

THE CONCEPT OF THE HOLY ONE IN FIRST ISAIAH AND IN THE PRIESTLY CODE

Hanna Liss
Heidelberg

Introduction

In his study *The Sanctuary of Silence* (1995), Israel Knohl states that the *Priestly Code* (*P*) seeks “to maintain an interior, ‘holy kingdom’ alongside the broader political structure.”¹ To him, this “‘holy kingdom’ disregards not only the sphere of political power (...) but the entire social-judicial realm as well.”² In his depiction of the relationship between the priests and the people, Knohl refers to the description of the manufacture of the tent, the tabernacle (*miškan*) and its equipment (Exod 25-40), the priestly tasks (Lev 1-16), as well as some of the priestly accessories like Urim and Thummim.³ The detachment from all kinds of political and social legislation that Knohl claims for the theology of *Priestly Code* does not, however, according to him, hold true for the so-called ‘Holiness School’ (*HS*). As a corollary, Knohl sees the main differences between the *Priestly Code* and *HS* (*inter alia*) in *HS*’s postulate of a special relationship between God and Israel,⁴ expressed in *HS* as a covenant (*bērit*⁵), based “on a unique relation of reciprocity.”⁶ Knohl argues, that, in contrary to *P*, *HS* blends the cultic concept of holiness with a social awareness and moral concerns,⁷ thereby trying to abate the sharp disjunction of cultic affairs from moral commands as laid out in *P*.

Central for our question is the fact that Knohl suggests a theological relationship between *HS* and the prophecy of the 8th-Century Isaiah with regard to their concept of holiness.⁸ He states: “We have demonstrated that one of the unique features of *HS* is that it infuses the concept of holiness with moral content (...). Now, Isaiah is the only prophet who unequivocally expresses the moral dimension of holiness.”⁹ Since Knohl puts the main emphasis as regards content on moral and social issues, his elucidation of the cultic system of *P*¹⁰ lacks any reference to Isaiah’s prophecy.

Although I would, principally, agree with Knohl’s assertion that by the end of the 8th century there was a more direct and vivid relationship between priestly and prophetic circles than generally assumed, I would, nevertheless, claim that Isaiah, like *P*, sought to detach (at least) the political sphere as far as possible from the idea of the Holy One. To put it in other words: Isaiah makes every effort to break up the existing arrangement between

-
1. Knohl, I., *The Sanctuary of Silence. The Priestly Torah and the Holiness school*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1995 (Knohl 1995) p. 155.
 2. *Ibid.*
 3. See Knohl (1995) esp. pp. 152-157.
 4. See e.g. Lev 11:45f.; 19:2; 20,26; 21:8.
 5. Cf. Lev 26,9.15.44f.
 6. Knohl (1995) p. 173.
 7. See Knohl (1995) esp. pp. 175-180.
 8. See Knohl (1995) esp. pp. 212-214.
 9. Knohl (1995) p. 213.
 10. See Knohl (1995) pp. 148-157.
-

politics and cultic affairs and to delineate his own idea of a new and hitherto unknown 'Theo-Politics.' Above insisting on certain moral standards, Isaiah's main concern is witnessing to the development of a theo-political view of history (Isa 6-10.28-32), and of an enlarged theological concept of Israel's God in view of the political and military circumstances at the end of the 8th century, the threat by the Assyrian troops and Judah's defeat in 701. In this detachment of the notion of the Holy One from the political affairs of the Judean kings, the prophecy of Isaiah suits the theology of the *Priestly Code* far more closely than Knohl claimed. Isaiah conveys this prophetic claim regarding the 'retreat' of Israel's God from the realm of policy by means of the metaphor of the 'YHWH's (strange) work' (Isa 5:12.19; 10:12; 28:21). It is in particular the notion of YHWH's 'strange work' that sets out to draw a sharp demarcation line between God's action and the policy of the Judean elite: Not only should no one be able to refer to God for his military plans within the course of history or make demands on God for his own purposes; rather, Isaiah insists on the incompatibility between man's and God's action within the course of history.

Isaiah's Concept of YHWH's 'Strange Deed' in the Course of History

Isa 5:18f.

- (5,18) *Woe to those who drag guilt with cords of falsehood,¹¹
and sin as if with cart ropes,*
- (19) *who say: Let him make speed, let him hasten His work,
that we may see it.
Let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel come near,
that we may know it. וְהַצַּבְבָּנִים לֹכְזֵי הַשְּׂדֵה*

The 'Woe'-cry (interjection *hōy*¹²) connects the idea of the 'Holy One of Israel' (*qēdōsh Yisrā'ēl*) to the terms 'guilt' and 'sin' (*āwōn*; *ḥattā'ā*). The most appropriate parallel for the common mentioning of *āwōn* and *ḥattā'ā* in the context of man facing the Holy One is embedded in the report of Isaiah's vocation (Isa 6:7). In analogy to Isa 6:7, Isa 5:18 does not elucidate *āwōn* and *ḥattā'ā* in any more detail. Although Isa 6:7 correlates the purification¹³ to the prophet's 'unclean' lips, and, thereby, puts forward a connection between 'guilt/sin' on the one hand and 'unclean lips' on the other, 'guilt' and 'sin' in this context convey in general the deficient status of man facing the Holy One. Isaiah recognizes that his (human) forlornness is not caused by a specific transgression, but forms

11. Read with MT (against LXX).

12. For the form-critical background of the interjection *hōy* in prophetic texts compare Hardmeier, Ch., *Texttheorie und biblische Exegese. Zur rhetorischen Funktion der Trauermetaphorik in der Prophetie*, München: Kaiser 1978, esp. p. 375f.; Liss, H., *Die unerhörte Prophetie. Kommunikative Strukturen prophetischer Rede im Buch Yesha'yahu*, Leipzig, Evang. Verl.-Anst. 2003, p.95f. (Liss 2003).

13. See Brown, M "Kippēr and Atonement in the Book of Isaiah," in: Chazan, R, Hallo, WW a.o. (ed.), *Ki Baruch Hu. Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of BA Levine*, Winona Lake 1999, pp. 189-202, esp. p. 194ff.; Lind, MC, "Political Implications of Isaiah 6," in: Broyles, CC, Evans, CA (ed.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, 2 vol., Leiden - New York a.o. 1997, vol. I, pp. 317-338, esp. p. 321. Compare also the commentaries of Rashi, R Yosef Qara, R Yeshaya ben Eliyah di Trani, and R David Kimhi on Isa 28:18 (and Isa 47:11).

a constituent of the relationship between God and man. The ‘silenced man’ is the human being who cannot even dare to come within reach of God.¹⁴

In Isa 5:18, the prophet notices a kind of inability of his contemporaries to act adequately in response to the ‘work’ of the Holy One.¹⁵ As the following verse shows, this inability becomes manifest in their short argument with the prophet’s message. *His* (God’s) work confronts *their* expectations; their political and military understanding (as human ‘wisdom’¹⁶) collides with what Isaiah calls (God’s) counsel. In their critical demand, the contemporaries quoted in v19 take up the prophet’s metaphorical expressions (*ma’āsēhū; ʾasat qēdōsh Yisrā’ēl*). Despite the fact that these metaphors lack any concrete exposition as regards content, one should note that Isaiah’s opponents do not refer to the prophet’s rebuking word concerning the internal problems of the Judean society (social criticism¹⁷), but to the prophetic speech dealing with the divine manifestation in history (Israel’s), his ‘work’ and ‘divine counsel.’ Thus, Isaiah’s contemporaries only call the ‘theological’ metaphors into question. Within this context, Isa 5:18f. takes up the second ‘Woe’-sequence in Isa 5:11f.:

*(...) but they do not take note of YHWH’s deeds,
nor do they see the work of his hands (Isa 5:12b).*

This remark, too, recognizes his opponents’ incapacity to look at YHWH’s deed(s) in the course of history in the same way, as the prophet would become conscious of it. The prophetic speech even consists of comparable metaphors (*pō’al; ma’āsē*). However, one can see from both utterances mentioned in this context that in the prophet’s eyes the divine plan is well under way. Isaiah refers to divine ‘events’ that have become reality merely in his eyes and mind,¹⁸ but not for his contemporaries who are confronted with the prophetic threats. YHWH’s ‘deeds’ do not seem to correspond to the historical events.

The embedding of the opponents’ quotation into the prophet’s speech leads to a deeper theological meaning concerning the correlation of the individual sections, the ‘Woe’-cry (v18) on one hand, and the quotation (v19) on the other. Corresponding elements are:

*‘guilt’//‘his work (...) that we may see it’
‘sin’//‘counsel of the Holy One’ (...) that we may know it’*

The correlation between the ‘Not-(yet)-seeing’/‘Not-(yet)-knowing’ with ‘guilt’ and ‘sin’ is extended by the time-factor that set up a distinction between the real political level of understanding (for the people) and a ‘theo-political’ level of knowledge for the prophet. This means that the ‘guilt’ and ‘sin’ of the prophet’s contemporaries are constituted *only* on the level of the prophetic speech. Isaiah declares the ‘guilt’ and ‘sin’ of those who - in their eyes - have asked (‘innocently’) for the divine work to come. It is, therefore, *not* a de-facto transgression or sin that Isaiah’s opponents can be blamed for. They become ‘guilty’ only within the immediate encounter with the Holy One represented in the prophetic word, a gap hardly to be bridged. In that, Isa 5:18f. (like Isa 6:5-7) comes very close to the

14. See esp. Liss (2003) pp. 34-54; idem., “Undisclosed Speech: Patterns of Communication in the Book of Isaiah,” in: *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 4,4, 2002, pp. 1-51 (<http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/jhs-article.html> = Liss 2002), pp. 9-13.

15. See also Liss (2003) pp. 93-103.

16. Compare Isa 5:21.

17. Cf. Isa 1:10-15.16-17.21-28; 3:12-15.16-24; 5:8.13b; 10:1-2; 28:14-22; 30:1-5.9-11; 31:1.

18. See also Rashi ad loc.

characterization given by Knohl with regard to man's condition in confrontation with the sublime holy as laid out in *P*: "Such an encounter necessarily engenders feelings of guilt and sin and the need for atonement. This guilt is not associated with any particular sin; rather, it is a result of human awareness of insignificance and contamination in comparison with the sublimity of God's holiness."¹⁹

Isa 28:21

The context of Isa 28:21 (Isa 28-32*) belongs to the so-called 'Assyrian cycle'. In its final literary shape this sections unites primarily words of the prophet from the late period. The 'Woe'-cries (28:1; 29:1.15; 30:1; 31:1) rebuke the Judean military stance towards Egypt ('shoulder-to-shoulder') and refer, by general consensus, to the anti Assyrian rebellion movements from the time of Hezekiah (after 705).²⁰

More than Isa 28:7-13, Isa 28:14-22 describes a dramatic confrontation between Isaiah and his contemporaries, the 'scoffers'.²¹ Another and largely independent threat can be found in v21. It consists also and almost exclusively of metaphorical phrases:

Isa 28:21 *For YHWH will rise up as at Mount Perazim,
He will rage as in the valley of Gibeon
to do his deed - strange his deed,
And to perform his work - peculiar his work.*

As regards its traditio-historical content, Isa 28:21 offers a clear reverence-point: In Ba'al-Perazim, David had defeated the Philistines, yet with solid Divine support (2Sam 5:17-25 // 2Chr 14:8-17).²² The narrative in 2Sam 5:17-25 shows basic elements of the so-called 'Divine warfare'.²³ For our question, it is important that 2Sam 5:19f. depict David's and YHWH's deeds as completely congruent to each other. This correspondence between human and divine military activities is based on the correlation between David's inquiry of YHWH concerning military strategic details and the immediate and absolute execution of the divine instructions given. Whereas these traditions of divine warfare refer to the 'good old days' in which YHWH acted victoriously on behalf of his people, our text creates a new and 'strange' divine reality differing remarkably from the one in Israel's glorious past: This war will be unlike the one in the federation with David, it's outcome less brilliant. The

19. Knohl (1995) p. 151.

20. Compare e.g. Blenkinsopp, J, *Isaiah 1-39. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York - London a.o.: Doubleday 2000, pp. 391-395; idem., "Judah's Covenant With Death (ISAIAH XXVIII 14-22)," in: *VT* 50 (2000) pp. 472-483.

21. Compare also Liss (2003) pp. 117-141; Liss (2002) pp.19-22.

22. See esp. Kang, S-M, *Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East*, Berlin - New York: De Gruyter 1989, p. 204ff.; Beuken, WAM., "Isaiah 28: Is It Only Schismatics That Drink Heavily? Beyond the Synchronic Versus Diachronic Controversy," in: JC de Moor (ed.), *Synchronic Or Diachronic? A Debate in Old Testament Exegesis*, Leiden - New York a.o.: Brill 1995, pp. 15-38, esp. p. 28f. incl. note 34.

23. See esp. vRad, "Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel", Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1958, p. 6 ff.; Smend, "Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund. Erwägungen zur ältesten Geschichte Israels," Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1963, Weippert, "'Heiliger Krieg' in Israel und Assyrien. Kritische Anmerkungen zu Gerhard von Rads Konzeption des 'Heiligen Krieges im Alten Israel'," in: Müller, H-P (ed.), "Babylonien und Israel. Historische, religiöse und sprachliche Beziehungen", Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft 1972, 21991, pp. 259-300; see also Liss (2003) pp. 134-138.

question arises, why Isaiah traces a line back to the traditions of divine warfare while at the same time de-familiarizing them.

According to vRad, Isa 22:8 and 31:1 form the central motif for the traditions for the divine warfare as regards content. Isaiah wanted to persuade his contemporaries to wage war in alliance with God only. Yet, this was not Isaiah's concern since he knew that YHWH as the Judean 'Reichsgott' had already become much weaker than the God of the Assyrian empire, Aššur. Isaiah, therefore, did not propagate faith in YHWH's military power. The metaphorical speech of the 'peculiar work' expresses just the opposite: This divine deed will not be the one the cultic and political elite should (and could!) rely on.²⁴ David's war was not uncanny, insofar as YHWH had initiated military actions exactly as they might have fit into David's military plans and arrangements: YHWH and David had 'marched to the same tune.' Likewise, in Jdg 5:23 the inhabitants of Meroz are cursed because they did not come to the help of YHWH.

Isaiah, on the contrary, wanted to set up a contrast to these 'good old days' by means of this word of the 'strange divine deed'. In this (new) war, the close military alliance between the divine and human warrior(s) is terminated by the divine word. The concern of Isa 28:21 is, therefore, not at all about a political elite that did not want to pursue their military advantages without YHWH, but, vice versa, that YHWH (as the Judean 'Reichsgott') did not want to be abused by 'this people.' Isaiah's word forms the basic opposition to the *Zaw la-Zaw* of the 'staggering priests' (Isa 28:7ff.) having murmured a calming 'cradle song' into the people's ears who would have liked to rely on the old sacred traditions.²⁵ Hezekiah certainly would have been fond of enacting his foreign policy and military plans in congruence with the arrangements of a divine warrior. Isaiah's word of the 'peculiar divine work' insists on the fundamental incompatibility between the work of the Holy One (cf. Isa 31:1) and the endeavors of the 'scoffers'.

YHWH's Scope of Action According to the Priestly Code

Different from the Isaianic tradition(s), the texts of the *Priestly Code* never use the expression 'the Holy One' (*ha-qādōsh*). YHWH is neither mentioned nor ever addressed in this way. On the other hand, *P* insists in particular on the 'holy place' (*māqōm qādōsh*; Ex 29:31; Lev 6:9.19f.; 7:6; 10:13; 16:24; 24:9).²⁶ In the following, therefore, we will give a short survey on *ēlōhīm*'s/YHWH's spatial dimensions mentioned in the *P*-texts.²⁷

The *P*-texts in the book of Genesis do not know about a holy place. The narrative of creation (Gen 1) does not even touch upon the question of *where* (or *from where*) God (*ēlōhīm*) takes action. This story simply implies a diffuse divine omnipresence. From Exod 24 onwards, significant changes can be observed. God's location (i.e. the location of his glory's) is specified gradually more, at first restricting his abode to mount Sinai (Exod

24. Compare also Gitay, Y., *Isaiah and His Audience. The Structure and Meaning of Isaiah 1-12*, Assen - Maastricht 1991; van Gorcum 1991, p. 126: "The metaphor implants a yet unperceived idea into the audience's consciousness."

25. See likewise Jer 7:4ff. and 26:4ff.

26. Ex 19:6 is not a *P*-text.

27. The following is based on my article on the literary quality of the *Priestly Code* (Liss, H "The Imaginary Sanctuary: The Priestly Code as an Example of Fictionality in the Hebrew Bible," in: *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian (Achaemenid) Period*. Proceedings of the Conference held in Heidelberg University, July 2003 (edited by Lipschits, O and Oeming, M, Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns 2004; forthcoming).

24:16), his speech coming out 'from the midst of the cloud' (Exod 24:16). In the account of the divine command to construct the ark (Exod 25:10-22), YHWH's scope of action is restricted once again: *P* introduces the idea of YHWH's 'meeting' (*yā'ad* Niphal) with Moses and 'speaking' to him from above the *kappōret* (Exod 25:21f.; see also 29:42f.; 30:6.36; Num 17:19), thereby confining YHWH's spatial extent to an area of 2.5 x 1.5 cubits.²⁸ *P* hereby expresses YHWH's constant retreat to the smallest spot imaginable.²⁹

Simultaneously, one can see that within the textual chronology from Gen 7 and 17 to Exod 6 up to Exod 25, *P* pursues the idea that the spatial dimensions in which man walks 'before YHWH'³⁰ gradually decrease, while at the same time YHWH's human counterpart gets more and more specific: Noah's place is 'the world' in a very broad and vague sense, corresponding to Gen 1-11. Abraham's scope is already delimited to Palestine and Egypt.³¹ The meeting between Israel and YHWH can take place only by means of Priestly mediation in the cult, its place being the tent of meeting (*ōhel mō'ēd*). According to *P*, therefore, Israel's meeting with YHWH takes place *within* history, yet with reference to its inner target *outside the profane scope*, i.e. any political and/or military sphere. The *kappōret* functions as a symbol for the gradual retreat of YHWH from the profane scope towards a consecrated area of 3.75² cubits.

It is now important to note that YHWH's spatial restraint corresponds to his renunciation of any execution of his commands. In contrary to the story of creation, in which *P* presents God as the only active figure, the narrative on the erection of the tabernacle (*miškan*) introduces Moses as kind of intermediate authority who passes the orders to the Israelites/Bezalel/Oholiab.³² 'Speaking' and 'doing' is from now on distributed to different parties. In the course of the narrative, the Israelites (only!) become those who *make*, while YHWH is restricted to the role of the one who speaks and commands. As a corollary, *P* restricts the use of the 'formula of order and execution' almost exclusively to the cultic realms, using it outside the cultic narratives only in the flood account (Gen 6:22; 7:5) and in the story of Moses and Aaron in front of Pharaoh (Exod 7:6.10.20). Regarding the structure of 'command' (YHWH) and 'execution' (Israel), *P* shifts from a broader setting (creation; historical event) to the limited realm of cult. In correspondence to the ongoing textual chronology, YHWH's commands cover only(!) ritualistic implementations successfully, and in that, *P* severely restricts YHWH's power and his scope of action.³³

In *P*'s description, YHWH's gradual spatial retreat and his presence in the tent of meeting serve as a symbol for his 'retreat' from the profane 'space' in history or even of history. *P* depicts Moses' and Aaron's confrontation with Pharaoh/Egypt (Exod 7:6.10.20) as the last historical-political event, in which YHWH not only provides Israel with clear instructions (see Exod 7:6), but also interferes directly and positively into the course of history. From now on, *P*

28. See also *Gen. Rab.* 4,4.

29. Already RaMBaN (Nahmanides) in his commentary on Ex 25:21 noted the accumulation of deictic particles used in Exod 25,22 (and Num 7,89).

30. See e.g. Gen 7:1; 17:1; Exod 28,12.29.30.38; 29:11 a.fr.

31. Gen 17:8; 28:4 a.fr.

32. Exod 7,2; 25,22; 31,6; 35,10; 38,22; Num 15,23; see Exod 24,16; Lev 1,1; Exod 6,10.13.29; 13,1; 14,1; 16,11; 25,1; 30,11.17 and fr.

33. See e.g. Exod 39:1.5.7.21.26.29.31.43; Exod 40:19.21.23.25.27.29.32; Lev 8:4.9.13.17.21.29; 9:7.10; 10:15; Num 1:19; 2:22; 8,3.22; a.fr.

uses both the 'formula of order' as well as the 'formula of execution' exclusively in cultic context.³⁴ From the moment that the Israelites become an *ēdâ* (Exod 12:3), the structure of the "fulfillment of a pre-established plan"³⁵ cannot take place within the profane area of history. It remains restricted to the cult and the sacrificial service.

The Distant God

According to *P*, it is only within the cultic scope that divine order and human implementation can correspond meaningfully with one another. According to Isaiah, especially in line with Isa 6:9f., there is hardly a way in which YHWH's call and man's answer to it could be synchronized.³⁶ The 'command not to comprehend' negates any positive communication within the actual course of history. Rather, it sets up a completely negative communicational relationship between God and the people of Israel,³⁷ which only at a later stage in Israel's history became a written testimony and, thereby, was converted into a collective *traditum* as part of the literary heritage of the people of Israel.

As a first result, one can, therefore, say, that to both, Isaiah and the author(s) of the *Priestly Code* the actual encounter of man and God necessarily causes 'sin' and 'guilt' that are fatal for man. Man can survive in the face of YHWH only when not confronted directly with him. Therefore, even though both theological concepts differ from one another not only with regard to their specific 'Sitz im Leben', but in particular on the topic of cultic practice and observation, the structure of a divine dissociation ('retreat') from the human and profane realm forms a crucial notion within their concepts of the relationship between God and man to Isaiah as well as to *P*. However, it seems that *P* goes a step further, insofar as its author(s) tried to convert the Isaianic theologically 'desperate' (and therefore: discouraging) state of affairs into a positive relationship between God and man by means of erecting a cultic sphere, in which the 'meeting' (*yā'ad* Niphal) of God and Israel is not doomed to failure from the very beginning. In addition, *P*'s theology opens up prospective opportunities for an encounter between God and man by introducing regular cultic purifications and atonement for the people, thereby renewing a positive relationship between the divine sphere and the people of Israel, whereas the theology of Isaiah lets the people remain in the status of a 'people of unclean lips' (cf. Isa 6:5).

The Isaianic theology as well as the *Priestly Code* represents an answer to the questions that arose when the Judean state ideology (Zion-Theology) faced the threat and defeat of foreign nations (Assyria; Babylonia³⁸). It is, therefore, primarily *P* who "reflects the great

34. Cf. Exod 12:28.50.

35. Blenkinsopp, J, "The Structure of P," in: *CBQ* 38 (1976) pp. 275-292.

36. See Liss (2002) esp. p.11f.

37. See also Liss, H, "Die Funktion der »Verstockung« Pharaos in der Erzählung vom Auszug aus Ägypten (Ex 7-14)," in: *Biblische Notizen* 93, 1998, pp. 56-76, esp. 60ff.

38. I will not deal with the question of the date of *P* in this context; see e.g. Kaufmann, Y, "Der Kalender und das Alter des Priesterkodex," in: *VT* 4, 1954, pp. 307-313; idem., *Toledot ha-Emuna ha-Yisre'elit*. 3 vols., Jerusalem - Tel Aviv: Bialik 1954, vol. 1, pp. 113-142 (= *The Religion of Israel. From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*, engl. translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg, Chicago: Chicago University Press 1960, pp. 175-211); Hurvitz, A, "Dating the Priestly Source in Light of the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew. A Century After Wellhausen," in: *ZAW* 100 (1988) 88-100; idem., "The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code," *RB* 81 (1974) 24-56; idem., "The Language of the Priestly Source and Its Historical Setting - the Case for an Early Date," *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Bible Studies and Hebrew Language*, Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies vol. 5 (1981) 83-94; Blenkinsopp,

changes in Priestly circles that took place in the second half of the Eighth century.”³⁹ In contrary to the authors of *HS* who present a concept of holiness that aims in particular at showing that YHWH's and Israel's holiness is analogous and compatible⁴⁰, the earlier *P* comes much closer to Isaiah's concept of the incompatibility between YHWH and man. As a later answer to *P*, the authors of *HS* want to overcome or at least to blur the distance between YHWH and man by emphasizing social and moral concerns.

J, “An assessment of the alleged pre-exilic date of the priestly material in the Pentateuch,” in: *ZAW* 108,4 (1996) 495-518; Milgrom, J, “The antiquity of the priestly source: A reply to Joseph Blenkinsopp,” in: *ZAW* 111,1 (1999) 10-22; Hurvitz, A, Once again: The linguistic profile of the priestly material in the Pentateuch and its historical age. A response to J Blenkinsopp, in: *ZAW* 112,2 (2000) 180-191.

39. Knohl (1995) p. 212.

40. Compare e.g. Lev 11:44f.; 19:2; 20:7.26; 21:6 a.fr.