my holy name”) is only found in the HC (Lev 20:3; 22:2, 32) and in Ezekiel (20:39; 36:20; 36:21, and 22).<sup>398</sup> And fourth, the Sabbath connection is further strengthened by the description of the Sabbath as a sign (אֵימָה) between YHWH and the Israelites. Exodus 31:13, as it will be demonstrated in the next chapter, is part of H's activity beyond the scope of the HC:

וְאַתָּה דִּבַּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר אֲךָ אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ כִּי אֹת הוּא בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם לֵדַעַת כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה  
מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם:

You shall keep my Sabbaths, for this is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, given in order that you may know that I YHWH sanctify you.

Ezekiel 20:12 (and v. 20) parallels Exod 31 almost verbatim:

<sup>395</sup> Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul*, 81. Obviously Ezekiel speaks of a future temple, a much grander and greater temple, but this does not connect it to the priestly Tabernacle. This fits the H-like nature of Ezekiel, to incorporate non-priestly material, such as the lexemes used for the temple. Ezekiel, like H, does not favour P over non-priestly materials.

<sup>396</sup> Kohn mistakenly claims that the phrase שַׁבְּתֹתַי occurs in Ezekiel ten times. However, to be exact, the phrase שַׁבְּתֹתַי, with this orthographic form, only occurs in Ezekiel twice (20:13 and 22:8). It occurs in a different orthographic form (שַׁבְּתוֹתַי, note the long spelling with the *vav*) in Ezek 20:12, 16, 20, 21, and 24; 22:26; 23:38; and 44:24. This is curious since Ezek 20 contains both spellings right next to each other (vv. 12 and 13). Additionally, this longer spelling occurs in Isa 56:4, a fact that Kohn missed and, until I was corrected by Craig Broyles, I did as well. Appreciation to Craig Broyles for pointing this out to me.

<sup>397</sup> See above footnote.

<sup>398</sup> A lexical connection that Genesis 1 has with H based on this connection between HC and Ezekiel is רָקִיעַ (“firmament”). רָקִיעַ appears in Genesis 1 in verses 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 17 and in Ezekiel 1:22, 23, 25, 26, and 10:1. It also appears in Psalm 19:2; 150:1; and Daniel 12:3.

וגם את־שבתותי נתתי להם להיות לאות ביני וביניהם לדעת כי אני יהוה מקדשם:  
 Moreover I gave them my sabbaths, as a sign between me and them, so that they might  
 know that I YHWH sanctify them.<sup>399</sup>

With these literary connections, it is understandable why Graf would believe the author of the HC was Ezekiel. Throughout the next two chapters, Ezekiel will be brought into the discussion here and there as support of H in various passages outside of the HC. Consider this discussion the rationale for doing so.

## 5.2. Narratological Reasons for Genesis 1 being Ascribed to P

The focus now turns to the narratological reasons for Gen 1 being ascribed to P, while the next chapter will explore the lexical and theological reasons. Stackert emphasizes that Gen 1 could not have been H because it is essential to P's narrative as a whole for two reasons: (1) its sabbath aetiology "provides groundwork for P elsewhere in the Torah and is thus integrally tied to the larger P narrative;"<sup>400</sup> and (2) the close parallels between Gen 2:1–3 and P's sanctuary building (especially in Exod 39–40) "confirm the inseparability of Genesis 1:1–2:4a from P."<sup>401</sup> These two claims will be explored and summarily challenged. Instead, it will then be shown that H is responsible for Gen 1 and the wider narrative that stems from Gen 1. Furthermore, it will be demonstrated that P's narrative does not require Gen 1 to be its opening.

---

<sup>399</sup> This expression at the close of both Exodus 31:13 and Ezekiel 20:12, 20, "I YHWH sanctify you/them" is found in the HC in Leviticus 20:8; 21:8; and 22:32.

<sup>400</sup> Stackert, "Compositional Strata ...," 13.

<sup>401</sup> Ibid., 14.

### 5.2.1. P's Narrative Character Compared to J

Stackert correctly posits that P must be understood primarily as a narrative source.<sup>402</sup> He does not deny sub-genres within P's narrative, but for him, these sub-genres "are all encompassed within, informed by, and function as part of its larger narrative."<sup>403</sup> Joel Baden agrees and observes that J, unlike P, has a tendency to place material into its narrative that does not fit its larger narrative.<sup>404</sup> P's narrative is much more cohesive and intact than J's.

### 5.2.2. H's Narrative Relationship with P

Stackert's view of the narratological relationship between P and H is important here. He correctly views H as supplementing and updating P from its cultic (or outdated) foci.<sup>405</sup> H remains attentive to its forbear, employing narrativizing elements in its legal supplements. For example, H's legislation in the HC contains short snippets that set the giving of YHWH's commands in the Sinai wilderness (see Lev 25:1). The result is that P's narrative remains intact. Conversely, Stackert also observes that H "violates P's narrative integrity—in particular, its plot

---

<sup>402</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>403</sup> Ibid.

<sup>404</sup> Joel Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Considerations," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 18. He gives the example of the Song of the Sea, which disrupts the J narrative, but J does not fret this since the poem was of such value to the author of J that it was included, "contradictions notwithstanding," as Baden puts it.

<sup>405</sup> Stackert, "The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources," 189.



—even as it attempts to accommodate and mimic it.”<sup>406</sup> In other words, H does not always follow P’s narrative lead.<sup>407</sup>

There are two take aways here. First, H has narratological elements in both its legislation (the HC) and in its interpolations outside the HC that are attentive to P’s narrative integrity. Second, whether accidental or intentional, H at times “violates” P’s narrative cohesion, especially as it concerns plot.

### 5.2.3. A Closer Look at P’s Narrative Characteristics

Joel Baden makes two key observations about P’s narrative character throughout the Pentateuch.<sup>408</sup> First, Baden observes that P’s narrative, all but twice, presents YHWH’s law-givings exclusively at Sinai. Those exceptions will be explored below. Second, Baden observes that P’s narrative presents YHWH’s law-givings exclusively to the first generation of Israelites who were wandering the wilderness just after escaping Egypt. Consequently, P’s narrative lacks parenthesis and aetiology, features found in the other pentateuchal groups.

---

<sup>406</sup> Stackert, “Compositional Strata ...,” 12.

<sup>407</sup> Stackert’s view reduces H to a somewhat clumsy caricature as though they miss the point unintentionally, as though it is by accident. though perhaps they do so intentionally. It is possible that H is not clumsy, rather it is equally possible (and in my opinion probable) that H both understands the details and intentionally breaks from them for their own socioreligious reasons (e.g. better harmony with non-P materials like D and JE, relevance based on current needs, etc.).

<sup>408</sup> See Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 13-29; and also Baden, “A Narrative Pattern and Its Role in Source Criticism,” in *HS* (2008): 41-54.

### 5.2.3.1. *P's Focus on Lawgiving only at Sinai*

Between Exod 19 and Num 10, the setting for P's law-givings is exclusively Sinai.<sup>409</sup> This is, of course, contrary to D and E where the location is Mount Horeb.<sup>410</sup> Outside of this narrative stretch, P's narrative is bereft of law-givings; except for only two exceptions: (1) there is Gen 17's circumcision law; and (2) there is Exod 12's legal additions to the feast of unleavened bread.

Beginning with the second exception, Baden himself argues that it is likely from H.<sup>411</sup> Exodus 12:14–20 demonstrates strong literary and theological connections to H's festival calendar in Lev 23.

Consequently, this is most likely H's interpolation. This means that Baden's theory of P's narratological cohesion remains intact, since Exod 12:14–20 is not an example of P narrating an episode of law-giving somewhere other than Mount Sinai, it happens to be an example of H doing so. This, as it may be recalled, is normal behaviour for H based on Stackert's hypothesis that H "violates" P's narrative cohesion at times.

This leaves only one place where P describes a law being given somewhere other than Sinai—Gen 17. Baden sidesteps this narratological hurdle by arguing that P's circumcision covenant in Gen 17 is not an actual law. He explains that P does not understand ברית as a *covenant* but as a *promise*. For Baden, the sinaitic laws are opposite to promises, they are

---

<sup>409</sup> Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P," 20. The material between Exod 19 and Num 10 is entirely legal in nature. Though Baden wishes to separate the HC from P, he notes that it too is legal and fits in well here. Perhaps this is why the HC was added here, among all the legislative material.

<sup>410</sup> Though it should be noted that in D, the law was presented to the people in the plains of Moab as a matter of exactness. Though the law was given to them there, it was given based on the law being given to them at Horeb.

<sup>411</sup> Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P," 20. This is also Knohl's view. See Knohl, "Priestly Torah versus the Holiness School," 77; idem., *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 52.

demands followed by rewards. Therefore, Baden concludes that Gen 17 is not legal material, and it subsequently does not contradict P's tenet of narrative cohesion.

However, in contrary to Baden's view of Gen 17 but also wishing to retain his claim that P exclusively presents law-givings at Sinai, Genesis 17's so-called circumcision "promise" looks far too much like a law to just be casually circumvented by labelling it as such. The point that *ברית* has more to do with a *promise* in P material than with a *covenant* cannot be conceded.<sup>412</sup> Though, even if it could be conceded, only vv. 1–8 portray God making promises (e.g. I will make you very fruitful; I will establish my covenant, etc.). Whereas in vv. 9–14, circumcision is commanded in no uncertain terms: "This is my covenant, which you shall keep, between me and you and your offspring after you: Every male among you shall be circumcised" (v.10).<sup>413</sup> There are even a few additional stipulations such as waiting until the child is eight days old (v. 12) and making sure that any slaves or servants within the household are also circumcised (vv.12–13). Add to these stipulation the importance placed on observing the command of circumcision: it is a sign of the covenant between God and the people (v. 11), it is a longstanding covenant as indicated by the use of *לדורותיכם* ("throughout your generations") in vv. 9 and 12 and *לברית עולם* ("an everlasting covenant") in v. 13, and the punishment for disobeying this command is exile, or

---

<sup>412</sup> Though it is interesting that P never uses *ברית* but instead uses *עדות* ("testimony, witness") except here in Genesis 17 and in Genesis 6–9 with the flood narrative. Bill T. Arnold argues that this is because the use of *ברית* within priestly material is not P but H. See Bill T. Arnold, "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative," in *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honour of Samuel Greengus*, ed. Bill T. Arnold, Nancy L. Erickson, John H. Walton (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 30. See also Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 141–46.

<sup>413</sup> This is immediately after the opening line in v. 9: "God said to Abraham, "As for you, you shall keep my covenant, you and your offspring after you throughout their generations." This is clearly not a promise, but a command. Circumcision is presented as a condition of covenant, not as a benefit of a promise. Baden's notion that *ברית* does not mean covenant here but promise does not suite the context.

metaphorically, being cut-off (כרת) from one's people (v. 14). Genesis 17, therefore, is a priestly example of pre-sinaitic law. If Baden is correct, it is the only example of this.

Since Gen 17 violates P's narrative tenet of narrative cohesion, a satisfactory argument to explain its curious presence could be that P is not the hand that composed it. With it being a doublet with J's covenant (ברית) in Gen 15 and with it having priestly terms, this is indicative of it being an H interpolation. If this is the case, then Baden's observation that P's narrative lacks pre-sinaitic law-givings can still be salvaged.

There are many features of Gen 17:9–14 that distinguish it as H.<sup>414</sup> There are four terms or phrases that are widely regarded to be H (terms that Baden earlier highlighted to demonstrate that Exod 12 is H and not P). First, the phrase ברית עולם (everlasting covenant) is used in Gen 17:13 (also 17:7, and 19) as well as in H's sabbath command outside the HC in Exod 31:16<sup>415</sup> and in the HC (Lev 24:8).<sup>416</sup> Second, the use of פָּרַח ("breaking") with ברית ("covenant") occurs in both Gen 17:14 (את־בריתי הפָּרַח, "he has broken my covenant") and in the HC's Lev 26:15 (יִלְחֹד אֶת־בְּרִיתִי, "you have broken my covenant").<sup>417</sup> Third, the use of the phrase יָלִיד בֵּית to describe a home-born slave appears in Gen 17:12, 13, and 27, and in only one other place within the Pentateuch—the HC's Lev 22:11.<sup>418</sup> And fourth, H's version of the cutting off formula

<sup>414</sup> See Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*, trans. J. J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 255–57. He argues that vv. 3b–21 is a late theological expansion of vv. 1–3a. Bill T. Arnold argues for the entire chapter to be from the Holiness Redactor due to the reworking and supplementation of material already found in Genesis 15 with the material in 18:9–15 in mind, see Arnold, *Genesis*, NCBC, 168. There is also stylistic similarities to Exod 31:12–17 in Gen 17:9–14 that should be considered.

<sup>415</sup> I will discuss Exod 31:12–17, as well as other sabbath pericope throughout the Pentateuch, in the next chapter.

<sup>416</sup> Note that it also appears in the H-like Ezekiel, in 16:60 and 37:26.

<sup>417</sup> See also Lev 26:44, Ezek 16:59; 17:15, 18; 44:7. Since H is understood to be aware of D, note as well the construction הפָּרַח אֶת־בְּרִיתִי in Deut 31:16, and 17.

<sup>418</sup> Genesis 17 constructs all three as יָלִיד בֵּיתְךָ וּמִקְנֶת כֶּסֶּף ("the born-one in your house and the one you bought with your silver") and in Lev 22:11, it similarly read: יָקָה נֶפֶשׁ קָנִין כֶּסֶּף ... וְיָלִיד בֵּיתוֹ ("he bought a slave with his silver ... and the born-one in his house").

(וּנְכַרְתָּהּ) occurs here in Gen 17:14 (see Lev 23:29).<sup>419</sup> For these reasons, Gen 17:9–14 can be confidently ascribed to H. Moreover, circumcision theologically and ideologically fits far better with H than it does with P. H is interested in expanding the holiness of the individual to all of Israel, not just the priesthood and their confined sanctum: the Temple precinct. Circumcision is a practice that is a covenant marker for all Israel (well, just the men of obvious reasons), for all time.

#### *5.2.3.1.1. H's Redaction of The Flood Narrative in Genesis 6–9*

This brings up the flood narrative in Gen 6–9. The priestly narrative that begins in Gen 1 undoubtedly continues in Gen 6–9. Genesis 17's circumcision episode has just been discussed and shown to be likely H. For similar reasons, H interpolations can be detected within the Gen 6–9 narrative.

Bill T. Arnold demonstrates, in a recent article,<sup>420</sup> that parts of the flood narrative were added by H (expansions) while other parts were redacted by H (interpolations). These claims are evidenced by the detection of lexemes and phrases that are more easily explained as belonging to H than to P.

Arnold rejects the previous source analysis typically held by pentateuchal scholarship.<sup>421</sup>

For example, David M. Carr argues that P is dependant on an older J account based on what he

---

<sup>419</sup> This same cutting off construction occurs in Exod 12 as well. And though Baden observes this and cites it as evidence of H's hand in Exodus 12, he curiously does not do the same here with Gen 17? For more details on this cutting off formula and its ascription to the hand of H, see Knohl, "The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School," 71.

<sup>420</sup> Arnold, "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative," 13-40.

<sup>421</sup> Ibid., 14-17. Arnold summarizes that he is interested in tracing the entire priestly narrative through Genesis and in showing that H is more involved in the final form of the narrative in Genesis than was previously thought or admitted. As he puts it: "my proposal is that Knohl and subsequent scholars who follow his approach have not given enough consideration to the possibility that much of the narrative material in Genesis is the result of H's editorial activity and creativity instead of P, as is most often assumed."

sees as expansions by P to match J's framework and dating.<sup>422</sup> However, as Arnold posits, these so-called P expansions to J's account deserve a second look. He sees the lion's share of these editorial expansions and interpolations as H, not P.<sup>423</sup> Those H expansions and interpolations are: Gen 6:9–22; 7:8–10, 13–24; 8:1–5, 15–17; and 9:1–17. What is left over to P's stratum is eighteen verses, and is “little more than an expanded genealogical note on Noah, with a few narrational details about the flood.”<sup>424</sup> Thus, J and P were drawn together by a redactor who composed “whole stretches of new material,” thus expanding P and J, as well as at other times “correcting and nuancing the older account” with interpolations.<sup>425</sup>

There are a few reasons for positing that the content within these expansions and interpolations are H and not P. First, the sections ascribed to H contain direct divine speech, something uncommon in P. And, naturally, the sections that Arnold ascribes to P, that expanded genealogical note, do not contain direct divine speech.<sup>426</sup>

Second, the presence of ברית (“covenant”) in Gen 9, instead of the expected P-lexeme עדות (“witness”), indicates authorship other than P.<sup>427</sup> The same argument could be made here for

---

<sup>422</sup> See David M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 48–62; esp. 60–61.

<sup>423</sup> Arnold, “The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative,” 14–17.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid., 38. See pp. 39–40 for Arnold's reconstruction of P's stratum (Gen 5:28, 30–32; 7:6–7, 11; 8:1–2a, 3b–5, 13–14, 18–19; and 9:28–29).

<sup>425</sup> Ibid. The motivation for this H redactor is two-fold: (1) “to preserve the authoritative sources before him;” and (2) to prepare the reader for two essential H themes, themes that this redactor deemed “central to its overall message.” Those central themes are “holiness and dietary purity.”

<sup>426</sup> Ibid. In the Pentateuch, אני only occurs as divine direct speech here in Gen 6:17; 9:9, 12; 17:1, 4. Knohl explains this literary anomaly with narratological rationale: it is due to Gen 6–17 coming before the revelation of the divine name in Exod 6 (see Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 125–28). However, Arnold argues that “perhaps we should consider these as genuine Holiness compositions, which would better explain the linguistic evidence.” See Arnold, “The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative,” 22.

<sup>427</sup> Arnold, Flood, 28. This same concern for ברית exists in Genesis 17 as well, where ברית was used, not עדות. See Genesis 9:1–17.

Gen 9 as was made in the earlier discussion on the ברית-covenant passage in Gen 17. Arnold concludes that these two covenant passages in Genesis (i.e. Gen 9 and 17) “prepare the reader specifically for Leviticus 26, where God promises to remember the ברית-covenants of Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham.”<sup>428</sup> Leaving Arnold’s point and the previous discussion on Gen 17 aside, the simple fact is that in H the lexeme ברית is used almost exclusively. For instance, the term עדות occurs 35 times between Genesis and Numbers; and only one of those 35 occurrences is in the HC (Lev 24:3);<sup>429</sup> whereas ברית occurs in the HC 9 times (Lev 24:8; 26:9, 15, 25, 42, and 44–45).<sup>430</sup> And, even though the term ברית is used universally among each of the pentateuchal groups (i.e. JEDP), there are a litany of occurrences in Deuteronomy—twenty-seven of them to be exact.<sup>431</sup> This is significant when one considers Stackert’s assertion that H is influenced by material found in D, whereas P is not.<sup>432</sup> The priestly use of ברית here in Gen 9 is by a priestly group who has likely interacted with D. Moreover, the term עדות does not occur in H-like Ezekiel, whereas the term ברית does 18 times.<sup>433</sup>

Third, the J account opens by explaining the justification for the flood as being due to the wickedness of humanity (see Gen 6:5–8), whereas 6:11–12 interpolates that it is also because of the corruption of the land. The notion of the land being a corruptible thing, something to be

---

<sup>428</sup> Arnold, “The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative,” 39. Arnold also points out the difficulty of ascribing these ברית-covenants to P saying, “How likely is it that P objected to the bilateral mutuality of the Sinai covenant, while accepting a ברית covenant for the ancestors in Genesis? It seems more like P would have proposed a unilateral עדות-pact for Noah and Abraham rather than articulating an ‘everlasting’ ancestral covenant to compete with Sinai.”

<sup>429</sup> See Exod 16:34; 25:16, 21–22; 26:33–34; 27:21; 30:6, 26, 36; 31:7, 18; 32:15; 34:29; 38:21; 39:35; 40:3, 5, 20–21; Lev 16:13; 24:3; Num 1:50, 53; 4:5; 7:89; 9:15; 10:11; 17:19, 22–23, 25; and 18:2.

<sup>430</sup> It only occurs once in Leviticus outside the HC (Lev 2:13).

<sup>431</sup> See Deut 4:13, 23, 31; 5:2–3; 7:2, 9, 12; 8:18; 9:9, 11, 15; 10:8; 17:2; 28:69; 29:8, 11, 13, 20, 24; 31:9, 16, 20, 25–26; and 33:9.

<sup>432</sup> Stackert, “The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources,” 188.

<sup>433</sup> See Ezek 16:8, 59–62; 17:13–16, 18–19; 20:37; 30:5; 34:25; 37:26; and 44:7.

profaned, is a central concern in the HC and D.<sup>434</sup> And fourth, similar to how Gen 17 is an example of pre-sinaitic law-giving, the flood narrative also presents laws long before Sinai with Elohim's commands concerning the making of the ark and who is to be onboard (6:13-22). Additionally, after the flood waters recede, the divine command to be fruitful and multiply occurs (9:1), just as it did in Gen 1 (1:28). Just as with Gen 17, the presence of pre-sinaitic law-giving suggests that these narrative pericopes are not best assigned to P. Together, this all suggests that H is responsible for the final version of the flood narrative.

This conclusion also challenges Stackert's view that the flood narrative is P's work. Stackert arrives at this conclusion based largely on the narratological connections between Gen 1 and Gen 6–9. For instance, he notes that the divine image in Gen 1:27 and 9:6 “is actually only one of several connections between the creation and flood texts in P that strongly recommends that these texts be assigned to the same Priestly stratum.”<sup>435</sup> Consequently, for Stackert, “Without Gen 1:1–2:4a, these features [in the flood narrative] are insufficiently explained in P.”<sup>436</sup>

#### *5.2.3.1.2. Conclusion to Baden's view of Sinaitic Exclusivity*

In summary, both Exod 12 and Gen 17's pre-sinaitic law-givings are likelier to be from the hand of H, than they are to be from P. On account of this, P's narratological tenet to not present law-givings beyond Sinai remains unbroken. Additionally, Stackert's observations are confirmed: H is both concerned with accommodating P's narrative tenets (e.g. the use of אלהים in Gen 17 before the revelation of the Tetragrammaton to Moses in Exod 6:2 and the use of יהוה in Exod 12, which of course comes after the revealing of the Tetragrammaton), though it will at

<sup>434</sup> Arnold, “The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative,” 21.

<sup>435</sup> Stackert, “Compositional Strata . . .,” 14, n.46.

<sup>436</sup> Ibid.



times also “violate” P’s narrative cohesion (e.g. these two aforementioned pre-sinaitic law-givings: Exod 12 and Gen 17).<sup>437</sup>

#### 5.2.3.2. *P’s Focus on Lawgiving only to the Israelites*

The second narratological characteristic of P is that P exclusively directs law-givings only to the Israelites. That is to say, the laws are directed specifically to the generation of Israelites living in the wilderness, not to the Israelites who later settle in the land. Thus, as Baden notes, P’s narrative lacks elements of *parenesis*.<sup>438</sup> Jan Joosten defines *parenesis* as that moment when “the structure of the discourse intends to break out of [the] narrative context in order to speak directly to the real addressees.”<sup>439</sup> Martin Noth notes that “The P narrative is not oriented toward an impending occupation of the land; rather, its real goal was reached with the presentation of the regulations established at Sinai, regulations which became valid immediately rather than being put off until a later occupation.”<sup>440</sup> P’s narrative is not waiting for future generations of Israelites, it is focused on the narrative’s present generation.<sup>441</sup>

---

<sup>437</sup> A rationale that comes to mind to explain why H would violate P’s narrative structure and break the tenet of sinaitic exclusivity when it comes to divine law-givings, is H’s influence by non-priestly materials. This influence may have meant, one can only infer, that D’s assertion that Mount Horeb was the location of divine law-giving opened the door for H to see the specificity of where one receives divine laws as soft. Though H agrees with their forebears that the majority of divine law-givings occur at Sinai, not Horeb, H’s concern for a specific location may have been somewhat softened, making their violation of P’s narrative tenet possible and acceptable.

<sup>438</sup> Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 23.

<sup>439</sup> See Jan Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code*, VTSup 67 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 194.

<sup>440</sup> See Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. Bernhard W. Anderson (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 9. (First published in German as *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948].)

<sup>441</sup> Perhaps this is P’s rhetorical strategy to communicate to its current readers or audience. It legitimizes and authorizes its claims for its current audience by setting the narrative in the salient past. Regardless, P may have a current audience in mind, just as the other sources do, but P never breaks out of its setting to speak directly to the current audience. Everything is set in the past to that generation of ex-slaves wandering in the wilderness.

### 5.2.3.2.1. *Non-P Uses Parenesis*

The narrative character of the CC (E) and Deuteronomy are both comparatively parenetic. For example, the CC references houses, vineyards, and fields (Exod 21:6; 22:4, 6–7; 23:10–11, 16, 19); and ends with directives of what to do with the Canaanite religious items found in the land (Exod 23:24). Similarly, Deuteronomy references laws about the land, future kings within that land, cities of refuge, and what to do when one is away from the Temple (even the name of that Temple is parenetic: “the place that YHWH your God will choose as a dwelling for his name”).<sup>442</sup> These laws in both E and D are not addressed to the Israelites at Horeb or in the plains of Moab, they are addressed to their current audience—the Israelites who are already settled in the land.<sup>443</sup> This is in stark contrast to the narrative style of P, which does not break its narrative integrity to speak to its current audience directly.

### 5.2.3.2.2. *H Also Uses Parenesis*

But what of H? When it comes to parenesis, H is much closer to non-priestly narrative styles than it is to P. Joosten observes H’s proclivity to utilize parenesis with the occurrence of ראשונים (“ancestors” or literally “former ones”) in Lev 26:45, which demonstrates the “well-known tendency of the Holiness Code occasionally to step out of its fictional framework so as to address its real addressees directly.”<sup>444</sup> Milgrom agrees, and adds Lev 18:25’s description of the land “vomiting out” (קיא) its inhabitants for defiling it (טמא) as evidence for H’s proclivity for

<sup>442</sup> Deuteronomy 17:14–20; 19:1–7; 12:11. See also Deut 12:1, 20, 29; 17:14; 18:9, etc., where the deuteronomist continually uses parenetic expressions like “when you enter the land ...”

<sup>443</sup> See Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 23.

<sup>444</sup> Jan Joosten, “Covenant Theology in the Holiness Code,” ZABR 4, 1998, 152.

parenthesis.<sup>445</sup> Baden also observes that H is more similar to D (non-priestly), as both of them do not hide the fact that their focus is on the current generation.<sup>446</sup>

#### 5.2.3.2.3. *Aetiologies with P and H*

Another distinction between P's narrative style and that of J, E, D, and H is the presence of aetiologies. Baden remarks that P is "conspicuously free" of aetiologies.<sup>447</sup> An aetiology is "a narrative designed in its basic structure to support some kind of explanation for a situation or name that exists at the time of the storyteller."<sup>448</sup> Thus, an aetiology may be applied to any narrative that uses the past to explain the author's present, which is, of course, very similar to parenthesis.<sup>449</sup>

The primeval history in Gen 1–11 contains many aetiologies. Among such aetiologies are aetiologies that explain the origins of animal taxonomy for later dietary legislation (1:6–13; 19–31; compare with Lev 11), the origin of the religious calendar (1:14–18), the explanation for how the world became full of people and living creatures (1:20, 24, and 28), the origin of the Sabbath (2:1–3), the origin of marriage (2:24), the legless-motion of snakes (3:14), pain in childbirth (3:16), the various elements of human civilization (urbanization in 4:17; pastoral nomadism in 4:20; musical arts in 4:21; and metallurgy in 4:22), the origin and meaning of the rainbow (9:12–

---

<sup>445</sup> See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22, AB*, 1580–81.

<sup>446</sup> For example both frequently use the parenetic expression "when you enter the land." See Lev 19:23; 23:9; 25:2; cf. Deut 12:1, 20, 29. Much of H's legislation is in the context of the land, reminding the Israelites that YHWH is bringing them into the land (see Lev 25:2), and warning them that the land will reject them if they do not adhere to YHWH's commands, as it rejected the previous Canaanite inhabitants whom YHWH is now dispossessing (See Lev 18:24–30; 20:22–26).

<sup>447</sup> Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P," 24. He presents the example that in J, unlike P, the phrase "to this day" is never used.

<sup>448</sup> George W. Coats, *Genesis, with an Introduction to Narrative Literature* (FOTL 1: Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), 10. First found in and quoted in Arnold, *Genesis, NCBC*, 10.

<sup>449</sup> See Arnold, *Genesis*, 10–11; and Arnold, "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative," 31–32.

17), and the origin of the name *Babylon* (11:9). Arnold surveys these aetiologies in Gen 1–11 and concludes that “such etiologies in P are rare, and the occurrence of a Sabbath etiology at 2:2–3 is perhaps evidence for H’s composition rather than P’s.”<sup>450</sup> Baden similarly observes: “the priestly author’s strict avoidance of legal material in Genesis and the first half of Exodus is evident also in those texts in which there are ample opportunities for law, or at the very least for explicit etiology of later legal practice, but in which such opportunities are manifestly not taken.”<sup>451</sup>

Simply put, P does not communicate in aetiology and Gen 1 is full of aetiology. It stands to reason that Gen 1, then, cannot be P. Moreover, as Thomas Krüger notes: “Remarkably the link between creation and Sabbath established in the present text of Gen 1:1–2:3 is never again taken up in the basic layer of P.”<sup>452</sup>

#### 5.2.3.2.4. *Baden’s Argument that Genesis 2:1–3 is not Aetiology*

However, Baden denies that Gen 2:1–3 is an aetiology.<sup>453</sup> Though if Gen 1 is to remain P, then one would have to deny the presence of any aetiologies—since Gen 1 cannot be both P and aetiological. Baden’s claim that Gen 1 does not really contain a Sabbath aetiology is quite the uphill battle. One would be better to posit that P can, at times, dabble in aetiology; rather than attempt to claim that there are no aetiologies present.

Moreover, the Sabbath is not the only aetiology present in Gen 1. There is day four’s aetiology for the Israelite calendar (as seen in Gen 1:14–18 paving the way for either Num 28–29

---

<sup>450</sup> Arnold, “The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative,” 32, n.64.

<sup>451</sup> Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 21.

<sup>452</sup> Thomas Krüger, “Genesis 1:1–2:3 and the Development of the Pentateuch,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 130.

<sup>453</sup> Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 21.

or Lev 23) and there is the aetiology for dietary restrictions as seen in Gen 1's animal taxonomy which prepares the audience for the dietary restrictions in Lev 11.<sup>454</sup> In fact, much of Gen 1, just like much of the material in Gen 1–11, is aetiological. As such, it is not intended for an audience at Sinai, wandering in the wilderness, but rather for an audience that is either already in the land, settled, or out of the land, exiled.

Additionally, Baden's argument that Gen 1 contains no laws or commands is not accurate. Of course, for Gen 1 to be P, it is favourable to find no commands or laws being discussed therein. However, Gen 1:28 (also Gen 9:1–7 in the flood narrative) has a few commands such as be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over living things.<sup>455</sup> Narratively speaking, these commands all come before Sinai and are not even addressed to Israelites but rather to all of humanity.<sup>456</sup>

Baden's argument that Gen 2:1–3 is not an aetiology is not convincing. Narratively, the situation in Gen 1 makes perfect sense, especially in light of Stackert's view of how H operates

---

<sup>454</sup> Note that days two, three, five and six's discussion on animal taxonomy, and the command to eat vegetables in Gen 1, which then becomes unrestricted meat-eating in Gen 9 after the deluge (with the exception of blood), later back to a restricted diet for a holy people living in a foreign land as discussed in Lev 11. This is discussed further in more detail in the next chapter.

<sup>455</sup> It is worth noting that the command *פרו ורבו* ("be fruitful and multiply") appears in the flood story both directed to animals in 8:17 as it was in 1:22 and then to Noah and his sons in 9:1 (and similarly in 9:7). It also occurs exactly the same in Jeremiah 23:3. It also occurs, albeit in slightly different syntactical constructions, throughout the HB and does not constitute evidence for any particular source. It occurs in Genesis 17:20; 35:11; 47:27; and Exodus 1:7. It does occur in the HC in Leviticus 26:9 and the H-like Ezekiel 36:11. Similarly, *כבש* ("to subdue") only occurs here in the Pentateuch and twice in 2 Chronicles (9:18; 28:10), which is a later priestly stratum (it also occurs in the deuteronomistic 2 Samuel 8:11, and H was evidently and likely influenced by D). But more significantly is that *רדה* ("to have dominion") appears in the Pentateuch here in Genesis 1:26 and 28 and in the HC 4 times (Leviticus 25:43, 46, 53; 26:17) and in Numbers 24:19. The use of this term may point to H.

<sup>456</sup> Though this is foreign to P's narratological character, it is perfectly at home in H's. For example, the frequent use of the term *גר* ("aliens, sojourners") demonstrates H's concern for laws being expected on peoples other than the Israelites. This term occurs most pervasively in the HC than any other pentateuchal book, littering the law code 21 times within a span of 9 chapters. H also is concerned with separating themselves from among the nations. This duality of being *apart from* while also *inclusive of* marks a tension point within holiness theology that merits further study.

—both accommodating P’s narrative while also violating it.<sup>457</sup> In Gen 1, H accommodates P’s narrative by (1) using *Elohim* and not YHWH; (2) by not presenting the Sabbath as an explicit command to Israel (since Israel does not officially exist yet); and (3) since this cannot be directed to Israel, the author only presents *Elohim* resting on the seventh-day. This accomplishes what the author intended, an aetiology for later Sabbath observance, which is later picked up and made explicit through the narrative sequence of Exod 16:22–30; 20:8–11; and 31:12–17.<sup>458</sup>

#### 5.2.4. The Beginning of the Priestly Narrative is Genesis 5:1–3

There is one loose end in this discussion. Both Stackert and Baden argue that the problem with Gen 1 being ascribed to H and not P is that P would be without a narrative start. However, a prime candidate for P’s narrative beginning is Gen 5:1–3. It does not contain a Sabbath aetiology or any other aetiology for that matter; and unlike Gen 1, but typical of P material, it heads a genealogical record. This raises the (rhetorical) question: if Gen 1 is P and Gen 5:1–3 is P, why would P need to mention creation twice?

The difference between Gen 5:1–3 and J’s antediluvian account of Gen 2–4 is well attested due to their differing genealogies. The two sources split nicely right at the end of Gen 4, where J’s genealogy ends and P’s begins. It is likely that P added its genealogical record to J’s account since the opening in J’s creation myth in Gen 2:4b, ביום עשות יהוה אלהים ארץ ושמים (“in the day when YHWH *Elohim* made earth and heaven”), is similarly conveyed in 5:1b, which reads: ביום ברא אלהים אדם (“in the day when *Elohim* created humanity”). This demonstrates that

<sup>457</sup> See Stackert, “Compositional Strata ...,” 12; and Baden, “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 20.

<sup>458</sup> This is contrary to D which argues that the sabbath originates in the memory of YHWH’s deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, not in the memory of YHWH’s rest at creation.

P's genealogical beginning in 5:1 had access to J's creation account. Indeed, it seems that P is summarizing J's creation account, thus employing it as the start of their own narrative.<sup>459</sup> The similarity is in the sentence structure; both have the temporal clause (ביום) followed by a verb of making followed again by the subject and again by its object. Neither have the direct object marker (את) and neither uses the definite article (ה), both of which are used by the author of Gen 1 does in Gen 1:1.<sup>460</sup>

Additionally, 5:1 opens ביום ברא אלהים אדם ("in the day when Elohim created Adam/humanity") utilizing יום similarly to how J does. Whereas in Gen 1, יום is used differently.<sup>461</sup> Moreover, at the close of Gen 1's account in 2:4a, the term יום is avoided altogether. Instead of closing as P does in 5:2, ביום הבראם ("in the day they were created"), H closes in 2:4a with בהבראם ("when they were created").

Taken as a whole, the three beginnings are all slightly different. J's creation myth in the Garden of Eden is echoed and utilized by P in 5:1–3. H then adds Gen 1 subsequent to J and P's accounts and is comparably more precise with its definition of time (יום).<sup>462</sup>

Evidence for Genesis 5:1–3 being the narrative beginning for P comes in two ways: (i) Gen 5:1 claims that it is the beginning of a document (ספר);<sup>463</sup> (ii) Gen 5:1–3 possesses all the

<sup>459</sup> It is equally possible that P and J are unaware of one another. That is, P was not influenced by J's Garden of Eden, and it is only through a shared tradition that both mention creation and Adam.

<sup>460</sup> Genesis 1:1: והשמים והארץ; and 2:4a: השמים והארץ.

<sup>461</sup> In Genesis 1 its meaning is more precise (a day being from evening to morning) and there are six of those before the narrative comes to the seventh day which does not seem to end. I take this to be for rhetorical effect. There is this cadence to the narrative and then on the seventh day, it sort of just hangs there, it perpetuates seemingly without an end. This distinguishes it literarily from the other days, adding to its significance and uniqueness.

<sup>462</sup> Reasons for H's addition of Genesis 1:1–2:4a is addressed in Chapter 2.

<sup>463</sup> Arnold posits correctly that "The other תולדות clauses in Genesis appear derived from this one [5:1]," which he considers "older than the rest and attributable to P." Arnold adds that it is "likely that 5:1 is the opening clause of a document that we may identify as P itself." See Arnold, "The Holiness redaction of the Flood Narrative," 19.

narratological requirements P needs. Put another way, P does not need Gen 1 as a narrative beginning since it already has Gen 5:1–3.<sup>464</sup>

### 5.3. Close Parallels between Genesis 2:1–3 and P’s Tabernacle

The second major narrative claim that Stackert posits is the parallel between Gen 2:1–3 and P’s Tabernacle construction, especially in Exod 39–40; which, as he claims, “confirm the inseparability of Gen 1:1–2:4a from P.”<sup>465</sup> Benjamin Sommer elaborates Stackert’s view:

For P, creation was not quite complete until the tabernacle was built. In ancient Near Eastern cosmologies (of which the priestly creation account in Gen. 1:1–2:4a is a typical example) the apogee of creation is the construction of a sanctuary for the creator god, but in P this apogee is deferred to Exodus 39–40, which describe[s] the erection of the tabernacle. The extensive verbal parallels between Gen 1:1–2:4a and Exodus 39–40 (which several scholars have noted) form an *inclusio*, indicating that world-creation and tabernacle-construction belong to a single narrative that culminates in the latter.<sup>466</sup>

---

<sup>464</sup> Seeing Gen 5:1 as the beginning of the P narrative resolves Stackert’s problem with Jacob Milgrom’s claim that Genesis 1:27 is H (see Milgrom, HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah, 33). Stackert argues that Milgrom “notes the strong continuity between Gen 1:27 and 9:6 with regard to the image of God” (Stackert, “Compositional Strata . . .,” 13–14). Though it should be noted that Milgrom mentions this in a footnote, as an example of the caution (directed specifically at Yairah Amit) of assigning priestly material containing anthropomorphic descriptions of deity to H instead of P. Stackert jumps on this footnote as though it were stated directly as evidence for H’s authorship of Gen 1:1–2:4a, when it was a footnote of caution. Milgrom was not making a sophisticated argument for Gen 1:27 and Gen 9:6. “Yet,” Stackert challenges, “[Milgrom] fails to recognize that assigning Gen 1:27 to H but Gen 9:6, which cites the creation of humanity in the divine image, to the historically anterior P leaves the rationale in Gen 9:6 without any force *at the level of the narrative*” (Stackert, Compositional Strata . . .,” 14, italics his). Stackert is correct in pointing out that the two are connected, but is incorrect positing that both 1:27 and 9:6 are P, and injudicious to leave 5:1–3 out of the discussion. Arnold argues that both Milgrom and Stackert are incorrect, arguing that both 9:6 and 1:27 are both H (see Arnold, “The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative,” 28–29). Genesis 5:1–3 can help clarify some things here if it were consulted more.

<sup>465</sup> Stackert, Compositional Strata . . .,” 14. Baden claims a similar position, see “Identifying the Original Stratum of P,” 17.

<sup>466</sup> Benjamin D. Sommer, “Conflicting Constructions of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle,” in *BibInt* 9:1 (2001): 43. The scholars he cites who have noted this connection are Umberto Cassuto, Martin Buber, Franz Rosenzweig, Erhard Blum, and, as he says, “especially” Moshe Weinfeld.



Since Sommer argues that the “extensive” verbal parallels between the two form an inclusio,<sup>467</sup> the door is opened to discuss the verbal dissimilarities as well, and these dissimilarities are not arbitrary. Genesis 2:1–3 states:

And the heavens and the earth and all their host were finished (pual כלה), and on the seventh day God finished (piel כלה) his work (מלאכה) that he had done (עשה), and on the seventh day he rested (שבת) from all his work (מלאכה) that he had done (עשה), and God blessed (ברך) the seventh day and sanctified (קדש) it, for on it God rested (שבת) from all his work which he created to make.

Compare, then, with Exod 39:32; 39:43; and 40:33:

And all the service (עבד) of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting was finished (qal כלה); the Israelites did (עשה) according to all that YHWH commanded Moses; thus they did it.

And Moses saw (ראה) all the work (המלאכה) and behold, they did (עשה) it just as YHWH commanded, thus they did it. And Moses blessed (ברך) them.

So Moses finished (piel כלה) the work (המלאכה).<sup>468</sup>

One can see that there are certainly similarities between these two narratives, such as the particular use of the piel form of כלה in both Exod 40:33 and Gen 2:2. Additionally, the author of Gen 1 very likely meant 2:1–3 to echo Exod 39–40 (and, as Sommer posits, form an inclusio).<sup>469</sup> But whether these verbal parallels justify Sommer’s conclusion that “world-creation and tabernacle-construction belong to a single narrative that culminates in the *latter*,” it is not proven by this inclusio alone; since one could just as easily state that world-creation and tabernacle-construction belong to a single narrative that culminates in the *former*. Thus, a closer look at why

<sup>467</sup> A literary term (as used within biblical studies) denoting an envelopment where the beginning and closing material echo one another so that it one is alluded to by the other, albeit implicitly. I assume this is what Sommer has in mind with his use of the term. Though it is debated how much material ought to be similar (e.g. just a word, a sentence, etc.). See Richard N. Soulen and R. Kendall Soulen, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism 3rd edition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 85–86.

<sup>468</sup> Exodus 40:33 in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint both read “all the work.”

<sup>469</sup> These connections only demonstrate that one author knew of the other. It does not demonstrate that they both originated from the same authorial hand.

this inclusio was made in the first place is required, and the best way to do this is to look at the differences between the two.

### 5.3.1. The Differences between Genesis 1 and Exodus 39–40

There are two differences between Gen 1 and Exod 39–40. First, there is a different protagonist. In Exod 39–40, “*Moses* blesses [the Israelites]” who built the Tabernacle; whereas in Gen 1, “*Elohim* blesses the seventh day” that he rested (שבת) on. This same theme persists as Gen 2:1 states that *Elohim* finished all his work on the seventh day, and Exod 40:33 states that *Moses* finished the work [of the Tabernacle].

Second there is a difference in focus. The term מועד is used in the Tabernacle account to denote sacred space, literally the “appointed” tent, or “Tent of Meeting,” as it is commonly translated (see Exod 39:32). Whereas in Gen 1, the term מועד is used to denote sacred time, those appointed-times or festivals. Thus, Gen 1 focuses on the sanctity of time, and the Tabernacle narrative focuses on the sanctity of space.

And third, and this is related to the second point, Gen 2:1–3 culminates with the Sabbath, not with a Tabernacle construction. Sommer correctly observes that “Priestly literature repeatedly highlights the tabernacle’s centrality,”<sup>470</sup> and that “In ancient Near Eastern cosmologies (of which the priestly creation account in Gen. 1:1–2:4a is a typical example) the apogee of creation is the construction of a sanctuary for the creator god,” however, there is no Tabernacle, Temple, Sanctuary, indeed, there is no mention of sacred space in Gen 2:1–3.

---

<sup>470</sup> Sommer, “Conflicting Constructions of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle,” 42.

### 5.3.2. Additional Thoughts on P's Focus on Sacred Space

There are a couple observations that need to be made based on P's focus on the Tabernacle. First, one might expect P to make it clear (that is, explicit) that the Tabernacle has cosmic significance going all the way back to creation, whether that would be done here in Gen 2:1–3 (where sacred place is absent from the text even though it is here that it is expected) or in Exod 39–40 (where creation is not mentioned or alluded to). Second, narratively speaking, Erhard Blum notes that P states, in no uncertain terms, that the goal of its narrative is the Tabernacle's construction, which culminates with YHWH's presence dwelling therein.<sup>471</sup> P's narrative, then, is not concerned with creation (and it is definitely not concerned with the Sabbath).

## 5.4. Conclusion

In conclusion, Stackert and Baden's narratological argument for Gen 1 being attributed to P and not H due to the reason that P's narrative integrity would be lost is unfounded. Genesis 5:1–3 provides an adequate narrative beginning for P, one that fits P's narrative tenets, tenets that are lacking in Gen 1. Furthermore, P does not employ aetiologies nor does its legislation get revealed anywhere other than Sinai, and to people other than the specific Israelites tenting at the foot of Mount Sinai.<sup>472</sup> All of this is 'violated' in Gen 1; and since H is known to violate P's narrative tenets at times, Gen 1 ought to be ascribed to H.

---

<sup>471</sup> Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990), 297. See also Exod 29:45–46.

<sup>472</sup> It is worth noting that Schwartz struggled in placing Gen 2:1–3 in P's hand because it is addressed to everyone (not just the Israelites). See Schwartz, "Sabbath in the Torah Sources", 12.

It is similarly the case when one considered the argument that Gen 1 is P narratively because it forms an *inclusio* with the Tabernacle account. First, the *inclusio* is made by the author of Gen 1 since Gen 1 was added later. Second, the focus of Gen 1 is on the sanctity of time, not the sanctity of a space; as is the case in Exod 39–40. And third, the author of Gen 1 uses YHWH instead of Moses. This suggests that the author of Gen 1 intended the *inclusio* to cause a comparison of the two texts, a comparison that leaves the Sabbath of Gen 1 in a higher position than the Tabernacle in Exod 39–40.<sup>473</sup> Would P, who is so focused on the centrality of the Tabernacle, muddy the centrality of the Tabernacle by adding the Sabbath as the first thing sanctified by YHWH? Likely not.

As Knohl suggests, the sabbath interpolations in Exod 31:12–17 and 35:2–3 were intended to elevate the Sabbath to the same level of the Tabernacle,<sup>474</sup> interpolations that are

---

<sup>473</sup> My argument is not that H is supplanting the Temple or the Tabernacle, or replacing it. Rather it is attempting to elevate the status of the sabbath as a sort of temple in time, one that can be located anywhere, which solves a crucial issue the exilic Jews would have faced in Babylon. I believe H utilized YHWH here in Genesis 1 not to defeat the Tabernacle, but to legitimize the sabbath. The Tabernacle is in-dwelted by YHWH, it is his residence. Genesis 1 is not replacing the Tabernacle, it is substituting for it in the meantime. More on this back in Chapter 3, where the temple and creation connections are explored.

<sup>474</sup> Knohl, “The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School,” 74. Knohl cites the HC’s sanctuary-sabbath formula: אֲתִשְׁבַּתִּי תִשְׁמְרוּ וּמִקֹּדְשִׁי תִירָאוּ (“You shall keep my Sabbaths and you shall revere my sanctuary”) which occurs in Leviticus 19:20 and 26:2 as evidence since it too places the sabbath before the sacred space.

Contra Baruch Schwartz who argues that the placement of these sabbath commands were not meant to communicate that the sabbath overrides all labour (even holy labour such as the labour meant for the construction of holy places like the Tabernacle); but their placement is the actual first time the sabbath command was given in P. He concludes that Exodus 31:12–17 “is not a repetition of a command already known; it is P’s primary account of how sabbath-law became known to the Israelites in the first instance.” See Schwartz, “Sabbath in Torah Sources,” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, San Diego, CA, November 19, 2007 [cited June 15, 2014] Online: <http://www.biblicallaw.net/2007/schwartz.pdf>), 13. And based on the assumption that Gen 1 is P, he claims that: “P’s story is that after eons of waiting in the wings, the sanctity of the seventh-day was proclaimed to Moses ... At the moment that sacred space and sacred persons and sacred objects are first brought to their attention and the prohibitions and obligations they entail are first imposed upon them, that is when the command not to desecrate sacred time is first given to them too” (pp. 13–14).

This may be understood as narratological over-reach based on a few of his pentateuchal assumptions. (1) Schwartz assumes that the Pentateuch has no multiple redactional stages and that all four sources were combined into one at the same time by an unaligned redactor. Thus there is no development within priestly materials, there is just P. No distinction is made between H and P (see pg. 1). (2) Schwartz assumes that each source worked independently of one another and that each of these independently working sources has to have a sabbath aetiology. This leads to a divvying up sabbath passages equally to all the pentateuchal sources, regardless of their lack of verbal parallels.

widely agreed to be H.<sup>475</sup> Exodus 31:12–17 concludes YHWH’s instructions to Moses for the construction of the Tabernacle, while Exod 35:2–3’s Sabbath command opens Moses’ instructions to the Israelites as they begin building it. The combined effect of this is to claim that even sacred work, such as the work of building the Tabernacle, does not usurp the authority and sanctity of the Sabbath. Sacred time comes first. As such, in the exile when sacred space is unceremoniously removed from the equation, shifting the focus to sacred time through a mnemonic shift is not only authorized, it is necessary.

The presence of the Sabbath in Gen 2:1–3 is something that Sommer neglects. The Sabbath is not essential in P, whereas the Tabernacle is. In H, the Sabbath is central to their exilic temple-less existence (historical setting) and this is backed by H’s extensive legislation concerning the Sabbath.<sup>476</sup> Genesis 2:1–3 does not mention the Tabernacle or any sacred space, but instead mentions the Sabbath day with the creator resting (שבת) on the seventh day (where the Tabernacle would be expected if indeed P authored it). In conclusion, a rhetorical question: Why would P place the Sabbath where it could be have placed the Tabernacle?<sup>477</sup>

---

<sup>475</sup> Stackert, Knohl, Milgrom, Arnold, Oylan all agree that H is involved with both and responsible for their final versions. They all, however, disagree with some of the details. More will be discussed in the next chapter.

<sup>476</sup> See the next chapter.

<sup>477</sup> Also, why place the sabbath in a place that calls into question the authority of the tabernacle?

CHAPTER 6:  
WHO ADDED GENESIS 1?  
THE LEXICAL AND THEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR H AUTHORSHIP

**6.1. Introduction**

This chapter essentially picks up the discussion from the end of chapter 2, where the aetiologies of Gen 1 were briefly discussed, and builds on them, albeit from a source-critical perspective. This chapter will be organized into three steps. First, the animal taxonomy of Lev 11 and its connections to Gen 1 will be explored more fully. This will demonstrate that H's hand was, at the very least, involved in the compositional process of Lev 11; and, at best, that H was possibly responsible for its final form.

Second, the "appointed times" of Gen 1:14 will be explored and compared to both P's cultic calendar in Num 28–29 and H's calendar in Lev 23. This will demonstrate that Gen 1 and Lev 23 are more aligned than Gen 1 and Num 28–29 are; which indicates H authorship of Gen 1.

Third, the Sabbath connection will be more fully explored. The litany of occurrences of the Sabbath in the HC substantiates the claim that H is also responsible for Gen 1. Building on this, other pentateuchal Sabbath passages which have been commonly ascribed to P will be

examined. This will reveal that all but one of them can be reasonably ascribed to H as well, thus strengthening the assertion that Gen 1 is from the hand of H.

Before beginning all this, a few more words by way of introduction. First off, a brief overview of the lexical reasons why Gen 1 is typically assigned by pentateuchal source-critics to a priestly hand will be given. And second, since this thesis is arguing in favour of a change in authorship from P to H, an overview of the differences inherent in those two groups will serve as useful information as one reads on.

### 6.1.1. Genesis 1 is Priestly

Even when both priestly groups are in mind, that is, when P and H are considered distant layers, scholarship generally ascribes Gen 1 to P.<sup>478</sup> In addition to the narrative reasons for Gen 1 being ascribed to P, as discussed in the last chapter, there are basically three lexical reasons why Gen 1 is considered priestly.<sup>479</sup>

First, the action of “separating/distinguishing between” (בדלל בין) *x* and *y*, as used in Gen 1 (vv. 4, 6, 7, 14, and 18) is typically an action performed by priests, especially as it pertains to sacrifices as recorded in Lev 10:10 and 11:47. Second, the expression “according to its kind (מיין)” as used in Gen 1 (vv. 11 and 24) is found extensively in the taxonomy section of Lev

---

<sup>478</sup> See Herman Gunkel, *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), S.R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis: With Introduction and Notes*, WC (London: Methuen, 1904), vii–xi; E.A. Speiser, *Genesis, AB* (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 8. Speiser emphasizes the תולדות (*toledot*) headings throughout Genesis as evidence of P’s authorship, see p. xxiv.

<sup>479</sup> *Priestly*, with the capital ‘P’, refers to material that is from the Priestly document and it is synonymous with the siglum ‘P’ and it is opposed to H. Whereas ‘priestly,’ with the lowercase ‘p,’ refers to all priestly-like material; so P and H. For a good discussion on the differences between the two priestly groups, consider the book of Leviticus as a good case study. Chapters 1–16 are typically ascribed to P while chapters 17–26, dubbed the HC, are ascribed to H. See Esias E. Meyer, “From Cult to Community: The Two Halves of Leviticus,” *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34:2 (2013): 1–7.

11:14–29.<sup>480</sup> Both of these first two lexical connections demonstrate Gen 1’s strong connection to priestly dietary legislation. Third, the focus on “festivals” (מוֹעֵד) in Gen 1:14 as found in other priestly passages such as Lev 23; Num 9:1–13; 10:10; 15:3; and especially 28–29. And fourth, the presence of the Sabbath on the seventh day in Gen 2:1–3 as found in priestly texts such as Exod 16:23–29; 31:12–17; 35:1–3; Lev 16:31; and in Num 15:32; and 28:9–10.<sup>481</sup>

Before moving forward, it should be noted that each of these reasons for Gen 1 being ascribed to P can just as easily be ascribed to H, since many of the lexemes occur in the HC. For example, בָּדֵל occurs in Lev 20:24–26 four times,<sup>482</sup> מוֹעֵד occurs in Lev 23:2–4 and 37–44, and שָׁבַת occurs in Lev 19:3, 30; 23:3, 11, 15, 16, 32, 38; 24:8; 25:2, 4, 6; 26:2, 34, 35, and 43.

#### 6.1.2. Further Distinctions between P and H

Consequently, the two priestly groups, P and H, will be compared in order to determine which group is likeliest to have composed and added Gen 1 to the beginning of the Pentateuch. H, is often understood as “an addition to the Priestly text made by a later generation of priests.”<sup>483</sup> It should be noted though that P and H both come from a shared priestly tradition. Thus, some of the HC’s material is expectedly “reminiscent of the more cultic texts in the first half of Leviticus, interested in both sacrifices and purity issues,” however, other material in the

<sup>480</sup> See also Deut 14:13–18. Note that a growing number of scholars understand Lev 11:14–29 to have been redacted by H (see Firmage, “Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda,” in *JSTOT* 82 (1999): 97–114; and Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” in *Let us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Iain Provan and Mark J. Boda, *VTSup*, 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 331–43.

<sup>481</sup> All of which, apart from Num 28:9–10, all can be ascribed to H. More to follow.

<sup>482</sup> All of Genesis 1’s uses have בֵּין used with the verb, however in Lev 20:24–26, only one of the four uses בֵּין with it, the other three concern YHWH separating the Israelites from the other peoples, which is very reminiscent of Deuteronomy’s use of בָּדֵל.

<sup>483</sup> Esias E. Meyer, “People and Land in the Holiness Code: Who is YHWH’s Favourite?,” in *OTE* 28:2 (2015): 435.



HC is reminiscent of the Decalogue and more focused on issues of social justice.<sup>484</sup> This main ‘ethical’ difference between H and P is perhaps the clearest (social) evidence that H is influenced by non-priestly material (like D), just as it is also influenced by their forbears—P. Altogether, these differences indicate that it is necessary to treat P and H distinctly (as always, no pun intended); that is, one should be careful when using the catch-all phrase: *priestly*.

There are three main differences between P and H, and these differences are best examined using the book of Leviticus. This is because Lev 1–16 is typically assigned to P and the HC from Lev 17–26 is typically assigned to H. The first difference is P’s focus on the holiness of a select group of people—namely the priesthood. Whereas H expands this focus not only to include the entire community of Israel, but beyond them to also include the ‘other’ (the alien/stranger, גֵּר).<sup>485</sup> Second, P considers sacred space to be isolated to the Temple and its sanctuary. Whereas H expands this sacred space to include the entire land of Israel.<sup>486</sup> And third,

---

<sup>484</sup> Esias E. Meyer, “Rituals and Social Capital in the Book of Leviticus? An Attempt at an Interdisciplinary Discussion,” in *NGTT* 54: 3&4 (2013): 5. See the laws in Lev 19, esp. vv. 11–18, as evidence of ‘social ethics’. See Lev 19:3, 4, 11, 12, 16, 18 and 29.19 as evidence of Decalogue-like texts.

<sup>485</sup> As Meyer notes: “One could illustrate the point further by looking at how the concept of holiness is used in the Holiness Code compared to the first half of Leviticus. In the first half the term is applied only to the cult, its officials and paraphernalia, but in the second half it is applied to ordinary people, who are now asked to be holy themselves. Yet, it should be clear that there is a very obvious move in the second half of Leviticus away from a narrow cultic focus to a broader view of the community and the responsibility of community members to take care of each other, including strangers, the poor and other vulnerable people. One could describe that movement as a movement from ritual to ethics, and the question that has obviously kept Biblical critics busy is: why? Why does the book broaden its horizons from focusing on the cult and its rituals to include the behaviour of Israelites to one another and even to outsiders?” See Meyer, “Rituals and Social Capital in the Book of Leviticus?,” 6.

Furthermore, consider the frequency of the term גֵּר in the HC (it occurs just twice more throughout all of Deuteronomy). It occurs 20 times in the 9 chapters of the HC, and occurs only once outside the HC in Leviticus (16:29).

<sup>486</sup> Of the 82 occurrences of אֶרֶץ in Leviticus, 67 occur in the HC (see Lev 4:27; 11:2, 21, 29, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46; 14:34; 16:22; 18:3, 25, 27, 28; 19:9, 23, 29, 33, 34, 36; 20:2, 4, 22, 24; 22:24, 33; 23:10, 22, 39, 43; 25:2(x2), 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 18, 19, 23, 24, 31, 38, 42, 45, 55; 26:1, 4, 5, 6, 13, 19, 20, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45; 27:24, and 30). Leviticus 25 and 26 alone account for more than half (43 times). See discussion on the importance of the land to H in: Meyer, “People and Land in the Holiness Code,” 433–450.

P gives very little attention to the Sabbath. Whereas H focuses on the Sabbath the way a moth focuses on a flame. This third aspect is a major focus throughout this chapter.

Thus, H is distinguished from P by its expansionist perspective as compared to P's more isolated perspective. H is inclusive, whereas P is exclusive. Esias Meyer summarizes: "whereas P is focused on the cult itself and the rituals aimed at maintaining the cult, H broadens its horizons to include what we might call 'ethics'."<sup>487</sup> The basic difference between the two groups, that is, the core of the issue between them, is in how they define *holiness*. H does not only expand holiness, but by expanding it, H also redefines it. David P. Wright explains: "The Priestly Torah is more interested in priestly or cultic matters and only peripherally in how holiness relates to the cult. The Holiness School, in contrast, has holiness as its central focus and related it to God, humans, various places, objects, and time."<sup>488</sup> Bryan Bibb agrees and adds that holiness in H "does not mean to be set apart for a specific use in the cultic sphere. Rather, it implies a total relation to the deity that includes but transcends the cultus and engages the people in their everyday lives."<sup>489</sup>

---

<sup>487</sup> Meyer, "Rituals and social capital in the book of Leviticus?,"<sup>4</sup> Meyer is working from B.B. Bibb's comment: "The central movement [from P to H] ... is the shift from a narrow cultic focus to the larger communal setting." (See B.B. Bibb, *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus* (London: T & T Clark, 2009), 152.) Something that Meyer misses in many of his treatments with H and P, particularly as it relates to the book of Leviticus, is the over-abundance of occurrences of the term שבת. More on this below.

<sup>488</sup> David P. Wright, "Holiness in Leviticus and Beyond. Differing Perspectives," Int 53 (October 1999): 352.

<sup>489</sup> Bibb, *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*, 145.

## 6.2. Animal Taxonomy and Diet in Genesis 1 and Leviticus 11

The connections between Gen 1 and Lev 11 are significant for understanding the motivation for composing and adding Gen 1 to the Pentateuch. What follows is a discussion that zooms in on the source-critical intricacies of Lev 11, the chief priestly passage in the Pentateuch on dietary law. By focusing on this chapter, it will be demonstrated that H was both part of the compositional history of Lev 11 and likely the last redactor of it. After this, the discussion will zoom back out to the narratological view, seeing the whole pentateuchal narrative from Gen 1 through Gen 6–9 all the way to Lev 11.

### 6.2.1. Leviticus 11

The late Jacob Milgrom determined that there were at least four hands involved in the compositional history of Lev 11, with one of those hands being H.<sup>490</sup> The legislation in Lev 11 as a whole can be divided into two separate foci: one-half is concerned with dietary restrictions, that is, what one is permitted to eat and what one is forbidden from eating (esp. 11:1–23, and vv. 41–42); and the second half is concerned with contamination through touch, whether touching unclean animals or touching the carcasses of animals (11:24–40). The chapter, then, is held together by a mutual focus on animal taxonomy.

The presence of two distinct strands of legislation suggests redactional activity. This suggestion is made more certain with further redactional activity in the chapter, the most obvious of which is H's interpolation in vv. 43–45. Leviticus 11:39–40 is also considered by many

---

<sup>490</sup> Milgrom, "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, *VTSup. 93: Formation and Interpretation of OT Literature III*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 32; idem., *Leviticus 1–16, AB* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1991), 39.

scholars to be a late, if not the latest, addition to Lev 11, as it is placed right at the end of the legislation on contaminated animals (vv. 24–40). Many scholars consider both Lev 11:39–40 and vv. 43–45 to be H interpolations.<sup>491</sup> Interestingly, Lev 11:44 is the first time in the Pentateuch that Israel is mandated to be holy, and it occurs in relation to dietary and purity law.<sup>492</sup> This suggests that dietary law and purity law are important matters for members of the H community. This leads some scholars to assign more material within Lev 11 to H.<sup>493</sup> Firmage, as an (extreme) example, argues that all of Lev 11 is from H.<sup>494</sup> This is, nonetheless, an overreach since, based on the independent sections not matching one another, there are clearly multiple hands involved in Lev 11's composition.<sup>495</sup> If it were all from H one would expect there to be no differences in Lev

---

<sup>491</sup> For a fuller discussion, see Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," in *Let us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Iain Provan and Mark J. Boda, *VTSup*, 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 336–38. Jeffery Stackert agrees, see "The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplementation, and Replacement," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden, *ATANT* 95 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 189. as does Saul M. Olyan, "Exodus 31:12–17: The Sabbath According to H, or the Sabbath According to P and H?," in *JBL* 124:2 (Summer, 2005): 202. Milgrom "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 32.; idem., *Leviticus 1–16, AB*, 39; Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 69–70, and Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," 106–109.

<sup>492</sup> Although there is Exodus 19:6 where YHWH tells Moses that if Israel keeps the commandments they will be a treasured possession, a holy nation, this is not a direct command to be holy as YHWH is holy. Compare with the HC's 19:1–2, 36; 20:26; and 22:32–33. Generally speaking this all refers to what is required to be holy to YHWH. Specifically, though, dietary law refers to what one can and cannot eat as a means of being holy; and purity law refers to what one can and cannot touch, which is here particularly applied to the carcasses of dead animals, both clean and unclean animals.

<sup>493</sup> See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16 AB*, 691–98; and Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 69–70.

<sup>494</sup> See Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," 107–08, n. 23. He cites Baruch Levine in support of this view and Jacob Milgrom in their respective commentaries on Leviticus. However, Levine may not agree with the way he has been represented here by Firmage. Levine notes the presence of H, or more accurately, the presence of language and themes that are also found in the HC. He does not posit that all of Lev 11 is H. He does observe that H themes are present particularly in 11:43–45, which is consistent with other scholars, and perhaps in 11:1–23 due to its connections to Deut 14. Firmage further claims that Milgrom assigns the verses concerning purity to a secondary stratum (Lev 11:24–40), called P<sub>3</sub>, which Milgrom later identifies as the same stratum as H. Unfortunately for Firmage, Milgrom ascribes 11:39–40 to this H/P<sub>3</sub> stratum, but he identifies Lev 11:24–38 as P<sub>2</sub>. Moreover, Milgrom sees P<sub>3</sub> as H, the 8th century BCE stratum, not the exilic H<sub>R</sub> who composed Gen 1. This is a point Firmage avoids mentioning. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16. AB*, 62. See Firmage, *Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda*, 107–108, n. 23. See Baruch Levine, *Leviticus, JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1989), xvi–xvii, esp. 63–65.

<sup>495</sup> For example, vv. 1–23 categorizes animals into 4 categories, and along with restricting diet, it claims that these animals' carcasses are not to be touched. This is claimed already in vv. 24–38 when the touching of carcasses is specifically discussed. If both authors were the same, there would be no need to add information on touching carcasses in vv. 1–23, and vice versa for the author of vv. 1–23 with vv. 24–38.

11; however, Lev 11 is rife with inconsistencies. All of which will be discussed as this section unfolds (e.g. different terms used, different order of animals, etc.). But these differences and inconsistencies suggest multiple sources, not just one.

Milgrom's source hypothesis for Lev 11 will be used as a launching point for this discussion. Milgrom posits a four-source hypothesis consisting of P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, and H.<sup>496</sup>

### ***Section 1:***

P<sub>1</sub>     *Introduction* (vv.1-2ba)

### ***Section 2:***

#### ***Prohibition (and contamination)***

P<sub>1</sub>     Large quadrupeds (vv. 2bβ-8)  
P<sub>1</sub>     Water animals (vv. 9-12)  
P<sub>1</sub>     Large flying animals (vv. 13-19)  
P<sub>1</sub>     Flying insects (vv. 20-23)

### ***Section 3:***

#### ***Contamination***

P<sub>2</sub>     Large quadrupeds (vv. 24-28)  
P<sub>2</sub>     Land swarmers (vv. 29-38)  
H/P<sub>3</sub>   Quadrupeds: species that are permitted for consumption (vv. 39-40)<sup>497</sup>

### ***Section 4:***

#### ***Prohibition***

P<sub>1</sub>     Land swarmers (vv. 41-42)

### ***Section 5:***

#### ***Call to holiness***

H     Land swarmers (vv. 43-45)

### ***Section 6:***

---

<sup>496</sup> Chart is from Naphtali Meshel, "P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, and H. Purity, Prohibition, and the Puzzling History of Leviticus 11," *HUCA* 81 (2010): 1-15; who is constructing this chart based on two of Milgrom's works: (1) Jacob Milgrom, "The Composition of Leviticus," in Gary A. Anderson and Saul M. Oylan, eds., *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, JSOTSup 125 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991) 182-91; and from (2) Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16 AB*, 691-98. I have added section numbers that Meshel himself uses. Note, then, that Meshel does not work with Milgrom's most recent article, "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah" from 2003. Both of Milgrom's works that Meshel uses are from 1991, even though Meshel wrote his article in 2010.

<sup>497</sup> Milgrom later identified his P<sub>3</sub> as H. See Jacob Milgrom. "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 32. Compare with Milgrom's 1991 works: *Leviticus 1-16, AB*, 62; and "The Composition of Leviticus," 182-91.

P<sub>1</sub> Subscript: organized by classes of animals (v. 46)

***Section 7:***

P<sub>2</sub> Subscript: organized by legal status (v. 47)

Thus, Milgrom proposes that there are multiple Priestly layers with H coming after them in the compositional history of Lev 11. However, Naphtali Meshel argues for a different compositional history.<sup>498</sup> He argues that the composition order is instead P<sub>1</sub>, H, P<sub>2</sub>, and then P<sub>3</sub>. Thus, he argues contrary to Milgrom that two P layers came after H's layer.

The focus of this discussion will centre on the subscript(s) to Lev 11 in vv. 46–47. It will be shown that (1) vv. 46–47 should not be split into two separate interpolations and (2) that both v. 46 and v. 47 can be ascribed to H. Part of the problem in not seeing H's redactional hand in vv. 46–47 is a presumption that only P can have multiple layers of redactional activity while H is limited to just one (hence P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, but only H, not H<sub>1</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>).

For the purposes of this chapter, and the thesis to which it is in service of, the presence of H within Lev 11 is sufficient enough to support the notion that Gen 1's animal taxonomy is meant to support this dietary legislation in Lev 11, legislation that, by being redacted at some point by H, suggests that H is interested in it and would thus be interested in composing a creation myth that sets up an aetiology for legitimizing its later practice.

Still though, the focus of this investigation into Lev 11 is admittedly the discovery of more H-like characteristics in Lev 11 for the purpose of strengthening H's claim to material in Lev 11. Though this discussion will not be as optimistic as Firmage's argument—that all of Lev 11 is H—it will be argued that the presence of H in Lev 11 goes beyond just 11:43–45 and 39–

---

<sup>498</sup> Meshel, "P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, and H," 1–15.

40. Here is an alternative diagram proposed for Lev 11. This is meant to be a guide to help clarify what will be argued throughout this section.

<b>Section 1:</b>	
P <sub>1</sub>	<i>Introduction</i> (vv. 1-2b $\alpha$ )
<b>Section 2:</b>	
<i>Prohibition (and contamination)</i>	
P <sub>1</sub>	Large quadrupeds (vv. 2b $\beta$ -8)
P <sub>1</sub>	Water animals (vv. 9-12)
P <sub>1</sub>	Large flying animals (vv. 13-19)
p <sub>1</sub>	Flying insects (vv. 20-23)
<b>Section 3:</b>	
<i>Contamination</i>	
P <sub>2</sub>	Large quadrupeds (vv. 24-28)
P <sub>2</sub>	Land swarmers (vv. 29-38)
H <sub>2</sub>	Quadrupeds: species that are permitted for consumption (vv. 39-40)
<b>Section 4:</b>	
<i>Prohibition</i>	
P <sub>1</sub>	Land swarmers (vv. 41-42)
<b>Section 5:</b>	
<i>Contamination and a Call to holiness</i>	
H <sub>1</sub>	Land swarmers (vv. 43-45)
<b>Section 6:</b>	
H <sub>2</sub>	Subscript (vv. 46-47)

As can be seen, the differences in what this chapter proposes compared to Milgrom and Meshel mostly concern vv. 46-47.

#### 6.2.2. Interpolations Already Ascribed to H: Leviticus 11:39-40 and 11:43-45.

Before discussing the reasons for extending the activity of H in Lev 11, the material that is already considered by many scholars to be H should be discussed, albeit briefly.

The first interpolation that is ascribed by many scholars to H is Leviticus 11:43–45.<sup>499</sup>

Along with Milgrom, Meshel observes that:

Verses 43–45 are thematically and stylistically distinct from all other sections identified in the chapter. Thematically, these verses—and these alone—explicitly deal with holiness, view the aspiration for holiness as a guiding principle of divine legislation, and draw an analogy between for holiness of the community and that of YHWH.<sup>500</sup>

This is opposite to P material where only the priests are holy and the idea of the entire community being holy is sacrilegious; that is, the very opposite of their definition of holiness.<sup>501</sup>

The ascription of vv. 39–40 to H is based mostly on its connection to the HC's Lev 17:15–16. Leviticus 11:39–40 states:

וכי ימות מן־הבהמה אשר־היא לכם לאכלה הנגע בנבלתה יטמא עד־הערב והאכל מנבלתה יכבס בגדיו וטמא עד־הערב והנשא את־נבלתה יכבס בגדיו וטמא עד־הערב:

If an animal of which you may eat dies, anyone who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening. Those who eat of its carcass shall wash their clothes and be unclean until the evening; and those who carry the carcass shall wash their clothes and be unclean until the evening.

Compare with Lev 17:15–16, which states:

וכל־נפש אשר תאכל נבלה וטרפה באזרח ובגר וכבס בגדיו ורחץ במים וטמא עד־הערב וטהר ואם לא יכבס ובשרו לא ירחץ ונשא עונו:

All persons, citizens or aliens, who eat what dies of itself or what has been torn by wild animals, shall wash their clothes, and bathe themselves in water, and be unclean until the evening; then they shall be clean. But if they do not wash themselves or bathe their body, they shall bear their guilt.

And also compare Lev 11:39–40 to the HC's Lev 22:5–8:

<sup>499</sup> See Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 336–38; Stackert, "The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources," 189; Oylan, "Exodus 31:12–17," 202; Milgrom "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 32; idem., *Leviticus 1–16, AB*, 39; Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 69–70; and Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," 106–109.

<sup>500</sup> Meshel, "P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, and H," 5.

<sup>501</sup> See Num 16:3; and see Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 81.



אוֹרֵאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע בְּכָל־שֶׂרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יִטְמָא־לוֹ אוֹ בָאֵדָם אֲשֶׁר יִטְמָא־לוֹ לְכָל טְמֵאתוֹ נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תִּגְעֶיבוּ וְטִמְאָה עַד־הָעֶרֶב וְלֹא יֵאָכֵל מִן־הַקֹּדְשִׁים כִּי־אִם־יֵרַחֵץ בַּשֶּׁרֶץ בַּיּוֹם וּבֹא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְטָהַר וְאַחֵר יֵאָכֵל מִן־הַקֹּדְשִׁים כִּי לַחֲמוֹ הוּא נִבְלָה וְטָרְפָה לֹא יֵאָכֵל לְטִמְאָה־בָּהּ אֲנִי יְהוָה:

... and whoever touches any swarming thing by which he may be made unclean or any human being by whom he may be made unclean—whatever his uncleanness may be—the person who touches any such shall be unclean until evening and shall not eat of the sacred donations unless he has washed his body in water. When the sun sets he shall be clean; and afterward he may eat of the sacred donations, for they are his food. That which died or was torn by wild animals he shall not eat, becoming unclean by it: I am YHWH.

Thus, Lev 11:39–40 seems to be an insertion based largely on the legislation in 17:15–16 and in 22:5–8; all of which revise P’s legislation on touching carcasses in Lev 5:2 (and 7:21<sup>502</sup>), which states that only touching unclean (טמא) carcasses makes one unclean:

אוֹ נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תִּגַּע בְּכָל־דָּבָר טָמֵא אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת חַיָּה טְמֵאָה אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת בְּהֵמָה טְמֵאָה אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת שֶׂרֶץ טָמֵא וְנֹעֵלִם מִמֶּנּוּ וְהוּא טָמֵא וְאִשָּׁם:

when any of you touch any unclean thing—whether the carcass of an unclean beast or the carcass of unclean livestock or the carcass of an unclean swarming thing—and are unaware of it, you have become unclean, and are guilty.

The prohibition in P contains no instructions on what to do if the carcass one touches is that of a clean or permitted animal; nor does it contain any instructions on what to do if one does touch an unclean animal. Both of which are addressed in Lev 11:39–40.

Milgrom originally ascribed vv. 39–40 to P<sub>3</sub>, but later changed his mind and associated P<sub>3</sub> with a later H layer.<sup>503</sup> Meshel retains Milgrom’s first word on the matter and argues that vv. 39–40 is a later P layer (P<sub>3</sub>).<sup>504</sup> The reasons Meshel ascribes vv. 39–40 to a P layer as opposed to H, all amount, in one way or another, to the notion that vv. 39–40 is the latest layer and H is

<sup>502</sup> See Lev 7:21 as well where the prohibition is applied specifically to consumption of YHWH’s sacrifice.

<sup>503</sup> See Jacob Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 32. Compare with Milgrom’s 1991 works: *Leviticus 1–16*, AB, 62; and “The Composition of Leviticus,” 182–91.

<sup>504</sup> Meshel, “P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, and H,” 7–10.

assumed to only have one layer. As far as vv. 39–40 being the latest layer, he and Milgrom agree, and rightfully so. What makes Meshel wrong in ascribing vv. 39–40 to a later P layer, and vindicates Milgrom’s switch P<sub>3</sub> to some later H layer, is because vv. 39–40 harmonize P material (Lev 5:2 and 7:21) with H material (Lev 17:15–16 and 22:5–8). Between P and H, the only group that benefits from this harmonization is H. It seems far-fetched to posit that P would harmonize with H material.

### 6.2.3. An Interpolation Not Yet Ascribed to H: Leviticus 11:46–47

Milgrom, followed by Meshel, argues that v. 46 forms an *inclusio* with vv. 1–23 and vv. 41–42;<sup>505</sup> while v. 47 corresponds to vv. 24–40. This leads them to ascribe v. 46 to the P<sub>1</sub> layer and v. 47 to the P<sub>2</sub> layer. However, there are three reasons why this is not the case and, moreover, three reasons why v. 46 and v. 47 should be ascribed to H.

#### 6.2.3.1. Verses 46–47 Belong Together

First, vv. 46–47 ought to be seen as a single whole.<sup>506</sup> For one thing, v. 47 begins with an infinitive of purpose (להבדיל from בדל). If this was a subscript solely for P<sub>2</sub>, one would expect להבדיל to begin with a *vav* (thus, ולהבדיל), like Lev 10:10 does. Regardless, v. 47 on its own (without v. 46) does not make sense. Since it is an infinitive of purpose, it requires the previous verse, which it is modifying, to complete its meaning.<sup>507</sup> For example, it is the opening in v. 46

---

<sup>505</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>506</sup> Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 175. She calls Lev 11:46–47 a “smooth merging in the triumphant return of the chapter to its own opening phrase, echoing Genesis [1:1–2:4a].”

<sup>507</sup> See Ezek 42:20 where להבדיל is used to modify the phrase that came before it.

that provides the context for the infinitive: e.g. ‘This is the law concerning ... [the purpose of which is] to make a distinction between ...’

Additionally, v. 47 does not only close the P<sub>2</sub> section (vv. 24–40), it also closes the P<sub>1</sub> section (vv. 1–23, and 41–42). Compare the two halves of v. 47:

v. 47a

להבדיל בין הטמא ובין הטהר

... to make a distinction between the unclean and the clean [*what can be touched*]

v. 47b

ובין החיה הנאכלת ובין החיה אשר לא תאכל

and between the living creature that may be eaten and the living creature that may not be eaten. [*what can be eaten*]

Thus, Lev 11:47 closes both sections of Lev 11 all on its own. Moreover, v. 46 does not really close a specific section. It appears to correspond to P<sub>1</sub> (vv. 1–23, and 41–42), but the order in which it presents the animals is different and it employs different terminology—terminology that is actually H-like (see below the discussion in section 2.1.4. for more on this).

#### 6.2.3.2. Lexical Connections between Leviticus 11, Genesis 1, and the HC.

Second, assuming that Gen 1 is H, there are lexical similarities that only exist between Gen 1 and Lev 11:46–47, and some that exist between Gen 1, Lev 11, and the HC. This may sound like circular reasoning, and admittedly it is (which is why it sounds like circular reasoning). However, there are connections lexically to the HC as well. Meshel’s argument too relies on his presumption of Gen 1’s author being P.<sup>508</sup> Regardless, the evidence cannot be ignored and it serves the primary purpose of this section: to understand how Gen 1 is an

---

<sup>508</sup> Meshel, “P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, and H,” 13, n. 39.

aetiology for dietary restrictions. There are four lexical connections between Lev 11:46–47 and Gen 1.

First, the phrase כל נפש החיה הרמשת (“every living creature that moves ...”) is only found in Lev 11:46 and in Gen 1:21; nowhere else in the HB does this phrase occur. Second, the root בָּדַל occurs many times in Gen 1 (5 times, see vv. 4, 6, 14, and 18) and in the HC (4 times in 20:24–26), thus drawing a connection between Gen 1 and the HC. But the *hifil* infinitive occurs in both Lev 11:47 and Gen 1:14 and 18. This is significant because this is the exact form in 11:47 and it is only found in H-like passages.<sup>509</sup> Third, the term רָמַשׁ appears in its verb form in Gen 1:21, 26, 28, and 30 and in Lev 11:46.

This third term can be further used to draw an even stronger connection between Lev 11:46–47 and H. Apart from Gen 1 and Gen 6–9, the verb form that occurs here in Lev 11:46 only occurs in the Pentateuch in Lev 11:44, which was already ascribed to H, and in the HC’s Lev 20:25.<sup>510</sup> The noun form appears twice in Ezekiel.<sup>511</sup> Throughout Lev 11, the term הָלַךְ is used to describe the way animals move, whereas H’s interpolations use the term, רָמַשׁ. Consider P<sub>1</sub>’s Lev 11:20, 21, and 42:

All winged insects that move/walk (הָלַךְ) upon all fours are detestable to you (v. 20).

But among the winged insects that move/walk (הָלַךְ) on all fours you may eat those that have jointed legs above their feet, with which to leap on the ground (v. 21).

<sup>509</sup> It also occurs in Lev 10:10, which contains H-like characteristics with its expansion of the Holiness of humans to include all of Israel, not just the priesthood, and in Ezek 42:20, where it occurs verbatim with the use here in Lev 11:47. Both are infinitives of purpose and both modify the phrase before them.

<sup>510</sup> The term occurs in Deut 4:18, but here it is not used in the context of diet, but of idolatry. The Israelites are commanded to not make idols in the likeness of creepers (reptiles).

<sup>511</sup> It is found two more times in Ezekiel (8:10 and 38:20).

Whatever moves/walks (הלך) on its belly, and whatever moves/walks (הלך) on all fours, or whatever has many feet, all the creatures that swarm upon the earth, you shall not eat; for they are detestable (v. 42).

And P<sub>2</sub>'s Lev 11:27:

... All that move/walk (הלך) on their paws, among the animals that move/walk (הלך) on all fours, are unclean for you ...

Whereas, 11:44, already acknowledged to be H, and 11:46, not as yet ascribed to H, both use רמש, just like Gen 1, Gen 6–9, and Lev 20:25 does.

For I am YHWH your God; sanctify yourselves therefore, and be holy, for I am holy. You shall not defile yourselves with any swarming creature that moves (רמש) on the earth (v. 44).

This is the law pertaining to land animal and bird and every living creature that moves (רמש) through the waters and every creature that swarms upon the earth (v. 46).

#### 6.2.3.3. *Leviticus 11 and its Connection to the HC's Leviticus 20:25*

Lastly, this brings up Lev 20:25 and its strong lexical and theological connections to Lev 11:46–47. Leviticus 20:25:

You shall therefore make a distinction (*hifil* of בדל) between the clean animal and the unclean, and between the unclean bird and the clean; you shall not bring abomination on yourselves by animal or by bird or by anything with which the ground moves (רמש), which I have set apart (*hifil* of בדל again) for you to hold unclean.

Although Lev 20:25 does not have the categories for aquatic animals, like Gen 1 and Lev 11:46 do, it still may indicate the motivation for a later H stratum to insert v. 46 and thus redact Lev 11.

#### 6.2.4. Meshel's Argument that H was not the Last Hand to Redact Leviticus 11

Before moving off of the topic of Lev 11, a closer look will be given to Meshel's argument for H not being the final redactor of Lev 11. Meshel argues two things: (1) that two P layers, P<sub>2</sub> (vv. 24–38, and v. 47) and P<sub>3</sub> (vv. 39–40), come after H's interpolation in vv. 43–45;<sup>512</sup> and (2) he argues that v. 46 forms an *inclusio* with P<sub>1</sub>'s vv. 1–23.

The first claim makes sense to Meshel because for P<sub>2</sub> to add vv. 24–38 (section 3) after P<sub>1</sub>'s vv. 1–23 and before P<sub>1</sub>'s vv. 41–42, 46, it would disrupt the cohesive flow likely existing in the original P<sub>1</sub> layer. He argues that if H's vv. 43–45 were not already present when P<sub>2</sub> came along, P<sub>2</sub> would have added its layer right to the end of vv. 41–42, not before it.<sup>513</sup>

Meshel's point here relies heavily on v. 46 being ascribed to P<sub>1</sub>. However, if P<sub>1</sub> is not responsible for v. 46,<sup>514</sup> as this chapter argues, then the P<sub>1</sub> layer ends in vv. 41–42. In fact, if P<sub>1</sub> ends in vv. 41–42, it makes perfect sense that P<sub>2</sub> would insert its purity concerns in front of P<sub>1</sub>'s closing in vv. 41–42 since P<sub>1</sub> already explicitly legislates against contaminating oneself by touching an animal, albeit briefly. In v. 8, the pig's carcass is specifically restricted from touching (Lev 11:8). Thus, the precedent is set and the door is open for P<sub>2</sub> to elaborate on P<sub>1</sub>'s brief legislation on touching carcasses.

Meshel's second point is that v. 46 forms an *inclusio* with 11:1–23 and vv. 41–42. However, the order of the animals is different in v. 46 as compared to that in vv. 2–23.<sup>515</sup> See the following diagram:

---

<sup>512</sup> Meshel, "P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>, and H," 10–14.

<sup>513</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>514</sup> *Ibid.*, 13. Meshel admits that it is a possibility that H is the hand behind v. 46: "Another possibility is that P<sub>1</sub> had no subscript at all, and that H inserted v. 46 as a whole."

<sup>515</sup> Also, it is likely that P<sub>1</sub> has a five-fold structure, not a four-fold structure.

vv. 2–23

Quadrupeds (vv. 2b–8)

Aquatic animals (vv. 9–12)

Large flying animals (vv. 13–19)

Flying insects (vv. 20–23)

v. 46

Large Quadrupeds

Flying creatures (birds and insects)

Aquatic animals [וכל נפש החיה הרמשת במים]

Land swarmers [כל-נפש השרצת על-הארץ]

This so-called inclusio seems forced, especially when one considers the lexical evidence. The terminology for the aquatic animals and the land swarmers in v. 46 is different from that of vv. 2–23. The terminology with the use of רמש instead of הלך is much more H-like and it parallels the terminology in Gen 1 and Gen 6–9.

So, the logic for P<sub>2</sub> is that if P<sub>1</sub> is left alone as is, then it is only stipulates that a pig's carcass cannot be touched. What about all the other unclean animals? Can their carcasses be touched? For the author of P<sub>2</sub>, this ambiguity could not be left unclear. Thus, vv. 24–38 were inserted by P<sub>2</sub> to elaborate on P<sub>1</sub>'s minimal legislation on touching carcasses.<sup>516</sup>

Thus, vv. 41–42 are the close of P<sub>1</sub>. P<sub>2</sub> adds vv. 24–38 in between P<sub>1</sub>'s legislation, in order to elaborate on the law concerning the touching of carcasses. Then an early H redactor adds vv. 43–45 to close the P<sub>1</sub>'s section with an exhortation, such as: קדשים כי קדוש אני.<sup>517</sup> It is important to note that vv. 41–42 with the “swarmers that swarm upon the land” is distinct from vv. 20–23's “birdlike-swarmers.” Verses 41–42 does not really close or conclude P<sub>1</sub>'s section. It is a continuation of it. In other words, P<sub>1</sub> is not a section with a taxonomy of four, but of five. For example:

vv. 2b–8	animals which are on the land
vv. 9–12	all that is in the waters

<sup>516</sup> The reason for not inserting vv. 24–38 after v. 41–42 could be that P<sub>2</sub> wanted its addition to be read alongside with P<sub>1</sub>'s legislation, as opposed to against it by placing it after P<sub>1</sub>'s layer closed.

<sup>517</sup> This exhortation is repeated in vv. 43–45. It happens first in v. 44 and again in v. 45.

vv. 13–19	from the birds
vv. 20–23	all birdlike swarmers
vv. 41–42	(continued) all swarmers that swarm upon the land

Thus, P<sub>1</sub> begins with the above five-fold taxonomy. P<sub>2</sub> adds a section that elaborates on v. 8's restriction of touching a pig's carcass. So now it looks like this:

vv. 2b–8	animals which are on the land
vv. 9–12	all that is in the waters
vv. 13–19	from the birds
vv. 20–23	all birdlike swarmers
vv. 24–38	<i>elaboration, and explanation on touching carcasses</i>
vv. 41–42	all swarmers that swarm upon the land

Then, H adds an exhortation to the end. So now it looks like this:

vv. 2b–8	animals which are on the land
vv. 9–12	all that is in the waters
vv. 13–19	from the birds
vv. 20–23	all birdlike swarmers
vv. 24–38	elaboration, and explanation on touching carcasses
vv. 41–42	all swarmers that swarm upon the land
vv. 43–45	<i>exhortation to holiness</i>

Then, this thesis argues that later H hands (either a single one or two) adds both vv. 39–40, in order to further elaborate on the explanation on v. 8's restriction for touching carcasses. It adds the aspect of touching the carcasses of clean animals. And vv. 46–47 is added to stitch the passage's two segmented parts together. So, it now looks as it does now:

vv. 2b–8	animals which are on the land
vv. 9–12	all that is in the waters
vv. 13–19	from the birds
vv. 20–23	all birdlike swarmers
vv. 24–38	elaboration, and explanation on touching carcasses
vv. 39–40	<i>further elaboration on the explanation on touching carcasses</i>
vv. 41–42	all swarmers that swarm upon the land
vv. 43–45	exhortation to holiness
vv. 46–47	<i>subscript to tie together the two segmented parts</i>



#### 6.2.4.1. Connections Between Genesis 1, Genesis 6–9, Leviticus 11, and H.

Zooming out the perspective on this matter, the connections between Lev 11, Gen 1, and Gen 6–9 will be examined. First, the lexical connections between all three, as well as the HC, will be discussed. And second, the narratological connections between Lev 11 and Gen 1 will be discussed.

Mark Smith does a side-by-side comparison of Gen 1's terminology with Lev 11, albeit a very general comparison. He observes:

Leviticus 11 mentions “the animals that are on the land” (Leviticus 11:2); those “that are in the waters” (11:9, 10); “the winged” (11:13); “all winged swarming” (11:20, 23); and “all that swarm on the earth” (11:41). Genesis 1 uses several of the same terms: “swarms of living creatures” (1:20) and “all the living creatures that move that swarm in the waters” (1:21); “the winged” (1:20) and “the winged bird” (1:21); “living creatures, animals, creepers” (1:24).<sup>518</sup>

And after these observations, he aptly concludes that “One might therefore say that Leviticus 11 represents the concrete prescriptions that underlie the narrative description of creation in Genesis 1.”<sup>519</sup>

Mary Douglas notes the theological connection between Gen 1 and Lev 11 via their use of בָּדַל. Though Gen 1's acts of separation (בָּדַל) are not explicitly dietary, she concludes that the spatial separations of the world into distinct realms (e.g. land, water, and sky) can be understood as a first step in categorizing animals by their habitat, which in turn is a step toward the desired dietary prescriptions contained in Lev 11.<sup>520</sup> The author of Gen 1, then, divides the spatial realms

---

<sup>518</sup> Mark S. Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 91–92.

<sup>519</sup> Ibid., 92.

<sup>520</sup> Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 2002), 51–71. See also idem., “The Forbidden Animals in Leviticus,” in *JSOT* 59 (1993): 3–23.

this way in order to “present the notion of separation of realms in order to facilitate the separation of animals within these realms.”<sup>521</sup> This not only connects Gen 1 to Lev 11, it also connects Gen 1 to the flood narrative (Gen 6–9) and both of them to Lev 11.

Beyond lexical connections directly from Gen 1 to Lev 11, these lexical connections also exist with the flood narrative in Gen 6–9. There are three terms that connect all four passages. Taken as a whole, these connections suggest that none of them can belong to P.

#### 6.2.4.2. *Lexical Connections between Leviticus 11, Genesis 1, Genesis 6–9, and H*

The lexical connections between Gen 1 and Lev 11 have already been established in a previous section (2.1.3.2.), thus, they will not be repeated here, but should be recalled as further evidence of Lev 11 and Gen 1’s relationship to one another. Here are three more key terms that connect not only Lev 11 and Gen 1, but also the flood narrative in Gen 6–9. All of which, serves to demonstrate H’s hand in all three pericopes.

The first term is מִי. This term occurs in Gen 1 ten times (1:11, 12 [2x], 21 [2x], 24 [2x], and 25 [3x]), seven times in the flood narrative (6:20 (3x), and 7:14 (4x)), nine times in Lev 11 (11:14, 15, 16, 19, 22 [4x], and 29), and four times in Deuteronomy’s dietary legislation (14:13, 14, 15, and 18). There is only one other occurrence of this term in the HB and it is in Ezekiel.<sup>522</sup> Every use of מִי in the HB is prefixed with ל, and each time, it is used is in the context of animal taxonomy.<sup>523</sup>

---

<sup>521</sup> Smith, *Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 92.

<sup>522</sup> Ezekiel 47:10.

<sup>523</sup> The only variance within the uses of מִי is in how the suffixes vary between third person masculine singular and plural and feminine third person singular uses. Always in the third person, but gender and number vary.

The second term is שרץ. The verb form of this root (typically translated as “swarming” but perhaps it is better translated as “teeming”<sup>524</sup>) occurs in the creation story (Gen 1:20, 21), in the flood story (Gen 7:21; 8:17), and in Lev 11 (vv. 29, 41, 42, 43, and 46).<sup>525</sup> The noun form of the term is found similarly in the creation narrative (Gen 1:20, and 21), in the flood story (Gen 7:21), in Lev 11 (vv. 10, 20, 21, 23, 29, 31, 41, 42, 43, 44), and in the HC (Lev 22:5).<sup>526</sup> The term also is found in Deut 14:19 to describe “winged/bird swarms” (שרץ העוף), similar to Lev 11:20 which uses the same expression but differs from D’s restriction of eating all winged-swarmers (insects), and states that four-legged winged-swarmers are detestable, while hoppers are permitted, such as the locust, the bald locust, the cricket, and the grasshopper.<sup>527</sup>

Third is the term רמש (“crawl” or “creep” or “move”). The noun form only occurs in in the creation myth (Gen 1:24, 25, 26) and in the flood story (Gen 6:7, 20; 7:14, 23; 8:17, 19; 9:3). The verb form occurs in the creation narrative (Gen 1:21, 26, 28, 30), in the flood story (Genesis 7:8, 14, 21; 8:17, 19; and 9:2), and in Lev 11:44, and 46.<sup>528</sup> The only other occurrence of the

---

<sup>524</sup> Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature*, 159. Douglas notes that שרץ ought to be translated as “teeming” and not “swarming” because the term has more to do with “breeding, brining forth, and fertility in general.” She asserts that this aspect of שרץ has been ignored in translations of Leviticus 11. In other words, the term refers to animals that mass-produce, whether insects, reptiles, or small rodent-like creatures.

<sup>525</sup> There is one more occurrence of this term in the HB, it is found in Ezek 47:9.

<sup>526</sup> The term also occurs outside H in Lev 5:2. Here P proposes the categories for animals as beasts (חיה), livestock (בהמה), and swarmers/reptiles/insects (שרץ). Here as well the touching of carcasses is deemed unclean, which incurs guilt on the party who touched the unclean animal, whether intentionally or accidentally (see 5:1–4ff). Also, animal taxonomy within P seems largely based on sacrifices. Certain animals are required for sacrifice while others are not up to par, as it were. Thus, it could be seen that a different taxonomy exists in P, one that is (likely) expanded in Lev 11, a major expansion is the inclusion of aquatic animals.

<sup>527</sup> For further connections between Deut 14 and Lev 11 see Levine, *Leviticus, JPS*, 63–65; Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature*, 137–142 (land animals), p. 153 (water animals), and p. 154 (air). The close connection between Deut 14 and Lev 11 requires explanation. Either P borrowed from D, which is unlikely for P, or the D borrowed from P, or that neither borrowed from the other and instead they both got their material from a similar *Vorlage*. I would agree with this assessment, at least for now.

<sup>528</sup> The term occurs in Deut 4:18, but here it is not used in the context of diet, but of idolatry. The Israelites are commanded to not make idols in the likeness of creepers (reptiles).

term in the Pentateuch is in the HC (Lev 20:25), and, apart from Ezekiel, it is not found elsewhere in the HB.<sup>529</sup>

These three terms and the bonding power they possess for connecting Gen 1, Gen 6–9 and Lev 11 together suggests that the redactor intended to incrementally introduce the reader to H's dietary legislation.<sup>530</sup>

#### 6.2.4.3. *The Big Picture Between Genesis 1 and Leviticus 11*

Narratively, that is, zooming out and taking the entire narrative from Gen 1 to Lev 11 as a whole, H finishes in Lev 11 what it began in Gen 1. Beginning with the addition of Gen 1, H describes a vegetarian diet, which J's creation account does as well (Gen 2–3).<sup>531</sup> Perhaps H notes the oddity in the J narrative where Cain's vegetarian offering is considered to be wanting as compared to Abel's acceptable meat offering (4:2–7). There is no rationale provided for why or when YHWH began consuming meat, or at the very least, accepting meat.<sup>532</sup>

It is important to understand the dilemma Gen 2–3 as a creation story, as a version of Israel's origins, would have been for any priestly group where meat-sacrifice is an integral part

---

<sup>529</sup> It is found two more times in Ezek (8:10 and 38:20).

<sup>530</sup> Also consider the term *לֶאֱכֹל* when it is used as a noun ("for food") and not a verb ("to eat"). It only occurs in H material, the flood narrative and Gen 1. It occurs in Gen 1:29, 30 (though for vegetarian foods); 6:21 (presumably non-meat foods); and 9:3 which has the shift from vegetarian diet to the unrestricted diet, except for the prohibition against eating it with blood, which is a restriction central to the HC (see Lev 17:14). The expression also occurs 11 times in Ezek (15:4, 6; 21:37; 23:37; 29:5; 34:5, 8, 10, 12; 39:4). Additionally, consider the expression: *בַּעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה* ("on this same day"). It occurs in H narratives such as Exodus 12 (verse 17, 41, and 51) with the interpolation on the Passover commands, and it occurs multiple times in the HC (Lev 23:14, 21, 28, 29, and 30). It is also found in the flood narrative in Gen 7:13, and in the circumcision section of Gen 17 (vv. 23 and 26). It is worth noting here that Driver believed these uses to all be the work of the Pentateuchal compiler. The expression does not occur anywhere else in the HB.

<sup>531</sup> J's creation narrative describes animals as man's companion not their food (see Genesis 2:18–20).

<sup>532</sup> Genesis 3:21 mentions that YHWH made garments of skin for the man and woman. This may be YHWH shifting to animal slaughter, but it is not made explicit here in Genesis 2–3 and there is still no rationale or command by YHWH that meat sacrifice is more acceptable than non-meat sacrifices. The text is quite silent on this issue.

of their worship of their (meat-eating) deity. There is no rationale in J's narrative for when YHWH requires meat as a sufficient sacrifice. Thus, the priestly group (H) saw an inadequacy in J's creation account, one that needed to be revised and updated.

This also explains why Gen 1, as a priestly text (regardless of whether one views it as P or H) would need to start out with vegetarianism. By doing so, the memory that Gen 1 constructs does not conflict with the memory already set and established in J's version. But H deals with this problem at the level of the narrative. Arnold explains H's narrative strategy: "by incremental steps, the Holiness authors and editors establish dietary law that brings humans from vegetarianism (Genesis 1), to near unrestricted meat-eating (Gen 9:3–6), and finally, to a dietary law that distinguishes Israelites from their neighbors (Leviticus 11)."<sup>533</sup>

Thus the meat-eating issue is resolved. After the deluge, meat eating is unrestricted (save eating blood). Thus all of humanity is unencumbered to eat any animal. Leviticus 11 hones this in for Israel, restricting what can be eaten so as to distinguish them from the other nations of the earth. Thus for Israelites, adhering to these dietary restrictions makes them both YHWH's and sanctifies them. As Firmage concludes, "Given the extraordinary emphasis the H tradition places on diet as a means of teaching Israel about holiness, mention of diet in the Priestly account of creation should no longer surprise us."<sup>534</sup>

---

<sup>533</sup> Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 338.

<sup>534</sup> Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," 109. Firmage does conclude that Gen 1 is the work of H.

### 6.3. Calendars

Genesis 1's use of מועד in v. 14 is a definite sign that Gen 1 belongs to the priestly tradition.<sup>535</sup> Priestly material is rife with this term. However, the way it is used throughout priestly material is worth a closer look. For instance, מועד is used in two specific and distinct contexts: (1) to denote appointed spaces, commonly in reference to the Tent of Meeting (אהל מועד, or lit. the “appointed tent”);<sup>536</sup> or (2) to denote appointed times, in reference mostly to the community's calendar; thus, it is translated as “appointed (times)” or “festivals.”<sup>537</sup>

#### 6.3.1. Genesis 1 and Time

Genesis 1 and H have a similar concern for the sanctity of time and, conversely, a lack of concern for sacred space. Genesis 1's focus on time is visible in its structure. For example, the first, fourth, and seventh days are all focused on time. In fact, the entire narrative (Gen 1:1–2:3) is even structured into temporal units (days). The fourth day's lights in the dome do not just mark the passage of time arbitrarily, they mark the significance or meaning of that passage of time. They mark when the appointed times have arrived, thereby indicating to all of Israelite society that it is time to observe one of YHWH's festivals.<sup>538</sup> This suggests that, for Gen 1:14, the context in mind for its use of מועד is a temporal one, not a spatial one.

---

<sup>535</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 339.

<sup>536</sup> Tabernacle is also the context here with אהל מועד often used in the same context as the משכן.

<sup>537</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 341. The translation of מועד as “festivals” is rightly championed by Arnold over the translation “seasons.” Seasons gives the impression that Spring, Summer, Fall, and Winter are in mind. However, as Arnold notes, this term “is referring to the festivals and religious feast days of Israel's liturgical calendar.”

<sup>538</sup> Ibid., 341.

### 6.3.2. H's concern for Time and P's Lack of Concern for Time

The book of Leviticus can effectively serve as medium for comparing H and P. The term מועד, in its spatial use, appears 37 times in Lev 1–16, each time in reference to the אהל מועד (“Tent of Meeting”). Whereas in the HC (Lev 17–26), the same term is used in reference to sacred space only 6 times. See Table A.

Table A: Spatial Use of מועד in Leviticus

	Leviticus 1–16	Leviticus 17–26
אהל מועד (“appointed tent”)	37 times (1:1, 3, 5; 3:2, 8, 13; 4:4, 5, 7 [bis], 14, 16, 18 [bis]; 6:9, 19, 23; 8:3, 4, 31, 33, 35; 9:5, 23; 10:7, 9; 12:6; 14:11, 23; 15:14, 29; 16:7, 16, 17, 20, 23, 33)	6 times (17:4, 5, 6, 9; 19:21; 24:3)
קדש or מקדש (“sanctuary” or “holy [place]”)	16 times (4:6; 6:20; 10:4, 17, 18 [bis], 12:4; 14:13; 16:2, 3, 17, 17, 20, 23, 27, 33)	6 times (19:30; 20:3; 21:12; 22:9; 24:9; 26:2)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53 times</b>	<b>12 times</b>

The use of מועד in a temporal sense is the exact reverse. The term is used in the HC temporally 6 times, and in Lev 1–16 it is used temporally zero times. See Table B.

Table B: Temporal Use of מועד

	Leviticus 1–16	Leviticus 23	Numbers 28–29
Use of מועד in a temporal sense	None	6 times (23:2 [bis], 4 [bis], 37, 44) “my appointed times”	2 times (Num 28:2; 29:39) “your appointed times”

Moreover, in H's calendar in Lev 23, the term מועד occurs six times, all of which are in a temporal context.<sup>539</sup> Additionally, P's calendar (Num 28–29) uses מועד only twice (Num 28:2,

<sup>539</sup> Leviticus 23:2, 4, 37, and 44. Also, the term מועד was used in Numbers the majority of the time, compared to any other Torah book. Within it though, all the temporal uses of מועד are considered by both Knohl and Milgrom to be within the H tradition (see Numbers 9:2, 7, 13; 10:10; and 15:3 ). See Knohl, *The Divine Symphony: The Bible's Many Voices* (Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 2010), 158. Another interesting feature of מועד is that every use of it up until Exod 23:15 is temporal, and then, until Lev 23, it is only used spatially. This single term deserves a more thorough study. Note the use in Num 16:2 where it is used not of spatially or temporally, but anthropomorphically in the context of “well-known men” or appointed men. Thus it is translated as “assembly.”

and 29:39). Every other use of מועד in P is in reference to the Tabernacle (lit. “The Tent of Meeting”), only these two are temporal in all of P’s corpus.<sup>540</sup>

Moreover, there is a difference worth noting between these two calendars in how they use מועד. Compare Num 29:39 and Lev 23:2, particularly the relationship מועד has with YHWH:

Num 29:39

אֵלֶּה תַּעֲשׂוּ לַיהוָה בְּמוֹעֲדֵיכֶם

These things you will do for YHWH  
at your appointed times

Lev 23:2

מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרְאוּ אֹתָם מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ  
אֵלֶּה הֵם מוֹעֲדָי:

The appointed times of YHWH  
which you will proclaim to [Israel],  
these are holy convocations,  
they are my appointed times

Numbers 29:39 closes the priestly calendar with this term, but it is used in the second person plural. In other words, P describes YHWH as saying to the Israelites that the appointed times are *theirs*. Leviticus 23:2, contrailly, describes YHWH as calling them *his* appointed times using the first person singular. Thus, Lev 23 understands the festivals to be YHWH’s own appointed times, whereas in P’s calendar they are not YHWH’s own.

Thus, similar to Gen 1 and dissimilar to P, H uses מועד temporally. As Arnold rightly concludes: “the author of Gen 1 sets out to prepare the reader for the ‘appointed festivals’ of YHWH (מועדי יהוה) of Lev 23, by addressing generally the creation of time in 1:3–5, which is more important for this author than the creation of space.”<sup>541</sup> Arnold calls *time* the author’s

<sup>540</sup> Deuteronomy uses the term three times, once in 31:14 which is widely regarded as an addition, in the context of the Tent of Meeting, and two other times (16:6 and 31:10), both of which refer to מועד in the temporal sense.

<sup>541</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 339. See also Walter Vogels, “The Cultic and Civil Calendars of the Fourth Day of Creation (Gen 1,14b),” *SJOT II* (1997): 178–79.



“central concern;”<sup>542</sup> and the markers of time (i.e. the greater and lesser lights, and the stars) are “created for the express purpose of notifying the Israelites when they must observe their sacred festivals, especially Passover and Unleavened Bread (Lev 23:5–8), Firstfruits (Lev 23:9–22), Feast of Trumpets (Lev 23:23–25), Yom Kippur (Lev 23:26–32), and Succoth (Lev 23:33–43).”<sup>543</sup>

### 6.3.3. Numbers 28–29 and Leviticus 23

Arnold’s correct conclusion can be further explored by comparing H’s calendar in Lev 23 with P’s calendar in Num 28–29, and gauging which one has a stronger connection to Gen 1’s fourth day. It should be noted that the existence of different calendars is not arbitrary, calendars are constitutional elements that make a society distinct from other societies around them.

Shemaryahu Talmon explains:

No barrier appears to be more substantial and fraught with heavier consequences than differences in calendar calculations. An alteration of any one of the dates that regulate the course of the year inevitably produce a break-up of communal life, impairing the coordination between the behavior of man and his fellow, and abolishes that synchronizations of habits and activities which is the foundation of a properly functioning social order.<sup>544</sup>

The very existence of a P calendar and an H calendar within the same collection invites comparison and demands that each source be treated as distinct from one another. To group all priestly literature together as priestly (P+H), and ignore their differences, is to construct a source,

---

<sup>542</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 339.

<sup>543</sup> Ibid., 339.

<sup>544</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, *ScrHier 4* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965), 163–64. First read in, and cited in Amit, *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays in Retrospect*, trans. Betty Sigler Rozen, (Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 2012), 20.

and a group or tradition behind that source, that never existed; regardless of how cautious one wishes to be (i.e. no matter how general one is with their terms, such as priestly, non-priestly, JE, not J and E, etc.). In other words, the question cannot be: Is Gen 1 priestly? It is obviously priestly. The question is: Is Gen 1 H or P?

### 6.3.3.1. *Connections between Genesis 1:14 and Leviticus 23*

There are four reasons why Gen 1:14 is more connected to Lev 23 than it is to Num 28–29. First, as has already been demonstrated above, but worth repeating here, Lev 23 is exclusively focused on time whereas Num 28–29 is not. And the reverse is true as well. Throughout Lev 23, sacred spaces like the Tent of Meeting or the Sanctuary are conspicuous by their absence. Whereas with P’s calendar in Num 28–29, the Sanctuary is mentioned in 28:7 making it clear that these sacrifices and offerings are intended to only to take place there.<sup>545</sup> Thus, just as sacred time is prominent in H, sacred space is prominent in P.<sup>546</sup>

Second, Lev 23 both relies on P’s calendar and it updates it.<sup>547</sup> This indicates (1) that H’s calendar is later than P’s, but more importantly, this further indicates that (2) H is interested in distinguishing itself from P since it is not satisfied with P’s calendar.<sup>548</sup> This reveals H’s motivation behind its focus on appointed times—to provide an aetiology for their own calendar

---

<sup>545</sup> In fact the use of מועד in Num 28:2 and 29:39 may refer to specific times, but the context of P’s calendar has in mind a specific location as well, the Sanctuary.

<sup>546</sup> For example, the “Tent of Meeting,” which is obviously very significant to P (see Exod 25–31 and 35–40), occurs in Lev 1–16 thirty-seven times (see Lev 1:1, 3, 5; 3:2, 8, 13; 4:4, 5, 7, 14, 16, 18; 6:16, 26, 30; 8:3, 4, 31, 33, 35; 9:5, 23; 10:7, 9; 12:6; 14:11, 23; 15:14, 29; 16:7, 17, 20, 23, and 33), but only six times in the HC (see Lev 17: 4, 5, 6, 9; 19:21; and 24:3).

<sup>547</sup> Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> in Leviticus and Elsewhere,” 24.

<sup>548</sup> If it was satisfied, it would not need to add another one.

in Lev 23 in order to legitimize it (the logic being that YHWH himself created the system by which Lev 23 follows).

Milgrom points out that Lev 23 regularly uses the formula, וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם אֲשֶׁר לַיהוָה (“you shall present offerings to YHWH”), when it agrees with the sacrificial offerings listed in Num 28–29.<sup>549</sup> Conversely, when H prescribes sacrifices that differ from P it does not use this formula (see Lev 23:12–13; 18–19). For example, P’s calendar has no first fruits of barley offering, so H must prescribe it themselves, and so they do (Lev 23:12–13). H also differs with P regarding the wheat offering. P does prescribe the first fruits of wheat offering (Num 28:26–31), but H is unsatisfied with P’s required amounts. So instead, H prescribes its own amounts (Lev 23:18–19).<sup>550</sup> As Milgrom concludes, H “only cites from P’s cultic calendar (Numbers 28–29) in order to compose its own.”<sup>551</sup> This demonstrates that H was concerned enough with matters of calendar and time reckoning to add an aetiology about the origin of Israel’s calendar.

Third, the Sabbath holds a prominent position in both Gen 1 and Lev 23, while it is merely an additional (even an optional) sacrifice in Num 28. As Milgrom notes, there are two layers in Lev 23, one is H and the other is a later H hand (what Milgrom dubs H<sub>R</sub>).<sup>552</sup> These additions are visible especially with the duplicated Festival of Tabernacles section in Lev 23:39–43 and its repeat in 23:33–36, and the Sabbath command added at the head of the calendar (Lev

---

<sup>549</sup> See Lev 23:8, 27, 36, and 37. Milgrom mistakenly cites v. 23 as well, however the formula does not occur there. Also, Milgrom translates the formula as “you shall offer food gifts to YHWH.”

<sup>550</sup> Milgrom’s conclusions differ with Knohl and Haran’s conclusion that Leviticus 23 is a composition of P and H materials. See Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 8–52; and Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 298, n.27.

<sup>551</sup> Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> in Leviticus and Elsewhere,” 24.

<sup>552</sup> Milgrom posits that Lev 23 is totally the product of H. Though He argues that there are multiple strata (four of them), they are all the hand of H. To be exact, he proposes that there are two “PreH” strata that H used, then there is the 8th century H strata, and then finally the exilic H<sub>R</sub>.

23:3).<sup>553</sup> Thus, the final form of H's calendar (thanks in large part to H's exilic redactor) holds the Sabbath in a very high position.<sup>554</sup> Beyond the Sabbath's placement at the head of H's calendar, the Sabbath's prominence is further evidenced by the abundant use of שבת and שבתות throughout the calendar (11 times). Moreover, successive festivals are counted using Sabbaths (see Lev 23:11).<sup>555</sup> Thus, H's calendar legislation in Lev 23 is teeming with Sabbath references and the Calendar works by counting Sabbaths in between each festival.

And fourth, the number *seven* is frequently featured in Lev 23, similar to Gen 1's emphasis on the number *seven*. For example, שבעת ימים ("the seventh day") occurs in Lev 23 eight times.<sup>556</sup> Whereas in Num 28–29, it only occurs three times.<sup>557</sup> A closer look reveals a significant difference between P and H. The lexeme "the seventh day" occurs in Num 29:32 within P's Festival of Tabernacles (Num 29:12–38). In Lev 23, and throughout the entire corpus of H outside the HC, the lexeme שבעת ימים ("the seventh day") is reserved exclusively for its Sabbaths. So a problem occurs here for H since P uses this lexeme to describe a non-Sabbath day (e.g. a Friday instead of a Saturday). Therefore, H corrects this in Lev 23:33–36 by stating clearly that the first and the eighth days are sacred and no work is to be done and that the festival lasts seven days from the first day, thereby avoiding using the lexeme for a day that it is not sacred. Then 23:39–43 describes the same festival again, and does so after the calendar's

---

<sup>553</sup> This is obvious redactional activity since vv. 1–3 are an additional opening to the already present opening in v. 4.

<sup>554</sup> Also note Lev 23:32, where the nominal form of Sabbath (שבת) is used on the holiest of days – the day of atonement – and 23:39–43 where the festival of booths is reiterated and reconstituted as the "festival of YHWH" and that on the first and eighth days they are to *sabbaton* ("completely rest").

<sup>555</sup> For example, determining when to observe the festival of weeks (23:15–16), the Israelites are to count off seven Sabbaths or weeks (literally שבע שבתות) from the Sabbath observance at the close of the previous festival.

<sup>556</sup> Leviticus 23:6, 8, 34, 36, 39, 40, 41, and 42.

<sup>557</sup> Numbers 28:17, 24; and 29:12.

conclusion (23:37–38), this time the H redactor adds that the first and eighth days are to be Sabbath rest days (שבת שבתות).

Additionally, P only commands that “no regular service” is to be done on these sacred days (Num 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 12, and 35), which gives the impression that some work can still be done so long as it is not regular work or routine work. This is especially the case when these sacred days of no regular work are compared to the Day of Atonement’s sacred day where “no work” is to be done. For P, the Day of Atonement is the most central day and it requires that no work be done at all. The other sacred days just require stopping one’s regular chores. Contrarily, Lev 23 ensures that they are to not work at all each and every seventh day; for these days are YHWH’s Sabbaths.

Upon considering the differences between the two calendars, Israel Knohl, in his article “Priestly Torah versus the Holiness School,” notes that the calendar in Lev 23 is concerned with *time* whereas the calendar in Num 28–29 is concerned with *sacrifice*.<sup>558</sup> The reference to “appointed times” in Gen 1:14 matches H’s calendar in Lev 23 more so than it does with P’s in Num 28–29.

#### 6.3.3.2. *The Importance of H’s Calendar in (Post) Exilic Times*

H differs from P and Babylon in two ways. First, H lessens the significance both Babylon and P place on the moon in determining *where* one is temporally speaking, that is (a lunar calendar). This is the case in both Lev 23 and Gen 1. In Lev 23 the new moon offerings that P legislates in its calendar (Num 28:11–15) are omitted by H. Instead, H moves toward a calendar

---

<sup>558</sup> Knohl, “The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School,” 67.

that is counted by Sabbaths (see Lev 23:11). For example, the Festival of Weeks is determined not by lunar cycles but by counting seven Sabbaths (lit. שבע שבתות) from the Sabbath observance at the close of the previous festival (the Festival of Firstfruits in Lev 23:15–16).<sup>559</sup>

Genesis 1 also places the Sabbath in an acclaimed position, and it too lessens the significance of the moon, especially in relation to the Babylonian calendar. This is done in three ways. First, Gen 1 situates the sun ahead of the moon, contrary to the *Enuma Elish* which places the moon ahead of the sun.<sup>560</sup> Second and relatedly, typically the luminaries determined days, months, and years; however, in Gen 1, contrary to this, the notion that the luminaries indicate months is ignored (see Gen 1:14b).<sup>561</sup> And third, Gen 1's naming of the sun and the moon differ from Babylonian norms so as to avoid them. The H author avoids using *Shemesh* or *Yarikh*, which, along with being the Hebrew words for the sun and the moon, are the Babylonian names for the gods of the sun and moon. Instead, the H author calls the moon the “lesser light” (המאור)

---

<sup>559</sup> Babylonian days started and ended at sunset, whereas Gen 1's days start at sunrise and end at sunset. See Philippe Guillaume, *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18* (New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 37; contra Jon D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 123. This claim is further supported by the claim that the root of בקר, “morning,” means “to split.” So in Exod 7:15; Num 16:5; 1 Sam 9:19, בקר retains the original sense of the “morrow” (see HALOT 1:152). Thus, in Gen 1, the appearance of light splits the day from the preceding night and time is now distinguishable and thus, measurable. Once Judaism adopted a lunar calendar and the separation of days at sunset, בקר lost its original meaning and became a mere “morning” while the “morrow” was expressed through מחר, which originally had a wider meaning: “in the future” (see HALOT 2:572). See also Exod 13:14 and Deut 6:20.

<sup>560</sup> COS 1.111: iv:138–v:49. The text is broken in the spot where the sun is described (v:23–48). All translations of *Enuma Elish* (or the Epic of Creation) are by Benjamin R. Foster, in COS 1.111.

<sup>561</sup> *Enuma Elish* stresses the importance of the monthly cycles regulated by the moon (see V:13–22), Gen 1:14 reduces the moon to ruling the night; as Guillaume notes, this is a “meagre secondary role that fades into irrelevance since in Gen 1 it is actually the absence of sunlight that separates the day from the night” (see Guillaume, 39).

הקטן) and the sun the “greater light” (המאור הגדל),<sup>562</sup> thereby avoiding the potential misunderstanding of regarding the sun and the moon as deities.<sup>563</sup>

Second, H distinguishes itself from its Babylonian hosts and its priestly forefathers by making literacy of the heavens accessible to all people, not just to the (astro-literate) priesthood. Babylonian texts describe the stars, moon, and sun metaphorically as “heavenly writings.”<sup>564</sup> This heavenly script can be read and interpreted by just the learned few, who have the power to determine not only when the appointed times are but also what the will of the gods is (divination). This is not the course taken by H with its calendar. With H’s concern that holiness is pursued by all of Israelite society, it is necessary for the heavenly script to be readable by all; “the signs of heaven,” explains Arnold, must be “transformed into a sacred calendar in the sky on display for all Israelites to follow.”<sup>565</sup> By having the celestial signs readable to all, not just diviners and astrologists, not just the priesthood, every Israelite has unencumbered access to YHWH’s appointed times (מועדי יהוה).

#### 6.4. The Sabbath in the Holiness Code

The Sabbath clearly plays a prominent role in Gen 1. This day is the most unique day out of the previous six, both in what it lacks (i.e. the “evening and morning” refrain) and in what it

---

<sup>562</sup> Genesis 1:16. Not to mention that the stars are listed as almost an afterthought.

<sup>563</sup> The book of Jubilees excluded the moon and attributed the role of regulating the calendar to the sun alone. This marks a conflict that arose in the last two centuries BCE through to the first century CE, a conflict centred on calendrical calculations. See Jub 2:9; 4Q216 VI.7 (DJD 8:16–17). Also compare Ps 104:19 and Ben Sira, as both deny the calendrical significance of the sun in regard for the appointed times (Sirach 33:7–9; 43:6–8; 50:6–7). It is worth noting that both Nehemiah and Ezra use lunar and sabbatical calendars.

<sup>564</sup> “Heavenly Writings” is the translation for *šīṭir šamāmī* or *šīṭir burūmē*. See Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 340. See also Francesca Rochberg, *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1–3.

<sup>565</sup> Arnold, “Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble,” 341.

adds (e.g. the sanctifying of time by inaction). It is the denouement of creation, its *telos*, its *raison d'être*.

Though the presence of the Sabbath in Gen 1 is thought to indicate both P and H authorship, the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of H. The lexeme שבת is teeming within the HC, and is comparatively nonexistent in P.<sup>566</sup> To demonstrate the centrality of the Sabbath to H, the sheer quantity of occurrences of the term will be highlighted, followed by a look at the quality of H's placement of the Sabbath throughout their legislation. This will reveal the centrality of the Sabbath in H's *weltanschauung*.

After surveying the HC, this examination of priestly Sabbaths will be expanded beyond the HC and into the rest of the Pentateuch. Each priestly Sabbath passage will be examined and compared to H and P's material respectively.

#### 6.4.1. The Centrality of the Sabbath in the HC

The Sabbath is central in the HC. There are two main ways this can be divided: the abundance of Sabbath references in the HC and the position the Sabbath holds in the HC. Together, these two things demonstrate convincingly that the HC is focused on the Sabbath.

---

<sup>566</sup> In fact, the only way one could argue that the Sabbath holds a place in P, modest as all it could hope to be, is if H's material is absorbed into P so as to form the more general "priestly material" category. Then one could claim that the Sabbath is important to P. However, if one distinguishes between P and H, they would struggle to find Sabbath passages. For example, in P's first half of the book of Leviticus, the term שבת only occurs once and it is a verbal form (as opposed to the nominal form) and is not in reference to "resting" but in reference to not continuing an action. See Lev 2:13.



### 6.4.1.1. The Abundance of Sabbath References in the HC

This abundance of lexical evidence can be shown by looking at three categories for how the Sabbath is presented within the HC: (1) the use of the nominal form, (2) the verbal form, and (3) the use of שבתון. See Table C.

Table C: The Use of שבת in Leviticus

	Lev 1–16	Lev 17–26 (Holiness Code)
Nominal Form of שבת	1 time (16:31)	24 times (19:3, 30; 23:3 [bis], 11, 15 [bis], 16, 32 [bis], 38; 24:8 [bis]; 25:2, 4 [bis], 6, 8 [bis]; 26:2, 34 [bis], 35, 43)
Verbal Form of שבת	1 time (2:13)	6 times (23:32; 25:2; 26:6, 34, 35 [bis])
Special absolute form: שבתון	1 time (16:31)	7 times (23:3, 23:24, 23:32, 23:39 [bis], 25:4, and 25:5)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3 times</b>	<b>37 times</b>

First, the nominal form of שבת, in both the plural and singular, appears 24 times throughout Lev 17–26. Whereas in Lev 1–16, it only occurs in the nominal form once (16:31); and 16:31 is believed to be part of an H interpolation.<sup>567</sup> Accordingly, it is possible and some would say likely that all 21 uses of שבת in the nominal form in the book of Leviticus are by H.

Second, the verbal form of שבת occurs 7 times in Leviticus and of those 7 occurrences, only one is outside the HC.<sup>568</sup> And this one use outside the HC is not related to Sabbath rest but simply refers to the action of ceasing (Lev 2:13).<sup>569</sup>

<sup>567</sup> This is due to the similar syntax and terminology.

<sup>568</sup> Not to mention that שבת occurs more often in Leviticus than any other book of the HB. Interestingly, second place is Ezekiel (28 times).

<sup>569</sup> It is used in Lev 2:13 to speak of cessation generally, not specific to a rest day: “You shall not omit (שבת) from your grain offerings the salt of the covenant with your God ...” This is the only use of שבת outside of the HC in Leviticus.

And third, H's quintessential lexeme שבתון (which is translated as "complete rest") occurs seven times in the HC (23:3, 23:24, 23:32, 23:39 [*bis*], 25:4, and 25:5), and only once outside of it in Lev 16:31, which, again, is likely H. Moreover, the only other occurrences of this term in the entire HB is in Exodus (Exod 16:23; 31:15; 35:2); two of which are widely regarded to be H, and one that has been argued to be H (Exod 16:23).

#### 6.4.1.2. *The Position of the Sabbath in the HC*

Obviously, the Sabbath is prevalent in the HC; so much so that one could be forgiven for designating Lev 17–26 as the *Sabbath Code*. Just as the Sabbath rests in a central place in Gen 1, it is situated in many prominent places within the HC as well. Amit notes four examples of the quality of the Sabbath's position within the HC.

First, the Sabbath is prevalent in the H's calendar, both in its position and in how it is distinguished from the other festivals. Its position is as prominent as it can get—the very first holy time one encounters.<sup>570</sup> Milgrom observes that the Sabbath is the only thing in the calendar with no sacrifices prescribed for it, thereby distinguishing it from the other holidays.<sup>571</sup> This is also a departure from P's idiosyncrasies regarding the Sabbath. P prescribes that sacrifices are to be offered on the Sabbaths. That is to say, for P, to observe a Sabbath one must do something, one must offer the regimented amount of sacrifices. Whereas in H, the Sabbath is observed by abstaining.

---

<sup>570</sup> Though it is close to the beginning of P's calendar, the beginning festivals in P are not the prominent ones. Rather they are merely the more frequent ones. Leviticus 23 places it first and in its context it holds a high place.

<sup>571</sup> Milgrom, "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 29–30. Also note that this is distinct from P's version of the Sabbath in Num 28, where it is listed as an optional sacrifice, one made in addition to the sacrifices that are already required. This suggests that the Sabbath is second-rate in P's calendar, especially as compared to the other festivals. Whereas in Lev 23, the reverse is true.

Moreover, even during these festivals in Lev 23 where there are offerings to be made, on the Sabbath there are no offerings prescribed as they must abstain from all work.<sup>572</sup>

Consequently, in H's calendar the Sabbath is positioned as a sort of holy of holies, a sanctuary at the centre of holiness, surrounded by the festivals which are made holy by their connection to the Sabbath.<sup>573</sup> Likewise, Gen 1 distinguishes the Sabbath from the festivals by placing them on separate days (e.g. Sabbath on the seventh day and the appointed times on the fourth).<sup>574</sup>

Therefore the Sabbath plays the lead role in H's calendar. This is similar to the role the Sabbath plays in Gen 1 but dissimilar to the role the Sabbath plays in P's calendar.

Second, Amit points out that ירא ("fear" or "reverence") occurs six times in the HC, four times in reference to YHWH (Lev 19:14, 32; 25:36, 43) but more importantly for this chapter's purposes, twice in reference to the YHWH's sanctuary (19:30; 26:2). However, both of these occurrences follow the command: "You shall keep my Sabbaths." Thus, the Sabbath is placed in a position that is, at the very least, equal to the YHWH's sanctuary.<sup>575</sup>

Third, the HC expands its Sabbath theology from people, every seventh day, to the land, every seventh year. The year when the land rests is called "its Sabbath" (Lev 25:6). H is the only pentateuchal group to do this. According to Lev 26:34–35, the punishment for violating the

---

<sup>572</sup> Like P's Day of Atonement prescriptions where the day's sanctity is achieved by abstaining from all work, not just one's regular (routine) services, and unlike P's other seventh day abstentions from work which is only from routine services.

<sup>573</sup> H repeatedly adds the nominal form of שבת to particular festivals in order to impart to them greater importance (or holiness). For example, the first and eighth days of Succoth in 23:35–36, 39, the New Year in 23:24, and, of course, the Day of Atonement in 23:32. See Amit, 12.

<sup>574</sup> For example, in the conclusion of H's calendar, the Israelites are reminded that the observance of YHWH's Sabbaths are separate from the observance of the appointed times of YHWH (Leviticus 23:37–38). See Amit, 11–12. Numbers 29:39 similarly states that the festivals' sacrifices are to be offered in addition to the votive offerings and freewill offerings. Leviticus 23 adds observing the Sabbaths of YHWH to this list.

<sup>575</sup> And with the command to keep YHWH's Sabbaths coming before the command to have reverence for his sanctuary, it may suggest that Sabbath is more important.

Sabbaths of the land is prolonged exile, so that the land can make up for its lost rest.<sup>576</sup> In other words, the land will obediently Sabbath, and if its inhabitants thwart that need, the land will “vomit” them out (see Lev 18:25) and enjoy its Sabbaths one way or another.

#### 6.4.2. *The Sabbath of the Land*

This sanctifying of space (i.e. land) through the sanctification of time is, when compared to the other pentateuchal sources, unique.<sup>577</sup> One might bring up E’s seventh year parallel in Exod 23:10–11 as evidence against the uniqueness of H’s Sabbath of the land, but the seventh year in Exod 23:10–11 (which immediately precedes E’s Sabbath command in 23:12) does not prescribe a sabbatical year.

In fact, as Stackert argues, H used E’s legislation in order to make their own. Stackert demonstrates two things concerning the relationship between Exod 23:10–11 and Lev 25:2–7: (1) H’s appropriation of Exod 20:10–11 demonstrates the posteriority and dependence of H to E; but (2) this also demonstrates the difference between E and H’s view of the seventh year. There is no command of land fallowing in E. As far as E is concerned, the land is to be harvested and the yield given to the poor. Consequently, E “knows of no *sabbatical* year.”<sup>578</sup> H borrows from E’s seventh year legislation and uses it to prescribe their own legislation that sees the Sabbath extended to the land itself. This is another indication of how important the Sabbath is to H.

---

<sup>576</sup> See also Lev 26:42–43.

<sup>577</sup> Amit, *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible*, 13.

<sup>578</sup> Stackert, “The Sabbath of the Land in the Holiness Legislation: Combining Priestly and Non-Priestly Perspectives,” in *CBQ* 73 (2011): 244. Stackert points out that H understands E’s claims but wants to include its Sabbath ideology. Thus, it “categorically forbids sowing and pruning in Lev 25:4b, which are activities requisite and required in Exod 23:11.

Influences from Deut 15 can be observed in Lev 25:2–7 as well. Stackert argues that שנת (‘‘a year of complete rest’’) in Lev 25:5 seems to have Deut 15:9 in mind: שנת השבע שנת (‘‘the seventh year, the year of the release’’). The similarity between D’s שִׁמַּט (‘‘release’’ or ‘‘remission’’) and שִׁבַּת (‘‘rest, Sabbath’’) may have presented an opportunity for H to either replace שִׁמַּט with שִׁבַּת, or redefine it as a Sabbath rest. As Stackert points out, this is further evidenced by the root שִׁבַּת occurring in Lev 25:2–7 seven times which is similar to the six-time repetition of the root שִׁמַּט in Deut 15:1–11.<sup>579</sup>

The way the land is deemed holy is also worthy of note. It is not declared holy in connection to the sanctuary complex. Nor is it made holy through any actions, holy or otherwise. Stackert explains, ‘‘The land’s holiness is an *achieved* sanctity, not one imbued through anointing like that of the sanctuary, priests, and other sacred objects (cf. Exod 28:41; 30:26–30; 40:9–15; Lev 8:10–12).’’<sup>580</sup> The land must obey YHWH and observe its Sabbaths. Consequently, when the land’s Sabbaths are violated the land is compelled to turn against its inhabitants and vomit them out (see Lev 18:24–30). The land, just like the Israelites, is required to obey YHWH’s commands. So while the Israelites are away, Lev 26:34–35 envisions this period as a time when the land can repay its Sabbath debt. Thus, though there are similarities and signs of literary borrowing on the part of H, H’s sabbatical year and the severity of the punishment for violating it remains distinctively H.<sup>581</sup>

---

<sup>579</sup> Ibid., 245. Unfortunately, Stackert avoids explaining or positing a historical setting for this situation, which would provide a rationale for it. In the exile, releasing one’s slaves every seven years is no longer relevant, since the captives are now those in need of release. Thus, D’s legislation is irrelevant for Israel’s current situation, which makes reimagining and rewriting both possible and necessary.

<sup>580</sup> Ibid., 247.

<sup>581</sup> Ibid., 248–49. One of the characteristics that both E and D have that H borrows, or at least seems influenced by is humanitarian concerns (i.e. the care of the alien and stranger, the poor, etc.). This does not occur in P at all.

The land's holiness is likely due to H's extension of holiness from the priesthood to all of Israel. In P, only the priesthood is holy, and the priests occupy the holy space – the sanctuary. The priests are made holy by the anointing of oil, just as the sanctuary and its objects and furnitures are sanctified in this manner. “When H extends holiness to Israelite laypersons, a logical next step is to extend the geographical range of holiness to include the space occupied by the (holy) Israelite laity.”<sup>582</sup> So in H, the land is also to be holy, just as the Israelites are to be holy by adhering to divine commands.<sup>583</sup>

The main point that all of this demonstrates, the abundance of occurrences of שבת in the HC, the prominence of the Sabbath including the notion of the land keeping Sabbath, is that the Sabbath is very central to the HC. Genesis 1 is focused on the Sabbath as well. P, on the other hand, is not. Therefore, it makes more sense that Gen 1 be ascribed to the priestly group H as opposed to P.

What follows is a discussion on the Sabbath interpolations in Exodus and Numbers. This is meant to demonstrate two things: (1) that these Sabbath interpolations are H, and not P; and (2) taken as a whole, these interpolations demonstrate the presence of a late redactor whose goal it is to elevate the Sabbath to a higher position.

### **6.5. The Sabbath Beyond the Holiness Code**

It is clear that the Sabbath holds a very special place in the HC. But what of Gen 1 and all the other Sabbath passages sprinkled throughout the Pentateuch? With the goal of demonstrating

---

<sup>582</sup> Ibid., 247, n.23.

<sup>583</sup> Elias Meyer argues that the land is basically considered a person or a character in the HC. One of the responsibilities of the land is to observe the Sabbath, just as it is required of the Israelites. See Meyer, “People and Land in the Holiness Code,” 433-50.

the validity of ascribing H to Gen 1, the aforementioned evidence of the HC's cynosure of the Sabbath will be combined with Knohl's thesis that H was active beyond the HC in order to show that all but one of the priestly pentateuchal Sabbath pericopes are H. Outside of the HC there remains, in total, eleven Sabbath pericopes, and seven of them are priestly.

### 6.5.1. Non-Priestly Sabbath Pericopes

Outside of the priestly material, the Sabbath is comparatively scarce.<sup>584</sup> It occurs in Deut 5:12–15, which appears to be a merging of two other non-priestly Sabbath pericopes—E's two Sabbath commands—Exod 20:8–10<sup>585</sup> and Exod 23:12. See for example a comparison of E's pericopes with D's (parts that Deut 5 shares with Exod 20 are underlined and parts that Deut 5 shares with Exod 23 are *italicized*):

Exodus 23:12:

Six days you shall do your work (עשה), but on the seventh day you shall rest, so that your ox and your donkey may have relief (נוח), and your homeborn slave and the resident alien may be refreshed (נפש).

Exodus 20:8–10:

Remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy. Six days you shall labor (עבד) and do all your work (מלאכה). But the seventh day is a Sabbath to YHWH your God; you shall not do any work (מלאכה)—you, your son or your daughter, your male or female slave, your livestock, or the alien resident in your towns.

And now compare with Deuteronomy 5:12–15:

---

<sup>584</sup> Contrary to Baruch Schwartz who argues that J is responsible for the Sabbath interpolations in Exod 16 (vv. 4–5, 15b, 16b–31), Exod 16 will be treated as a priestly story. See Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Sources,” 4–10.

<sup>585</sup> Exodus 20:8–11 has been broken into two sources, which is customary, that 20:8–10 is one source (likely E) and verse 11 something else. So I am treating them as two distinct Sabbath pericopes because 20:8–10 is concerned with *who* ought to observe the Sabbath whereas verse 11 is concerned with *why* placing the impetus for its observance back to the memory of creation. these two distinct agendas or purposes or foci make it beneficial to treat them as distinct.

Observe the Sabbath day and keep it holy, as YHWH your God commanded you. Six days you shall labor and do all your work. But the seventh day is a Sabbath to YHWH your God; you shall not do any work—you, or your son or your daughter, or your male or female slave, or your ox or your donkey, or any of your livestock, or the resident alien in your towns, so that your male and female slave may rest as well as you. Remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and YHWH your God brought you out from there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore YHWH your God commanded you to keep the Sabbath day.

It appears that Exod 20:8–10 expanded Exod 23:12, and Deut 5:12–15 combined the two together and expanded on them as well; even going further in v. 15 and offering a rationale for why YHWH commanded the Sabbath to be observed/remembered. A rationale, one should add, that is different from the one in Exod 20:11. This will be explored in more detail below.

The only other non-priestly Sabbath pericope is Exod 34:21. Exodus 34:21 is curious and deserves more time and thought than this thesis can afford. It is typically assigned to J in traditional pentateuchal source-criticism.<sup>586</sup> However, as Bar-On concludes: “The analysis of the two festival calendars in Exod. xxiii 14–19 and Exod. xxxiv 18–26 has led to the realization that they are not two separate texts at all; rather, the latter is but a midrashic revision of the former.”<sup>587</sup> This proposal makes sense since the basic command to rest is given (six days work, but the seventh is a rest), and then, this Sabbath command clarifies that any work on the fields, even if it is without the ox or the donkey, is still restricted.<sup>588</sup> Either way, Exod 34:21 is not priestly and it serves as a possible bridge between human Sabbath observance and H’s land Sabbath.<sup>589</sup>

---

<sup>586</sup> See Shimon Bar-On, “The Festival Calendars in Exodus xxiii 14–19 and xxxiv 18–26,” in *VT* 48:2 (April 1998): 161–195, esp. 161–62.

<sup>587</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>588</sup> Exodus 34:21: “Six days you shall work, but on the seventh day you shall rest; even in plowing time and in harvest time you shall rest.”

<sup>589</sup> See discussion in 4.1.3. concerning the Sabbath/rest of the Land.



### 6.5.2. Priestly Sabbath Pericopes

The priestly Sabbath pericopes are Gen 2:1–3, Exod 16, Exod 20:11, Exod 31:12–17, Exod 35:2–3, Num 15:32–36, and Num 28:9–10. The methodology for positing that only one of these Sabbath pericopes belong to P (Num 28:9–10), and the rest belong to H (or more accurately an exilic H redactor) is a three-fold process.

First, signs of redactional activity will be presented. In other words, the idea that the Sabbath pericope was added to the already existing P passage will be demonstrated. Second, where redaction is likely, then affinities to accepted H material will be presented. And then third and last, the Sabbath pericope will be connected to Gen 1.

#### 6.5.2.1. *Exodus 16*

##### 6.5.2.1.1. *Redactional Activity*

Exodus 16 is a composite text of (likely) two sources. On this many scholars agree, though which bits go with which sources garners less agreement. Dillmann, though positing this source composition of Exod 16 over a century ago, identified an additional strata in Exod 16 as vv. 4–5, and vv. 22–30; in fact, he argued that this was the final layer.<sup>590</sup> The reason for this division is simple, there is a Sabbath layer which is a test of the Israelite's obedience to YHWH and there is a complaint narrative that has nothing to do with Sabbath, and it begins in vv. 2–3:

The whole congregation of the Israelites complained against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness. The Israelites said to them, “If only we had died by the hand of YHWH in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the fleshpots and ate our fill of bread; for you have brought us out into this wilderness to kill this whole assembly with hunger.”

---

<sup>590</sup> See A. Dillmann and V. Ryssel, *Exodus and Leviticus* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1897), 190. To be exact he argued that Exodus 16:4–5, 22–30 is P2R, but this layer is equal to Milgrom's H<sub>R</sub>.

Apart from the evidence that if vv. 4–5 and vv. 22–30 were removed from Exod 16, the narrative would run smoothly, this complaint narrative (vv. 1–3, 5–21, and 31–34) is distinguished from the Sabbath layer in four additional ways: (1) in the Sabbath layer, YHWH speaks to Moses primarily; whereas in the complaint narrative Moses and Aaron speak to the Israelites primarily. But more distinguished is the fact that in the complaint narrative, Moses speaks to YHWH, whereas in the Sabbath narrative Moses does not speak to YHWH. Second, the complaint narrative mentions YHWH providing meat/flesh (בשר) and bread, in the Sabbath narrative there is no flesh/meat. Third, whatever it is that the Israelites were gathering in the mornings, with the heat of the sun, this fine flaky frosty sort-of substance, which is called bread, melts. Oddly, in the Sabbath narrative of Exod 16, the Israelites are told to bake and boil it. Evidently, in the Sabbath narrative there is no worry of melting the substance. And fourth, there is a difference in terminology for designating the place where the Israelites are living. In the complaint narrative, it is called ‘your tents’ (אהל), in the Sabbath narrative it is called ‘your place’ (מקום).

#### 6.5.2.1.2. Exodus 16:4–5 and 22–30 are H

Exodus 16:23 is undoubtedly H.<sup>591</sup> This certainty is based on (1) the occurrence of the quintessential H term שבתון (“complete rest”), which is exclusive to H;<sup>592</sup> and (2) the occurrence of the phrase שבת קדש ליהוה (“a Sabbath holy to YHWH”), which again is exclusive to H.<sup>593</sup>

Apart from the lexical evidence of Exod 16:23 and by extension, the rest of what Dillman identified as the final stratum of Exod 16 (i.e. vv. 4–5, 22–30), there is a narrative reason why the

<sup>591</sup> Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 37. Amit argues similarly, see Amit, *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible*, 14.

<sup>592</sup> It appears here in 16:23, which if not H would be the only time in the HB that someone other than H used the term, also it occurs in Exod 31:15; 35:2; and Leviticus 16:31 (widely regarded to be an H interpolation just before the start of the HC); and in the HC’s 23:3, 24, 32, 39; and 25:4.

<sup>593</sup> Only occurs here and in Exod 31:15; 35:2; and Lev 23:3.

Sabbath portion of Exod 16 cannot be P and is better thought of as H.<sup>594</sup> The Sabbath episode precedes the Sinai event and P does not present legal material anywhere other than Mount Sinai.<sup>595</sup>

#### 6.5.2.1.3. *Schwartz's Disagreement*

Baruch Schwartz argues that Exod 16 is a P and J composition.<sup>596</sup> He argues that P's narrative is visible in 16:1–3, vv. 6–15a, and vv. 31–36,<sup>597</sup> and the rest is J (16:4–5 and vv. 15b–30).<sup>598</sup> Schwartz cites as evidence for this four things: (1) the language in 16:5 and vv. 22–27 is not characteristic of P and is more reminiscent of widely acknowledged non-P passages; (2) without the Sabbath-theme, the P narrative is consistent and well-focused being concerned solely with the complaint and YHWH's response to that complaint; (3) P already has an aetiology for

---

<sup>594</sup> Baden notes the inconsistencies in the Manna Episode. See Baden, "The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16," *ZAW* 122: 4 (2010): 491–504. So much so that Baden concludes that the manna episode is in the wrong place and should be either placed before or after the Korah rebellion in Numbers 16–17 (see page 500).

<sup>595</sup> Baden, "Identifying the Original Stratum of P," 13–29.

<sup>596</sup> Schwartz, "Sabbath in the Torah Sources," 4. Though he does not recognize H, nor does he pursue development among the sources. They are all independent sources.

<sup>597</sup> Schwartz, "Sabbath in the Torah Sources," 4.

<sup>598</sup> Ibid. Joel Baden follows this same conclusion stating that the non-P portion (vv. 4–5, and vv. 22–30) is J; see Baden, "The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16," 492.

the Sabbath in Gen 1 and “it does not need, nor can it accommodate, another one;”<sup>599</sup> and (4) this non-priestly portion fits J because J does not have a Sabbath account like the other sources do.<sup>600</sup>

The first two reasons are gold, and they can be included with the aforementioned evidence in support of the claim that P is not responsible for the material in vv. 4–5 and vv. 22–30. However, both Schwartz’s third and fourth points fail to convince. Even though Gen 1 is a Sabbath aetiology, it is assumed to be P despite how rare it would be for P to engage in aetiologies, law-givings somewhere other than Sinai, and law-givings to people other than the Israelites at Sinai. In other words, it should not be assumed that Gen 1 is P. Schwartz then uses this as evidence for his third point which is that Exod 16’s Sabbath interpolations cannot be priestly because P already has a Sabbath aetiology. Then with his fourth point, he further assumes that each source must contain a Sabbath command. So if J lacks one, fair is fair, Exod 16:22–30 must be J’s. In short, Schwartz’s third and fourth points are assumptions built on other assumptions.<sup>601</sup>

---

<sup>599</sup> Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Sources,” 4.

<sup>600</sup> In the interest of exploring other assumptions Schwartz brings to the table, and this is not stated as a critique of these assumptions, all scholars have them, but as background that explains why Schwartz understands Exodus 16 as J: (i) each pentateuchal source is a stand alone, and can theoretically be separated from each of the other sources and be read as a complete document; (ii) there are no redactional layers or sources building on previous sources (e.g. H building on P, D building on E, etc.); and (iii) the Sabbath, being as significant as it is in Judaism, must be represented in each of the four Torah sources, albeit differently from one source to the next. These three presuppositions influence Schwartz in ascribing the Sabbath portions of Exod 16 to J. However, these presuppositions have little evidence to support and, at best, are shaky ground to stand on, let alone build a theory of pentateuchal sources on. One of the narrative glitches Exodus 16’s Sabbath has within the priestly narrative is that it comes before Exod 31:12–17’s command (which, based on its context appears to be the first time the Sabbath command is conveyed, as Schwartz does observe). Though Exod 31’s Sabbath command will be discussed further below, suffice it to say for now that scholars generally hold that it is a P and H composite text. Accordingly, if P or H is behind Exod 16’s Sabbath command to Israel, then why command it twice? This will be demonstrated as the other pentateuchal Sabbath passages are examined. See, Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Sources,” 1–2.

<sup>601</sup> Also, Exod 34:21 is a Sabbath pericope that could be J, though Schwartz cannot conceive of this due to his minority view in the lateness of J. See Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Sources,” 4.

#### 6.5.2.1.4. Narrative Connection to Genesis 1

Milgrom provides the rationale for H's redaction of Exod 16's manna episode.<sup>602</sup>

Milgrom argues that it is because YHWH cannot work on the seventh day, as Gen 2:1–3 stipulates. According to Gen 2:1–3, YHWH cannot provide food (bread or meat) on the seventh day since he is resting from his work that day.<sup>603</sup> The earlier P strata speaks of bread by morning and flesh/meat by night, and gives no indication that YHWH will cease from providing meat or bread on the seventh day. This also indicates that the Sabbath redaction to Exod 16 likely came after or simultaneously with the addition of Gen 1. If Gen 1 was not added to the Pentateuch, this episode of the Israelites in the wilderness being provided for by YHWH morning and evening would be fine. It is only by adding Gen 1 that this passage presents a theological issue.

Moreover, the Sabbath at creation is only observed by YHWH, it is not prescribed to humankind. So here in the manna episode, YHWH, who cannot work on the Sabbath, gives the Sabbath to Israelites (16:29) so that they too may rest *with* him. This is the first time, narratively speaking, that the Israelites are introduced to the notion of YHWH's Sabbath. They are told that YHWH rested on the seventh day at creation in Exod 20:11 for the first time.

---

<sup>602</sup> Milgrom, "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 37.

<sup>603</sup> The episode before about the bitter water of Marah does not mention a seventh day. It said they were in Shur for three days and then came to Marah. The Sabbath is not jeopardized here. But in Exod 16:1–3, and 6–21, it is necessary to redact because this material suggests that this manna is available "morning by morning" (v. 21).

### 6.5.2.2. *Exodus 20:11*

#### 6.5.2.2.1. *Redaction in Exodus 20:8–11*

The next priestly Sabbath passage is Exod 20:11. Schwartz argues, as many others do, that Exodus 20:8–10 is E and that v. 11 is from another hand.<sup>604</sup> This is largely because of the allusion to creation, a theme not included in vv. 8–10.

#### 6.5.2.2.2. *Exodus 20:11 is H via Genesis 1*

Milgrom argues that the entire Sabbath command (20:8–11) in the (so-called) decalogue is actually the work of H.<sup>605</sup> He bases this on two reasons. First, the word זָכוֹר (“to remember”) in v. 8 has to refer back to a specific command, such as Exod 16’s Sabbath command which Milgrom argues is H’s. Second, he notes that vv. 8–11 are framed within an *inclusio* (v. 8, “Remember the Sabbath day to sanctify it” and v. 11b, “Therefore, YHWH blessed the Sabbath day and sanctified it.”).

Though sympathetic to Milgrom’s intentions, the evidence supporting his conclusion is not convincing.<sup>606</sup> First, the reasons Milgrom provides could just as easily go the other way. The redactor (whether H<sub>R</sub> or non-aligned) who added v. 11 is capable of creating this *inclusio* after vv. 8–10 were already there. An *inclusio* does not prove that both were composed at the same time, it only proves that, in its final form, the two parts were intended to be read together. Second, and similar to the first point, the reference back to a previous command does not guarantee that the author of Exod 16:22–30 is also this author. Again, H is capable of adding Exod 16:22–30 because of E’s reference back to a previous Sabbath command. Third, E’s other

<sup>604</sup> Schwartz, “Sabbath in the Torah Sources,” 7–8.

<sup>605</sup> Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 38. To be exact, he argues that it is the work of H<sub>R</sub>.

<sup>606</sup> Although the reference of the event of the command זָכוֹר (“to remember”) deserves more thought.

Sabbath passage in Exod 23:12 means that E already possesses a Sabbath tradition, therefore E including the Sabbath in its decalogue makes sense.<sup>607</sup> Fourth, D, who uses E's material in constructing its own decalogue, does so by condensing E's two Sabbath commands (Exod 20:8–10 and 23:12) into one pericope (Deut 5:12–15).<sup>608</sup> If Exod 20:8–11 is all H's then where did Deut get its information from to construct its Sabbath pericope? Stackert correctly concludes that Exod 20:8–10 is “inseparable from the rest of the Decalogue, which is an integral part of the Elohist source.”<sup>609</sup>

Granted, the textual evidence for ascribing Exod 20:11 directly to H is based largely on the assumption that Gen 2:1–3 is H. For this connection, Milgrom rightly notes three lexical parallels between Exod 20:11 and (H's) Gen 2:3: (1) the use of כִּי to express purpose; (2) the

---

<sup>607</sup> As for the similarities, both specify that one is to rest on the seventh day, 23:12 says this is so that the ox, donkey, homeborn slave, and resident alien may all be refreshed. Whereas 20:10 commands that sons, daughters, male or female slaves, livestock, and resident aliens are not to work on the Sabbath. The rationale comes in verse 11.

<sup>608</sup> The list of persons who are to observe the Sabbath in E is spread over the two locations with Exod 23:12 stating that the ox, donkey, son of one's servant, and resident alien are to observe the Sabbath; while 20:10 states that one's own (Israelite) sons, daughters, female slaves, and livestock are to observe the Sabbath. Deuteronomy economically covers all this same ground listing the son, daughter, male and female slave, ox, donkey, livestock, and the resident aliens all at once (Deut 5:14). D then shares the rationale as found in Exod 23:12: “so that your male and female slave may rest (נוח) as you do” (Deut 5:14). Then D provides a reason for the command, an impetus to do it, which is, as Deut 5:15 claims, to remember that they were once slaves in Egypt. Which is, of course, borrowed from Exod 23:12, which also claims that the impetus for Sabbath observance is refreshment or rest (נוח) for the resident alien and son of one's slave (it also claims this for the ox and donkey as well). Thus, D can be seen as appropriating E, copying it and yet altering it. Though D alters E's wording slightly, by omitting the refreshing of the ox and donkey, it retains E's focus on the human benefits of Sabbath rest. Thus, D can be seen as appropriating E, copying it and yet altering it.

<sup>609</sup> Stackert, *Compositional Strata ...*, 15, n. 49. Stackert is using Menahem Haran and Joel Baden, See Haran, *The Biblical Collection. Its Consolidation to the End of the Second temple Times and Changes of Form to the End of the Middle Ages* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004, 2: 157–64 [in Hebrew]; Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, *FAT* 68 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 153–61.

claim that YHWH blessed the seventh day; and (3) the claim that YHWH sanctified the seventh day.<sup>610</sup>

Schwartz and Stackert argue that 20:11 is the pentateuchal redactor (R).<sup>611</sup> By *pentateuchal redactor* both Schwartz and Stackert mean an unaligned hand. This argument is evidenced by the use of נוח (“rest”) instead of שבת (“cessation”). The rationale for this use of נוח is due to E’s other Sabbath pericope in the CC (23:12), where the term is used. So, as Schwartz postulates, the pentateuchal redactor borrows E’s own language in 23:12 to make 20:11 look as though it belongs with 20:8–10.

In all honesty, this assertion cannot be denied, though, neither can it be proven. The notion of an unaligned redactor does not seem right. Of course the redactor is aligned in one way or another. With regard to Exod 20:11, the redactor chose to connect the Sabbath command to creation, which is a choice to not connect the Sabbath to the memory of slavery in Egypt, as Deut 5:15 does. Thus, a choice was made, a choice that perhaps reveals which way the redactor leans.

It is possible that H is the redactor responsible for Exod 20:11. First, D used both Exod 20:8–10 and Exod 23:12 to compose its Sabbath legislation. Without v. 11, Exod 20:8–10 does not explain why the Sabbath is to be remembered. So Deut 5:15 adds a rationale, claiming that it is because they were once slaves in Egypt. Next, the H redactor comes along and sees Deut 5:12–15 and Exod 20:8–10 and realizes that Exod 20:8–10 has no reason given for why one ought to observe the Sabbath, whereas Deut 5:15 does. Then the H redactor adds a rationale for

<sup>610</sup> Milgrom also claims that the God “resting” on the seventh day is a connection. However, the term in Exodus 20:11 is נוח and in Genesis 2:3, the verb form of שבת. See Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 38. Thus one is forced to conclude that the use of נוח on the part of the H redactor here in v. 11 intends 20:11 to be connected within E’s corpus (as Exodus 23:12 uses this same term for the animals, and D uses it for humans, just as H does here), similar to how the (H) author of Exodus 31:17 does so with נפש, just as E does so here in Exodus 23:12.

<sup>611</sup> Stackert, *Compositional Strata* ..., 14, n. 49.



Sabbath keeping, but instead of following D, the redactor connects the Sabbath to Gen 1.<sup>612</sup>

Regardless of whether the redactor responsible for Exod 20:11 is H or unaligned, it is clear that the author of Exod 20:11 agreed with Gen 1.

### 6.5.2.3. *Exodus 31:12–17 and 35:2–3*

Though agreement can hardly be expected among scholars, most do agree that Exod 31:12–17 is, at the very least, redacted by H. Even more consensus exists that Exod 35:2–3 is H based largely on its similarities to Num 15:32–36, which many scholars attribute to H.<sup>613</sup> Saul Oylan, along with Stackert, asserts that Exod 31:12–17 is a P and H composite text;<sup>614</sup> though they disagree on the particulars. Milgrom and Knohl, on the other hand, assert that the entire command in 31:12–17 and its repeat in 35:2–3 are from the hand of H.<sup>615</sup> What follows is an assessment of the the arguments proposed by these scholars.

Here are three diagrams. The first maps out what Oylan proposes, the second what Stackert proposes, and the third is what this thesis is arguing:

---

<sup>612</sup> Why not just include D's rationale? Why would H decide to connect Sabbath observance to creation and not slavery in Egypt? I posit that the exilic H redactor had two primary reasons: (i) to legitimize Gen 2:1–3 by alluding or referencing it in a law code, like E's which lacks a reason for Sabbath observance (which is why D adds the memory of Egypt as why they are to observe the Sabbath, E did not provide a reason so D did); and (ii) as exiles and captives in Babylon now, remembering their ancestor's slavery in Egypt fails to motivate Sabbath observance since they are again in a subservient position. Thus the memory of creation, remembering that YHWH rested on the seventh day makes Sabbath observance a relevant means to an end again, that being a way to connect with YHWH regardless of where they are and regardless of who is subjugating them.

<sup>613</sup> As Stackert attests ("Compositional Strata ...," 19) following Chavel, "Numbers 15:32–36: A Microcosm of the Living Priesthood and Its Literary Production," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. *ATANT 95* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 45–49. Also, Exod 35:3 may contain an older reading preserved in the LXX, adding "I am YHWH" to the end of the verse. However, as Stackert notes, regardless of whether the LXX contains an older reading or not, this verse and Num 15 are certainly H.

<sup>614</sup> Saul M. Oylan. "Exodus 31:12–17: The Sabbath According to H, or the Sabbath According to P and H?" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 124, No. 2 (Summer, 2005): 201–209; and Stackert, *Compositional Strata ...*, 14.

<sup>615</sup> Knohl, "The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School," 74; Milgrom, "H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 29.

## Oylan's view of Exod 31:12–17

<i>Layer</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Material</i>
1	H	vv. 12–15
2	P	vv. 16–17

## Stackert's view of Exod 31:12–17

<i>Layer</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Material</i>
1	P	vv. 12–13α
2	H	vv. 13αβ–14, and the addition of שבתון קדש to v. 15
1	P	vv. 15–17
3	Redactor	single phrase (וינפש) in v. 17

## This thesis's view

<i>Layer</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Material</i>
1	P	31:1–11
2	H	31:12–15
3	HR	31:16–17
1	P	31:18

## 6.5.2.3.1. Oylan's Proposal

Oylan argues that 31:12–17 is a composite work, with 31:12–15 assigned to H and 31:16–17 assigned to P.<sup>616</sup> This division between v. 15 and v. 16 is based on two things: (1) the contrast between the second person plural form of address in 31:12–15 with the third person form in 31:16–17; (2) the reason given for Sabbath observance.<sup>617</sup> Both units view the Sabbath as an ongoing “sign” (אֵימָה), as v. 13 indicates with its use of לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם (“through your generations”), and vv. 16–17 indicates with עֲלֹמָם (“forever”); but both claim different reasons for the Sabbath after their respective use of כִּי. For example, in v. 13 it is a sign for the purpose of Israel knowing that it is YHWH who sanctifies them; and in v. 17 it is a sign for Israel to know that YHWH

<sup>616</sup> Oylan, “Exodus 31:12–17,” 202.

<sup>617</sup> Ibid., 204.

made the heavens and the earth in six days, and on the seventh he rested and refreshed himself. The former is for the general purpose of informing Israel that it is YHWH who makes them holy and the latter claims it is because YHWH rested at creation.

Oylan rightly observes that vv. 12–15 are from H, stating that the first unit’s focus on the Sabbath as a sign of the holiness of Israel is a feature that is “identical” to a number of texts from H.<sup>618</sup> He evidences this with: (1) the use of שבת שבתון in Exod 31:15 (and Exod 35:2); (2) the concern that the Sabbath be sanctified and not profaned (cf. Ezek 20:13, 16, 21, 24; 22:8; 23:38);<sup>619</sup> (3) the use of the כרת formula (see Lev 19:8); and (4) Exod 31:15’s passive formulation (“six days work may be done, but on the seventh day ...”), which also occurs in Exod 35:2, is connected to Lev 23:3.

As expected, these same connections are also cited by Milgrom and Knohl, but with some additions. Both note the use of אני יהוה מקדשכם (“I YHWH sanctify you”) in v. 13, and Milgrom also notes the use of YHWH’s direct speech to Israel as evidence.<sup>620</sup> Leviticus 20:7–8 says: “Consecrate (קדש) yourselves therefore, and be holy (קדש); for I am YHWH your God. Keep my statutes, and observe them; *I am YHWH; I sanctify (קדש) you.*” This expression, אני יהוה מקדשכם, only occurs in the HC (Lev 20:8; 21:8; 21:15; 21:23; 22:9; 22:16; and 22:32), with the only

<sup>618</sup> Ibid., 204. See also, Lev 20:8; 21:8, 15; 22:9, 16, 32; see also Ezekiel 7:24; 20:12, 20; 37:28. Especially Ezek 20:12 whose language is identical to that of Exod 31:13.

<sup>619</sup> Oylan understands Ezekiel to be very H-like. Thus, he sees the abundance of lexical connections therein to suggest H authorship here in Exod 31:12–15.

<sup>620</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22, AB*, 1338–39; idem., “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 29; and Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 15–16. Stackert argues that Oylan’s (and Milgrom and Knohl’s) use of the passive construction is not limited to H. He cites evidence that P speaks in the passive voice as well. See Stackert, “Compositional Strata ...,” 16. However, Oylan, Milgrom, and Knohl are not merely stating that H exclusively speaks in a passive voice, rather they are saying that in Ex 31:15, the same exact passive construction is also in the HC and other H passages, a construction that is not in P material.

exception being its use here in Exod 31:13.<sup>621</sup> Nowhere else does this expression occur outside the HC.

Oylan concludes that the second unit (31:16–17) is P, and not H, based largely on vv. 16–17 showing no signs of H activity. Because of this, he rejects Milgrom and Knohl’s hypothesis that the whole pericope (31:12–17) is entirely H, since the evidence they both cite for H authorship is all from vv. 12–15 not from vv. 16–17.<sup>622</sup> Additionally, his conclusion is based largely on his predetermined view that Gen 2:1–3 is P. He states:

Exodus 31:17; 20:11; and Gen 2:2–3 share a number of important characteristics. All three associate the Sabbath with creation, and 31:17 and 20:11 justify Israelite Sabbath observance by citing YHWH’s rest on the seventh day as a model for human rest. They also formulate their justifications using a very similar style, which raises the possibility of intended allusion from one text to the other and even borrowing.<sup>623</sup>

Consequently, assigning vv. 16–17 to P is based largely on one’s already predetermined view of who was behind Gen 2:1–3 and Exod 20:11.<sup>624</sup> Oylan’s view that Gen 2:1–3 is P forces him into a very unique position regarding pentateuchal sources and their relative dating. Due to v. 17 being akin to Exod 20:11, and their combined affinities to the exilic Gen 2:1–3, Oylan concludes

---

<sup>621</sup> The Hebrew verb שמר was also used 16 times in Leviticus, 15 of which were within the HC.

<sup>622</sup> To be precise, Milgrom sees it as H<sub>R</sub>. See Oylan, “Exodus 31:12–17,” 206; Milgrom “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 29; Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 15–16.

<sup>623</sup> Oylan, “Exodus 31:12–17,” 208–09.

<sup>624</sup> The exception to this rule would be Knohl. Though Knohl views both Exod 20:11 and Exod 31:12–17 as HS, he views Gen 2:1–3 as P. Though in a forthcoming article, Knohl alters his opinion slightly and posits certain H editing in Gen 1. See, “The Original Version of the Priestly Creation Account and the Religious Significance of the Number Eight in the Bible,” *forthcoming*.

that vv. 16–17 must have been added by a later stratum of P onto a preexisting H stratum, thus making P the final redactor of the Pentateuch.<sup>625</sup>

#### 6.5.2.3.2. *Stackert's Proposal*

Though Stackert agrees with Oylan regarding Exod 31:12–17 being a P and H composite text, he disagrees that vv. 16–17 indicate a distinct P strata that is above H.<sup>626</sup> Regarding Oylan's view of vv. 16–17, Stackert says that it “reflects a neglect of the basic literary character of P as a continuous narrative with an internally coherent plot.”<sup>627</sup> The narrative cohesion of P is the main focus for Stackert.<sup>628</sup>

Regarding v. 17, Stackert disagrees with it being assigned entirely to P. Instead he posits a third hand, a redactor (though he calls him a “compiler”). This is based on the very uncharacteristic term for a P author in v. 17, the term *נִפְשׁ*.<sup>629</sup> Accordingly, the compiler likely

---

<sup>625</sup> Oylan, “Exodus 31:12–17,” 207. This is a position held traditionally by source critics, but has been rejected with the emergence of H as a later source than that of P. Though Nihan's views may be sympathetic, not in this particular discussion on Exodus 31:12–17, but he does posit that Numbers may have been redacted by a later P stratum. Oylan's claim here of a P stratum atop H as a reversal of Knohl's thesis. It is also conflicting as as it is a later P strata itself, both are priestly. Milgrom posits an exilic H redactor that added on top of an earlier 8th century H. Perhaps Oylan is speaking of the same thing milgrom is, albeit with different siglums.

<sup>626</sup> Stackert, “Compositional Strata . . .,” 16, n. 55. Stackert grants that Oylan made a logical conclusion since vv. 16–17 is not part of a continuous narrative source, that is, vv. 16–17 are not connected to anything that precedes or follows.

<sup>627</sup> Ibid., 16, n. 55.

<sup>628</sup> Ibid., 11. Stackert speaks in no uncertain terms: “I hope to show the importance of reading P as a narrative source, with its law and historical narrative as integral components of a single composition.” Stackert asserts that the narrative opening here is in vv.12–13aa which he assigns to P. And since v. 15a and vv. 16–17 “accord with P's larger historical myth,” they too are assumed to be P.

<sup>629</sup> A reason for Exod 31:16–17 being from the HC is the curious anthropomorphic description of YHWH being refreshed (*נִפְשׁ*) in verse 17, which was not like the typical P material. Since the HC describes YHWH anthropomorphically resting, it would seem more able to accommodate such a view of YHW being refreshed. It was to this that Walter Brueggemann remarked, “This usage is all the more astonishing in the Priestly tradition, which tends to present God primarily in terms of majestic transcendence.” (Walter Brueggemann, “The Book of Exodus,” in *NIB I* (1994): 924).

borrowed this term from E in Exod 23:12.<sup>630</sup> Thus, Stackert claims that the original P stratum is 31:12–13aα, and vv. 15–17, which was appended by H with 13aβ–14, and the use of *שבתון קדש* in v. 15, and then lastly, v. 17 was appended by the pentateuchal compiler with *וינפש*.

The issue with Stackert's conclusions is that they do not explain why H needed to or wanted to redact P's material. According to Stackert, H is trying to update P with non-priestly materials so as to complete them. So why does H append P's Sabbath command here? Everything that Stackert ascribes to H is already covered in P's original stratum.<sup>631</sup> Why would H need or want to redact P's Sabbath command? This is perhaps the problem with assigning source layers based solely on lexical or literary evidence, it can lead to nonsensical assertions.

Additionally, v. 17 is linked to Gen 2:1–3, as Oylan noted above and Stackert admits.<sup>632</sup> Thus, one's view of Gen 2:1–3 determines their view of Exod 31:16–17.

#### *6.5.2.3.3. This Thesis' View*

This thesis posits that Exod 31:12–17 is indeed a composite text, though not between P and H but between two H strands with the last one being exilic and contemporaneous with Gen 2:1–3. The first layer is Exod 31 minus vv. 12–17 and Exodus 35:4 and following. The second layer is added to this first layer, and it consists of Exod 31:12–15 and Exod 35:1–3. The third and final layer is added to the second, and it consists of Exod 31:16–17. The first layer is the original P narrative, the second is H, and the third is an exilic H redactor (possibly Milgrom's H<sub>R</sub>).

#### *Layer 1*

---

<sup>630</sup> See Stackert, "Compositional Strata ...," 17, n. 58. He argues that the compiler (who, if he keeps assigning additions to him ought to be called the redactor) also did this with Exodus 20:11. Despite Stackert ascribing both Exodus 20:11 and Exodus 31:17 to a pentateuchal compiler, he does not ascribe Genesis 2:1–3 to the compiler but to P for narratological reasons.

<sup>631</sup> For example, v. 13b's the Sabbath as a sign is covered in v. 17, the punishment in v. 14 is covered by P in v. 15.

<sup>632</sup> Stackert, "Compositional Strata ...," 13.

The first layer that has been identified here is vital to understanding the compositional history of Exod 31 and 35. It is important to realize that the entire Sabbath pericope of Exod 31:12–17 is itself a redaction to P's Tabernacle narrative. This is evidenced by the use of the term ברית in v. 17 for *covenant*, which is different from the one in the very next verse: v. 18, which contains P's typical term for *covenant*: עדות. Additionally, if the Sabbath pericope is removed, the narrative reads smoother skipping over v. 12 to v. 18. Moreover, two rhetorical questions spring to mind: first, if vv. 16–17 are P, why would they use one term for covenant in v. 17 and then switch to another term in v. 18? And second, why would P redact a narrative about its own central topic?

Switching over to Exod 35, verse 1 opens the chapter saying:

Moses assembled all the congregation of the Israelites and said to them: These are the things that YHWH has commanded you to do.

However, v. 4 also opens the chapter:

Moses said to all the congregation of the Israelites: This is the thing that YHWH has commanded.

This double opening suggest that vv. 1–3 were added before vv. 4 and following. Also, v. 4 uses the singular, וזה הדבר; whereas v. 1 uses a plural, אלה הדברים, perhaps because the (H) redactor understood that 35:4 opens a whole host of commands from YHWH from Exod 35–40. Thus a plural form was deemed to be the more accurate and appropriate opening to the entire Tabernacle-building narrative in Exod 35–40. And, just as with Exod 31:12–17, if one skips over 35:1–3, the narrative reads smoothly without it.

## Layer 2

The second layer, then, is Exod 31:12–15 and Exod 35:1–3. These are added by H to preexisting P material. Evidence that Exod 31:12–15 is from H is well argued by Oylan.<sup>633</sup> Amit notes that these Sabbath commands close the instructions given by YHWH to Moses in Exod 25–31, and begin the building phase of the Tabernacle in Exod 35–40. Consequently, as Amit concludes, “juxtaposing the Sabbath commandment to the building of the sanctuary served to reinforce the sanctity of the Sabbath by putting them on the same level.”<sup>634</sup> This would not be something that P would do, at least it would be odd for P to do this to its most central object.

## Layer 3

The third layer is Exod 31:16–17, and it is not P, as Oylan argued, and it is not an unaligned compiler or redactor as Stackert asserts. Instead, it was added by another H layer. The evidence that vv. 16–17 is an additional layer added to vv. 12–15 is two-fold and was already mentioned by Oylan: (1) the contrast between the second person plural form of address in 31:12–15 with the third person form in 31:16–17; (2) the reason given for Sabbath observance.

Additionally, there is lexical evidence that Exod 31:16–17 is H. First, v. 16 contains the term *ברית*, which is uncharacteristic for P, who prefers *עדות*. In Leviticus, the term *ברית* occurs 10 times, 9 of which were within the HC.<sup>635</sup> As an example, Lev 24:8 says: “Every Sabbath day

<sup>633</sup> As noted above, (1) the use of *שבת שבתון* in Exod 31:15 (and Exod 35:2); (2) the concern that the Sabbath be sanctified and not profaned (cf. Ezek 20:13, 16, 21, 24; 22:8; 23:38); (3) the use of the *כרת* formula (see Lev 19:8); and (4) Exod 31:15’s passive formulation (“six days work may be done, but on the seventh day ...”), which also occurs in Exod 35:2, is connected to Lev 23:3.

<sup>634</sup> Amit, 16. She goes on to say: “Moreover, not engaging in building does not involve a death penalty, showing that the holiness of the Sabbath is greater than that of the sanctuary.”

<sup>635</sup> Leviticus 26 has 8 of the 10 uses. The only occurrence of *ברית* outside the HC is Leviticus 2:13. The uses within the HC are Leviticus 24:8; 26:9, 15, 25, 42 (3x), 44, and 25.



Aaron shall set them in order before YHWH regularly as a commitment of the people of Israel, as a covenant (ברית) forever (עולם).”

Second, the term ברית is characteristic of non-priestly materials (JE, and D), occurring in D 27 times. As Stackert and Nihan posit, H’s interactions with P are influenced by non-priestly materials. Meaning that H is both capable and willing to incorporate non-priestly concepts and terms as it completes and updates P. This explains not only why ברית occurs in v. 16, but also why H could use נפש at the end of v. 17 (which is uncharacteristic for P, but not for E, and not, therefore, for H).<sup>636</sup>

Third, the use of אות (“sign”), ברית (“covenant”), and עולם (“everlasting”) only occurs in the covenant passage with Noah (Gen 9<sup>637</sup>), the circumcision covenant with Abraham (Gen 17<sup>638</sup>), here in Exod 31:16–17,<sup>639</sup> and finally in Ezek 20:12.<sup>640</sup>

For these reasons then, and indeed if Gen 2:1–3 is H, Exod 31:16–17 is an H addition to already existing H material. As a whole, Exod 31:12–17 expresses a few things that have not been mentioned previously by H’s interpolations in Exod 16:22–30 and 20:11: (1) the severe death penalty if the Sabbath is not kept;<sup>641</sup> (2) the claim that the Sabbath is a sign between

<sup>636</sup> Not to mention that this is similar to H’s redaction of Exodus 20:8–10 where the term נזח is borrowed from E’s Exodus 23:12. Likewise, here in Exodus 31:17, the term נפש is borrowed from E’s Exodus 23:12.

<sup>637</sup> Genesis 9:12–13: God said, “This is the sign of the covenant that I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for all future generations: I have set my bow in the clouds, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and the earth.

<sup>638</sup> Genesis 17:11, 13: You shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you ... So shall my covenant be in your flesh an everlasting covenant.

<sup>639</sup> Exodus 31:16–17: Israel is to observe the Sabbath, to perform Sabbath throughout their generations, an everlasting covenant. Between me and Israel, it is a sign forever, for in six days YHWH made *the heavens and the earth* (same syntax as Genesis 1:1), and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed.

<sup>640</sup> Ezekiel 20:12: Moreover I gave them my Sabbaths, as a sign between me and them, so that they might know that I YHWH sanctify them.

<sup>641</sup> Though v. 14 mentions cutting people off from their people, Exodus 35:2 and Numbers 15:32–36 clarify that death is really what is in mind.

YHWH and the Israelites throughout their generations (v. 13); and (3) the claim that the Sabbath is an everlasting sign and covenant between YHWH and Israel (vv. 16–17).

#### 6.5.2.4. *Numbers 15:32–36*

Numbers 15:32–36 is considered by many to be H. Milgrom follows Kuenen that all of Num 15 is the product of H or even H<sub>R</sub>.<sup>642</sup> This Sabbath passage clarifies how the death penalty for breaking the Sabbath is to be carried out. Amit observes, “The story of the woodgatherer removes any shadow of doubt as to how society should behave.” It shows, in practical terms, how to carrying out the warnings previously given in Exod 35:3 and 31:14–15. Thus, this Sabbath pericope is a midrash on previous H Sabbath passages. The source division for Num 15 is difficult to determine. As mentioned before, the entire chapter could be an addition. The chapter contains a series of siloed topics, of which the Sabbath pericope is just one. For example, vv. 1–10 concerning additional offerings; vv. 11–16 appears to be an expansion on the previous section that now stipulates that this legislation for extra offerings applies to all of Israel and to the גֵּר (alien, stranger) who dwells with them (very H-like); vv. 17–21 speak of bread donations to YHWH; vv. 22–26 concerns unintentional sins and the offering to atone for them for the entire community; vv. 27–31 concerns unintentional sins for the individual; vv. 32–36 is the episode of the Sabbath-breaking wood-gatherer; and vv. 37–41 is the law concerning the fringes (צִיצִית).

Signs of H, though, are throughout. First, there is a wide concern for the alien and the stranger in Num 15 just as there is in the HC (see Num 15:14–16, 26, 29–30; and compare with the HC’s

---

<sup>642</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22, AB*, 1341–44; idem., “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 31; Kuenen, A. “An Historical-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch,” Tr., London, 1886. Luther, B., *Die Persönlichkeit des Jahvisten*.” Meyer, qv: 96, n. 37.

Lev 17:8, 10, 12–13, 15; 18:26; 19:10, 33–34; 20:2; 22:18; 23:22; 24:16, 22; 25:23, 35, 47).

Second, the term אֹזֶרָה (“native”) is used by H and it appears here three times in Num 15:13 and vv. 29–30.<sup>643</sup> As for something specific to a literary connection between the Sabbath pericope in Num 15 and H, a parallel can be drawn between H’s description of the death penalty being carried out in Lev 24:10–14 and here in Num 15:32–36.

#### 6.5.2.5. Numbers 28:9–10

The last priestly Sabbath passage left to consider is the one found in P’s calendar. And it, Amit notes, “is totally different from what is described in the other Sabbath passages.”<sup>644</sup> Absent here are expressions common to H: “Sabbath of complete rest” (שַׁבְּתוֹן שֶׁבֶת); the terms “holy” (קֹדֶשׁ), “the seventh day” (בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שֶׁבֶת), any instance of expressions such as “the Sabbath to YHWH,” and most unusual, any prohibition of work; even though there are prohibitions against working during P’s other festivals. For example, in Num 28:18, the fifteenth of Nissan is described as “a sacred occasion: you shall not work at your occupations.”<sup>645</sup> Thus, Amit concludes concerning P’s unique Sabbath: “There is no hint of the prohibition against work or of the day’s holiness.”<sup>646</sup> Instead, it is merely about additional sacrifices.

Therefore, P prescribes that sacrifices are to be offered on its Sabbath days. That is to say, for P, to observe a Sabbath one must do something, one must offer the regimented amount of

---

<sup>643</sup> It also appears in the HC beginning with the interpolation in Lev 16 (16:29; 17:15; 18:26; 19:34; 23:42; 24:16, 22).

<sup>644</sup> Amit, *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible*, 17.

<sup>645</sup> See also Numbers 28:25, 26; 29:1, 7, 12, and 35.

<sup>646</sup> Amit, *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible*, 17.

sacrifices. Whereas in H, the Sabbath is observed by abstaining from any work, including the offering of sacrifices. Compare the two calendars and their respective views on the Sabbath:

Lev 23:2

שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲשֶׂה מְלָאכָה וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּת שְׁבָתוֹן  
מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ כָּל־מְלָאכָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ שַׁבָּת הוּא לַיהוָה בְּכָל  
מִוֹשְׁבֵיכֶם:

Six days work shall be done, but on the seventh day a complete Sabbath rest, a holy convocation. All work you shall not do, it is a Sabbath to YHWH in all your settlements.

Num 28:9-10

וּבַיּוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת שְׁנֵי־כֶבֶשִׂים בְּגִי־שָׁנָה תָּמִימִם וּשְׁנֵי עֶשְׂרֹנִים  
סֵלֶת מִנְחָה בָּלוּלָה בַשֶּׁמֶן וְנִסְכּוֹ: עֲלֵת שַׁבָּת בְּשַׁבָּתוֹ  
עַל־עֲלֵת הַתָּמִיד וְנִסְכָּה:

And on the sabbath: two male lambs a year old without blemish, and two-tenths of an ephah of choice flour for a grain offering, mixed with oil, and its drink offering; [this is] a sabbath offering on its sabbath, in addition to the regular burnt offering and its drink offering.

The way the Sabbath is described in Gen 1, as being characterized by the abstention of work, it follows that Gen 1's description of the Sabbath is much closer to the HC's than it is to P's.

#### 6.5.2.6. Conclusion on the Sabbath Beyond the HC

After surveying Exod 16; 31:12–17; 35:2–3; num 15:32–36; and this one in Num 28:9–10, Amit observes how similar the first four are and how different this last one in Num 28 is. She states, “one is led to regard the source of the passage on the Sabbath in the festival calendar of the P Code as different from the school of the other writings.”<sup>647</sup> Consequently, it is possible and perhaps even probable that Gen 2:1–3, 16:22–30; 31:12–17; 35:2–3; and Num 15:32–36 are all from H. Milgrom's conclusion is to the point:

In my recently published commentary, I argued that Genesis 2:2–3 must be attributed to H<sub>R</sub>. I would like to strengthen this thesis by arguing that the entire priestly story of creation (Genesis 1:1–2:4a) is the work of H<sub>R</sub> and then by demonstrating that one verse

<sup>647</sup> Ibid., 17. Similarities such as: (1) all four ascribe holiness to the Sabbath; (2) the prohibition against work (generally in Genesis 2:1–3 and 31:12–17; while specifically in Exodus 16:26; 35:3; and Numbers 15:32–35); and (3) how different Numbers 28 is from the rest.

of the Sabbath pericope (Genesis 2:3) is the source for several passages in Exodus and Numbers which also bear the imprint of H<sub>R</sub>.<sup>648</sup>

Thus, “taking a cumulative view of each of these passages and weighing the contribution of each element to the preceding one and the effect of all of them together, the purpose is clear: to proclaim the sanctity of the Sabbath, to which the editing process imparts supreme importance.”<sup>649</sup> P virtually ignores the Sabbath, whereas H embraced it “as an institution that could sanctify all of society.”<sup>650</sup> Therefore, the presence of the Sabbath aetiology in Gen 1 best serves the interests of the community who was also responsible for the HC and for H-like redactions throughout the Pentateuch.

#### 6.5.2.7. Knohl's Ascription of Genesis 2:1–3 to P<sup>651</sup>

Interestingly, Knohl does not think there is sufficient evidence to say that Gen 1 was the work of H.<sup>652</sup> Knohl argues that Gen 2:1–3 is P because (1) no nominal form of שבת (“sabbath”); and (2) the lack of any prohibition against human work.<sup>653</sup> To evidence this, Knohl cites Num 28’s Sabbath, since there is also no prohibition against work there.

---

<sup>648</sup> Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 33.

<sup>649</sup> Amit, *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible*, 16.

<sup>650</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>651</sup> It should be noted that Israel Knohl is about to publish an article that reverses his position slightly. Though he still argues in it that Gen 1 is not H, but P, he argues that it was edited by H, and that the seven-fold structure and the Sabbath aetiology are the work of the H redactor. See “The Original Version of the Priestly Creation Account and the Religious Significance of the Number Eight in the Bible.” Here is his abstract: “In my view, the original version of the Priestly account of creation (Gen 1:1–2:4a), was based on the number eight. However, later editors from the “Holiness School” changed the text to reflect the more popular sanctity of the number seven, with the Sabbath day as the culmination of the story. However, the esoteric sanctity of eight did not disappear, but continued to be transmitted within some biblical circles.”

<sup>652</sup> Knohl, “Priestly Torah versus the Holiness School,” 76. See also, *The Divine Symphony*, 163–164.

<sup>653</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

However, unlike Num 28, Gen 2:1–3 still does prohibit labour, granted, this is not directed to humans, but YHWH himself does this as a means of sanctifying the seventh day. Call it a self-imposed prohibition, regardless, YHWH ceases working and, though human inactivity is not explicitly prescribed here, the pentateuchal narrative makes it an inferable certainty.

Secondly, the vast majority of the occurrences of the term שבת occur within the HC, this convincingly demonstrates the significance of the Sabbath within H's tradition, and this same significance for שבת occurs in Gen 2:1–3. Thirdly, the holiness motif that permeates the HC and other H interpolations is also present in Gen 2:3. And lastly, Gen 2:1–3 is an aetiology for the Sabbath. With this being the case, using the nominal form would ruin it as an aetiology.

Consequently, Knohl's objections can be best answered by understanding Gen 2:1–3 as a Sabbath aetiology. This position has been argued by Cassuto who argued that the author of Gen 2:1–3 basically meant "Sabbath" by using שבת, but wanted a formulation not specifically directed to an anachronistic Israel.<sup>654</sup> So instead, it is directed to no one in particular allowing the audience to infer it based on later narrative episodes (i.e. Exod 16:22–30; 20:11; and 31:16–17).

## 6.6. A Brief History of the Sabbath and the Sabbatical Calendar

This brief history of the Sabbath will begin with the term שבת itself, which has had many proposals for its etymology, basically falling into one of two options: either it is solely a Hebrew word or it is an Akkadian loanword. Regarding the proposal that it is an Akkadian loanword, new moons (*arhu*, which means "moon," or by extension "month") marked the beginning of the

---

<sup>654</sup> Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, vol. 1, trans. I. Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961), 64. This is contrary to Amit's perspective that the Holiness author of Genesis 1 intended the audience to recognize that as image bearers, when the one they are to image is resting one day in every seven, they are to do this as well. I admit, that this may be the case. However, in and of itself, Genesis 1:1–2:3 cannot make this argument, it is only after reading Exodus 16; 20:8–11; and 31:12–17 that this is a possible conclusion.

month and full moons (*šapattu* or *šabattu*) its middle (the fifteenth day). Thus, for the Babylonian calendar, “Each month was made of two ‘weeks’ (new moon to full moon and full moon to new moon), the full moon bearing the Akkadian name *šapatum* from the root *šaba*’ (“to be full”).”<sup>655</sup> Guillaume concludes, “the intermediary of Akkadian, which regularly drops guttural letters, in this case *ayin*, to obtain Hebrew שבת from *šabatum* renders the lunar aspect of the original biblical Sabbath inescapable.”<sup>656</sup>

Regardless of the etymology of the root שבת, the earliest references to the Sabbath are in connection to the lunar cycle.<sup>657</sup> For example, ancient biblical Sabbath passages always refer to the Sabbath *as* a full moon (see 2 Kgs 4:23; Isa 1:13; Hos 2:13; Amos 8:5).<sup>658</sup> Consider the phrase in these passages, חדש ושבת (“new moon and Sabbath”), where חדש appears where the Babylonian *arhu* would and שבת where *šapattu* would. Thus, שבת is positioned as the full moon.

Guillaume further argues that it is in Gen 1 that “shifts the lunar aspect of the original biblical sabbath from the full moon to the seventh day, a move that may have been facilitated by the fact that the Babylonian Pleiades, the *sibitti*, derive their name from the word ‘seven’ and are pictured as seven dots.”<sup>659</sup> Thus, it is here in Gen 1 where a new calendar is established, a sabbatical calendar.

---

<sup>655</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 41.

<sup>656</sup> Ibid., 41. See also D.E. Fleming who doubts that the biblical Sabbath derives from *šapattu* because at Ugarit, the full moon was called *ym maPat* (KTU 1.109.3, see 1.46.11); see Fleming, “A Break in the Line: Reconsidering the Bible’s Diverse Festival Calendars,” *RB* 106 (1999): 161–74.

<sup>657</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 40.

<sup>658</sup> Ibid., 40. See also, W.W. Hallo, “New Moons and Sabbaths,” *HUCA* 48 (1977): 1–18.

<sup>659</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 41.

In the first temple era, there seems to be little evidence of the Sabbath. However, by the post-exilic period, the Sabbath held a central position.<sup>660</sup> For example, in many of the later prophetic books, the exile is understood as a direct result of Sabbath breaking.<sup>661</sup> How did the Sabbath go from an optional extra days sacrifice to a mandatory everlasting covenant?

Thus, during the exilic period, the Sabbath rose in prominence. Transforming from an additional and optional sacrifice (as it is described in Num 28) into a mandatory practice that even carried the death penalty for breaking it. The reason for the sudden elevation of the Sabbath is obvious to Milgrom who explains: “Deprived of its temple in the Babylonian exile, Israel is informed that the observance of the Sabbath is just as acceptable to God as worship in the Temple.”<sup>662</sup>

A very important distinction to be made is that the Sabbath was not invented, rather it was elevated. Traditions can only be invented so long as no one knows they are invented. They have to be anchored into the past, a past that is both accessible by all and agreed upon by all. In Babylon, a new way to be holy and faithful to YHWH was required that was not spatially bound, as temples can be torn down and one can be carried away from their lands. They required a sanctuary in time. This sanctuary is not jeopardized by invading armies or internal strife, it can be observed by any Israelite living in any land, no matter how far away. Thus, as Amit concludes: “it was the H school that raised the status of the Sabbath from folk practice to a binding, circumscribing and separating practice.”<sup>663</sup>

---

<sup>660</sup> See Nehemiah 10:31–33; 13:15–30.

<sup>661</sup> See as an example, Jeremiah 17:19–27; Ezekiel 16:21; 20:1–24.

<sup>662</sup> Milgrom, “H<sub>R</sub> In Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” 29.

<sup>663</sup> Amit, *In Praise of Editing*, 21.



### 6.6.1. The 364-Day Year Calendar

The sabbatical calendar consists of 364 days per year, neatly divided into 52 ‘weeks’ of seven days each. Broken down more, there are 4 quarters of 91 days each, or 13 weeks.<sup>664</sup> Or one could count this by months. Each solstice or equinox comprises three months, with the first and second carrying 30 days each and the third month carrying 31 days.<sup>665</sup> “In fact,” says Ben Dov, “the best definition for the year is neither a ‘solar’ nor ‘luni-solar’ year but rather a seven-based (septenary) schematic year.”<sup>666</sup> And by this reckoning, the Sabbath and the festivals always fall on the same days, and they never overlap with one another.<sup>667</sup>

The creation myth in Gen 1 is very important for the the sabbatical calendar. Guillaume notes that the year must begin on the fourth day of the week “in order to prevent the days of preparation of the Passover meal to fall on the Sabbath and to eliminate any coincidence of the Sabbath and the Festivals.”<sup>668</sup> Thus, “day one is the beginning of the week, while day four is the beginning of the year.”<sup>669</sup> This is because, until day four, there are no ‘indicators’ or ‘signs’ in the sky to measure the passage of time. Ben Dov agrees saying,

In the 364-day year it is impossible for a day of feast to fall on the Sabbath day, an occurrence which could cause great confusion ...Owing to the fact that the number 364

---

<sup>664</sup> Ben Dov, 72.

<sup>665</sup> See 6Q17; and 1 En. 72.

<sup>666</sup> Jonathan Ben-Dov, “The 364-Day Year in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Pseudepigrapha,” in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, ed. Menahem Kister (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2009 [Heb]), 72. The luni-solar way of reckoning time was critiqued by the 364-day year adherents because of the human involvement in determining and calculating the position of the moon and making intercalations. The 364-day year was stable and beyond further tweaks and whims of a human agency. “This human involvement, typical of luni-solar calendars, was condemned by adherents of the 364-day year calendar.” See Ben-Dov, “The 364-Day Year in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Pseudepigrapha,” 74.

<sup>667</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 42.

<sup>668</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>669</sup> Ibid.

divides neatly into seven, and since the day of the week in which the beginning of the year falls is fixed, all the dates, festivals etc. in the year will wittingly occur in the very same day of the week.<sup>670</sup>

Below is Table D, which lays out the 364-day year.

Table D: Sabbatical Calendar<sup>671</sup>

Day	Weekday	Months 1, 4, 7, 10	Months 2, 5, 8, 11	Months 3, 6, 9, 12
4	Wednesday	1 8 15 22 29	6 13 20 27	4 11 18 25
5	Thursday	2 9 16 23 30	7 14 21 28	5 12 19 26
6	Friday	3 10 17 24	1 8 15 22 29	6 13 20 27
7	Sabbath	4 11 18 25	2 9 16 23 30	7 14 21 28
1	Sunday	5 12 19 26	3 10 17 24	1 8 15 22 29
2	Monday	6 13 20 27	4 11 18 25	2 9 16 23 30
3	Tuesday	7 14 21 28	5 12 19 26	3 10 17 24 31

By this reckoning, the Sabbath day is never violated by also observing the holy days of the appointed times. For example, the festival of Unleavened (*Mazzot*) lands on the 15th day of the first month and is consistently on the fourth day (Wednesday) of the week. Additionally, the festival of Tabernacles (*Sukkot*) lands on the 15th of the seventh month. Consequently, or inconsequently, the Sabbath is never breached.

The 364-day year is also distinguished from the other calendrical systems by its nomenclature for months. There are three types of designation used for months in the HB. The 364-day year uses ordinal numbers only (e.g. first, second, twelfth). This is exclusively used in priestly material throughout the Pentateuch and even in the rest of the HB (1–2 Chronicles).<sup>672</sup>

<sup>670</sup> Ben-Dov, “The 364-Day Year in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Pseudepigrapha,” 73.

<sup>671</sup> Chart from Jonathan Ben-Dov, “The 364-Day Year in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Pseudepigrapha,” 74.

<sup>672</sup> A possible exception is 2 Kings 25. See James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999), 13.

Second, there are the Canaanite month names (e.g. *Abib*, *Ziv*, *Ethanim*, and *Bal*) *Abib* occurs in relation to the Passover (Exod 13:4 and 23:15 [E] and Deut 16:1–3) and later in relation to the construction of the Solomonic Temple. The latter three terms occur in Deuteronomistic literature (see 1 Kgs 6:1, 37, 38; 8:2).<sup>673</sup>

And third, there are the Babylonian month names. The Talmud, perhaps, preserves a memory that the returnees brought these names back with them from exile in Babylon (see Rosh Ha-Shanah 1.56d). Not all twelve are even mentioned in the HB. And it should be noted that they are sometimes referred to with ordinals for reference.<sup>674</sup> The ones that are mentioned in the HB are:

Nisan (Esth 3:7; Neh 2:1)  
 Sivan (Esth 8:9)  
 Elul (Neh 6:15)  
 Chislev (Zech 7:1; Neh 1:1)  
 Tebeth (Esth 2:16)  
 Shebat (Zech 1:7)  
 Adar (Esth 3:7, 13; 8:13; 9:1, 15, 17, 19, 21; Ezra 6:15)

The same concern that the 364-day year calendar has for avoiding Sabbath violation is also the same concern, it seems, that the entire HB has. Guillaume notes, “most dated events in the Hebrew Scriptures are calculated according to the 364-day calendar to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath.”<sup>675</sup> James VanderKam specifically looks into the flood narrative, and observes, “Of all the stories in the first book of the Bible, the flood narrative has the highest density of specific dates, all of which fit within slightly more than a one-year span and all of which

---

<sup>673</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>674</sup> Ibid.

<sup>675</sup> Ibid. See also R.T. Beckwith, “The Significance of the 364-Day Calendar For the Old Testament Canon,” in *Calendar, Chronology and Worship*, ed. R.T. Beck with (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 54–66.

designate the months by ordinals.”<sup>676</sup> As discussed above, ordinal months are the nomenclature of the 364-day year calendar.

Regarding Guillaume’s assertion that the HB avoids violating the Sabbath with its dates, there are two exceptions. The first is Esth 9:15, which dates the massacre of the 300 inhabitants of Susa to the fourteenth day of Adar.<sup>677</sup> The fourteenth of Adar is possibly a Sabbath day; although it may not have been because Esther does not use a sabbatical calendar, as evidenced by the use of *Adar* instead of using numbered months (perhaps this is a reason why Esther has not been found at Qumran, a community that used a sabbatical calendar primarily).<sup>678</sup>

The second exception is in 2 Chr 3:2, which dates the building of the Temple clearly on the Sabbath. Since *Chronicles* is a post-exilic work, this may be an intentional ‘breach’ of the rule for calendar reckoning in order to “underline that the whole project was doomed from the beginning.”<sup>679</sup>

#### 6.6.2. The Origin of the 364-Day Year Calendar

Many scholars believe the sabbatical calendar to originate from the middle of the third century BCE.<sup>680</sup> This is based on the evidence from the oldest manuscripts of the Astronomical

---

<sup>676</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>677</sup> Ibid. See also B.Z. Wacholder and S. Wacholder, “Patterns of Biblical Dates and Qumran’s Calendar: The Fallacy of Jaubert’s Hypothesis,” *HUCA* 66 (1995): 1–40.

<sup>678</sup> See Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 41–42.

<sup>679</sup> Ibid., 42.

<sup>680</sup> See Ben-Dov, “The 364-Day Year,” 70–71.

Book contained in 1 Enoch.<sup>681</sup> Thus, the sabbatical calendar is often viewed as a peripheral sectarian calendar as opposed to a normative Jewish contingent.<sup>682</sup>

However, from 1953 to 1957, Annie Jaubert analyzed the dates in the book of Jubilees and compared them with dates arising from the priestly sources in the HB which predate Jubilees by a few centuries.<sup>683</sup> She focused her argument on two main things: (1) the days of the week as described in priestly material, especially Gen 1; and (2) the 364-day structure to accommodate the priestly calendars (Num 28–29 and Lev 23). And when finished she presented what was then, and still is, a maverick conclusion: the calendar in Jubilees was identical to the calendar as contained within the priestly writings of the Pentateuch, as well as other books of the HB.<sup>684</sup>

When the Dead Sea Scrolls were unearthed around Qumran, some preliminary readers emerged and were very similar to both Jubilees and Jaubert's perspective of the priestly calendar in the HB. Thus, these readings seemed to support Jaubert's assertion that the priestly calendar in the HB was a 364-day year. She concluded that these Qumranic 364-day year calendars had very early origins, saying that they went back to the first few centuries after the restoration of the

---

<sup>681</sup> See Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 42. One Qumran fragment refers to 1 Enoch explicitly: 4Q252 ii 3. George Brooke observed that this is the only non-reconstructed reference to a 364-day year. See Brooke, "4QCommentaries on Genesis A and Genesis D," in *Qumran Cave 4, XVII, Parabolical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G.J. Brooke, et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 2003), 198–199. The Qumran texts that reflect a 364-day year: 1Q32; 1Q34; 4QMMT; 4QShirShabb; 4Q252 frag. iii.3; 4Q317–30; 4Q365; 4Q559; 6Q17; 11QTemple; 11QPs<sup>a</sup> Dav Comp 27.6.

<sup>682</sup> For discussion, see VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, JSJSup. 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 81–104; and M.G. Abegg, "The Calendar at Qumran," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five, The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Vol. 1, Theory of Israel* (ed. Jacob Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck; HdO 1/56; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 145–71, esp. 150.

<sup>683</sup> See Annie Jaubert, *La date de la Cène: calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*, (Paris: Gabalda, 1957). Though Jaubert's focus was on determining the date of the Last Supper, her book brought together two previous works that focused on Second Temple Jewish calendrical reckonings. See "Calendrier des Jubilés: origines," "La date de la dernière Cène," *RHR* 146 (1954): 140–73; "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine," *VT* 7 (1957): 35–61. See also, Stéphane Saulnier, *Calendrical Variations in Second Temple Judaism: New Perspectives on the 'Date of the Last Supper' Debate*, (SJSJ 159, Leiden: Brill, 2012), 19–63.

<sup>684</sup> Saulnier, *Calendrical Variations in Second Temple Judaism*, 19–30.

Jerusalem Temple, and the luni-solar calendar which was to be later adopted by Rabbinic Judaism gradually supplanted the older sabbatical calendar under Hellenistic influence.<sup>685</sup>

The main point of contention against Jaubert's theory is voiced by Ben Dov: "there exists no 'positive proof' for the existence of a 364-day calendar in Judah before it appears in the *Astronomical Book*."<sup>686</sup> Guillaume notes that this view of a sectarian calendar requires understanding that all the biblical dates that avoid activity on the Sabbath day were added or modified during the third century BCE. This implies that a peripheral group, or a group without a lot of clout, as they are peripheral and not central, re-dated events in the entire Pentateuch for the purpose of conforming all biblical events to their desired reckoning of time.<sup>687</sup> Instead, Guillaume argues that "It is preferable to understand the dates of the Pentateuch as original." Thus, all the dates that fit the sabbatical calendar represent the pentateuchal redactor's chronological system.<sup>688</sup>

He elaborates on his theory, arguing that this calendar system "was modified when the dominant group imposed a calendar reform which replaced the sabbatical calendar with the Babylonian calendar, either during the Seleucid era, or already during the reign of Atraxerxes II

---

<sup>685</sup> Ibid., 28.

<sup>686</sup> Ben-Dov, "The 364-Day Year," 77. He adds earlier, "Inasmuch as Jaubert's argument with regard to the dates in the Pentateuch rests on a rather equivocal statistic analysis of her database, it is impossible to determine whether her conclusions are valid. It would be fair to say that they are possible but not necessary."

<sup>687</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 43.

<sup>688</sup> Ibid. Guillaume ascribes this to Pg. For argument, and one that is basically the exact reverse of how Guillaume argues this point, see Ben-Dov, "The 364-Day Year," 77. Jonathon Ben-Dov argues: "If something could be learned from the general history of the early Hellenistic period, it is that small kingdoms in the Levant usually practiced the luni-solar calendar of Babylonia, the Persian Empire, and the Seleucids, with minor modifications. It is hard to conceive that the luni-solar calendar was only introduced in Jerusalem in the second-century BC."

(404–358 BCE).”<sup>689</sup> Thus, Jubilees “is defending the traditional scriptural calendar rather than an innovative one.”<sup>690</sup>

As mentioned, one of the main contentions against this hypothesis is that there is no evidence of a 364-day year or sabbatical calendar prior to the middle of the third century BCE. However, the 364-day year is attested around the beginning of the first millennium BCE in the Assyrian treatise MUL.APIN.<sup>691</sup> The earliest copy of this text dates to the seventh-century BCE. Wayne Horowitz concludes, “Thus, it remains my position that the mean lunar/stellar year of 364 days was known to Ancient Mesopotamian astronomers no later than the 7th century, and that this Mesopotamian year is the ultimate source for the 364 day year in later Babylonian and Jewish sources.”<sup>692</sup> Based on this, Guillaume concludes that “there is no need to wait until the third century BCE for its [364 day year] appearance in biblical texts. It could have reached Palestine as early as the Western Assyrian campaigns of the Sargonid kings.”<sup>693</sup> This position is supported by Shemaryahu Talmon<sup>694</sup> and James VanderKam<sup>695</sup> and is nothing new, being at least a century old.<sup>696</sup>

---

<sup>689</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 44. He adds that “Atraxerxes introduced a calendar reform celebrating the return of a sun-like Mitra and of Sin, two divinities which the Zoroastrianism of previous Persian rulers had suppressed.” See also, Saulnier, 45–50.

<sup>690</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>691</sup> See H. Hunger and D. Pingree, MUL.APIN, an Astronomical Compendium in Cuneiform (*AFOB* 24; Horn: F. Bergen & Söhne, 1989). See also Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 44–45.

<sup>692</sup> Wayne Horowitz, “The 364 Day Year in Mesopotamia, Again,” in *NABU* 49 (1998): 49–51.

<sup>693</sup> Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 44.

<sup>694</sup> Talmon argues that the 364-day calendar is in mind within the biblical era. See, “Qumran Studies: Past, Present and Future,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 1–31, esp. 28.

<sup>695</sup> VanderKam narrows the biblical era to the early centuries of the Second Temple period. See “The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert’s Hypotheses,” in *CBQ* 41:3 (1979): 103.

<sup>696</sup> See B.W. Bacon, “Calendars of Enoch and Jubilees,” *Hebraica* 8 (1891–92): 79–88.

This means that at some point the Babylonian lunar-oriented calendar was *reintroduced* in Jerusalem, replacing the sabbatical calendar. This replacement or change in calendar systems is the conflict that the book of Jubilees and many writings from Qumran engage with.<sup>697</sup>

“Measuring units of time was not simply a matter of convenience; rather, it was a moral issue involving obedience to divine revelation about the nature of reality and the laws by which the world operated.”<sup>698</sup>

### 6.7. Conclusions

The scholarly consensus for generations has been that Gen 1 is P. This consensus is based on the aforementioned lexical connections between Gen 1 and Priestly literature (i.e. use of ,בדל, מועד, מין, and שבת). However, not only is this lexical connectivity stronger in H, it would almost not even be considered if H and P were separated. For example, the lexical evidence for ,שבת, מועד, and בדל is stronger in H than it is in P.<sup>699</sup> The main concentration of occurrences of these terms are in the HC, not outside of it. Thus, if the HC were considered distinct from the rest of P, scholars may not attribute it to P so confidently. In fact, one could say that Gen 1 is P only if, by P, one means P + H.

It is important to separate P and H from one another. Granted, one should not venture deep down paths of conjecture and theory. Scholars need to work with real evidence. However,

---

<sup>697</sup> See Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 45. And see J.C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon*, 105–27.

<sup>698</sup> VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 13.

<sup>699</sup> Lexically speaking, the evidence for מין being priestly is weak. It is connected to Lev 11, but it is just as connected to Deut 14. No one would say it is connected to D because of the other evidence in Gen 1 that clearly make it connected to a priestly strand. For example, the Sabbath, which in D only shows up once.



the distinction between P and H is such that though both are priestly and are aligned with various mutual interests, they are not the same.

For one thing, the Sabbath is extremely important in H, as evidenced by the frequency of occurrences in the HC of the root שבת; whereas in P it is almost non-existent. And where it does occur, such as in Num 28, it is not recognizable as the same Sabbath that the HC speaks of. With the importance placed on calendars and the Sabbath in the HC, one could say that *time* is an essential part of H's ideology. Second, and speaking of time, H's calendar in Lev 23 is a counter-memory to P's calendar in Num 28–29. With the importance that calendars have in the construction of a community's identity, the presence of two priestly calendars logically suggests that there are two distinct priestly groups.

Genesis 1 serves as an aetiology for dietary legislation, Israel's calendar, and the Sabbath. And it is this aetiological aspect of Gen 1 that suggests the author's purpose. Genesis 2–3, for example, does not introduce these concepts, all three of which are important to H. First for dietary (kosher) laws, H is involved in the redaction of Lev 11; and moreover, Lev 20:25 uses the priestly term כָּלֵל multiple times in the context of dietary and purity law. Second, H uses P's calendar in Num 28–29 and makes their own in Lev 23. The calendar in Lev 23 does not mention the sanctuary, and the Sabbath plays a prominent role in indicating when the festivals are to take place. And third, the Sabbath is the most prominent in the HC than in P. Of the Sabbath passages outside of the HC, the one in Num 28 is quite different compared to the rest. This leads to the conclusion that there are two distinct versions of the Sabbath in priestly circles.

Thus, by introducing these three aspects in the beginning, not only are their origins explained, but their origins are connected to YHWH himself. This provides a certain level of

authority and legitimacy to H's dietary laws, H's calendar over P's calendar, and, of course, the Sabbath with the Temple. All together, these three things constitute essential ethnic markers of Israelite identity, especially in an exilic context. All three are ethnic markers that do not require a temple. Genesis 1 is a countermemory of creation for the purpose of establishing Lev 11's dietary laws, H's calendar over P's and the Sabbath to a level parallel to the recently lost temple. Thus, Gen 1 is a countermemory that benefits H much more than it does for P.

## CONCLUSION

The essential question that began this investigation into the memory of Gen 1 was why a group added it to an already existing memory of creation. Subsequently, it was shown throughout this thesis that Gen 1 was added to be a countermemory, a deliberate recasting of Israel's memory of the past so as to shift the focus away from sacred space and toward sacred time. This is why Gen 1 is structurally concerned more with time than it is with space; this is why it culminates with a Sabbath aetiology rather than a temple aetiology. And because Gen 1 is so focused on time, as the Sabbath aetiology on day 7 and the calendar aetiology on day 4 both demonstrate, it follows that the group who added Gen 1 would also be focused on time. It was determined to be such a group. It was shown to have the motivation to add Gen 1 as well as the one that would have benefitted the most from Gen 1's inclusion in the Pentateuch.

Chapter 1 demonstrated what a cultural memory is and what a countermemory is. A cultural memory is a shared authoritative version of the past that was *formed by* the group's present concerns, needs, and aspirations, as well as *formative for* their group identity. And a countermemory is a deliberate recasting of a group's (cultural) memory of the past. This further demonstrated the versatility of cultural memory to both import various cross-disciplinary methods and implement them together toward a common goal.

Chapter 2 provided a close reading of Gen 1. This close reading demonstrated that Gen 1 was focused on temporal matters. For example, the first, fourth, and seventh days are all concerned with time, and together they all contribute to overcoming the primordial condition of darkness, which culminates with the seventh (Sabbath) day where there is no darkness at all (unlike the previous six days). Thus, the Sabbath was shown to be the *raison d'être* for Gen 1. Therefore, in drawing a comparison between Gen 1 and typical ANE creation myths in subsequent chapters, Gen 1's unique focus on time is in stark contrast to typical ANE creation myths. In other words, Gen 1, as compared to other creation myths, shifts the focus away from sacred space toward sacred time.

Chapter 3 picked up on the uniqueness of Gen 1 as a creation myth focused on time and compared it with Gen 2 in order to show two things. First, it was shown that Gen 1 was deliberately added to Gen 2 so as to become part of Israel's cultural memory of creation. And second, it was shown that Gen 1 was added because Gen 2 was deemed incomplete and inadequate as Israel's memory of creation for three aetiological reasons: Gen 2 does not adequately prepare the audience for the dietary prescriptions in Lev 11, it is incomplete in that it does not establish a calendar specific to Israel or YHWH, and it does not have a Sabbath aetiology. These two things demonstrated that Gen 1 was deliberately added in order to alter or revise Israel's memory of creation; therefore, Gen 1 was shown to be a countermemory.

Chapter 4 continued to investigate why Gen 1 was added as a countermemory by focusing on two additional aspects: (1) how Gen 1 was a countermemory to memories of

creation outside the Pentateuch, such as Psalms 74:12–17 and 104, and especially *Enuma Elish*; and (2) how Gen 1 communicated its countermemory.

Just as chapter 3 was a comparative reading of Gen 1 with Gen 2, chapter 4 expanded to include other ANE creation myths, such as biblical ones like Psalms 74 and 104, as well as non-biblical ones like *Enuma Elish*. This comparative reading demonstrated that the author both intentionally imitated the genre of creation myth to create an expectation in the audience for a Temple. Instead of temple, however, the audience heard Sabbath. Thus, the Sabbath is placed in the perfect spot to have the audience equate the temple with the Sabbath.

Chapters 5 and 6 were both concerned with identifying the group responsible for this countermemory. Which group would have been motivated to add Gen 1? Chapter 5 focused on the narrative perspective of Gen 1, that is, how Gen 1 fitted into the wider P narrative that spans the entire Pentateuch. Many scholars argue that Gen 1 cannot be anything other than P, because it is indispensable to P's master narrative as the beginning of its narrative. However, it was demonstrated that P does not require Gen 1 as its narrative beginning since it already has Gen 5:1–3 as its beginning. Additionally, it was shown that Gen 1 is characteristically more H-like narratively speaking than it is P-like. For these narrative reasons, Gen 1 ought to be ascribed to H, not P.

Chapter 6 continued, zooming the focus in from the broad narrative level of the Pentateuch to the comparably minute lexical level. It has been argued that Gen 1 is P due to particular lexemes and phrases. These lexemes happen to parallel the three aetiological reasons why Gen 1 was added to Gen 2, as discussed in chapter 3. First, there are lexemes

that connect Gen 1 to the dietary law and purity code in Lev 11. Thus, it was demonstrated that H redacted Lev 11, and that H was responsible for its final form. Second, there was lexical evidence that connects the fourth day's calendar aetiology to a priestly calendar, either P's Num 28–29 or H's Lev 23. Thus, the two calendars were compared and it was demonstrated that Lev 23 used P's calendar in Num 28–29 in order to construct its own, and that Gen 1 is much more suited as an aetiology for Lev 23 than it is for Num 28–29. Third, it was shown that Gen 1 is lexically connected to H due to the presence of the Sabbath. Though scholarship generally assigns Gen 1 to P because of the Sabbath, it was demonstrated that H, especially within their HC, focuses on the Sabbath much more than any other pentateuchal group. In fact, P rarely focuses on the Sabbath.

This was taken a step further and every Sabbath interpolation or passage in the Pentateuch was examined. It was demonstrated that all the Sabbath pericope in the Pentateuch except one is likely H, or at the very least redacted by H. Consequently, Gen 1 ought to be ascribed to H.

Altogether, these chapters demonstrate the original thesis statement: Gen 1 was intentionally added by H, not P, to the very beginning of the Pentateuch as a countermemory. The purpose of this countermemory has been shown to be for bringing about a shift in focus from sacred space to sacred time. The microcosm of which is Gen 1's shift from the Temple to the Sabbath; thus presenting the Sabbath as a sanctuary in time.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, M.G. "The Calendar at Qumran." Pages 145-71 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five, The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Vol. 1, Theory of Israel*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck. HdO 1/56. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Amit, Yairah. *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays in Retrospect*. Translated by Betty Sigler Rozen. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 2012.
- . *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Andreasen, N.E. *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation, SBLDS 7*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972.
- Arnold, Bill T. "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative (Gen 6:9–9:29)." Pages 13-40 in *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold, Nancy L. Erickson, and John H. Walton. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- . "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble." Pages 331-43 in *Let us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Iain Provan and Mark J. Boda. VTSup, 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . *Genesis. NCBC*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . *Who Were the Babylonians? Society of Biblical Literature Archaeology and Biblical Studies, 10*. Atlanta: SBL, 2004.
- Assaf, A. Abou, Pierre Bordreuil, and Alan R. Millard. *La statue de Tel Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne. Etudes assyriologiques; Cahiers 10*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1982.
- Assmann, Jan. "Exodus and Memory." Pages 3-15 in *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience. QMHSS*. Edited by Thomas E. Levy, Thomas Schneider, and William H.C. Propp. New York: Springer, 2015.

- . *The Price of Monotheism*. Translated by Robert Savage. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- . “Communicative and Cultural Memory.” Pages 109-118 in *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Edited by Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning. New York: de Gruyter, 2008.
- . *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- . *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- . *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Bacon, B.W. “Calendars of Enoch and Jubilees.” *Hebraica* 8 (1891–92): 79–88.
- Baden, Joel S. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- . *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.” In *ZAW* 122: 4 (2010): 491-504.
- . “Identifying the Original Stratum of P: Theoretical and Practical Considerations.” Pages 13-29 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- . “A Narrative Pattern and Its Role in Source Criticism.” In *HS* (2008): 41-54.
- Bar-On, Shimon. “The Festival Calendars in Exodus xxiii 14–19 and xxxiv 18–26.” In *VT* 48:2 (April 1998): 161–195.
- Barr, James. *History and Ideology in the Old Testament: Biblical Studies at the End of the Millennium. The Hensley Henson Lectures for 1997 Delivered to the University of Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Barton, John. “Redaction Criticism.” In *ABD*: 6:162-165.
- . “Source Criticism.” In *ABD*: 6:162-165.



- Beckwith, R.T. "The Significance of the 364-Day Calendar For the Old Testament Canon." Pages 54-66 in *Calendar, Chronology and Worship*. Edited by R.T. Beckwith. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "The 364-Day Year in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Pseudepigrapha." Pages 435-476 in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*. Edited by Menahem Kister. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2009 [Heb]. Accessed in english from online: [http://www.gardenoftruthandlies.com/app/download/760584187/DSS\\_-\\_1Q71Daniela+\(1\).pdf](http://www.gardenoftruthandlies.com/app/download/760584187/DSS_-_1Q71Daniela+(1).pdf)
- Bibb, B.B. *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*. London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Blum, Erhard. "Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings." Pages 31-44 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- . *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch, BZAW 189*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.
- Brettler, Marc. "Memory in Ancient Israel." Pages 1-17 in *Memory and History in Christianity and Judaism*. Edited by Michael Singer. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- . *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Brooke, George J. "4QCommentaries on Genesis A and Genesis D." In Qumran Cave 4, XVII, Parabolical Texts, Part 3. Edited by G.J. Brooke, et al.; *DJD 22*; Oxford: Clarendon, 2003.
- Brown, William P. *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- . *Structure, Role and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3*. SBLDS 132. Atlanta: SBL, 1992.
- Broyles, Craig. *Psalms. NIBC*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "The Book of Exodus." NIB 1 (1994): 675-981.
- . *Genesis. INT*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

- 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 Press, 1996.
- Cassuto, Umberto. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967.
- . *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. 2 Vols.* Trans. I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961, 1964.
- Chavel, Simeon. "Numbers 15:32–36: A Microcosm of the Living Priesthood and Its Literary Production." Pages 45-55 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and the Bible*. CBQMS 26. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994.
- Coats, George W. *Genesis, with an Introduction to Narrative Literature. FOTL I*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember: Themes in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1973.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford university Press, 2000.
- Davies, Philip. *Memories of Ancient Israel: An Introduction to Biblical History—Ancient and Modern*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Dillmann, August and V. Ryssel. *Exodus and Leviticus*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1897.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- . *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

———. “The Forbidden Animals in Leviticus.” In *JSOT* 59 (1993): 3–23.

Driver, S.R. *The Book of Genesis: with Introduction and Notes*, WC. London: Methuen, 1904.

Dundes, Alan. “Madness in Method Plus a Plea for Projective Inversion in Myth.” Pages 147–59 in *Myth and Method*. Edited by Laurie L. Patton and Wendy Doniger. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996.

Durham, John I. *Exodus*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.

Enns, Peter. “When Was Genesis Written and Why Does it Matter? A Brief Historical Study.” In *BioLogos Foundation*: [http://biologos.org/uploads/resources/enns\\_scholarly\\_essay3.pdf](http://biologos.org/uploads/resources/enns_scholarly_essay3.pdf).

Fentress, James and Chris Wickham. *Social Memory: New Perspectives on the Past*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992.

Firmage, Edwin. “Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda.” In *JSTOT* 82 (1999): 97–114.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Myth and Rabbinic Mythmaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Fleming, Daniel E. *The Legacy of Judah in Israel's Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

———. “A Break in the Line: Reconsidering the Bible's Diverse Festival Calendars.” *RB* 106 (1999): 161–74.

Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault*. Edited by D.F. Bouchard. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Friedman, Richard E. “Torah (Pentateuch).” In *ABD* 6:605–22.

Fretheim, T.E. *Exodus. INT*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1991.

Funkenstein, Amos. *Perceptions of Jewish History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Gallager, Catherine and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

- Garr, W. Randall. "'Image' and 'Likeness' in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh." In *Israel Exploration Journal* (2000): 227-234.
- Geertz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." Pages 3-30 in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- George, Andrew R. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Gluska, Isaac. "Akkadian Influences on the book of Ezekiel." Pages 718-37 in *An Experienced Scribe who Neglects Nothing: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*. Edited by Y. Sefati, et al. Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2005.
- Graf, Karl H. *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des alten Testaments. Zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: Weigel, 1866.
- Green, Arthur. "Sabbath as Temple: Some Thoughts on Space and Time in Judaism." Pages 287-305 in *Go and Study—Essays in Honor of Alfred Jospe*. Edited by R. Jospe and S. Fishman. Washington, D.C.: B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, 1980.
- Greenstein, Edward L. "God's Golem: The Creation of the Human in Genesis 2." Pages 219-40 in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition, JSOT 319*. Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow and Yair Hoffman. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Guillaume, Philippe. *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18*. New York: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Edited and Translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . *The Collective Memory*. Introduction by Mary Douglas. New York: Harper & Row Colophon Books, 1980.
- Hallo, William W., ed. *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World. Vol. 1 of The Context of Scripture*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "New Moons and Sabbaths." *HUCA* 48 (1977): 1–18.

- Halpern, Baruch. *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Hamilton, Victor. *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Haran, Menahem. *The Biblical Collection. Its Consolidation to the End of the Second Temple Times and Changes of Form to the End of the Middle Ages*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004. [in Hebrew]
- . *Temples and Temple Service*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Hartly, J. E. *Leviticus*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word, 1992.
- Heidel, Alexander. *The Babylonian Genesis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Hendel, Ronald. "The Exodus as Cultural Memory: Egyptian Bondage and the Song of the Sea, in Israel's Exodus. Pages 65-77 in *Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*. Edited by T. E. Levy, T. Schneider, and W. H. C. Propp. New York: Springer, 2014.
- . "Exodus and the Poetics of Memory." Pages 87-97 in *Reading a Tendentious Bible Essays in Honor of Robert B. Coote*. Edited by Marvin L. Chaney, Uriah Y. Kim, Annette Schellenberg. Hebrew Bible Monographs, 66. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014.
- . "Historical Context." Pages 51-81 in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by C. A. Evans, J. N. Lohr, and D. L. Petersen. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "Culture, Memory, and History: Reflections on Method in Biblical Studies." Pages 250-61 in *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism*. Edited by Thomas Levy. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2010.
- . "Cultural Memory." Pages 28-46 in *Reading Genesis: Ten Methods*. Edited by Ron Hendel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . "Is the 'J' Primeval Narrative an Independent Composition? A Critique of Crüsemann's 'Die Eigenständigkeit der Urgeschichte.'" Pages 181-205 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid, and B. J. Schwartz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . "The Archaeology of Memory: King Solomon, Chronology, and Biblical Representation." Pages 219-30 in *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel in Honor of William G. Dever*. Edited by S. Gitin, J. E. Wright, and J. P. Dessel. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

- . "Genesis 1-11 and Its Mesopotamian Problem." Pages 23-36 in *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*. Edited by E. Gruen. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- . *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . "The Exodus in Biblical Memory." *JBL* 120 (2001): 601-22.
- Heschel, Abraham J. *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1951.
- Hiebert, Robert. "Introduction and Translation: Genesis." In *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Horowitz, Wayne. *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography. Mesopotamian Civilizations 8*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1998.
- . "The 364 Day Year in Mesopotamia, Again." In *NABU* 49 (1998): 49-51.
- Hunger, H. and D. Pingree. *MUL.APIN, an Astronomical Compendium in Cuneiform. AfOB 24*. Horn: F. Bergen & Söhne, 1989.
- Jaubert, Annie. *La date de la Cène: calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne*. Paris: Gabalda, 1957.
- . "La date de la dernière Cène," *RHR* 146 (1954): 140-73.
- . "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine," *VT* 7 (1957): 35-61.
- Joosten, Jan. "Covenant Theology in the Holiness Code." In *ZABR* 4 (1998): 145-64.
- . *People and Land in the Holiness Code. VTSup 67*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Keel, Othmar. *Goddesses and Trees: Ancient Near Eastern and Yahweh: Ancient Near Eastern Art and the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Translated by Timothy J. Hallett. New York: Crossroad, 1985.

- Kirk, Alan. "Social and Cultural Memory." Pages 1-24 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Alan Kirk. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- Kirk, Geoffrey S. *The Nature of Greek Myths*. London: Penguin, 1974.
- Knight, Douglas A. "Tradition History." In ABD 6:633-38.
- Krüger, Thomas. "Genesis 1:1–2:3 and the Development of the Pentateuch." Pages 125-38 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Kuenen, A. "An Historical-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch." Tr., London, 1886. Luther, B., *Die Personlichkeit des Jahvisten*. Meyer, qv: 105-173.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Divine Symphony: The Bible's Many Voices*. Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 2010.
- . *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- . "The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals." *HUCA* (1987): 65-117.
- Kohn, Lisa Levitt. *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*. JSOT Sup. 358. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Lambert, Wilfred G. "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation." in *Keilschriftliche Literaturen, BBVO 6* (1986): 55-60.
- . "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," In *JTS 16.2* (1965): 287-300.
- Levine, Baruch. *Numbers*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 4-4a. New York: Doubleday, 1993-2000.
- . *Leviticus. The JPS Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1989.
- Levinson, Bernard M. "A Post-Priestly Harmonization in the Flood Narrative." Pages 113-23 in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles*. Edited by Federico Giuntoli and Konrad Schmid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- . "Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel." In *BibInt 18* (2010): 481–83.
- Machinist, Peter. "Mesopotamian Imperialism and Israelite Religion: A Case Study from the Second Isaiah." Pages 237-64 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past:*

- Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age Through Roman Palestina*. Edited by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- . “Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah.” In *JAOS* 103 (1983): 719–37.
- Mattingly, Gerald L. “The Pious Sufferer: Mesopotamia's Traditional Theodicy and Job's Counselors.” Pages 305–348 in *The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature*. Edited by W.W. Hallo, et al. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 8. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1990.
- Meshel, Naphtali. “P1, P2, P3, and H. Purity, Prohibition, and the Puzzling History of Leviticus 11.” In *HUCA* 81 (2010): 1–15.
- Meyer, Esias E. “People and Land in the Holiness Code: Who is YHWH’s Favourite?” *OTE* 28:2 (2015): 433–50.
- . “Rituals and Social Capital in the Book of Leviticus? An Attempt at an Interdisciplinary Discussion.” In *NGTT* 54: 3&4 (2013): 263–75.
- . “From Cult to Community: The Two Halves of Leviticus.” In *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34:2 (2013): 1–7.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N.V. *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2–3*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Milgrom, Jacob. “Covenants: The Sinaitic and Patriarchal Covenants in the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–27).” Pages 91–102 in *Sefer Moshe*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- . “H<sub>R</sub> 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: *Formation and Interpretation of OT Literature III*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003.
- . *Leviticus 23–27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. AB*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2000.
- . *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. AB*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2000.
- . “The Firstfruits Festivals of Grain and the Composition of Leviticus 23:9–12.” Pages 81–90 in *Tehillah Le-Moshe*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.



- . *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. AB.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1991.
- . “Priestly (‘P’) Source.” In *ABD* 5:454-661.
- . “The Composition of Leviticus.” Pages 182–91 in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Gary A. Anderson and Saul M. Oylan. *JSOTSup* 125. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- . *Numbers. The JPS Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.
- Nagy, Gregory. “Can Myth be Saved?” Pages 240-48 in *Myth: A New Symposium*. Edited by G. Schrempf and W. Hansen. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Newsom, Carol. “Selective Recall and Ghost Memories: Two Aspects of Cultural Memory in the Hebrew Bible.” Pages 41-56 in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Edited by Tom Thatcher. SemeiaSt 78. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- Nihan, Christophe. “The Priestly Covenant: Its Reinterpretations, and the Composition of ‘P’.” Pages 87–134 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- . “Israel’s Festival Calendars in Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28-29 and the Formation of Priestly Literature.” Pages 177-231 in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*. Edited by Thomas Römer. *BETL* 215. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- . *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch. A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. FAT 2. Reihe, 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- . “The Holiness Code Between D and P. Some Comments on the Function and Significance of Leviticus 17-26 in the Composition of the Torah.” Pages 81-122 in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. Edited by Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated by Bernhard W. Anderson. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Olick, Jeffrey., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2011.
- Otto, Eckart. “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 Debate*

- and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- Olyan, Saul M. "Exodus 31:12–17: The Sabbath According to H, or the Sabbath According to P and H?" In *JBL* 124:2 (Summer, 2005): 201–209.
- Pardee, Dennis. *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. Edited by Theodore J. Lewis. SBLWAW 10. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2002.
- Paul, Shalom. "Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions." In *JAOS* 88 (1968): 180–86.
- Powell, Mark A. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative, Volume 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Rochberg, Francesca. *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Römer, Thomas. "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document." Pages 157–74 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. ATANT 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- Sandoe, Kent, and Lorne Olfman. "Anticipating the Mnemonic Shift: Organizational Remembering and Forgetting in 2001," in *ICS 1992 Proceedings*. Paper 53, 1992.
- Sarna, Nahum. *Genesis: JPS Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: JPS, 1989.
- Sasson, Jack. "Time ... to Begin." Pages 183–94 in *'Sha'arei Talmon': Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by M. Fishbane and E. Tov. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Saulnier, Stéphane. *Calendrical Variations in Second Temple Judaism: New Perspectives on the 'Date of the Last Supper' Debate*. *SJSJ* 159. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Schwartz, Barry. "Where There's Smoke, There's Fire: Memory and History." Pages 7–37 in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwarz*. SemeiaSt 78. Edited by Tom Thatcher. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- . *Abraham Lincoln in the Post-Heroic Era: History and Memory in the Late Twentieth Century*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- . "History, Commemoration, and Belief: Abraham Lincoln in American Memory, 1945–2001" (Barry Schwartz and Howard Schuman), *ASR*, 70 (2005): 183–203.

- . *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- . “Memory as a Cultural System: Abraham Lincoln in World War II.” In *ASR*, 61 (1996): 908-927.
- Schwartz, Baruch J. “Sabbath in Torah Sources.” Pages 1-14. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, San Diego, CA, November 19, 2007. Cited June 15, 2014. Online: <http://www.biblicallaw.net/2007/schwartz.pdf>.
- Schudson, Michael. “Dynamics of Distortion in Collective Memory.” Pages 346-78 in *Memory Distortion: How the Minds, Brains, and Societies Reconstruct the Past*. Edited by D.L. Schacter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Segal, Robert A. *Myth: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Smith, Anthony. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1988.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. “Religion Up and Down, Out and In.” Pages 1-10 in *Sacred Time, Sacred Place: Archeology and the Religion of Israel*. Edited by Barry M. Gittlen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002.
- Smith, Mark S. “Is Genesis 1 a Creation Myth?: Yes and No.” Pages 71-102 in *Myth and Scripture: Contemporary Perspectives on Religion, Language, and Imagination*. Edited by Dexter E. Callender. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- . *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.
- . *Memoirs of God: History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- . “Remembering God: Collective Memory in Israelite Religion.” *CBQ* 64 (2002): 631-51.
- Sommer, Benjamin D. “Conflicting Constructions of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle.” In *BibInt* 9:1 (2001): 41-63.
- . “The Babylonian Akitu Festival: Rectifying the King or Renewing the Cosmos?” In *JANES* 27 (2000): 81-95.
- . *A Prophet reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

- Soulen, Richard N. and R. Kendall Soulen. *Handbook of Biblical Criticism 3rd edition*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Sparks, Kenton L. "Enūma Elish and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism." In *JBL* 126, no. 4 (2007): 625-648.
- Speiser, Ephraim A. *Genesis. AB*. New York: Doubleday, 1964.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. "The Composition of Exodus 31:12–17 and 35:1–3 and the Question of Method in Identifying Priestly Strata in the Torah." Pages 175-96 in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond. SBLRBS*. Edited by Roy E. Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2014.
- . "Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction: Leviticus 26 as a Test Case." Pages 369–86 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research. FAT 78*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath Law: Exodus 31:12–17 and 35:1–3." *JHS* 11 (2011): Article 15, pp. 2-20.
- . "The Sabbath of the Land in the Holiness Legislation: Combining Priestly and Non-Priestly Perspectives." In *CBQ* 73 (2011): 239–50.
- . "The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplementation, and Replacement." Pages 187–204 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. *ATANT* 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- . *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation. FAT 52*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "Jerusalem as Eden." *BAR* 26: 3 (May/June 2000): 36-47.
- Stavropoulou, Francesca. "Exploring the Garden of Uzza: Death, Burial and Ideologies of Kingship." In *Biblical* 87:1 (2006): 1-21.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Qumran Studies: Past, Present and Future." In *JQR* 85 (1994): 1–31
- . "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert." Pages 162-99 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. *ScrHier* 4. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965.

- Trible, Phyllis. *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1978.
- Tsevat, Matitiah. *The Meaning of the Book of Job and other Biblical Studies: Essays on the Literature and Religion of the Hebrew Bible*. Ktav Publishing House, 1980.
- Tsumara, David. *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation*. JSOTSup 83. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- VanderKam, James C. "Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In NEA 63: 3 (2000): 164-67.
- . *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. JSJSup. 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1999.
- . "The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses." In CBQ 41:3 (1979): 390-411.
- Veyne, Paul. *Writing History: Essay on Epistemology*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984.
- Vogels, Walter. "The Cultic and Civil Calendars of the Fourth Day of Creation (Gen 1,14b)." In SJOT 11 (1997): 163–80.
- Von Hendy, Andrew. *The Modern Construction of Myth*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Wacholder, B.Z. and S. Wacholder. "Patterns of Biblical Dates and Qumran's Calendar: The Fallacy of Jaubert's Hypothesis." In HUCA 66 (1995): 1–40.
- Walton, John H. *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- . *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010.
- . *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Weimar, Peter. *Studien zur Priesterschrift*. Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, 2008.

- Weinfeld, Moshe. "God the Creator in Gen. 1 and in the Prophecy of Second Isaiah." In *Tarbiz* 37 (1968): 120–32.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. New York: Meridian Books, 1957. Reprint of *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and A. Enslin, with preface by W. Robertson Smith. Edinburgh: Black, 1885. Translation of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 2nd ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1883.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*. Translated by J. J. Scullion. A Continental Commentary. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Whitekettle, Richard. "Where the Wild Things Are: Primary Level Taxa in Israelite Zoological Thought." In *JSOT* 93 (2001): 17–37.
- Wright, David P. "Holiness in Leviticus and Beyond. Differing Perspectives." In *Int* 53 (October 1999): 351–364.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- . "Social memories: Steps to a sociology of the past." *Qualitative Sociology* 19: 3 (1996): 283–299.
- Zerubavel, Yael. *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1995.
- Zetiv, Ziony. *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches*. New York: Continuum, 2001.