

SEMANTICS OF THE CONCENTRIC SABBATH COMMANDMENTS IN TWO DECALOGUE VERSIONS

Jozef Jančovič

Comenius University Bratislava

■ ABSTRACT

The Sabbath Commandment is the most extensive and elaborated injunction of the Decalogue. In modern times critical research has dedicated much attention to the differences between the two text-versions (Exod 20:8-11 and Deut 5:12-15). Scholars have frequently interpreted these differences within the framework of historical-critical or literary-critical hypotheses. This paper aims to highlight the corresponding elements in the two texts, especially in the overall structural rationality of the Sabbath-Proclamation, in its texture and concentric shape. The meaning or semantics of such concentric arrangement is explored. Because of the considerable degree of agreement on various levels, which is demonstrated in the intertextual ties as well as in the correspondence in detail, the two texts are understood to be two variant elaborations of a literary, textually-defined entity. Therefore, the Decalogue should be reconsidered as the result of two partially independent literary traditions.

Keywords: Decalogue; version; Sabbath Commandment; differences; concentric; semantics.

<https://doi.org/10.63154/CETR2024.1-4>

Introduction

The seminal legislative Old Testament text in tradition and theology is undoubtedly the Decalogue.^[1] It is the main pillar of the Sinai covenant in Exod 19–24. The prominence of the Law and especially of the Ten Commandments is demonstrated by the consistent judging of Israel on the basis of its adherence to the Law. David Noel Freedman has argued that the story told from Exodus through 2 Kings tries to demonstrate that Israel violated the covenant by breaking each of the Ten Commandments.^[2] Lists of commandments that overlap partially with the Decalogue are found in Lev 19:1-18 and Deut 27:15-26. Reworkings are found in the prophetic writings (Amos, Hosea, and Jeremiah) and in the Psalms (e.g., Psalms 50 and 81). The Lord’s speech sounding from Sinai is identified three times in Scripture as the “ten words” in Exod 34:28 (LXX *deka logoi*); Deut 4:13; and in Deut 10:4 (*dekalogoi*).^[3] In addition the Decalogue is usually considered in Old Testament studies to be a paradigmatic example of the doublet.^[4] It is a well-known fact that the literarily most developed and thematically most important differences are to be found in the Sabbath Commandment.

The two different versions of the Sabbath Commandment have been intensely studied in the past. In modern times the hypotheses were usually raised in the paradigm of literary history or the history of traditions (*Literaturgeschichte, Traditionsgeschichte*).^[5] This is documented in several surveys of the history of the Decalogue-research published in recent decades.^[6]

I would like to examine the shape of the texture and concentric structure in the two versions, paying special attention to the formal features of the composition in each case.^[7] As Helmut Utschneider and Stefan A. Nitsche already stated, in the case of the Decalogue we are faced with two variations of a stabilized text shape, not with two different formations generated by developing tradition.^[8] The extent of similarities and literal agreements between the two versions extends so far and the character of the variations in the given literal context is so fitting, that using the text as a starting point is justified. Questions like when and where these variant texts originated will not be handled in the context of this article.

1. Similarities and Differences of the Two Versions

(Exod 20:8-11 and Deut 5:12-16)^[9]

<p>זְכוֹר אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ: שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעָשִׂיתָ כָּל־מְלֹאכֶתֶךָ: וַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה כָל־מְלָאכָה אֶתָּה וּבִנְךָ־וּבִתֶּךָ עֹבֵדֶךָ וְאִמָּתֶךָ וּבַהֶמְתָּךְ וּגְרָם אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ: כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת־יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֶת־הַיָּם וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בָּם וַיָּנַח בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי עַל־כֵּן בֵּרַךְ יְהוָה אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ:</p>	<p>8 Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. 9 Six days you shall labor and do all your work, 10 but the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, nor your animals, nor any foreigner residing in your towns. 11 For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.</p>
<p>שָׁמֹר אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ: שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעָשִׂיתָ כָּל־מְלֹאכֶתֶךָ: וַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כָל־מְלָאכָה אֶתָּה וּבִנְךָ־וּבִתֶּךָ וְעֹבֵדֶךָ־וְאִמָּתֶךָ וְשׂוֹרֶךָ וְחֹמְרֶךָ וְכָל־בְּהֵמָתֶךָ וּגְרָם אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ לְמַעַן יָנוּחַ עֹבֵדֶךָ וְאִמָּתֶךָ כַּמֹּד: וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי־עֶבֶד הָיִיתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיֹּצֵאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִשָּׁם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה וּבְזְרַע נְטוּיָה עַל־כֵּן צִוָּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת:</p>	<p>12 Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the LORD your God has commanded you. 13 Six days you shall labor and do all your work, 14 but the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, nor your ox, your donkey or any of your animals, nor any foreigner residing in your towns, so that your male and female servants may rest, as you do. 15 Remember that you were slaves in Egypt, but the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.</p>

It is quite peculiar that a text as important as the Decalogue figures twice in the Torah in markedly different versions. It is a well-known fact that the most important literary and the-

matic differences between the two Decalogues are to be found in the Sabbath Commandment. The key differences of the two versions of Sabbath Commandment are well-known:^[10]

1) The first word of the proclamation is already a difference: the *qal* infinitive absolute: זָכוֹר (*remember!* Exod 20:8) compared to שְׂמוֹר (*observe!* Deut 5:12a).

2) Deut supplements the main clause with a retrospective argument (v. 12b: צִוָּה יְהוָה: כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ *as the LORD your God has commanded you*). The same subordinate clause appears also in the following commandment (כְּבַד אֶת- יְהוָה וְאֶת-אִמְךָ וְאֶת-אָבִיךָ *honor your father and your mother, as the LORD your God has commanded you...* Deut 5:16).

3) The list of those addressed in the Deuteronomy-version contains two additional members in the appositional chain (וּבְנֵי-יִבְתְּךָ וְעַבְדְּךָ- וְאִמְתְּךָ וְשׁוֹרְךָ וְחֲמֹרְךָ... *you and your son and your daughter, your male or female slave, and your ox and your donkey...* v. 14d).^[11]

4) Finally, the best known variation is the different rationale – the so-called creational and the social-ethical – for the Sabbath. The first in Exod 20:11 is based on the *creation of the cosmos* described in Gen 1:1-2:3, while the second in Deut 5:15 is based on the *redemption of Israel* narrated in Exod 13:17–14:31:

a) The book of Exodus, relying on the priestly tradition, utilizes the contrasting creational motif of the “six days’ labor” and “the rest on the seventh day”; the argument makes an explicit reference to Gen 1, where the priestly tradition tells how the whole of creation was made in the same rhythm.^[12] The Lord himself

created the whole cosmos in six days and rested on the seventh day; therefore you should also rest on the seventh day and keep it holy.

b) By contrast, in Deuteronomy the argument follows the motif of “the servant” (עֶבֶד; v. 14c.f) and rationalizes the Sabbath Commandment as a memory of the Passover and the liberation from the Egyptian slavery. Your servant must rest with you on the Sabbath because you were also “a slave” (עֶבֶד) but now you (and your house) are free and redeemed for the Lord.

Apart from these four differences and variations there are some smaller and less important ones (a *waw* in the phrase you ...*AND your slave* (Deut 5:14c); the word כָּל- (*all*) in the phrase ...*and ANY of your animals* (Deut 5:14d); the Exod-version doubles the predicate in the last clause: *therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day AND MADE IT HOLY* (וַיְבָרֵךְ וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ) v. 11c-d).^[13]

So far, biblical scholarship has paid much attention to these differences and variations and the critical study of the doublet-question of the Sabbath Commandment is usually based exclusively on the analysis of these differences. Curiously, the reverse perspective, the extent and character of the similarities and literary correspondences, has received far less attention. Nevertheless, the corresponding elements are prevalent – in both versions they represent more than 50% of the word units. Moreover, the literary congruence of the two versions lies not in the quantity of identical words but rather in the same con-

struction of these literary units and their particular sequences.

The text of the Sabbath Commandment can be divided into five sequences, with the five respective sequences of each version versions corresponding in content, form and function.

The first sequence is the introductory clause (Exod 20:8; Deut 5:12a-b), which has the same syntactic structure in both versions. The semantic difference זָכוֹר ~ שָׁמוֹר (*remember ~ observe*) is an opening word (*Stichwort*) variation without any influence on the syntactic construction. The infinitive-absolute-form of the verb, governing the motif-word in the position of a direct object אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת (*the Sabbath day*) and the adverbial construction לְקַדְּשׁוֹ (to keep it holy) build the core of both sentences and represent a strong correspondence of the two versions. Actually, this formulation does not introduce the Sabbath Commandment as a new institution or new commandment, but rather presents a parenetic exhortation. Israelites have to *remember* or *to keep* the Sabbath. This does not seem to be the core sentence of the Sabbath Commandment, which should formally correspond with other statements of the Decalogue.

The second sequence is a pragmatic definition of the Sabbath (Exod 20:9a.b-10a; Deut 5:13a.b-14a) using the contrast between *six days* of labor and the *seventh day* (which is *the Sabbath for the LORD your God*). Both versions

of this part of the commandment are identical *verbatim*.

The third sequence contains the core utterance of the Sabbath Commandment (Exod 20:10b-e; Deut 5:14b-f). Here, the main clause takes the form of an apodictic law sentence (negative particle אַל + *yiqtol*-form of the verb + direct object in the accusative); this clause expresses the pivotal demand of the whole utterance (cf. Lev 32:3.30.31; Jer 17:24). In both versions the basis of the main clause is identical. In addition, the Deuteronomy-version contains in vv. 14-15 a subordinate clause expressing the intention of this demand (*you shall not do any work, neither you ... neither your male or female servant ... so that your male and female servants may rest, as you do*). Moreover, the motif-word (“the servant”) also represents a link with the following sequence. Deut 5:14-15 adds an expression of purpose to the main command using the usual clause type with conjunction לְמַעַן (“so that...”) + *yiqtol*-form of the verb + subject. This sentence has no parallel in the Exodus-version of the Decalogue (but see Exod 23:12).

The fourth sequence (Exod 20:11a-b; Deut 5:15a-c) is the only substantially different part of the text. It serves as a development of the preceding core commandment. Due to the different connections with their preceding contexts the variants have different functions: in Exod 20:11 the whole sequence serves as a direct argumentative substantiation of the core

commandment; quite differently Deut 5:15a relates the main verb וְזָכַרְתָּ (literally: *and you shall remember*) back to the main clause (v. 14b) as a continuation or a development of the core commandment – that means, *remembering* the deliverance from the Egyptian slavery belongs to the content of the Sabbath, not to its substantiation; cf. זָכוֹר in Exod 20:8.

The fifth sequence (Exod 20:11c-d; Deut 5:15d) at the end of the commandment expresses a retrospective explanation (cf. the strong conjunction עַל־כֵּן [*therefore*]). The two versions

are partially different on the semantic as well as the syntactic level. Nevertheless, they also contain several corresponding elements (conj. עַל־כֵּן, the clause-type *qatal-X* with the name of the LORD as the subject of the main verb and the motif-word “the day of Sabbath” as its direct object). Both versions manifest some similarities in the outline of the literary unit. Both versions can be divided into five sequences; their order and their functions are comparable, in several parts even identical. Actually, only one of these five sequences (the fourth one) contains a major alteration.

2. The Concentric Structure of the Sabbath Commandment and its Particular Shape

Both versions exhibit some features of a concentric framework. A concentric or palistrophic arrangement of a text or composition – sometimes simply termed a “chiasmus” – uses some elements (words, phrases, motifs, sequences or some formal features) in such a way that the textual unit forms a concentric network. Multiple layers of parallel items build up a structured frame around the centre of the utterance, which becomes stylistically emphasized by it.^[14] Such an arrangement is often used in the Bible and can be found in smaller textual units, e.g. Gen 1;^[15] Gen 2:4–3:25;^[16] Gen 6:9–9:29;^[17] Gen 17;^[18] Deut 5:28 – 6:3;^[19] Ruth 1:16-17, 19-22^[20] as well as in larger compositions, e.g. Gen 18–19;^[21] the whole Abraham-cycle Gen 11:27 – 25:11;^[22] 2 Chron 1:1 – 9:28;^[23] Isa 10:24–12:6.^[24]

The chiasmic form can be used as an effective stylistic tool or as part of the compositional strategy in poetry or in narratives. Broadly speaking, according to Watson, the general function of the chiasmus is to break the monotony of persistent direct parallelism. More specially, chiasmic patterns fall into two main classes: structural and expressive. Structural chiasmic patterns contribute to the overall form of a poem or prose, often providing a key to the writer’s plan. Structural functions of chiasmus are: (a) – to open a stanza or poem; (b) – to close a stanza or poem; (c) – to link components of a poem; (d) – to indicate the midpoint of a poem. “Expressive chiasmus” (or pragmatic chiasmus) is a rather vague term adopted to cover what is in effect

non-structural chiasmus, where the device is used to achieve a certain effect or to heighten an effect already present in the meaning of the words. Expressive functions of chiasmus

are to express: (a) – merismus; (b) – reversal of existing state; (c) – emphatic negation or prohibition; (d) – strong contrast or antithesis; (e) – other functions.^[25]

2.1 The Concentric Structure of the Exodus-Version and Its Semantics

Exodus 20:8-11	Deuteronomy 5:12-15
<p>C</p> <p>8a Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy.</p>	<p>C</p> <p>12a Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, b as the LORD your God has commanded you.</p>
<p>B</p> <p>9a SIX DAYS YOU SHALL LABOR b AND DO ALL YOUR WORK, 10a but the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD your God.</p>	<p>B</p> <p>13a SIX DAYS YOU SHALL LABOR b AND DO ALL YOUR WORK, 14a but the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD your God.</p>
<p>A</p> <p>b On it you shall not do any work, c neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, d nor your animals, e nor any foreigner residing in your towns.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>b On it you shall not do any work, c neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, d nor your ox, your donkey or any of your animals, e nor any foreigner residing in your towns, f so that your male and female servants may rest, as you do.</p>
<p>B'</p> <p>11a For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, b but he rested on the seventh day.</p>	<p>B'</p> <p>15a Remember b that you were slaves in Egypt c but the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm.</p>
<p>C'</p> <p>c Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day d and made it holy.</p>	<p>C'</p> <p>d Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.</p>

As far as the Sabbath Commandment is concerned, the palistrophic or concentric composition is quite obvious in the Exodus-version.^[26] We offer in the table above the English text of the two versions of the Sabbath Commandment, highlighting the

different parts of the commands already described above (section 1).

In the Exodus version of the first and last sequences (v. 8+11c-d; marked as C+C'), the phrase שַׁבָּת הַשְּׁמִינִי (the *Sabbath-day*) and the piel verb שָׁמַרְתָּ (to *make / to keep holy*) represent

the outer thematic frame of the composition (an *inclusio* formed by the motif-words). In simple terms, the first and the last sentence state what the commandment is about: to make the Sabbath holy.

Both the second and the fourth sequences (v. 9a-10a+11a-b; marked as B+B') use the antithetical polarity of "the six days" in contrast to the "seventh day" (*verbatim* in both sequences יום השביעי ~ ששת ימים [seventh day ~ the six days]). In addition, the verbs used in these sequences also show some correlation. "To make" (עשה) is used in a similar sense in the first sentence of both parts. The motif-words of the second sentences are not identical, but both of them – the noun שַׁבָּת (*Sabbath*) in v. 10a and the verb נָח (to rest) in v. 11b – belong here to the same semantic group; both are also related to the same subject, namely to the name of the LORD. In addition, the sequence B' (v. 11a-b) contains the inner chiasmus that is evident not only between "the six days" and "seventh day" (ששת ימים ~ יום השביעי) but also between the two verbs, which have the LORD as their subject: "he made" and "he rested" (עָשָׂה ~ וַיָּנַח).

The third sequence – a single, unparallelled sentence (v. 10b-e; marked as A) – forms the center of the concentric or palistropic composition. Because of this core position and because of the standard shape of the apodictic law formula, this utterance may be considered the core statement of the Sabbath Commandment as a whole (cf. Lev 23:3; Jer 17:24). This

means, consequently, that the often-discussed problem of the positive formulation of the Sabbath Commandment^[27] is dissolved; if the main sentence of this commandment is not the first, but the central clause, it corresponds perfectly by its positive formulation with the other commandments of the Decalogue. In sum: the concentric or palistropic arrangement of the Exodus-version can be presented as a regular concentric structure, marked as a C-B-A-B'-C' hierarchy. The version contains a rhetorical device, a large-scale chiasmus of five strophes (20:8/20:9a-10a/20:10b-e/20:11a-b/20:11c-d). The central utterance is: לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כְּלִמְלָאָה (you shall not do any work; v. 10b). The central part (A) contains the chief thesis (a single, unparallelled sentence). The central strophe may be chiasmic. In other words, the structural function of the large-scale chiasmus (built of 5 strophes) in the Exodus version is to indicate the midpoint of an utterance about the Sabbath day. The midpoint is the chief thesis of the commandment or its climax. The other parts of the chiasmus only emphasize the prohibition of the work on the Sabbath day. The parts B+B' express the definition of the Sabbath-day and the reason why it should be kept. These two parts (B+B') represent the inner frame, while the parts C+C' form the outer frame. Part C introduces the topic of "keeping holy ... the Sabbath-day" and the parallel part C' closes the text unit with the same words. Moreover, in parts C+B (and A), focus is on the person addressed ("you"); in the last two parts (B'+C') the Lord himself is in focus as their subject.

2.2 The Concentric Structure of the Deuteronomy-version and its Semantics

The Deuteronomy-version can be described in a similar way.^[28] The palistrophic features of its composition are not so obvious, however, especially in the inner frame (B+B'). The outer frame (C+C'), which has the function of introducing and concluding the subject matter, is also focused on the chief motif-word אַת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת (*the day of Sabbath*). Moreover, in both places this phrase is connected with an infinitive construction expressing the intention (לְקַדְּשׁוֹ *to make it holy*, v. 12a / לְעֹשׂוֹת *to observe it*, v. 15d). In addition, a typically deuteronomic phrase כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ (*as the LORD your God has commanded you*; vv. 12b, 15d) is used, which serves as a retrospective argument and explanation of the command.^[29] This means that in these sequences the palistrophic correspondence and concentric structure are even stronger than in the Exodus-version. The inner frame is constructed quite differently in both its parts (B+B'). Nevertheless, even here some phrasal and thematic correspondences can be found. The first is in the relationship between the instruction תַּעֲבֹדָה (you shall labor; v. 13a) and the argument עָבַדְתָּ הָיִיתָ ([remember that] you were a slave; v. 15b). More apparent is the double occurrence of the typical divine title in the book of Deuteronomy יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ (*the LORD your God*), which is used not only in this inner frame but also in the outer, thereby connecting the authority behind the given command (vv. 12d+15d), and bracketing the liberation act of exodus (v. 15c) and the relational content of the

Sabbath יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שָׁבַת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ (*the seventh day is a Sabbath for the LORD your God* v. 14a). Another corresponding feature is the adversative logic of the argument; in both sequences a speaking contrast is expressed by the *waw* between the human and the divine domain: “six days you shall labor ... , BUT the seventh day is a Sabbath for the LORD your God” (v. 13a-14a) and “you were a slave in Egypt, BUT the LORD your God brought you out of there” (v. 15b.c).

When it comes to the central sequence (v. 14b-f, part A) the same may be said as in the case of the Exodus-version. The only slight difference – the partially extended enumeration of the subjects addressed – does not alter anything in the palistrophic structure. However, it is worth considering this slight divergence. How should the difference between the two versions be understood? Why is it that the Deuteronomy version makes special mention of “your ox and your donkey” but the Exodus-version mentions only the general term וּבְהֵמָתֶךָ (*nor your animals*). In analysing the formal features of the text we should look at the effects or interrelations this alteration could produce in the respective versions of the text. The difference concerns the part of the text which enumerates the subjects addressed by the commandment; not only “you” yourself, but all your house with every one of its members is involved (the whole of your *bayit*-community, i.e. people and the animals, the family members, the slaves, both male and female, and the sojourners). The appositional chain describes

the whole of a household – in other words: the elementary unit of the community of Israel, which is subject to the Law. Actually, this is the only command of the Decalogue that points directly not only to the addressed person in the singular but also to the related community. All members of the appositional sequence are provided with the suffix “your.” Fascinatingly, in this sequence the words suffixed (i.e. marked) with the pronoun “your” occur just twelve times in Deuteronomy and seven times in Exodus. These numbers carry symbolic meaning in biblical ecclesiology. For the Deuteronomists “twelve” stands for the complete identity of Israel, the perfect community of her tribes, the whole of the covenant people. For the priestly writers, on the other hand, the number “seven” represents holy perfection, faultless holiness, the specific structure of the divine domain; in the most immediate context the Sabbath is identified as “the seventh day.” The significant numbers of pronominal suffixes in these contexts are remarkable, especially in light of the highly elaborated texture of the two Decalogue versions.

3. Two Concluding Notes

The primary purpose of this paper has been to underline the concentric arrangement of both versions of the Sabbath Commandment, which are the largest textual units in the Exodus and Deuteronomy Decalogues. The large-scale chiasmus of the two Sabbath Commandments is

based on the pivot pattern, where the central clauses (Exod 20:10b-e and Deut 5:14b-f) are structurally and pragmatically fundamental. The greatest advantage of this approach is the double consequence of declaring the central sentence to be the core and basic utterance of the whole commandment: (a) there is no strong tension with other commandments in the Decalogue concerning the positive or negative formulations, because the main clause fits the genre. (b) The five sequences of the Sabbath Commandment form in both versions a well-functioning literary whole. The core of the utterance (the main clause of part A), the basic demand, is identical; given differences concern the accompanying arguments, the expression of purpose or retrospective hints. Simply put, the core is identical, while the differences concern the preaching or the rhetoric of the command, providing plausible embedding in the particular (priestly or deuteronomic) contexts.

Secondly, by evaluating the nature and character of the differences between the two versions of the Sabbath Commandment, as well as the similarities and the congruence between them, we arrive – with high probability – at two, at least partially independent, fruits of the course of tradition. Their congruence, as well as the character and nature of their differences, indicates that the two versions are quite similar and interdependent, both being richly textured literary elaborations of the Sabbath Commandment.^[30]

Bibliography

- Alt, Albert. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel I*. München: Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953.
- Beer, Georg. *Exodus*. HAT 3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1939.
- Bush, Frederick W. *Ruth, Esther*. Word Biblical Commentary 9. Dallas: Word, 1996.
- Cassuto, Umberto. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 1-11*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961.
- Childs, Brevard. *The Book of Exodus*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.
- Dillard, Raymond B. *2 Chronicles*. Word Biblical Commentary 15. Dallas: Word, 1987.
- Driver, Samuel R. *The Book of Exodus*. University Press: Cambridge, 1953.
- Dubovský, Peter (ed.). *Genezis. Komentáre k Starému zákonu 1*. Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2008.
- Freedman, David Noel. *The Nine Commandments: Uncovering the Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Gressmann, Hugo. *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. *Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen*. OBO 45. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- _____. "Zum synoptischen Vergleich der Dekalogfassungen: Eine Fortführung des begonnenen Gesprächs". Pages 73-117 in *Vom Sinai zum Horeb*. Edited by Frank-Lothar Hossfeld. Würzburg: Echter, 1989.
- Hostovecký, Miroslav. *Biblická a semitská rétorická analýza. Teoretický a praktický úvod do metódy rétorickej analýzy pre študentov teológie*. Bratislava: RKCMBF UK, 2022.
- Jančovič, Jozef. "Logika Dekalógu: teologické aspekty jeho štruktúry v Dt 5,6-21". Pages 52-70 in *Legislatívne texty Bible*. Edited by Pavol Farkaš. Bratislava-Nitra: Kňazský seminár sv. Gorazda, 2007.
- Johnstone, William. "The Decalogue and the Redaction of the Sinai Pericope in Exodus." *ZAW* 100 (1988): 361-385. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zatw.1988.100.3.361>
- Kaiser, Otto. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: eine Einführung in ihre Ergebnisse und Probleme*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1984.
- Kessler, Martin and Deurloo, Karel A. *A Commentary on Genesis: The Book of Beginnings*. Paulist Press: New York, 2004.
- Langston, Scott M. *Exodus Through the Centuries*. Blackwell Bible Commentaries. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Lohfink, Norbert. *Das Hauptgebot. Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11*. *Analecta Biblica* 20. Roma: PIB 1963.
- Najman, Hindy. "Decalogue." Pages 526-528 in *Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by Daniel Harlow and John Collins. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Otto, Eckart. "Art. Dekalog I., Altes Testament". Pages 626-627 in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 4th ed. Edited by Hans D. Betz et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Perlitt, Lothar. *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 36. Neukirchen: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969.
- _____. "Dekalog: Altes Testament". Pages 408-413 in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie VIII*. Edited by Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1981.
- Schmidt, Werner H. "Mose und der Dekalog". Pages 78-119 in *Eucharisterion: Festschrift Hermann Gunkel*. FRLANT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923.
- Utzschneider, Helmut - Nitsche, Stefan Ark. *Arbeitsbuch literaturwissenschaftliche Bibelauslegung. Eine Methodenlehre zur Exegese des Alten Testaments*. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. "Chiastic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry". On July 5, 2023.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1-33*. Word Biblical Commentary 24. Dallas: Word, 1985.
- Wenham, Gordon. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary 1. Dallas: Word, 1987.
- _____. *Genesis 16-50*. Word Biblical Commentary 2. Dallas: Word, 1994.

- ^[1] The name Decalogue was first used by St. Clement of Alexandria. The naming is based on the translation of the Hebrew term into Greek in Exod 34:28. In Scripture the Decalogue is designated as testimony (Exod 31:18; 32:15; 34:29) and as covenant (Deut 4:13; 9:9); as law and commandments (Exod 24:12).
- ^[2] David Noel Freedman, *The Nine Commandments: Uncovering the Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- ^[3] Brevard Childs, *The Book of Exodus, Old Testament Library* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 397.
- ^[4] Several answers have been offered to the question about the original version of the Decalogue. Earlier scholars did not hesitate to place the origin of the Ur-Decalogue in the time of Moses, others in the time of the exile or in the post-exilic period, though its beginnings may go back to a Deuteronomistic author. Any exact date of the origin of the Decalogue, or of its later expansion into its current form, is difficult to verify. It is not necessary to incline to a late date of origin, however. (cf. Hugo Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921], 237; Werner H. Schmidt, "Mose und der Dekalog," in *Eucharisterion* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923], 78-119; Samuel R. Driver, *The Book of Exodus* [Cambridge: University Press, 1953], 413-417; Georg Beer, *Exodus, HAT 3* [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1939], 103-104; Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen OBO 45* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982], 281-284; William Johnstone, "The Decalogue and the redaction of the Sinai Pericope in Exodus," *ZAW* 100 [1988]: 361-385).
- ^[5] Cf. Otto Kaiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: eine Einführung in ihre Ergebnisse und Probleme* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1984), 73: "Hauptprobleme der Dekalogforschung sind heute: 1. Die Frage nach seiner Zugehörigkeit zu einer der Pentateuchschichten; 2. das Problem der Rekonstruktion seiner Urform; 3. die Frage nach der Ursprünglichkeit seiner Komposition und 4. nach seinem Sitz im Leben."
- ^[6] Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog*, 33-56; Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, "Zum synoptischen Vergleich der Dekalogfassungen: Eine Fortführung des begonnenen Gesprächs", in *Vom Sinai zum Horeb* edited by Frank-Lothar Hossfeld 73-117, (Würzburg: Echter 1989); short outline in the encyclopedias: Lothar Peritt, "Dekalog: Altes Testament," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie VIII*. (Berlin: de Gruyter 1981), 408-413 and Eckart Otto, "Art. Dekalog I., Altes Testament," in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (4th ed), ed. Hans D. Betz (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 626-627.
- ^[7] Cf. the concentric shape of Decalogue in Deut 5 in Jozef Jančovič, "Logika Dekalógu: teologické aspekty jeho štruktúry v Dt 5,6-21," in *Legislatívne texty Biblie*, ed. Pavol Farkaš (Bratislava-Nitra: Kňazský seminár sv. Gorazda, 2007), 58-62.
- ^[8] Cf. Helmut Utzschneider and Stefan Ark Nitsche, *Arbeitsbuch literaturwissenschaftliche Bibelauslegung. Eine Methodenlehre zur Exegese des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 2001), 237: "Der Dekalog liegt bekanntlich in zwei weitgehend wortgleichen, aber doch auch signifikant unterschiedlichen Fassungen vor (vgl. besonders das jeweilige »Sabbatgebot« ...). Aus Vorgängen der mündlichen Textweitergabe ist Doppelüberlieferung kaum erklärbar. Sehr viel wahrscheinlicher ist, daß eine der beiden Fassungen bei der Abfassung der anderen schriftlich vorlag; dabei kann darüber »gestritten« werden, welcher der Fassungen die Priorität zukommt."
- ^[9] I follow the English text of the New International Version (NIV 2011) with slight modifications.
- ^[10] The questions of the mutual relationship between the two versions, their particular origin and the specific intentions of the variations have been discussed since ancient times (see for example Midrash ShemR 47 or Ibn Ezra in his commentary on the book of Exodus). Already Pseudo-Philo had supplemented some of the Ten Commandments by clarifying the basis of each: all work on the Sabbath is condemned with the exception of praising and glorifying God in the assembly (quoted in Scott M. Langston, *Exodus Through the Centuries, Blackwell Bible Commentaries* [Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006], 187). The Decalogue functions in two different ways in early Judaism. It is incorporated into Jewish liturgies (e.g., in the DSS and the Nash Papyrus) and can also provide a legal framework for the details of Jewish law (e.g., in Philo of Alexandria's essay *On the Decalogue*). Philo of Alexandria composed an entire essay entitled *On the Decalogue*. In it he explains each of the ten utterances or oracles in legal, moral, and philosophical terms. According to Philo, the ten utterances

are actually ten heads or categories of law, under which all the details of the laws may be arranged. The fourth commandment according to the Jewish numbering is to keep holy the seventh day, the Sabbath. Philo claims that this is a day that should be devoted to philosophical contemplation and no work at all should be done on this day. Philo focuses on the reason that one keeps the Sabbath day: God observed it, so human beings must follow God in all things. For Philo the Sabbath day is of universal, not particular significance. Philo reminds his readers that the details are already implicit in the ten heads or categories (i.e., the Decalogue). The example he cites is Passover, which for him is already implied in the fourth commandment to observe the holy Sabbath day (Hindy Najman, "Decalogue," in *Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. Daniel Harlow and John Collins [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 526-528).

- ^[11] The Hebrew word-pair שׁוֹרֶךָ וְחִמְרֶךָ – your ox and your donkey is typical for legislative texts (Exod 21:33; 22:3, 8; 23:4, 12; Deut 5:21; 22:4, 10) and is used also in Isa 1:3; 32:20; Job 1:14; 24:3. Here in Deut 5:14d this typical word-pair completes the number of two previous word-pairs (your son and your daughter, your male or female slave) in the appositional chain to three just like in Deut 5:21 (You shall not set your desire on your neighbor's house or land, his male or female servant, his ox or donkey...).
- ^[12] Peter Dubovský (ed.), *Genezis, Komentáre k Starému zákonu 1* (Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2008), 84-86.
- ^[13] This last clause is a clear paraphrase or rewording of Gen 2:3 (וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת-יְוִם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וַיְקַדְּשׁ אֹתוֹ) then God blessed the seventh day and made it holy).
- ^[14] Cf. Miroslav Hostovecký, *Biblická a semitská rétorická analýza. Teoretický a praktický úvod do metódy rétorickej analýzy pre študentov teológie* (Bratislava: RKCMF UK v BA, 2022).
- ^[15] Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 1-11* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), 42-45.
- ^[16] Jozef Jančovič in Peter Dubovský (ed.), *Genezis, Komentáre k Starému zákonu 1* (Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2008), 170-171.
- ^[17] Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1-15, Word Biblical Commentary 1* (Dallas: Word, 1987), 156-158.
- ^[18] Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 16-50, Word Biblical Commentary 2* (Dallas: Word, 1998), 17.
- ^[19] Norbert Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot. Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11, Analecta Biblica 20* (Roma: PIB, 1963), 67-68.
- ^[20] Frederick W. Bush, *Ruth, Esther, Word Biblical Commentary 9* (Dallas: Word, 1996), 73-77-90.
- ^[21] Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 41.
- ^[22] Martin Kessler and Karel A. Deurloo, *A Commentary on Genesis: The Book of Beginnings* (Paulist Press: New York, 2004), 88-90.
- ^[23] Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles, Word Biblical Commentary 15* (Dallas: Word, 1987), 5-7.
- ^[24] John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1-33, Word Biblical Commentary 24* (Dallas: Word 1985), 154-156.
- ^[25] Cf. Wilfred G. E. Watson, "Chiastic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry" (July 5, 2023 file:///C:/Users/rober/Downloads/Chiastic%20Patterns%20in%20Biblical%20Hebrew%20Poetry).
- ^[26] Cf. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog*, 39.
- ^[27] Albert Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel I* (München: Beck, 1953), 317-320; Werner H. Schmidt, "Mose und der Dekalog", in *Eucharisterion: Festschrift Hermann Gunkel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), 78-119, 27.
- ^[28] Cf. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog*, 38.
- ^[29] *Lectura continua of the book of Deuteronomy after the book of Exodus makes it possible for us to see this phrase as a clear development of the Sabbath command as found in the Exodus version.*
- ^[30] Also Lothar Perlit, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 36* (Neukirchen: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969), 90-96 and Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog*, 57 uniformly claim that the literary formation of the Decalogue originated in the deuteronomic workshop.