



BRILL

JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF JUDAISM 45 (2014) 471-492

Journal for
the Study of
Judaism
brill.com/jsj

Anchoring Revelations in the Authority of Sinai: A Comparison of the Rewritings of "Scripture" in *Jubilees* and in the P stratum of Exodus

Hans Debel

Postdoctoral Research Fellow of the FWO-Vlaanderen
Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven
St. Michielsstraat 4, box 3101, 3000 Leuven, Belgium
hans.debel@theo.kuleuven.be

Abstract

As a contribution to the on-going scholarly process of developing a new paradigm for the study of authoritative Scripture within Second Temple Judaism, this paper investigates the use of one particular authority-conferring strategy both within the Scriptural texts themselves and in a prominent example of "rewritten Scripture." After some introductory reflections on the notion of "Authoritative Scripture," it specifically explores how the tradition of the theophany at Sinai functions in the book of *Jubilees* and in the Priestly layer within the Pentateuch. As such, it also attempts to bring classical redaction criticism of the biblical texts into dialogue with the study of other Second Temple Jewish writings.

Keywords

P – *Jubilees* – Rewritten Scripture – Mosaic discourse – Sinai

* A preliminary version of this paper was presented during a symposium on the authoritative-ness of Scripture co-organized by the universities of Helsinki, Tartu, and Munich in the Fall of 2011. I am very grateful to the organizers and to Juha Pakkala in particular, for their kind invitation to contribute to their joint meeting, and I thank all the participants for their fruitful remarks in the course of the discussions. Likewise, I wish to express my appreciation for the productive suggestions made by the anonymous reviewers of this article.

The Bible is dead, long live “authoritative Scripture”! In the past few years, scholarly study of Second Temple Judaism and its literary traditions has witnessed an important shift in perspective: the notion of a formal canonization of a single text has been replaced by the idea of a canonical process in which a plurality of texts with various degrees of authority gradually evolved into a stable collection of immutable texts. For this reason, scholars increasingly prefer to speak of “authoritative Scripture(s)” when referring to the Second Temple Period rather than using the terms “Bible” and “biblical.”¹ Nevertheless, as Mladen Popović recently observed, “the notion of authoritative Scriptures plays an important part in the new paradigm, but it has not yet been sufficiently reflected upon and is in need of clarification.”² The analysis of specific examples seems indispensable in this regard, thus the main part of this paper will be focused on one particular authority-conferring strategy. First, however, some general remarks must be made on what exactly is implied in the notion of “authoritative Scripture,” since our understanding of it significantly influences its application to concrete texts.

1 What We Talk about when We Talk about “Authoritative Scripture”: Some Preliminary Reflections³

Most often, words are not just words: they do not simply help us to understand reality, they also shape our perception of it.⁴ Even if our subconscious presuppositions prevent us from attaining absolute objectivity, we must at least try to discover how preconceived notions influence our thinking, if indeed we hope that our discussions might be meaningful. Specifically with respect to “authori-

1 Cf. the oft-quoted dictum by Eugene Ulrich, “Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden, Brill, 1992), 23-41 at 32: “If we try to achieve a historical perspective on the text of the Bible, the first step is not to talk about a Bible.”

2 Mladen Popović, “Introducing Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1-17 at 1.

3 For this title, cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, “What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 531-32.

4 See Molly M. Zahn, “Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila; BZAW 419; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 93-119, esp. 93.

tative Scripture,” we should acknowledge the lasting influence of the outcome of the canonical process, i.e. the historical reality that eventually a single text became predominant for each book within a fixed collection or “canon.” Many discussions about authoritative writings in the Second Temple Period too quickly assume that all the books that ended up in this canon must have been on a “tenure track” towards gaining canonical status, with some of them taking a more advanced position than others, while a number of additional books fell off the track at some point or another. Clearly, certain books—particularly Genesis, Deuteronomy, and Isaiah—seem to have taken a more or less stable shape by the latter half of the Second Temple Period and were widely recognized as important for Israel’s religious identity (or were perhaps consciously promoted as such), but whenever we set off on a discussion as to which books were “in,” which were “out,” and which were still “uncertain,” we are in fact creating a pseudo-canon that we know did not exist.

In order to avoid such connotations, the terms “Bible” and “biblical” for the Second Temple Period have been widely discarded in favor of “Scripture” and “scriptural,” which more accurately reflect the use of the roots כָּתַב and γράφειν as an authoritative device.⁵ It does not suffice, however, to merely switch terms; it needs to be taken into account that our own understanding of Scripture as a (collection of) holy writing(s) does not necessarily coincide with that of the ancient Jews. For this reason, a distinction is sometimes made between the upper-case “Scripture” as synonymous to “Bible” and the lower-case “scripture” as a more general designation for “any text...considered sacred and authoritative.”⁶ At this point, a crucial question arises: was all “scripture” considered sacred, or may certain “scriptural” texts also have been authoritative but not sacred? After all, divine inspiration does not seem an absolute prerequisite for a text to possess normative importance. In its most basic sense, “scripture” refers to a writing’s *writtenness*, which may have been considered an indication of its importance but not necessarily of its sanctity.⁷ As Popović notes, “divine inspiration...often seems less important as a source of the authoritative character of these Scriptures than their presumed antiquity.”⁸

5 See Peter W. Flint, “The Shape of the ‘Bible’ at Qumran,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part Five: The Judaism of Qumran* (ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce D. Chilton; 2 vols.; HO 56; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:45–103, esp. 56–58.

6 See Zahn, “Talking about Rewritten Texts,” 97.

7 Comp., however, Hindy Najman, “The Symbolic Significance of Writing in Ancient Judaism,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; JSJSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

8 Popović, “Introducing,” 2.

An important observation, in this regard, is that authoritativeness did not necessarily imply textual immutability. While it may seem perfectly natural for us to assume that an authoritative text cannot be changed (or that only minor changes can be tolerated), no such link seems to have existed in the minds of Second Temple Jews, despite Josephus's assertion that nobody dared to add to, take away from, or alter the Jewish scriptures.⁹ The editors of the volume *Changes in Scripture* put it as follows:

The evidence we have challenges the ideal of the immutability of sacred and authoritative texts and reveals a reality of texts being changed, revised, and corrected in the course of their compilation and transmission. In some cases the development towards being an authoritative text seems to go hand in hand with the changes.¹⁰

In other words, the authoritativeness of a writing was not necessarily dependent upon its relative proximity to some generally accepted standard text, even if certain scribal circles may have been devising the idea of an immutable text.¹¹ At the same time, the room for change was not infinite: some form of collective memory seems to have created certain expectations and, in practice, put limits to the variance that could be tolerated in a text that represented an authoritative tradition. Although there seems to have been plenty of opportunity to introduce new elements within texts and to change their details, certain elements within the tradition could not be omitted, so that the only remaining option was to absorb and rework them in a way that suited one's purposes.

Furthermore, we must reckon with another closely related issue, namely, that no text was authoritative by itself but only in relation to a community who recognized it as authoritative. As Molly Zahn recently emphasized, questions of a text's production need to be separated from issues pertaining to its author-

9 *Ag. Ap.* 1.42. As various scholars have observed, Josephus's statement conflicts with his own practice in the *Antiquities*; see, e.g., Steve Mason, "Josephus and His Twenty-Two Book Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 110-27, esp. 119-21.

10 Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, "Introducing Changes in Scripture," in *Changes in Scripture*, 3-20 at 6.

11 See the "conservative" and "revisionist" scribal traditions as discussed by Sidnie White Crawford, "Understanding the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible: A New Proposal," in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Nóra Dávid et al.; FRLANT 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 60-68.

itative reception.¹² Nevertheless, the two issues of production and reception intersect when authors take pains to present their writings as a binding representation of a tradition to their readers. Strictly speaking, such authority-conferring strategies belong to the level of production and do not guarantee anything about the text's reception. Yet, they may have facilitated its recognition as authoritative because they offered readers a powerful tool to grant the new work an important and, indeed, authoritative place in the ongoing development of their identity. As such, the construction of authority appears as a multifaceted interplay between the text itself, its (intended and actual) audience(s), and the (literary and historical) context in which it was read.¹³

In order to contribute to this ongoing discussion of "authoritative Scripture," the present study investigates one particular authority-conferring strategy by which two different literary works became firmly anchored within the tradition they rework, namely by using the story of the theophany at Sinai—an element that calls for re-presentation in the Exodus tradition—as a steppingstone for their own accounts and legislation. By drawing attention to the book of *Jubilees*—commonly considered a prime example of "rewritten Scripture"¹⁴—and to the P stratum in Exodus—the only pillar of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis that has more or less stood its ground during the storms that have raged through Pentateuchal studies¹⁵—, this paper also intends to test the hypothesis that "redactional layers" in the biblical text and the works commonly referred to as "rewritten Scripture" represent different aspects of the same literary process.¹⁶

12 See Zahn, "Talking about Rewritten Texts," 116.

13 For a more elaborate discussion on authority as a "polyphonous affair," see George J. Brooke, "Authority and the Authoritativeness of Scripture: Some Clues from the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 25/100 (2012): 507-23.

14 See, e.g., the recent essay by Molly M. Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: University Press, 2010), 323-36.

15 For a survey of research, see, e.g., Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer, "Le Pentateuque en question: position du problème et brève histoire de la recherche," in *Le Pentateuque en question* (ed. de Pury and Römer; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1991), 9-82; cf. also Römer, "Le Pentateuque toujours en question: Bilan et perspectives après un quart de siècle de débat," in *Congress Volume: Basel 2001* (ed. André Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 343-74 and most recently Römer, "Zwischen Urkunden, Fragmenten und Ergänzungen: Zum Stand der Pentateuchforschung," *ZAW* 125 (2013): 2-24.

16 Compare the blurring of the boundaries advocated by George J. Brooke, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as*

2 The Theophany at Sinai as *Jubilees's* Revelatory Frame

As is well known, the book of *Jubilees*—which presents itself as a rehearsal of the events related in Genesis and the first half of Exodus, disclosed to Moses on Mt. Sinai—takes first rank among the apocryphal/pseudepigraphal texts that are likely to have enjoyed an authoritative status for some time among certain Second Temple Jews.¹⁷ In spite of the longstanding assumption that it constitutes the work of a single author, in recent years it has been called into question whether *Jubilees* is a coherent rewriting that relies on the text of the Pentateuch as it later became canonical.¹⁸ Michael Segal, in particular, has argued that the book cannot be considered a unity in view of certain contradictions, doublets, and tensions and should instead be regarded as a compound of different traditions which a redactor integrated within a new scope.¹⁹ More specifically, this redactor would have appended a series of legal passages

Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; vol. 4 of *The Bible as Book*; London: British Library, 2002), 36; and Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 13, who respectively introduce the notion of a “sliding scale” and a “spectrum.” See also my essay “Rewritten Bible, Variant Literary Editions and Original Text(s): Exploring the Implications of a Pluriform Outlook on the Scriptural Tradition,” in *Changes in Scripture*, 65–92, esp. 81–84.

- 17 See, e.g., James C. VanderKam, “Revealed Literature in the Second Temple Period,” in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible & Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 1–30; as well as his earlier study “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402. Florentino García Martínez, “Rethinking the Bible: Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and Beyond,” in Popović, *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, 19–36 at 31 refers to *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* as “the two best examples of rewritings . . . that we can ascertain were accepted as authoritative by certain groups.”
- 18 Note, however, that these recent theories of later additions and/or editorial layers in *Jubilees* are not without precedent; see the works mentioned by James C. VanderKam, “The Origins and Purpose of the *Book of Jubilees*,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 3–24, esp. 12–13; cf. VanderKam, “Recent Scholarship on the *Book of Jubilees*,” *CBR* 6 (2008): 405–31, esp. 410–16, which includes a detailed assessment of Segal’s theory.
- 19 See Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007); as well as Segal, “The Relationship between the Legal and Narrative Passages in *Jubilees*,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 203–28; and Segal, “The Composition of *Jubilees*,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 22–35.

to the rewritten patriarchal narratives which he encountered and imposed upon them a comprehensive chronological framework of *Jubilees* and weeks of years. James Kugel developed a slightly different theory accounting for the inconsistencies described by Segal, arguing that the original text of *Jubilees* has been modified by an "Interpolator" who inserted twenty-nine passages that stand out for their distinct terminology.²⁰ This "Interpolator" seems to have basically shared the original author's ideology and worldview, so Kugel argues, but he introduced the notion of the "Heavenly Tablets" in order to avoid the impression that certain practices spontaneously initiated by the patriarchs had later been institutionalized into divinely ordained laws.

Although Segal and Kugel are both convinced that *Jubilees* exhibits too many contradictions to be attributed to a single author, they disagree as to how the book reached its present shape. For Kugel, it had already acquired its most distinctive features before the insertions of the "Interpolator," whereas Segal opines that the redactor who incorporated different so-called "rewritten" narratives ought to be credited for these features. As such, both scholars also part company with respect to the prologue, which Segal attributes to the redactor and Kugel to the original author. Nevertheless, in both cases the prologue serves an important role in determining the scriptural setting of the book as a whole, of which the reader is regularly reminded through a series of scattered references to the Angel of the Presence's dictation to Moses, and through the closing of the circle in the final chapter, where reference is once more made to Moses' sojourn on the mountain.²¹ Whether these are to be laid at the door of *Jubilees*'s original author or that of a later redactor does not alter the fact that they locate the book at the momentous point in Israelite history when Moses went up Mount Sinai, where the glory of the Lord had taken residence in a cloud.

Particularly interesting, in this regard, is the relationship between *Jub.* 1:1-4 and *Exod* 19:1; 24:12, 15-18. In general, the opening verses of *Jubilees*'s first chapter follow the Exodus account of Moses' ascent very closely, although the relocation of the passage at the beginning of the book evidently necessitated

20 See James Kugel, "On the Interpolations in the *Book of Jubilees*," *RevQ* 24/94 (2009): 215-72, as well as his monograph *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation* (JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012); and specifically with respect to the Interpolator's motivation, his essay "The Figure of Moses in *Jubilees*," *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1 (2012): 77-92.

21 See, e.g., James C. VanderKam, "The Scriptural Setting of the Book of *Jubilees*," *DSD* 13 (2006): 61-72. A list of twenty-two direct or indirect reminders can be found in his monograph *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001), 24-25.

some slight modifications.²² In addition, two further changes merit attention. First, *Jubilees* leaves no doubt that only Moses acts as the people's mediator before God, as any reference to Aaron, Joshua, or the elders accompanying Moses on the mountain has been wiped out.²³ Second, the general chronological designation of the theophany in the third month after the Exodus (Exod 19:1) is turned into a specific date, the sixteenth of the month, thus locating Moses' ascent on the day that followed the Festival of Weeks, during which the ancestral covenant with the patriarchs had been renewed with all Israel.²⁴ Both changes indicate that the author or redactor of *Jubilees* did not simply copy these verses from Exodus but reworked them from his particular theological perspective and interest in chronological matters.

The close correspondence to the respective verses from Exodus seems to serve a clear purpose in terms of an authority-conferring device: it provides its readers with an evident and powerful means to anchor the book's distinctive practices and ideological framework within the story of Israel's glorious past.²⁵ As Hindy Najman has argued in her oft-quoted monograph *Seconding Sinai*, the book of *Jubilees* aims to transform rather than to replace an already authoritative scriptural tradition by providing it with a particular interpretative context.²⁶ James VanderKam has rightly pointed out, however, that *Jubilees* is not so much *seconding* Sinai but *initiating* Sinai, since the book presents itself as the only written text left from Moses' first stay on Mount Sinai after he smashed the stone tablets.²⁷ The relationship of *Jubilees* to its parent text is therefore

22 See the detailed study by Jacques van Ruiten, "The Rewriting of Exodus 24:12-18 in *Jubilees* 1:1-4," *BN* 79 (1995): 25-29.

23 The absence of Aaron, Joshua, and the elders may also have been inspired by a desire to harmonize the account of Exod 24 with Moses' second ascent of the mountain in Exod 34; cf. the suggestion by George J. Brooke, "Exegetical Strategies in *Jubilees* 1-2: New Light from 4QJubilees^a," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, 39-57 at 47, that *Jubilees* intended to present itself as the fruit of Moses' one and only stay on the mountain.

24 For a discussion, see particularly James C. VanderKam, "Studies on the Prologue and *Jubilees* 1," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000), 266-79, esp. 273-79.

25 Cf. John J. Collins, "Changing Scripture," in *Changes in Scripture*, 23-46 at 36, who notes that *Jubilees*'s authority "does depend on the setting at Sinai, and the reader's acceptance that a foundational revelatory event occurred there."

26 See Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 44-46.

27 Thus James C. VanderKam, "Moses Trumping Moses: Making the Book of *Jubilees*," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 25-44 at 31.

highly ambiguous: even if the book did not intend to physically replace the text that was being rewritten, it does seem to claim a higher authority on the functional level, at least at those points where it conflicts with the earlier text.²⁸ As such, a subtle interplay of authority may be observed in *Jubilees*: the authority of the written Torah is neither denied nor called into question, but it is employed in such a way as to encourage its readers to consider the interpretation of *Jubilees* as the correct one where necessary.

As a consequence, the revelation at Sinai may be considered an indispensable part of the book's authority-conferring strategy: the account is rewritten in such a way that readers may accept the book of *Jubilees* as a faithful representation of it, and at the same time recognize its higher authority where needed. In fact, the book's self-presentation as the written testimony of Moses' first sojourn at Sinai enhances the authority attached to Sinai as a revelatory event. At the same time, however, it should not go unnoticed that the significance of the Sinai event is subtly disqualified through the concept of the "Heavenly Tablets," whose existence makes Sinai appear as "merely a public proclamation of existing statutes."²⁹ Moreover, *Jubilees*'s rehearsal of the history of Israel's ancestors turns the observation of the covenant and its ritual expressions into a reiteration of what the patriarchs had already done in the past. In both respects, the book creates the impression that "the revelation at Mount Sinai did not count for much,"³⁰ whereas the authority of Sinai as a revelatory event was quintessential for its own claims to authority.

3 The Theophany at Sinai as P's Revelatory Frame

Although *Jubilees* is often set apart as a distinctive example of "rewritten Scripture," its rewriting of the Torah can hardly be considered unique in light of two centuries of historical-critical research. It is well known that nineteenth-century scholarship gradually developed a theory that considered the present Pentateuch—or, more precisely, the Hexateuch, since most scholars assumed that the sources continued in the book of Joshua³¹—as a

28 Cf., e.g., the reflections on the issue by Collins, "Changing Scripture," 36; VanderKam, "Moses Trumping Moses," 27-28; and Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," 330-31.

29 Kugel, "The Figure of Moses," 92.

30 Ibid., 92.

31 As aptly noted by Thomas Römer, "How Many Books (Teuchs): Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?" in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas

conflation of four originally independent sources. Whereas earlier literary critics like Hermann Hupfeld and Theodor Nöldeke had defended the priority of the so-called Priestly source as the *Grundschrift* of the Pentateuch, Karl Heinrich Graf and Abraham Kuenen firmly established a re-dating of P as the fourth and final source to be integrated into the developing text. In doing so they provided the final constitutive element for the classical formulation of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis in the work of Julius Wellhausen.³² Even though Martin Noth departed from earlier scholarship by separating the Tetrateuch from the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua (which he believed to belong to the Deuteronomistic History), he confirmed and elaborated upon Wellhausen's distinction between the three narrative sources J, E, and P in the books of Genesis to Numbers, thus further contributing to the success of the Documentary Hypothesis.³³ In fact, the theory was almost universally accepted among biblical scholars until the mid-seventies of the twentieth century, when a number of radical revisions were proposed that ultimately led to the abandonment of the Documentary Hypothesis in its classical form,³⁴ at

Römer, and Konrad Schmid; SBLAIL 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 25-42 at 29: "The idea that there was an original Hexateuch and not a Pentateuch is as old as the Documentary Hypothesis . . . [and it] arose because of the idea that the book of Joshua is the fitting conclusion to the narration that starts with the promise of the land in the book of Genesis, so that the end of J and E (and also P) should be preserved in Joshua." This preoccupation with the idea of a Hexateuch may readily be seen from the title of Julius Wellhausen's *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1899). Likewise, Abraham Kuenen, *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des ouden verbonds* (Leiden: Engels en zoon, 1887), 5-331 discusses the growth of the Hexateuch as a whole before proceeding to the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings.

32 For a summary of the work of these scholars, see, e.g., de Pury and Römer, "Le Pentateuque en question," 22-29; cf. also the relevant sections of John Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany* (London: SPCK, 1984).

33 At present, however, the thesis of a Deuteronomistic History encompassing Deuteronomy through Kings has been called into question and the idea of a Hexateuch is again gaining ground; see, e.g., Thomas Römer, "La fin de l'historiographie deutéronomiste et le retour de l'Hexateuque?" *TZ* 57 (2001): 269-80; cf. the section on *la renaissance de l'Hexateuque* in Römer, "Le Pentateuque toujours en question," 355-60. However, whereas earlier source critics believed that the sources J, E, and P originally continued into Joshua, the inclusion of the theme of the land is now considered a rather late creation for which a "Hexateuch redaction" is to be credited.

34 See, e.g., the survey by Ernest Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 95-195.

least among European scholars.³⁵ The ensuing discussions, however, mostly pertained to the *non*-Priestly portions of the Pentateuch, more specifically to the coherence of the *pre*-Priestly elements and to the presence of *post*-Priestly layers. The presence of a Priestly stratum characterized by a specific vocabulary and ideology is hardly ever called into question.³⁶ It is still considered a valuable point of departure for literary-critical research,³⁷ and even rose to the position of an Archimedean point.³⁸ Moreover, despite some attempts to redefine P as a redaction (i.e., an editorial supplement or *Bearbeitungsschicht* to pre-existent traditions),³⁹ the majority opinion still holds that an independent Priestly narrative or “source” (*Quelle*) once existed.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, the existence of P as a separate source does not imply that P arose in complete isolation: P’s dependence upon the pre-Priestly traditions is almost universally

- 35 However, it would also be too simple to state that, whereas the Documentary Hypothesis is still commonly accepted in North America and Israel, European scholarship completely rejects it; see particularly Konrad Schmid, “Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).
- 36 Cf., e.g., the comment by Thomas Römer, “The Exodus Narrative according to the Priestly Document,” in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ed. Sarah Shechtman and Joel S. Baden; ATANT 95; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 157-74 at 157-58: “the existence of ‘Priestly texts’ in the Pentateuch is probably with very few exceptions the most stable theory of pentateuchal research since Graf and Wellhausen.”
- 37 So Römer, “Le Pentateuque toujours en question,” 360.
- 38 So Reinhard G. Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. Jan Christian Gertz, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295-323 at 295.
- 39 See the seminal essay by Frank Moore Cross, “The Priestly Work,” in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 293-325. For further discussion and bibliography, see, e.g., Marc Vervenne, “The ‘P’ Tradition in the Pentateuch: Document and/or Redaction? The ‘Sea Narrative’ (Ex 13,17-14,31) as a Test Case,” in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989* (ed. Chris Brekelmans and Johan Lust; BETL 94; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 67-90 and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, “The So-Called ‘Priestly’ Layer in Exod 7:14-11:10: ‘Source’ and/or/nor ‘Redaction?’ ” *RB* 109 (2002): 481-511, esp. 482-99.
- 40 In the words of Schmid, “Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis?” 18: “in the current European discussion nearly everyone considers P a source document.”

taken for granted,⁴¹ so that P itself may be characterized—like the book of *Jubilees*—as a form of what is conveniently called “rewritten Scripture.”⁴²

Notwithstanding these points of convergence, an understanding of the nature of P as a whole has been seriously hampered by disagreement on the original end of P’s narrative base-text (P^G), which is probably the most controversial issue with respect to P in current scholarship. As the theme of land settlement was believed to have been of great importance to P, reconstructions of the Priestly narrative traditionally extended beyond the death of Moses into the book of Joshua. This position is still echoed in recent research, for example in David Carr’s statement that the Priestly source may have constituted “a complete counternarrative to the non-P Hexateuch to which it responded.”⁴³ Particularly influential in this regard is Joseph Blenkinsopp’s seminal study wherein he argues that P exhibits a triadic structure focused on the creation of the world, the construction of the sanctuary in the wilderness, and the occupation of the land.⁴⁴ Working along the same lines, albeit with a more limited view on the presence of P in Joshua,⁴⁵ Norbert Lohfink pointed out that the unusual verb כָּבַשׁ in Josh 18:1 creates a literary parenthesis vis-à-vis the

41 Cf., e.g., de Pury and Römer, “Le Pentateuque en question,” 71: “Tout le monde reconnaît que P connaît et réinterprète les textes présacerdotaux”; and Reinhard G. Kratz, “The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives*, 31–61 at 38: “the Priestly text from beginning to end cannot be understood without knowledge of the non-P material to which it refers.” See also the “practically universal claim” noted by Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (ABRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 188, who nevertheless disagrees with it.

42 See a programmatic suggestion by Kratz, “The Pentateuch in Current Research,” 37, on which I elaborated in my “Moving beyond the Deadlock of Rewritten Scripture Research: Composition and Reception, Once Again” (paper presented at the eighth meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Munich, 4 August 2013).

43 David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 296. See recently also Philippe Guillaume, *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18* (OTS 391; New York: T&T Clark, 2009).

44 Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 275–92.

45 More specifically, Lohfink believes that Josh 4:19, 5:10–12, 14:1–2, 18:1, and 19:51 originally constituted a brief appendix to P^G, which effectively ended with the death of Moses, whereas Blenkinsopp attributes the distribution of land to the tribes in Josh 18–19 in its entirety to P. In this regard, it may also be noted that John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 331–37, argues that the whole account of the distribution of the land in Josh 13–19 and 21 belongs to P, displaying a geographic precision that parallels P’s concern for chronological precision.

commandment to subdue the land in Gen 1:28.⁴⁶ Alternatively, there are scholars who have called into question the existence of a pre-Priestly Hexateuch that united a “proto-Genesis,” an early Moses tradition, and an early form of Deuteronomy. They point out a number of similar references to P’s creation account in Exod 39-40⁴⁷ and tend to consider the Priestly verses in Joshua as later *Fortschreibungen*, which consciously set off the Hexateuch as a separate literary unit.⁴⁸ In their opinion, the Priestly *Grundschrift* ended with the construction and dedication of the wilderness sanctuary, presumably when the glory of YHWH took residence in it in Exod 40,⁴⁹ or with the bestowal of authority upon the high priest, concluded by the prescriptions for the ceremony on the Day of Atonement in Lev 16.⁵⁰ Ultimately, the debate centres on the question whether P^G was solely interested in the establishment of Israel as a cultic community at Sinai (where the sacrificial cult was initiated), or also attached importance to the physical presence of the mobile sanctuary in the land.⁵¹ In other words, if indeed P continued until the occupation of the land, then this theme was clearly subordinate to the interest in cult and

-
- 46 See Norbert Lohfink, “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte,” in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977* (ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 189-225. He notes in “The Strata of the Pentateuch and the Question of War,” in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 173-226 at 200: “At this point, the last of the arcs drawn from the beginning has reached its end.”
- 47 See Konrad Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 148.
- 48 For a critical analysis of this as well as other arguments in favor of P extending into Joshua, see most recently Suzanne Boorer, “The Envisioning of the Land in the Priestly Material: Fulfilled Promise or Future Hope?” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch*, 99-125.
- 49 See particularly Thomas Pola, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von P⁸* (WMANT 70; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995).
- 50 So Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (FAT 2.25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 379-94. In a somewhat similar vein, scholars have also argued that P^G ended with the initiation of the sacrificial cult in Lev 9. For a survey of different positions with further references, see Erich Zenger, “Das priester(schrift)liche Werk (P),” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. Zenger et al.; 7th ed.; Studienbücher Theologie; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 156-75, esp. 164-66. David Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 112 has recently raised a further possibility, namely that the original end of P is simply lost. Cf. Jean-Louis Ska, “Le récit sacerdotal: Une ‘histoire sans fin?’ ” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 631-54.
- 51 As demonstrated by Lohfink, “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte,” 193-95, this question has also generated discussion in the past.

worship. In both cases, there is no doubt that the construction and inauguration of the sanctuary at Sinai present the climax of the entire Priestly Narrative.⁵²

In its present form, however, the actual Sinai pericope has been described as one of the most compositionally complicated literary units in the entire Pentateuch.⁵³ In particular, the accounts of the theophany in Exod 19 and of the closing of the covenant in Exod 24 appear as a patchwork of traditions displaying tensions that seem to resist a satisfactory explanation.⁵⁴ Traditional source criticism divided the bulk of these chapters over J, E, and R^JE (or JE), with only a very few verses assigned to P.⁵⁵ These reconstructions, however, could not cope with all the tensions in the text and raised new problems.⁵⁶ For example, the blood ceremony performed at the foot of mountain (24:3-8) was often considered as belonging to E, in spite of the presence of the divine name, so that the surrounding verses that seem to form an independent account (24:1-2, 9-11) had to be assigned to J, even though their depiction of God does not fit J's theology.⁵⁷ Wellhausen, for his part, proceeded in the opposite direc-

52 In the words of Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 173: "Everything in P builds to this point."

53 Thus Jean-Louis Ska, *Introduction à la lecture du Pentateuch: Clés pour l'interprétation des cinq premiers livres de la Bible* (Le livre et le rouleau 5; Brussels: Lessius, 2000), 303: "l'une des plus compliquées de tout le Pentateuch."

54 As noted by Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. John Bowden; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 137: "The many toings and froings, Moses' repeated ascending and descending, alone make it clear that many interests and hands have been at work on the present composition." Nevertheless, in response to the many works emphasizing the disparateness of traditions in these chapters, some attempts have been made to highlight their coherence and even their literary unity; see particularly Erhard Blum, "Israël à la montagne de Dieu: Remarques sur Ex 19-24; 32-34 et sur le contexte littéraire et historique de sa composition," in *Le Pentateuch en question*, 271-300 and T. D. Alexander, "The Composition of the Sinai Narrative in Exodus xix 1-xxiv 11," *VT* 49 (1999): 2-20. Thus, it is evident that, as aptly noted by William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2; New York: Doubleday, 1999), 141, "depending on presuppositions and temperament, one scholar's break will be another's artistic effect."

55 An overview of the convoluted nature of these chapters is provided, e.g., by Brevard S. Childs, *Exodus: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM, 1974), 344-64 and Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 142-54. For a discussion of the presence of the different sources in Exod 19, see, e.g., Richard Klopfer, "Zur Quellenscheidung in Exod. 19," *ZAW* 18 (1898): 197-235.

56 Further distinctions were therefore introduced, such as J¹ and J² in the work of Rudolph Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch: auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912), 165-68.

57 As argued by Childs, *Exodus*, 500-501.

tion by attributing verses 3-8 to J and 1-2, 9-11 to E;⁵⁸ yet this ends up creating similar problems, particularly with respect to the presence of the divine name in 1-2.⁵⁹ In view of such arbitrariness, one cannot help but wonder whether the distinction between J and E in these chapters was not made on the basis of literary arguments, but on an intuitive basis—as Lothar Peritt aptly remarked, *durch Losorakel*⁶⁰—because of the assumption that both narrative sources simply had to cover this episode in Israel's history.

It thus comes as no surprise that recent scholarship has become more cautious to provide detailed *Quellenscheidungen* that disentangle originally independent pre-Priestly strands in these chapters, which in a sense follows suit with Wellhausen's emphasis on the "Jehovist" (JE) as the true author of the Sinai pericope.⁶¹ It seems plausible to assume that an ancient "Mountain of God" story, which only related the people's experience of a theophany and their performance of a ritual, has been transformed at various occasions,⁶² but this story cannot be reconstructed in detail. The only point at which some

58 See Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 81-98.

59 This, then, led to the further question whether verses 9-11 could not represent yet another, originally independent tradition, as argued by Ernest Nicholson in "The Interpretation of Exodus xxiv 9-11," *VT* 24 (1974): 77-97 and in "The Antiquity of the Tradition in Exodus xxiv 9-11," *VT* 25 (1975): 69-79.

60 Lothar Peritt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969), 181 states: "Über die literarische Uneinheitlichkeit dieses theologisch gewichtigen Kap.s besteht Einmütigkeit; die quellenmäßige Zuordnung seiner Schichten dagegen könnte ebensogut durch Losorakel bestimmt werden."

61 In the words of Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 94, "Der Jehovist ist hier mehr als Redaktor, er kann als der eigentliche Verfasser des Abschnittes von der Gesetzgebung auf Sinai gelten." An example of this reemergence of the "Jehovist" is the *Jerusalem Geschichtswerk* reconstructed by Erich Zenger; see specifically with respect to this passage Zenger's essay "Wie und wozu die Tora zum Sinai kam: Literarische und theologische Beobachtungen zu Exodus 19-34," in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation* (ed. Marc Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 265-88.

62 See, e.g., Thomas B. Dozeman, *God on the Mountain: A Study of Redaction, Theology and Canon in Exodus 19-24* (SBLMS 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 197-200. A similar case for an early "Mountain of God" story has recently been made by Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 119-22, who uses references in Deuteronomy as a control to identify an initial account of an auditory theophany that preceded Moses' forty-day sojourn on the mountain during which he received the stone tablets. Nevertheless, Carr explicitly notes that the text as it stands is more plausibly explained through later supplements to this story than through the conflation of originally independent accounts, thus preferring a supplementary hypothesis over a documentary approach.

form of consensus seems to exist concerns the deuteronomistic reworking to which this story has been subjected, turning it into the occasion for the making, breaking, and renewal of a covenant.⁶³ Moreover, current Pentateuchal literary critics also diverge from their predecessors in assigning sizeable portions of text to one or more post-Priestly redactions oriented towards larger complexes, which combined elements of the Priestly and pre-Priestly concepts and language.⁶⁴ As such, four main stages in the literary development of these chapters may be envisioned, but, as Brevard Childs once noted, it may be “the better part of wisdom” not to go too far into detailed reconstructions.⁶⁵

Notwithstanding these complex developments in the field of literary criticism, the identification of P within Exod 19-24 has proven remarkably stable. The Priestly contribution is regarded as a fairly limited, independent account

63 See, e.g., Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Structure and Meaning in the Sinai-Horeb Narrative (Exodus 19-34),” in *A Biblical Itinerary: In Search of Method, Form and Content: Essays in Honor of George W. Coats* (ed. Eugene E. Carpenter; JSOTSup 240; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997), 109-25, who argues that Exod 19-34 is essentially a relatively coherent deuteronomistic reworking of older traditions; see also Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (ABRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 189-94. Likewise, Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 45-99 considered it a significant example for his K^D. Although he rejects the idea of a deuteronomistic redaction, a very similar scenario has actually been suggested by John Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (CBET 10; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 286: “The [post-dtr] Yahwist has also transformed the event from a simple convocation to hear the law, as in Deuteronomy, into a ceremonial event with careful preparation and a final solemn act of consecration and sacrifice.”

64 See particularly Eckart Otto, “Die nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus*, 61-112, esp. 77-82 and Reinhard Achenbach, “The Story of the Revelation at the Mountain of God and the Redactional Editions of the Hexateuch and the Pentateuch,” in *A Critical Study of the Pentateuch: An Encounter between Europe and Africa* (ed. Eckart Otto and Jurie LeRoux; Altes Testament und Moderne 20; Münster: Lit Verlag, 2005); cf. Thomas Römer, “Provisorische Überlegungen zur Entstehung von Exodus 18-24,” in “Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben” (Gen 18,19): *Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie: Festschrift für Eckart Otto zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Reinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneith; BZABR 13; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 128-54. Although scholars do not concur on the precise extent of these post-Priestly redactions, many tend to consider Exod 19:3-8 as a late redactional insertion; see also Jean-Louis Ska, “Exode 19,3b-6 et l’identité de l’Israël postexilique,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus*, 289-318; and Ludwig Schmidt, “Israel und das Gesetz: Ex 19,3b-8 und 24,3-8 als literarischer und theologischer Rahmen für das Bundesbuch,” *ZAW* 113 (2001): 167-85.

65 Childs, *Exodus*, 500-501.

of the theophany, which consisted of the chronological note in 19:1-2a and the story of Moses' ascent to the mountain in 24:15b-18a, serving as the immediate introduction to the large blocks of Priestly material in Exod 25-31 and 35-40 (and perhaps beyond).⁶⁶ Even though it has recently been argued that some parts of the people's preparations and the actual theophany in 19:10-18 may also be assigned to P,⁶⁷ most scholars agree on the striking fact that P did not relate the making of a covenant at Sinai. If indeed—as seems to be the majority opinion among literary critics—P^G existed as an independent document modelled on earlier traditions, then the Priestly authors seem to have deliberately omitted this central aspect of the Sinai episode from Israel's history.⁶⁸ Although Wellhausen designated P as the “book of the four covenants” (*liber quattuor foedorum*, abbreviated “Q”), P^G seems to have actually encompassed only two covenants: the covenant with humanity established with Noah and the covenant with Israel established with Abraham, which in P's view—unlike for the deuteronomistic authors⁶⁹—was not dependent upon Israel's obedience to the Law and therefore needed no renewal at Sinai.⁷⁰ For P, the climax of the theophany at Sinai consists of the descent of the divine כבוד to dwell among the people and the accompanying inauguration of sacrificial worship for which detailed prescriptions are provided.⁷¹ As such, P redefines the theo-

66 Cf., e.g., Martin Noth, *Das zweite Buch Mose (Exodus): übersetzt und erklärt* (ATD 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 162: “Mit 24,15b beginnt ein großer zusammenhängender Abschnitt der P-Erzählung (24,15b-31,18), in dem ausführlich mitgeteilt wird, wie Mose auf dem Berge die detaillierten Anweisungen für die Herstellung des Heiligtums und aller für den kultischen Gottesdienst erforderlichen Einrichtungen von Jahwe erhält.”

67 See, e.g., Römer, “Provisorische Überlegungen,” 144-45 and Thomas B. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus* (Eerdmans Critical Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 425.

68 Cf. Blenkinsopp, “Structure and Meaning,” 113: “The most notable feature of P's Sinai narrative is not . . . what it says but what it omits: it has nothing to say about the *making of a covenant*” (emphasis original). That scholars cannot easily accept the idea that P would have omitted this highly significant aspect of the Sinai episode may be seen from the fact that it is one of the main arguments of scholars who consider P a “redaction” instead of a “source”; see Cross, “The Priestly Work,” 312-13; cf. John Van Seters, *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 173.

69 See Schmid, *The Old Testament*, 150.

70 See the seminal article by Walter Zimmerli, “Sinaibund und Abrahambund: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift,” *tz* 16 (1960): 268-80.

71 Thus according to, e.g., Ralph W. Klein, “The Message of P,” in *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Jörg Jeremias and Lothar Perlt; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981), 57-66, esp. 62, and Baruch J. Schwartz, “The

logical significance of Sinai: the mountain is disqualified as the place where the covenant was closed and instead is reinterpreted as the unique place where Israel became a cultic community as a confirmation and expression of the everlasting covenant. In this respect, Sinai does indeed seem to represent the ultimate goal of the Priestly writing as a whole, irrespective of whether it continued beyond Sinai or not.⁷² Additionally, Moses' role is also transformed from a lawgiver to the (high) priest who, like the high priest on Yom Kippur, enters the realm of the divine in order to mediate for the people.⁷³

4 Implications

As a dialogue between literary criticism, textual criticism and the study of other Second Temple Jewish literature has a high potential for mutual enrichment,⁷⁴ it is an interesting exercise to compare the hallmarks of P's alleged reworking of the Sinai account with the documented rewriting attested in the book of *Jubilees*. In fact, such a comparison reveals several similarities. First of all, P and the author/redactor of *Jubilees* seem to have enjoyed similar interests: both provided the story as they found it in their respective sources with a more detailed chronology that fitted the overall time-frame of their compositions (Exod 19:1; Jub 1:1), and both enhanced the picture of Moses as the sole mediator of the people who alone experiences a direct revelation. On the theological plane, too, some interesting convergences may be observed: both P and *Jubilees* depict God as the omnipotent and supreme Lord of the entire earth,

Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai," in *Texts, Temples and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (ed. Michael V. Fox et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 103-34, esp. 133.

72 Compare the oft-quoted suggestion on the theophany at Sinai as *das eigentliche Ziel* of PG by Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948), 8.

73 See Dozeman, *Exodus*, 431.

74 Examples of such a fruitful dialogue may be found, e.g., in the application of redaction criticism to the study of the Qumran rule texts by Charlotte Hempel, "Sources and Redaction in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Growth of Ancient Texts," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 162-81; or in the integration of recent textual research into a literary-critical analysis of the Hebrew Bible by Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*. Similarly, the approaches of Segal and Kugel to the book of *Jubilees* (see resp. notes 19 and 20 above) may also be considered examples of the integration of source and redaction criticism into the study of other Second Temple Jewish literature.

both understand the relationship between God and humanity in terms of a covenant that is grounded in the very order of creation itself, and both emphasize that Israel has been irreversibly elected by God, even if the majority of the people may have gone astray in their own times.⁷⁵ In this respect, both also clearly tend to consider the covenant established with the entire people of Israel at Sinai as a further expression of the covenant established in ancient times with the patriarchs, which continued to exist despite the people's failures to uphold it.

Second, a subtle interplay of enhancing and downplaying the significance of Sinai may be observed both in P and in *Jubilees*. Since both present Sinai as the place for the *renewal* of a covenant that had never been abrogated, it might seem as if they disqualify the uniqueness of the events that occurred there. At the same time, Sinai is assigned an important—and, in fact, unique—place in the overall course of Israel's history as a revelatory event of unsurpassed significance. It thus seems to function as an authority-conferring device for both: the specifically Priestly laws on the construction of the Tabernacle and on the sacrificial cult and *Jubilees*'s ideologically distinct rehearsal of the patriarchal narratives are both anchored in the Sinai event by presenting them as revealed to Moses during his sojourn in the cloud where God himself had taken residence. As such, *Jubilees*'s strategy of transforming a pre-existent account of the theophany at Sinai to meet its own purposes was not without precedent. Borrowing the influential expressions coined by Najman, it may be observed that P is likewise "seconding Sinai," and that the four features of the "Mosaic discourse" equally apply to P's reworking of the non-P traditions: (1) through its reworking and expansion of older traditions, P claims for itself the authority already attached to them; (2) P portrays itself as an authentic expression of the law revealed to Moses; (3) P emphasizes that it is a faithful representation of the revelation at Sinai; and (4) P is clearly associated with Moses as a founding figure.⁷⁶ Although we must admit that the absence of any physical evidence for the pre-Priestly Torah gives the discussion a more hypothetical character,

75 A description of the theology of *Jubilees* along these lines may be found in VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 120–26. On the specific theology of P, see, e.g., the introductory summaries by Zenger, "Das Priester(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 175; Jan Christian Gertz, "The Partial Compositions," in *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament* (New York: T&T Clark, 2012), 293–304, esp. 302–3; and Schmid, *The Old Testament*, 149–52; or the older study by Walter Brueggemann, "The Kerygma of the Priestly Writers," *ZAW* 84 (1972): 397–414; cf. Klein, "The Message of P."

76 See Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 16–17.

P does seem to unfold in a very similar way to *Jubilees*: rather than presenting its own material and ideological framework on their own terms, these were incorporated into an already authoritative tradition.

Third and finally, in light of the specifically Priestly outlook of both works, the question arises whether P and *Jubilees* may be generically linked to one another as parts of an ongoing Priestly discourse throughout the Second Temple Period. The Priestly flavor of *Jubilees* has long been noted. The presentation of the patriarchs as forming a continuous chain of priests instructing their successors in proper worship,⁷⁷ as well as the specific halakic positions developed in the book and perhaps also its calendar,⁷⁸ have led scholars to believe that the origins of *Jubilees* are to be sought in Priestly circles.⁷⁹ Furthermore, in recent years the Priestly sections in the Pentateuch are increasingly attributed to different Priestly schools: the Holiness Code in Lev 17-26 and its cognates are commonly considered a later Priestly composition that re-interpreted P,⁸⁰ and a convincing case has been made to interpret the P texts in Numbers as late theocratic revisions.⁸¹ Christophe Nihan, in particular, has argued that, despite the overall coherence of the Priestly literature, we should allow for a historical development within it by envisaging at least three different, albeit closely related, Priestly schools active throughout the Persian Period, which "testify to the existence . . . of an ongoing tradition of legal and religious reflection,

77 So Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 7.

78 As is well known, in the wake of the first discoveries at Qumran the affinities between the chronology of *Jubilees* and the Priestly calendar were highlighted by Annie Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân: Ses origines bibliques," VT 3 (1953): 250-64. As early as the year 1900, however, the Priestly identity of the author of *Jubilees*, and more specifically his dependence upon the P sections in Genesis and his summary approach to the J and E accounts, had been noted by E. Littmann in his introduction to Kautzsch's collection of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament; cf. VanderKam, "The Origins and Purpose," 7.

79 See, e.g., VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 141-43.

80 See, e.g., Christophe 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; FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 81-122.

81 So according to Reinhard Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Pentateuch und Hexateuch* (BZABR 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003); cf. Thomas Römer, "Israel's Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Construction of the Book of Numbers," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 419-46.

leading regularly to the revision of older documents.”⁸² The observations made in the present paper raise the intriguing question whether *Jubilees* may represent the further development of this Priestly tradition in the Hellenistic age, particularly as Nihan suggests that the activity of these Priestly schools continued in the tradition reflected in the Temple Scroll.⁸³

5 Conclusion

One of the most important insights yielded by the historical-critical study of the scriptural texts is that a desire for *change* has fuelled the development of the tradition from its earliest beginnings, resulting in a multi-layered text. Moreover, the renewed interest in the scribal creativity of the latter half of the Second Temple Period triggered by the Dead Sea Scrolls has revealed that a similar desire gave rise to “variant literary editions” and to the works conveniently arranged under the heading of “rewritten Scripture.”⁸⁴ The old stories were faithfully transmitted because they were deemed important for Israel’s religious identity, but they were also adapted to present circumstances precisely because they were considered of foundational value. In an attempt to draw separate areas of scholarly research closer, this paper has explored how both the author(s) of *Jubilees* and the Priestly writer(s) employed the theophany at Sinai to bestow an aura of authoritativeness to their innovations

82 Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 619; cf. Nihan’s essay “Israel’s Festival Calendars in Leviticus 23, Numbers 28-29 and the Formation of ‘Priestly’ Literature,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, 177-231 at 231: “Perhaps more than any other portion of the Torah, the Priestly literature is the product of a creative yet highly coherent process of reception, revisions, and re-formulation spanning the totality of the Persian period . . . continuously adapting the doctrine of previous generations of scribes to the ever-changing historical circumstances in order to meet the religious and political requirements of their time.”

83 See Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 619, who points out that “even this move was prepared in the Torah itself by means of the last addition made to Leviticus, the account of ch. 10” (emphasis original). As is well-known, the *Temple Scroll* is often perceived as closely related to *Jubilees*; see, e.g., James C. VanderKam, “The Temple Scroll and the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester December, 1987* (ed. George J. Brooke; JSPSup 7; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 211-36; and Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Book of *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, 99-115.

84 See, e.g., Eugene Ulrich, “Empirical Evidence for Scribal and Editorial Transmission of Second Temple Religious Literature,” in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ed. Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny; CBET; Leuven: Peeters; forthcoming).

of the tradition. By presenting their innovations as an authentic representation of this momentous event in Israel's past, and at the same time enhancing the authority emanating from it, they were irrefutably honoring the tradition, while also opening the door for their readers to accept the higher authority of their new creations. Doing so, both attempted to present the product of their efforts as "authoritative Scripture" in a very similar way—and yet the authoritative reception of both writings would differ considerably. As such, this paper has also undergirded the necessity to methodologically distinguish composition from reception.

Copyright of Journal for the Study of Judaism: In the Persian Hellenistic & Roman Period is the property of Brill Academic Publishers and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.