

The Sacrifices in the Covenant Between the Pieces Allude to the Laws of Leviticus and the Covenant of the Flesh

Gershon Hepner – Los Angeles

Recognition of verbal resonances is of major importance in the interpretation of biblical narratives and their linkages to biblical laws¹. A close reading of the narrative of the Covenant between the Pieces indicates that it reflects the laws of Leviticus concerning burnt offerings. The allusions the Torah makes in this narrative to the laws in Leviticus concerning sacrifices follow an allusion to the law of the thanksgiving sacrifice in the previous narrative in which Melchizedek offers a sacrifice to El Elyon. An analysis of this sacrifice and the covenants that follow it, the Covenant between the Pieces and the Covenant of the Flesh, indicates that they all allude to sacrifices described in the Priestly laws. Verbal resonances indicate that the narratives of the two covenants are a single narrative in which Abraham is linked to Noah by verbal resonances. Awareness of their connection gives rise to a radical new interpretation of Gen. 15: 6 according to which the language links Abraham to Noah while expecting Abraham's obedience to the commandment. The verse and the narrative of Melchizedek that precedes may allude to the Zadokite priesthood, echoing the allusion to it implied by the reference to Melchizedek in the previous narrative while raising the possibility that it is a Zadokite document of post-exilic origin. The paper also suggests a new interpretation of *piggul*, relating it to a prohibition of carrion. This interpretation is supported by awareness of the linkage between the manna narrative and the laws of *piggul*.

The Torah first mentions animal sacrifices, each described as a *מנחה*, a term that the author of Samuel uses for an animal offering (1 Sam. 2: 17), in the narrative of Cain and Abel:

And Abel was a shepherd of the flocks, and Cain was a worker of the soil.

And it was at the end of days, and Cain brought an offering to YHWH from the fruit of the soil.

And Abel brought as well *מבכרות*, *from the first fruit*, of his flock *ומחלהן*, *and from their fat*, and YHWH paid attention to Abel and his offering (Gen. 4: 2-4).

¹ Gershon Hepner, "Verbal Resonance in the Bible and Intertextuality," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 96 (2001): 3-27; "Midrash and the Elaboration of Biblical Meaning," *Judaism* (in press); "Jacob's Oath Reflects the Law about Oaths in Lev. 5: 4-6 and Causes Rachel's Death," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte*, 2002 (in press); "The Affliction and Divorce of Hagar Involves a Violation of the Covenant and Deuteronomic Codes," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte*, 2002 (in press); "Jacob's Servitude Reflects Differences in the Covenant and Holiness Codes and Deuteronomy," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 2003 (in press).

The word *מבכורה*, *from the first fruit*, alludes to the firstfruits mentioned in Exod. 13: 2,15; 23:16; Lev. 2: 14; 27: 26; Deut. 15: 19), while the word *ומחלהבן*, *and from their fat*, alludes to the fat that the priestly laws require the Israelite to offer to God². Waltke says: “The unusual element in the story from a lexical viewpoint is not that Cain’s offering is bloodless but that Abel’s is bloody”³. Actually the Torah does not highlight the blood that Abel sacrifices but the fat! The Midrash says:

R. Eleazar said: The Noahides brought well-being offerings. R. Jose b. Hanina said. The Noahides brought only burnt offerings. R Eleazar tried to refute R. Jose b. Hanina from the verse: And Abel, he too, brought from the firstlings of his flock and from their fat (Gen. 4: 4), which implies offerings from which the fat is offered. What did R. Jose make of the word *ומחלהבן*, *and from their fat*? He took it to mean “and from their fat ones”⁴.

It is clear, therefore, that Abel’s sacrifice conforms with the priestly laws of sacrifice⁵, causing God to be pleased with Abel⁶. Interestingly, Targum Jonathan suggests that Abel’s sacrifice was the Passover offering⁷, an interpretation that implies that Abel was trying to save his life with a firstborn offering in the same way that the Passover offering saved the lives of Israel, God’s firstborn (Gen. 4: 22), in the Tenth Plague.

The Torah mentions sacrifices again after the Flood, when Noah offers sacrifices to God:

And Noah built an altar to YHWH and took from all the pure animals and from all pure fowls, *ויעל עלה במזבח*, *and offered burnt offerings upon the altar*.

וירח י-הוה את-ריח הניחח, *and YHWH smelled the soothing savor* (Gen. 8: 20-21).

² The Rabbis say that the deficiency of Cain’s offering was due to the fact that he offered “from the refuse” (Gen. R. 22: 5).

³ B. K. Waltke, “Cain and His Offering,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 48 (1986): 363-372.

⁴ Lev. R. 9: 6.

⁵ See Kenneth A. Mathews, “Genesis 1-11: 26,” *The New American Commentary*, Broadman & Holman, 1995, 267-268.

⁶ It is interesting that the author of Hebrews claims that Abel’s sacrifice was better than Cain’s because he offered his sacrifices with faith (Heb. 11: 4). This opinion parallels that of Paul in Rom. 4: 1-5; Gal. 3: 5-6, highlighting the importance of Abraham’s faith before the Covenant between the Pieces, an opinion to be discussed below. Like Paul, the author of Hebrew misinterprets the texts in Genesis that highlight the important of the sacrifices described in Leviticus.

⁷ See Larry Lyke, “King David with the Wise Woman of Tekoa: The Resonance of Tradition in Parabolic Narrative,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement* 255, 1997, 36.

The name נח, *Noah*, resonates with the words ריח הניחח, *soothing savor*, words the Torah uses throughout the Priestly laws to denote the fragrance produced by sacrifices (Exod. 29: 18; Lev. 1: 9; Num. 15: 3), and the Torah relates this term to the very name of Noah, as the Midrash points out⁸. The words ריח הניחח, *soothing savor*, also recall language in the Gilgamesh tale where the hero offers sacrifices and libations after the flood and the hungry gods, having been denied food during the flood, smell the “sweet savor” and “crowded like flies around the sacrificer”⁹. However, as Sarna points out, the fact that Noah offers no libations indicates that he does not feed a hungry deity¹⁰. His sacrifices contrast with those in the Gilgamesh epic and echo those in Leviticus that do not feed God but please Him by their ריח הניחח, *soothing savor*, their acceptance being a sign that He does not reject them (Lev. 26: 31; cf. Amos 5: 21). The Holiness Code uses the phrase ריח הניחח, *soothing savor*, which the Priestly legislator uses in Exod. 29: 18, 41; 29: 25; Lev. 1: 9, 13, 17; 3: 5, 16; 2: 2, 9, 12; 6: 8, 14; 8: 21, 28; Num. 15: 7, 10, 13, 14; 28: 6, 8, 13, 26¹¹, when describing how God will lay waste the cities of the Israelites should they disobey His laws:

And I will make your cities a ruin and make your sanctuaries desolate and I will not אריח בריח ניחחכם, *savor your soothing savors* (Lev. 26: 31).

The verbal resonances that link the covenant that God makes with Noah to the one that the Holiness Code says God makes with Israel imply that the sweet savor God smells when Noah offers Him sacrifices after the Flood is a sign that He no longer wishes to destroy mankind because the Holiness Code makes it clear that God will not smell such sweet savor when He intends to wreak destruction.

The Covenant between the Pieces is the second narrative in which the Torah mentions animal sacrifices¹². Before promising Abram that his seed will inherit the land of Canaan after enduring 400 years of slavery (Gen. 15: 13-16) God says to him:

⁸ Gen. R. 25: 2. The Midrash gives an alternative explanation of Noah's name, relating it to the words ותנו התבה *and the Ark rested* (Gen. 8: 4) (Gen. R. 25: 2). The Torah probably implies both explanations, as is often the case with biblical names.

⁹ ANET, 95.

¹⁰ Nahum Sarna, “The JPS Pentateuch: Genesis,” Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society, 1989, 59.

¹¹ Milgrom points out that Ezekiel uses the word only for idolatrous worship (Ezek. 6: 1; 16: 17-19; 2: 28, except for Ezek 20: 41, where it bears a figurative meaning (Jacob Milgrom, “Leviticus 1-16,” New York, Anchor Bible, Doubleday, 1991, 162-163).

¹² I discount the sacrifices that God may have made after the Primal Sin in order to make garments out of skin for Man and Woman (Gen. 3: 21). Presumably these skins were obtained from animals, implying that God sacrificed animals in order to cover Man and Woman! Since God build Woman from a

Pray take for Me a heifer that is *משלש*, *three-year old*, a goat that is *משלש*, *three-year old*, and a ram that is *משלש*, *three-year old*, and a turtledove and a young bird (Gen. 15: 9).

The Midrash claims that the literal meaning of the words *משלש* and *משלש*, is “three-year old”, a meaning that is attested in Nuzi Akkadian¹³. The Midrash has a different explanation, suggesting that the words imply that God shows Abram three kinds of animals in each group:

He showed him three kinds of bullocks, three kinds of goats and three kinds of rams. Three kinds of bullocks: the bullock sacrificed on the Day of Atonement, the bullock sacrificed on account of the unwitting transgression of any of the precepts (Lev. 4: 13-21) and the heifer whose neck was broken (Deut. 21: 1-9). Three kinds of goats: the goats sacrificed on festivals, the goats sacrificed on the New Moon and the she-goat brought by an individual (Lev. 4: 27-31). Three kinds of rams: the reparation offering of certainty¹⁴ and the reparation offering where there is some doubt and the purification offering of the lamb brought by an individual (Lev. 4: 32). And a turtledove and a young bird: that is the turtledove and the young dove (Lev. 1: 14). “And He took him all these” (Gen. 15: 9). R. Simeon b. Yohai said: The Holy One blessed be He showed Abraham all the atoning sacrifices except the tenth of an ephah [of fine flour] (Lev. 5: 11)¹⁵. The Rabbis say: He showed him the tenth of an ephah also, for “כל אלה”, *all these*,” is stated here (Gen. 15: 10), while elsewhere it is said: “And you shall bring the cereal offering that is

צלע, *side*, of Man (Gen. 2: 22-23), that echoes the *צלע*, *side*, of the tabernacle where the word appears 10 times in the description of the instructions for the tabernacle (Exod. 25: 12 [2], 14; 26: 26, 27 [2], 35 [2]; 27: 7; 30: 4), and 7 times in the description of its construction (Exod. 36: 25, 31, 32; 37: 3, 5, 27; 38: 7), it is likely that the way that God covers Man and Woman is meant to foreshadow the way that the Israelites cover the tabernacle.

¹³ Nuzi Akkadian cognates identify animals which have the legal age for sacrifice, as E. A. Speiser reported in the Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 72 (1938): 15-17. See P. Kyle McCarter, on 1 Sam. 1: 24 (“1 Samuel,” The Anchor Bible, Doubleday, New York, 1980, 63).

¹⁴ B. T. Zebahim 54b.

¹⁵ The omission of the cereal offering is interesting. It is the sacrifice that the suspected adulteress must offer. A close reading of the language in Gen. 16: 5 suggests that Sarah suspects Hagar of being an adulteress and that she suffers a measure for measure punishment when the same suspicion falls on her because she becomes pregnant only after being taken by Abimelech. As a suspected adulteress Sarah would be required to offer a reparation-offering as part of the ordeal necessitated by her ostensible sacrilege. This reparation offering of one tenth of an ephah of fine flour is the one that the suspected adulteress must offer (Num. 5: 15). It is possible that the Torah fails to allude to this sacrifice in the Covenant between the Pieces in order to indicate that Sarah has no need to offer it since she never commits adultery despite the fact that she is taken by Abimelech in Gen. 20: 2 and becomes pregnant thereafter.

made *מאולה*, *of these things* (Lev. 2: 8). "But the bird he did not split" (Gen. 15: 10). He intimated to him that the bird for the burnt offering is divided (Lev. 1: 15), but the bird for the purification offering is not divided (Lev. 5: 8)¹⁶.

It is likely that the sacrifice in Genesis 15 foreshadow the three kinds of burnt offerings listed in the first chapter of Leviticus, as Ginsburg points out¹⁷. The list of these animals consists of cattle (Lev. 1: 3), animals from the flock (Lev. 1: 10) and birds (Lev. 1: 14). They therefore follow the order of sacrifices for the burnt offering described in the first chapter of Leviticus¹⁸. The fact that the sacrifices in the Covenant between the Pieces follow the order of sacrifices described in the first chapter of Leviticus supports this suggestion. Although the Midrash suggests that the sacrifices Abram offers are a *קטאת*, *purification offering*, it is likely that they are an *עולה*, *burnt offering*, echoing the one that Noah offers after the Flood (Gen. 8: 20), and foreshadowing the one that Abraham brings in the near-sacrifice of Isaac, where the word *עולה*, *burnt offering*, appears 6 times (Gen. 22: 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 13)¹⁹. The Midrash gives a homiletic explanation for the fact that Abram does not divide the bird, claiming that while the other sacrifices symbolize the other nations the bird symbolizes Israel which the author of Song of Songs compares to a dove²⁰, as in Song 2: 14. However, the plain reason why Abram does not split the birds is because he follows the prohibition of dividing birds stated in Leviticus:

And the priest shall tear it open by its wings but not *יבדיל*, *divide*, it (Lev. 1: 17).

The word *יבדיל*, *divide*, is semantically similar to *בטר*, *split*, the word that is used 3 times in the Covenant between the Pieces (Gen. 15: 10 [3]), but otherwise only twice in the bible, in Jer. 34: 18-19, in a passage where Jeremiah clearly echoes the Covenant between the Pieces, with the language in Jer. 34: 13

¹⁶ Gen. R. 44: 14.

¹⁷ C. D. Ginsburg, "The Third Book of Moses Called Leviticus. Vol. 3 of The Handy Commentary," ed. C. J. Ellicott, London, Cassel, 1889.

¹⁸ This explanation also supports the suggestion of Rabbenu Jonah ben Abraham Gerondi (c. 1200-1263) in his commentary to the introduction of the tractate of Berakhot that the animals that Abram splits in the Covenant between the Pieces constitute the paradigm of all other sacrifices. It is interesting that according to another Midrashic interpretation the four animals represent the kingdoms of Babylonia, Media, Greece and Rome (Gen. R. 44: 15). This interpretation links the animals in the Covenant between the Pieces with the four kings of the east who attacked the five kings of the east in the narrative that precedes the Covenant between the Pieces (Gen. 14: 1-2), and is therefore based on a close reading of the text rather than a flight of the midrashic imagination.

¹⁹ In Genesis, The term *עולה*, *burnt offering*, denotes only the sacrifices brought by Noah (Gen. 8: 20), and Abraham (Gen. 22: 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 13), not only linking them but highlighting the burnt offering brought by Abraham since it is the seventh citation of the word (see Wilfried Warning "Terminologische Verknüpfungen und Genesis 22," *Spes Christiana* 12 (2001): 38-39.

²⁰ Pirquei deRabbi Eliezer 28 cited by Rashi.

echoing the language in Gen. 15: 7 while the language in Jer. 34: 20 echoes language in Gen. 15: 11. Thus the sacrifices in the Covenant between the Pieces echo the laws of the first chapter in Leviticus even more closely than the Midrash suggests.

It should be noted that in the Mari texts to kill the foal of an ass (*hayarum/ayarum qatalum/suqtulum*) means to conclude a covenant, as Sarna points out²¹, suggesting that the term "son of חמור, *Hamor*," in the narrative of the rape of Dinah (Gen. 34: 1), may mean "bound by treaty". This would be consistent with the rest of the narrative where Hamor tries to bind the children of Israel to his people by a treaty and is even willing to allow all his people to be circumcised in order that this treaty take place. The Torah forbids the Israelites to offer the firstborn of a חמור, *ass*:

And every breacher of a חמור, *ass*, you must redeem with a lamb; if you do not redeem, then you must break its neck. And every firstborn of a human among your sons you must redeem (Exod. 13: 13).

It is likely that this prohibition is meant to highlight the fact that the treaty the Israelite makes with God must be made with a pure animal, echoing the sacrifices of pure animals described not only after the Flood (Gen. 8: 20-21) but in the Covenant between the Pieces²².

The Torah also alludes to sacrifices, albeit non-animal sacrifices, immediately before the Covenant between the Pieces when it says:

And Melchizedek king of שלם, *Salem*, had brought out bread and wine. And he was a כהן, *priest*, to El Elyon.

And he blessed him and said: Blessed is Abram to El Elyon, creator of the heavens and the earth.

And blessed is El Elyon who delivered your foes into your hand (Gen. 14: 18-20).

Melchizedek, a כהן, *priest*, to El Elyon, offers bread and wine to his god in שלם, *Salem*, which is either ירושלים, *Jerusalem*, as the Targumim suggest, or Shechem, the latter identification being supported by language in Gen. 33: 18, as Rashbam points out on that verse. The Midrash considers these sacrifices to

²¹ Nahum Sarna, "The JPS Pentateuch: Genesis," Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1989, 114.

²²It is interesting that according to another Midrashic interpretation the four animals represent the kingdoms of Babylonia, Media, Greece and Rome (Gen. R. 44: 15). This interpretation may be an attempt to link the animals in the Covenant between the Pieces with the four kings of the east who attacked the five kings of the east in the narrative that precedes the Covenant between the Pieces (Gen. 14: 1-2).

foreshadow those described by the Priestly leger in Numbers²³, foreshadowing the sacrifices that would be brought in Jerusalem. Although the name El Elyon means “God the Highest” it is also the name of a Canaanite god, as Cross points out²⁴. Abram therefore makes it clear that he worships YHWH alone, saying:

הרימתי ידי אל-י-הוה, *I have raised my hand to YHWH*, El Elyon, creator of the heavens and the earth (Gen. 14: 22).

Abram not only makes it clear that he considers the sacrifice that Melchizedek offers El Elyon to be dedicated to YHWH, describing El Elyon not only as “El Elyon, creator of the heavens and the earth” (Gen. 14: 19), but as “YHWH, El Elyon, creator of the heavens and the earth” (Gen. 14: 22). He also emphasizes that he considers the sacrifice to have been offered in accordance with the Levitical law regarding the תודה, *thanksgiving offering*, which is technically a תרומה, *gift*:

If he offer it on account of תודה, *thanksgiving*, he shall offer together with the sacrifice התודה, *of thanksgiving*, unleavened cakes mixed with oil, unleavened wafers smeared with oil and well-soaked cakes of semolina mixed with oil, with cakes of leavened bread he should offer his sacrifice, along with his תודה, *thanksgiving*, of well-being
And he shall offer one of each kind from every offering, תרומה ל-י-הוה לכהן, *a gift to YHWH, to the priest*, who dashes the blood of the well-being offerings (Lev. 7: 12-14).

When Abram uses the word הרימתי, *I have raised*, he alludes to the law of the תרומה, *gift*, in Leviticus, implying that he considers Melchizedek’s sacrifice of bread and wine to be comparable to the תרומה, *gift*, that the Torah says that the Israelite may offer God. The fact that the offering that Melchizedek brings is called מעשר, *a tithe*, supports this explanation, because the Torah uses the verb רום, meaning “elevate” or “set aside,” to describe the way that the offering of מעשר, *a tithe*, must be made:

For the מעשר, *tithe*, of the Israelites which ירמו, *they raise*, to YHWH as תרומה, *a gift*, I have given the Levites as a share (Num. 18: 24).

A similar wordplay to the one in which the word הרימתי, *I have raised*, alludes to the sacrifice of תרומה, *gift*, occurs in the manna narrative:

²³ Gen. R. 43: 6.

²⁴ Frank Moore Cross, “Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History and Religion of Israel,” Harvard University Press, 1973, 46-60.

And they did not listen to Moses ויִתְּרוּ אֲנָשִׁים, *and some men left a remainder*, of it until daybreak, וַיִּרָם, *and it raised, maggots*, וַיִּבְאֵשׁ, *and became offensive* (Exod. 16: 20).

The word וַיִּרָם, *and it raised*, implies that the manna is God's תְּרוּמָה, *gift*, to the Israelites, echoing the תְּרוּמָה, *gift*, that the Priestly legislator commands that they offer him while the word ויִתְּרוּ, *and they left over*, resonates with the word בִּיתְרוֹ, *remainder*, describing the remainder of sacrifices that the Priestly author forbids the Israelite to eat (Lev. 7: 18; Lev. 19: 6)²⁵. The verb בָּאֵשׁ that the Torah uses to describe the offensiveness of the manna after it has become a remainder is one that is characteristically used to describe the offensiveness of corpses such as the dead frogs in the Second Plague (Exod. 8: 10), and human corpses (Isa. 34: 3). Indeed, the Torah describes the portion of the manna as being an עֹמֶר, *omer* (Exod. 16: 18), linking it to the עֹמֶר, *sheaf* (Lev. 23: 10), that the Holiness Code commands the Israelite to elevate on מַחֲרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, *on the morrow of the Sabbath* (Lev. 23: 11). This term that probably means "the morrow of the Passover," as a close reading that links the phrase to the term מַחֲרַת הַפֶּסַח, *on the morrow of the Passover*, in Num. 33: 3 and Josh. 5: 11 indicates²⁶. Although the verb נִרְמָה which the Holiness Code uses for the verb "elevate" in Lev. 23: 11 differs from the verb רָמַם, *elevate*, it is semantically identical, as Milgrom points out²⁷, so that the verbal resonance links the manna to the offering that the Holiness Code commands the Israelites to offer God מַחֲרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, *on the morrow of the Sabbath* (Lev. 23: 1). Interestingly, the Torah says that the Israelites leave Egypt בְּיָד רִמָּה, *with elevated hand* (Exod. 14: 8; Num. 33: 3). This foreshadows the תְּנוּפָה, *elevation offering* (Lev. 23: 17), they must offer מַחֲרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, *on the morrow of the Sabbath*, because the verb נִרְמָה means "raise". The Deuteronomist alludes to the elevation offering in an oblique manner that involves exquisite wordplay. He says that the Israelites must start counting the seven weeks after the Passover when the חֲרִמָּה, *sickle*, is first raised to the standing grain (Deut. 16: 9). The word חֲרִמָּה, *sickle*, resonates anagrammatically with מַחֲרַת, *morrow* (Lev. 23: 11), and is associated with the verb נִרְמָה, *elevate*, to describe the elevation of the sickle that cuts the grain:

²⁵ Regarding the prohibition of remainders, Mary Douglas notes the use of the concept to describe the "remainder" of Israel (Ezek. 6: 8; Zeph. 2: 9; Mic. 5: 7, 8; Zech. 14: 2), and suggests that the prohibition of the "remainder," including the caudate lobe of the liver which the Torah describes as בִּיתְרוֹ, *remainder* (Exod. 29: 13; Lev. 3: 4, 10, 15; 4: 9; 8: 16, 25; 7: 4; 9: 10, 19) may relate to the desire to save a remnant of Israel after the invasion of the northern kingdom in the 7th century of the Temple of Solomon in the 6th (Mary Douglas, "Leviticus as Literature," Oxford University Press, 200, 81-86).

²⁶ The term "the morrow of the sabbath" (Lev. 23: 11) probably means "the morrow of the Passover," as indicated by verbal resonances that link the law to language in Josh. 5: 11-12.

²⁷ Jacob Milgrom, "Leviticus 1-16," Anchor Bible, Doubleday, New York, 1991, 461-473.

When you enter another man's standing grain you may pluck ordained fruit with your hand, והרמש לא תניף, *and do not raise a sickle*, to your fellow's standing grain (Deut. 23: 26).

The word הרמש, *sickle*, therefore alludes both to the term מחרה, *morrow*, and the תנופה, *elevation offering*, that is brought on it. Another interesting connection between the manna and the elevation offering is the fact that the Torah compares it to כפר, *hoar-frost* (Exod. 16: 14), implies that it has an expiatory function like sacrifices offered to God since כפר, *hoar-frost*, resonates with כפר, *expiate*. It follows that the wordplay implying that Abram considers Melchizedek's sacrifice to be comparable to the sacrifice the Torah denotes with the word תרומה, *gift*, parallels a similar wordplay regarding the manna. The wordplay also implies that Abram considers the sacrifice of Melchizedek, כהן, *priest*, to El Elyon is dedicated not to the Canaanite god El Elyon but to YHWH, the God to whom the Levitical laws commands the Israelite to offer תרומה ליהוה לכהן, *a gift to YHWH, to the priest* (Lev. 7: 14).

The word הרמתי, *I have raised* (Gen. 14: 22), alluding to the sacrifice that the Torah classifies as a תרומה, *gift*, has an Akkadian cognate *ramu*, which mean "give a gift": the nouns *rimu* and *tarimtu* mean *gift*²⁸. Yochanan Muffs has shown that the word *rimutu* conveys the legal idea of free and uncoerced willingness, the will that motivates the giving of a gift or the selling of property, similar to the Aramaic *brhmn*, meaning "with love" or "willingly"²⁹. By using the word הרמתי, Abram signifies not only that he is offering the sacrifice of a תרומה, *gift*, to El Elyon but highlights the fact that he is giving it willingly and generously in accordance with the Levitical law concerning the sacrifice of תודה, *thanksgiving*. That this sacrifice is described immediately before the Covenant between the Pieces implies not only that God accepts Abram's sacrifice of תודה, *thanksgiving*, but that it foreshadows the sacrifice that Abraham himself makes at God's behest in the Covenant between the Pieces. Interestingly, when the Covenant between the Pieces uses the word שלם to denote the completion of the sin of the Amorite which is a prerequisite for the return of the fourth generation from exile and affliction (Gen. 15: 16), it implies that the fourth generation after Abram will go to שלם, *Salem*, the seat of Melchizedek, described as the king of שלם, *Salem*, in the previous narrative (Gen. 14: 18), and implied by the word צדקה, *righteousness* (Gen. 15: 6). Rabbi J. B. Soloveitchik has suggested that Jacob thought that the fourth generation to which the promise refers were his children who accompanied him to Shechem after leaving Laban. The Torah identifies Shechem with Salem in Gen. 33: 18, as Rashbam points out. This may explain why Jacob calls the altar that he builds in Shechem/Salem "El, the God of Israel" (Gen. 33: 20), a name that is a variation of the name of the god

²⁸ W. von Soden, "Mirjam-marion (Gottes-) Geschenk," Verkündigung und Forschung, 1970, 2: 69-72.

²⁹ Yochanan Muffs, "Love and Joy: Law, Language, and Religion in Ancient Israel," Harvard University Press, 1992, 122, fn. 10 on 132.

whom Melchizedek calls El Elyon and Abram calls YHWH, El Elyon, and now carries Jacob's new name, Israel!

The sacrifice of Melchizedek that Abram regards as a תרומה, *a gift*, prepares the stage for the Covenant between the Pieces, because before this covenant the Torah says:

והאמן, *and he trusted*, in YHWH, ויחשבה לו לצדקה, *and he accredited it to him as merit* (Gen. 15: 6).

The meaning of the word צדקה in this verse and elsewhere is unclear. It resonates with the name of מלכ־צדק, *Melchizedek*, linking the descendants of Abram to מלכ־צדק, *Melchizedek*, as the Psalmist says:

YHWH has sworn and will not relent.
You are a priest forever,
by My decree מלכ־צדק, *Melchizedek* (Ps. 110: 4).

The verbal resonance suggests that the word לצדקה in Gen. 15: 6 may be an allusion to the priesthood of צדוק, *Zadok*, a priest whom the Chronicler claims to have Aaronite lineage (1 Chron. 6: 3-8; 24: 3), like Ezra, who was a descendant of Zadok and his father Ahitub (Ezra 7: 1-6). If this is correct then the language in Gen. 15: 6 proleptically validates Solomon's choice of Zadok (1 Kings 2: 35; 1 Chron. 29: 22), followed by his son Azariah (1 Kings 4: 2), when he dispossessed Abiathar from the Shilonite house of Eli which may have claimed descent from Moses³⁰, in contrast to David who had appointed Abiathar as his priest together with Zadok (2 Sam. 8: 17). Indeed, the name of אליעזר, *Eliezer*, Abram's steward whose name is mentioned only in the Covenant between the Pieces (Gen. 15: 2), may be an allusion to עזריה, *Azariah*, Zadok's son mentioned in 1 Kings 4: 2 as well as the Zadokite priest whom the Chronicler describes as being the chief priest in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chron. 31: 10)³¹. Indeed, the name עזריה,

³⁰ See Frank Moore Cross, "Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays on the History of Religion of Israel," Harvard University Press, 1973, 209-215.

³¹ The resonance between the name of Zadok's son עזריה, *Azariah*, and אליעזר, *Eliezer*, whose name is mentioned only in Gen. 15: 2 certainly supports the view that the word לצדקה, *as merit*, refers to Zadok. On the other hand, it should be remembered that the use of the name אליעזר, *Eliezer*, may be based on its resonance with the word זרע, *seed* (see Gershon Hepner, "Verbal Resonance in the Bible and Intertextuality," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 93 (2001): 11-12). Furthermore, the name Melchizedek may be related to a Canaanite god referred to in late sources as Sydyk, connected with the sun god and justice. Many monarchs in the ancient Near East adopted the epithet meaning "righteous king," including King Yehimilk (ca 950 B.C.E.) and King Yehaumilk (5th-4th century B.C.E., both of Byblos, while in Mesopotamian royal inscriptions the corresponding epithet was *šar mešarim*. The name of Sargon means "the king is legitimate" (*šarru-ken*) (see Nahum Sarna, "The JPS Pentateuch: Genesis," The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1989, 380). Although the name of אליעזר, *Eliezer*, suggests that the author is alluding to Zadok's son עזריה, *Azariah*, it is also possible that he is alluding to the צמח צדקה, *sprout of righteousness*, to whom Jeremiah alludes (Jer. 33: 15) in a covenant in which God promises that the

Azariah, is semantically equivalent to אֱלִיעֶזֶר, *Eliezer*, the former meaning “the warrior of Yah” while the latter means “the warrior of El”. The word והאמן, *and he trusted*, may be an allusion to the בְּהוֹן אֱמֵן, *faithful priest*, to whom God refers when telling Eli that He would terminate his priesthood:

And I will establish for Myself a בְּהוֹן אֱמֵן, *faithful priest*. That which is in My heart and soul he will do, and I will build him a בֵּית אֱמֵן, *faithful house*, and he will go before My anointed one all the days (1 Sam. 2: 25).

According to this explanation, it is possible that the language in Gen. 15: 6 links the rulership of Abraham to the priesthood of Zadok, the priest who replaces the Elide priests when Solomon banishes Abiathar, the last of the Elides, as a result of his support of Adonijah (1 Kings 2: 26-27), replacing him with Zadok (1 Kings 2: 35) and Zadok’s son Azariah (1 Kings 4: 2).

צְדִיקָה can mean “merit” as in Deut. 6: 25; 9: 5, 6; 24: 13 where Targum Onqelos and Jonathan translate the word זָכָר or זָכַר, meaning “merit”. When the Jews of Elephantine write to the governor of Judea asking his help in building the Jewish temple in Elephantine they tell him that a positive answer to their request will be a “*tsdqh, credit*, to you before Yⁿ”³². In the Aramaic Nerab inscription we read: “On account of my merit (*bsdqty*) he established for me a good name and he lengthened my days”³³. Deutero-Isaiah appears to echo the language in Gen. 15: 6, linking the promise of the land to righteousness, as John Van Seters points out³⁴:

And your people are all צְדִיקִים, *righteous*, they will inherit the land forever (Isa. 60: 21a)³⁵.

Davidic line and the Levitical priests would never be cut off (Jer. 32: 20-21). In that covenant God compares the numbers of the Israelites to the hosts of heaven and the sand of the sea (Jer. 32: 22), echoing God’s words to Abram in Gen. 15: 5.

³² A. E. Cowley, “Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan,” London, 106, 30.27, cited by Moshe Weinfeld, “Anchor Bible: Deuteronomy 1-11,” New York, 1991, 349.

³³ H. Donner and W. Röllig, “Kanaanäische und aramäische Interschriften,” Wiesbaden, 1962-64, 226.2-3.

³⁴ John Van Seters, “Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian,” Louisville, Westminster, John Knox, 1992, 250-251.

³⁵ Sommer notes that Deut. 60: 17-61: 1 alludes to Isaiah 11 and the presence of the word צְדָק in Isa. 11: 4, 5 but does not make any reference to the way that Deutero-Isaiah alludes to Gen. 15: 6 and the promise of the land in the Covenant between the Pieces (Benjamin D. Sommer, “A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66,” Stanford University Press, 1998, 86-87.

The Psalmist echoes the phrase ויהיחשב לו לצדקה when describing the way that God gives Phineas credit for stopping the plague after the Israelites whore after Midianite women:

ותחשב לו לצדקה, *and it was considered as merit for him* (Ps. 106: 31).

Targum Jonathan translates: “It will be accredited to him לזכו, *as merit*”. In the Priestly law the Torah four times uses the verb חשב to mean “accredit”:

And if any of the well-being sacrifice should be eaten on the third day the person who offers it will not be acceptable. As for the person who offered it, it will not be acceptable for him; it will not יחשב, *be accredited*, to him, it is פגול, *offensive*, and the person who offers it shall bear his punishment (Lev. 7: 18).

Blood יחשב, *shall be accredited*, to that man: he has shed blood, and that man shall be cut off from the midst of his people (Lev. 17: 4).

ונחשב, *and it will be accredited*, for them as your gift, like the grain from the threshing-floor and like the flow from the vat....

And you shall say to them: When you separate the fat from it ונחשב, *and it will be accredited*, to the Levites like the produce of the threshing floor or vat (Num. 18: 27, 30).

In Lev. 17: 4 the Holiness Code uses word יחשב, *will be accredited*, to say that the blood of the man who slaughters an animal outside the sanctuary will be considered subject to forfeit like that of a murderer. The word implies a legal pronouncement, implying that a sentence will issue from the divine court³⁶, contrasting the punishment that the divine court inflicts for improper sacrifices with the award of merit that it court awards when a sacrifice is performed in accordance with the Priestly law, as in Lev. 7: 18 and Num. 18: 17, 30. . Targum Jonathan translates the word יחשב in Lev. 7: 18 as "will not be reckoned to him לזכו, for merit" and both Targum Onqelos and Jonathan translate the word ונחשב, *then it shall be accredited*, in Num. 18: 27 and 30 as “then it shall be accredited as merit”. The translation highlights the connection between the law in Lev. 7: 18 and the Covenant between the Pieces. The verses share the verb חשב, which can mean “consider” or “accredit”. The linkage implies that when the Torah says that Abraham’s trust in God caused God to accredit merit to him it considers that Abram’s trust in God brings him the same merit as sacrifices such as the ones he brings in the Covenant between the Pieces or the ones described in Lev. 7: 18 and Num. 18: 27, 30.

³⁶ Jacob Milgrom, “Leviticus 17-22,” New York, Anchor Bible, Doubleday, 2000, 1457.

The word לצדקה also implies that God recognizes Abram as a צדיק, *righteous man*, linking him to Noah:

These are the begettings of Noah: Noah was a man who was צדיק תמים, *righteous, perfect*, in his generations, את־האלהים התהלך־בנו, *Noah walked with God* (Gen. 6: 9).

The word לצדקה may mean “as righteousness” as well as “as merit,” and thus link Abram to Noah whom the Torah describes as צדיק, *righteous*.

The word והאמן, *and he trusted* (Gen. 15: 6), has the same root as the word אמת, *truth*, which the author of Joshua links with the word תמים, *perfect*, when he says that Joshua exhorts the Israelites to be loyal to God:

And now, fear YHWH and serve his בתמים ובאמת, *with perfection and truth*, and remove the gods that your fathers served on the other side of the river and in Egypt and serve YHWH (Josh. 24: 14).

The Torah uses the word תמים, *perfect*, to complete the description of Abraham after the narrative of the expulsion of the pregnant Hagar, when it says:

And Abram was 99 years old and YHWH appeared to him and said: I am El-Shaddai. התהלך לפני והיה תמים, *go before me and be perfect* (Gen. 17: 1).

The words התהלך לפני והיה תמים, *go before me and be perfect*, echo those describing Noah תמים, *perfect*, את־האלהים התהלך־בנו, *Noah walked with God* (Gen. 6: 9). The words לצדקה in Gen. 15: 6 and תמים in Gen. 17: 1 link the two pericopes and imply that when God makes the covenant with Abram in the Covenant between the Pieces He makes it with him as a man who is צדיק, *righteous*, while when He makes it with him in the covenant of the flesh in Genesis 17 Abraham, as Abram becomes, is תמים, *perfect*. The covenant God makes with Abram therefore echoes the one He makes with Noah whom the Torah describes with both these words in Gen. 6: 9. In both cases the description of the heroes with whom God makes the covenant is similar to terminology in Assyrian land grants, as Weinfeld points out. For example, Weinfeld cites the covenant made with Baltaya, about whom the king says: “Baltaya...whose heart is devoted (lit. is whole) to his master, served me (lit. stood before me) with truthfulness and acted perfectly (lit. walked in perfection) in my palace”³⁷. Similar language describes God’s relationship with David (1 Kings 3: 6, 9: 4;

³⁷ See Moshe Weinfeld, “Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist School,” Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1992, 75ff.

14: 8; 15: 3)³⁸. The word תמים describes loyalty in many places in the bible (Josh. 24: 14; Judg. 9: 16, 19; 2 Sam. 22: 24, 26; Pss. 7: 9; 102: 2, 6), and the word צדיק has a similar connotation, so that both words not only indicate the moral probity of the heroes but their suitability for covenants with God. The fact that the covenant with Baltaya also stresses his truthfulness links God's covenant with Abram about whom the Torah uses the words והאמן, *and he trusted* (Gen. 15: 6), with the one the Assyrian king makes with Baltaya.

Whereas God makes a single covenant with Noah after the Flood He makes two with Abram, linking the Covenant of the Flesh when He recognizes that he is תמים to the Covenant between the Pieces when He recognizes that Abram is צדיק and imbued with אמת, *truth*. The unity between the two covenants is further highlighted by the word ברית, *cut*, which also links them (Gen. 15: 18; 17: 14), as does the word ברית, *covenant* (Gen. 15: 18; 17: 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19, 21)³⁹. The reason why God does not make both covenants at the same time is probably because He wishes to exclude the descendants of Ishmael from the Covenant of the Flesh even though Abraham circumcises Ishmael. The Torah makes this clear in two ways, first by intercalating the narrative of the expulsion of the pregnant Hagar between the two covenants and secondly by reporting that God tells Abraham, after he pleads for the life of Ishmael (Gen. 17: 18):

But My covenant I will establish with Isaac whom Sarah will bear for you at this appointed time in the next year (Gen. 17: 21).

The covenant that God makes with Noah applies to all his sons, including Ham and Ham's son Canaan whom Noah curses. It is a covenant that applies to all mankind in contrast with the one He makes with Abraham. Indeed, even that covenant is made only with Isaac and excludes Ishmael, as the Torah explains in Gen. 17: 21. The Covenant between the Pieces and the Covenant of the Flesh are a single unit in which the covenant God makes with Abram and the sacrifices that accompany them echo the one He makes with Noah after the Flood and the sacrifices that precede it. The covenant with Noah and the Covenant between the Pieces foreshadow the Covenant of the Flesh that God makes with Abram after changing his name to Abraham in the second part of a divided pericope. Both covenants that God makes

³⁸ For the linkage between the Covenant between the pieces and david see R. Clements, "Abraham and David: Genesis XV and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition," London, SCM Press, 1967, 55-60.

³⁹ The fact that the word ברית, *covenant*, appears 11 times in the two covenants links the verb to the verb מול, *circumcise*, which appears 11 times in the Covenant of the Flesh (Gen. 17: 10, 11, 12, 13 [2], 14, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27). This number is associated with multiplication (Gershon Hepner, "Verbal Resonances in the Torah and Intertextuality," 96 (2001): 21), as in the appearance of the words שמים, *heavens*, מים, *water*, in the first Creation narrative (Gen. 1: 1, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 20, 26, 28, 30; 2: 1; 1: 2, 6 [3], 7 [2], 9, 10, 20, 21, 22) and the tetragrammaton in the second (Gen. 2: 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22), and the words אבן, *stone*, and פדן ארם, *Paddan-aram*, in the narrative describing the way that Jacob has 11 sons in Mesopotamia (Gen. 28: 11, 18, 22; 29: 2, 3 [2], 8, 10; 31: 45, 46 [2]); 25: 20; 28: 2, 5, 6, 7; 31: 18; 33: 18; 35: 9, 26; 46: 15; 48: 7).

with Abraham are part of a single unit in which He first regards Abram as צדיק, *righteous*, and then recognizes him to be תמים, *perfect*. The two covenants with Abraham therefore echo the single covenant with Noah⁴⁰.

In addition, circumcision, the sign that God gives Abraham in the Covenant of the Flesh, circumcision, may be considered to be a form of sacrifice. It is as if God requires Abraham to make a partial sacrifice of his own body and that of his descendants before commanding him to offer a complete human sacrifice, his son Isaac (Gen. 22: 1-2). Interestingly, Jacob's struggle with the angel echoes the Covenant between the Pieces. This linkage may explain the deep significance of the way that the angel touches Jacob's member⁴¹. In ancient Israel it was the custom to hold the circumcized membrum while swearing an oath (Gen. 24: 2-9; 47: 29-31). Noegel⁴² suggests that the word סוד, *terror*, that Jacob uses when making an oath by the God of Isaac (Gen. 31: 42, 53, 54), is a wordplay for a cognate Aramaic word meaning "thigh," suggesting that when Jacob swears by the member of Isaac he links the oath that Jacob swears to Laban to the way that the angel touches his member at Jabbok⁴³, thus linking Jacob's struggle with Esau that follows the struggle with the angel to his struggle with Esau that preceded it. A Babylonian practice attested as early as 1700 B.C.E. settles matters by means of an oath in the presence of a symbol of the god, such as the saw of the sun god, the spear of Ishtar, the mace of Ninurta. The circumcized membrum indicates the presence of God as a divine witness, as R. D. Freedman points out⁴⁴. When the angel touches Jacob's member it makes a covenant with him comparable to the one that God makes with Abraham at the Covenant between the Pieces, affirming that he is destined to fulfill the destiny of the seed

⁴⁰ The fact that God also regards Abram as imbued with אמת, *truth*, as the Torah indicates by the word ונתאמן, *and he trusted* (Gen. 15: 6), suggests that the biblical author also regards Abram to echo Baltaya, as we have explained.

⁴¹ Although the angel ostensibly wounds Jacob's thigh a close reading of the narrative and careful analysis of the term גיד הנשה in Gen. 32: 33 which halakhic exegesis considers to mean the tendon of the vein, namely the sciatic nerve, indicates that it is Jacob's genitalia that the angel wounds, as I have shown in a work in preparation where I demonstrate that the phoneme גד has sexual connotations throughout the bible.

⁴² Scott B. Noegel, "Drinking Feasts and Deceptive Feasts," in Scott B. Noegel ed., "Wordplay in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature," Bethesda, Maryland, CDC Press, 2000, 171.

⁴³ A close reading of Gen. 32: 33 indicates that the term גיד הנשה means "male member". Ilona Rashkow highlights the sexual implications behind Jacob's struggle with the angel ("Taboo or Not Taboo: Sexuality and the Family in the Hebrew Bible," Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 2000, 133-138), but fails to recognize the meaning of the word גיד הנשה. An appreciation of this fact clarifies the meaning of several biblical narratives that use the root *gimel* and *dalet*, including the manna narrative where the word גד means the male member (Exod. 16: 21), and the triple prohibition of seething a גדי, *kid-goat*, in the milk of its mother Exod. 23: 19; 34: 26; Deut. 14: 21), which is likely to be an oblique prohibition of intereen mother and son.

⁴⁴ R. D. Freedman, "Put Your Hand Under My Thigh,"---the Patriarchal Oath," *Biblical Archaeologist Reader 2.2* (1976): 3-4, 42.

of Abraham that God promises Abraham in the Covenant between the Pieces. The injury the angel causes is comparable to the one that God commands Abraham to inflict on himself in the Covenant of the Flesh that is a continuation of the Covenant between the Pieces. Indeed, in both narratives God changes the hero's name: Abram's name becomes Abraham (Gen. 17: 4) and Jacob's becomes Israel (Gen. 32: 29).

It follows that the Covenant of the Flesh no less than the Covenant between the Pieces involves the obligation of performing a commandment, in spite of Mendenhall's claim that it is a covenant without obligation⁴⁵. This is confirmed in Exodus by language that links the obligation to perform circumcision to language obliging the Israelites to reaffirm the covenant by observing the Sabbath (Exod. 31: 16-17), a commandment that is quite clearly dependent on observance of the laws of the Sabbath. This interpretation contradicts Paul's interpretation of Gen. 15: 6 in which he claims that the verse implies that Abraham's faith in God was his justification and that God did not require him to obey any commandments, including that of circumcision (Rom. 4: 1-5; Gal. 3: 5-6). As Levenson points out, Paul's interpretation of the verse appears to be based on the assumption that Abraham could not have performed any commandments since the commandments were not given before the Sinai theophany⁴⁶. This assumption is mistaken for four reasons.

(a) The linkage between the Covenant between the Pieces and the Covenant of the Flesh established by the words *וַיִּצְטַדֵּק* (Gen. 15: 6), and *תָּמִים* (Gen. 17: 1), imply that the commandment of circumcision is part of the Covenant between the Pieces. Even though God does not give Abraham that commandment of circumcision in the Covenant between the Pieces, He anticipates it with the word *וַיִּצְטַדֵּק* and the Torah indicates this anticipation by means of the word *תָּמִים* at the beginning of the Covenant of the Flesh. It is therefore illogical to conclude, as Paul does, that God does not require Abram to fulfill any commandments when He learns that he trusts Him. The opposite is true. As soon as God learns that Abram trusts God He encourages him to fulfill the commandment of offering sacrifices in accordance with the laws of Leviticus and after Abram expels Ishmael he commands him to circumcise his seed.

(b) Secondly, the language in Gen. 15: 6 alludes to another verse in Deuteronomy:

וְרָצוּהָ, and it will be merit, for us because we observe and perform all this commandment before the presence of YHWH our God, as He has commanded us (Deut. 6: 25).

⁴⁵ G. E. Mendenhall, "The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible," New York-Nashville, Abingdon, 1962, I. 714-723. See Frank Moore Cross, "Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays on the History of Religion of Israel," Harvard University Press, 1973, 271 fn. 224.

⁴⁶ Jon D. Levenson, "Abraham Among Jews, Christians, and Muslims: Monotheism, Exegesis, and Religious Diversity," *Journal of the Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill*, 26 (1998): 5-29.

The word לצדקה, *as merit* (Gen. 15: 6), alludes to the word בצדקה, *and it will be merit*, in Deut. 6: 25 where the Deuteronomist explicitly commands the Israelites to obey all the commandments⁴⁷! The fact that the Covenant between the Pieces alludes to language in Deuteronomy which is its *Vorlage* is apparent in another Deuteronomic passage where the Deuteronomist refers to צדקה, *righteousness*:

Do not say in your heart when YHWH has thrust them out before you, saying: בצדקתי, *because of my merit*, YHWH brought me to take possession, this land, וברשעה, *and because of the guilt*, of these nations YHWH dispossesses them, before you.

It is not בצדקתך, *because of your merit*, and the rectitude of your heart that you come to inherit their land but ברשעה, *because of the guilt*, of these nations that YHWH dispossesses them before you, and in order to establish the word that YHWH your God swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob

And you shall know that it is not בצדקתך, *because of your merit*, that YHWH gives you this good land to possess it, for you are a stiff-necked people (Deut. 9: 4-6).

The Deuteronomist highlights the fact that God enables the Israelites to take possession of the land of Canaan for two reasons, their צדקה, *righteousness*, and the רשעה, *guilt*, of the nations whom they dispossess. Before the Covenant between the Pieces, God emphasizes that Abram has צדקה, *merit*. After the Covenant he points out that . . . the רשעה, *guilt*, of the Canaanites must be completed before the merit of Abram enables his descendants to possess the land of Canaan:

And the fourth generation will return here, because the sin of the Amorite is not yet complete (Gen. 15: 16).

Thus the Covenant between the Pieces echoes the Deuteronomist, highlighting the fact that the possession of the land of Canaan by the Israelites is dependent on the Deuteronomic law that requires not only righteousness on the part of the Israelites and guilt on the part of the Canaanites. When God tells Abram that his descendants will only be able to return to the land of Canaan after the sin of the Amorite has been completed He echoes the words of the Deuteronomist who emphasizes that God allows the Israelites to take possession of the land of Canaan not only because of their צדקה, *merit*, but because ברשעה, *because of the guilt* (Deut. 9: 5), of the nations whom God dispossesses from the land of Canaan⁴⁸. It is clear therefore that the word לצדקה, *as merit* (Gen. 15: 6), is a reference to the Deuteronomist's language

⁴⁷ See Richard Elliot Friedman, "Commentary on the Torah," HarperSanFrancisco, 2001, 588. Friedman points out that the word צדקה appears twice in connection with Abraham (Gen. 15: 6; 18: 19) and once in connection with Jacob (Gen. 30: 33) but not again until Deut. 6: 25.

⁴⁸ The similarity with the events in the 20th century when The United Nations recognized the State of Israel only after the evil events of the Holocaust is truly amazing.

explaining that God's gift of the land of Canaan to the Israel is due to the merit the Israelites obtain when they perform the commandments while the Canaanites violate them⁴⁹!

(c) The Torah implies that God fulfills the Covenant between the Pieces when He gives the Israelites the Ten Commandments which begin with the words:

אנכי יהוה-אלהיך אשר הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים, *I am YHWH your God who has taken you out of the land of Egypt*, מביית עבדים, *from the house of slaves* (Exod. 20: 2; Deut. 5: 6).

The beginning of the Decalogue echoes the language at the beginning of the Covenant between the Pieces and implies that the covenant is dependent on the Israelites' obedience to God's laws in general and those of the Decalogue in particular. The language at the beginning of the Covenant between the Pieces echoes the introduction to the Decalogue:

And He said to him: אנכי יהוה אשר הוצאתיך מארץ כשדים, *who took you out of Ur of the Chaldees*, to give you this land as an inheritance (Gen. 15: 7).

The link between these two pericopes suggests to Fishbane that Abraham served as a prototype of Israel for later generations, comparable to the way that the affliction of Pharaoh in Exod. 12: 17-20 when Abram and Sarai go down to Egypt during a famine parallels the afflictions of the Egyptians during the Tenth Plague⁵⁰. The language in Gen. 15: 7 clearly alludes to language at the beginning of the Decalogue

⁴⁹ This interpretation has the interesting implication that God expects all people to obey His commandments, even Canaanites, and considers those people who do not to be guilty—hence the words, “because the sin of the Amorite is not yet complete” (Gen. 15: 16).

⁵⁰ Michael Fishbane, “Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel,” Clarendon, Oxford, 1985, 375-376. According to most Jewish interpretations, Exod. 20: 2 is the First Commandment and the language in Exod. 20: 3 begins the Second Commandment. The language in Exod. 20: 2-3 also echoes language in Exod. 6: 6-7, when God promises Moses to take the Israelites out of Egypt”. These two verses form one commandment in Judg. 7-10. They view that they form a single commandment is supported by the way that these verses are foreshadowed by language God uses to Moses after revealing His name to Him:

אנכי יהוה-אלהיך אשר הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים מביית עבדים, *I am YHWH your God who has taken you out of the land of Egypt, from the house of slaves.*
לא יהיה לך אלהים אחרים עלי-פני, *you shall have no other gods, in My Presence* (Exod. 20: 2-3; Deut. 5: 6-7).

Assuredly, say to the Israelites: I am YHWH, והוצאתי אתכם מן תחת סבלות מצרים, *and I will take you out from under the burdens of Egypt*, and I will rescue you מעבדתם, *from servitude to them*, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great judgments.

And I will take you to be My people, והייתי לכם לאלהים, *and I will be a God to them*; and you shall know that אני יהוה-אלהיכם המוציא אתכם מן תחת סבלות מצרים, *I am YHWH your God who brought you out from under the burdens of Egypt* (Exod. 6: 6-7).

in Exod. 20: 2; Deut. 5: 6⁵¹, clearly implying that the covenant is dependent not on faith, as Paul maintains, but on observance of the commandments of the Decalogue!

Jeremiah also implies that the Covenant between the Pieces is based on observance of the commandments when he says:

And I will make the men *העברים את־בריתי*, *who violate My covenant*, who did not maintain the words of *הברית*, *the covenant*, which *כרתו*, *they cut*, before Me with the calf which *כרתו*, *they cut*, into two *ויעברו*, *and crossed*, between *בתרי*, *its slices*, the princes of Judah and the princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs and the priests and all the people of the earth *העברים*, *who cross*, between *בתרי*, *the slices*, of the calf. And I shall hand them over to their enemies, to those who seek to kill them and their carcasses shall become food for the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth (Jer. 34: 18-20).

In his description of a covenant that clearly echoes the Covenant between the Pieces Jeremiah's use of the root *כר*, *slice*, twice (Jer. 34: 18, 19), echoes the root's triple occurrence in Gen. 15: 10, the only other place where the word appears. Jeremiah says:

The word that came to Jeremiah from YHWH, after Zedekiah cut a covenant with all the people in Jerusalem, to call a release for them, *לשלה איש את־עבדו ואיש את־שפחתו העברי והעבריה חפשים*, *that every person should free his male and female slave free*, so that no Judahite should enslave his brother (Jer. 34: 8-9).

Jeremiah's language alludes to the first law of the Covenant Code:

If you buy an *עבד עברי*, *Hebrew slave*, *שש שנים יעבד*, *he should serve six years*, and on the seventh he should go out *חפשי*, *free*, without payment (Exod. 21: 2).

Jeremiah quotes the Covenant Code almost verbatim, highlighting the fact that he considers obedience to this code the *sine qua non* for the covenant that God makes with the Judeans. Although the

⁵¹ See John Van Seters, "Confessional Reformulation in the Exilic Period," *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972): 448-459; "Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis," 1992, Westminster, John Knox, 1992, 240.

Judahites do as commanded they re-enslave their slaves (Jer. 34: 10-11), leading Jeremiah to cite the Covenant Code again:

So said YHWH the God of Israel: I have cut a covenant with your fathers on the day I took them out of the land of Egypt, from the house of slaves, saying:

At the end of seven years every person should set free his Hebrew brother that is sold to you, ועבדך שש שנים, *and he shall serve you for six years*, ותשלחתו חפשי מעמך, *and then you shall send him away free from you* (Jer. 34: 13-14).

The way that Jeremiah makes the covenant that he describes dependent on the Judeans' obedience to the Covenant Code before they go into exile for 70 years in accordance with his prophecy (Gen. 29: 10), echoes the way that God makes the covenant with Abram before his seed go into exile for 400 years (Gen. 15: 13) dependent on their obedience of to the commandments of the Decalogue and Deuteronomy, as indicated by verbal resonances that link its language both to the first verse of the Decalogue and the language of the Deuteronomist that associates צדקה, *merit*, with fulfillment of the commandments. It follows that Paul's interpretation of Gen. 15: 6 is fatally flawed. The error of his analysis is caused by his assumption that Abraham did not have to observe the laws of the Pentateuch. This assumption is incorrect since our analysis of other narratives in Genesis indicate that all the laws of the Pentateuch apply to the protagonists of Genesis no less than to their post-Sinaitic descendants⁵².

Interestingly, the Covenant between the Pieces also echoes the covenant that the Israelites make with God at Sinai as described in Exodus. The flaming torch that Abram sees during the Covenant between the Pieces foreshadows the fiery manifestations of the Sinai theophany, having in common the words לפיד, *torch* (Gen. 15: 17; Exod. 20: 15), and עשן, *smoke* (Gen. 15: 17; Exod. 19: 18; 20: 15). While the covenant Israel makes with God at Sinai echoes the Covenant between the Pieces, Jethro's visit to Moses preceding it must be regarded as a prelude to the covenant, as pointed out by Brekelmans⁵³, Fensham⁵⁴, Cody⁵⁵ and

⁵² See Gershon Hepner, "Jacob's Servitude Reflects Conflicts in Laws of the Pentateuch," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 2003 (in press); "Jacob's Oath Reflects the Law about Oaths in Lev. 5: 4-6 and Causes Rachel's Death," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte*, 2002 (in press); "The Affliction and Divorce of Hagar Involves a Violation of the Covenant and Deuteronomic Codes," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte*, 2002 (in press).

⁵³ C. Brekelmans, "Exodus XVIII and the Origins of Yahwism in Israel," *Old Testament Studies* 10 (1954): 215-224.

⁵⁴ F. C. Fensham, "Did a Treaty Between the Israelites and Kenites Exist?" *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 175 (1964).

⁵⁵ Aelred Cody, "Exodus 18.12: Jethro Accepts a Covenant With the Israelites," *Biblia* 49 (1968): 153-166.

Hyatt⁵⁶. There are three words that Moses' meeting with Jethro have in common with Jacob's struggle with the angel, לבד, *by himself* (Gen. 32: 25; Exod. 18: 23), יכל, *prevail* (Gen. 32: 29; Exod. 18: 18, 23)⁵⁷, and יתר, *remain*, which denotes the way that Jacob remains alone (Gen. 32: 25) and is also the root of the name of Moses' father-in-law יתרו, *Jethro*, a keyword that appears 7 times (Exod. 18: 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12). Indeed, the word ויתרו, *and he remained* (Gen. 32: 25), resonates with the word בטר, *slice* (Gen. 15: 10 [3]), with a change of a *bet* and *waw* that is seen many times in the bible⁵⁸. יתרו, *Jethro*, is the man who points out to Moses the nature of his struggle with the Israelites when he is לבד, *by himself*, and the Torah uses verbal resonances to compare it to that of Jacob with the angel when it says ויתרו, *and he remained*, לבד, *by himself*. Since verbal resonances link the Covenant between the Pieces to Jacob's struggle with the angel it follows that the covenant at Sinai echoing the Covenant between the Pieces also reflects the one that God makes with Jacob when He changes his name from Jacob to Israel. In the Covenant between the Pieces sacrifices are divided into slices while after the covenant at Sinai concludes sacrifices are offered and blood is divided:

And Moses took half of the blood and put it into basins and threw half of the blood at the altar (Exod. 24: 6).

The Hebrew verbs denoting division differ in the two narratives, but the division that occurs in the two narratives is conceptually similar. In the case of the Covenant that God makes with Jacob at the Crossing of Jabbok after he prevails over the angel there is no sacrifice. However, the Torah mentions the first Pentateuchal prohibition regarding the consumption of meat:

On account of this the Israelites do not eat the male member that is on the inside of the thigh to this day, because he touched the inside of Jacob's thigh, on the male member (Gen. 32: 33).

⁵⁶ J. P. Hyatt, "Commentary to Exodus," New Century Bible, London, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971, 189.

⁵⁷ Friedman notices these two verbal resonances (Richard Elliot Friedman, "Commentary on the Torah," HarperSanFrancisco 2001, 230).

⁵⁸ An excellent example of such interchangeability occurs in Genesis when Laban tells the servant of Abraham:

We have plenty of both straw and fodder, also a place ללון, *to spend the night* (Gen. 24: 25).

The word ללון, *to spend the night*, resonates with לבן, *Laban*. An even more striking example of such interchangeability occurs in Ezekiel where there is a wordplay between ערב, *be pleasant*, and ערוה, *nakedness* (Ezek. 16: 37).

This prohibition is an oblique allusion to a sacrifice since Priestly law declares that meat may only be eaten as part of a sacrifice (Lev. 17: 3-6) in a law that was only waived by the Deuteronomist (Deut. 12: 20-23). It follows that the prohibition of eating the male member described in Gen. 32: 33 is one that involves meat eaten in a sacrifice. The Covenant between the Pieces therefore foreshadows not only the covenant at Sinai but the one that God makes with Jacob at Jabbok⁵⁹.

Further analysis suggests that the Covenant between the Pieces and its conclusion, the Covenant of the Flesh, foreshadow the Passover offering. Whereas God takes Abram outside for the Covenant between the Pieces (Gen. 15: 5), He commands that no Israelite may go outside to eat the Passover (Exod. 12: 22, 46). The difference is significant. The Covenant between the Pieces contains the warning that the Israelites will be exiled (Gen. 15: 13), so that when God takes Abram outside He symbolizes the exile. When He commands the Israelites to stay in their dwellings during the Passover ritual He implies that the exile is over, each person being able to live in freedom in his household just as they were when they left Canaan, coming "each man with his household" (Exod. 1: 1). The Passover sacrifice symbolizes the end of the exile and slavery that God predicts in the Covenant between the Pieces. Whereas before God tells Abram that his seed will be exiled for 400 years He takes him outside when the time for the end of the exile arrives God commands the Israelites to remain within their dwellings for the Passover ritual. The Torah says that fire consumes the pieces of the sacrifice (Gen. 15: 17), so that the sacrifice foreshadows the Passover sacrifice that must be roasted in fire, as the Torah emphasizes twice (Exod. 12: 8, 9), adding that any remainder must also be burned in fire (Exod. 12: 10). Finally, the Covenant between the Pieces ends with the covenant of the flesh, which is not a separate covenant but the conclusion of the Covenant between the Pieces, as pointed out. The way the laws of the Passover sacrifice conclude with the commandment that a male must be circumcized in order to eat the Passover (Exod. 12: 48) and the term *מקנת יססף*, *acquired by silver*, is common to the two pericopes (Gen. 17:12,13, 23, 27; Exod. 12: 44) echoes the way that the Covenant between the Pieces concludes with the Covenant of the Flesh and the circumcision of Abraham and his entire household. The two pericopes end with similar language:

בַּעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, *on this selfsame day*, Abraham was circumcized, and Ishmael his son (Gen. 17: 26).

וַיְצַדֵּק אֱלֹהִים אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם, *on this selfsame day*, YHWH brought the Israelites out of Egypt by their hosts (Exod. 12: 51).

⁵⁹ As Rashbam points out on Exod. 33: 18, the verb *רבע*, *cross*, which occurs both in the Covenant between the Pieces (Gen. 15: 17) and Jacob's struggle with the angel (Gen. 32: 23 [2], 24 [2]), is the act that is a prerequisite for a covenant. The Torah highlights the fact that Jacob's struggle with the angel is a covenant by using the verb 4 times.

Indeed, the phrase *היום הזה*, *on this selfsame day*, which appears 14 times in the bible (Gen. 7: 13; 17: 23, 26; Exod. 12: 17, 41, 51; Lev. 23: 21, 28, 29, 30; Deut. 32: 48; Josh. 5: 11; Ezek. 24: 2; 40: 1), appears twice in the Covenant of the Flesh (Gen. 17: 23, 26), and 3 times in connection with the Passover (Exod. 12: 17, 41, 51), highlighting the connection between the pericopes⁶⁰. It therefore seems likely that the sacrifices in the Covenant between the Pieces foreshadow the Passover sacrifice, while the Covenant of the Flesh foreshadows the circumcision that is required as a prerequisite for the Passover sacrifice. Interestingly, the commandment of circumcision is implied in the “bridegroom of blood” narrative when Zipporah circumcises either one of Moses’ sons or Moses, calling him a “bridegroom of blood” (Exod. 4: 25-26)⁶¹. This action occurs after God tells Moses that Israel is His firstborn and commands him to warn Pharaoh that He will kill his firstborn if he does not allow the Israelites to go (Exod. 4: 22-23). The way the Israelites signify their acceptance of the news about their redemption after the “bridegroom of blood” narrative by bowing down foreshadows the way they signify their acceptance of the Passover by this action:

And the people believed and heard that YHWH had taken account of the Israelites and that He had seen their affliction, *ויקודו*, *and they bowed down*, and prostrated themselves (Exod. 4: 31).

And you shall say: It is the sacrifice of the Passover because he spared the house of the Israelites in Egypt when he smote Egypt and saved our houses. *ויקודו העם*, *and the people bowed down*, and prostrated themselves (Exod. 12: 27)

The verb *קוד*, *bow*, links the circumcision that takes place in the “bridegroom of blood” narrative to the laws of the Passover. The Torah says that Moses performs *האחת*, *the signs*, before the people (Exod. 4: 30) after the “bridegroom of blood” narrative. The signs to which the Torah points refer primarily to the ones that God had told Moses to perform with his rod:

And this rod you shall take in your hand with which you shall perform *האחת*, *the signs* (Exod. 4: 17).

⁶⁰ The phrase *היום מריה מצעב*, *היום הזה*, *on this selfsame day*, links the offering of first grain that the Holiness Code prescribes for the morrow of the Passover (Lev. 23: 21), with the offering that Joshua brings on that day (Josh. 5: 11).

⁶¹ As Wilfried Warning points out (personal communication), the word *ערלה*, *foreskin*, appears in the Torah for the seventh time in the “bridegroom of blood” narrative (Gen. 17: 11, 14, 23, 24, 25; 34: 14; Exod. 4: 25), not only highlighting the linkage between these narratives but highlighting the importance of Zipporah’s deed since it is the seventh citation of the word.

The signs that Moses shows the people are perhaps not only the ones that God shows him at the Burning Bush, but perhaps include the *אֵימָה*, *sign*, of circumcision in the covenant of the flesh (Gen. 17: 11). Supporting this interpretation, the Midrash says that when Joseph declares his identity to his brothers he shows them that he was circumcized:

“Joseph the son of Jacob, Joseph the son of Jacob!” he cried out, while they looked in the four corners of the house. “What do you see?” he said, “‘I am Joseph your brother’ (Gen. 45: 4)”. But they did not believe him until he uncovered himself and showed that he was circumcized⁶².

Since Moses is the successor of Joseph, when the Midrash suggests that Joseph shows his brothers that he is circumcized to identify himself to them it evidently considers that the Torah makes a similar implication in the case of Moses.

Language in the Covenant between the Pieces also helps to clarify a law in Leviticus that we have cited above:

And if any of the well-being sacrifice be at all eaten on the third day the person who offers it will not be acceptable. As for the person who offered it, it will not be acceptable for him; it will not *יחשב*, *be accredited*, to him, it is *פְּטוּר*, *offensive*, and the person who offers it shall bear his punishment (Lev. 7: 18).

The word *יחשב*, *be accredited*, resonates with the word *וַיַּחֲשֶׁבָה*, *and he accredited it*, in the verse describing the way that God considers Abram’s trust as deserving merit:

וַיַּחֲשֶׁבָה, *and he accredited it*, to him as merit (Gen. 15: 6).

The word *יחשב*, *be accredited*, which Milgrom says is a legal term in P⁶³, implying that the heavenly court is taking account of the act (e.g. Lev. 17: 14; Num. 18: 27, 30; cf. Ps. 106: 31)⁶⁴, resonates with the word *וַיַּחֲשֶׁבָה*, *and he accredited it*, in the verse describing the way that God considers Abram’s trust as deserving merit (Gen. 15: 6). The linkage between the two pericopes implies that God considers

⁶² Gen. R. 93: 10 and Rashi on Gen. 45: 4.

⁶³ The Holiness Code uses the verb in Lev. 35: 50 as a legal term involved in the process of redemption.

⁶⁴ Jacob Milgrom, “Leviticus 1-16,” Anchor Bible, Doubleday, New York, 1991, 421.

Abram's trust to be as meritorious as a timely sacrifice, as we have explained above. The Torah alludes to the need for sacrifices to be timely after Abram divides the pieces:

And the bird of prey descended on הפגרים, *the carcasses*, and Abram retrieved them (Gen. 15: 11).

The Egyptian god Horus is often represented as a falcon so it is like that the bird of prey is a falcon (cf. Isa. 18: 6; Ezek. 39: 4), representing Egypt. Abram dreams that he is warding off the ruler of Egypt, foreshadowing the way that Moses would do so when the Israelites become slaves there⁶⁵.

The image of a bird of prey eating carrion from carcasses foreshadows language that David uses before fighting Goliath:

Today YHWH will deliver you into my hand and I will smite you and remove your head from you and offer פגר, *the carcass*, of the Philistine camp to the bird of the heavens and the wild beasts of the earth, and all the world will know that Israel has a God (1 Sam. 17: 46).

The symbolism of Abram's vision that occurs following his military triumph rescuing Lot (14: 1-17) foreshadows David's first military triumph that occurs when he delivers Israel from the Philistines. The language also echoes language in the covenant that Jeremiah recalls after Zedekiah cuts a covenant with the people. Jeremiah echoes the language in Gen. 15: 7, also echoing Exod. 20: 2. After using the root בטר, *divide*, in Jer. 34: 18, 19, echoing its use in Gen. 15: 10 [3], he says:

And I gave them into the hand of their enemies and the hand of those who sought their lives, and גבלתם, *their corpses*, were the food of the bird of the heavens and the beast of the land (Jer. 34: 20).

The description of the corpses of princes who pass between the בתרים, *parts*, of the calf becoming the food of the bird of the land echoes the way that the bird of prey descends on הפגרים, *the carcasses*, in Gen. 15: 11, suggesting that the words הפגרים, *the carcasses*, and גבלתם, *their corpses*, are coterminous. The Targum translates הפגרים, *the carcasses*, with the word פגליא, a word that resonates with פגול, *offensive*,

⁶⁵ According to the Midrash, the bullock represents the exile of Babylon, the goat that of Media, the ram that of Greece and the dove and baby dove represent the exile of Edom, which is Rome (Gen. R. 44: 15).

as Rashi points out⁶⁶. The fact that the Covenant between the Pieces refers to the law of פגול, *offensive*, when it uses the הפגרים, *the carcasses*, only becomes apparent when the word הפגרים, *the carcasses*, is translated into the Aramaic פגליא. Such bilingual allusions are not uncommon in the Torah. One notable example is the bilingual wordplay that the Torah uses when Abraham offers Abimelech כבשות, *ewe-lambs* (Gen. 21: 29-30), as a sign that he חפר, *dig*, a well whose ownership is disputed (Gen. 21: 30), because the Aramaic word for כבשות, *ewe-lambs*, is חורפן, which resonates anagrammatically with חפר, *dig*⁶⁷. The prohibition of sacrifices that are more than two days old is due to the fact that after this time they must be considered to be carrion rather than edible flesh. Israelites are not only forbidden to eat meat that the Torah calls בבלה, *carrion*, from animals that are otherwise edible (Lev. 7: 24; 11: 40; 17: 15; 22: 8, Deut. 14: 21) but are even told that touching בבלה, *carrion*, causes impurity (Lev. 11: 28; 40). The Deuteronomist explains the reason:

You shall not eat any בבלה, *carrion*. You shall give it to the stranger in your gates and he may eat it or set it to the alien, because you are an עם קדוש, *holy people*, to YHWH your God (Deut. 14: 21).

The Priestly legislator demands that Israelites only eat consecrated meat that is sacrificed in the sanctuary (Lev. 17: 3-7), perhaps leading to the Hezekian reform that endorsed and implemented centralization⁶⁸. However, the Deuteronomist makes a concession, allowing them to eat meat that has not been consecrated if the journey to the central shrine is prohibitive (Deut. 12: 20-23). בבלה, *carrion*, is meat that may not be eaten because it has not been consecrated, as Mary Douglas points out⁶⁹. Even though the Deuteronomist allows the consumption of unconsecrated meat, he forbids the consumption of בבלה, *carrion*, on the grounds that the Israelites are a holy nation (Deut. 14: 21). While he permits meat to be eaten even though it has not been consecrated he forbids the consumption of meat that could never have been consecrated because it is בבלה, *carrion*. The Priestly author considers that meat becomes virtual בבלה, *carrion*, after two days even if it has been sacrificed and therefore forbids it, calling it פגול. The connection

⁶⁶ Some manuscripts of Onqelos read פלגיא, which means “part” (Marcus Jastrow, “A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature,” The Judaica Press, New York, 1989, 1136; “Targum Onqelos on the Torah,” Bnei Berak, 1999, 18 (Hebrew). This variant is presumably a scribal error based on the fact that פלגיא translates בטר, *slice*, in Gen. 15: 10 and the word פגליא is likely to be correct.

⁶⁷ I am indebted to my son Zachary Gedaliah Hepner for pointing out this bilingual wordplay.

⁶⁸ M. Haran, “Studies in the Bible: The Idea of Centralization of the Cult in the Priestly Apprehension,” Beer-Sheva 1 (1973): 114-121 (Hebrew); “Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel,” Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978, 141; Israel Knohl, “The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School,” trans. E. Feldman and P. Rodman, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1995, 199-224; Jacob Milgrom, “Leviticus 17-22,” New York, Anchor Bible, Doubleday, 2000, 1503-1514.

⁶⁹ Mary Douglas, “Leviticus as Literature,” Oxford University Press, 2000, 151.

between *piggul* and the prohibition of בלה, *carrion*, is therefore apparent from a close reading of the Covenant between the Pieces and an awareness of the Aramaic word for carcass because the Torah alludes to it when it uses the word הפגרים, *the carcasses* (Gen. 15: 11), denoting the status of the sacrifices once they had become *piggul*⁷⁰.

We have pointed out above that the language describing the manna in Exodus implies that it is comparable to a sacrifice called חרומה, *gift*, linking it to the sacrifice that Abram brings El Elyon in the presence of Melchizedek. A close reading of the manna pericope in Exodus suggests that the author also recognized the connection between פגול and carrion. The Torah says:

And Moses said to them: No man should יותר, *leave a remainder*, of it until morning. And they did not listen to Moses, ויותר אנשים, *and some men left over*, some of it until morning וירם תולעים, *and it raised maggots*, and became offensive, and Moses became angry with them (Exod. 16: 19-20).

The words יותר, *leaves a remainder* (Exod. 16: 19), and יותרו, *and they left a remainder* (Exod. 16: 20), resonate with the word נותר, *remainder*, denoting the remainder of a thanksgiving or votive offering that the Torah says must be burned on the third day, declaring that it becomes פגול, *piggul*. The Torah's use of the words יותר, *leaves a remainder* (Exod. 16: 19), and יותרו, *and they left a remainder* (Exod. 16: 20), implies that manna that has remained overnight is comparable to a sacrifice that has become נותר, *remainder* (Lev. 7: 16, 17), since it has remained on the altar for more than two days. The way that the manna raises maggots makes it comparable to carrion, highlighting the fact that פגול, *piggul*, is forbidden because it is like carrion! The presence of the תולעים, in the manna narrative is highlighted by the word וירם, *and it raised*, which resonates with רמה, *worm* (Exod. 16: 24), as Ibn Janah suggests. It is possible that this verbal resonance also implies that the manna becomes a defiled חרומה, *gift*.

The narrative describing the way that Elijah revives the son of the woman of Zarephath makes an oblique allusion to the concept of פגול, *piggul*, similar to the one made in the manna narrative when the author of Kings describes the way that Elijah takes the ostensibly dead son of the woman of Zarephath to העליה, *the loft*:

And he took him up to העליה, *the loft*, where he was dwelling and laid him on his own bed (1 Kings 17: 19b).

⁷⁰ Heider discusses the Akkadian *pagru*-offering (G. C. Heider, "The Cult of Molek," Sheffield, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1985, 393), and Ebach has proposed that it has this meaning in Ezek. 43: 7, 9 (J. Ebach, U. Rütterswörden, "Unterwelstbeschwörung in Alten Testament," Ugaritische Forschungen 9 (1977): 58-70; 12: 205-220). It is unlikely that the prohibition of *piggul* has any relationship to such a prohibition.

The word העליה, *the loft*, resonates with תולעים, *maggots* (Exod. 16: 20). The verbal resonance is extremely poignant because it indicates that the boy whom Elijah takes to העליה, *the loft*, is destined to be consigned to תולעים, *maggots*, and become offensive. This happens after the widow's son dies:

After a while the son of the mistress of the house fell sick and his illness grew worse until לא־נותרה־בו נשמה, *no breath remained in him* (1 Kings 17: 17).

The author of Kings therefore implies that the widow's dead son has become like meat that is נותר, *a remainder*, that has remained on the altar too long and is therefore comparable to פגול, making it necessary for Elijah to take him to the העליה, *the loft*, which resonates with תולעים, *maggots*. There are many other verbal resonances that link the two narratives. The Sabbath plays a major role in the manna narrative since God commands the Israelites not to collect manna on that day, providing a double portion on that day (Exod. 16: 23, 29). When Elijah first encounters the woman of Zarephath she is מקששת עצים, *gathering wood* (1 Kings 17: 10), an activity that the Torah forbids on the Sabbath, as the Torah indicates in a narrative dealing with a man who מקשש עצים, *gathers wood*, on the Sabbath (Num. 15: 32, 33)⁷¹. The word צפחה, *jug*, occurs 3 times in the Elijah narrative (1 Kings 17: 12, 14, 16)⁷², denoting the jug in which the woman of Zarephath kept her oil, and resonates with the hapax צפיהה, *wafer*, that the Torah uses when it compares the taste of the manna to a צפיהה, *wafer*, of honey (Exod. 16: 31). The fact that the manna tastes like dough kneaded with oil (Num. 11: 8) highlights the parallel between the miraculous multiplication of the flour and oil of the widow of Zarephath and the manna. When Elijah saves the life of the widow's son we read:

ויתמדד, *and he stretched*, over the child three times (1 Kings 17: 21).

The word ויתמדד, *and he stretched*, resonates with the word וימדד, *and they measured*, in the manna narrative:

וימדד, *and they measured*, the omer the one who gathered much did not leave over and the one who gathered little did not החסיר, *have a deficiency*; everyone gathered as much as they could eat (Exod. 16: 18).

⁷¹ When Pharaoh tells the Israelites to gather straw (Exod. 5: 7) he does this to ensure that they violate the Sabbath, as is clear from his oblique reference to it in Exod. 5: 5 when he uses the word השבתם, *you have caused to cease*, meaning "you have caused to rest as on the שבת, *Sabbath*".

⁷² The word appears only four other times in the bible (1 Sam. 26: 11, 12, 16; 1 Kings 19: 6).

When the author of Kings says *וַיִּתְמַדּוּ*, *and he stretched*, he implies that the way Elijah saves the life of the son of the woman of Zarephath by stretching over him echoes the way that the manna saved the lives of the Israelites in the wilderness when they measured it. The verb *חָסַר*, *fail*, denotes the way that oil does not fail the woman of Zarephath (1 Kings 17: 14, 16), and echoes the way that the Torah says that none of the Israelites *הָיוּ חֹסְרִים*, *have a deficiency*, when they gather the manna. When the author of Kings says that Elijah takes the body of the son of the widow of Zarephath to *הַלֵּלִיָּהּ*, *the loft*, after *לֹא יָנֻחַ בְּרִיבוֹ בְּשָׁמַר*, *no breath remained in him*, he implies that the child's body is comparable to carrion that is ready to raise maggots, thus highlighting the miracle that Elijah performs when he brings him back to life. It is not clear whether the *Vorlage* is the manna narrative or that of Elijah and the woman of Zarephath. The oblique allusion to the Sabbath in the Elijah narrative with the description of the woman *מְקַשֶּׁשׂת עֵצִים*, *gathering wood* (1 Kings 17: 10), suggests that the manna narrative may be the *Vorlage* in the same way that it may have influenced Matthew in the narrative in Matt. 12: 1-8 where the way that Jesus allows his disciples to violate the Sabbath in order to feed themselves contrasts with the strict laws that apply to the provision of manna on the Sabbath. On the other hand the fact that the author of the manna narrative uses *צַפִּיתָה*, *wafer* (Exod. 16: 31), makes it more likely that narrative in Kings is the *Vorlage* and that the manna narrative echoes it by means of the hapax that resonates with the word *צַפִּיתָה*, *jug*, which occurs 3 times in the Elijah narrative (1 Kings 17: 12, 14, 16). Considering the Elijah narrative in conjunction with that of Elisha it seems clear that the author of Kings wishes to compare the miraculous way that Elijah revives the life of the son of the woman of Zarephath to the way that God revives the Israelites by providing them with manna than *vice versa*. Elisha, Elijah's disciple, also performs a miracle in which he leaves excess, miraculously enabling twenty loaves to feed a multitude in a narrative that also echoes the manna narrative, using the words *וַיִּתְּרֵם*, *and leave over*, and *וַיִּתְּרֵם*, *and they left over* (2 Kings 4: 43, 44). The Elisha narrative echoes the manna narrative in other ways. The word *רָעַב*, *famine* (2 Kings 4: 38), and *סִיר*, *pot* (2 Kings 4: 38, 39, 40, 41 [2]), both appear in Exod. 16: 3. The word *בָּשַׁל*, *boil* (2 Kings 4: 38), appears in Exod. 16: 23. The word *לָקַט*, *gather* (2 Kings 4: 39), is a keyword in the manna narrative (Exod. 16: 4, 5, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 18, 22, 26). The phrase *כִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ*, *because they did not know* (2 Kings 4: 39), echoes the same language in the manna narrative (Exod. 16: 15). The words *מֵוַת בְּסִיר*, *death is in the pot* (2 Kings 4: 40), echo the Israelites' words:

Would that *מֵוַתנוּ*, *we had died*, by the hand of YHWH while we sat *עַל־סִיר הַבָּשָׂר*, *on the pot of meat*, when we ate bread to satiety (Exod. 16: 3).

The linkage of the narratives of Elijah and the woman of Zarephath and Elijah and Shunamite to the manna narrative suggests that the manna narrative is the *Vorlage* and that the author of Kings wishes to imply that both prophets bring Israelites back to life in the same way that God revived all Israelites by

providing them with manna⁷³. Since the Elisha narrative is more closely linked to the manna narrative than the Elijah narrative this analysis also suggests that it may be the *Vorlage* to the Elijah narrative rather than *vice versa*. Nevertheless, the Elijah narrative clearly evokes the imagery of פגול, *piggul*, when the author of Kings says that Elijah takes the body of the son of the widow of Zarephath העליה, *the left*, after לא נותרה בו נשמה, *no breath remained in him*, because this language implies that her son's body is ready to raise maggots like a carcass. We remember that when the Torah says that meat that becomes a נותר, *remainder*, on the altar becomes פגול, *piggul*, it implies that it becomes offensive because it is like a corpse ready to raise maggots. Such meat is not fit for God and cannot be accepted on the altar because it is carrion, not only dead meat but meat that is ready to rot. The same applies to the manna that remains overnight. The imagery implies that the same applies to the son of the widow of Zarephath, highlighting the miraculous nature of his revival as a result of Elijah's ministrations since he was not only dead but ready to rot!

Interestingly, Jonah also echoes Exod. 16: 20:

וַיִּמֶן אֱלֹהִים תְּרֹלַעַת, *and God appointed a maggot*, at dawn on the next day which attacked the plants so that it withered (Jon. 4: 7).

The use of the word וַיִּמֶן, *and He appointed*, which resonates with מַן, *manna*, suggests that the author of Jonah implies that the תְּרֹלַעַת, *maggot*, which causes Jonah's plant to rot echoes the תְּרֹלַעִים, *maggots*, that cause the manna to rot (Exod. 16: 20).

Ezekiel also links פגול with בבלה, *carrion*:

And I said: אָהֵה, my Lord YHWH, here, my being has not become defiled, וַנְּבִלָה, *and carrion*, or torn meat I have not eaten from my youth until now, and meat that is פגול, *piggul*, has not entered my mouth (Ezek. 4: 14).

The word אָהֵה means "alas" in Judg. 11: 35; 2 Kings 6: 5, 15; Joel 1: 15. It is likely to be an allusion to God's name אָהֵה, *Ehyeh*, which means "I will be," as Rashbam explains on Exod. 3: 14-15⁷⁴. אָהֵה alludes to the ineffable name of God אָהֵה, *Ehyeh*, whenever it is associated with the words אֲדַבֵּר יְהוָה,

⁷³ The Midrash says that Elijah did eight miracles and Elisha sixteen (Yalqut Breishit 92, cited in Rashi to 2 Kings 2: 14; 3: 1). The parallelism between the narratives has been noted by R. L. Cohn ("The Literary Logic of 1 Kings 17-19," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 335-350) and Nachman Levine ("Twice As Much Of Your Spirit: Pattern, Parallel and Paronomasia in the Miracles of Elijah and Elisha," *Journal of the Study of the Old Testament* 85 (1999): 25-46).

⁷⁴ See Martin I. Lockshin, "Rashbam's Commentary on Exodus: An Annotated Translation," Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997, 36-37.

my lord YHWH, as it is 10 times (Josh. 7: 7; Judg. 6: 22; Jer. 1: 6; 4: 10; 14: 13; 32: 17; Ezek. 4: 14; 9: 8; 11: 13; 21: 15). In the Gideon narrative, Gideon's use of the word links his exclamation to Moses' theophany at the Burning Bush where God tells him that His name is אהיה, *Ehyeh*. Although the word אהה means "alas" in Judg. 11: 35; 2 Kings 6: 5, 15, Joel 1: 15, it is likely to be an allusion to God's name אהיה, *Ehyeh*, meaning "I will be" whenever it is associated with the words אדני יהוה, *my lord YHWH*, as it is 10 times (Josh. 7: 7; Judg. 6: 22; Jer. 1: 6; 4: 10; 14: 13; 32: 17; Ezek. 4: 14; 9: 8; 11: 13; 21: 15). In the Gideon narrative, Gideon's use of the word links his exclamation to Moses' theophany at the Burning Bush where God tells him that His name is אהיה, *Ehyeh*. Similarly Jeremiah's use of the words אהה אדני יהוה, *alas my Lord YHWH*, are his very first words to God:

And I said: אהה אדני יהוה, *alas my Lord YHWH*, here, I do not know how to speak, because I am a young lad (Jer. 1: 6).

אהה not only means "alas" but for Jeremiah and Gideon, as for Joshua and Ezekiel, it is synonymous with God's name אהיה, *Ehyeh*, which God tells Moses at the Burning Bush. Ezekiel can only utter this ineffable name because defiled meat such as פגול, *from a carcass*, has not entered his mouth. Since God's name is holy a mouth that has been defiled may not mention it. It follows that when Ezekiel pronounces God's holy name he implies that it has not been defiled by unconsecrated meat.

Biblical scholars have hitherto been unaware of the connection between the word פגול and פגליא. Akkadian and Egyptian derivatives for פגול have been suggested⁷⁵. Wright considered it to be meat that has become desecrated⁷⁶, deriving this meaning from the language in Lev. 19: 7-8. Milgrom⁷⁷ supports this explanation by pointing out that an offering whose time limit has expired becomes desecrated:

And if any of the flesh of the consecration become remaindered⁷⁸ from the meat of the consecrations and from the bread until the morning then you shall burn the remainder in fire. It may not be eaten because it is holy (Exod. 29: 34).

⁷⁵ M. Görg, "Piggul und pilaegaes: Experimente zur Etymologie," *Biblische Notizen* 10: 7-11.

⁷⁶ D. P. Wright, "The Disposal of Impurity," Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1987, 140-143.

⁷⁷ Jacob Milgrom, "Leviticus 1-16," Anchor Bibl, Doubleday, New York, 1991, 422.

⁷⁸ The word יתור, *becomes remaindered*, resonates with the word ייתר, *and he remained*, in the narrative of Jacob's struggle with the angel (Gen. 32: 23), which we have linked to the Covenant between the Pieces.

The Rabbis relate the sin of פגול to sacrificing with the wrong intention at the time of the sacrifice, intending to leave the meat and eat it only after two days have elapsed⁷⁹. They do not relate the offense to the word פגליא, *carcass*, explaining as we have done that after two days a sacrifice turns from meat into carrion.

Interestingly enough, it is possible that the Holiness Code connects the word פגול to revulsion when it says:

And I will destroy your cult places and cut down your incense stands and I will heap your פגריכם, *carcasses*, on your פגריי, *carcass-like*, fetishes and My being גועלה, *will loathe*, you (Lev. 26: 30).

The verb גועל, *loathe*, that the Holiness Code associates the word פגור, *carcass*, which the Targumim on Gen. 15: 11 but not in this verse translate as פגליא, *carcass*, resonates with פגול, sharing two consonants and differing in *ayin* and *peh*, two adjacent consonants which are sometimes interchangeable, as in the words שסע and שסף which both mean “cleave,” as in 1 Sam. 15: 17 and 24: 7⁸⁰.

The Covenant between the Pieces not only foreshadows the covenant at Sinai and the one God makes with Jacob at Jabbok but is echoed by pseudo-sacrifice that Samson performs when he burns three hundred Philistine foxes:

And Samson went and captured three hundred foxes and took לפידים, *torches*, and put tail to tail and put אחד אחד, *one torch*, between two tails בתוך, *in the midst*.
ויבער־אש בלפידים, *and he set fire with torches*, and he set them off to the grain stacks of the Philistines, ויבער, *and set fire*, from grain stacks to vineyard, to olive (Judg. 15: 4-5).

The language echoes language in the Covenant between the Pieces where the Torah says:

And he took all of these for him and split them בתוך, *in the midst*....
And it was, when the sun had set, and there had been night-blackness, and here, an oven of smoke, ולפיד אש עבר, *and a torch of fire crossed*, between the pieces (Gen. 15: 10, 17).

⁷⁹ Mishnah Kelim 25: 9; Mishnah Zebahim 2: 2-5; 3: 6.

⁸⁰ Baruch Halevi Epstein in his book “תוספת ברכה,” demonstrates that adjacent letters are frequently interchangeable in biblical Hebrew.

The word בתוך, *in the midst*, is common to the two narratives⁸¹. Samson burns foxes in שׂא, *fire*, caused by לפידים, *torches*, echoing the אש לפיד, *torch of fire*, that burns the pieces in the Covenant between the Pieces after Abraham splits them בתוך, *in the midst*. The root בער, *burn*, resonates anagrammatically with עבר, *cross*, a verb that is related to the cutting of a covenant (Gen. 15: 17; 32: 23, 24; Exod. 33: 19, 22 [2]; Jer 34: 18), as Rashbam explains on Exod. 33: 23⁸². Samson's pseudo-sacrifice of three hundred foxes is a travesty of the Covenant between the Pieces in the same way that his death is a travesty of the near-sacrifice of Isaac, as a close reading indicates.

Rashbam considers the Rabbinic explanation of פגול as an example of a case where the Rabbis "uproot the plain meaning of a verse". On Gen. 37:2 he says that the rabbis had no interest in peshat and what they did had nothing to do with peshat. Rashbam's statement is mistaken, as Shadal says, cited by Lockshin in a discussion of this verse⁸³. It is likely that they based their interpretation on the use of the word חשב, which can mean "intend," as Milgrom suggests⁸⁴. Ibn Ezra wonders how a sacrifice that God had accepted as a sweet savor could retrospectively be invalidated. The Rabbis' interpretation of the prohibition in Lev. 7: 18 may have been their solution to this problem, based on their conviction that meritorious deeds could not retrospectively be considered as having lacked merit, unlike sins which could be excuplated retrospectively when the sinner repents. According to such a conviction, a meritorious deed like a sacrifice can only be invalidated if it was flawed from the start as a result of having had the wrong intention. The Rabbis' interpretation of Lev. 7: 18 is therefore not an uprooting of the peshat, as Rashbam claims, but is based on the recognition of the linkage between Lev 17: 8 and Gen. 15: 6 and 11.

This paper provides an excellent illustration of the way that the recognition of verbal resonances may help to elucidate the significance of words that have hitherto defied interpretation. The word פגול, *piggul*, is clearly semantically similar to בבלה, *carrion*, but this relationship has eluded exegetes for more than two thousand years because their adherence to a strict philological paradigm has prevented them from recognizing the importance role that recognition of verbal resonances may play in elucidating the peshat. Use of verbal resonances has been considered unscholarly because it is associated with midrash, but the

⁸¹ The death of Samson also involves the use of the word תוך, *middle*:

And Samson twisted the two pillars התיך, *in the middle*, on which the house was established and leaned on them, one with his right hand and one with his left (Judg. 16: 29).

⁸² The tablets were inscribed on both עבריהם, *their sides* (Exod. 32: 15), a word that is also related to the verb עבר, *cross*, and highlights the fact that the two tablets are the basis of the covenant between God and Israel, as if the Israelites pass between them like the two slices of a divided animal.

⁸³ Martin I. Lockshin, "Rashbam's Commentary on Leviticus and Numbers: An Annotated Translation," Brown Judaic Studies, Providence, 2001, 43.

⁸⁴ Jacob Milgrom, "Leviticus 1-16," Anchor Bible, Doubleday, New York, 1991, 421.

dichotomy between midrash and peshat is a false one since interpretation of the peshat often requires midrashic analysis⁸⁵. The meaning of פגול, *piggul*, becomes clear when we realize that the Covenant between the Pieces alludes to it by means of verbal resonances that link it to a Priestly law. Happily, this paper also demonstrates the usefulness of verbal resonances for understanding the rationale of hapax legomena, because it seems likely that the rationale that צפחה, *wafer*, a hapax that the Torah uses to compare the taste of the manna to a wafer of honey (Exod. 16: 31), is to link it to the word צפחה, *jug*, which occurs 3 times in the Elijah narrative (1 Kings 17: 12, 14, 16)⁸⁶, describing the jug in which the woman of Zarephath kept her oil, thus highlighting the fact that the manna became comparable to פגול, *piggul*, after being left overnight.

Many scholars attribute Genesis 15 to the Deuteronomist⁸⁷. Westermann has drawn attention to Ugaritic parallels connecting the narrative to the way that El grants King Keret offspring⁸⁸. Van Seters has drawn attention to the links between the language in the Covenant between the Pieces and Deutero-Isaiah's language when he says that צדיקים, *the righteous*, will inherit the earth (Isa. 60: 21)⁸⁹. Sadly, none of these scholars recognize the connection between the chapter and the priestly laws or its organic link to the Covenant of the Flesh. According to Richard Elliot Friedman the Covenant between the Pieces is part of the "hidden book in the bible" that was written by a Judean scribe in the court of David in the 10th century⁹⁰. The priestly laws were probably written at a far later date. Although Kaufmann⁹¹, Haran⁹²,

⁸⁵ See Gershon Hepner, "Midrash and the Elaboration of Biblical Meaning," *Judaism*, 2002 (in press).

⁸⁶ The word appears only four other times in the bible (1 Sam. 26: 11, 12, 16; 1 Kings 19: 6).

⁸⁷ R. Rendtorff, "Genesis 15 im Rahmen der theologischen Bearbeitung der Vätergeschichten," in "Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments: Festschrift für C. Westermann," edited by R. Albertz, Göttingen/Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1980, 74-81; H. H. Schmid, "Gerechtigkeit und Glaube: Genesis 15,1-6 und sein biblisch-theologischer Kontext," *Evangelische Theologie* 40 (1980): 396-420; M. Anbar, "Genesis 15: A Conflation of Two Deuteronomic Narratives," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 39-55; E. Blum, "Die Komposition der Vätergeschichten," *Wissenschaftlichen Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 57, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984, 362-383. For a discussion of the unity of the chapter see J. Ha, "Genesis 15," *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Berlin and New York, 1989.

⁸⁸ Westermann, "The Promises to the Fathers," Philadelphia 1976, 165-186. See also R. S. Hendel, "The Epic of the Patriarch, *Harvard Semitic Monographs* 42 (1987): 37-59.

⁸⁹ John Van Seters, "Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian," Louisville, Westminster, John Knox, 1992, 250-251.

⁹⁰ Richard Elliot Friedman, "The Hidden Book in the Bible: The Discovery of the First Prose Masterpiece," Harper, San Francisco, 1998, 80.

⁹¹ Yehezkel Kaufmann, "The History of the Israelite Religion," 4 vols., Tel Aviv, Dvir (Hebrew (1937-56).

⁹² M. Haran, "Temples and the Temple Service in Ancient Israel," Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978.

Hurvitz⁹³, Milgrom⁹⁴ and Knohl⁹⁵ maintain that they may have been written in pre-exilic times, possibility inspiring the reforms of Hezekiah, more scholars are inclined to believe that they are of exilic or post-exilic origin, as suggested by Wellhausen⁹⁶. Furthermore, language in Gen. 15: 6 appears to allude to two pericopes in Deuteronomy, which also argues for a date of composition that is unlikely to have occurred before the end of the 6th century B.C.E. The way that the Covenant between the Pieces echoes language in Jeremiah suggests that it was probably written after Jeremiah, the prediction of 400 years exile in Gen. 15: 13 echoing Jeremiah's prediction of an exile of 70 years. On the other hand, it is possible that the Covenant between the Pieces is the *Vorlage* of Jeremiah's prophecy.

The possible reference in the Covenant between the Pieces to Zadok, echoing the possible allusion to him in Gen. 14: 18, raises the possibility that the narrative is a Zadokite polemic echoing the one in Ezekiel 40-48. This suggests that the narrative was written as part of a post-exilic polemic championing the Zadokite claims to priesthood⁹⁷, linking it to the Davidic dynasty whose kingship is clearly foreshadowed in the Abraham narrative. Although the power of the Zadokites survives the disappearance of the Davidic dynasty and ultimately was not dependent on it, originally a link between the two was required to legitimate them, as Pomykala points out⁹⁸. When the Davidic dynasty ended the Chronicler, in

⁹³ A. Hurvitz, "A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel," Paris, Gabalda, 1982.

⁹⁴ Jacob Milgrom, "Leviticus 1-16," New York, Anchor Bible, Doubleday, 1990, 3-13.

⁹⁵ Israel Knohl, "The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School," Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1995, 209. The term "Holiness Code" should be viewed with some skepticism. It was first used by August Klostermann in 1877 in an attempt to refute the theory that Ezekiel wrote the second part of Leviticus. Kaufmann and Weinfeld both claim that the laws of the Holiness Code are part of the Priestly Torah (Y. Kaufmann, "A History of the Religion of Israel," Jerusalem, 1960, 121; Moshe Weinfeld, "Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School," Oxford, 1972, 179-243). The work of Warning casts serious doubts about the separation between the laws attributed to P and HS since numerical patterns suggests that a single author was responsible not only for redacting these laws but writing them (Wilfried Warning, "Literary Artistry in Leviticus," Leiden, Brill, 1999, 8-19).

⁹⁶ Julius Wellhausen, "Die Komposition des Hexateuchs," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 21, 1876, 392-450, 531-602, now published as "Die Komposition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments," Berlin, de Gruyter, 4th edition, 1963. Wellhausen's view that the Priestly stratum of the Pentateuch was the latest of the Pentateuchal sources is supported by K. H. Graf, "Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments: Zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen," Leipzig, Weigel, 1866; E. Reuss, "L'histoire sainte et la loi (Pentateuch et Josue)," 2 vols, Paris, Sandoz & Fischbacher, 1879; Abraham Kuenen, "An Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch," 2 vols., London, Macmillan, 1886.

⁹⁷ See Gabriele Boccaccini, "Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, From Ezekiel to Daniel," Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 2002, 43-72.

⁹⁸ Kenneth E. Pomykala, "The Davidic Dynasty in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism," Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1995, 110.

what Boccaccini calls “an astonishing example of theological supersession”⁹⁹, does not consider God’s promise to David to be broken but the Davidic dynasty to be fulfilled in the cultic community of the temple, notable the Zadokite priesthood. The linkage between God’s promise of seed to Abraham and Abraham’s acceptance of the Zadokite priesthood implied by the language in Gen. 15: 6 and the presence of Eliezer whose name resonates with Azariah, the son of Zadok mentioned in 1 Kings 4: 2 as well as the Zadokite priest whom the Chronicler describes as being the chief priest in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chron. 31: 10) provides a most intriguing subtext to the narrative of the Covenant between the Pieces and suggests that it could be post-exilic Zadokite polemic. On the other hand, the alleged allusion to Zadok in Gen. 15: 6 may be a reference to the Davidic dynasty, especially since the narrative has several links to the prophecy in which Jeremiah alludes to it using the term צמח צדקה, *sprout of righteousness* (Jer. 33: 15)¹⁰⁰, in a covenant in which God promises that the Davidic line and the Levitical priests would never be cut off (Jer. 32: 20-21) while comparing the numbers of the Israelites to the hosts of heaven and the sand of the sea (Jer. 32: 22), echoing God’s words to Abraham in Gen. 15: 5. However, the promise to the Davidic house is unexpected in the tradition of Jeremiah who tends to regard the dynasty as a problem for Israel (Jer. 22: 13-18, 24-30). His promise must be seen in the context of the Deuteronomic law of the king in which the Deuteronomist grudgingly allows the Israelites to have a king provided that he follow the instruction of the Levitical priests (Deut. 17: 14-20). The quality of צדקה, *righteousness*, is a *sine qua non* for the king, and this requires priestly control. It follows that even if the language in Gen. 15: 6 echoes Jeremiah’s language in Jer. 33: 15 it is likely to be a covert priestly rather than kingly polemic.

⁹⁹ Gabriele Boccaccini, “Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, From Ezekiel to Daniel,” Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 2002, 60. See William Riley, “King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement* 160, Sheffield, 1993, 155.

¹⁰⁰ Walter Breggemann, “A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile & Homecoming,” Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1998, 318.