

## A SUMMARY OF RECENT FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF AN EARLY DATE FOR THE SO-CALLED PRIESTLY MATERIAL OF THE PENTATEUCH

David R. Hildebrand\*

Recent years have seen a growing movement toward an early dating of the Priestly tradition—of the traditions themselves, if not also for their written form—and this in opposition to the majority opinion that assigns the P-corpus a postexilic provenance.

### I. THE MAJORITY OPINION: WELLHAUSEN

The classic exposition of this opinion was, of course, set forth by Julius Wellhausen.<sup>1</sup> He said that development in Israel's religion can be traced from simple and spontaneous to formal and ritualistic, and with it an increase in the influence of the priesthood. The culmination of this growth is to be seen in P and Chronicles.

Such a development can be noticed concerning the place of worship. During Samuel's time one could sacrifice wherever he chose (e.g. 1 Sam 16:2). Josiah limited all sacrifice to the temple at Jerusalem (2 Kings 23; cf. Deuteronomy 13). Josiah's centralization seems to have received general acceptance, for Leviticus (e.g. 17:1-9) assumes that all sacrifices must be offered at the tabernacle. Wellhausen and others consider the Leviticus tabernacle to be a retrojection of the Jerusalem temple back into Mosaic times.

The growth of ritualism can be seen also in the offering of sacrifices and in the festivals. Sacrifice was once a joyous fellowship meal (see e.g. Judg 13:16 ff.), but by the time of Leviticus it was a fairly complicated priestly ceremony largely for the purpose of atonement for sin.

The festivals—e.g., Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and Tabernacles—were at first harvest festivals, celebrated at different times in the different areas, according to how early or late the crops and the harvest were in that particular area. Then, when worship was centralized in Jerusalem, a fixed timetable was established for the national feasts, the situation presupposed in Leviticus 23.

Another area that evolved from simple to more complex was the priesthood. In ancient Israel a priest was not needed in order to offer a sacrifice. But by postexilic times, not only was it required that a priest attend the offering of a sacrifice, but also there were significant gradations within the priesthood itself: high priest, priests, Levites.

\*David Hildebrand is dean of academic affairs at Briercrest Bible College in Caronport, Saskatchewan.

<sup>1</sup>J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (New York: Meridian, 1957).

In ancient times, gifts to the priest were voluntary. By the time of Leviticus, however, the priests required tithes, firstfruits, and certain parts of the sacrifices.

A further argument for a late date of P stems from the similarity between P and Chronicles as compared with Kings. Chronicles was written a couple of centuries later than Kings. It gives much more attention to cultic ritual than does Kings. Its similarity with P in connection with cultic ritual argues for a late date for P also.

While there has been some modification of details since Wellhausen's exposition, for many the general picture of the evolution of Israel's religion remains as described above.

## II. A MORE RECENT VIEW FAVORING AN EARLIER DATE

Recent years have seen a growing movement toward an earlier dating of the Priestly tradition. Support for this movement has come from several Jewish scholars.

1. *The situation best suits early Israel.* Yehezkel Kaufmann<sup>2</sup> has been a leader in this school of thought, arguing that the Priestly code in its entirety is a pre-exilic composition. Others have added to Kaufmann's points.<sup>3</sup>

First, concerning the chosen city and the camp, Kaufmann points out that P contains no reflection of the concept of the chosen city as the place of worship. For example, P says that the priests' portion of the peace offerings is to be eaten in any clean place (Lev 10:14), and no fixed place is specified for the layman to eat his part of the offerings (7:19). By contrast, Deut 12:6 ff. requires that sacred meals be eaten only at the chosen city. Thus P appears to antedate Deuteronomy. Furthermore, P's camp is an armed camp with a prescribed order of march (Numbers 2), rules of war (10:9) and a prescribed division of booty (31:25 ff.). The purpose of the camp is not cultic exercise under the protection of foreign rulers, as would fit postexilic conditions, but the conquest of Canaan. The land is spied out (the parts of Numbers 13–14 assigned to P), and the request of the two and a half tribes to settle in Transjordan is granted only on condition that they join in battle with the rest (Numbers 32).

Kaufmann adds that the idea that the tent is a reflex of the Second Temple is baseless. To be sure, P knows of only one legitimate sanctuary—namely, the tabernacle—but it is represented as an historical necessity rather than as a legal requirement. It is called the tent of meeting because there Yahweh revealed himself to Israel (giving laws, judgments, and guidance through the desert), and therefore it was the only legitimate cult place. P speaks of the presence of God in the tent (e.g. Lev 10:2), which is inappropriate for a time when the ark was nonexistent. Haran observes that there was a lack of correlation between the Second Temple and the tabernacle not only in their func-

<sup>2</sup>Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1960) esp. 175–200. See also M. Greenberg, "A New Approach to the History of the Israelite Priesthood," *JAOS* 70 (1950) 41–47.

<sup>3</sup>And one has tried to reconcile the two opposing views; see n. 5 below.

tion but also in their appurtenances.<sup>4</sup> The Second Temple had no ark, no cherubim, no Urim and Thummim (cf. Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65), no anointing oil. And the altar of the Second Temple was of stone (Ezra 3:2) rather than wood and metal.<sup>5</sup>

The tabernacle fits the situation of ancient Israel. The danger that ensues from approaching the divine sanctum, so frequently mentioned in P, is also alluded to in early sources (1 Sam 6:19–20; 2 Sam 6:6–9). And the placing of tabernacle personnel (Levites) in Levitical cities spaced throughout the whole country is appropriate to pre-exilic times rather than postexilic. Cassuto notes a similar tent construction for the habitation of another deity.<sup>6</sup> The Ugaritic epic of King Keret speaks of the dwelling place of El as a tabernacle and tent, letter for letter the same as in Hebrew (*mškn* and *ʾhl*). And El's tabernacle was made of boards erected on pedestals like the Biblical tabernacle. Thus P's tabernacle is appropriate to antiquity.

Concerning the growth of Israel's cultic festivals from spontaneous to formal and fixed rituals, Kaufmann writes that "fixity in times and rites and absence of 'natural spontaneity' characterize the festivals of ancient Babylonia, Egypt, and all known early civilizations. Annual purifications are likewise ubiquitous, alongside of nature festivals."<sup>7</sup> As for Israel herself, Haran shows that the principal features of the Passover sacrifice, detailed in P (Exod 12:1–14, 43–50), were in existence well before the end of the pre-exilic period, and "indeed are compressed into succinct injunctions occurring already in the Books of the Covenant"<sup>8</sup> (23:18; cf. 34:25). Weinfeld shows that other sacral institutions that

<sup>4</sup>M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 3–4, 189 ff.

<sup>5</sup>Haran ("Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source," *JBL* 100 [1981] 321–333) suggests that the tabernacle reflected, rather, the first temple (Solomon's) before changes by Ahaz, Hezekiah and especially Manasseh. Haran postulates that the Priestly source was likely formed during the time of Ahaz/Hezekiah and that the arrival of northern priests must have led to the functional dichotomy of priests and Levites. Haran does not give evidence for the arrival of northern priests, nor how their arrival would have brought a split along lineage lines of "Levites" and "priests"—Haran's northern priests falling, I assume, into the secondary category of Levites. According to 1 Kgs 12:31, Jeroboam "appointed priests from all sorts of people, even though they were not Levites." And the Chronicler notes that Jeroboam got rid of both groups (Aaronite priests and Levites; 2 Chr 13:9–10). Any who might have come south during Hezekiah's reign might just as likely have been some from either group. To categorize northern priests as Levites and southern priests as priests—i.e., by locale rather than by lineage, as I assume Haran does—is contrary to the evidence above. As for the tabernacle reflecting Solomon's temple rather than vice versa, David's words in 2 Sam 7:1, 6 indicate that the wilderness tent came first and that he wishes to update it to a suitable and stationary house, which reality, the account says, becomes Solomon's privilege. Haran is attempting to reconcile points made by Wellhausen and Kaufmann: that the Priestly law was written during Hezekiah's reign but promulgated and canonized three hundred years later by Ezra (who read to the people from early morning until midday; Nehemiah 8–10).

<sup>6</sup>U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967) 322–323.

<sup>7</sup>Kaufmann, *History* 178.

<sup>8</sup>Haran, *Temples* 4, 317–322. He notes the Passover observance in Josh 5:10–11; 2 Kgs 23:21–23; 2 Chr 3:1–20; 35:12–13; 30:5, 16, 18 (the latter is based on "the law of Moses, the man of God").

occupy a central place in the priestly tradition are also known to us from early Biblical literature (e.g. the Sabbath, the New Moon, the feasts; cf. Amos 8:5; 1 Sam 20:24–34; 2 Kgs 4:23; Isa 1:13; Hos 9:4–5).<sup>9</sup>

Occupying much of Kaufmann's (and others'<sup>10</sup>) attention is the matter of the gradations within the priesthood. In response to the idea that the high priesthood was a late development, it can be pointed out that the portrayal of the high priest in P does not reflect the conditions of the Second Temple period. At the head of P's camp is not Aaron but Moses. Aaron's importance is restricted to the cult—and even there it is Moses who consecrates Aaron and his sons and assigns their tasks. They are answerable to Moses for what takes place in the tabernacle (Lev 10:16 ff.). Joshua's relationship to Eleazar, who inquires for him by Urim and Thummim, was similar (Num 27:21). Priestly functions in P gained importance from the use of Urim and Thummim and from the priest's place of march with the holy trumpets in the army (31:6; cf. 10:9). Urim and Thummim were not in existence in the Second Temple period, nor did Israel at that time march off to war. Furthermore, priests in postexilic times were no longer anointed.<sup>11</sup> The unction of the high priest in P (Exod 30:30; Lev 8:12; 21:10–12) is thus a sign of antiquity.

Gradations of rank in the priesthood are indicated during the monarchy and even earlier.<sup>12</sup> Eli has prominence over his sons at Shiloh (1 Samuel 1–3), and Abimelech is head of a priestly community at Nob (22:11–20). Jehoiada (2 Kgs 12:10 [Hebrew 12:11]) and Hilkiah (2 Kgs 22:4, 8; 23:4; cf. 2 Chr 34:9) are

<sup>9</sup>M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 186. M. Douglas, *Implicit Meanings* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) 315–316, writes: "In general it would suit my thesis to follow the minority view that takes P to be a very early source, since the unity and coherence of the Pentateuch in regard to purity laws supports this view, but obviously in such a technical matter I have no option but to follow the consensus."

<sup>10</sup>E.g. R. Abba, "Priests and Levites," in *IDB*, 3. 886–889; Greenberg, "New Approach" 41–46; Haran, *Temples* 3, 75–109.

<sup>11</sup>"Neither the books of Maccabees nor Josephus mentions the anointing of priests or kings. . . . A tannaitic tradition (Babylonian Talmud, Baraitha of Yōmā, 52b) counts the anointing oil among the features of the Solomonic that were lacking in the Second Temple. The high priest of later times was distinguished only by his apparel." Kaufmann, *History* 186 n. 8.

<sup>12</sup>Abba, "Priests" 887, lists also the reference to Zephaniah as the "second priest" (2 Kgs 25:18; Jer 52:24), the "senior priests" mentioned in Hezekiah's reign (2 Kgs 19:2; Isa 37:2) and Jeremiah's ministry (Jer 19:1). In Solomon's temple there apparently was a college of priests, at the head of which was one usually referred to as "the priest"—e.g., Zadok (2 Kgs 2:35), Jehoiada (11:9; 12:7, 9; cf. Jer 29:25 ff.), Uriah (2 Kgs 16:10–11, 15–16; cf. Isa 8:2), Hilkiah (2 Kgs 22:10, 12, 14). As for the point that Ezekiel does not mention the high priesthood, Abba, "Priests" 886, compares the position of authority of the high priest, equal to the Davidic governor Zerubbabel, in the restoration (Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4; cf. Ezra 3:2; Zech 6:9–13; cf. 3:7), observing that it is "quite inconceivable that such an office . . . was created *de novo* in the half century between Ezekiel (572 B.C.) and the second return (520 B.C.)." It seems rather to be represented as a well-established institution. An argument from silence, in any case, needs to be used with caution. For example, one would hardly argue from Ezekiel's silence regarding the king that kingship was nonexistent in Israel up till that time. Haran, *Temples* 75–76, notes that the Aaronides in P could not have replaced the Zadokites in Ezekiel (44:1–14) because, according to P, the priesthood family had two branches, Eleazar and Ithamar, one of which must necessarily exclude Zadok and his descendants. Thus the idea of two remaining sons to Aaron is inappropriate for postexilic conditions.

called "high priests," and Seraiah (2 Kgs 25:18) is called "chief priest" (cf. Ezra 7:5). The Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26), generally considered by the Wellhausen school to be based on pre-exilic practice, uses the same phraseology for the high priest: "the priest who is chief among his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil is poured, and who has been consecrated to wear the garments." The Holiness Code (H) and Kings together furnish strong evidence for the antiquity of the high priesthood.

The distinction between priests and Levites also antedates the exile. They existed as a defined group during the restoration, and since the cultless exile cannot have given rise to a cultic caste their origin must go back to pre-exilic times.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, P assumes several times as many Levites as there are priests, whereas in postexilic times the Levites were relatively few and powerless (4,289 priests and 74 Levites; Ezra 2:36–40; cf. Neh 7:39–43<sup>14</sup>).

Num 18:21–32 prescribes that a tithe be levied for the Levites, a tenth of which was set aside for the priests. This law obviously belongs to a time when the Levites were numerous and serving a significant function. By the beginning of Second Temple times it was "an obsolete law, a relic of another age."<sup>15</sup> How is such conflict with the realities of postexilic times to be explained? Kaufmann admits of only one possible explanation: that "by postexilic times P was a collection of ancient laws that later generations did not presume to alter by even so much as a letter."<sup>16</sup> This confirms what has been inferred from the historical situation generally in P: that the law corpora had already been crystallized by the beginning of Second Temple times.

2. *Archaic language points to antiquity.* Archaic terms or expressions found in P also argue for its antiquity. One who has done work in this area is E. A. Speiser.<sup>17</sup> He was working on four problems of interpretation in Leviticus, all chosen without thought to the question of dating. These items were illuminated

<sup>13</sup>The Levites could hardly have arisen as the result of a degradation of rural priests after the destruction of the temple, for the very book (P) that supposedly confirms their deposition bestows on them their bountiful tithe.

<sup>14</sup>Even if the singers and gatekeepers be included in the tally of Levites the total is only about 341. By comparison the Chronicler speaks of 30,000 Levites 30 years old and over in David's time, including 4,000 singers and 4,000 gatekeepers (1 Chr 23:3–5). The Priestly writer appears to know of only priests and Levites, making no mention of the other classes that appear in Ezra's and Nehemiah's lists: singers, gatekeepers, temple servants, and sons of Solomon's servants (Ezra 2:41–58; cf. 7:24; Neh 7:44–60).

<sup>15</sup>Kaufmann, *History* 191. It was likely shortly after Nehemiah's time that, due to economic necessities, the priests appropriated the Levitical tithe to themselves. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 20.8.8; 9.2; *Life* 15 (cited by Kaufmann, *History* 192); *Jub.* 13:25–26; *Jdt* 11:13 (cited by Haran, *Temples* 94). Kaufmann says that for a long time this appropriation was questioned, though the priests justified their action by Ezra's penalizing the Levites for having refused to leave Babylonia by giving their tithe to the priests (*b. Yebam.* 86b; *b. Hul.* 131b and parallels).

<sup>16</sup>Kaufmann, *History* 192.

<sup>17</sup>E. A. Speiser, *Oriental and Biblical Studies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1967) 137–142.

by cuneiform material, which—for each of the four items—dated either from the Old Babylonian or the Middle Babylonian period (i.e., from the fifteenth century B.C. at the latest). This of course does not mean that the practices were discontinued early, but Speiser proceeds to show that tradition was unable to do justice to these passages because their meaning became obscure over the centuries. While he is not saying that all of Leviticus is homogeneous and archaic, the four items are scattered throughout the book: two in the section generally acknowledged to be early and referred to as H, and two elsewhere. He concludes that the late date generally assigned to most of Leviticus is not upheld by his findings and that all the passages in question bear the unmistakable imprint of pre-exilic times.

The four passages in Speiser's study are: (1) 5:15, *bē'erkēkā* ("convertible into payment in silver"); (2) 19:20, *biqqōret* ("[economic] damage"); (3) 25:35 ff. ("If your brother's fortunes decline so that he is reduced to being under your authority/staying in your household, and you hold him as though a resident alien, and he lives in your household, he shall remain with you as your brother"); (4) 27:12, *bēn tōb ūbēn rā'* ("The priest shall assess it; high or low, whatever the priest's assessment, it shall be so").

A. Hurvitz<sup>18</sup> observed that the description of the tabernacle in Exodus uses *šēš* ("fine linen") more than thirty times, to the exclusion of *būš*, its postexilic parallel. In this practice P is independent of the circles that were writing Scripture in postexilic times.

Later Hurvitz published an examination of nine sets of terms or phrases of priestly vocabulary in pre-exilic Biblical sources, in P, and in the literature universally recognized as exilic and/or postexilic as it is known to us from Biblical (Ezekiel, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles) and post-Biblical (rabbinic) sources.<sup>19</sup> He found that each set may clearly be categorized in terms of pre- and postexilic Hebrew and that P invariably takes sides with the pre-exilic group. While Ezekiel, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles may occasionally use the earlier terms, P is alone in its systematic preference for them.

<i>Late</i>	<i>Early</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
1. <i>htyhš</i>	<i>spr, pqd, yld, šph</i>	"to be enrolled by genealogy"
2. <i>htndb (Hithpael)</i>	<i>ndb</i> (other forms)	"freely offered"
3. <i>hippá</i>	<i>šippá</i>	"to overlay"
4. <i>būš</i>	<i>šēš</i>	"fine linen"
5. <i>hryh</i>	<i>rḥš</i>	"to wash"
6. <i>mn . . . wlm'lh</i>	<i>mn . . . wm'lh</i>	"from . . . and upward"
7. <i>sbyb sbyb</i>	<i>sbyb</i> (not doubled)	"around"
8. <i>āzārā</i>	<i>ḥšr</i>	"enclosure"
9. <i>qbl + dm</i>	<i>lqh + dm</i>	"catching the blood of the sacrifice"

In J. Milgrom's study of the priestly doctrine of repentance, he makes the following comments:

The absence of the root *šwb* from P which, because of the prophets, becomes the

<sup>18</sup>A. Hurvitz, "The Usage of *šēš* and *būš* in the Bible and Its Implication for the Date of P," *HTR* 60 (1967) 117–121. Also, *šēš* is Egyptian/southern while *būš* is Mesopotamian-Syrian/northern.

<sup>19</sup>A. Hurvitz, "The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code," *RB* 81 (1974) 24–57.

exclusive term for repentance from the exile onward and, conversely, the absence of the equivalent Priestly root *'šm* in the post-exilic literature demonstrates that the Priestly texts on sacrificial expiation stem from a time before prophetic *šwb* became the norm for Israel, i.e., they are of pre-exilic provenance.<sup>20</sup>

Rendsburg observes that "one of the strongest and most peculiar forms in Biblical Hebrew is the third person common singular indicative pronoun (*hiw'*) in the Pentateuch."<sup>21</sup> It occurs there 120 times and almost never elsewhere.<sup>22</sup> On the principle that anomalous forms are survivals, fossils, remainders of past linguistic systems, Rendsburg treats this form as more than a scribal recording phenomenon, as a mark of the earliest stage of Hebrew. He notices that in Genesis 14, whose early date is unquestioned, the editorial comments (vv 2, 3, 7, 8, 17) use *hi'* once (v 2) and *hiw'* twice (vv 7, 8). He suggests that these comments were written during the transition period—i.e., when the gender distinction was entering Hebrew.<sup>23</sup>

Rendsburg points out the impossibility of the P writer using *hiw'* for "she" in the Pentateuch but not in the so-called P additions to Joshua through Kings, the same for D in Deuteronomy and the so-called D additions, and likewise JE.<sup>24</sup> He suggests two possible ways in which the third-person common pronoun might have found its way into Hebrew (no other Semitic language has this phenomenon except Old Babylonian). Perhaps it is the result, he says, of Hurrian and Hittite influence. Neither Hurrian nor Hittite had a gender distinction for the third-person singular pronoun. Earliest Hebrew settlers settled in the same hill country as the Hurrians and Hittites. When the Israelites spread out, especially during the time of David and Solomon, the Canaanite distinction of *hú'* (masculine) and *hi'* (feminine) was adopted. The second possible way<sup>25</sup> is that the pronominal lack of distinction might have come with Abraham from Ur of Sumer, since Sumerian did not distinguish gender for the third-person singular pronoun. In any case, he concludes that the Priestly tradition—indeed, the whole Pentateuch—must be earlier than Joshua/Judges.

Elsewhere he refers also to the relatively large number of dual personal pronouns in the Pentateuch and to the lack of Persian influence there, these also arguing for an early date of P and of the whole Pentateuch.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>20</sup>J. Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience: The ASHAM and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance* (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 124.

<sup>21</sup>A. Rendsburg, "A New Look at the Pentateuchal *HW'*," *Bib* 63 (1982) 351–369.

<sup>22</sup>Exceptions are 1 Kgs 17:15; Isa 30:33; Job 31:11. The usual *hi'* is found only a few times in the Pentateuch: Gen 14:2; 20:5; 38:25; Lev 11:39; 13:10; 16:31; 20:17; 21:9; Num 5:13, 14.

<sup>23</sup>He observes, however, that this is not an explanation for the other times *hi'* occurs (pp. 365–366; see n. 22 above).

<sup>24</sup>Rendsburg, "New Look" 367.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 368 n. 62. But Rendsburg dates the patriarchs to the Late Bronze period and divorces Abraham's Ur from Ur of Sumer.

<sup>26</sup>Rendsburg, "Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'," *JANESCU* 12 (1980) 65–80.

3. *Quotations and allusions evidence priority.* A third kind of evidence for an early date of the P-corpus concerns quotations and allusions to the Priestly tradition in Ezekiel, Deuteronomy and the early historical books.

Ezek 22:26, for example,<sup>27</sup> denounces the priests for their failure to make a distinction between the holy and the common, the unclean and the clean. The prescription for them to make such a distinction is found in Lev 10:10. Milgrom remarks: "That the arraignment of Ezekiel 22 contains a mixture of ethical and ritual sins based solely on those chapters (Leviticus 18–20, from incest and violation of menstrual impurity to sabbath breaking, from dishonouring parents to ill treatment of the poor and of the sojourner, from idolatry to slander and robbery) shows that their written formulation is pre-exilic."<sup>28</sup> Ezek 20:11 reminds the people that God gave them statutes and ordinances by whose observance they would live. This is an allusion to Lev 18:5: "You shall therefore keep my statutes and ordinances, by whose observances man shall live." Ezekiel 34 alludes to the statement of the covenant in Leviticus 26 (e.g., with Ezek 34:12–13 compare Lev 26:33, 44–45; with Ezek 34:26–27 compare Lev 26:4).

As for Deuteronomy and P, Haran finds that "in the whole corpus of P there are no 'kernels' that might be traced back to D, either in the legal and narrative material or in stylistic elements, so much so that one can be sure that the priestly writers did not ever have access to D."<sup>29</sup> The same conclusion is stated by Weinfeld<sup>30</sup> and Abba.<sup>31</sup> By contrast, Deuteronomy does contain traces of Priestly views and phraseology. For example, the list of regulations concerning clean and unclean animals is to a large extent verbally identical with that in Lev 11:2–23. The style of this passage links it with the Priestly code rather than with Deuteronomy.<sup>32</sup> And in Deut 24:8–9 there is a reference to the Priestly law concerning leprosy in Leviticus 13–14 and an allusion to the ac-

<sup>27</sup>For a full list of parallels between Ezekiel and Leviticus see Hoffmann, *Das Buch Leviticus* (Berlin: Poppelauer, 1905–06), 1. 478; 2. 3–4, 81–82, 319–320, 359–361, 384–386. See also W. Zimmerli, "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel," *ZAW* 66 (1954) 1–26, esp. 10–17. More recently A. Hurvitz deals with affinities and contrasts in *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem*, *CahRB* 20 (1982) xviii–198. In an appendix he discusses the theory of P's archaizing style. Abba, "Priests" 88, sees an acquaintance of Ezekiel with the Priestly code, rather than vice versa, for the following reasons: (1) Ezekiel's law is more systematic than the Priestly code; (2) Ezekiel's arrangements for housing temple personnel close to the sanctuary, rather than in Levitical cities spread throughout the country, is more in line with postexilic conditions; (3) the sacrificial law of P calls for the offerer to kill and cut up the sacrificial animal (Lev 1:5–6, 11–12; cf. Exod 12:6), whereas in Ezekiel it is the Levites who kill the animal (44:11; cf. 2 Chr 35:6, 10–11; 30:16 ff.).

<sup>28</sup>J. Milgrom, "Leviticus," *IDBSup* (1976) 541–545.

<sup>29</sup>Haran, *Temples* 7.

<sup>30</sup>Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy* 181.

<sup>31</sup>Abba, "Priests" 889.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 888; W. L. Moran, "The Literary Connection between Lev 11:13–19 and Deut 14:12–18," *CBQ* 28 (1966) 271–277.



count of Miriam's leprosy in Num 12:1–10. Weinfeld<sup>33</sup> has observed other instances of Priestly idioms in Deuteronomy. For example, chap. 4 has Priestly terms throughout: "male and female" (*zkr wñqbh*, v 16), "winged bird" (*špw knp*, v 17), "pattern" (*tbnyt*, vv 17–18), "creeping thing" (*rms*, v 18), "beget" (*hwlyd*, v 25), "created" (*br*, v 32).

Priestly expressions are to be found also in the early OT historical books. Josh 14:1–21:40 evidences traces not only of Priestly expressions (14:1–5; 18:1–10; 19:49–51) but also of arrangement of the material, which is similar to Numbers 26–36. The division of the land in the presence of Joshua and Eleazar, together with the geographical lists (Joshua 14–19), corresponds to similar material in Numbers 26–27; 32–34. And the establishment of the Levitical cities and cities of refuge in Joshua 20–21 is the implementation of related commands found in Numbers 35. The prohibition of "eating on the blood"<sup>34</sup> (Lev 19:26) is referred to in 1 Sam 14:32–35. Priestly ritual expressions are to be found in 2 Kgs 12:5–17 (English 12:4–16)—e.g., "the money for which each man is assessed" (*ksp npšwt 'rkw*), v 5 (English v 4, cf. Leviticus 27); "guilt offering" (*'šm*), "sin offering" (*h't*), v 17 (English v 16), and in 2 Kgs 16:10–16—e.g., "burnt offering," "cereal offering," "drink offering" (*'wlh, mnħh, nsk*), "throwing blood upon the altar" (*zrq dm 'l hmzbbh*), "which was before the Lord" (*'šr lpny yhwħ*), "the morning burnt offering" (*'lh hbqr*), "model" (*dmwt*), "pattern" (*tbnyt*). As Weinfeld observes,<sup>35</sup> it seems that the Priestly account concerning cult and temple affairs lay before the writer of these passages in 2 Kings and therefore must date from an earlier time.

All the evidence above regarding history and law, archaic expressions, and allusions by pre-exilic writers argues for an early (pre-exilic) provenience for the Priestly tradition. And the explicit witness of the text itself should not be overlooked: It is a record of what God revealed to Moses (cf. the frequent introductory formulae "as the Lord commanded Moses," "the Lord said to Moses [and Aaron]").

Some of the evidence above argues for a pre-exilic crystallization of that tradition in written form. Particularly the fact that the tithe law in Num 18:21–32, unsuitable as it was to the postexilic ratio of Levites to priests, went unaltered in the Priestly code indicates that the law corpora had already been crystallized. The quotations from the Priestly material in pre-exilic writings also argue for an earlier written form. In the case of similar passages, it is

<sup>33</sup>Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy* 180–181 n. 3. Weinfeld observes further that Deut 12:23 reflects Priestly phraseology and attitudes in Gen 9:4; Lev 17:11 concerning eating blood. "An ark of acacia wood" (Deut 10:3) seems to be taken from Exod 25:10. Deut 10:6–9, concerning Yahweh's choice of the Levites, seems to draw from several Priestly traditions, though the wording is not entirely the same as P (cf. Num 33:30–39; 20:22–29 and traditions about the Levitical tribe in Numbers 3–4; 8; 18). "And to their descendants after them" (Deut 1:8; 4:37; 10:15) reflects a P phrase used in Genesis. And the Priestly formula, "I will be your God and you shall be my people," is reflected in Deut 26:17–18 (English 26:18–19); 27:9; 29:12 (English 29:13).

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 187, interprets this as "eating without first sprinkling the blood upon an altar," a violation of the law against nonsacrificial slaughter in Leviticus 17.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 182.

sometimes difficult to discern which is quoting and which is being quoted. But when a pericope represents itself as the implementation of orders prescribed earlier (compare Joshua 14—19 with Numbers 26—27, 32—34; Joshua 20—21 with Numbers 35), or as the violation of an established law (compare Ezek 22:26 with Lev 10:10; Ezek 20:11 with Lev 18:5; Deut 24:8—9 with Lev 13—14 and Num 12:1—10; 1 Sam 14:32—35 with Lev 19:26), the more natural assumption is that the implementation or violation chronologically follows the statement of the directions or commands. The above evidence points, then, to an early date (pre-exilic at least) for the Priestly tradition in the Pentateuch.