The fundamental premise in unpacking Leviticus is that it comprises two priestly sources, P (chapters 1–16) and H (chapters 17–27) and that H is the redactor of P. In addition to the evidence cited by Knohl\(^1\) I have found thirteen additional pieces of ammunition to add to his stockpile.\(^2\) Among the most potent is H’s festival calendar, Leviticus 23. The reference of the repeated formula יָדַע תְּפִלְלָה, “you shall offer food gifts to YHWH” (vv. 8, 23, 27, 36 [bis], 37) is Numbers 28–29 (P). When H agrees with Numbers 28–29 on sacrificial offerings it uses this formula. However, when H prescribes sacrifices for the grain festivals it enumerates all the requisite sacrifices (vv. 12–13, 18–19).

The reason is obvious. P’s festival calendar (Numbers 28–29) has no firstfruits of barley offering; H (Lev 23:12–13) must therefore prescribe it. P does prescribe a firstfruits of wheat offering (Num 28:26–31). In this case H differs with P’s sacrificial requirements. H must therefore prescribe its own version (Lev 23:18–19). Thus the logical (and chronological) relationship between Leviticus 23 (H) and Numbers 28–29 makes sense only if H is later than P. Indeed, if H were earlier than P why would two of its festivals list sacrifices and not the others? And what would be the referent of “you shall offer food gifts to YHWH”?

I cite, as an example of how the borrowing took place, the prescriptions for the festival of Alarm Blasts.\(^3\)

---


Lev 23:23-25

(YHWH spoke to Moses saying, 23)

Speak to the Israelites thus: (24) In the seventh month, on the first day of the month, you shall observe a sacred occasion; you shall do no laborious work. (You shall observe a day of) alarm blasts. (You shall sacrifice a burnt offering ... of pleasant aroma) a food gift to YHWH.

The parentheses in Numbers contain words deleted in Leviticus, while the brackets in Leviticus contain additions to Numbers. Leviticus 23 (H) takes for granted the sacrificial list detailed in Numbers 29, and it innovates two new terms, לֶחֶם מַסָּכִית and לֶחֶם לֵדֶשׁ. One must therefore conclude that the H legislator had the actual text of P before him.

In my opinion, more than 95% of H’s material is the product of the eighth century. It may be the work of a single generation of “young Turks,” who radically changed priestly thought. Here I agree with Israel Knohl but I differ with him by rejecting his term “school” because I find no sign of continuous literary activity that would warrant it. There is only H and the remaining H_R (approximately 5%) composed in the Babylonian exile.

Leviticus 23 also testifies that H is not monolithic. It comprises four strata, two consisting of several (mainly partial) verses which were absorbed in H, labeled Pre-H_1 and Pre-H_2, and one exilic stratum H_R (vv. 1–3, 39–43) attached to the main text, the original calendar (H, vv. 4–38, 44). Thus, Leviticus 23 is totally the product of H. Against Haran and Knohl there is no original P in the entire