

---

## Introduction

What did “memory” mean to the Israelite authors behind the Pentateuch? The question assumes, first of all, that memory was a meaningful concept for them, an assumption unlikely to be challenged by the mainstream ever since 1982 when Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi published *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Yerushalmi identified memory as “a religious imperative to an entire people” of biblical Israel. He wrote,

Its reverberations are everywhere, but they reach a crescendo in the Deuteronomic history and in the prophets. “Remember the days of old, consider the years of ages past” (Deut 32:7). “Remember these things, O Jacob, for you, O Israel, are My servant; I have fashioned you, you are My servant; O Israel, never forget Me” (Isa 44:21). “Remember what Amalek did to you” (Deut 25:17). “O My people, remember now what Balak king of Moab plotted against you” (Micah 6:5). And, with a hammering insistence: “Remember that you were a slave in Egypt. . . .”<sup>1</sup>

Yerushalmi further observed that the Pentateuch concretizes the religious imperative of remembering in religious practice:

Memory flowed, above all, through two channels: ritual and recital. . . . [T]he great pilgrimage festivals of Passover and Tabernacles were transformed into commemorations of the Exodus from Egypt and the sojourn in the wilderness. . . . A superlative example of the interplay of ritual and recital in the service of memory is the ceremony of the first fruits ordained in Deuteronomy 26. . . .”<sup>2</sup>

1. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), 9–10.

2. *Ibid.*, 11–12.

As his biblical references suggest, Yerushalmi's comments on memory in biblical religion are based almost entirely on deuteronomic literature. In other words, he equates "memory" in biblical literature with the way "memory" is understood in Deuteronomy, as a religious obligation for the Israelite nation. Because Yerushalmi was looking for the origins of the modern idea of Jewish memory in the foundational text of Judaism, it likely did not occur to him to question whether that literature represents the whole of the Bible with respect to memory. Nor did he find it necessary to distinguish between different biblical conceptions of memory or to investigate how the biblical authors spoke about memory. These distinctions have remained largely unexamined in treatments of memory and the Bible by biblical scholars, with the result that both the particular ways in which memory is conceptualized in different religious traditions in the Bible and the possibility of a meaningful connection between memory and the religious programs of individual traditions within the Bible have been overlooked and unexplored.<sup>3</sup>

A salutary exception comes in an offhand comment by Moshe Greenberg in his commentary on Ezekiel:

Israel's duty to always remember YHWH's redemptive and sustaining deeds (particularly in her prosperity) as the chief motive of obedience to his commandments is a Deuteronomic commonplace. . . . The priestly writings, on the other hand, extol YHWH's remembrance of his covenant as a feature of his trustworthiness.<sup>4</sup>

What Greenberg remarks upon is what this book seeks to demonstrate and develop. Both of the two principal traditions of the Pentateuch, one deuteronomic (D) and the other priestly (P), identify memory as the most instrumental guarantee of covenantal fidelity.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, they diverge significantly over what memory is, how memory serves its vital purpose, and as Greenberg observes, whose memory serves it. As Greenberg states, in the deuteronomic tradition, *Israel's* fidelity to the Sinai/Horeb covenant—expressed through the fulfillment of its terms (commandments)—depends on Israel's

3. To a great extent, this critique applies to almost all work on memory in the Bible as the review of scholarship below will illustrate. Some examples are, Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Memory, Tradition, and the Construction of the Past in Ancient Israel," *BTB* 27 (1997): 76–82; Mark Zvi Brettler, "Memory in Ancient Israel," in *Memory and History in Christianity and Judaism*, ed. M. A. Signer (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 1–17; Anto Popović, "The Bible as a Book of Memory," *Antonianum* 79 (2004): 441–43.

4. Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, AB 22 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 305.

continually remembering its obligation to Yahweh. In a slight, but significant, alteration of the second half of Greenberg's statement, in priestly literature, it is *God* who must be reminded of his "eternal covenant" (*bərît ôlām*) with Israel and of his particular commitment to his people.

The possibility that God forgets, except when deliberately and mercifully, is not readily acknowledged by readers of the Hebrew Bible, yet the priestly tradition clearly recognizes it. The most obvious example comes in the beginning of Exodus when, after 400 years, God remembers his covenant with the patriarchs and is thus prompted to intervene on behalf of their descendants. But further confirmation comes from God himself in Genesis 9, when God places his bow in the sky to remind him of his covenant with the world.

So it is that in both traditions, memory—that of Israel on the one hand and God on the other—must be induced or sustained, and the religious programs envisioned provide for that necessity. The different mechanisms used in each tradition reflect their radically different conceptualizations of what memory is. In Deuteronomy, memory tends to be semantic in content: that is to say, it is the acquisition and retention of information and doctrine. Israel's memories are formed verbally, through speech, and they are sustained and transmitted verbally, through recitation or oral instruction. Memory in priestly literature is more of a sensory phenomenon and is "episodic" in content.<sup>6</sup> In this tradition, God's awareness of a specific circumstance or obligation is provoked through sensory cues, particularly visual, but also olfactory and aural. In the main, the priestly tradition regards Israel's memory as suspect, but it nonetheless

5. The designations D and P derive from the Wellhausen–Graff "Documentary Hypothesis," which Julius Wellhausen presented in 1886 in his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (*Prolegomena to the History of Israel*). Wellhausen postulated four "sources" underlying the Pentateuch: a Yahwistic source (J), an Elohist source (E), the deuteronomistic source (D), and a priestly source (P). Although it is no longer generally held that four distinct narratives underlie the Pentateuch as we now have it, these designations continue to be employed to refer to units of textual material that exhibit linguistic and ideational commonality. Because that material may come from several historical periods, I choose to use the term "traditions" rather than "sources" in connection to D and P. On the priority of these two traditions, see Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Row, 1963) and Stephen A. Geller, "The Religion of the Bible," in *The Jewish Study Bible*, ed. M. Z. Brettler and A. Berlin (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 2121–40. Scholarly consensus attributes the final redaction of the Pentateuch to P. D's role is mainly limited to Deuteronomy, though deuteronomistic elements (sometimes called "proto-deuteronomistic") can be identified in Genesis–Numbers. See, for example, Anthony Phillips, "A Fresh Look at the Sinai Pericope," *Parts 1 and 2*, *VT* 34 (1984): 39–53 and 282–94; Casper J. Labuschagne, "The Pattern of Divine Speech Formulas in the Pentateuch: The Key to Its Literary Structure," *VT* 32 (1982): 268–96; and Yair Zakovitch, "The Book of the Covenant Interprets the Book of the Covenant: The 'Boomerang Phenomenon,'" in *Texts, Temples and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. M. V. Fox et al. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), \*59–64 [Hebrew].

appreciates the power of memory to promote the fulfillment of specific, punctual duties, and to warn about improper behavior. For either purpose, Israel's memory, like God's, is induced through sensory means. In one respect Israel's memory, though of secondary importance relative to God's, plays handmaiden to the task of sustaining God's memory. In another, more intriguing respect, the priestly treatment of Israel's memory illuminates a fundamental yet often obscured tension in priestly religion between a dominant theology authorized by creation and a subordinate theology authorized through revelation.

In addition to assigning to memory a crucial part in their covenant theologies, both the deuteronomic and priestly traditions situate memory's covenantal importance in terms of a divinely authorized worldview. The two versions of creation that open the book of Genesis describe two visions of a "right order."<sup>7</sup> Each creation account is succeeded by a narrative describing the failure and, consequently, the destruction of that right order. The sequence concludes with the resumption of life, but under new terms. In these two versions of the creation-destruction-restoration paradigm, the deuteronomic and priestly traditions each establish the necessity of the particular partnership for God that is realized in God's covenant with Israel.

The claim made in this book is that for deuteronomic and priestly traditions, these three elements—covenant, cosmogony, and memory—are intricately related. In both traditions, Israel's covenant with God is an answer to the reality of life in a world less perfect than the one conceived originally by God. It offers a way of life to restore as closely as possible the primeval ideal, a way of life in which memory is essential. The identification of Israel's covenant with the reclamation of the right order of the world lends urgency

6. The terms "episodic memory" and "semantic memory" come from the field of cognitive psychology. Each has its own cognitive underpinnings. Episodic memory concerns specific events—usually but not exclusively personally experienced—that are preserved as images or sensations and are generally triggered by sensual stimuli. Semantic memory refers to information that is stored in the mind. This can be "how to" information, such as "how to ride a bicycle," content information (the capitals of the states in America; the Boy Scout code of ethics; the Ten Commandments) or propositional or normative tradition. "Episodic memory," rather like the "storehouse" model (see Chapter 3), is the recall of specific events that are filed in the mind as images or experiences. It tends to be triggered by sensual stimuli—a song from one's college years, or Proust's *madeleine*, and is experienced in a temporally limited way. Semantic memory is retained and thus has a durative quality.

7. The first creation story (Gen. 1:1–2:4a) is nearly universally attributed to the priestly author(s). The second story (Gen. 2:4b–3:24) is attributed to the Yahwist (J) source, but I suggest, based on analysis I give in Chapter 2, that it resonates with the authors of Deuteronomy, who allude rather directly to it in their literature.

to the religious programs through which Israel's covenant is lived. Israel's covenant with God, whether the conditional covenant known to D or the unconditional covenant of P, must be maintained. For both the deuteronomic and priestly traditions, memory—in the particular way each understands it—is the mechanism to ensure this. Put differently, how each tradition understands Israel's covenant with God and how each conceptualizes memory undergirds the religious programs imagined by D and P.

A considerable body of scholarship has been devoted to clarifying the distinctive theologies of the deuteronomic and priestly traditions,<sup>8</sup> but none has really explored the role of memory in terms of the totality of these traditions: the religious programs that each envisions, their ideational elements, their theologies and cosmologies, and the narrative strategies that each employs to promulgate its programs. As I hope the following investigation will demonstrate, the manner in which memory is conceptualized and used in the deuteronomic and priestly literature correlates integrally with most, if not all, aspects of the religious programs that each imagines. Hence, a focus on the meaning and function of memory, particularly its relationship to Israel's covenantal bond with God, can yield important new insights into these traditions, the religious programs they prescribe, and their relationship to one another.

The support for this claim will come in three stages. First, I will attempt to demonstrate the salient relationship between the cosmogonies that open Genesis and the covenant as conceived of in deuteronomic and priestly literature. Second, I will clarify how the deuteronomic and priestly traditions

8. For example, von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, and Geller, "The Religion of the Bible," in *The Jewish Study Bible* as referenced in note 5. Geller expands upon the general comments in his essay in a number of articles, including, "God, Humanity, and Nature in the Pentateuch," in *Gazing on the Deep: Ancient Near Eastern and Other Studies in Honor of Tzvi Abusch*, ed. J. Stackert, B. N. Porter, and D. P. Wright (Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2010), 421–65; "Manna and Sabbath: A Literary–Theological Reading of Exodus 16," *Interpretation* 59 (2005): 5–16; "Sabbath and Creation: A Literary–Theological Analysis," *Interpretation*, forthcoming; and the essays, "Fiery Wisdom: The Deuteronomic Tradition," and "Blood Cult: An Interpretation of the Priestly Work of the Pentateuch," in Geller, *Sacred Enigmas: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 30–61, 62–86. Michael Fishbane's essay on the "sign" is another comparison of the two traditions' treatment of a particular idea ("On Biblical Omina," *Shnaton Ha-Miqra'* 1 [1976]: 213–34 [Hebrew]). Other important contributions are von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, SBT 9 (London: SCM, 1953); Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985); Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3 vols., AB 3–3b (New York: Doubleday, 1991–2001), and Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992).

each conceptualize memory by analyzing the language each uses to speak of it. For the third leg of my argument, I will analyze the literary representation of the religious programs—the rituals and practices imagined or prescribed in Deuteronomy and in priestly literature—to illustrate how these two traditions make use of memory as each understands it to sustain and preserve Israel's covenant with God.

It should be clear by now that this exploration of memory and covenant is primarily an investigation of biblical theology and biblical literature. I am interested in how the idea of Israel's covenant with God is expressed in the literary representations of the religious programs imagined by D and P, and in how these representations reflect their understanding of Israel's place in God's world. That being said, I wish to state at the outset my belief that this literature has a practical dimension, and that it responds to or is based on, if only to a minimal degree, actual First Temple practices.<sup>9</sup> While the final form of the Pentateuch most likely dates from the postexilic period (539–400 bce), I contend that both traditions worked with a known religious system that they sought to amend or reinterpret.

#### THE PROVENANCE AND CONTEXT OF D AND P

The compositional history of the Pentateuch and of its constituent sources and literary corpora is both complicated, and subject to near continuous debate. At one end of the spectrum of opinions is a body of scholars, sometimes referred to as the Copenhagen School, who consider the entire biblical text, including the Pentateuch, to be a Hellenistic product dating to the late fourth century bce. At the other end are those who argue that the Pentateuch is entirely or mostly of preexilic (i.e., pre-586 bce), or possibly early Babylonian (i.e., early–mid sixth century bce) provenance. In the middle ground are scholars who maintain that the Pentateuch is the work of a postmonarchal<sup>10</sup> priestly editor(s) who either in concert with, or in response to, deuteronomistic authors, reworked preexilic traditions and texts, including traditions associated with the preexilic priesthood and Deuteronomy, to produce the final form before us now. I align myself with this middle position, and therefore with the belief that

9. On the complexities of using texts to analyze rituals and religious practices, see David P. Wright, "Ritual Theory, Ritual Texts and the Priestly-Holiness Writings in the Pentateuch," in *Social Theory and the Study of Israelite Religion: Essays in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. S. M. Olyan (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 195–216.

10. I borrow the term "postmonarchal" from Lauren Monroe, who uses it to refer to both exilic and postexilic material. *Josiah's Reforms and the Dynamic of Defilement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

we can speak of D and P as the two principal traditions in the Pentateuch. To be clear, by D, I mean both the deuteronomic law code (Deuteronomy 12–26) and the material surrounding it (Deuteronomy 1–11, 27–34) represented as Moses' address to the Israelites in Moab.<sup>11</sup> There are also occasional passages in Genesis–Numbers (e.g., Exod. 13:5, Exod. 20:21; Exod. 34:10–16) that exhibit markedly deuteronomic features. I do not necessarily attribute these passages to the authors of Deuteronomy itself. But I maintain that, in their final form, they evince deuteronomic influence or editing.<sup>12</sup> By P, I mean priestly material as a whole without distinguishing between strands or periods.<sup>13</sup> Within that corpus, significant differences distinguish the Holiness writers (H) that are germane to this study, including on the matter of whose memory is at stake (see below). When there is reason to differentiate between priestly and holiness material (for instance, in chapters 5 and 7), P denotes priestly material other than that of the Holiness writers (H).<sup>14</sup> With respect to how memory is conceptualized, however, P and H are similar to one another and distinct from D.

#### THE DEUTERONOMIC TRADITION

The identification of the deuteronomic law code with the scroll discovered in the temple during its repairs (2 Kings 22:8–20) is widely accepted as a foundation for dating a significant portion of Deuteronomy to the late seventh century bce.<sup>15</sup> According to one view (and one that I share), both the law code

11. Many scholars concur with Martin Noth's attribution of the historical introduction (Deuteronomy 1–3) and the narrative of the transfer of leadership from Moses to Joshua (3–4) to the author of the Deuteronomistic History (i.e., Joshua–2 Kings) who used it as an introduction to that larger history. See *The Deuteronomistic History*, trans. E. W. Nicholson, JSOTSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1981; trans. of pp. 1–110 of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 2nd ed. [Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1957]), 12–17). The remaining material includes last First Temple contributions (the introductory paranesis [4:44–11:32], the covenant ceremony on Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim [27–29, 31]; early exilic material [the two poems of 32:1–43 and 33]; and a late exilic addition [Deuteronomy 30]). See Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, AB 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 2–4, 9–13; Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 285.

12. See note 5.

13. The difficulty arises because “P” has a number of meanings in the literature. It can refer to one of the four sources posited by the Documentary Hypothesis; the priestly redactor of the Pentateuch in opposition to D; or to priestly material other than that of the Holiness tradition.

14. H's contribution was initially recognized as being limited to Leviticus 17–24, but is now believed to pervade P more widely. See Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1995; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007); Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT 2:35 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revisionism in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

and the material surrounding it (Deuteronomy 4–11, 27–29) date from roughly that time. Another view pushes the law code back to the eighth century bce in the context of Hezekiah's reforms while attributing much of the frame to Josianic period.<sup>16</sup> An early exilic date for the material surrounding the law code is also possible, as is the possibility of "double redaction."<sup>17</sup> In some respects, the reforms that Josiah is said to have undertaken in c. 622 bce, particularly abolishing all cultic shrines outside of Jerusalem and centralizing worship in Jerusalem (cf., 2 Kings 22, 2 Chronicles 35), conform to the ethos of the law code, in particular its restriction of sacrifice to only "the place Yahweh has chosen to let his Name reside" (cf., Deut. 12:5; 14:23; 15:20; 16:2, etc.) and the ban on all foreign altars, shrines, and images (Deut. 12:2–5).<sup>18</sup> Many of the

15. See the discussions in Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 1–9; Haran, *Temple and Temple Service*, 132–40; Marvin Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 137–69; Andrew D. H. Mayes, "Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament," *JOT* 82 (1999): 68–69. A minority associates the law code with Hezekiah. See Jack R. Lundbom, "The Law Book of the Josianic Reform," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 292–302. Both positions depend, to some extent, on the historicity of the Josianic reforms themselves, which not all scholars accept. At a minimum, Michael LeFebvre's claim that "For the Deuteronomistic Josiah, the law code is a basis for official action" is fair. LeFebvre, *Collections, Codes and Texts: The Re-characterization of Israel's Written Law* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 58 (italics mine).

16. Jonathan Rosenbaum, "Hezekiah's Reform and the Deuteronomistic Tradition," *HTR* 22 (1979): 23–43.

17. The latter is the position of the so-called "American School" of Frank Moore Cross and his students. Cross identifies a preexilic (seventh century bce) author (Dtr1) who took a version of Deuteronomy consisting of the law code and the material immediately framing it, added a historical introduction (Deut. 1:1–4:43) as well as 31:1–32:44 to serve as the introduction to a history (Deuteronomy–2 Kings). A second redaction of the history was done in exile by Dtr2. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 274–85. An alternative division comes from the Göttingen School, which posits three redactions, each reflecting a different orientation—historical, prophetic, and legal. For good recent summaries of scholarship on this topic, see Nathan MacDonald, "The Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Logic of Deut. I–IV," *VT* 56 (2006): 203–12; and Thomas C. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London and New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 21–37; Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: lšakkēn šəmō šām in the Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 1–7; Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*, *VTSup* 42 (Leiden and New York: E. J. Brill, 1991), 1–19; and idem, "Deuteronomistic History," *ABD* 2:160–68.

18. Some comparisons of Josiah's actions as reported in 2 Kings 22–23 and the Law Code undermine the notion of a direct relationship between the law code and Josiah's reforms. See for instance Monroe, *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement*; John J. Collins, "The Zeal of Phinehas and the Legitimization of Violence," *JBL* 122 (2003): 11; James W. Watts, "Ritual Legitimacy and Scriptural Authority," *JBL* 124 (2005): 401–17.



themes expressed in the framing material, including the importance attached to the verbalization of memory, may also be explained in connection to the political exigencies of Josiah's reign or as a theological response to Judah's newfound prominence in the aftermath of the fall of the northern kingdom a generation earlier, in 722 bce.<sup>19</sup>

The elimination of all extra-urban shrines likely left a vacuum in the religious life of people in outlying areas of the kingdom.<sup>20</sup> In the absence of opportunities to participate in sacrificial rituals, the requirement that doctrine be continually rehearsed, taught, and learned may have served a compensatory function. Josiah's geopolitical objectives may also have been served by the new religious program. Second Kings 23:19 and 29 tell of Josiah's expansionist campaign into Samaria. That being the case, his annexation of portions of the former kingdom would have introduced a new population that had to be integrated into Judah.<sup>21</sup> By establishing a shared, collective memory in the form of the official history as the primary ingredient of liturgy and as something that Israel is required *covenantally* to learn and inculcate, the deuteronomic program offered a way to ease and sustain the incorporation of communities into the religious polity that was Judah. In the same way the story of the first Thanksgiving was popularized as a foundational story for all Americans, the recitation required by Deuteronomy "preserves the store of knowledge from which a group derives an awareness of its unity and peculiarity."<sup>22</sup> Finally, in the sense that it promotes "intellectual religion," the investiture of memory as a central religious observance comports with Deuteronomy's abstract theology of a transcendent deity, whose "name" (*šem*) alone dwells in the temple.<sup>23</sup>

19. Various motives have been adduced for Josiah's reforms, among them his wish to assert the hegemony of Jerusalem and right of royal imprimatur over temple practices, and his desire to demonstrate Judah's release from Assyrian domination following the death of Assurbanipal in 627 bce by ridding the kingdom of foreign ritual material. As well, Josiah appears to have taken advantage of Assyria's decline by undertaking an expansionist campaign to annex the southern part of the foreign kingdom of Israel into Judah. Alternatively, some argue that centralization became a *de facto* position in the wake of the Assyrian destruction of most of Judah in 701 bce.

20. Possibly the loss was felt less keenly by women. See Susan Ackerman, "Cult Centralization, the Erosion of Kin-Based Communities, and the Implications for Women's Religious Practices," in *Social Theory and the Study of Israelite Religion: Essays in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. S. M. Olyan (Atlanta: SBL, 2012), 19–40.

21. The exact nature of the relationship between the two kingdoms prior to Israel's defeat is something at which we can only guess. According to the biblical account, at least, whatever common history the two kingdoms shared does not appear to have promoted strong feelings of unity or kinship. See for instance 1 Kings 12:16–17; 15:16–21; 2 Kings 14:8–14; 16:5–6. Cf. Isa. 7:1–2. Furthermore, after its conquest by Assyria, Samaria was repopulated by foreign peoples who had no shared background with Judah (2 Kings 17:24).

In sum, the deuteronomic liturgical program could serve both far-flung populations—that of Judah beyond the Jerusalem environs and that of Samaria. In place of ritual activity, both populations are provided with an “intellectualized” religion that entailed speaking about its unique relationship to Yahweh.<sup>24</sup>

### THE PRIESTLY TRADITION

The Hebrew Bible provides no *terminus ante quem* like that of the scroll of Second Kings from which to date priestly literature.<sup>25</sup> Further complicating the matter, as I alluded above, priestly literature includes several literary strata reflecting different periods and even different priestly schools. For the purposes of this project, I recognize three layers of priestly writing: a preexilic priestly corpus dating to the end of the monarchal period or the very beginning of neo-Babylonian conquest of Judah (i.e., /– 600 to 550 bce); the Holiness school (H) from the early exilic period; and a postmonarchal priestly corpus (P).<sup>26</sup> As indicated earlier, I will refer to the non-H material as P pointing out when necessary if the preexilic or postmonarchal stratum is intended.

22. See Jan Assmann and John Czaplicka, “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity,” *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 130. Their characterization of cultural memory is instructive: “[C]ultural memory is characterized by its distance from the everyday. Distance from the everyday (transcendence) marks its temporal horizon. Cultural memory has its fixed point; its horizon does not change with the passing of time. These fixed points are fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance).” Ibid., 129. Elsewhere, Assmann explains how such rites both sustain identity in the present and ensure their transmission in the future. Through “formative” and “normative” rites and texts, “cultural memory disseminates and reproduces a consciousness of unity, particularity, and a sense of belonging among members of a group.” Formative rites and texts establish and “transmit identity-confirming knowledge by narrating stories that are shared.” Normative rites and texts “transmit practical knowledge and point the way to right action.” See *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 38.

23. A religion that privileges verbalized historical narrative is, moreover, a logical consequence of the increased intellectualization and spiritualization of theology, which, it has been argued, was a characteristic of the so-called Axial Age (800 bce to 200 ce). Such a theology goes hand in hand with an emergent self-consciousness also associated with that period. On the Axial Age itself, see Karl Jaspers in *The Origin and Goal of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954); Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt, ed., *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations*, SUNY Series in Near East Studies (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986); and David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzman, *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005)

24. Cf. Hos. 6:6, 1 Sam. 15:22, and Prov. 21:3 where sacrifice is subordinate to pious behavior.

25. There has been an effort to establish such a benchmark by demonstrating either P’s familiarity with, or ignorance of, deuteronomic legislation, but neither position is conclusive.

There is ample evidence, I believe, to claim that the author(s) responsible for the preexilic layer of P were familiar with First Temple ritual. The meaning and function it had *in situ* may not have been identical to that of the priestly writers, but they worked with known practices, simultaneously reinterpreting them in terms of their theology of divine immanence.<sup>27</sup>

Writing in exile, the Holiness writers presuppose that priestly material, which they explain, supplement, revise, and reinterpret. Although the Holiness tradition conceives of memory, as P does, in sensory and episodic terms, it exhibits some characteristics that distinguish it from the rest of priestly material. Foremost for the purposes of this study is its concern for Israel's memory over that of God's. This shift in emphasis comports with the Holiness tradition's notion of what Israel Knohl terms "inclusive sacredness" and from its reinterpretation of Israel's covenant in bilateral terms. The latter is likely evidence of the influence of Deuteronomy on H.<sup>28</sup>

The influence of H can be seen in subsequent priestly material, which was likely composed in anticipation of the restoration of the temple in Jerusalem. In this stratum, a late exilic, or possibly postexilic, priestly author(s) reworked and/or added to the older material (early P and H) to shape it in terms of a thoroughgoing creation theology. In their representation, the cult assumes cosmic significance, and the transformative capacity of ritual is reinterpreted in terms of that significance. The cosmic significance of the cult also means that its performance must be perfect, and this in turn underscores the essential role of the priests. For this reason, the priestly writers use narratives to create memories powerful enough to keep unauthorized persons from intruding into the sacred precincts and practices.

## REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP

Considerable work has been done both on biblical notions of covenant and on memory in connection with the Bible, but almost no investigation of their relationship to one another or of the theological significance of that relationship has been carried out to date. There is also a growing body of work on ritual and

26. There are some scholars who dismiss the possibility of a preexilic P, among them Philip Davies, Thomas L. Thompson, and Niels Peter Lemche. A sizable cohort of scholars dates the composition of P to the Persian period, but concedes that it draws on preexilic traditions (for instance, Joseph Blenkinsopp, David M. Carr, Jeffrey Stackert, and Kenton Sparks). A few scholars such as Jacob Milgrom, Israel Knohl, and Avi Horowitz locate all but H in the preexilic period.

27. See Chapters 5 and 8.

28. Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 180–86. On the relationship between H and Deuteronomy, see Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah*; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*.

memory from the field of social anthropology, but again almost none of that work examines their relationship in connection with biblical religion.<sup>29</sup> Nor has the growing body of work on ritual and biblical religion given attention to the topic of memory.<sup>30</sup> It is my hope that this book will advance a synergistic understanding of these vital themes in biblical scholarship.

#### MEMORY AND BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship around the idea of memory in the Bible can be grouped under three general rubrics: lexical studies; discussions of biblical historiography in which memory is considered a contributive element; and examinations of memory in ideological or religious terms focusing on a discrete corpus of work. The two most important lexical studies to date are Brevard Childs's *Memory and Tradition in Israel* (1962) and Willy Schottroff's 1967 dissertation, "*Gedenken*" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament: Die Wurzel zākar in semitischen Sprachkreis.<sup>31</sup> Each purports to "discover what the Old Testament understands by memory, and what is the scope of its meaning,"<sup>32</sup> and does so through careful examination of the core root *zkr*. Schottroff's comprehensive taxonomical study analyzes both Hebrew *zkr* and its Akkadian and Canaanite cognates. Childs, too, begins with a lexical analysis of *zkr*, its semantic range and distribution in terms of subject (divine or human), and then proceeds to relate its usage to the theological idea of "actualization."<sup>33</sup>

As lexical studies, these works have the virtue of allowing biblical language rather than some externally imposed concept of "memory" to determine the parameters of study. That virtue is also their weakness. As John F. A. Sawyer shows in his study of Hebrew words for "salvation," it is not easy to subsume

29. An exception is Gilbert Lewis, "Religious Doctrine or Experience: A Matter of Seeing, Learning, or Doing," in *Ritual and Memory: Toward a Comparative Anthropology of Religion*, ed. H. Whitehouse and J. Laidlaw (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2004), 155–72. Lewis addresses the issue of "orthopraxy" in Leviticus, in the context of a collection of essays responding to Harvey Whitehouse's Divergent Modes Theory (see below).

30. Recent examples include Saul Olyan, *Biblical Mourning: Ritual and Social Dimensions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Roy Gane, *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement and Theodicy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005); Frank Gorman, *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in Priestly Theology* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990); and Watts, "Ritual Legitimization and Scriptural Authority."

31. Brevard Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, SBT (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1962). Willy Schottroff, "*Gedenken*" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament, die Wurzel zākar im semitischen Sprachkreis (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967).

32. Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 6.

even a solidly biblical concept under a single modern English lexeme.<sup>34</sup> Concentrating exclusively on *zkr*, neither work considers the full complement of biblical terms and expressions relating to memory. Furthermore, they overlook the possibility that the meaning of *zkr* for one author may have a different semantic range than when used by another. As we shall see in Chapter 3, the memory lexicons of D and P are considerably large and *zkr*, though a core term, does not account for the entire conceptual field of memory in the Bible.<sup>35</sup>

A second weakness in Childs's work derives from his theological commitment to the idea of "actualization." In his reading of Deuteronomy, memory allows Israel to "actualize" its *Heilsgeschichte* or "salvation history."<sup>36</sup> Because the cult was no longer relevant yet could not be abandoned, Deuteronomy "relativized" its practices, interpreting them as mechanisms enabling later generations of Israelites to participate in the redemptive history of their ancestors.<sup>37</sup> The Israelites are to observe the Sabbath (or pilgrimage

33. Ibid., 63–73, 81–89. The concept of "actualization" (*Vergegenwärtigung*) with respect to biblical theology was introduced by von Rad, who used the term to explain Israel's reinterpretation of agrarian cultic traditions in terms of a historically determined religion. This allowed the historical acts through which God established Israel to be contemporized (*Old Testament Theology*, 2:103–5). In this original sense, "actualization" presumes a diachronic approach to the Bible. For Childs, however, it is inextricable from his view of canonical Scripture as transhistorical. The canonical Bible becomes universal, and its theological meaning transcends historical particularity. "Within the Old Testament Israel is portrayed both as a concrete, historical nation, and as well as a transhistorical, even ideal reality. It has both a political past and an eschatological future." *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflections on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1992), 442. In short, for Childs through "actualization," events in Israel's past become part of a universal narrative of redemption, no longer tied to Israelite practice (law) or nationhood.

34. John F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation*, SBT 2/24 (London: SCM, 1972). Sawyer uses the term "concept field" to refer to the overlapping semantic ranges of terms related to a broad concept such as "salvation" or, for the present purposes, "memory."

35. More recent language studies of *zkr* take the broader semantic field into consideration. See for instance H. Eising, "זָכַר *zākhār*; זָכָר *zēkher*; זִכְרֹן *zikkārōn*; אִזְכָּרָה *'azkārah*," *TDOT* 4:64–82, and Michael Carasik, *Theologies of the Mind in Biblical Israel*, SBL 85 (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 54–91. On the problem of semantics in general, see Michel Bréal, *Semantics: Studies in the Science of Meaning, with a new introduction by Joshua Whatmough* (New York: Dover, 1964), 109–14, 115–21; repr. of *Semantics: Studies in the Science of Meaning*, trans. Mrs. H. Cust (New York: Henry Holt, 1900); John Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 408, 412–14. For its application to biblical literature, see Edward Ullendorff, "Thought Categories in the Hebrew Bible," in *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language? Studies in Semitic Languages and Civilizations*, ed. E. Ullendorff (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977).

festivals or care for the indigent and the stranger) *so that* they will recall the experience of slavery and remember their deliverance by God. Actualization of the history is the ultimate object rather than observance of the law:

Israel is commanded to be obedient to the commandments *in order to* remember the redemptive history . . . memory in this case assumes the meaning of actualization. By keeping the Sabbath holy, later Israel remembers or participates in the redemptive history of her past. (Italics in original.)<sup>38</sup>

Childs mainly applies the concept of “actualization” to Deuteronomy, but it influences his interpretation of memory in priestly literature as well. Thus Childs—mistakenly in my view and that of many scholars—finds the priestly tradition to profess a “theology of history,” and on God’s memory in P, he concludes, “The use of the verb *zkr* reflects the Priestly writer’s concern to present history as a witness to the unfolding of the purpose of the covenant God who is active in Israel’s midst. This history is merely a working out of the one eternal act of divine grace.”<sup>39</sup>

While Childs regards memory of the redemption history as the chief object of ritual and fulfillment of commandments, Moshe Weinfeld and Jeffrey Tigay see it the other way around. Memory of slavery and the exodus serves the humanitarian aim of stirring empathy that leads to just treatment of the disenfranchised. Weinfeld locates the function of memory emphatically within

36. The concept of *Heilsgeschichte* underlies Childs’s notion of “actualization.” He regards salvation as the essence of deuteronomic (and biblical) religion over the particular covenant between God and Israel with its mandates to fulfill commandments. Privileging Israel’s emotional connection to its past over a physical, concretizing tie fits well with the Christian, in particular Protestant, emphasis on “faith” over “works,” a prioritization that has its roots in the New Testament (e.g., Rom. 3:27-28; 4:13-16; Gal. 2:15-16; 3:21-26; Hebrews 11) and in protestant theology more generally. Childs is not alone in this perspective. Referring to memory in the introduction to his commentary on Deuteronomy, J. A. Thompson writes, “This active recall, not merely by those who had participated in the exodus, but by all the future members of Israel, was designed to enable the continuing Israel to participate in the great acts of redemption wrought by Yahweh in the course of their own history. Such a recollection and identification in memory and *by faith* would stimulate both gratitude and love in the Israelite of every age.” He adds in a footnote to this statement, “The Christian worshipper will recall at once the Lord’s Supper, which provides an opportunity to ‘remember’ the Lord’s death. Such an act of remembrance leads to an *identification with Christ* and a response of *faith, love and gratitude.*” Thompson, *Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC (London: InterVarsity, 1974), 77 (italics mine).

37. Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 79.

38. *Ibid.*, 78–79.

39. *Ibid.*, 43.

the context of the humanistic orientation characteristic of Deuteronomy, but he also associates that orientation with Israel's feelings of gratitude for its deliverance. The empathy and gratitude that are stirred result from the memory of both slavery and deliverance. Their combined force motivates the Israelites to obey the commandments. The end objective, however, is fulfillment of the commanded act.<sup>40</sup> Tigay makes a similar claim in his comments on four verses invoking memory of slavery and exodus (Deut. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; and 24:18). He writes (commenting here on Deut. 16:12): "[T]he memory of slavery is invoked to motivate extending the benefits of this prescription to servants and other poor individuals."<sup>41</sup> It should be noted that these readings also evidence the influence of theology, in this instance the search for rational explanations for the commandments (*t' amê miššwôt*), which has deep roots in the Jewish exegetical tradition.

Like the majority of scholars, Childs, Weinfeld, and Tigay principally address Deuteronomy in their discussions of memory and the Bible. They are aware that P speaks of memory and makes use of its terminology (Childs gives some attention to P's use of the noun *zikkārôn* but does not discuss other terms in P's memory lexicon<sup>42</sup>), but because they assume memory to be only a cognitive process, they fail to recognize its reference or employment elsewhere in the Bible. The study of experiential (episodic) or "imagistic" memory and the Bible is a scholarly lacuna.

A second avenue of biblical scholarship looks at memory as a contributive element in biblical historiography. Moving away from the issue of the Bible's "historicity," scholars have looked at Israel's "collective" or "cultural" memory as a valid alternative. Books like Jan Van Seters's *In Search of History*, Marc Zvi

40. Cf. Moshe Weinfeld's comments on Deuteronomy's reformulation of cultic observance and of the Sabbath commandment in the Decalogue. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 222. Weinfeld argues that the author of Deuteronomy reconceptualizes cultic observance as a means for providing for the poor and disenfranchised, a practical object that necessarily emphasizes the performative aspect of the commandment. With respect to the Sabbath, the author of Deuteronomy does more than provide an alternative rationale for this commandment; he shifts "[t]he stress . . . from cause to purpose (cf. לַמַּעַן): the purpose of the Sabbath is, to be sure, that man shall rest, but not because God himself rested on this day" (ibid.). On the Sabbatical year, see ibid., 233; on the laws of tithes and firstlings, 290.

41. Jeffrey Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPS (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 157. In a similar vein, see Tigay's note to 24:18, ibid., 228. In his comment on Deut. 5:15, Tigay notes that among traditional commentators, opinions are divided regarding the underlying purpose of memory's motivational power, with some stressing empathetic treatment of servants and strangers and others maintaining that its purpose is to affirm God's authority and Israel's corresponding obligation and fealty to God. Ibid., 69.

42. Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 43, 68.

Brettler's *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*, Baruch Halpern's *The First Historians*, and Jens Bruun Kofoed's *Text and History: Historiography and the Study of the Biblical Text* seek to establish criteria for determining the reliability of biblical historiography.<sup>43</sup> Some concept of "history" motivates this work, but what Israel remembered rather than *wie es eigentlich gewesen* ("how it actually happened") becomes the object of inquiry.

A different emphasis can be observed in the work of Ronald Hendel and Mark Smith, who shift the historiographic enterprise away from the search for the history of ancient Israel to the question of how the Israelites used their history. In *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible*,<sup>44</sup> Hendel explores how biblical Israel makes use of a remembered past to construct its identity as a distinct people. A similar objective drives Smith's *The Memoirs of God: History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel*.<sup>45</sup> Smith wants "to advance the claim that the academic study of collective memory offers important intellectual help for understanding the biblical representations of Israel's past."<sup>46</sup> How the Israelites remembered and transmitted their national stories reveals as much about them as it does about their past. In effect substituting "memory" or "collective memory" for "history," Smith does away with the accuracy requirement with respect to biblical narrative. He remains interested in reconstructing the past, only now the centerpiece of that past is the Israel that is remembering rather than the remembered Israel.

David M. Carr's *Writing on the Tablets of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* provides a somewhat different exploration of memory and biblical literature. Carr makes the case for a function of written texts as memory aids for the performance of traditional material, presumably by scribes already familiar with the texts they declaim, as a vital instrument of cultural transmission or "enculturation." His discussion of how written texts participate in the larger

43. Jan Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997); Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*; Baruch Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988); Jens Bruun Kofoed, *Text and History: Historiography and the Study of the Biblical Text* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005).

44. Ronald Hendel, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

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

46. *Ibid.*, 125. See as well Smith, "Remembering God: Collective Memory in Israelite Religion," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 631–51.



“cultural project of incising key cultural–religious traditions—word for word—*on people’s minds*” sheds light on the deuteronomic reliance on written support for the formal recitations this tradition mandates.<sup>47</sup> Four times in Deuteronomy (6:7, 9; 11:19–20, 31:9–13 and 31:19) the injunction to recite the teaching is accompanied by the instruction to write down the teaching in some form. This may reflect the very integration of the two forms of enculturation that Carr describes.<sup>48</sup>

The performance aim underlying written texts, which Carr presumes, may also elucidate an aspect of the priestly manipulation of memory. As I shall demonstrate in chapter 6, the priestly tradition incorporates narratives of trauma to incise memories and the lessons they teach on the minds of their audience. If, as Carr suggests, “the aim of the educational process was ultimately the scribe’s memorization of the cultural tradition and cultivation of his (and occasionally her) ability to perform it,” the written format of these narratives need not preclude their dramatization through oral performance where the trauma they recount can take on a more experiential quality.<sup>49</sup> A few scholars have worked on how the idea of memory is used in particular contexts of biblical literature. John Barton, for instance, looks at “memory” in the context of what he terms the “theology of divine forgetting” in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>50</sup> Barton observes that “a belief in the forgiving mercy of God is deeply connected with the idea of divine forgetfulness, in a way that is unfamiliar from Christian language about forgiveness.”<sup>51</sup> He writes, “God forgets, we might say, only after he has remembered, so that there is no ‘cheap grace’ as we may put it, in the Old Testament.”<sup>52</sup> Divine forgetfulness, however, is in dialectic tension with the necessity for human remembrance of sin: “God forgets, but we have to remember.”<sup>53</sup> Barton does not identify this dialectic in terms of a specific theological tradition in the Bible. His interest is in explaining a foreign conceptualization of divine memory and forgetfulness to a Christian audience committed to the twin ideas of God’s omniscience and graciousness. Barton places the subject of biblical memory in the context of religion and ideology.

47. David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablets of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 8. (Italics in original.)

48. See chapter 4.

49. Carr, *Writing on the Tablets of the Heart*, 9. Carr himself, it must be noted, does not attribute this objective to the performance of text.

50. John Barton, “Forgiveness and Memory in the Old Testament,” in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog*, ed. M. Witte (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 987–95.

51. *Ibid.*, 989.

52. *Ibid.*, 990.

53. *Ibid.*, 994.

His consideration of memory, however, deals with a very small corpus and he does not relate that corpus to the larger question of memory in the various religious traditions in the Bible.

Like Barton, Edward Greenstein's reading of Psalm 78 situates the subject of memory and the exercise of memory in the context of biblical religion. For Greenstein, the exercise of memory undertaken by the psalmist is done "not to recount the past, but to prompt the kind of remembrance that leads to change."<sup>54</sup> The psalmist uses "strategies of remembering" as "a rhetorical move" to educate the reader. Greenstein concludes,

The psalm, as I read it, is not about history; it deals in memory. It is not about something called memory; rather, through the rhetoric adopted by the psalmist for jogging the people's recollection, he exercises their memory by exercising his own. I read the psalm as a process of remembering. . . . The psalmist does not ruminate on the past; he addresses the present and, like a prophet, seeks to transform the future.<sup>55</sup>

Greenstein is exceptional in linking narrative strategy, theme, and ideology in his reading of the psalm. His interpretation argues for the integrative role of memory in biblical religion as a meaningful religious concept and as an instrument of religious practice.

Two recent investigations into the uses of memory in particular biblical traditions are Adriane Leveen's work on Numbers<sup>56</sup> and Jerry Hwang's on Deuteronomy.<sup>57</sup> Leveen's *Memory and Tradition in the Book of Numbers* argues that memory is both a theme and an instrument in the priestly editors' construction of the history of the wilderness period.<sup>58</sup> The priestly editors of the book, she maintains, attempted to shape Israel's collective memory to justify their particular vision of life after exile under the authority of the priesthood.<sup>59</sup> This agenda defines both the shape of Numbers and its texture. With descriptions of the proper organization and regulation of the community framing the rebellion narratives, the overall structure of the book demonstrates

54. Edward L. Greenstein, "Mixing Memory and Design: Reading Psalm 78," *Proof* 10 (1990): 197.

55. *Ibid.*, 209.

56. Adriane Leveen, *Memory and Tradition in the Book of Numbers* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

57. Jerry Hwang, *The Rhetoric of Remembrance: An Investigation of the "Fathers" in Deuteronomy*, Sifrut 8 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012).

58. Leveen, *Memory and Tradition*, 22. "[T]he editors of Numbers not only have created a usable past on behalf of a later community but have left behind sustained reflections on such an attempt."

the destabilizing potential of memory as well as the need for a formal structure to control it properly.<sup>60</sup>

With her main interest the political uses of memory as an instrument of control and authority, Leveen illuminates how the theme of memory serves the redactional project of the priestly editors. Priestly agenda rather than priestly theology drives her discussion. The same emphasis guides her representation of three commemorative objects introduced in Numbers: the fringes; the plating on the altar; and Aaron's staff—which, she writes, “are designed to remind the people of God and the commandments, leading to the proper conduct and the proper deference to God's chosen leaders.”<sup>61</sup>

As the most recent entry to the memory field, Hwang revives Childs's theology of actualization and of a timeless, universal covenant. Hwang proposes that Deuteronomy's references to the patriarchs and the promises made to them are an intentional rhetorical device employed not only to express Israel's transgenerational corporate solidarity but also to harmonize the Israelite (conditional) and patriarchal (unconditional) covenants. Deuteronomy's use of the “fathers,” he maintains, provides “a timeless symbol of every generation of God's people that receives YHWH's promise but still awaits their fulfillment,” while the synthesis of the two covenants transforms the law into “a gift rather than a burden for Israel.”<sup>62</sup> Like Childs, Hwang is foremost interested in the covenant concept, and like Childs, he conceives of the covenant apart from its essential feature, namely the laws and commandments that obligate Israel. This, I believe, distorts the biblical perspective. The reason memory is so crucial to Deuteronomy, however, is precisely because of the law. Israel is exhorted to remember so that Israel will fulfill its obligations.

Barton, Greenstein, Leveen, and Hwang begin to situate the study of memory and the Bible in the context of biblical ideology and religion, yet there is still work to be done. Outside of Barton's article, there is little exploration

59. Leveen is mainly interested in how the priestly editors “organized the various stories of the wilderness period, some of which dated from much earlier times, into a coherent whole while creatively editing or adding other materials to the mix, including their own comments, in order to ensure the success of their endeavor. A variety of agendas powered this project. Explain the past. Shape collective memory. Ensure the means of transmission. Prevent recurrence of disaster.” *Ibid.*, 3.

60. *Ibid.* The opening and closing sections of the book, she says, are “a frame in which the rest of the book is placed” (*ibid.*, 33). “[C]hapters 1–10 understand memory as a stabilizing force, used to forge Israel's identity as a collective with a shared past dominated by God's saving acts. Such memories oblige the people to serve God and Moses and to submit to priestly regulation, successfully preventing dissent and ensuring harmony in the camp.” *Ibid.*, 67.

61. *Ibid.*, 98.

62. Hwang, *The Rhetoric of Remembrance*, 233.

of God's memory and almost no work on God's memory in the Pentateuch. A second lacuna, as mentioned earlier, is any exploration of the dynamics of memory in its various forms and conceptualizations. Memory is a complex topic and can be understood in a number of ways. The attention given to the historiographic memory reflected in Deuteronomy has not been matched by work on sensory and experiential memory, which priestly literature seeks to exploit. I hope to address these lacks first in Chapter 3, which deals with memory theory and the memory lexicons of D and P, and subsequently in Part II of this book.

### THE DEUTERONOMIC AND PRIESTLY COVENANTS

That ancient Israel enjoyed a particular relationship with its God is an article of faith for both D and P. The precise nature of this relation differs for the two traditions but, behind them, and behind all the traditions in the Pentateuch, is the certainty that no matter how universal is Yahweh's authority, reign, or scope, Israel ranked most important in the divine mind. The biblical authors express this certainty through the idea of "covenant." For Deuteronomy, as stated at the outset of this chapter, this covenant requires Israel's obedience and loyalty in return for God's benevolent care. The priestly covenant is more in the nature of a boon. If Israel provides God with a *miqddāš*—a "place of holiness"—God will dwell (*šākantî*) with his people (Exod. 25:8). Israel's only obligation is to maintain the holiness of God's dwelling place, an obligation that justifies the laws of purity.

The Pentateuch refers to a great number of covenants, and the literature on covenant is likewise extensive. While a complete review exceeds the limits of the present study, a brief review may be useful.<sup>63</sup> Studies of the covenant

63. For an excellent and relatively brief discussion of the biblical concept of "covenant," see Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1997), 414–34. Among the surveys of research on covenant in the Hebrew Bible are Scott Hahn, "Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994–2004)," *Currents in Biblical Research* 3 (2005): 263–92; Steven L. McKenzie, *Covenant* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2000); Frank Crüsmann, *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*, trans. A. W. Mahnke (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); Robert Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel," in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives*, ed. R. E. Clements (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 323–47; Delbert R. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969). On the etymology of *berit*, see James Barr, "Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant," in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie, Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Donner, R. Hanhart, and R. Smend (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 23–38, and Moshe Weinfeld, "בְּרִית, *berith*" *TDOT* 2:253–79.

concept analyze it from a wide range of perspectives: in terms of its historical and ideational background, particularly ancient near eastern land-grant and sovereign-vassal treaties; the etymology of the term *berît* and the semantics of “establishing” (*hāqîm*) or “cutting” (*kārat*) a covenant; and the age and evolution of the covenant idea in the Bible.<sup>64</sup>

Another avenue of scholarship considers the individual covenants in the Pentateuch and their relationship to one another.<sup>65</sup> Genesis, for instance, knows three divine covenants: the eternal covenant with Noah and all living beings (Genesis 9) and the eternal covenant with Abraham (Genesis 17), both of which are priestly. The third is an alternative version of the covenant with Abra[ha]m, this one sealed through ritual ceremony, and is attributed to the J source (Genesis 15). The covenant between God and Abraham is presumed to extend to the patriarch’s descendants (cf. Exod. 2:22; 6:4-5), but it is not certain the patriarchal covenant is the same as the “eternal covenant between me and the Israelites” referenced in Exod. 31:16.<sup>66</sup> A different covenant idea is introduced in Exodus 24. Exodus 24:5-8 describes a covenant ceremony associated with the Sinai revelation that requires Israel to acquiesce to and observe all the laws binding it. Developing that idea, Deuteronomy refers to a covenant between God and Israel that was sealed at Horeb and that bound Israel to God’s commandments. Deuteronomy tells of a second covenant as well, which Israel enters into on the plains of Moab, and of the ceremony for its ratification when the Israelites enter the Promised Land. Finally, there are two somewhat anomalous covenants, one associated with the Bread of the Presence (Lev. 24:5-9), and the “covenant of well-being . . . an eternal covenant of priesthood,” which God bestows on Aaron’s son Pinchas (Num. 25:12-13).

64. For ancient near eastern sources for the covenant see, George Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955); Moshe Weinfeld, “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and Ancient Near East,” *JAOS* 90 (1970): 184-203; Klaus Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings*, trans. D. E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); Dennis J. McCarthy, *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinion* (Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1972). Examples of work exploring the covenant relationships in different literary traditions include Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1985); Claus Westermann, *The Promises to the Fathers: Studies on the Patriarchal Narratives*, trans. D. E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980. Originally published as *Die Verheissungen an die Väter*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976); S. David Sperling, “Yahweh’s *Berît* (Covenant): Which Came First—Sex or Politics?” in Sperling, *The Original Torah: The Political Intent of the Bible* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

65. Hwang’s book, mentioned earlier, is a very recent exemplar.

66. Blenkinsopp makes the observation that in terms of P, the covenant with Abraham in Genesis 17 “does not emerge . . . as structurally very significant.” “The Structure of P,” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 278.

Each of these may represent a different articulation of an underlying concept of Israel's relationship to God.

A different line of research examines biblical covenant as a theological idea. Ernst Nicholson's monograph *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* is an example, and one especially fruitful for the present study.<sup>67</sup> Nicholson borrows from social anthropology the interpretation of religious ideas and systems as constructs to "legitimize" a social institution:

One way of describing religion is that it is part of a society's endeavor to impose meaning upon its experience of the world. Among the nations of Israel's environment religion performed this role in an all-embracing manner. As a microcosm is related to a macrocosm, the humanly perceived "right order" of the social world was seen as a reflection of the cosmic order created and willed by the gods. . . . Society's structures and institutions were in this way believed to be grounded in the sacred order of the cosmos and were accordingly seen as being divinely legitimized.<sup>68</sup>

Drawing on social anthropology, Nicholson considers the function of creation myths to provide a model of "the 'right order' of the world [which] informed all activities of a society's life, the total well-being of which depended upon upholding it."<sup>69</sup> The authorizing function of creation myths for ancient near eastern societies spilled over into Israel, Nicholson maintains: "Israel too understood itself, its structures and institutions *sub specie aeternitatis*, as we may put it; religion in Israel performed a legitimizing role no less than the religions of other nations at the time."<sup>70</sup>

The mythic background of the priestly strand of biblical literature has not gone unremarked by scholars. The priestly conception of the tabernacle as a microcosm of creation, for instance, is widely recognized, as is its perception of the sacred calendar as a replica of divine time.<sup>71</sup> In fact, the creation underpinnings of Israelite worship are among the defining characteristics of the vision represented by postmonarchal P.<sup>72</sup> The possibility of an analogous cosmogonic background for Deuteronomy's covenant theology has received

67. Ernst W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986).

68. *Ibid.*, 193–94. On this see also Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. W. R. Trask (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1959).

69. Nicholson, *God and His People*, 194.

70. *Ibid.*, 200.

less attention, but should, I believe, be explored. If, as Clifford Geertz has famously explained, religious systems are “models *of* and models *for*” reality, the religious system that the deuteronomic tradition promotes rests on a foundational conception of reality that transcends history to be operative at all times. Grounded in such a foundational conception of reality, the deuteronomic religious system, like that of the priestly tradition, reflects a divinely authorized “right order.”<sup>73</sup>

### RELIGIOUS PRACTICE AND MEMORY

The role of memory in religious practice has gained some attention in the last few decades, principally in the work of Harvey Whitehouse.<sup>74</sup> Whitehouse maintains that there is a salient relationship between memory and religious systems. His theory of Divergent Modes of Religiosity correlates the kind of memory a given society privileges and the nature of its ritual or religious practice.<sup>75</sup> With some caveats, Whitehouse’s theory is suggestive for the study of memory and the religious programs envisioned in the Pentateuch. Before

71. See, for instance, Mark Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 92–93, 107–12; Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P”; Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 54–55; Nahum M. Sarna, *Exploring Exodus: The Origins of Biblical Israel* (New York: Schocken, 1986), 213–15; and Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, trans. I. Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997), 477.

72. Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 111–12.

73. David Carr expresses this well in his remarks on “cultural memory”: “Though . . . cultural memory often consists in large part of recollection of various narratives in the group’s past, it can also include behavioral norms and visions of the future. Within the ancient world, however, such behavioral norms and visions usually are embedded in memories of the distant past, with this past having powerful associations of goodness and normativity. Indeed, that past is never ‘past’ in the way we might conceive it but stands in the ancient world as a potentially realizable ‘present’ to which each generation seeks to return” (*Writing on the Tablets of the Heart*, 11 [italics mine]). On the relationship between theology and ideology in Deuteronomy, see Mayes, “Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament,” 73–78.

74. Harvey Whitehouse, “Apparitions, Orations, and Rings: Experiences of Spirits in Dadul,” in *Spirits in Culture, History and Mind*, ed. M. Mageo and A. Howard (New York: Routledge, 1996), 173–94; *Arguments and Icons: Divergent Modes of Religiosity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); *Inside the Cult: Religious Innovation and Transmission in Papua New Guinea* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); *Modes of Religiosity: A Cognitive Theory of Religious Transmission* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2004); “Rites of Terror: Emotion, Metaphor and Memory in Melanesian Initiation Cults,” in *Religion and Emotion: Approaches and Interpretations*, ed. J. Corrigan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 133–48 [repr. from *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 2 (1996): 703–15].

75. The term “religiosity” refers to such features as ritual practice, the transmission and dissemination of religion, and the social/political organization of religious systems, which collectively describe their “mode.”

it can be applied to the Bible, however, two things must be clarified: What is meant by ritual practice, and to what extent can a literary description represent it?

The literature on ritual is both extensive and heterogeneous, and the difficulty of coming up with a definition inclusive enough to account for the variety of material and ideological contexts in which ritual is found is readily acknowledged by anthropologists.<sup>76</sup> Most taxonomies of ritual tend to dichotomize thought and action,<sup>77</sup> explicit expression and symbolic communication, and utilitarian and non-utilitarian objectives, with ritual representing the second part of each pair. This polarization makes immediately apparent the insufficiency of such descriptions for pentateuchal religion. They work well for the practices mandated in priestly religion, but are of no use to those of deuteronomic religion, for which thought, explicit communication, and clear functional objectives are intrinsic to prescribed religious practices.

Approaches that map more generous parameters within which to identify ritual are also problematic, as the following quote from Catherine Bell's *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* demonstrates:

[W]hat sort of practice is ritual? Clearly, ritual is not the same thing everywhere; it can vary in every feature. As practice, the most we can say is that it is [*sic*] involves ritualization, that is, a way of acting that distinguishes itself from other ways of acting in the very way it does what it does; moreover, it makes this distinction for specific purposes.<sup>78</sup>

Bell's statement tells us as much about the difficulty of identifying ritual as it does about the character of ritual itself. The definition suggested by Evan Zuesse in the *Encyclopedia of Religion* is only somewhat more specific. Rituals, he writes, are

conscious and voluntary, repetitious and stylized symbolic bodily actions that are centered on cosmos structures and/or sacred

76. For a review of theories of ritual see Jack Goody, "Religion and Ritual: The Definitional Problem," *The British Journal of Sociology* 12 (1961): 142–64; Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); and idem, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

77. Goody, "Religion and Ritual," 147. "Generally [ritual] has been used to refer to the action as distinct from the belief component of magico-religious phenomena."

78. Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*, 81.



presences. (Verbal behavior such as chant, song, and prayer are of course included in the category of bodily actions.)<sup>79</sup>

In the face of such little clarity, the analysis of priestly and deuteronomic ritual may be aided by two approaches: Bell's "practice approach," which considers "how a particular community of culture ritualizes (what characteristics of acting make strategic distinctions between these acts and others) and then address[es] when and why ritualization is deemed to be the effective thing to do,"<sup>80</sup> and Geertz's conception of ritual as enactment, dramatic rendering, materialization, or realization of ideology.<sup>81</sup> The virtue of Bell's approach is that it permits deuteronomic and priestly religion to define the salient practices in their respective traditions. Geertz's enactment idea integrates the dichotomous poles of ritual taxonomy listed above so that both deuteronomic practice and priestly practice can fall under the rubric of ritual. Both the cultic practices of priestly religion and that of Deuteronomy, in which verbalization has both theological and utilitarian value, can be understood as enactments, or models, of and for theological reality.<sup>82</sup>

Of course the Pentateuch is not an anthropological field report. Although it is possible, as I suggested earlier, that the text describes rituals that were meant to be enacted or were based on actual practices, what the Pentateuch principally offers are theological statements whose relationship to actual practice can neither be determined nor assumed.<sup>83</sup> This reality does not greatly disturb the exploration of deuteronomic and priestly theology, nor of how each tradition conceptualizes memory, but it does complicate the analysis of deuteronomic and priestly worship and practice as represented, and of the literary presentation of those practices. As *represented*, prescribed practices must be imagined as if taking place in the reality constructed by the narrative. Their literary *presentation*, however, is directed to a reading or listening audience, for not only do both traditions offer visions of religious life, they also seek to involve the audiences reading or listening to their writing in that religious life.

79. Evan M. Zeuse, "Ritual," *ER* 12:405b.

80. Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*, 81.

81. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 114.

82. *Ibid.*, 93.

83. A utilitarian purpose for Leviticus has been argued by scholars but cannot be proven definitively. That ancient near eastern cultures produced guiding documents for the enactment of ritual seems certain based on Hittite and Akkadian documents. See *COS*, 1:160–63, 1:427–36, and 3:61–65. However, with regard even to documents such as these, the precise relationship between document and actual practice is something at which we can only guess.

As David P. Wright says with respect to priestly literature (and I would add, for D as well),

“the socialcultural [*sic*] world in which PH was created, whatever that may have been has to be considered as a factor in its formulation. The corpus has been written in dialogue with that environment and in reaction to it. As such it is probably not merely descriptive but prescriptive in the larger ideological sense in that it seeks to shape opinion and motivate response.<sup>84</sup>

In Deuteronomy, the gap between religious practice as represented and the presentation itself is not so great, since both the text and the practices it prescribes have a pedagogic purpose and rely on narrative. For instance, Deuteronomy 26 not only contains a liturgy for offering the first fruits, it also contains introductory material that sets the scene with allusive language that reinforces the ideas recited in the liturgy. The religious practices represented in P, however, are more problematic. First, and perhaps most obviously, because P’s rituals are directed to God, the text cannot provide much information on how they are received or experienced.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, because these rituals rely on sensory experience, the presumed enactment and effect of ritual on the one hand, and its textual representation on the other hand, are asymmetrical. One is experiential; the other is cognitive.

The engagement of Israel’s memory in P also poses difficulties. To demonstrate: in an episode to be taken up later, the two rebellions in Numbers 16–17, two different appeals to Israel’s memory are involved. One, represented in the narrative, makes use of commemorative objects to remind the people of Aaronide authority. The second appeal is achieved through the presentation of the event.<sup>86</sup> On the second level it seeks to ensure that the audience remembers

84. Wright, “Ritual Theory, Ritual Texts, and the Priestly-Holiness Writings of the Pentateuch,” 207.

85. As we will see in the next chapter, however, one function of P’s cosmogony is to illustrate God’s reception to ritual.

86. Such compensatory participation may also take the form of ritual, namely the ritualized reading, hearing, or recitation of the text, which, as the rabbis of the *Mishna* understood, could substitute for experience and be regarded, therefore, as a kind of religious activity. Consider, for instance, the statement of Rabbi Gamliel: “Anyone who does not say these three things has not fulfilled his [Passover] obligation, and they are: *pesah maṣṣah* and *marar*. *M. Pesah* 10:5. The statement is included in the Passover Haggadah, where it invites participants at the *seder* to fulfill their obligation by saying the three words in lieu of actually sacrificing the Passover offering and eating with unleavened bread and bitter herbs as required according to Exod. 12:8. See Mordechai Leib Katzenellenbogen, ed. *Haggadah Shel Pesach*, Torat Chaim (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1998), 143.

the consequence of flouting God's choice. It provides what Wesley Bergan calls "imaginative performance" of an event meant to create a terrifying experiential memory.<sup>87</sup> To the extent that the experience of reading or hearing the text has ritual significance, the rhetorical and literary strategies to engage the audience's memory are worthy of investigation.

### ORGANIZATION OF THIS PROJECT

This work is organized into two parts. Part I provides the theoretical underpinnings for the analysis of the religious programs that occupy Part II. The theoretical work begins in Chapter 2, where I show how the deuteronomic and priestly covenant ideas reflect worldviews as encapsulated in the creation stories that open Genesis (Gen. 1:1–2:4a and Gen. 2:4b–3:24). I offer a close reading of the two creation stories and (in connection with Genesis 1), the flood narrative in Genesis 6–9, and correlate them with passages in Deuteronomy and in priestly material to show how they respectively reflect deuteronomic and priestly theology. Through this process, I demonstrate that each of the two stories endows Israel's covenant as conceived in each tradition with cosmogonic purpose and establishes memory as a key covenantal instrument.

In Chapter 3, I turn to the subject of memory. Here, I clarify how D and P each conceptualize memory by analyzing the language each tradition uses to speak of it. I also coordinate the two conceptualizations of memory with the

87. Wesley Bergan uses the model of Monday-night football to explain that rituals involve four levels of participants: the direct participants in the ritual (level 1); those who make the game possible (level 2); the spectators at the game (level 3); and the audience that watches from a distance spatially and perhaps temporally as well. He correlates levels 1–3 with the characters in the biblical text (i.e., the individuals who bring sacrifices, the officiating priests, and the Israelites of the biblical world, respectively) and level 4, with the readers of the biblical text: "Like the fourth-level participants in Monday Night Football, the reader of the text is far removed from the events described in the text. . . . In fact, the text very carefully removes any illusion of direct participation by locating the event in the 'Tent of Meeting,' a building that did not exist even in the writer's own time. So not only does the existence of the text create the possibility of the fourth-level participant, but the text deliberately creates readers who recognize that their participation in the act of reading the text involves their *imaginary* participation in a dead ritual" (italics mine). Wesley J. Bergan, *Reading Ritual: Leviticus in Postmodern Culture*, JSOTSup 417 (London and New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 31. The model is useful, however, if Israelites (and later, Jews) are indeed reading or listening to the text and recalling its content, then "dead" is probably too strong a word. Indeed, the detailed expositions of temple ritual in the Mishna were recorded long after the temple itself was destroyed and the rituals were made obsolete. As two examples among numerous such passages, see the detailed description of the Day of Atonement in *M. Yoma* (e.g., 1:1–2, 4:1–3) and of the Passover sacrifices in *M. Pesah* 5:5–10. The authors of the Mishna write as if describing a living institution, although it is also possible that the texts reflect messianic preparation for a new temple in the future.

worldviews expressed in the creation stories to establish memory's participation in the thought complex informing D's and P's respective worldviews. The privilege Deuteronomy accords semantic memory and its faith in the verbalization of memory is shown to be matched by the concern for the proper use of human intellect evinced in Genesis 2–3. Loyalty and obedience to God should be the object of the thinking Israelite. The foundation of that loyalty and the means by which it is sustained and transmitted is the verbalization of authorized versions of the past. In contrast, priestly terminology and the way it is used reveal this tradition's preference for the sensory and experiential over the intellectual and doctrinal. According to the priestly tradition, memory is awakened through sensory cues, and its primeval history proves that sensory instruments can be used to keep God attentive and mindful of Israel.

In the second half of this book (Chapters 4–8), I analyze the literary representation of the religious programs—the rituals and practices imagined or prescribed in Deuteronomy and in priestly literature—to illustrate how these two traditions make use of memory. Chapter 4 analyzes the several recitations mandated in Deuteronomy to keep covenantal obligation and loyalty firmly and continually in mind. These include parental instruction (and Moses' modeling of it in the historical retrospect that opens Deuteronomy), the sabbatical recitation of the Law, the creedal recitations associated with offering the first fruits and the third-year tithe, and the song that Moses teaches the Israelites.

Chapter 5 looks at the tabernacle instruments and practices that serve God's memory according to the priestly tradition. I explore the mnemonic function of the various instruments and garments that God instructs Moses to have made as “reminders” (*zikkārôn*) and the sacrifices, particularly the *'azkkārâ* of the meal offering which provides a “pleasing fragrance” for God.

Israel's memory returns for consideration in Chapters 6 and 7. In Chapter 6 I relate the priestly conception of memory and its use in connection with the Israelite laity. Although Israel's memory is not its primary concern, the priestly tradition nonetheless makes use of memory to regulate the behavior of the non-priesthood. The necessity for this is not only in support of the political objectives of the priesthood as Leveen suggests, but derives from a theological urgency as well. From that perspective, I discuss not only the commemorative objects associated with wilderness rebellions, but the priestly use of dramatic narratives and overall literary structure to teach the Israelites of the danger of encroachment on the sacred.

Chapter 7 turns to the Holiness school and memory in the context of exile. As mentioned earlier, the Holiness school shares the basic conceptualization

of memory as sensory and experiential found in the priestly tradition, but it places greater emphasis on Israel's memory than on God's. In this chapter, I demonstrate how the Holiness writers transform divine mnemonics into memory tools for Israel, and how they reinterpret priestly terminology to give new meaning to unviable practices, while maintaining a connection to the ritual life of the past. Chapter 8 focuses on the priestly use of the term "sign" (*'ôl*), arguably the most important term in the priestly memory lexicon. I discuss the "signs" introduced in priestly literature and their transformation from concrete markers to symbolic cues for God's memory. Chapter 9 concludes this investigation with some thoughts about the relationship between deuteronomic and priestly literature, the kind of religiosity each promotes, and the integrative model that the Pentateuch provides by their combined presence in the text.