

枠組みとしての安息日規定再考  
(出エジプト記 31 章 12節 ~ 17節)

鞭木由行

**ABSTRACT** Yoshiyuki MUCHIKI, “*Reconsideration of the So-called Sabbath Frame in Exodus.*”

The Sabbath commandment occurs four times in Exodus: ①16:22-30, ②20:8-1, ③31:12-17, ④35:2-3, of which the third and the fourth ones have been assumed to constitute a frame around the golden calf episode and/or the tabernacle pericope, because the third and fourth appearances of the Sabbath commandment seem to be out of context in Exodus. For example, recently D. Timmer took up this subject in his Ph.D. dissertation and concluded that these two Sabbath commands are a pair constituting a frame around the golden calf episode theologically as well as literarily. I also had considered them to be a kind of framework closing the tabernacle commandment passage and starting the tabernacle fulfillment passage.

However, as a result of an exegetical reconsideration of each of the passages, I would now conclude that the third and the fourth Sabbath commandments do not constitute a frame, but rather that the third commandment is complementary to the second one. The second commandment, that in the Decalogue, is placed at the beginning of the law section (chap 20-31), and the third one occupies the end of the same section. The fourth commandment is independently related to the tabernacle fulfillment passage. Being given just before the start of the construction, it warns that the Sabbath day must be kept even during the process of the construction of the tabernacle.

The reasons which lead me to these conclusions are as follows: (1) The third and fourth commandments on the Sabbath in chapters 31 and 35 are so different from each other that they seem not to constitute a frame. (2)

The seven divisions of the tabernacle commandment passage are so disproportionate to each other that the division cannot be comparable with the seven days of the creation in Gen 1. (3) An exegetical and comparative study seems to compel the conclusion that the Sabbath commandment in chapter 31 should be compared to that in the Decalogue rather than to that in chapter 35.

First, I have surveyed previous studies on the usage of the prepositional phrase and observed that a similar phenomenon occurred in Egyptian. Then, I have collected Hebrew examples of the phrase and, for the sake of convenience, classified them into three categories according to the conjugation of the verb used with it: (A) Imperfect verb with negative particle  $\text{לֹא}$  for the sense of negative command; (B) Imperfect verb for the positive injunctive sense; and (C) Imperative verb. These variations indicate that it is impossible to explain all usages of this prepositional phrase with one single solution. We must investigate the context of the prepositional phrase to understand the real meaning and function where the phrase occurs. The following usages are observable from the sentences which I collected:

(1) When the prepositional phrase occurs in a negative injunctive like the second commandment, the phrase indicates the importance of the injunction itself, especially in connection with a ban on making idols (A1-A9). This usage is extended to affirmative sentences (B4-8, C-1, C-5, C-10). We may point out a similar usage in Egyptian.

(2) This phrase, in some way or another, emphasises the subject (B-15, C-4, C-6, C-9, C-10), which we may term “centripetal,” “reflexive,” or “contrastive subject focus.”

(3) This phrase is also used as *dativus commodi* (B-9, B-10, C-8).

(4) When this phrase is used with common verbs such as “to take,” “to get,” etc., it plays a complementary role in order to add some meaning to the verb (B-1, B-2, B-11, B-12, C-7).

(5) Lastly, there are idiomatic usages of this prepositional phrase (A-10, B-3, C-2), such as in language about marriage.