

The Holiness Editors' Systematic Scheme of the Feasts: Festal Innovation in Leviticus 23

Yoshiko Ueoka
Doctoral Student
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

Abstract

The process of festal transmission did not depend on a single unbroken line during the course of inscribing the ritual stipulations. However, the general interpretations on the cultic calendars plot the various independent elements onto a chronological sequence of four successive documents (J, E, D and P). This paper will re-examine the methodologies, which are based on fixed theologies of the three annual feasts which do not consider the Holiness editors' intention. Especially, Lev. 23, which is a complex of ritual traditions, adduces significant evidence of how and why H editors composed this festal calendar under conventional customs, priestly settings and D's cultic innovations. This investigation will elucidate many various aspects which are reconstituted as "*mô'ādē YHWH* (Yahweh's fixed times)" and "*miqrā' qōdeš* (a sacred proclamation)," and the conclusion suggests that H editors evolved systematic schemes through means of the significance of *Yôm Kippûrîm* and the new terminology of "*šabbat šabbātôn*."

Keywords

H editors, *mô'ādē YHWH*, *miqrā' qōdeš*, *Yôm Kippûrîm*, *šabbātôn*

1. A Preview of the Discussion about the Israelite Feasts

Conventionally, the biblical feasts have been discussed in light of the various sources (Ex. 23:14-19; 34:18-26=JE; Lev. 23=H; Nu. 28-29=P; Dt. 16:1-17=D),¹ since Julius Wellhausen attempted to reconstruct the history of festal calendars that designated Israel's cult. According to him, in the earliest period, represented by JE, the feast of *maṣṣôt* (Unleavened Bread) was agricultural in character, and later in the Deuteronomic reform, the feast was combined with *pesah* (Passover) in a historicized form as the celebration of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. He asserts, eventually, the post-exilic P removed the festival completely from its natural cycle with a rigid chronological framework.² Many scholars have been heavily influenced by his theory, while it is not validated by a wider review of the scriptures, mainly because of his late dating of the P document and its lack of relation to the ANE texts. In fact, ardent claims of the contrary have been made to prove the antiquity of P (Yehezkel Kaufmann, Moshe Weinfeld, Jacob Milgrom).³

However, in spite of scholars' questions regarding the developmental festal cycles, his counting system, starting from "Easter," is generally admitted as a plausible and desirable theory; the idea of "the feast of weeks" is accepted by many with the reckoning by the seven-day week towards "Pentecost."⁴ This method of reckoning towards the fiftieth day is not included in D's feasts, but only found in Lev. 23:15-16.⁵ Hans-Joachim Kraus appropriately points out, "The OT has not bequeathed to us any traditions about the second great annual festival in the cultic calendar, the feast of Weeks."⁶ Despite this, Gerhard von Rad concurs, asserting that "the creed we have in Dt. 26:5ff. is the cult legend of the Feast of Weeks" on the thesis that the tribute of Dt. 26 corresponds to his alleged "the Feast of Weeks" in Ex. 23:16; 34:22 and Lev. 23:17.⁷ Also, Martin Noth claims that "the continuous seven-day week determines the Sabbath,"⁸ but this view fails to consider all the various factors related to the Sabbath. Thus, the understanding of Sabbath in terms of week is obviously a late Jewish development, as J. B. Segal mentions, "There is no analogy throughout the Bible for the use of the week unit to fix the date of religious ritual. If, as is commonly assumed, the Jubilees calendar of the end of the second century B.C. does maintain such a system, it is precisely in this respect that it is at variance with ancient Hebrew practice. Indeed, the interpolation of *šabbāt* as a period of seven days in ending a day of rest—not necessarily the Sabbath—is the only interpretation which seems to yield satisfactory sense throughout the passage Lev. 23:9-21."⁹

The problem is that most critics tend to ignore the uniqueness of H¹⁰ and to assimilate it into P. Wellhausen acknowledges H's significance but for him H is an outgrowth from the J E, and D sources, which in turn develop into the P source.¹¹ On the other hand, Kaufmann's

presupposition is problematic in that the D's idea is reflected nowhere in the Holiness Code.¹² He asserts that P's festival laws (Lev. 23) betray pre-Deuteronomistic viewpoint. Also, Weinfeld, whose aim is to prove P's antedating D, in light of the many parallels between P and ritual texts from the Ancient Near East, concludes not only the dating of P, but also H is from pre-exilic times.¹³ He overlooks the evidence that H demonstrates the dependence on D. Instead, for him, they are to indicate D's development, not H's. He assumes that D built the seventh-year institution on the material which he ascribes to P, using an even more novel element, that of Yahweh's redemptive action in Israelite history, with the aim of Yahweh centralization. In my view, this rise came as a direct result of the decline in the purity of P worship, not for lack of interest in the observance of cults. Nonetheless, Weinfeld sees these omissions, and others, as evidence of D's deliberate suppression of sacral ritual.¹⁴ He ignores the valuable original elements relating to the H calendar in the Deuteronomistic sections.¹⁵ However, I owe much to Weinfeld's examinations of the P aspects of the D theology, even though obviously, his aim is to elucidate the biblical formation as the crystallization of D, not H.

This textual analysis limits its investigation to the divisions between P^G and P^S, and those of Dtr1 and Dtr2. Thus, regarding the procedure of editing the cultic calendars, we have much difficulty in investigating it within the framework of P/D's theology. This research has been significantly advanced by Israel Knohl, who initially claims that P was the earliest layer in the Pentateuch against the prevalent opinion that H antedated P.¹⁶ The crux of his theory is that H expands the realm of holiness which encompasses all of Israelite life, society and land.¹⁷ It is a new interpolation of the earlier narratives through an innovative theory and develops the languages from earlier legal collections as well. However, Knohl doesn't consider how D's traits influence the form of the feasts. D demanded not only the restriction of cultic ceremonies to Yahweh's sanctuary but also the innovation of the calendar, which is primarily holy and evolved through a strong claim to the representation of "the people's obedience" to Yahweh's holiness. Now, H demands the representation of "the people's holiness" to Yahweh through daily activities in H's annual calendar. From this perspective, it is productive to re-examine the methodologies, which are based on fixed theologies of the three annual feasts without correctly considering the H editors' intention.

2. The Structure of Lev. 23

Knohl begins with a detailed analysis of Lev. 23, focusing in particular on how H incorporates P's legislation and shows real concern for agricultural life.¹⁸ His main concern

is to compare Lev. 23 with Nu. 28-29 and detail the unique layered character of this chapter from the perspective of “the relationship between the P schools.”¹⁹ The structure of Lev. 23 must be first clarified before exploring the individual issues. This chapter can be divided fairly easily by the introductory formulae “*wayyēdabbēr YHWH ’el-Mōšeh lē’mōr (Yahweh spoke to Moses, saying)*” (v. 1, 9, 23, 26, 33). Also, it is generally assumed that v. 2-3 is a secondary addition to this chapter which is itself a literary composite in light of the existence of two superscriptions (v. 2, 4).²⁰ Noth points out that the first heading in v. 2, already composite in its inconsistent mixture of third and first persons for Yahweh, is followed by another in v. 4.²¹ Specifically, the double headings similarly characterize the *miqrā’ qōdeš* (sacred proclamation)²² as Yahweh’s *mō’ādīm* (fixed times). Also, Knohl reconstructs the original introduction (vv.1, 2a, 4) to the list of festivals in Lev. 23, and asserts that the H editorial addition includes v. 2b and v. 3, as follows.²³

v. 2b *mō’ādē YHWH ’āšer-tiqrē’ū ’ōtām miqrā’ē qōdeš ’ēlleh hēm mō’āday*
(the fixed times of YHWH, which you shall proclaim as sacred proclamations, these are My fixed times.)

v. 3 *šēšet yāmīm tē’āšeh mēlā’kâ ūbayyôm haššēbī’î šabbat šabbātôn miqrā’-qōdeš kol-mēlā’kâ lō’ta ’āšû šabbāt hi’ laYHWH békōl mōšēbōtēkem*
(Six days shall work be done but on the seventh day is *šabbat šabbātôn*, a sacred proclamation; you shall do no work. It is Yahweh’s Sabbath in all your dwellings.)

It is comprehensible that primarily, the seventh-day Sabbath ordinance of v. 3 does not really belong to this annual festal-calendar, and it is deliberately inserted to the top of the original calendar, which reconstituted various elements of the feasts. However, as a recapitulation of his theory, Knohl assembles the stratification list of HS and PT²⁴ and includes Lev. 23:2b-3, 9-22, 24-26, 28-32, 38-43 in H’s list and regards v. 4 as the P heading of the original calendar. Here, we must first clarify one issue with Knohl, initially raised by Milgrom, who claims that the Sabbath is not a *mō’ēd*, even though it is called such in Lev. 23. Milgrom argues that the designation of “*mō’ādē YHWH ’āšer-tiqrē’ū (Yahweh’s fixed times which you shall proclaim)*” as distinctive H vocabulary and the omission of the required public sacrifices, pinpoint the exilic period as the time for the composition and insertion of the Sabbath pericope at the head of the festival calendar with his exilic theory.²⁵ Therefore, according to him, the H redactor composed the framework not only of Lev. 23 but also Nu. 28-29 to indicate that the Sabbath is one of the *mō’ādē YHWH*. He asserts, “The original P list subsumed all of the festivals under the heading “*’ēlleh mō’ādē YHWH (v. 4).*”²⁶ I agree

that H demands the Sabbath as “*mô'ädê YHWH*,” but for a different reason.

Explicitly, this proclamation (with slight differences) recurring in v. 37²⁷ indicates v. 4-37 should be regarded the body of the annual calendar. The proclamation of v. 4 designates the feasts as *mô'ädê YHWH* and *miqrā' qōdeš* by early H editors. That of v. 2b proclaims the seventh-day Sabbath as such with the designation of *mô'ädäy* by later H editors. Regarding the second Tabernacles passage (v. 39-43), which is close to the center section (v. 9-21) in manner and content,²⁸ it is regarded as the H later addition.²⁹ Lev. 23 itself features a blended product of historical process and traditional agricultural festivals, and the period of H's activity can be divided into at least two stages. Knohl asserts that the formula “*'ānī YHWH 'ēlōhēkem* I am Yahweh your God (vv. 22, 43),” which is characteristic of H, indicates that the sections (v. 9-22 and 38-43) stem from HS.³⁰ In the former section, the H editors retain original traditions of the calendar but display various innovative elements as well. Now, the relationship between Lev. 23, Dt. 16 and other various sources must be examined.

3. H's Harvest Festival Collection—v. 9-22

3-1. Šeba' Šabbātôt—Seven Sabbaths

D promoted the custom of eating *maššôt* material and the period of seven days, using an even more novel element, that of Yahweh's redemptive action in Israelite history (Ex. 13:4; 23:15; 34:18).³¹ Over time, the seven-day *ħag maššôt* joined with the *pesaħ* was emphasized through D's calendrical innovation (Dt. 16:1-7 [8]), but conventional P customs could not be ignored, so various materials were integrated into H's inventive concept. The key example is v. 9-22, which represents a clear development of the older festal arrangements. This integral section describing the harvest does not name the feast, while D's harvest festival is named “*ħag* (feast) *šābū'ôt* (sevens/sevenness)”³² by the seven-multiplied expression of “*šib'āh šābū'ôt* (seven sevens) (Dt. 16:9-10).” This existent term has been traditionally rendered as “the feast of weeks,” interpreted in light of H's counting system in Lev. 23:15-16.³³ However, unlike in the earlier decree, H no longer employs D's term of seven *šābū'ôt*, nor the name of the feast, as follows.

v. 15 *ūsēpartem lākem mimmōħōrat haššabbāt miyyôm ħābī'ākem 'et-'ōmer hattēnūpā šeba' šabbātôt tēm'imōt tihyēnā*

(You shall count for yourselves seven Sabbaths from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day on which you bring the sheaf of the elevation offering; they shall be

complete.)

v. 16 *'ad mimmōḥorat haššabbāt haššēbī'ti tispērū ḥāmiššim yôm weḥiqrabtem minḥā ḥādāšā laYHWH*

(You shall count until the morrow after the seventh Sabbath, fifty days; then you shall present a new grain offering to Yahweh.)

Here, it is essential to explore how to characterize this harvest festival as shown in H's own unique depiction of the Sabbath in the following points. First, H's intentional phrasology, "*šeba' šabbātōt*" which means "seven Sabbaths," reveals H's attachment to this term. Second is the question why H puts this nameless feast in the middle of the calendar. The reason is clarified on reading this section as one passage collected from the harvest traditions. The nature of this complex of traditions is substantiated by the key lexeme *qsr*,³⁴ which means "reap, harvest" in the first and last verses (vv. 10, 22),³⁵ enclosing the stipulations of the harvest offerings. Primarily, in v. 10, H's intention is to edify as to the notion of the land as Yahweh's gift with D's phraseology, "*kī-tābō 'ū 'el-hā 'āreṣ 'ānī nōtēn lākem* (When you enter the land that I grant you),"³⁶ and express how to serve the ritual of harvest and present "*'ōmer rē'sīt qēšīrēlkem* (the first sheaf of your harvest)" in light of priestly view. Furthermore, v. 11 defines the beginning of the ritual as "*mimmōḥorat haššabbāt* (the morrow after the Sabbath)," and stipulates that "*ha'ōmer* (the sheaf)" is lifted up³⁷ by "*hakkōhēn* (the priest)."³⁸

Thirdly, the reckoning system of counting "*šeba' šabbātōt* (seven Sabbaths v. 15)" from the morrow of the Sabbath is again explained by adding the new phraseology of "*mimmōḥorat haššabbāt haššēbī'ti* (the morrow after the seventh Sabbath)," and "*ḥāmiššim yôm* (fifty days)" in v. 16. The countdown to "*haššabbāt haššēbī'ti* (the seventh Sabbath)" expresses the heart of this section, that is, the hope of the people looking forward to the harvest, with repetition of the H phrase "*ḥuqqat 'ōlam lēdōrōtēkem bēkōl mōšēbōtēkem* (an everlasting statute throughout your generations in all your dwellings)"³⁹ (vv. 14, 21). Also, Knohl includes "*ūqērā 'tem bē'ešem hayyôm hazzeh* (on that very day you shall proclaim)" in the H origin and differentiates it from the P phrase; "*miqrā-qōdeš yihyeh lākem kol-mēle'ket 'ābōdā lō' ta'āšū* (you shall hold a sacred proclamation; you must do no laborious work)."⁴⁰

Undoubtedly, H's accurate phraseology "*šeba' šabbātōt* (seven Sabbaths)" indicates H's appropriation of D's "*ḥag šābū'ōt* (the feast of Sevenness)" in Dt. 16:9. Here, the term Sabbath is implicitly a double synonym for both "seven days," and "the seventh day," and the whole passage using "Sabbath" must have been re-constructed from the festal traditions. This must be validated through further examination. Linguistically, H's idea of the longing for

the harvest during the period framed by these Seven Sabbaths can be regarded as crucial for a new understanding of the Sabbath. Of particular note is the fact that the counting of every seventh-day does not correspond to H's annual calendar, in spite of H's concern with the seventh Sabbath and the morrow, that is the fiftieth day, which corresponds to the fiftieth year. By the same token, this textual evidence betrays the erroneous rendering of "the feast of weeks." It also indicates that the conventional interpretation of the second annual festival is based on the Deuteronomic sections.⁴¹ Andreas Schuele believes the Holiness Code is "a collection of legal and cultic materials from the First Temple period" considering "that one exception (Lev. 23:3) the Sabbath is not yet the seventh day of the week." According to him, "the day of a particular festival is determined in relation to its preceding Sabbath, most likely understood as the day of the full moon in the middle of the month."⁴² This suggestion raises a question about controversial terminology, "*mimmōḥōrat haššabbāt* (the morrow after the Sabbath vv. 11, 15, 16)."

3-2. *Mimmōḥōrat Haššabbāt*— the Morrow after the Sabbath

In the light of the literary context of this phrase, the possibility that the counting start-day can be associated with *mimmōḥōrat haššabbāt* connects v. 11-16 with the preceding v. 5-8; namely, the seven-day *ḥag maššōt* following the paschal rite. Accordingly, most scholars interpret this terminology in the light of the prescriptions for *ḥag maššōt*, which are succeeded by the 'ōmer rite. However, Karl William Weyde⁴³ points out that v. 10ff. sets no specific date for the 'ōmer rite, the dating of which is conditionally dependent on regional differences of the climate. He contends that "it would be impossible to bring the sheaf of the first fruits to Yahweh at the same time." According to him, the regionally dependent dating indicates Lev. 23 allows worship at local sanctuaries. Weyde quotes Milgrom who held the exilic H redactors as those who embraced the Sabbath as the only cultic ritual the community could celebrate together. Therefore, he asserts that "the day after the Sabbath" is "the day of the 'ōmer celebration" and can be several "weeks later than the *ḥag maššōt*." Even though I agree with him regarding the disconnection of the dating between *ḥag maššōt* and the 'ōmer rite, his assertion based on the recurring Sabbath institution is problematic.

On the other hand, Gnana Robinson⁴⁴ suggests that the morrow of "the full-moon night (his alleged Sabbath) in v. 5" is the first day of *maššōt*, a work-off day, including a full Sabbath day (the 15th day). According to him, therefore, the counting start-day is the sixteenth day, and the seventh day of *maššōt* (the 22nd day) in v. 8 is the second work-off and Sabbath day. This assumption can be accepted as a later interpretation, but the characteristics of v. 5-8 do not belong to H, but P (discussed later). Also, the fact that the

present calendar sets no specific date for the *ōmer* rite and that the seventh day of *maṣṣôt* is not called the Sabbath makes his theory difficult.

As for this complex subject based on competing interpretations, Fishbane⁴⁵ maintains that the striking onset of festivals in priestly sources points to some significance still accorded to lunar-especially full-moon phrases. He presents a conclusion that “the original meaning of *šabbāt* had long since fallen into obscurity, and that reference to it in Lev. 23:10-16 were interpreted inner-biblically and in terms of current usage.” Consequently, he emphasizes the importance of understanding Josh. 5:10-12 as a fulfillment of the prescription of Lev. 23:10-14. According to him, “Josh. 5:10-12 preserves eloquent witness to the fact that the old lunar sense of the term *šabbāt* was once current in priestly circles was the basis for ritual calculations towards Pentecost.” His rationale is that Joshua “preserves a covert exegetical clarification of the practical ritual sense of Lev. 23:10-16; and that it does so in the context of a descriptive historical narrative which purports to be a fulfillment of the prescriptive command of proper ritual procedure ‘when you come into the land.’” Thus, he suggests that the Sabbath in Lev. 23:10-16 was identified with the Passover that was the spring full moon. I agree with the traditional interpretation of the *šabbāt* and *pesah* on the full moon.⁴⁶ This evidence indicates H’s theology, not D’s, but his explanation needs further examination on the relevant terms in light of the literary context, such as “*bē’eṣem hayyôm hazzeh* (on that very day Josh. 5:11; Lev. 23)”⁴⁷ and the significance of the verb *šabāt* (Josh. 5:12).

Furthermore, another problem lies regarding “*maṣṣôt wēqālūy* (unleavened bread and parched grain, Josh. 5:11) and *qālūy* (Lev. 23:14).” As Noth points out the peculiar expression “*maṣṣôt wēqālūy*” in Josh. 5:10-12 differs from P’s divine commandment of the Passover (Ex. 12:1 ff.).⁴⁸ However, in my opinion, it is not D’s divine commandment in contrast to Noth’s assumption.

Explicitly, the difficulty lies in the identification of the word *šabbāt*, which is not identified with the seventh day, except in v. 3, and the calendar cannot apply to the recurring seventh day. My assumption, as mentioned already, is that Lev. 23 is a complex of variant sources and that H’s concept of *šabbāt* as a synonym for seven days, the seventh day and presumably the full-moon day is not fixed yet at this point. However, this section in question undoubtedly presents a phase of cultic innovation through means of H’s significant factors.

4. H’s Scheme for the Sacred Calendar

4-1. *Šabbātôn* as a Catalyst for the Sacred Feast

H's original terminology, *sabbātôn*, must be first clarified before exploring the individual factors. Robinson points out the atoning character of the seventh month, during which the important and religious activities were held (Dt. 31:10 ff). However, his argument proceeds without differentiating between the crucial traits of P and H in Lev. 23.⁴⁹ Thus, in my extensive review of academic literature,⁵⁰ I have yet to find a correct definition of *šabbātôn* to develop a conclusive idea on the formulation of the seventh-day Sabbath. Thus, based on the eleven cases found in the Bible, I would like to explicate my definition of *šabbātôn*. The term *šabbātôn* is linked to the following periods of "time."

- (1) "the seventh" **day** (Ex. 16:23, 31:15, 35:2; Lev. 23:3)
- (2) the first (Lev. 23:24), tenth (Lev. 16:31; 23:32), 15th and 22nd day (the first and eighth day of the festival) (Lev. 23:39 [twice]) of "the seventh" **month**
- (3) "the seventh" **year** (Lev. 25:4, 5)

First and foremost, we must ascertain the definition of "*šabbātôn*" from the above examples, which are applied to "the seventh" day, month, and year, only appearing in the books of Exodus and Leviticus. Four cases of the seventh-day Sabbath are found, but as for Leviticus, the definition of the seventh-day Sabbath is limited to only Lev. 23:3. The idiom, *šabbat šabbātôn*, is employed to all the seventh-day Sabbaths (except in the fourth commandment), the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev. 16:31; 23:32) and the seventh-year Sabbath for the land (Lev. 25:4). The single term *šabbātôn* is attested in once to the seventh year,⁵¹ and in three cases to the seventh month: the first day as "*zikārôn tērû'â* (a memorial with alarm blasts) (Lev. 23:24),"⁵² and the 15th and 22nd of the month as the first and last days of "*ḥag sūkkôt* (the Feast of the Booths)"⁵³ (Lev. 23:39 [twice])." Thus, it is noteworthy that the single *šabbātôn* occurs in only the seventh month of this calendar. (On the other hand, except vv. 3, 9-22, 32, *šabbāt* does not appear alone in this festal calendar.)

The term *šabbātôn* is generally supposed to be the noun for observing the Sabbath, derived from the verb *šabat*.⁵⁴ However, I assume that the form of the abstract noun becomes *šabbātôn* in Hebrew, with three vowels using the particularizing suffix *-on*, giving the form a characteristic aspect different from the previous *šabbāt*.⁵⁵ In short, it seems to describe the concept which really characterizes "Yahweh's holiness," not the paganized full moon *šabbāt*. The aim of projecting *šabbātôn* onto the festal calendar is not an appeal to abstain and rest from work but to emphasize the holiness of the seventh. In this light, H definitely designated the seventh month as *šabbātôn*.

On the other hand, *pesaḥ laYHWH* (the fourteenth day) and *ḥag hammaṣṣôt laYHWH*

(the fifteenth day) in “the first month”⁵⁶ are not designated as *šabbātôn*, despite the fact that the prohibition of work is enjoined in Lev. 23:7-8 as follows.

v. 7 *bayyôm hārī’sôn miqrā-qōdeš yihyeh lākem kol-mēle’ket ‘ābōdā lō’ta’āsū*

(The first day shall be for you a sacred proclamation, you shall do no laborious work.)

v. 8 *wēhiqrabtem ‘iššeh laYHWH šib’at yāmūm ūbayyôm haššēbī’ī miqrā’-qōdeš kol-mēle’ket ‘ābōdh lō’ta’āsū*

(Seven days you shall present a fire offering to Yahweh and on the seventh day, a sacred proclamation, you shall do no laborious work.)

Why are neither the first day (the full moon day) nor seventh day in the first month designated *šabbāt* or *šabbātôn*? Here, Knohl’s estimation that v. 5-8 is ascribed to P, not H, comes into consideration. Also, it is true to the *ḥag sūkkôt* in v. 34-36.⁵⁷ That is to say that for P the sacred day is not *šabbāt* nor *šabbātôn* but *miqrā qōdeš*.

4-2. *Miqrā Qōdeš*—a Sacred Proclamation

Obviously, *miqrā’ qōdeš* pertains to the strict prohibition of work in order to participate in the sacred (the secular work is abstained from). We can confirm that the full-moon festivals in the first and seventh months are proclaimed as *miqrā qōdeš* by P, while the New Moon and the Sabbath are not (Nu. 28:9-15). However, some claim that the recurring seventh-day Sabbath is not equivalent to the feasts.⁵⁸ As for the terminology in the above, Milgrom repeats that the Sabbath is neither a *mō’ēd* nor a *miqrā’ qōdeš*, because the people were already familiar with it and its fixed customs.⁵⁹ According to him, all responsibility belongs to his hypothetical author in the Exile who had to adapt the terminology of *miqrā’ qōdeš* in order to stress the complete Sabbath rest (Ex. 35:2), which is incumbent on Israel. Moreover, he maintains that the speciality of the Sabbath should demand the comprehensive prohibition of work (*kol-mēlā’kā*). Also, according to Knohl, the function of *šabbātôn* is assigning great importance to the prohibition of work on the Sabbath. His contention is “HS assigns great importance to the prohibition of work on the Sabbath, whereas PT ignores this aspect completely.”⁶⁰ Following him, Milgrom states that the work prohibition on the Sabbath is missing in P’s festal calendar, in contrast to the other festivals (Nu. 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 7, 12, 35).⁶¹

However, the crucial difference is that unlike the other festivals, neither the Sabbath nor the New Moon are conceived by P as a *miqrā’ qōdeš*. That is to say, for P, the Sabbath has the same status as the New Moon. That is why H in Lev. 23 explicitly ignores the sacrifice of the

conventional full-moon Sabbath as well as the New Moon as found in Nu. 28. Whereas H introduces an even more novel interpretation when incorporating the cultic materials from the earlier traditions, not necessarily restricted to the exilic situation. *Šabbātôn* does not necessarily indicate the prohibition of work without *miqrā' qōdeš* (Lev. 23:39 [twice]). In regard to this inconsistency, Milgrom explains the lack of prohibition in v. 39: “the term *šabbātôn* implies a minor Sabbath (except in the completed *šabbat šabbātôn*) when minor, non-occupational work is permitted.”⁶² Conversely, however, examining this annual calendar, without the foundational presupposition of the seventh-day Sabbath, shows the opposite conclusion. I assert that the process of the Sabbath conceptualization should be reversed. H's systematic scheme starts as follows. First, the Sabbath as well as other festivals was defined commensurately with “Yahweh's *mô'êd* and *miqrā'ê qōdeš* (Lev. 23:4).” Subsequently, H coined the new terminology *šabbātôn*, which appears alone in reference to the first day of the seventh month as *zikārôn tēru'á* (v. 24), and the first and eighth day of the seventh month to the seven-day *ḥag sūkkôt* transformed (v. 39 [twice]), is not minor.

Therefore, Milgrom's view is not supported by a wider review of the scriptures. The H editors seem to have evolved their first systematic scheme to bring together *miqrā' qōdeš* and *šabbātôn*, the two notions which have become identical in content. The former which holds significance of holiness different from D's⁶³ reinforces the nature of the concept of the latter. Thus, for H, the role of *miqrā' qōdeš* is innovated. Also, the basic characteristic of the root *šbt* is the cessation of work,⁶⁴ but both primarily demand holiness. Such a notion as the work prohibition comes as the result of strict holiness' demands.

4-3. *Yôm Kippûrîm* and *Šabbat Šabbātôn*—The Birth of New Concepts from the Tenth Day

Now, we have to consider the crux of this paper: How does H encourage the people's holiness? H, for whom *šabbātôn* has a special trait, considers the scheme more enlightening on all sacred occasions. The date designation is one feature of the priestly document, while the notion of a sacred number is arbitrary. In the original P stipulations seven days is not holy; impurity lasts seven days, which is regarded as the period of purgation, and on the eighth day a sin offering must be brought to the priest (ex. Lev. 15:14-15, 28-30). Eventually, P's festival calendar related this period to the full-moon day. Specifically, P designated as *miqrā' qōdeš* the first and last day based on the full-moon day of the first and seventh months (Ex. 12:16 [twice]; Lev. 23:7, 8, 35, 36; Nu. 28:18, 25; 29:12).⁶⁵ Thus, the prohibition of work on the first, seventh and eighth day is enjoined by the designation of a *miqrā' qōdeš*. One corresponding specific formula “*kol-mēle'ket 'ābôdh lō'ra'šû* (you shall

do no laborious work)” is employed in Lev. 23:7, 8, 35, 36; Nu 28:18, 25; 29:12.⁶⁶

The experience of the exiles changed the transition of the sacred time. The crucial change influenced the liturgical calendar, in which *ḥag sūkkôt* (Lev. 23:34)⁶⁷ of the biggest annual harvest is preceded by *Yôm Kippûrîm* on the tenth of the seventh month (v. 27).⁶⁸ Significantly, this dating corresponds to the stipulation of the tenth day of the first month for the *pesah* preparation in Ex. 12:3. It is commanded to “*kôl ’ădat yiśrâ’el* (all the congregation of Israel).”⁶⁹ Knohl appropriately suggests that as H’s characteristic phrase, “the repetitive resumption of *lědôrôtêkem ḥuqqat ’ôlam* (Ex. 12:14, 17)”⁷⁰ brackets the seven-day *ḥag maṣṣôt* (v. 15-16).⁷¹ Noticeable are the severe penalties: “*wěnikrētâ hannepeš hahîy’ miyiśrâ’el* (v. 15: that soul shall be cut off from Israel.),” and *miqrā-qōdeš* (v. 16 [twice]), which does not appear apart from here in Exodus, with the expression “*kol-mělā’kâ lō’ yē’āse* (no work shall be done).”⁷² Undoubtedly, the traditional purgation theology⁷³ is expanded by placing its dating and more emphasis on holiness through the addition of stricter injunctions. Furthermore, the main focus shifts to the tenth of the seventh month.⁷⁴

As a point of departure, the tenth day is designated as *miqrā’ qōdeš* enjoined with the total prohibition of work: “*kol-mělā’kâ lō’ta’ăšû* (you shall not do any work) (Lev. 23:28; 31; Nu. 29:7).” The enjoined concept is definitely related to not only the severe prohibition of secular activities, also to a self-affliction formula such as the strict phrases: “*wě’innîtem ’et -napšôtêkem* (you shall afflict your souls) (Lev. 23:27, 32; Nu. 29:7).”⁷⁵ In this purifying stipulation, the tenth day of the seventh month is designated as *Yôm Kippûrîm* (the Day of Purgation)⁷⁶ by the H editors (Lev. 23: 28b).⁷⁷ Furthermore, H’s intention is integrated in this sacred tenth day, the holiness of which is emphasized as *šabbat šabbātôn*, as the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev. 23:27-32).⁷⁸ It is the completed *šabbat šabbātôn* (v. 32), the repetitive sound *ša* of which emphasizes holiness.

It must be noted that this phrase does not indicate a specific date, whereas *Yôm Kippûrîm* indicates specified the tenth of the seventh month and is couched as the commencement of the Jubilee year (Lev. 25:9). Also, the significance of *šabbat šabbātôn* is interpolated at the end of Lev. 16 as the center of Leviticus (16:29-34).⁷⁹ Lev. 16:29 addresses the people directly to observe “*ḥuqqat ’ôlam* (an everlasting statute)” on the tenth day of the *šabbātôn* month. Thus, *šabbat šabbātôn* acquires a critical place and significance in the ritual legislation combined with H’s intention as follows.

v. 29 *wěhāyētâ lākem lěḥuqqat ’ôlām baḥōdeš haššēbî’î be’āsôr laḥōdeš tē’annû et-napšôtêkem wěkol-mělā’kâ lō’ ta’ăšû hā’ezrāh wěhaggēr haggār bētôkêkem*

(It shall be an everlasting statute to you: in the seventh month, on the tenth of the month,

you shall afflict your souls and do no work at all, the native and the alien who resides among you.)

v. 30 *kî bayyôm hazzeh yĕkappēr ālĕkem lĕtahēr 'etkem mikkōl ḥattō'tĕkem lipnē YHWH tithārû*

(For on that day purgation shall be effected on your behalf to purify you; you shall become pure from all your sins before Yahweh.)

v. 31 *šabbat šabbātôn hî' lākem wĕ'innĕtem 'et-napšōtĕkem ḥuqqat 'ōlām*

(It is *šabbat šabbātôn* to you, and you shall afflict your souls; it is an everlasting statute.)

The injunction corresponds to the phraseology of Lev. 23:27-32 and gives no reference of the seventh day. However, the equality of the sojourner and the purification of the people are enjoined. Intrinsically, the purgation ritual itself contains the most significant element: how we are to prepare for “*kābôd yehwh* (Yahweh’s presence).” It is the climax of the priestly theology and H’s aim. In Ex. 24:16, the preceding period of six days is completed on the seventh day, which encourages the people’s holy worship, intensifying the salvific faith. This six-seventh day scheme is already utilized in Ex. 23:12; 34:21, in which the verb *šābat* represents the work-off commandment. It also appears with a didactic modification in Josh. 6:3-4; 14-15. Here it must be affirmed that this trajectory of seven or six-seventh formulas may have led to H’s new concept of *šabbat šabbātôn* and the seventh-day Sabbath commandment holds the heading position in H’s festal calendar (Lev. 23:3).

5. Conclusion

The H editors elevate Yahweh's sacred calendar through various innovations. Each H editor presents his own new interpretation respectively using such integral elements as *mô'éd*, *miqrā' qôdeš*, and (*šabbat*) *sabbātôn*. The formation of Lev. 23 begins with gathering of the conventional feasts that were closely connected with “Yahweh’s *mô'éd* and *miqrā'ê qôdeš* (v. 4).” Consequently, the resonance of *šeba'* (seven) and *šabbāt* in the middle section is ticking Yahweh’s time with strong echoes mutually rebounding (v. 15-16). It impacts the reckoning of time, although we cannot deny that it is a rhetorical expression. However, the crux of H’s intention is not the feasts’ dating but the Israelites’ sacred worship to Yahweh, who demands the prohibition of foreign gods and moon worship. The purgation commandment is most rigidly enjoined to the people as well as priests (v. 27-32; 16:29-34). The present form of Lev. 23, which represents various aspects of the cultic traditions, is reconstituted by injecting the

seventh-day *šabbat šabbātôn* in the opening words (v. 3). It is declared as Yahweh's Sabbath by the final H editors.

Wellhausen says: “The undesigned preponderance gained by the Sabbath may have ultimately given it independence, and led to the reckoning of time by regular intervals of seven days without regard to new moon, with which [the Sabbath] came into collision, instead of, as formerly, being supported by [the new moon]. In the end, even its name came to be interpreted as if derived from the verb ‘to rest.’... The highest development, amounting even to a change of quality, is seen in the Priestly Code.”⁸⁰

In the above, if we substitute Holiness for Priestly, no better comment than this is to be found. However, the above discussion indicates that the main thrust of H's work was still in the transitional stage and H's position was not stable during its period of activity. Much more still remains to be investigated. Above all, it is essential to explore the process of interpolating *šabbat šabbātôn* and the six-seventh day scheme with the aim of elucidating their roles in the course of the biblical formation.

Notes

* Abbreviations

A New Concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible (=NCB), edit. Even-Shoshan, Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1983.

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (=IDB), Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962-1976.

The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (=NIDB), Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006-2009.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (=TDOT), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-.

Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament (=TLOT), Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.

- ¹ The following abbreviations are traditionally employed: P (referring to the Priestly material in the Pentateuch), D (Deuteronomic material), J (the Jahwist), E (the Elohist), H (the Holiness Code).
- ² Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel: with a reprint of the article Israel from the Encyclopaedia Britannica preface by W. R. Smith* (Meridian Books, 1957 [1878]), pp. 52-120. Wellhausen's influential theory is based on the three-fold development through the historicization of agricultural festivals into P feasts. He suggests an earlier stage in which the sacrifice of the firstling belonged to the primitive *pesah*. In other words, the insight that common laws governed the development of religious practice from primitive to higher forms was applied to the Bible, particularly to the rite of *pesah* and first-born. Many scholars do not agree, presumably due to the terminology; primitive or higher.
- ³ Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel, from its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*, tr. and abri. Moshe Greenberg (University of Chicago Press, 1960 [1937]), esp. pp. 170-1. Moshe Weinfeld, *The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (Brill, 2004), esp. pp. 34-63. Jacob Milgrom,

-
- Leviticus 1-16* (Yale University Press, 1991), esp. pp. 3-13. *Leviticus 23-27* (Yale University Press, 2001), esp. pp. 2241-45.
- ⁴ Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 83 “In JE and D there is a rotation of three festivals. Easter and Pentecost mark the beginning and the end of the corn-harvest.” Also see p. 86 “seven weeks after Easter (Dt 16: 9),” p. 99 “during Easter week and also on the day of Pentecost,” and p. 101 “Easter falls upon the fifteenth, that is, at full moon, of the first, the feast of tabernacles upon the same day of the seventh month; Pentecost, which, strange to say, is left undetermined in Num. 28, falls, according to Lev. 23, seven weeks after Easter.” German original version; Ostern fällt auf den 15. Tag, d. h. auf den Vollmond, des ersten Monats, Laubhütten auf den selben, pp. 96-97. However, the terminology of Easter by his interpretation is not based on the Hebrew text, nor the Greek one.
- ⁵ In spite of this evidence, Haran claims that “since the substantive ‘week’, *sabuot*, in the plural, is associated with the name of this feast not only in P H, and D.” Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978), p. 295.
- ⁶ Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Worship in Israel: a cultic history of the Old Testament*, tr. G. Buswell (John Knox, 1966), p. 55. Also see p. 57, “We cannot now discover the original meaning of this ‘seven-week period’.”
- ⁷ Gerhard von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch, and other essays*, tr. E.W. Trueman Dicken (Oliver & Boyd, 1966 [1938]), pp. 42-43. von Rad asserts that “the tribute of agricultural produce envisaged by Dt. 26 corresponds to that of Ex. 23:16; 34:22 and Lev. 23:17, so that according to the ancient Israelite calendar the ceremony in question was observed at the Feast of Weeks.” He utilizes this counting system of summing up fifty days, which comes from Lev. 23:15-16, demonstrating his creed theory.
- ⁸ Martin Noth, *Exodus*, tr. J.S. Bowden (S.C.M. Press, 1966 [1962]), pp. 164-65.
- ⁹ J. B. Segal, *Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* (Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 196-97.
- ¹⁰ The complex in Lev. 17-26 customarily has been called the Holiness Code, due to God’s holiness addressed to the Israelites in general “*qēdōšim tihyū kī qādōš ’ānī YHWH ’ēlohēm* (You shall be holy, for I Yahweh your God am holy).”
- ¹¹ Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, pp. 376-80) argues that Lev. 17-26 takes its starting-point from the JE legislation, and modifies it in the manner of D. According to him, H’s concerns with ethical behavior are uncharacteristic of P. Also, he (p. 384) states, “the fact that the last edition of the Law of H proceeds from the P Code” derives from “the use of Lev. 23:9-22 in this connection is completely justified by the consideration that only in this way do the rites it describes find meaning and vitality” (p. 86, n. 1). As Knohl mentions, “[Wellhausen] believed that H constitutes an intermediate stage between J, E, and D sources and the P source,” for Wellhausen H’s agricultural worship shows signs of the previous stage to “the creation of P.” (Israel Knohl *The Sanctuary of Silence: the priestly Torah and the holiness school* (Fortress Press, 1995 [1992]), p. 4.)
- ¹² Kaufmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-80 (esp., pp. 175-6).
- ¹³ Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic school* (Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 179-243. He claims, “Had P been dependent on D—as Wellhausen assumed—then we should be able to discern this dependence in verbal and conceptual parallels, but no such dependence has yet been convincingly demonstrated (p. 180).”
- ¹⁴ Weinfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 179 -224 (esp. pp. 219f).

- ¹⁵ In my view, the festal calendar in D indicates the above transformation, and the features in D16:9-10 can be evaluated as evidence that the details had not yet been fixed in contrast with later H editors in Lev. 23.
- ¹⁶ Knohl critically examines the concept of God and cult in the P Torah (*op. cit.*, esp. pp. 124-67) and explains about HS (Holiness School)’s essential features different from P (esp. pp. 168-98). He asserts that this holiness legislation refers to laws outside of Leviticus. For Knohl’s terminology of HS, such designations are usually associated with particular schools. In this paper, I have chosen to use a more general division of (earlier and later) H. According to him, PT’s period of activity was about two and a half centuries, from the time of David and Solomon down to the reign of Ahaz. HS’s period of activity fell between 743 and 701 BC.
- ¹⁷ Knohl, *op. cit.*, pp. 180-98.
- ¹⁸ Knohl represents H phraseologies characteristic of the elements of this chapter that are HS origin and details difference between the language of PT and the language of HS. Knohl, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 106-10.
- ¹⁹ Knohl, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
- ²⁰ Compare “*mô’aday* (my fixed times)” in v. 2 with v. 4: “*’elleh mô’ādê YHWH miqrā’ê-qōdeš ’āšer-tiqrē’û ’ōtām bemô’ādām* (These are Yahweh’s fixed times, sacred proclamations, you shall proclaim at their fixed time).
- ²¹ Martin Noth, *Leviticus*, tr. J. E. Anderson (SCM Press, 1965 [1962]), pp. 165-68, esp. p. 166.
- ²² The technical term, *miqrā’ qōdeš* occurs 19 times: Ex. 12:16, 16; Lev. 23:2 3, 4, 7, 8, 21, 24, 27, 35, 36, 37; Nu. 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 7, 12. *Miqrā’ qōdeš* means literally “sacred proclamation” and the expression regularly bound up with the work-prohibition. It is generally rendered as a “holy convocation” (KJV, JPS, NRSVA etc.) Noth (*op. cit.*, p. 168) mentions that the technical term *miqrā-qōdeš* means literally “holy calling,” which does not mean “holy feast-assembly.” David Wright (*ABD*, v. 3, pp. 243-44) states that *miqrā’ qōdeš* means “declaration of, call for, summoning to holiness” rather than “holy convocation.” Knohl’s rendering is “proclaimed holiness.” Note Lev. 23:2, 4, 37 *miqrā’ê* (m. pl. cstr.) *qōdeš*.
- ²³ Knohl, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 104-6.
- ²⁵ Milgrom, *The Case for the Pre-Exilic and Exilic Provenance of the Book of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers in Reading the Law* (T & T Clark, 2007), pp. 48-49. Also see *Leviticus 23-27*, esp. pp. 1953-59. Milgrom attributes an editorial interpolation of the Sabbath passages to the exilic period. According to him, they are located in the interstices between the instructions and building of the sanctuary, telling signs that their author is the H redactor, who “lived among the exiles in Babylonia, where the temple and the sacrificially bound *mô’ādīm* of Lev. 23:4-38 and Nu. 28-29 were inoperative.” Also, he (1953-54) asks appropriately, “Why, then, has H found it so urgent to go against accepted usage and label the Sabbath a *mô’ēd*?” To which he replies as the only logical answer: the H redactor “had no choice; he was citing Ex. 35:2 (H).” He explains about “two major differences between the two passages: the death penalty (Ex. 35:2; cf. 31:15) is dropped, and the phrase *bēkōl mōšēbōtēkem* ‘throughout your settlements’ is borrowed from the following verses (Ex. 35:3; it does not appear in Ex. 31:12-17).”
- ²⁶ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, p. 19. Milgrom states, “Knohl shows convincingly that the Sabbath prescription in 23:2b-3 is an H interpolation into an original P list of festivals. That is, in this

passage, H innovates the notion that the Sabbath is a *miqrā' qōdeš* and a day of rest (1987: 72-77). What Knohl fails to notice is that H's innovation also consists in labeling the Sabbath a *mō'éd*. Whereas the original P list subsumed all of the festivals under the heading “*‘ēlleh mō'ādē YHWH* (v. 4).”

- ²⁷ Verse 37a reads, “*‘ēlleh mō'ādē YHWH 'āser-tiqrē'ū 'ōtām miqrā'ē -qōdeš* (These are Yahweh's fixed times, which you shall proclaim as sacred occasions).” See Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2033.
- ²⁸ See Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
- ²⁹ Knohl (*op. cit.*, p. 56) attributes to the late H editors v. 38, which was added to the original conclusion (v. 37) to account for the lack of sacrifices in the Sabbath interpolation (v. 3).
- ³⁰ Knohl, *op. cit.*, p. 9. Also, Budd suggests that the features, “the familiar self-introduction by Yahweh in vv. 22, 43, and the reference to Yahweh as deliverer of Israel from Egypt in v. 43 (cf. 19:36; 22:33)” are traced to the Holiness Code (cf. 20:22; 25:38). Philip J. Budd, *Leviticus* (W.B. Eerdmans, 1996), p. 314.
- ³¹ Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1972[1948]), pp. 48-49. Noth discusses the Passover in the Deuteronomic law (Dt. 16:1, 3, 6) and in other Deuteronomistic passages (Ex. 12:26, 27a; 13:3, 8f., 14-16; 23:15=34:18) as the example of “bringing of Israel out of Egypt.”
- ³² The expression of *ḥag šābū'ôt* occurs in Ex. 34:22; Dt. 16:10, 16; 2Ch. 8:13. It is conventionally called “the feast of Weeks.” However, the habituation of week system makes us fail to notice that the seven-day unit is nowhere mentioned as a division of the year before the Book of Jubilees (as mentioned earlier). The term *šābū'ôt* is attested 20 times (the above verses and Gen. 29:27, 28; Lev. 12:5; Nu. 28:26; Dt. 16:9, 9; Jer. 5:24; Ezek. 45:21; Dan. 9:24, 25, 26, 27, 27; 10:2, 3, 8). This alleged second annual festival is generally identified as *ḥag haqqāšîr* (Ex. 23:16) at the time of the first fruits of the harvest (Lev. 23:10), because of offering the firstlings in Ex. 34:22; Nu. 28:26; Dt. 16:9-12. However, Milgrom, (*Leviticus 23-27*, p. 1990) points out that *ḥag šābū'ôt*, first appears in the deuteronomic sources (Dt. 16:10, 16; Ex. 34:22). Also, Milgrom (1991-92) who remarks on “Nu. 28:26: *ūbayyôm habikkûrîm bêḥaqrîbkem minḥā ḥādāšā bēšābū'ōtēkem*,” points out that “the unique expression *šābū'ōtēkem*, a suffixed “your” betrays the existence of more than one date for the festival.” I maintain that basically *šābū'ôt* means a “seven day unit” and not a “week” in a calendrical sense. It must be noted that *ḥag šābū'ôt* in its present form is estimated as the seven-day observance, because the term, *šābū'ôt*, can be regarded as the emphatic plural form of the symbolic seven, *šābūa'* for the Deuteronomic offering date. See also Frank Crüsemann, *Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law* tr. Allan W. Mahnke, (Fortress Press, 1996), p. 133. He states, “Because of its name, it is often called the ‘festival of sevenness’ *šabu'ot*.”
- ³³ E. Otto, *TDOT*, v.14, p. 366. Otto states that “the different dates for the Feast of Weeks proposed in late Israelite and early Jewish circles derive from the different interpretations of *mimmāḥōrat haššabbāt* in Lev. 23:(12), 15, interpretations leading to differing solutions to the mediation of the festival calendar with the week-based structure that was not really carried through in the biblical tradition itself.”
- ³⁴ The verb and noun *qšr* occurs in Lev. 23:10, 22, while the frequency of the verb in Pentateuch is 6 times (Lev. 19:9; 23:10, 22; 25:5, 11; Dt. 24:9) and that of the noun is 11 times (Gen. 8:22; 30:14; 45:6; Ex. 23:16; 34:21-22; Lev. 19:9; 23:10, 22; 25:5, 11; Dt. 24:9).
- ³⁵ v. 10... *qēšārtētem 'et-qēšîrāh wahābē'tem 'et-'ōmer rē'sît qēšîrēlkem 'el-hakkōhēn* (you reap its

harvest, you shall bring the first sheaf of your harvest to the priest.)

v. 22 *ûbqšrkem 'et-qěšîr 'arškem lō 'tēkalleh... bēqěšreka... lō 'tēlaqqēt leānîy wēlagēr ta 'āzob otam 'ānî YHWH ėlôhēkem* (And when you reap the harvest of your land, you shall not complete... when you reap I Yahweh am your God.)

- ³⁶ Weinfeld, *op. cit.*, see the D phraseology list in p. 342. It is important to compare Lev. 23:10; 25:2 with Dt. 26.
- ³⁷ The term *wēhēnîp, yēnîpennû>nûp* is a special contribution. Milgrom, (*Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 461-73) concludes that is an actual or symbolic elevation rite of dedication.
- ³⁸ Noth (*Leviticus*, p. 170) postulates that the expression “‘*el-hakkōhēn*” is based on the ancient sentence.
- ³⁹ The phraseology *bēkōl mōšēbōtēkem* occurs in vv. 3, 14, 17, 21, 31 in this chapter.
- ⁴⁰ Knohl, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.
- ⁴¹ The expression “three times in a year” occurs in Ex. 23:14, 17; 34:23, 24; Dt. 16:16 and 1 K. 9:25; 2Ch. 8:13. This phraseology can be considered as D terminology and general interpretation regarding “three times of feasts” derived from the D documents. Lev. 23 does not refer to three feasts, and the precisely dated feasts are found in the first and seventh months. I assert that this is not a literal three times, but rather a rhetoric expression of the frequency of times.
- ⁴² Schuele, *NIDB*, v. 5, pp. 4-5. However, he admits the most notable exception is *yôm hakippûrîm* (the Day of Purgation), which is itself called a *šabbāt sabbātôn* (v. 32), although it does not fall on a full moon day.
- ⁴³ Karl William Weyde, *The Appointed Festivals of YHWH* (Mohr Siebeck, 2004), pp. 78-84, esp. pp. 82, 83.
- ⁴⁴ Gnana Robinson, *The Origin and Development of the Old Testament Sabbath* (P. Lang, 1972), pp. 379-82. According to Robinson’s counting, the fourteenth evening (*pesaḥ*) i.e. the full moon night of the fifteenth day, the Sabbath (v. 5) and the first day of *maššōt* (the fifteenth day) is a work-off day and a full Sabbath day.
- ⁴⁵ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Clarendon Press, 1988 [1985]), pp. 145-51. However, Fishbane (pp. 166-67), regarding the phrase in Lev. 23:15, suggests “that the noun *šabbāt* also meant ‘week’ in the biblical period. A comparison of Lev. 23:15 with Dt. 16:9 supports this observation.... The two prescriptions show both a traditional formulation (‘you shall count’) and a significant variation.”
- ⁴⁶ The transformation of the Passover narrative: the morrow of the Passover in Josh. 5:10-12 might have caused the concept of the Sabbath to be changed. That is the morrow of the Sabbath, the day of the first-fruit offering.
- ⁴⁷ Knohl, *op. cit.*, p. 13. He suggests that the verse “*bē’ešem hayyôm hazzeh* (on that very/same day)” is characteristic of the elements of HS origin (Lev. 23: 14, 21, 28, 29, 30). Cf. Gen. 7:13; 17:23, 26; Ex. 12:17, 41, 51; Dt. 32:48.
- ⁴⁸ Noth, *The Chronicler’s History* (Sheffield, 1987 [1981]), pp. 111-12.
- ⁴⁹ Robinson (*op. cit.*, pp. 349-52) emphasizes Yahweh’s Sabbath as the impact of Yahweh’s kingship ideology, states that the word “*šabbātôn*” could be applied to any day which has an atoning or sanctifying character, independent of the full-moon day. According to Robinson, Dt. 31:10ff, the release seventh-year also commenced in the seventh month, with the festival *sukkôt*. Both in Babylon and in Israel, the seventh month” was the holiest of all the months. However, he argues that

P, “for whom the number seven acquires a special atoning character,” seems to have considered all those solemn occasions in the seventh month as *šabbātôn*.

⁵⁰ Niels-Erik A. Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath* (Society of Biblical Literature for the Form Criticism Seminar, 1972), pp. 72-73, 111-113. He claims that “there is general agreement among Semitists that *šabbātôn* is a denominative of *šabbāt*,” and the term *šabbātôn* is not the superlative noun and “does not carry any idea of propitiation.” Also, according to him, “it seems to describe that which really characterize the Sabbath or any other day which has Sabbath qualities.” His conclusion is “that *šabbātôn* describes the content of the Sabbath, i.e., it is an abstraction of “keeping Sabbath,” used only in the late literature of P and H.” Moreover, he assumes “that the priestly circles found certain qualities in the Sabbath institution, probably abstention from work, which would justify the use of the name for these feast days.”

Morgenstern, *IDB*, v. 4, p. 140.

Haag, *TDOT*, v. 14, pp. 389, 396.

Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus* (Jewish Publication Society, 1989), p. 155.

Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 1057-58; *Leviticus 17-22* (Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 1405-6; *Leviticus 23-27*, pp. 1959, 2013-14, 2018-19, 2036, 2040, 2056-58. Milgrom writes an exhaustive study dissecting, deliberating and defending his interpretation of the Sabbath. His work is the valuable guidance for my research, but his assertion, based on his reading of *šabbāt* as “rest,” is that the construct chain *šabbat šabbātôn* (as a superlative form) means literally “the most restful rest.”

Knohl, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 35.

Erhard. S. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus* (J. Knox Press, 1993), pp. 340-41. 348-49, 375.

Budd, *op. cit.*, pp. 237, 319.

Schuele, *NIDB* (2009), v. 5, p. 5.

Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch* (Mohr Siebeck, 2007), p. 567.

William Propp, *Exodus 1-18* (Doubleday, 1999), pp. 431, 589, 597. *Exodus 19-40* (Doubleday, 2006), p. 493.

Daniel C. Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), pp. 47-51.

Jeffrey Stackert, *How the Priestly Sabbaths Work: Innovation in Pentateuchal Priestly Ritual in Ritual Innovation in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism*, ed. Nathan MacDonald (De Gruyter, 2016), p. 106.

⁵¹ The phraseology of “*šēnat* (year) *šabbātôn*,” occurs only in Lev. 25:5, which designates the seventh year as Yahweh’s Sabbath.

⁵² Some scholars (ex. Noth, *Leviticus*, 172) interpret Lev. 23:24 as the New Year’s Day but the text explicitly defines not the first month, but the seventh month (*hōdeš haššēbī’î*) as “*šabbātôn zikārôn tērû ‘â miqrā-qōdeš*.” I assert that the blast of the horn means not necessarily the New Year’s Day, but the proclamation of the significant day. The same hold true also for Lev. 25:9.

⁵³ Here, this name “*ḥag sūkkōt*” comes from Lev. 23:34.

⁵⁴ Knohl follows this idea and asserts that “The term *šabbātôn*, which indicates the prohibition of labor, is unquestionably derived from *šābat*.” (Knohl, *op. cit.*, p. 35.)

⁵⁵ cf. Paul Joüon, *Orthography and Phonetics; Morphology*, tr. and revised by T. Muraoka (Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993), p. 262; John Huehnergard, *A grammar of Akkadian 3rd* ed. (Eisenbrauns, 2011), p. 198.

- ⁵⁶ Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Harvard University Press, 1997 [1973]), pp. 105, 123. He argues that two New Year's festivals in early Israel were celebrated at different sanctuaries, or periods and seasons; in the fall and the spring.
- ⁵⁷ v. 35 *bayyôm hārī'sôn miqrā'-qōdeš kol-mēle'ket 'ābōdā lō'ta'āšū* v. 36 *šib'at yāmīm taqrībū 'iššeh laYHWH bayyôm haššminī miqrā'-qōdeš yihyeh lākem wēhiqrabtem 'iššeh laYHWH kol-mēle'ket 'ābōdā lō'ta'āšū 'āšeret hī' kol-mēle'ket 'ābōdā lō'ta'āšū* (v. 35 The first day shall be a sacred proclamation; you shall do no laborious work. v. 36 Seven days you shall present a fire offering to Yahweh. On the eighth day, you shall observe a sacred proclamation and you shall present a fire offering to Yahweh. It is a solemn assembly, you shall do no no laborious work.)
- ⁵⁸ See Noth's contention that the Sabbath-ordinance does not belong to the feast (*Leviticus*, p. 166).
- ⁵⁹ Milgrom (*Leviticus 23-27*, pp. 1953-78) claims that "the Sabbath erroneously termed *mō'ādīm* in the heading and subscript," through the presupposition of the seventh-day Sabbath that is a "sacred occasion," a day of rest for Yahweh, and a *šabbat šabbāthôn* "complete day of rest." He saw no need to label the Sabbath as *mō'ādīm* or *miqrā' qōdeš*, as he viewed its origins going back to antiquity, and rejects editing which added this phrase as attempts to modify or interpret the Sabbath beyond his view of its original form. In short, he asserts the occurrence of the Sabbath is calculated by God, expending considerable time defending why it isn't an appointed time. Whereas, the designated festivals, set in harmony with the lunar calendar, were to be calculated by man. However, it is clear from the outset that he is arguing from the stance of his presupposition of the weekly Sabbath. His discussion (esp. pp. 2034-35) goes on the rationale that the Sabbath is not *mō'éd*, but, Lev. 23:2b-3 is the product of the latest (exilic) H stratum (H_r), which wanted to incorporate the Sabbath into "*mō'ādē laYHWH*." He states, "The Sabbath is scrupulously distinguished from the *mō'éd* in all the biblical sources, and it is independent of the lunar month, falling on every seventh day, it is not a *miqrā'*, a proclamation day, its arrival need not be announced."
- ⁶⁰ Knohl, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
- ⁶¹ Milgrom, *op. cit.*, p. 1960.
- ⁶² Milgrom, *Ibid.*, p. 2040. "Perhaps because *šabbat šabbāthôn* 'rest' implies a prohibition against work, the injunction *kol- mēle'ket 'ābōdh lō'ta'āšū* 'you shall do no laborious work' (v. 36b) need not be repeated. That the term *šabbāthôn* implies a minor Sabbath (except in the completed *šabbat šabbāthôn*) when minor, non-occupational work is permitted."
- ⁶³ My assumption is that D demands the people should be holy to belong to God as an '*am qādōs* 'a holy people' (Dt. 7:6; 14:2, 21: 26:19; 28:9). Consequently, this concept of ethnic sanctity became H's slogan (Lev. 11:44-45; 19:2; 20:7, 8, 26; 21:6-8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32).
- ⁶⁴ The verb *šābat* primarily means "cease, to come to an end" and is employed as the obligation to cease from work in the festal calendar (Ex. 34:21).
- ⁶⁵ McLaughlin, *NIDB*, v. 4, pp. 138-139. "The monthly New Moon was a time of sacrifice and feasting (Nu. 28:11-15, 1 S 20:5, 18, 24, 27)." The new moon of the seventh month is especially holy, in Nu. 29:1f. As for the relationship between Lev. 23:23-25 and Nu. 29:1-6, Milgrom (*op. cit.*, p. 2013) states, "Lev. 23 (H) takes for granted the character and rites of Nu. 29 (P), and its innovations rest with two new (For H) concept: *šabbāthôn* and *zikkārōn*."
- ⁶⁶ The expression "*kol-mēle'ket 'ābōdh lō'ta'āšū*" occurs in Lev 23:7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36; Nu 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 12, 35. Two differing prohibitive formulas of assigned tasks pertain to *miqrā' qōdeš*. One is "*kol-mēle'ket 'ābōdh* (laborious work)" and the other is "*kol-mēlā'kā* (all work)." (discussed later)

- ⁶⁷ *Hag sūkkôt* occurs 9 times in Lev. 23:34; Dt. 16:13, 16; 31:10; Zec. 14:16, 18, 19; Ezr. 3:4; 2Ch. 8:13. It is noted that Lev. 23:34 employs the terminology of Dt. 16:13, 16 different from Numbers.
- ⁶⁸ Propp (*Exodus 1-18*, pp. 443-5) details more extensive similarities of *Pesah* and *Yôm Kippûrîm*. Both rituals begin in the evening (Ex. 12:6; Lev. 23:32; Dt. 16:6), and “have undertones of purification and vicarious offering. In fact, the verb kipper (purge) is associated with *Pesah* in Ezek. 45:18-20.”
- ⁶⁹ *’adat > ’edâ* is considered as P/H’s distinctive term for the entire Israelite nation. (Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, p. 1603 etc). In Ex. 12, the proclamation about the dating decrees that the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel should be held on the night of the fourteenth day (v. 6) of the first month of the New Year (v. 2).
- ⁷⁰ It is generally assumed Ex. 12:1-20, 40-50 are P units. However, Knohl ascribes v. 1-20 to HS (*op. cit.*, pp. 19-23). He argues that the “cutting off” warning in vv. 15, 19, which too is HS provenance, militates against P attribution (*op. cit.*, pp. 52, 93).
- v. 14 *wěhāyāh hayôm hazzeh lakem lezikkārôn wěhagōtem ’ōtô hag laYhwh lēdōrōtēkem huqqat ’ōlam tēhagghû* (This day shall be a memorial to you and you shall keep it Yahweh’s feast throughout your generations. You shall keep it a feast as an eternal law.)
- v. 17 *ûšmartem ’et-hammaššôt ... lēdōrōtēkem huqqat ’ōlam...*(You shall observe the feast of *maššôt*... throughout your generations as an eternal law...)
- ⁷¹ v. 15 *šib ’at yāmîm maššôt tō’kelû ’ak bayyôm hārī’sôn tašbîtu še’ôr mibātēkem* (Seven days you shall eat unleavened bread; on the first day you shall remove leaven from your houses) *kî kôl ’ākal hāmēt wēnikrētâ hannepēš hahîy’ miyîsrā’él miyyôm hārī’sôn ’ad yôm haššēbî’î* (whoever eats leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day shall be cut off from Israel.)
- v. 16 *ûbayyôm hārī’sôn miqrā-qōdeš ûbayyôm haššēbî’î miqrā-qōdeš yihyeh lākem kol-mēlā’kâ lō’ yē’āše* (On the first day it shall be a scared proclamation, and on the seventh day it shall be a scared proclamation to you; no work shall be done.)
- ⁷² This passage adds the exception: food preparation is permitted. Also, the verb “*yē’āše* (Niphal, masculine)” does not correspond with the subject *mēlā’kâ* (feminine).
- ⁷³ The full-moon evening (vv. 6, 16, 18) and the significance of the blood smearing (vv. 7, 13, 22, 23) are emphasized. Also, the procedure of Yahweh’s *pesah* (v. 11) is explained, developing the early narrative introducing *pesah*. The editors seem to have used earlier traditions to legitimate the paschal sacrifice. It is commonly held as an apotropaic rite to secure protection. I assume that the blood ritual is the emphatic accretion for redemption or purgation (Lev. 17:12-15).
- ⁷⁴ E. Otto (*TDOT*, v. 12, p. 18) states, “The redaction of the existing tradition in Ex. 12:1-14 stipulates the tenth day of the first month as the day of preparation (12:3) corresponding to the Day of Atonement of the seventh month; in so doing, it introduces an allusion to the atonement theme that, with the association of *ntn* (12:7) with the atoning smearing of the horns of the altar (29:12, 20, etc.), also lends a new semantic horizon to the blood ritual. Here the redaction stratum presupposes Dt. 16:1-7(8).”
- ⁷⁵ This self-affliction formula appears in the section of the tenth day of the seventh month; Lev. 16: 29, 31; 23:27, 29, 32; Nu. 29:7. The rendering of Lev. 16:31 ;23:32 is awkward like, “It is a sabbath of solemn rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls.” (JPS etc.).
- ⁷⁶ The general rendering of *Yôm Kippûrîm* is the Day of Atonement, but I employ Milgrom’s rendering, the Day of Purgation, because the primary focus of the day is the ritual cleansing, i.e.,

purging, of the accumulated sin from the sanctuary (Lev. 16:11-19). See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 253-69, 1079-84. He explains that in the context of the purification offering, the verb *kippēr* (“purge” or “purify”) has to do with decontaminating the sanctuary and its sancta.

⁷⁷ As Milgrom states (*Leviticus 23-27*, esp. p. 2023), it is admitted that Lev. 23:27-28a is copied from Nu. 29:7. Also see Knohl, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁷⁸ The tenth day of the seventh month is mentioned in Lev. 16:31; 23:32; 25:9 and Nu. 29:7. The sin offering details in Nu. 29:11. Segal (*Ibid.*, pp. 143-45) explores the theories about the original function of the tenth day.

⁷⁹ Milgrom (*op. cit.*, pp. 2019-21) argues that Lev. 23:26-32 depends on Lev. 16. However, the opposite view can be conceivable from H’s intention to emphasize the new terminology, *šabbat šabbātôn*, and Lev. 16:29-34 is widely regarded as a later addition to Lev. 16. As Noth (*op. cit.*, p. 174) states that “the concluding formula in v. 31b shows v. 32 to be an appendage,” I assume that the idiom *šabbat šabbātôn* is added at the end of this section. Also, Noth (*op. cit.*, p. 126) states, “the final section (vv. 29-34) first fixes (vv. 29-31) the date of the tenth day of the seventh month for the annual performances of the great cleansing ritual. The position at the end shows the supplementary character of the date-fixing. The same is shown by the fact that element in the priestly and holy-place atonement has quite disappeared and the only atoning of Israel—addressed in the second person plural—is considered (v. 34a). In this last respect the passage vv. 32, 33 is seen as obviously older, though already secondary element of the holy-place atonement.”

⁸⁰ Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 114.