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At the outset of this paper I wish to draw attention to its incompleteness and imperfections. Many factors have contributed to this condition, not the least of which was the flooding of our household in the week prior to ETS. The reader will note that there is no formal conclusion. This paper is presented as a work in progress intended to incite its author and its readers to a more extensive study of Leviticus 26 and its eschatological significance.

The Book of Leviticus is not noted for its eschatological content. Its theological focus is on holiness. As the people of God, the Israelites were called to holiness in their worship and in their daily living. Chapters 1--7 present the elements of a sacrificial system providing for an outward manifestation of individual and corporate covenant communion. The chief purpose of the sacrificial system was to exhibit continual covenant fellowship between the people of the covenant and the God of the covenant.

Chapters 8-10 define the priestly ministry. The priests were the caretakers of the covenant relationship exhibited in the sacrificial system. Chapters 11-15 describe the purity Yahweh required of His people in order that surrounding nations might recognize Israel's identification with Him. The covenant community was summoned to a lifestyle distinct from neighboring nations. Chapter 16 reveals that the Day of Atonement provided the community with an annual renewal of the covenant. That day highlighted the sovereign rule of Yahweh over the nation of Israel. The divine Suzerain blessed His covenant people by granting them His continued presence among them (16:16; cf. vv. 1-2).

Chapters 17-24 prescribe in detail the ordinances by which the covenant community was bound. This legislation affected their diet, social relationships, religious leadership, calendar, and center of worship. The calendar (chapter 23) focused on the seventh month with its three major observances (vv. 23-43). Eschatological overtones in the realm of kingship and kingdom were especially prominent in the New Year celebration (also known as the Feast of Trumpets, vv. 23-25).

Chapters 25 and 26 emphasize the monotheistic and sabbatical principles that were the two great supporting pillars of the Sinaitic Covenant (cf. 25:55-26:3 and Exod 20:2-11). Gerstenberger admits that Isaiah 61:1-2 together with Luke 4:16-21 suggests that Leviticus 25 should be read eschatologically. He himself, however, found nothing

eschatological in the Levitical instruction concerning the year of Jubilee.\(^3\) On the other hand, Gordon Wenham correctly connected Christ's quotation of Isaiah 61:1 with Leviticus 25. בְּיַעֲבֵר ("release") in Isaiah 61:1 is the same term employed in Leviticus 25:10.

It seems quite likely, therefore, that the prophetic description of the "acceptable year of the Lord" was partly inspired by the idea of the jubilee year. The messianic age brings liberty to the oppressed and release to the captives....

... The jubilee, then, not only looks back to God's first redemption of his people from Egypt (Lev. 25:38, 55), but forward to the "restitution of all things," "for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (Acts 3:21; 2 Pet. 3:13).\(^4\)

The twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus has been the threefold victim of perpetual neglect: (1) In the synagogue it has been avoided because of its unpleasant subject matter.\(^5\) (2) In commentaries (past and present, Jewish and Christian) it has been given sketchy treatment. (3) In materials dedicated to the concept of covenant in the Old Testament its covenant affinities are rarely discussed. Occasional references, however, demonstrate that some biblical scholars are aware of its significance in the realm of covenantal studies. Thirty-five years ago Delbert Hillers placed this section of the Torah on a par with Deuteronomy 28:

In the first place, the prophets did employ much traditional material in composing their threats of doom. This is not a new idea by any means, but it is worth pointing out that the parallels gathered here fully support it. Secondly, this inherited material in the prophets is related to the Israelite tradition of curses as preserved in Deut 28 and Lev 26.\(^6\)

The many similarities between Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 catapults the former pericope into the same sphere of significance as the latter. Meredith Kline tantalizingly suggested that the curses of Deuteronomy 28 were "anticipated in the promises and threats ... in Leviticus (chap. 26)."\(^7\) Assuming Mosaic authorship for both pericopes, it is perfectly consistent with the composition of the Pentateuch to assume that Leviticus 26 was written prior to Deuteronomy 28. It could be argued, therefore, that the latter passage is an exposition of the former.

Leviticus 26 consists of parenetic revelation given at Sinai on the threshold of Israel's wilderness wanderings. The pericope's relevance is best understood in the light of the apparent tension with the Abrahamic Covenant created by the promulgation of the Mosaic Covenant. After three disturbing apostasies at Sinai, Leviticus 26 explained the relationship between the two covenants and reemphasized the exclusive lordship of

---


Yahweh. The chapter revealed that the Mosaic Covenant had not nullified the eschatological promises of the Abrahamic Covenant. Paul's teaching in Galatians 3:17 was anticipated by Leviticus 26 fifteen centuries earlier.

The blessings and curses in the chapter advance the respective emphases of the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. The blessings are directly related to the Abrahamic Covenant's eschatological promises regarding land and blessing. The cursings represented the Mosaic Covenant's five-stage process designed to produce confession of guilt, humility, and restitution--elements that anticipated the New Covenant and its eschatological elements. The element of restitution involved the sabbatical principle so central to both the Mosaic Covenant and Leviticus 26. Indeed, the sabbatical principle is itself eschatologically significant. The Land-Giver and Exodus-Causer will always be loyal to His covenants and to His covenanted people. He is Lord of both space (the land) and time (the sabbaths). Yahweh's future loyalty and work on behalf of Israel were described by the Old Testament prophets. Along with Deuteronomy 27-28, Leviticus 26 anchored prophetic revelation's concepts of covenant.

Yahweh continues to be presented as the only deity, the sole Lord of all that exists. In particular the Lord remains the God who has created, blessed, sustained and judged Israel depending on whether the people have kept or broken the Sinai covenant.

The covenant principles found in the Law lead the prophets to approve or denounce the chosen nation's activities during their own lifetimes. The covenant blessings and consequences announced in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 27-28 help the prophets assess Israel's past, and these same concepts give them hope that the Lord has not finished with sinful Israel. The God who forgave once can surely do so again, as Deuteronomy 30:1-10 indicates.8

An Outline of Leviticus 26

The following outline represents the contents of this significant chapter. The bulk of this paper's discussion will be in the third major division regarding penalty (26:14-45), especially the consequence of deportation or exile (vv. 27-38) and the contingency for repentance (vv. 39-45).

I. Precept (26:1-2)
   A. Prohibition of Idols (v. 1)
   B. Preservation of Sabbaths and Sanctuary (v. 2)
      1. The Sabbath Observance (v. 2a)
      2. The Sanctuary Reverence (v. 2b)

II. Promise (26:3-13)
   A. The Prerequisite: Obedience: (v. 3)
   B. The Product: Blessing (vv. 4-12)
      1. Productivity (vv. 4-5)
      2. Peace (v. 6)
      3. Power (vv. 7-8)
      4. Population (v. 9)

The Eschatological Significance of Leviticus 26
Barrick, National ETS, November 19, 1999

5. Provision (v. 10)
6. Presence (vv. 11-12)
C. The Premise: Yahweh's Salvation (v. 13)

III. Penalty (26:14-45)
A. The Cause: Disobedience (vv. 14-15)
B. The Consequence: Retribution (vv. 16-38)
1. Debilitation and Defeat (vv. 16-17)
2. Drought (vv. 18-20)
3. Devastation by Wild Beasts (vv. 21-22)
4. Deprivation by Siege (vv. 23-26)
5. Deportation (vv. 27-38)
   a. Introduction (vv. 27-28)
   b. Dehumanization--Cannibalism (v. 29)
   c. Desolation (vv. 30-32)
   d. Dispersion -Exile (v. 33)
   e. Desertion of the Land (vv. 34-38)
      (1) The Sabbath Rest (vv. 34-35)
      (2) The Stricken Remnant (vv. 36-38)
C. The Contingency: Repentance (vv. 39-45)
   1. Repentance: Israel's Acceptance of Retribution (vv. 39-41)
   2. Remembrance: Yahweh's Acceptance of Repentance (v. 42)
   3. Repetition: A Summary Concerning Retribution (v. 43)
   4. Reaffirmation: Yahweh's Promise to the Exiles (vv. 44-45)

Retributive Dispersion/Exile (Lev 26:33)

The emphatic preverbal position of the direct object in the disjunctive clause presents the adversative: "but I shall disperse (גִּלְגַּל Piel) you (כָּכָב לְךָ) among the nations." Dispersion (גִּלְגַּל) is a subject common to this pericope and key sections in Ezekiel (e.g., 5:2, 10, 12; 6:8; 12:14, 15; 20:23). גִּלְגַּל is often employed "in agricultural contexts of the winnowing process (e.g. Ruth 3:2; Isa. 30:24; 41:16)."9 Perhaps this figure points to a remnant by implication (cf. Zech 1:18-21 [Heb. 2:1-4] and 13:8-9).10 At Sinai Yahweh warned Israel about their complacency during the time of their residence in the land. Dispersion would disrupt their complacency.11 The nation's apathy toward Yahweh and His covenants would make them landless again. They would return to the bondage out of which Yahweh had delivered them. Return to bondage would eventually

9 Ibid., 373.
10 In his study of the remnant, Hasel only refers to Leviticus 26 in passing. Summarizing the viewpoint of Othmar Schilling, he writes: "the origin of the prophetic remnant motif is grounded in the sanctions of the law, especially in Lev. 26 and its Deuteronomic parallels." Gerhard F. Hasel, The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah, 3rd ed., Andrews University Monographs: Studies in Religion, vol. 5 (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1980), 26; with reference to Othmar Schilling, "'Rest' in der Prophetie des Alten Testaments" (unpublished Th.D. Inaugural dissertation, Universitat Munster, 1942). Hasel disagrees with Schilling because Schilling had ignored early references in Genesis and had accepted too early a date for Leviticus 26. The author of this paper would agree that the remnant motif is earlier than Leviticus 26, but would argue that the chapter had a significant effect upon the prophetic development of the theology of remnant.
11 Budd, Leviticus, 372.
cure their selective amnesia. Brueggemann's poignant observation applies here: “It is hard enough for landed people to believe land will be lost. It is harder to imagine Yahweh will do it” (cf. Lev 26:32a, 33a).

The goal of the Abrahamic Covenant was to give an inheritance to the people of the covenant in accordance with Yahweh's promise (cf. Gen 12:7; 13:14-17). Exile delays the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promises. Therefore, it could be said that exile itself has eschatological implications. Exile and dispersion indicate that the ultimate fulfillment of the promise is yet future, or eschatological in nature.

“Yea, I shall unsheath (יִתְיְךָּ בְּעֶדֶתָה הָאָדָם הָאֲרוֹם הָאָדָם הָאָדָם הָאֲדָם הָאָדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה הָאֲדָמָה Hiph'il) the sword (בר) behind you (אָדָם Hiph'il).” In all four instances in the Old Testament where the idiom יִתְיְךָּ בְּעֶדֶתָה הָאֲדָם Hiph'il ("unsheath the sword behind") occurs (here; Ezek 5:2, 12; 12:14) it is preceded by the employment of הָאָדָם ("disperse") and it is always a reference to Israel. יִתְיְךָּ בְּעֶדֶתָה הָאֲדָם ("unsheath the sword") is employed in three other passages but always in reference to the judgment of a nation outside Israel (Egypt: Exod 15:9, Ezek 30:11; Tyre: Ezek 28:7). In these occurrences neither הָאָדָם nor הָאֲדָם ("behind") are employed.

The idiom in Leviticus 26:33 is reserved for Yahweh's dealing with Israel. Emptying (יָסֹר הָאֲדָם) His scabbard is an act of hostility. Yahweh will place the sword "behind" Israel for, on the one hand, they would be fleeing, and, on the other hand, the path of return would be blocked by the divine sword. Shades of Eden! As Adam and Eve were prevented reentry to Eden by the flaming sword of the cherubim (Gen 3:24), so Israel would be prevented reentry to Canaan by the avenging covenant sword of Yahweh.

The summation of deportation's effects on the land comes next in 33b: "thus your land shall be (הַיָּדִים הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָם הָאֲדָמָה Hiph'il) for devastation (שָׁמַע הָאוֹר הָאוֹר הָאוֹר הָאוֹר הָאוֹר Hiph'il) and your cities shall be (קֹטָת הָאֲדָמָה Hiph'il) ruins (קֹטָת הָאֲדָמָה)." Yahweh consigns the land and its cities to a state of devastation. This declaration, in its conceptualization and its syntax, corresponds to the earlier statement of divinely confirmed blessing:

and you yourselves shall be my people so that I shall be your God
and your cities shall be ruins thus your land shall be for devastation

The deviations from strict correspondence in these two statements are instructive:

1. The circumlocutions for the possessives "your" (לָכֶם) and "my" (לִי) in 12b emphasize mutual identification in the covenant relationship.
2. The phrase יִתְיְךָּ בְּעֶדֶתָה הָאֲדָם in 33b may be an allusion to Genesis 1:2 (וְיִתְיְךָּ בְּעֶדֶתָה הָאֲדָם "and the earth was empty and void"). Such an allusion potentially serves three purposes:

14 Cf. לֵי in Ezek 28:7 and 30:11, and no preposition in Exod 15:9. The מָלַע of both substantives is clearly assonant, drawing attention to the state of the land.
15 The alternation of the qatal and yiqtol of יָתֶר is characteristic (cf. 12b).
(a) to remind Israel that Yahweh is historically the Lord, the Creator, of all the earth—not just the Giver of the promised land;
(b) to emphasize the totality of the dispersion: the land would be without inhabitants; and,
(c) to imply that the dispersion was but the commencement of something new which Yahweh would do.

The possibility of an allusion to Genesis 1:2 in Leviticus 26:33b is noteworthy for several reasons:
(1) The re-creation or new creation of the earth is a key eschatological theme in apocalyptic Scripture (cf. Isa 65:17; 2 Pet 3:10-12; Rev 21:1). Eschatologically, judgment precedes emptying or emptiness followed by renewal and restoration (cf. Isa 24-26). Eichrodt recognized that "the thought of God's activity as Creator and Giver in the bērit... with the prophets—and even in P [including Leviticus 26] as well—was definitely primary.16
(2) Jeremiah 4:23 employs the very terms of Genesis 1:2 (הֹוָא נָהא, "empty and void") to describe the land of Israel following judgment.17
(3) It is recognized also that removal from the land or "exile is the way to new life in new land."18

The Sabbath Rest (Lev 26:34-35).
The following pattern of correspondences and emphatic logical development occurs in these verses:

Main clauses (a):

Main clauses (b):

17 A significant reference to the "presence" of Yahweh in judgment may be seen in Jer 4:26b if מִמְּעֹת הָיָה ("from the presence of Yahweh") can be interpreted thus (in spite of the bound form מִמְּעֹת cf the next phrase in that context.
Temporal clauses (b):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{all the days of its devastation} \quad - b^1 \\
&\text{while you are in the land of your enemies} \quad - b^2 \\
&\text{all the days of its devastation} \quad - b^1 \\
&\text{while you were dwelling upon it} \quad - b^3
\end{align*}
\]

The schematization of the two verses helps to demonstrate the following points:

1. The triple chiasm and the repetition of \( b^1 \) keep the temporal clauses together in order to emphasize the time factor in these verses--it is about the time of Israel's exile.
2. The repetition of \( tbw \) emphasizes the sabbatical principle.
3. Making \( crx \) the subject of all three main clauses emphasizes the centrality of the land and its relationship to the sovereign decrees of Yahweh.
4. The juxtaposition of \( hcr \) and \( tbw \) demonstrates their theological equivalence. Verse 34b is transitional, employing the epexegetical \( waw \) to join these two terms in the middle member of the construction. While 34a employs \( hcr \) and 35 utilizes only \( tbw \), having made the full transition.

The initial \( z\text{X} \) ("then") of v. 34 sets that verse apart from the preceding context. It serves, as it does sometimes in poetry, "to throw emphasis on a particular feature of the description."\(^{19}\) The emphasis is upon the land's \( r\text{za} \) which is variously translated "enjoy"\(^{20}\) and "make or obtain restitution."\(^{21}\) "Making restitution" could imply that the land shared in the guilt of Israel's failure to observe the sabbatical years. This is unlikely since the context appears to make \( r\text{za} \) practically equivalent to \( tbw \). The more positive concept of "obtaining restitution" might indicate the basis for the land being able to enjoy rest. The land might be depicted as being "pleased" at receiving "its due portion."\(^{22}\) The "due portion" is defined as "its sabbaths." When will this take place? According to the immediate context, "all the days of its devastation" (v. 35). Devastation will bring about a forced sabbatical rest--a rest the land had been denied under Israel's plows:

*Then* the land shall enjoy the restitution of \( (\text{hcr}, \text{Qal } yqtl) \)\(^{23}\) its sabbaths all the days of its devastation while you are in the land of your enemies. *Then* the land shall rest;


\(^{20}\) Cf. ASV, NASB, NIV, Septuagint, Targum Onqelos, Syriac, Latin.


\(^{23}\) The italicized words are supplied in order to bring out the full scope of \( hcr \).
yea, it shall enjoy the restitution of (נִפְסָך), Hiphil qtl\textsuperscript{24} its sabbaths. It shall rest all the days of its devastation on account of your sabbaths in which it did not rest while you were residing upon it (vv. 34-35).

The expulsion of Israel was necessitated by their defilement of the land.\textsuperscript{25} Leviticus appears to focus on Israel's unholy and impure condition as that which led to Israel's ultimate collapse and deportation. The book shares this viewpoint with Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{26} Idolatry and violation of the sabbath (Lev 26:2, 34-35) are specified here as the key areas of disobedience. Of these two, the sabbatical matter receives the greater emphasis in the context of this chapter. Second Chronicles 36:20-21 makes the same observation regarding the cause for the Babylonian exile:

The remnant surviving the sword were deported to Babylon so that they became servants for him [the king of Babylon] and for his sons until the ascendancy of the kingdom of Persia, so that the word of Yahweh through Jeremiah might be fulfilled until the land enjoyed the restitution of (נִפְסָך), Qal qtl\textsuperscript{27} its sabbaths. All the days of its devastation it rested, so that seventy years might be completed.\textsuperscript{27}

The association made by the Chronicler is between the chronological extent of the exile (seventy years) and the theological nature of the exile (the enjoyment of restitution for non-observed sabbatical periods). Any attempt to account for exactly seventy years of violated sabbatical years and/or jubilees would be an exercise in futility. The Scripture is silent about such figuring and there are too many unknown factors\textsuperscript{28} to make an exact accounting feasible.

The Stricken Remnant (Lev 26:36-38).

This section may be divided into two parts: (1) vv. 36-37a, indicated by the third person plural referring to the remnant, and (2) vv. 37b-38, identified by the second person plural referring to the exiles. The disjunctive waw with the accusative casus pendens serves to separate this section from the previous verses. "Those who are left from among you" are the prominent topic:

As for those who are left from among you, I shall bring timidity into their heart in the lands of their enemies. The sound of a driven leaf shall pursue them; yea, they shall flee as though in flight from before the sword and they shall fall without a pursuer--indeed, they shall stumble over each other as though in flight from before the sword except there will be no one pursuing them (vv. 36-37a).

The exiles will be sent into a panic by the mere rustling of leaves. In their paranoia they will strain their ears to catch the slightest sound that might indicate the presence of

\textsuperscript{24} The alternation of the forms of נִפְסָך is characteristic of the elevated style of the pericope.


\textsuperscript{28} E.g., the number of times Israel was obedient in sabbatical observances; and, the exact dates for the Babylonian exile itself.
their enemies. With shattered nerves they will give place to their fears and cowardice. They will flee, only to fall over one another. Not only will this wreak havoc with the trampling of the fallen, it will also add to their unbearable humiliation. Defeated by a non-existent enemy, they fall over their own soldiers in a stampede initiated by a stirring leaf.

Verses 36-37a are marked by the following forms of assonance:

The assonance, conciseness, and the subject matter are reminiscent of the taunt-song best exemplified by Isaiah 14:4, Micah 2:4, and Habakkuk 2:6. These taunt songs exhibit the following characteristics: assonance, conciseness, third person grammar in a second person context, a theme of judgment, an interrogative, and the use of מָלֹא in the introduction. Leviticus 26:36-37a contains all but the last two characteristics.

Turning from the remnant, verses 37b-38 describe the condition of the exiles lest they forget their own dire predicament: "Nor shall there be (הָיְהָ) any resistance (חָצַץ) from you (לַכָּם) before your enemies." There is a very obvious correlation between the last word of 37a (ך, "there shall be no") and the first construction of 37b (ך, "nor shall there be"). It is an example of a carefully worded transition or hinge, flipping from one subject to the next by means of the same concept though employing different terminology.

The result of nonresistance is clear: "so that you shall perish (דָּבָא) among the nations; yea, the land of your enemies shall devour (לָכֶם) you" (v. 38). The message is emphatic. There would be absolutely no escaping the judgment of Yahweh. Perishing (דָּבָא, cf. Deut 28:22, 63) and being devoured (לָכֶם), cf. Num 13:32 and Ezek 36:13-14 where land is the devourer) are parallel concepts as are also the nations (ספִּית

29 One cannot help but be reminded of eschatological passages like Isa 24:17-18, Amos 5:18-20, and Ezek 38:18-23.
31 In Isa 14:4 and Mic 2:4 the interrogative is ("How?") and in Hab 2:6 it is ("How long?").
32 (like , "timidity," in 36a) is a hapax legomenon. Targum Onqelos (תּוֹפָק) and the Syriac Peshitta (pv) both employ the same semitic root (פָּק) as the MT. However, the Targum's term may mean "rising" or "preservation" (Marcus Jastrow, compiler, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, 2 vols. [Brooklyn, N.Y.: P. Shalom Publishing Inc., 1967 reprint], 2:1690) and the Syriac may mean "opposition" (J. Payne Smith, ed., A Compendious Syriac Dictionary [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967 reprint], 495). The Septuagint indicates the ability to stand (ou дιστάσεται, "you shall not be able to resist/stand against") and the Vulgate bears the concept of bringing oneself to resist/oppose (audebit resistere). In the Qumran materials from Cave 1, the equivalent phrase employs ("resistance"-- in the OT; cf. BDB, 765.). 1 QM xiv.8 is the nearest syntactically: ("and there is no resistance from any of their mighty men/warriors"--Eduard Lohse, ed., Die Texte aus Qumran, 2nd ed., revised [Munchen: Kosel-Verlag, 1971], 212-13; cf., also, 1QM xviii.13 and 1 QH v.29). Lohse's translation of (in 1 QM xiv.8 is identical to Elliger's for in Leviticus 26:37b: geben Standhalten ("give resistance/resist"--ibid., 213; Elliger, Leviticus, 362, 377).
and the land of the enemies (אָרֹן יָדֵי הַשֵּׁבָת). It is not the land of Canaan which devours the exiled captives. The infertility of Israel's land (due to devastation) is not intended, either. Nor, for that very fact, could the devouring refer to wars, depopulation, drought, famine, or the chastisements of Yahweh. The context of Leviticus 26:38b refers to physical destruction so clearly that even the concept of spiritual stumbling (becoming entangled in sins) must be ruled out as a viable interpretation. "Their falling under the pressure of the circumstances in which they were placed" is too vague. What, then, is the meaning? The reference is to the vanishing of the exiles. They would be taken from the land Yahweh had given to them, would enter their enemies' land(s), and not return. They would die and be decimated in a strange land (cf Amos 7:17, "but you yourself shall die upon unclean ground [or, in an unclean land, הָעַלְמַת יָדֵי הַשֵּׁבָת"]37). When Yahweh brought them out of exile, they would be fewer in number than when they went into captivity.38 This exile would be unlike the Egyptian bondage in which the nation multiplied greatly (cf Exod 1:7). The entirety of the Abrahamic Covenant is set aside during Israel's exile:

(1) Rather than possessing the land (Gen 12:1; 15:7, 18-21; 17:8), Israel would be dispossessed from the land (Lev 26:33-38).
(2) National greatness (Gen 12:2) would be turned into humiliation, inferiority, and insignificance (Lev 26:29, 32, 36-37; Deut 28:43-44).
(3) Blessing (Gen 12:2; 22:17) would turn to cursing (Lev 26:14-38; Deut 28:15-68).
(4) Instead of being a blessing (Gen 1:2-3; 22:18), Israel would become a curse (Lev 26:32, 36-37a; Deut 28:25, 37).
(6) Success over Israel's enemies (Gen 22:17) would turn to defeat at the hand of their enemies (Lev 26:16-17, 32, 36-38; Deut 28:25, 31, 48, 52, 68).

Promise would be turned to privation. Covenant vengeance consisted of the removal of all privileges and protection together with all attendant prosperity.

37 Cf. the use of ("land") in Amos 7:17 before and after this phrase.
The Contingency: Repentance (Lev 26:39-45)

Divine retribution, according to verses 39-45, has the repentance of Yahweh's covenant people as its ultimate goal (vv. 39-41). Their repentance would allow the covenant relationship to be reinstated or reactivated by Yahweh. The reactivation of the covenant must be founded upon a clear understanding of their relationship to the land, the sabbatical principle, and the recognition of guilt by the transgressors (vv. 42-43). Thus, the land and the people may be restored to a right relationship with Yahweh, Lord of the covenant. Above all else, it must be remembered that Yahweh's covenant promise is sure. He revealed His commitment to restoration in order to reassure His people (vv. 44-45). Yahweh remains loyal to His covenant--even when His covenanted people are disloyal.39

Repentance: Israel's acceptance of retribution (vv. 39-41). The same casus pendens employed in verse 36 is repeated here: "As for those who are left from among you."40 The languishing (ךיהנמ)41 suffered by the guilt-ridden Israelites is emphasized here. This was their condition while in exile. Ezekiel best described both the resulting cry of the people and Yahweh's response:

Now you, O son of man, you say to the house of Israel: "Thus you speak: ‘Our transgressions and our sins are upon us so that we are languishing (ךיהנמ) in them. Therefore, how shall we live?’" Say to them: "’As surely as I live,’ declares Lord Yahweh, ‘I do not delight in the death of the wicked, but rather in the turning (or, repenting) of the wicked from his way so that he lives. Turn (or, Repent)! Turn from (or, Repent of) your ways, 0 wicked ones! Yea, why will you die, 0 house of Israel?’" (Ezek 33:10-11)42

Therefore, Leviticus 26:39a says of the remnant of Israel, "they shall languish because of their guilt (ךיהנמ) in the lands of your enemies." While in exile, the disobedient nation would suffer terribly in exile: "Yea, they also (ךיהנמ) shall languish (ךיהנמ) because of the guilt (ךיהנמ) of their fathers which shall be with them" (39b). By moving the verb (ךיהנמ) from the first word in its clause (39a) to the last word in its clause (39b), an inclusio brings emphasis upon the concept of languishing. "They will ... fester and decay

39 Cf. a similar concept in 2 Tim 2:13.
40 In v. 36 מִקְיָם ("those who remained") is an accusative casus pendens (i.e., an accusative absolute) serving to isolate and give marked prominence to the object of the sentence. Cf. GKC § 143c.
41 "Many will perish in a foreign land. Others will ךיהנמ, ‘languish away,’ slowly in the land of their enemies. ךיהנמ means ‘fester’ of wounds (Ps 38:6[5]). The noun of this root ךיהנמ means ‘rot’ (Isa 3:24; 5:24; BDB 596-97). In Zech 14:12 it describes the wasting away of the body, the flesh, the eyes, and the tongue. Here it pictures the slow but steady erosion of people's lives as they eke out a miserable existence in a foreign land (cf. Ezek 4:17; 24:23; 33:10)"--Hartley, Leviticus, 468.
43 Plural of intensity.
44 I.e., the guilt. Cf. Keil and Delitzsch, Pentateuch, 2:477. The third masculine plural is in agreement with the plural of נוּדָה, which is irregular and takes a feminine ending in the plural.
45 Supplied in agreement with the time element of the main verb in the context.
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as a generation, just as their fathers did. In 39b the preverbal adverbial phrases draw attention to themselves: "because of their fathers' guilt ... with them." Rashi's explanation for this concept is that "it means that the guilt of their fathers will be with them as those who are holding fast to the practice of their fathers." Various theologians offer the explanation that corporate guilt (i.e., the concept of it) was rigid in Israel's early history. In fact, corporate guilt was so rigidly maintained that the responsibility of the individual was ignored until the exile during which it was demonstrated that Yahweh was concerned more about the individual's guilt. This change in theology was to have come about by experience and by the writings of the prophets. Usually, therefore, Ezekiel 18 is praised as new light for Israel since it teaches individual responsibility.

Although their ancestral guilt had contributed to the reality of exile, 39a clearly establishes (prior to the mention of corporate guilt) that Israel would be subject to its own, current guilt. In other words, the generation of Israelites facing the day of retribution was also guilty. This may not identify the individual per se, but it does distinguish the guilt of separate generations. This same principle of distinguishing guilt also applies to the concept of individual guilt.

In Ezekiel's day and in Moses' day, the way out of the entrapment was repentance (בわかנ, Ezek 33:11) or confession (ד"ה, Hitpa'el, Lev 26:40a) of personal and corporate guilt: "if they confess (את) their guilt (את) and the guilt (את) of their fathers" (40a). The order is significant. Even though corporate guilt had brought about their languishing in the awareness of the "specter of an irreversible destiny," Yahweh replied that personal guilt required attention first. The now-generation's guilt, as opposed to the past-generation's guilt, must be admitted if the repentance was to be genuine. Such a concept of personal guilt does not require a post-exilic date for Leviticus 26, any more than the emphasis on corporate guilt in Daniel 9:1-19 would require a Mosaic date for the composition of that pericope.

Corporate guilt cease to be a problem to the individual who has confessed his own guilt. Corporate guilt is not a straight jacket or a bottomless pit. Escape from it is the same as for personal guilt: repentance. It is not a destiny. It is a lesson. It is a lesson in the history of the faith (or, lack of faith). The covenant not only brings blessing to Abraham's descendants, it can also bring cursing, depending on each generation's personal obedience or disobedience. Each generation has the same opportunity to rid itself of a sordid history of disloyalty to the divine covenant. Each has the opportunity to be personally loyal to the Lord of the covenant.

From 40b through 41b a parenthesis is encountered which serves to explain the nature of the guilt and the reason for the nation thus burdened: "because of their being unfaithful to me" and also because they walked in opposition to the...
me (‘הליך ל Pháp תְּבֵּרָה טַבּוּרָה) and I brought them into the land of their enemies" (40b-41b). The only new terminology or concept presented in this parenthesis is מַעַל, which may be translated "act unfaithfully."

It was employed of sacrilege in the case of Achan (Josh 7:1; cf. 22:20). It was also used of the breach of vows (oaths or covenants; cf. Ezek 17:20; Num 5:12). This latter concept appears to be that of Leviticus 26:40b, which deals with covenant treason. But such a concept is also found in its employment in Ezekiel 14:13, 15:8, 20:27, and Daniel 9:7. All those contexts are similar to Leviticus 26 in both contents and concepts.55

The protasis begun in 40a (לַחֲמָנוּה, "if they confess") is resumed here by means of a dual particle construction (זָא אִי) containing the conditional אֵי ("if/whether") together with the temporal זָא ("then"): "If then their uncircumcised heart (לַכְּבָּא יֶנְשִׁיר) is humbled (לְנֵנָה *לְנֵנָה) and then (זָא) they make restitution (זָא עַל יָמִּית) for their guilt (בַּעַל יָמִּית)" (41cd). The temporal reference comes after the exile and at the time of their confession of guilt. This is the result of Yahweh's working in their heart (cf. v. 36a) while they are in exile. Exile would strip the nation of all pretense of being spiritual. Exile would be the irrefutable evidence that they were displeasing to Yahweh.

The covenant Lord demands heart-consecration which reflected the fulfillment of the consecration sworn in the circumcision oath. Circumcision is an oath-rite. To be uncircumcised would be to place oneself outside the juridical authority of Yahweh and a refusal to consign oneself to the ordeal of the Lord's judgment for the final verdict on one's life-eternal weal or woe.56

Israel's spiritual condition would be that of an uncircumcised heart (cf. Jer 9:25; Ezek 44:6-9; see, also, Jer 4:4). This would be the nation's condition while living in exile among uncircumcised nations who are outside the covenant (cf. Ezek 44:7). Yahweh was, in effect, declaring to the nation: "If you want to live like the uncovenanted nations, then live among them!" Exile was a fitting and just punishment.

The confession of guilt (40a) must be sincere. There is no room for pride. The humbling of the nation meant that they would no longer be self-reliant, but rather, trusting Yahweh. מַעַל ("humble") occurs 36 times in the Old Testament (19 of which are preceding noun. Note the employment of qatal in the relative clause. The emphasis of the expression could be rendered, "being treasonously unfaithful."

52 The qatal may have been maintained as a fixed form for this particular phrase. Cf. vv. 23, 24, 27, 28. See below, fn 34.

53 The only occurrence of this idiom with yiqtol. It is particularly significant since there is no waw involved either here or in the immediately preceding employment of the phrase in 40b, which uses qatal. When 41a is compared to 24a, it is clear that prepositive מַעַל מַעַל is responsible for the yiqtol (with qatal in 24a it was postpositive).


55 Cf. Dan 9:4-5 (confession, covenant, commandments, guilt, unfaithfulness), 11-14 (Deuteronomistic Covenant), 15 (exodus history = covenant formula), 16 (guilt of the fathers).

18 times (14 in Chronicles, 3 in Kings, and Lev 26:41c).\(^{57}\) The employment of חטא in the spiritual sense is always in a context of an invasion of the land by Israel's enemies. Such invasions were in all cases the chastisement of Israel for sinful pride or idolatry. The nations, therefore, would be the instrument of humiliation for disobedient Israel.

The last phrase of verse 41 is the most difficult theologically. The phrase מ加快发展 ("make restitution for guilt") occurs only three times in the Old Testament (here, v. 43, and Isa 40:2). Wenham interprets the phrase in Leviticus 26:41 as meaning that Israel would "accept (the punishment for) the guilt."\(^{58}\) Keil and Delitzsch, regarding the same reference, say that Israel "will take pleasure, rejoice in their misdeeds, i.e. in the consequences and results of them."\(^{59}\) In other words, Israel would rejoice that God was just in awarding what was deserved. However, Delitzsch elsewhere (regarding Isa 40:2) distinguishes between "a satisfactory reception" and "a satisfactory payment."\(^{60}\) He interprets Isaiah 40:2 in the latter sense. Edward J. Young takes the phrase in Isaiah 40:2 as a reference to the acceptance of "a sacrifice sufficient to atone for the iniquity."\(^{61}\) He further indicates that such a sacrifice is "more fully revealed in the fifty-third chapter of the book."\(^{62}\)

Young's view, therefore, is messianic in scope. He makes the concept in the phrase one of absolute soteriology wherein the only acceptable restitution for guilt must be made by God Himself in the person of Christ. It would be accurate to say that redemption or freedom from guilt is not the work of Israel, it is the work of Yahweh (cf. Isa 43:22-28).\(^{63}\) However, the phrase is not a statement of soteriological redemption. It is a statement of federal consequence. Conversion or repentance must be manifested.\(^{64}\) Conversion must demonstrate a turning away from sin. Conversion focuses on concrete commands, prescriptions, and rights, contempt for which had called down all the disasters of the past, and the strict observances of which was therefore essential in order to prove the seriousness of the new change.\(^{65}\)

The making of restitution for guilt, therefore, would be "an evidence of the repentance and expiation,"\(^{66}\) not the cause. Such evidence of true repentance also


\(^{58}\) Wenham, Leviticus, 332 n 12.

\(^{59}\) Keil and Delitzsch, Pentateuch, 2:478.


\(^{64}\) Cf. the concept of works as the evidence of faith in the epistle of James in the New Testament. The manifestation of conversion ought not to be limited to the active participation in "good works." It must also involve the passive acceptance of the righteous will of God regarding the effects of past sin.


involves the acceptance of the consequences of sin which are not removed immediately:
"conversion and the necessity of continuing to bear God's punishment are not mutually
exclusive."67 An example of such federal consequences may be seen in the case of
Rehoboam's servitude to Shishak (2 Chron 12:1-12). The leaders of Israel "humbled
themselves" (כנן, as in Lev 26:41c), Yahweh granted them a stay of full execution, but
left the nation in subject to Shishak as a means of teaching the converted leaders the
seriousness of disobedience to Yahweh and the pleasantness of walking in obedience (vv.
6-8, 12). The impact of exile would linger on. No matter when this repentance on the part
of Israel would take place, the remainder of the exile and the land's sabbaths would have
to be fulfilled. Also involved in making restitution for their guilt would be the
commencement of obedience to the demands of the law of Yahweh (e.g., regular

The protasis that is presented in. 40a and 41cd consists of three parts: (1)
acknowledging before Yahweh the breach of covenant (i.e., confession), (2) subjugating
the mind and will (heart) to the God of the covenant (i.e., humility), and (3) obeying the
life-changing commands of the law-giver (i.e., restitution). Thereby the covenant
relationship may be reentered.

Remembrance: Yahweh's acceptance of repentance (v. 42). The apodosis of the
conditional sentence begun with 40a is in a carefully constructed form:

and I shall remember my covenant with Jacob, ָּּוּלְּּוֹנַקְּּוֹהְי ֶּכְּרְּנַקְּיָה   42a
even my covenant with Isaac, ָּּוֵּלְּּוֹנַקְּּוֹהְי ֶּכְּרְּנַקְּיָה   42b
yea, I shall remember my covenant with Abraham, ָּּוֵּלְּּוֹנַקְּּוֹהְי ֶּכְּרְּנַקְּיָה   42c
and I shall remember the land. ָּּוֵּלְּּוֹנַקְּּוֹהְי ֶּכְּרְּנַקְּיָה   42d

The repetition formed by the verb לְכָּל ('remember') sets the tone of the apodosis. Six
occurrences of the first person singular (three times as the subject of לְכָּל and three times
as a pronominal suffix on לְכָּל ("my covenant") indicate that Yahweh Himself will
respond to Israel's repentance. The threefold repetition of לְכָּל confirms (again) the
pericope's covenant context and of Israel's repentance.

In addition to the repetitions, the following observations may be made concerning
this apodosis: (1) The elevated style of 42abc approaches that of a tristich containing
synonymous parallelism.68 (2) לְכָּל opens and closes the section in order to maintain the
emphasis on remembrance.69 "My covenant" is the object of לְכָּל only four times in the

67 Eichrodt, Theology, 2:471. Punishment, in this sense, is not the mediate effect, but the immediate effect
of the sin. Similarly, the New Testament believer, though forgiven by Christ, yet must die physically. His
spiritual (second) death, however, is completely removed.
68 This does not mean that the three proper names are synonymous. Those names are but modifiers of
לְכָּל. The last phrase of v. 42 and the subsequent context confirm that only one covenant is in view. If this
style is not poetic, it certainly is fastidiously developed so that the logical correspondences (parallelisms?)
are undeniable.
69 Note the typical weqatal followed by yiqtol. The absence of לְכָּל in 42b aids the employment of the
inclusion. Rashi indulges in fanciful speculation to explain the absence of לְכָּל in 42b. He explains it on the
basis of the presence of the ashes of Isaac on an altar before God.
Old Testament: Genesis 9:15; Exodus 6:5; and Ezekiel 16:60. In Leviticus 26 the remembrance of the covenant is the opposite of the breach (לעָבֹרנָה, v. 44) of covenant.70

(3) "yea, also/even" in 42bc continues the concept initiated in 42a and is not employed again at the commencement of 42d. This confirms the individual nature of 42d. (4) The names of the patriarchs in 42abc are the reverse of the usual order.71 The order certainly does not indicate comparative worth in an ascending fashion.72 It probably presents a backward look to the original promise to Abraham. The order would serve to confront Israel with the historical foundation of the nation and its covenant relationship to Yahweh. (5) The apodosis is concluded by 42d. It substitutes מָשָּׁה יָמָּה ("the land") for בָּרִי ("my covenant") since the central promise of the covenant was the land. It also utilizes the juxtaposition of these two terms since they are the only truly significant concepts in this context. The patriarchs are not the center of attention. The land, as given by Yahweh, is the focus of the verse. That land was granted by the covenant made with Abraham. (6) Verse 42d also duplicates the yiqtol of עַזָּר at the end of the line (cf. 42c) to maintain the continuity of thought between 42abc and 42d. Therefore, 42d is a concise summary of 42abc.

Repetition: a summary concerning retribution (v. 43). Retribution is not primarily reformatory, curative, or preventative in nature. Retribution is primarily revelatory. The just punishment of the sinner (the covenant breaker) is a clear manifestation of the holiness and righteousness of Yahweh. Verse 43 emphasizes the reason for the retribution involving the land and people of Israel:

Nevertheless,73 the land must be forsaken (בָּזֶף אֶזָּר) by them, so that it might enjoy the restitution of (םָּיָּה) its sabbaths during its desolation (הָמָּחַת) without them.

71 This is a hapax phainomenon in the Old Testament. The triad (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) occurs as follows:

with תֵּרָה: Exod 2:24; Lev 26:42
with תָּרָה: Exod 32:13 (לָשָׁרַע for Jacob); Deut 9:27
with תָּרָה: 2 Kgs 13:23; 1 Chr 16:15-18 = Ps 105:8-11
with שֵׂבֵעַ אֲדֹם ("the land sworn/promised to"): Gen 50:24; Exod 6:8; 32:13; 33:1; Deut 1:8; 6:10; 34:4
with שֵׂבֵעַ אֲדֹם (same as שֵׂבַע אֲדֹם): Num 32:11; Deut 30:20
with שֵׂבַע דֹּר ("the word/promise sworn to"): Deut 9:5
with שֵׂבַע הָעַלְמָה ("sworn to be a people/a god"): Deut 29:12
with אָלָי ("[God of . . . ] appeared"): Exod 3:16; 4:5; 6:3
with שָׁבוּ אֶל ("God of"): Exod 3:6; 15,16; 4:5; 1 Kgs 18:36; 1 Chr 29:18-12 Chr 30:6(where שָׁבוּ אֶל precedes).
73 The disjunctive waw is employed here with the emphasized subject, using the preceding מָשָּׁה יָמָּה (42d) as a springboard.
74 Yiqtol here is interpreted as a jussive.
75 The irregular syncope of the form may be due to an attraction to the preceding word for vocalic assonance: הָשָּׁה (unaccented holem is very minimal in pronunciation) rather than חָשָּׁה. Cf. GKC, 182 (§67y).
However, they themselves must make restitution (אָשָׁנָה, נְאֻנָה) for their guilt (אָשָׁנָה, נְאֻנָה) simply because (נָפָא, נְפָא) they rejected my ordinances and they inwardly [deeply?] despised (נְפָא, נְפָא) by statutes.

The structure of verse 43 (together with the preceding line, 42b) may be represented in the following fashion:77

$\begin{array}{ll}
(1cs) & \text{אָשָׁנָה, נְאֻנָה} \\
& \text{I shall remember} \\
& \text{and} \\
& \text{the land} \\
\hline
(3fs) & \text{מַעֲמַה, בּוּצָב} \\
& \text{by them} \\
& \text{shall be forsaken} \\
& \text{and} \\
& \text{the land} \\
& \text{without its sabbaths} \\
& \text{and it shall enjoy} \\
& \text{them} \\
& \text{during its desolation} \\
\hline
(3mp) & \text{אָשָׁנָה, נְאֻנָה} \\
& \text{for their guilt} \\
& \text{shall and} \\
& \text{they shall make restitution} \\
& \text{simply because} \\
& \text{they rejected my ordinances} \\
\hline
\end{array}$

The following observations may be made concerning this structure:

1. The repetition of the assonance involving fl in the first member of the first four lines emphasizes the main concern of retribution and restoration: the land (fire).
2. The repetition of guttural $+$ $z$ (רֶקֶז, בּוּצָב) serves to heighten the correspondence between the opposites "remember" and "forsake". What Yahweh will remember, Israel will forsake.

76 Cf. Paul Jouon, Grammaire de l’ Hebre Biblique (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1965), 523 (§170f n. 1). This phrase occurs only here, Ezek 13:10, and 36:3. One נָפָא occurs in Ezek 20:16, 24, with a similar context. Its use is emphatic; cf. GKC, §158b.

77 Some of the correspondences are conceptual, but most involve assonance which can be observed only in the Hebrew. The English translation cannot convey all the nuances (especially in the interlinear format).
The third person masculine plurals (מְנַחֶם, מְנַחֶם...מְנַחֶם) bind the first three lines of v. 43 together. Just as 42d and 43a began the same (מְנַחֶם), so 43a and 43b end the same (מְנַחֶם). Then 43c picks up the last concept of 43b (with בְּמַעֲלַת) to maintain the continuity by means of anadiplosis. The logical progression is noteworthy:

forsaken by them --> enjoyed restitution without them
--> nevertheless, the must make restitution

In 43b and 43c the commencing verb is זָכָה. The זָכָה continues the assonance of 42d and 43a. The concept of restitution is a key element in 43bc.

The repetition of nf in the last term of 43c and in the first two terms of 43d binds those lines together by assonance. The concepts presented by the three forms are also related: there is guilt, as is proven by the cause or reason for restitution. In other words, restitution would have to be made because of guilt which existed because of disobedience.

MwAp;na hlAfEGA ytaqo.Hu-tx,v; UsxAmA yFaPAw;miB; produces in reverse order the same phrases found in v. 15: מִשְׁמַרְתָּם, יָגוֹר תַּחְתָּם, יָגוֹר תַּחְתָּם. It is significant that both verbs in 43de are qatal even though they are preceded by their objects. This is the only such example occurring in Leviticus regarding וַחֲרֹד and its verbs. The same observation holds for מְשַׁמֵּר and its verbs: when the noun precedes its verb, the yiqtol is employed; and when it follows its verb, the qatal is utilized (Lev 18:4, 5, 26; 19:37; 20:22; 25:18; 26:15). The only exception is 26:43. The departure from the usual syntax of the pericope must be for the purpose of bringing the concepts forcefully to the mind of the reader. Disobedience is the true and emphatic cause for the need of restitution. There is no question regarding Israel's guilt. There is no doubt that restitution is necessary.

The first person singular is the subject of the verb in 42d. Every line of verse 43 has some mention of the third person plural (referring to Israel). However, the third feminine singular (referring to the land) is the subject in 43ab, while the third masculine plural (referring to the people of Israel) is the subject in 43cde. Therefore, verse 43 presents emphases concerning the land, responsibility/guilt, restitution, disobedience, and Israel. It is truly a negative picture in contrast to that presented by verse 42. The jussives (43abc), however, provide an element of anticipation and decree. Operation Restitution would be initiated by Yahweh on the basis of His covenant with Abraham. The Mosaic Covenant would have a role in the process by means of the sabbatical stipulations. The Abrahamic Covenant promised a land and a seed to inherit that land. The Mosaic Covenant promised a nation with a special relationship to Yahweh (Exod 19:5-6). As circumcision was instituted as the seal of the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen 17:9-14), so the sabbaths appear to have been the seal of the Mosaic Covenant (cf. Exod 20:8-11; Lev 25; 26:2; Neh 10:28-31; Isa 58:1-14). The emphasis on land in Leviticus 26 belongs to the sphere of the Abrahamic Covenant,
while the emphasis on sabbatical restitution belongs to the sphere of the Mosaic Covenant.  

Eschatological Significance

Covenant

"Covenant" (יהוה) is employed eight times in Leviticus 26 (vv. 9, 15, 25, 42 ter, 44, 45). It always denotes a binding relationship between Yahweh and His people Israel. This relationship provided Israel with a life which had a goal and with a history that had meaning. In all its occurrences in this pericope, "covenant" promotes the concept of the sovereignty of Yahweh, the covenant-giver. In six of the eight uses of the term, the first person singular suffix ("my") is attached (vv. 9, 15, 42 ter, 44). Yahweh Himself is always the antecedent. The unilateral nature of the covenants is implied by this form of reference. Yahweh Himself established the covenants, and He alone. Yahweh's personal intervention in the history of Israel is a central theme of the covenants. Such intervention is not limited to the past--it has its place eschatologically. His lordship is personal and absolute. The covenant lays hold of the people of Israel and demands unconditional surrender to the will of God. Loyalty to the covenant must be more than outward acquiescence, it must be an inward reality. The "uncircumcised heart" (v. 41) is the antithesis of this loyalty:

The covenant Lord demands heart-consecration which reflects the fulfillment of the consecration sworn in the circumcision oath. Circumcision is an oath-rite. To be uncircumcised would be to place oneself outside the juridical authority of Yahweh and a refusal to consign oneself to the ordeal of the Lord's judgment for the final verdict on one's life-eternal weal or woe.

The ultimate salvation of Israel is yet future (cf. Rom 9-11), therefore the covenant has eschatological implications.

The Abrahamic Covenant

Yahweh's covenant with Abraham appears to underlie the references to "covenant" in verses 9, 42, and 44. The theme of a fruitful population is an echo of the Abrahamic Covenant in Genesis 17:6, 7, 19, and 21 (cf, also, Exod 6:4 and Deut 8:18). Verse 9 may be employed as an example of the distinctions made within the passage concerning the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. The Abrahamic Covenant is characterized by the following elements:

1. The theme of promise,
2. emphasis on divine fulfillment, and
3. references to land, prosperity, and blessing and/or cursing.

On the other hand, the Mosaic Covenant is characterized by:

1. the theme of law,

Onqelos evidently interpreted the retribution of v. 43 in the light of the blessings and cursings of the Deuteronomic covenant since he substituted the following phrase for לְעַשֵׂי חַלְחֵל בְרָכָה אֲבֹאָה יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּקֵּשׁ לֵילָה וּבְרָשׁוֹן ("there are cursings instead of blessings distinguished against them").

(2) emphasis on human responsibility, and  
(3) references to sabbath, sanctuary, and divine sovereignty.

Although v. 9 is in the midst of Mosaic Covenant material, it displays Abrahamic vocabulary, phraseology, and theme. Its message is pertinent to that brief span of time immediately following the revelation of the Mosaic Covenant at Mt. Sinai. In effect, the message was: the revelation concerning law is equal in authority to the older revelation concerning promise. In order to receive the promised blessings contained in the Abrahamic Covenant, Israel would have to obey the stipulations of the Mosaic Covenant. In other words, the Mosaic Covenant would be the program by which Israelites would manifest their faith by faith's works (cf. Jas 2:14-26). Yahweh Himself will respond to Israel's repentance when it occurs. When Israel repents and turns back to Yahweh, the Abrahamic Covenant will be reconfirmed or renewed.

The blessings recited in Leviticus 26:4-12 are at least in part a fulfillment of the covenant made with Abraham. Those blessings fall into six categories:

1. productivity (vv. 4-5; cf. Gen 24:35, 27:28; 30:43)  
2. peace (v. 6; cf. Gen 22:17)  
3. power (vv. 7-8; cf. Gen 22:17)  
4. population (v. 9; cf. Gen 12:2; 15:5; 17:6)  
5. provision (v. 10; cf. productivity, above), and  
6. presence (vv. 11-12; cf Gen 17:7, 8).

All these blessings were associated with the land that Israel would receive from Yahweh. They are consistent with various statements and restatements of the Abrahamic Covenant. On the other hand, the covenant curses of Leviticus 26:14-38 are at least in part a removal of the Abrahamic blessings.80

The basis for Yahweh's historical extraction of Israel from Egypt was the Abrahamic Covenant (cf. Gen 15:13, 14). While the nation resided at Mt. Sinai, they would remember that covenant as part of their theological heritage. They experienced the beginning of the historical fulfillment of its promises.

The Abrahamic Covenant demonstrated that Israel's national identity was not of their own making. That covenant provided them with the hope of landedness at a time when they were landless. Leviticus 26:1-13 revealed to Israel that the recent covenant given at Mt. Sinai (the Mosaic Covenant) did not nullify the Abrahamic Covenant. The central concept of the Abrahamic Covenant was the land of promise (v. 42). The Mosaic Covenant would not conflict with the landedness promised long before.

Even the phraseology of covenant disloyalty ("uncircumcised heart," v. 41) was a reflection of the impact of the Abrahamic Covenant on the theology and life of Israel. Circumcision was the outward manifestation of inward commitment to the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen 17:9-14). Personal commitment and accountability were implicit even in the unilateral pact that Yahweh made with Abraham while the latter was in a deep sleep (15:12-21). Divine sovereignty and human responsibility are not opposing concepts in the biblical covenants. Indeed, it was because Yahweh was the sovereign Lord that the human vassal must obey Him. Human accountability would be nonexistent (at least, nonbinding) if it were not for the divine character. Yahweh's Lordship as revealed in His covenant with Abraham is not altered by subsequent covenants. Since the sovereignty of

80 See page 10, above.
God is not altered, neither are the promises of His covenant altered or nullified (cf. Gal 3:17).

The continuity of the Abrahamic Covenant throughout the Old Testament in deliverance contexts illustrates the eschatological implication of its presence in Leviticus 26. Arnold Fruchtenbaum demonstrated that this covenant ties the prophetic pronouncements together concerning the redemption of Israel.81

The Sinaitic Covenant

In Leviticus 26 attention is directed to the Mosaic Covenant by the prominence of the immediate historical context at Sinai and the legal nature of some of the terms used in the chapter ("statutes, commandments," v. 3; "commandments, statutes, ordinances," vv. 14-15; "statutes, ordinances, laws," v. 46). The precepts of verses 1-2 have the Mosaic Covenant in view:

- prohibition of idols
- observance of sabbaths, and
- reverence for the sanctuary

Any remaining doubt is removed by the clear statements of verses 15, 45, and 46. This legal emphasis sets the stage for covenant vengeance in verse 25. It also promotes the sense of Yahweh's Lordship which was already present in the Abrahamic Covenant. The covenant at Sinai was based upon the historical deliverance of Israel from Egypt. That deliverance was in accord with the prior covenant (vv. 13, 45). It was intended to identify more narrowly the people of Yahweh. The Abrahamic Covenant's identification of the land of promise was supplemented by the refined definition of the people of promise. Just as the outward seal/sign of the Abrahamic Covenant was circumcision, so the seal/sign of the Sinaitic Covenant was the observance of the sabbaths (cf. Lev 25; 26:2, 34-35, 43). The seal/sign of each covenant affected the realm of the other covenant: the covenant of the land (Abrahamic) was related directly to the people by circumcision, and the covenant of the people (Mosaic) was related directly to the land by the sabbaths.82 Thus the two aspects of these covenants (the land and the people) were bound together. The land was for the people, and the people for the land.

The legislation connected with the Mosaic Covenant encouraged a serious mindset regarding submission to the divine overlord. It also produced humility with reference to the unworthiness of Israel to be the special people of God, the chosen people (cf. Deut 7:6-11). Right behavior by the people of Yahweh was the means of witnessing to the nations. By such behavior Israel participated in the testimony that Yahweh Himself initiated by means of their miraculous deliverance out of Egypt (cf. Lev 26:45). The legislation marked Israel as the people belonging to Yahweh, the Exodus-Causer.

82 A distinction between a covenant of the land and a covenant of the people should not be pressed to an extreme. The Abrahamic Covenant also identified the people of promise, referring to them as the descendants of Abraham. It became clear, however, that some of the descendants of Abraham (through Ishmael) would not be the people of promise. The Mosaic Covenant clarified the situation regarding the identification of the covenant people.
Disobedience to the absolute sovereign of Israel's history would also result in the removal of covenant blessings associated with the Mosaic Covenant. The following aspects of the Mosaic Covenant would be rendered inoperable by the exile:

1. Though previously a people above all the nations (Exod 19:5; Deut 26:18-19), Israel would be abhorred by Yahweh and treated as the tail of all the nations (Lev 26:30; Deut 28:43-44). The future "times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24; Rom 11:25) reflect this curse.83

2. The kingdom of priests (Exod 19:6) would become ceremonially unclean and their sacrifices unacceptable (Lev 26:31).

3. The holy nation of Israel (Exod 19:6) would be burdened with guilt (Lev 26:39) and characterized by a heathenlike uncircumcised heart (v. 41).

4. Israel's history of national deliverance (Exod 19:4) would turn into a history of national exile (Lev 26:33, 38).

Sinai was but the commencement of the relationship between God and Israel. God and the nation must identify with each other if the wilderness years were to lead to the promised land. The apostasies of Sinai84 only served to remind the nation why Yahweh gave them legislation. They needed standards. Without the order those standards would produce, there would be chaos and anarchy. The nation must be prepared for their inheritance, the land. The means of preparation would be instruction, parenesis. Instruction is the primary concept of פָּנַי (v. 46). Leviticus 26's focus is on identification with the covenant deity/suzerain, Yahweh (cf. v. 45).

The Deuteronomic Covenant

The many parallels between Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 27-30 present the reader with a problem of relationship. How is the Palestinian Covenant related to Leviticus 26? The similarities of structure (blessing and cursing), the revelation of the ultimate chastisement for breach of covenant (exile preceded by siege which deteriorates into cannibalism), and a time sphere subsequent to the impartation of the Mosaic Covenant demonstrate a relationship in content. However, similarity is not identity. No third covenant is ratified in Leviticus 26. No third covenant is described in terms of a relationship to the past covenant (Abrahamic) and the present covenant (Mosaic). The

83 Wenham, Leviticus, 333.
84 The golden calf incident provoked the public shattering of the covenant tablets (Exod 32:19). About 3000 died that day (v. 28). Two priests, sons of Aaron, also died at Sinai when they did not follow divine instructions concerning service at the altar (Lev 10:1-2). Later, a man was executed because of his blasphemous appropriation of the name of God (Lev 24:10-23).
connotation of a future covenant may be present; however, that connotation would not have been identified with Deuteronomy 27-30 by those who received Leviticus 26. The former passage was revealed to the new generation of Israelites while they were camped on the plateau of Moab. The latter was revealed to their parents and grandparents while they were still at Mt. Sinai (Lev 26:46). Leviticus 26 may be considered a prophetic preview of the Deuteronomic Covenant only in the sense that the basic theological concepts of the Moab covenant are present in the pericope. However, Leviticus 26 does not specify that covenant per se. Leviticus 26 does not provide a formal prophetic announcement regarding any future covenant.

Revelation is progressive in nature. The seeds of one age become the flowers of yet another age. The seed of the Deuteronomic Covenant is present in Leviticus 26. The blessings and cursings of that chapter were transitional. They prepared Israel for the land while they were at Sinai prior to commencing their wilderness wanderings. Transitional revelation would be expanded and formalized in a covenant upon arrival at the threshold of the land (on the plateau of Moab). The title deed to the land (the Abrahamic Covenant), the constitution for the people of the land (the Mosaic Covenant), and the rights to the riches of the land (the Deuteronomic Covenant) would then provide the nation with all the revelation necessary to live within the land itself.

Land

Every gift to the nation of Israel was also a summons to an obligation before the covenant suzerain, Yahweh. The land grant to Israel involved the people's identification with Yahweh. The Land-Giver was summoning the people to service. The summons was both beneficial and binding. Benefits were conditioned upon obedience to the command of Yahweh. The enslaved nation was delivered from Egypt and became bond slaves belonging to Yahweh (v. 13). The prior bondage differed from the latter in that the latter brought blessing (vv. 2-12). No such rewards accrued as a result of Egyptian bondage. The land grant predated the existence of Israel per se. Abraham received the land grant at the time of his own exodus from Mesopotamia. Israel's national identity was established under Moses at the time their exodus from Egypt. God in His sovereignty controlled the history of the land and the people. "From the roughly 160 cases in which biblical passages speak of Jahweh's giving the land to Israel, more than half contain references to 'the fathers.'" It is significant, therefore that reference is made to "the ancestors" (v. 45) in a context related to the Mosaic Covenant. This establishes a continuity of covenants. Just as Abraham's descendants claimed the Abrahamic Covenant while they were at Mt. Sinai, so, in the future days, an exiled people would repent and claim the covenant made with their ancestors at Sinai. Willingness to identify themselves as Yahweh's people will qualify them for restoration to the land.

The land of promise is depicted as the setting for the fulfillment of both blessings (vv. 4-12) and curses (vv. 14-38). It is noteworthy that the worldwide extension of the Davidic kingdom is described in Psalm 72:16-17 in terms reminiscent of the blessings in Leviticus 26. That would be one indication of the eschatological significance of this

chapter. Another could be seen in the fact that a series of increasingly severe calamities affecting the reputation and the health of the nation of Israel should signal that divine judgment is underway. "Then that nation should know that it was the hand of God, and men should return to Him. This principle was first announced in Leviticus 26:3-33 and used in most of the prophets, especially Amos 4:6-12."88 Reward and retribution could not be fulfilled elsewhere. The landedness of Israel was essential for fulfillment. Israel could not receive landed prosperity without the land. On the other hand, Israel could not be exiled from the land until they had first possessed it.

Interestingly, the land itself was treated as a separate participant in the covenant. It could be the recipient of the restitution of sabbaths that it had been denied (vv. 34-35, 43). It was a land belonging first to Yahweh. As its sovereign Lord, He had authority to grant it to Israel. He presented the title deed to Abraham's descendants. Any intermediate generation who were disloyal to the covenant would be subject to expulsion from the land (vv. 33-44). Yet, the land would remain, kept in store for the future generation who would obey the precepts of Yahweh. The generations may come and go, but the land would abide as the Abrahamic Covenant's material entity. By means of sabbaths Yahweh intended to preserve the fruitfulness of the land for the ultimate possessors (cf. Lev 25). Therefore, disobedience to Yahweh's sabbatical legislation was considered a sin against the land. Even more, it was a sin against future generations since such a breach of the covenant resulted from greed. Such greed would rob the land of its fruitfulness and rob future generations of its provision.

Landedness made it possible for the people to be tempted in the areas of self-sufficiency, idolatry, and sabbath breaking. Such temptations could be resisted by remembering the history of the people and the land. Remembering the covenant deeds of Yahweh would remind the people that the land they enjoyed was an unearned gift. The exiled people, remembering the Lord of the land, would confess their guilt and make restitution (vv. 40-41). Their remembering and acting upon that memory would, in turn, result in Yahweh remembering the land (v. 42). He would then preserve the covenant blessings for His people.

At Mt. Sinai, the land represented hope. In the wilderness, the land represented hope. In the land, when the hope was fulfilled, the land presented the people with a challenge. They were challenged to exercise faith in the God of the covenant. Such faith had not been exhibited by those who apostasized at Sinai and who died in the wilderness.

John Jelinek observes that some theologians note the absence of land as a theme in the New Testament and assume that the Old Testament promises have been displaced. He rightly concludes that "we are not justified in emasculating the OT by the virtues of the NT."89 If language means anything, Israel must yet possess the promised land following their future national repentance.

88 Ibid., 251.
Heilsgeschichte

Heilsgeschichte ("salvation history") was the foundation of the Mosaic Covenant (vv. 13, 45). Yahweh is the God of history. He is the sovereign Lord of time and of place. Divine election and deliverance are the main factors in Israel's history. Nothing that Israel possessed was a result of her own work. Yahweh as Creator and Giver had graciously and mercifully associated Himself with this nation. As the Lord of history, He controls all history. He can move entire nations in order to chastise disobedient Israel and return her to the land in the time of her repentance. The God of history can prepare the nations for receiving the exiled people (cf. Joseph, Gen 50:20). The nations would swallow up the scattered Israelis (Lev 26:33) and would make them vanish (v. 38). Yet, Yahweh would preserve a remnant so that a new history could begin. Israel must trust the God of history who controls all time, places, and nations.

Breach and Preservation of Covenant

Israel might breach (דַּעְתֵּם, vv. 15, 44) the covenant, but Yahweh could not (v. 44). The "uncircumcised heart" (v. 41) of disobedient Israel reflected her disloyalty to the divine covenants. Yahweh could never be disloyal. He is always faithful because He is "Yahweh their God" (v. 44).

Breach of covenant occurred when Israel disobeyed the stipulations of the Mosaic Covenant (v. 15). Idolatry and sabbath breaking, especially, constituted breach of covenant (vv. 1-2). Such an action was willful. It would result in the nullification of blessings associated with the Abrahamic Covenant and identification associated with the Mosaic Covenant. Any infraction of Mosaic legislation was deemed rebellion against the sovereign will of the suzerain-legislator, Yahweh.

Yahweh, however, "remembers" (זָכָה) His covenants. He preserves the covenants. The covenants contained both blessing and cursing. Blessing and cursing were initiated by promise, and implemented by legislation. Promise emphasized divine sovereignty; legislation highlighted human responsibility. When Israel was unfaithful, Yahweh yet remained faithful. The suzerain's faithful preservation of the covenant is in sharp contrast to the vassal's failure to submit. Covenant history confirms both divine dependability and human culpability.

The Abrahamic Covenant was identified as a covenant with roots in the history of Israel. It involved Jacob, and before him, Isaac. Before Isaac, it was granted to Abraham. Verse 42 presented this confirmation of prior history. As the Abrahamic Covenant was preserved (and would continue to be preserved), so also the Mosaic Covenant would be preserved for future generations (v. 45). Yahweh's deeds in history illustrate His faithfulness to preserve the covenant in spite of the failure of one generation to be faithful to it.

Prohibition of Idolatry

It is a serious crime to defy the Creator of the universe and the God of all history. The ultimate reason for the prohibition of idolatry is succinctly expressed in the Selbstvorstellungsformel ("self-introduction formula"): "for I am Yahweh your God."

---

90 See above, 4.
This formula is the key phrase in Leviticus 18-26.\textsuperscript{92} The contrast is self-explanatory. Yahweh's inherent and exclusive authority makes idols worthless, powerless, anthropocentric, and void of any spiritually redeeming value. There is no room for divided loyalties. Yahweh insists upon exclusive lordship in the lives of His people. Awareness of Yahweh's existence, identity, and presence was central to the covenant relationship that Israel enjoyed.

The idolater chooses the way of the uncircumcised nations (cf. v. 41), therefore he will be eaten up by those nations (v. 38) among whom he will be exiled (v. 33). His guilt, his treason, will cause him great anguish (v. 39). The only way to be restored to Yahweh's favor will be by confession, humility, and restitution (vv. 40-41). Idolaters must confess their filthy idolatry. Humility must be produced by the realization that they cannot manipulate Yahweh. Restitution must consist in allowing Yahweh and His land priority in their lives. Only when this occurs will Israel be restored finally and permanently to the land from which they were expelled in A.D. 70.

**Observance of Sabbaths**

"Sabbaths" is plural throughout the pericope (vv. 2, 34-35, 43). The reference is undoubtedly intended to include both weekly sabbaths and annual sabbaths (including the year of jubilee) that are mentioned in the preceding context (chapters 23-25).

Sabbath observance is theologically rich. It specially signified God's dominion over Israel.\textsuperscript{93} In His sovereignty Yahweh established the nation, granted them their land, and claimed His demand upon their time.\textsuperscript{94} The sabbaths were also a means of reminding Israel of their deliverance from bondage.\textsuperscript{95} "Any OT theology must pay attention to the way in which the faith of the OT hears the commandment of its God in its liturgical ordinances."\textsuperscript{96} Israel's liturgical calendar was Yahweh-oriented. Yahweh is the God of time as well as the God of space. The sabbath honored the Lord of time. The Sabbaths taught the Israelites to trust the Lord of all things for their provisions. Lordship was the core of the sabbatical principle. By trusting the Lord to provide for the seventh day, the seventh year, and the forty-ninth and fiftieth years, Israel gave tangible witness to His power and wisdom. He who provided in the wilderness had already proclaimed the sabbatical principle while Israel was still at Mt. Sinai. The instruction for God's people was simple: "Trust me to provide. I am Yahweh. I will not lead you where I cannot care for you." God never demands what man is unable to do. He provides the way of service. He blesses the path of obedience. Sabbath in the OT was more than an expression of the vertical relationship to the Lord of all creation. It was also an expression of concern and care for those who were fellow participants in the covenant (cf. Lev 25).

\textsuperscript{93} Matitiahu Tsevat, "The Basic Meaning of the Biblical Sabbath," *Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1972): 455.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
The sabbatical principle was the test, the seat/sign, of the obedience demanded under the Mosaic Covenant (Exod 33:17-21). The legal covenant represented the legislative authority of Yahweh. The sabbath represented Yahweh's authority over time. It was the legislation of time.

Even the land needed restitution when the time that Yahweh demanded for it was not granted by Israel (Lev 26:34-35, 43). Yahweh is Lord of the land as well as the people. The land was a promised possession in a time-space continuum. Breach of the sabbatical principle regarding the land was evidence of rebellion against the Lord of time and space. The violation of the land by denying its just recompense was a violation of Yahweh's gift of fruitfulness. It was robbery because it denied continued fruitfulness for future generations of Abraham's descendants. The liberty proclaimed in the sabbatical principle was an echo of the Heilsgeschichte. The God of history delivered Israel from servitude in Egypt so that the people would be free from oppression. To deny that freedom was to deny the Lord who brought them out of Egypt (v. 13; cf. 25:38, 42, 55).

**Presence and Sanctuary**

The presence of Yahweh is referred to by means of "presence" (מְגַוַע, v. 17), "walk among you" (מְגַוַע הַמִּגַּוַע, v. 12), "sanctuary" (מְגַוַע, v. 2), and "tabernacle" (מְגַוַע, v. 11). His presence works both weal (vv. 11-12) and woe (v. 17). His presence is both edifice-oriented97 (vv. 2, 11) and people-oriented (vv. 12, 17). His presence is holy (note the employment of the root מְגַוַע "holy" in מְגַוַע, "sanctuary"). The reference to holiness is particularly striking because it is in a context of precepts prohibiting of idolatry and commanding observance of Sabbaths: Yahweh is holy because He is set apart from idols and His presence is distinct from idols. Also, He is holy because sabbatical time is set apart for Him.

The implication of verses 14-45 is that when disobedient Israel is confronted by the punishment-dealing presence of Yahweh, He has ceased to "walk among" them or to tabernacle among them. Indeed, He is pictured as "walking in opposition" to them (vv. 24, 28).

Even though His presence or sanctuary is not with the exiles among the nations (at least not in the same fashion as when they were obedient and in the land), yet Yahweh will preserve His covenant with them (v. 44).

**Promise**

Promise here is being used in a very broad sense of the term. It is being employed to cover both the promise to bless and the promise to curse. It is in the sense of fulfillment or commitment as much as in the sense of hope or expectancy. Promise in Leviticus 26 is identified with the solemn divine self-introduction (Selbstvorstellung) of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (vv. 1, 2, 13, 44, 45; cf v. 42). It is a promise preceding the history of deliverance from Egypt (the Abrahamic Covenant) and the entrance into Canaan (the Mosaic and Palestinian covenants). It is not a reference to something inward and spiritual, but a reference to the tangible aspects of

---

97 By "edifice-oriented" the writer does not mean that Yahweh is edifice-limited. The edifice was merely an accommodation to focus attention upon Yahweh's presence among His people. Cf. Ezek 10:3-19; 11:22-23; 43:1-5.
covenant life: productivity, peace, population, presence, and land. The promise includes a pledge to bless Israel for their loyalty to the covenant and to curse Israel for their disloyalty. Yahweh, the God of their ancestors, promises His own loyalty to His covenant with His people. He has not finished His design for Israel--His promises will yet be fulfilled:

Even Israel's failure, however, would not imperil the purposes of God, for, as New Testament revelation makes clear, the Lord Jesus Christ--the suffering Servant of Isaiah--is in Himself a "new Israel," as is His Body the church. . . . But praise be to God, His promise to Israel is not abrogated--not by Israel's Old Testament disobedience or by the subsequent role of the church. For He will regenerate His ancient people and thus qualify them in ages to come to bring to fruition the grand design for which He had called and elected them (Lev. 26:40-45; Deut. 30:1-30; Jer. 31:27-34; 33:19-26; Ezek. 36:22-38; Rom. 11:25-32). This is the theology of the Pentateuch.98

Blessing and Curse

The blessings and curses of Leviticus 26 are quite similar to those of Deuteronomy 27-28 as well as to those of the Esarhaddon vassal treaties and the Sefire stelas. The similarities involve both formal structure and traditional phraseology and vocabulary. By their very contexts in the biblical materials, the blessings and curses are distinctly covenantal.99 The blessings are directly related to the promised blessings and/or privileges of both the Abrahamic and the Mosaic covenants. Likewise, the curses are directly related to the nullification or removal of those same blessings and/or privileges.100

The blessings and curses do not in themselves indicate the presence of the Deuteronomic Covenant in Leviticus 26.101 Any preview of that covenant in the pericope must maintain a continuity with the two previous covenants. In other words, a third covenant (whether here or in Deuteronomy 27-30) does not nullify the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants.

Obedience and Disobedience

"Obedience to Yahweh, the one God, who delivered Israel out of slavery and is jealous of his own uniqueness, defines the fundamental nature of the OT faith."102 Obedience reflects respect for who and what Yahweh is personally and historically (Lev 26:1-3, 13-15, 39-45). Obedience involves the acceptance of the lordship of Yahweh in one's life in time and space (cf. vv. 2, 34-35, 43). Obedience produces participation in the covenant blessings (v. 9). The precepts reveal the will of God for Israel. The will of man must be yielded to the will of Yahweh in order to be loyal to the covenants (cf v. 41).

100 See above, 5-6, 8-9.
101 See above, 9-10.
102 Zimmerli, Old Testament Theology, 116.
Disobedience is the denial of the identity of Yahweh in history, covenant, and law. It is breach of covenant faith (v. 15). It is acting unfaithfully, disloyally, and treasonously (v. 40). It is blatant opposition to God (vv. 21, 23, 27). It is nonperformance of His commands (v. 14). It involves rejecting His statutes and despising His ordinances (v. 15). It is a matter that is concerned with the inner man (vv. 15, 41, 43; note "soul" and "heart"). Disobedience has frightful consequences. Even cannibalism is not beyond the capability of the disobedient (v. 29). It causes the unacceptability of the sacrifices which were the outward manifestation of faith (v. 31). Disobedience is worthy only of death (vv. 25, 33, 37, 38) and exile (vv. 33, 44). Death is separation from the body; exile is separation from the land.

**Retribution and Chastisement**

The application of the curses/penalties of verses 14-45 are highlighted by two factors: (1) the gradation of the punishments in five stages of severity (vv. 16-17, 18-20, 21-22, 23-26, and 27-38)\(^\text{103}\) and (2) the recurring refrain, "seven times for your sins" (vv. 18, 21, 24, 28). The stages of chastisement are emphasized also by the occurrence of the term "discipline" (τοιά, vv. 18, 23, 28). The entire process, from start to finish, was intended as a means of restoration. However, the primary purpose was not restoration, but the glorification of the covenant God, Yahweh (cf vv. 44, 45).

Retribution may be terminal (cf. vv. 25, 30, 38), but chastisement may result in restoration through repentance (cf. vv. 39-45). Both are involved in Leviticus 26. Divine retribution will come upon those who fail to confess their sins. Chastisement will be administered to those who confess their sins.

In the refrain, "seven times"\(^\text{104}\) implies the sabbatical principle and "for your sins" indicates breach of covenant. "Sin" is also a term applied to breach of covenant in the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon.\(^\text{105}\) Leviticus 26 emphasizes the seal/sign of the Mosaic Covenant, the sabbaths. Since the sabbaths were related to the land (vv. 34-35, 43), the Abrahamic Covenant is at least implied. Yahweh would judge His people for their nonobservance of the sabbaths, for their worship of idols and for the resulting defilement of the people among whom He dwelt (cf. vv. 1-2, 29-3 1). Divine judgment is not a betrayal of the covenants (v. 44). On the contrary, judgment declares that disobedience is sin and that sin in rebellion against the Lord. Eventually, Yahweh's judgments would increase to such an intensity and nature that there would be no doubt that He had exercised His covenant rights to exact retribution from those who defy His authority.

"Many of the horrifying judgments described in Rev. 6ff. find their original setting in the covenant curses of Lev. 26 and Deut. 28."\(^\text{106}\)

---


104 Seven is more than just a symbolic number: "It is an appropriate and evocative number in view of the importance of the seventh in Israelite religion" (Wenham, *Leviticus*, 331). Cf., also, Karl Elliger, *Leviticus*, HAT 1/4 (Tubingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1966), 375: "Natürlich ist 'sieben' eine schematische Steigerungszahl" ("Seven’ is naturally a stylized number of intensity").


Exile

Exile ("scattering among the nations," v. 33) was the ultimate penalty for breach of covenant. It meant removal from the band of promise. The landedness for which the nation had hoped would dissolve into the landlessness which had characterized their sojourn in Egypt. Servitude would once again engulf them. With their "uncircumcised heart" (v. 41) they would be placed among the uncircumcised-those who were outside the covenants. Exile was a living death, a living separation from the land of abundant life. Exile meant removal from the setting in which Israel could experience the blessings of the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. Exile, however, need not be terminal. Exile, landlessness, could be a condition that could give rebirth to hope (vv. 39-45).

Landlessness was not synonymous with divine rejection or abhorrence (v. 44). As at Sinai, and in the wilderness, landlessness presented the people with a goal for life and a meaning for history. The landless ones must cast their cares upon the one who would guide them out of bondage to freedom. Even in the land of their enemies, Yahweh was still their God (v. 44). The covenant relationship per se knows no geographical or political boundaries. Yahweh's loyalty is unaffected by the landedness or the landlessness of His people. He is above the circumstances of history, working for the repentance of His covenanted people so that His covenants might one day be fulfilled completely.

Repentance

The Hebrew word for "repentance" (בֵּית) does not occur in Leviticus 26. However, the concept of repentance is found in a threefold turning of the exiled people to Yahweh:

1. They would confess their guilt and the guilt of their fathers (v. 40), recognizing their personal and corporate culpability.
2. They would humble their "uncircumcised heart" (v. 41), bringing it into subjection to the precepts of Yahweh. Submission to the divine Suzerain is required of a covenanted people. They must submit to Yahweh's lordship. Their submission must not be mere external compliance externally in religious exercises; it must be internal and real.
3. They would make restitution for their guilt (v. 41), accepting the federal consequences of sin. Such restitution is not soteriological redemption. It is the evidence, not the cause, of repentance and expiation.

The impact of sin will be felt until the land has enjoyed its restitution. Exile will continue after repentance until the penalty has been fulfilled. Getting right with God does not insure immediate blessing and a solution to uncomfortable circumstances. It does guarantee a restoration to the covenant relationship whereby promised blessings might be renewed once the land is regained.

Is Israel's repentance a precondition to the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom? Fruchtenbaum responds with a clear affirmative, employing Leviticus 26:40-42 as the first piece of scriptural evidence. The future restoration of Israel is also predicated upon the fulfillment of prophecies concerning a worldwide dispersion. The return from the Babylonian Exile does not fulfill those announcements since the people were restored from but one nation, not from among all nations. Leviticus 26:33 and 39

speak of a scattering among "the nations." Are these references generic--merely referring to exile among Gentiles--or, are these references specifying a universal dispersion?

The restoration of Israel from its worldwide dispersion will depend upon their repentance (cf. Jer 3:11-18; Zech 12:11-10; Hosea 5:13 - 6:3). That this did not take place prior to the return from Babylonian Exile may be seen by the words of Jesus Himself 600 years later:

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, the way a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you were unwilling. Behold, your house is being left to you desolate! For I say to you, from now on you shall not see Me until you say, ‘Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord!’"  

Leviticus 26 and the New Testament

The employment of verses 11-12 in 2 Corinthians 6:16 is the only concrete example of the influence of Leviticus 26 on the revelation contained in the NT. The passage from this pericope was employed in order that Paul might better emphasize the concept of identification with God. It is unfortunate that Wenham did not deal with this NT usage in his commentary. Wenham, however, does observe that the blessings and curses of Leviticus 26 are expressed at least in principle by Christ's teachings in His pre-cross ministry. The chastisement of Israel because of covenant disloyalty was a reality among the Jews of Christ's day. Jesus also spoke of the eschatological reality of that chastisement. Wenham claims that "many of the horrifying judgments described in Rev. 6ff find their original setting in the covenant curses of Lev. 26 and Deut. 28." This is true insofar as they are directly related by the Book of Revelation to the nation of Israel. Application of the covenant blessings and curses to the Gentiles is unwarranted (with the exception of the blessing for all peoples mediated by Abraham's descendants; Gen 12:3). Technically, the covenants were made with Israel alone.

The principles of God's dealings with NT believers by means of reward and/or chastisement are basically the same as the principles by which He dealt with Israel under the covenants. This must not be construed, however, as meaning that the NT saints are under the same covenant relationship as Israel. The similarity is due to the same God, not to the same covenant. The very nature of God demands the federal consequences of sin be exacted from His people in all ages (cf. Gal 6:7-10; 1 Cor 11:30). The same God

---

108 Matt 23:37-39 (NASB); the statement of Israel at the end of this passage is a quotation from Ps 118:26. Paul's quotation of Lev 26:11-12 is paraphrastic. His emphasis was on the concept of identification with God (Lev 26:12b). The apostle's omission of Lev 26:11b is a clue to his intention. That phrase does not serve any purpose in Paul's discussion in the context of 2 Cor 6. Since he would omit Lev 26:11b ("and my soul will not despise you"), he paraphrased 11a ("I will set my dwelling place in your midst"--cf. 2 Cor 6:16, "I will dwell among them"). Having established the concept and the context, Paul proceeded to quote Lev 26:12. Elaborate discussions of conflation of OT texts, "pearl stringing," pre-Pauline usage, and 4Q LXX Lev are made unnecessary by the simple reading of the NT text alongside the MT.

109 Ibid., 329-30, 333-34.

110 Ibid., 334.

111 Cf. the postscript of Lev 26: "These are the statutes and the ordinances and the laws which Yahweh established between himself and the Israelites on Mt. Sinai through Moses" (v. 46). This same exclusivity is expressed in Exod 19:5-6 and Rom 9:4.
provides lessons for believers in every era based upon His historical deeds (cf Rom 15:4; 1 Cor 10:11-13). The same God blesses in tangible ways those who are faithful (cf. 2 Cor 9:6-15). The same God is loyal even in the face of His people's disloyalty (cf. 2 Tim 2:11-13; Phil 1:6). The same God is Lord (cf. 1 Cor 12:3). The same Lord requires confession, humility, and restitution (cf. 1 John 1:9; 1 Pet 5:5-7; Phil 1-25). The same God promises that obedient service will be rewarded (cf. 1 Cor 15:58). The same God demonstrates that the believer has been delivered from bondage into a servitude that is totally unlike the bondage of fear and the curse (cf. Rom 6:12-23; Heb 2:14-15; Acts 26:18; Col 1:12-13).

The Lord who by means of Leviticus 26 revealed to Israel the continued authority and perpetuity of the Abrahamic Covenant after the ratification of the Mosaic Covenant, also confirmed that testimony in Galatians 3:17. NT believers must recognize that the authority of one covenant does not annul the authority of a previous one. Any exceptions are clearly revealed by God (e.g., Heb 7:11-14). The epistle to the Galatian churches teaches that Abrahamic faith in Yahweh was not replaced by law under Moses. Therefore, faith is still binding upon any man's relationship to the God of Abraham.
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Leviticus 26 consists of parenetic revelation given at Sinai on the threshold of Israel's wilderness wanderings. The pericope's relevance is best understood in the light of the apparent tension that the promulgation of the Mosaic Covenant had created with the Abrahamic Covenant. After three disturbing apostasies at Sinai, Leviticus 26 explains the relationship between the two covenants and reemphasizes the exclusive lordship of Yahweh. Although Leviticus 26 antedates Paul's teaching in Galatians 3:17 by fifteen centuries, the same truth is proclaimed: "the Law, which came four hundred and thirty years later, does not invalidate a covenant previously ratified by God, so as to nullify the promise."¹

The respective emphases of both covenants were advanced by the blessings and curses of Leviticus 26. While the blessings were relevant to the Abrahamic Covenant's promises regarding land and blessing, the cursings represented a five-stage process of Mosaic Covenant vengeance.² The purpose of the cursings was to produce confession of guilt, humility, and restitution--elements that may be seen as anticipating either the Deuteronomic (or Palestinian) Covenant or the New Covenant.³ Restitution involved the sabbatical principle, a significant element of the Mosaic Covenant. The sabbatical principle is central to Leviticus 26. Yahweh is Lord of both space (the land) and time (the sabbaths). The Land-Giver and Exodus-Causer will always be loyal to His covenants and to His covenanted people. In addition to its direct links to the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants, Leviticus 26 also has bearing upon the existence of a covenant that Israel entered in Moab. Later prophetic revelation was anchored in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 27-28.

This paper will discuss the inter-covenantal aspects of Leviticus 26 as it relates to the following subject areas: (1) covenant, (2) law, (3) Yahweh, (4) promise, (5) repentance, and, (6) revelation. The parenesis in Leviticus 26 has something to contribute to each of these areas of OT theology.

¹ NASB. All translations in this study are the author's own unless otherwise indicated, as here.
² The five stages are: (1) debilitation and defeat (Lev 26:16-17), (2) drought (vv. 18-20), (3) devastation by wild beasts (vv. 21-22), (4) deprivation by siege (vv. 23-26), and (5) deportation (vv. 27-38).
³ There are a number of similarities between the Deuteronomic Covenant and the New Covenant. See Dennis T. Olson, Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading, Overtures to Biblical Theology (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 126-58 (esp. 153-56).
Covenant

"Covenant" (נְבֵין) is employed eight times in Leviticus 26 (vv. 9, 15, 25, 42 ter, 44, 45). It always denotes a binding relationship of Yahweh to His people Israel. This relationship provided Israel with a life which had a goal and with a history that had meaning. In all its occurrences in this pericope, "covenant" promotes the concept of the sovereignty of Yahweh, the covenant-giver. In six of the eight uses of the term, the first person singular suffix ("my") is attached (vv. 9, 15, 42 ter, 44). Yahweh Himself is always the antecedent. The unilateral nature of the covenants is implied by this form of reference. Yahweh Himself established the covenants, and He alone. Yahweh's personal intervention in the history of Israel is a central theme of the covenants. His lordship is personal and absolute. The covenant lays hold of the people of Israel and demands unconditional surrender to the will of God. Loyalty to the covenant must be more than outward acquiescence, it must be an inward reality. The "uncircumcised heart" (v. 41) is the antithesis of this loyalty:

The covenant Lord demands heart-consecration which reflects the fulfillment of the consecration sworn in the circumcision oath. Circumcision is an oath-rite. To be uncircumcised would be to place oneself outside the juridical authority of Yahweh and a refusal to consign oneself to the ordeal of the Lord's judgment for the final verdict on one's life-eternal weal or woe.4

The Abrahamic Covenant

Yahweh's covenant with Abraham appears to underlie the references to "covenant" in verses 9, 42, and 44. The theme of a fruitful population is an echo of the Abrahamic Covenant in Genesis 17:6, 7, 19, and 21 (cf, also, Exod 6:4 and Deut 8:18). Verse 9 may be employed as an example of the distinctions made within the passage concerning the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. The Abrahamic Covenant is characterized by the following elements: (1) The theme of promise, (2) emphasis on divine fulfillment, and (3) references to land, prosperity, and blessing and/or cursing. On the other hand, the Mosaic Covenant is characterized by: (1) the theme of law, (2) emphasis on human responsibility, and (3) references to sabbath, sanctuary, and divine sovereignty. Although verse 9 is in the midst of Mosaic Covenant material, it displays Abrahamic vocabulary, phraseology, and theme. Its message is pertinent to that brief span of time immediately following the revelation of the Mosaic Covenant at Mt. Sinai. In effect, the message was: the revelation concerning law is equal in authority to the older revelation concerning promise. In order to receive the promised blessings contained in the Abrahamic Covenant, Israel would have to obey the stipulations of the Mosaic Covenant. In other words, the Mosaic Covenant would be the program by which Israelites would manifest their faith by faith's works (cf. Jas 2:14-26).

Each of the three references to "my covenant" in verse 42 is associated with one of the patriarchs:

and I shall remember my covenant with Jacob

even my covenant with Isaac

yea, I shall remember my covenant with Abraham

and I shall remember the land

The triple employment of ברך sets the tone of this section. The first person references indicate that Yahweh Himself will respond to Israel's repentance when it occurs. When Israel repents and turns back to Yahweh, it is the Abrahamic Covenant that will be reconfirmed or renewed. Thus, the blessings and cursings of Leviticus 26 are set against the backdrop of the Abrahamic Covenant. The same covenant may also be in view at verse 44 in Yahweh's promise not to be the one to initiate any breach of the covenant.

The blessings recited in Leviticus 26:4-12 are at least in part a fulfillment of the covenant made with Abraham. Those blessings fall into six categories:

1. productivity (vv. 4-5; cf. Gen 24:35, 27:28; 30:43)
2. peace (v. 6; cf. Gen 22:17)
3. power (vv. 7-8; cf. Gen 22:17)
4. population (v. 9; cf. Gen 12:2; 15:5; 17:6)
5. provision (v. 10; cf. productivity, above), and
6. presence (vv. 11-12; cf. Gen 17:7, 8).

All these blessings were associated with the land that Israel would receive from Yahweh. They are consistent with various statements and restatements of the Abrahamic Covenant.

In addition to the repetitions in verse 42, the following elements should be noted: (1) The elevated style of 42abc is nearly a tristich containing synonymous parallelism. This does not mean that the three men are synonymous. The proper names are but modifiers of ברך. The last phrase of 42 and the subsequent context confirm that only one covenant is being described. (2) ברך forms an inclusion opening and closing the section in order to maintain the emphasis on remembrance. The absence ofברך in 42b helps the inclusio develop. (3) בברך in 42bc continues the concept initiated in 42a. Its absence in 42d confirms the individual nature of that stich. (4) The patriarchal names are the reverse of the triad's usual order (a hapax phainomenon in the OT). The backward look to the original Abrahamic promise served to confront Israel with their covenant relationship to Yahweh. (5) The apodosis (the protasis is in vv. 40-41) is concluded by 42d. The substitution of ברך forברך focuses attention on the central promise of the covenant: the land. The patriarchs are not the center of attention, the land grant is. (6) Verse 42d repeats the yiqtol form ofברך (cf. 42c) in order to maintain the continuity between 42abc and 42d. Therefore, 42d is best understood as a concise summary of 42abc. (Note, also, thatברך in 42d is immediately followed byברך in 43a. This case of contrastive anadiplosis is significant in that the Israelites' forsaking of the land must precede the divine remembering of the land.)
The covenant curses of Leviticus 26:14-38 are at least in part a removal of the Abrahamic blessings. Disobedience on the part of Israel would result in the following changes:

1. Rather than possessing the land (Gen 12:1; 15:7, 18-21; 17:8), Israel would be dispossessed from the land (Lev 26:33-38).
2. National greatness (Gen 12:2) would be turned into humiliation, inferiority, and insignificance (Lev 26:29, 32, 36-37; Deut 28:43-44).
4. Instead of being a blessing (Gen 12:2-3; 22:18), Israel would become a curse (Lev 26:32, 36-37a; Deut 28:25, 37).
6. Success over Israel's enemies (Gen 22:17) would turn to defeat at the hand of their enemies (Lev 26:16-17, 32, 36-38; Deut 28:25, 31, 48, 52, 68).

The basis for Yahweh's historical extraction of Israel from Egypt was the Abrahamic Covenant (cf. Gen 15:13, 14). While the nation resided at Mt. Sinai, they would remember that covenant as part of their theological heritage. They experienced the beginning of the historical fulfillment of its promises.

The Abrahamic Covenant demonstrated that Israel's national identity was, not of their own making. That covenant provided them with the hope of landedness at a time when they were landless. Leviticus 26:1-13 revealed to Israel that the recent covenant given at Mt. Sinai (the Mosaic Covenant) did not nullify the Abrahamic Covenant. The central concept of the Abrahamic Covenant was the land of promise (v. 42). The Mosaic Covenant would not conflict with the landedness promised long before.

Even the phraseology of covenant disloyalty ("uncircumcised heart," v. 41) was a reflection of the impact of the Abrahamic Covenant on the theology and life of Israel. Circumcision was the outward manifestation of inward commitment to the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen 17:9-14). Personal commitment and accountability were implicit even in the unilateral pact that Yahweh made with Abraham while the latter was in a deep sleep (15:12-21). Divine sovereignty and human responsibility are not opposing concepts in the biblical covenants. Indeed, it was because Yahweh was the sovereign Lord that the human vassal must obey Him. Human accountability would be nonexistent (at least, nonbinding) if it were not for the divine character. Yahweh's Lordship as revealed in His covenant with Abraham is not altered by subsequent covenants. Since the sovereignty of God is not altered, neither are the promises of His covenant altered or nullified (cf. Gal 3:17).

Sinaitic Covenant

In Leviticus 26 attention is directed to the Mosaic Covenant by the prominence of the immediate historical context at Sinai and the legal nature of some of the terms used in the chapter ("statutes, commandments," v. 3; "commandments, statutes, ordinances," vv. 14-15; "statutes, ordinances, laws," v. 46). The precepts of verses 1-2 have the Mosaic Covenant in view:

- prohibition of idols
- observance of sabbaths, and
reverence for the sanctuary

Any remaining doubt is removed by the clear statements of verses 15, 45, and 46. This legal emphasis sets the stage for covenant vengeance in verse 25. It also promotes the sense of Yahweh's Lordship which was already present in the Abrahamic Covenant. The covenant at Sinai was based upon the historical deliverance of Israel from Egypt. That deliverance was in accord with the prior covenant (vv. 13, 45). It was intended to identify more narrowly the people of Yahweh. The Abrahamic Covenant's identification of the land of promise was supplemented by the refined definition of the people of promise. Just as the outward seal/sign of the Abrahamic Covenant was circumcision, so the seal/sign of the Sinaitic Covenant was the observance of the sabbaths (cf. Lev 25; 26:2, 34-35, 43). The seal/sign of each covenant affected the realm of the other covenant: the covenant of the land (Abrahamic) was related directly to the people by circumcision, and the covenant of the people (Mosaic) was related directly to the land by the sabbaths. Thus the two aspects of these covenants (the land and the people) were bound together. The land was for the people, and the people for the land.

The legislation connected with the Mosaic Covenant encouraged a serious mindset regarding submission to the divine overlord. It also produced humility with reference to the unworthiness of Israel to be the special people of God, the chosen people (cf. Deut 7:6-11). Right behavior by the people of Yahweh was the means of witnessing to the nations. By such behavior Israel participated in the testimony that Yahweh Himself initiated by means of their miraculous deliverance out of Egypt (cf. Lev 26:45). The legislation marked Israel as the people belonging to Yahweh, the Exodus-Causer. Disobedience to the absolute sovereign of Israel's history would also result in the removal of covenant blessings associated with the Mosaic Covenant. The following aspects of the Mosaic Covenant would be rendered inoperable by the exile:

1. Though previously a people above all the nations (Exod 19:5; Deut 26:18-19), Israel would be abhorred by Yahweh and treated as the tail of all the nations (Lev 26:30; Deut 28:43-44).
2. The kingdom of priests (Exod 19:6) would become ceremonially unclean and their sacrifices unacceptable (Lev 26:31).
3. The holy nation of Israel (Exod 19:6) would be burdened with guilt (Lev 26:39) and characterized by a heathenlike uncircumcised heart (v. 41).
4. Israel's history of national deliverance (Exod 19:4) would turn into a history of national exile (Lev 26:33, 38).

Sinai was but the commencement of the relationship between God and Israel. God and the nation must identify with each other if the wilderness years were to lead to the promised land. The apostasies of Sinai only served to remind the nation why Yahweh

---

6 A distinction between a covenant of the land and a covenant of the people should not be pressed to an extreme. The Abrahamic Covenant also identified the people of promise, referring to them as the descendants of Abraham. It became clear, however, that some of the descendants of Abraham (through Ishmael) would not be the people of promise. The Mosaic Covenant clarified the situation regarding the identification of the covenant people.

7 The golden calf incident provoked the public shattering of the covenant tablets (Exod 32:19). About 3000 died that day (v. 28). Two priests, sons of Aaron, also died at Sinai when they did not follow divine instructions concerning service at the altar (Lev 10:1-2). Later, a man was executed because of his blasphemous appropriation of the name of God (Lev 24:10-23).
gave them legislation. They needed standards. Without the order those standards would produce, there would be chaos and anarchy. The nation must be prepared for their inheritance, the land. The means of preparation would be instruction, parenesis. Instruction is the primary concept of נָפָל (v. 46). Leviticus 26's focus is on identification with the covenant deity/suzerain, Yahweh (cf. v. 45).

**Deuteronomic Covenant**

The many parallels between Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 27-30 present the reader with a problem of relationship. How is the Deuteronomic Covenant related to Leviticus 26? The similarities of structure (blessing and cursing), the revelation of the ultimate chastisement for breach of covenant (exile preceded by siege which deteriorates into cannibalism), and a time sphere subsequent to the impartation of the Mosaic Covenant demonstrate a relationship in content. However, similarity is not identity. No third covenant is ratified in Leviticus 26. No third covenant is described in terms of a relationship to the past covenant (Abrahamic) and the present covenant (Mosaic). The connotation of a future covenant may be present; however, that connotation would not have been identified with Deuteronomy 27-30 by those who received Leviticus 26. The former passage was revealed to the new generation of Israelites while they were camped on the plateau of Moab. The latter was revealed to their parents and grandparents while they were still at Mt. Sinai (Lev 26:46). Leviticus 26 may be considered a prophetic preview of the Deuteronomic Covenant only in the sense that the basic theological concepts of the Moab covenant are present in the pericope. However, Leviticus 26 does not specify that covenant per se. Leviticus 26 does not provide a formal prophetic announcement regarding any future covenant.

Revelation is progressive in nature. The seeds of one age become the flowers of yet another age. The seed of the Deuteronomic Covenant is present in Leviticus 26. The blessings and cursings of that chapter were transitional. They prepared Israel for the land while they were at Sinai prior to commencing their wilderness wanderings. Transitional revelation would be expanded and formalized in a covenant upon arrival at the threshold of the land (on the plateau of Moab). The title deed to the land (the Abrahamic Covenant), the constitution for the people of the land (the Mosaic Covenant), and the rights to the riches of the land (the Deuteronomic Covenant) would then provide the nation with all the revelation necessary to live within the land itself.

---

Land

Every gift to the nation of Israel was also a summons to an obligation before the covenant suzerain, Yahweh. The land grant to Israel involved the people's identification with Yahweh. The Land-Giver was summoning the people to service. The summons was both beneficial and binding. Benefits were conditioned upon obedience to the command of Yahweh. The enslaved nation was delivered from Egypt and became bond slaves belonging to Yahweh (v. 13). The prior bondage differed from the latter in that the latter brought blessing (vv. 2-12). No such rewards accrued as a result of Egyptian bondage.

The land grant predated the existence of Israel per se. Abraham received the land grant at the time of his own exodus from Mesopotamia. Israel's national identity was established under Moses at the time their exodus from Egypt. God in His sovereignty controlled the history of the land and the people. “From the roughly 160 cases in which biblical passages speak of Jahweh's giving the land to Israel, more than half contain references to ‘the fathers.’” It is significant, therefore that reference is made to “the ancestors” (v. 45) in a context related to the Mosaic Covenant. This establishes a continuity of covenants. Just as Abraham's descendants claimed the Abrahamic Covenant while they were at Mt. Sinai, so, in the future days, an exiled people would repent and claim the covenant made with their ancestors at Sinai. Willingness to identify themselves as Yahweh's people will qualify them for restoration to the land.

The land of promise is depicted as the setting for the fulfillment of both blessings (vv. 4-12) and curses (vv. 14-38). Reward and retribution could not be fulfilled elsewhere. The landedness of Israel was essential for fulfillment. Israel could not receive landed prosperity without the land. On the other hand, Israel could not be exiled from the land until they had first possessed it.

Interestingly, the land itself was treated as a separate participant in the covenant. It could be the recipient of the restitution of sabbaths that it had been denied (vv. 34-35, 43). It was a land belonging first to Yahweh. As its sovereign Lord, He had authority to grant it to Israel. He presented the title deed to Abraham's descendants. Any intermediate generation who were disloyal to the covenant would be subject to expulsion from the land (vv. 33-44). Yet, the land would remain, kept in store for the future generation who would obey the precepts of Yahweh. The generations may come and go, but the land would abide as the Abrahamic Covenant's material entity. By means of sabbaths Yahweh intended to preserve the fruitfulness of the land for the ultimate possessors (cf. Lev 25). Therefore, disobedience to Yahweh's sabbatical legislation was considered a sin against the land. Even more, it was a sin against future generations since such a breach of the covenant resulted from greed. Such greed would rob the land of its fruitfulness and rob future generations of its provision.

Landedness made it possible for the people to be tempted in the areas of self-sufficiency, idolatry, and sabbath breaking. Such temptations could be resisted by remembering the history of the people and the land. Remembering the covenant deeds of Yahweh would remind the people that the land they enjoyed was an unearned gift. The exiled people, remembering the Lord of the land, would confess their guilt and make restitution (vv. 40-41). Their remembering and acting upon that memory would, in turn,
result in Yahweh remembering the land (v. 42). He would then preserve the covenant blessings for His people.

At Mt. Sinai, the land represented hope. In the wilderness, the land represented hope. In the land, when the hope was fulfilled, the land presented the people with a challenge. They were challenged to exercise faith in the God of the covenant. Such faith had not been exhibited by those who apostasized at Sinai and who died in the wilderness.

**Heilsgeschichte**

*Heilsgeschichte* ("salvation history") was the foundation of the Mosaic Covenant (vv. 13, 45). Yahweh is the God of history. He is the sovereign Lord of time and of place. Divine election and deliverance are the main factors in Israel's history. Nothing that Israel possessed was a result of her own work. Yahweh as Creator and Giver had graciously and mercifully associated Himself with this nation. As the Lord of history, He controls all history. He can move entire nations in order to chastise disobedient Israel and return her to the land in the time of her repentance. The God of history can prepare the nations for receiving the exiled people (cf. Joseph, Gen 50:20). The nations would swallow up the scattered Israelites (Lev 26:33) and would make them vanish (v. 38). Yet, Yahweh would preserve a remnant so that a new history could begin. Israel must trust the God of history who controls all time, places, and nations.

**Breach and Preservation of Covenant**

Israel might breach ("uncircumcised heart" (v. 41) of disobedient Israel reflected her disloyalty to the divine covenants. Yahweh could never be disloyal. He is always faithful because He is "Yahweh their God" (v. 44).

Breach of covenant occurred when Israel disobeyed the stipulations of the Mosaic Covenant (v. 15). Idolatry and sabbath breaking, especially, constituted breach of covenant (vv. 1-2). Such an action was willful. It would result in the nullification of blessings associated with the Abrahamic Covenant and identification associated with the Mosaic Covenant. Any infraction of Mosaic legislation was deemed rebellion against the sovereign will of the suzerain-legislator, Yahweh.

Yahweh, however, "remembers" ("Yahweh their God") His covenants. He preserves the covenants. The covenants contained both blessing and cursing. Blessing and cursing were initiated by promise, and implemented by legislation. Promise emphasized divine sovereignty; legislation highlighted human responsibility. When Israel was unfaithful, Yahweh yet remained faithful. The suzerain's faithful preservation of the covenant is in sharp contrast to the vassal's failure to submit. Covenant history confirms both divine dependability and human culpability.

The Abrahamic Covenant was identified as a covenant with roots in the history of Israel. It involved Jacob, and before him, Isaac. Before Isaac, it was granted to Abraham. Verse 42 presented this confirmation of prior history. As the Abrahamic Covenant was preserved (and would continue to be preserved), so also the Mosaic Covenant would be preserved for future generations (v. 45). Yahweh's deeds in history illustrate His

---

10 See above, 4.
faithfulness to preserve the covenant in spite of the failure of one generation to be faithful to it.

**Law**

Religious enthusiasm is insufficient for proper participation in the covenant relationship with God. Enthusiasm without identification leads to confusion. Identification produces unity within and recognition from without. At Mt. Sinai, the apostasies of the golden calf, the strange fire, and blasphemy demonstrated what an unguided and unstructured religious fervor can produce. Seeing that the emphasis of divine law is upon Yahweh Himself, any breach of the law is defiance directed against the Law-Giver. The stipulations of law exhibit the nature and personality of the law-giver. The morality of the law is a reflection of Yahweh's morality. Israel's faith is grounded in the precepts of divine law. Divine law identified Yahweh as the Creator of the heavens and earth, the Promise-Giver, the Land-Giver, and the Exodus-Causer. Every statute was a testimony to the election of the people and a witness to their identification with their sovereign Lord.

A variety of terms are employed for law in Leviticus 26: הָקָם ("statute"), מִצְוָה ("commandment"), מַשָּׁמְתִי ("ordinance"), and הָוָה ("law/instruction"). These terms represent the entire law promulgated at Mt. Sinai. The law was to be "kept/preserved" (שָׁמָר) "obeyed" (שָׁמָר), "walked in (ordering the life)" (וָלָד), and "practiced" (נָשָׁר) (cf. vv. 3, 14-15). Therefore, the law did not serve as mere ornamentation. It was Israel's constitution. The nation of Israel derived their identity from their observance of Yahweh's commandments.

The legislation promulgated at Sinai did not contradict the promise given to Abraham. The legal covenant (Mosaic) supplemented the promissory covenant (Abrahamic). The latter did not nullify the former. Mosaic legislation was a means of implementing Yahweh's suzerainty. It reaffirmed His lordship over His people prior to their entry into the land promised to Abraham's descendants.

**Relation to Covenant**

As already observed, law supplemented covenant. Stipulations were a part of the treaty form employed by several cultures in the ancient Near East. Thereby the suzerain could identify himself as the overlord, the one with authority to establish the calendar, ordain boundaries, grant life, or deal out death. Without legislation, authority would not be clarified. Every covenant must have an authority in which it resides, an authority capable of meting out the punishment required for breach of covenant. A covenant is as lasting as its ratifier. A covenant is as wise and moral as its ratifier. The ratifier of the covenants with Abraham and Moses was Yahweh Himself. The covenants are His covenants (cf. "my covenant," vv. 9, 15, 42, 44), and the laws are His laws (cf. first person singular suffixes on terms for law in vv. 3 and 15).

---

11 See above, 7-9, 14-15.
Prohibition of Idolatry

Leviticus 26:1 clearly prohibited all forms of idolatry. The prohibition emphatically identified the true nature of faith in Yahweh. Such faith recognizes the exclusivity of Yahweh's deity and lordship. No idolater can truly worship Yahweh. Yahweh's preeminence as the Creator of heavens and earth makes Him the only true God. Yahweh created and controls all the natural forces of the world. He is the Rain-Giver and the Rain-Withholder (vv. 4, 19). He is the Controller of wild beasts (vv. 6, 22). He is the Controller of the nations (vv. 7-8, 16-17, 33, 38). He knows the heart and its motives (vv. 36, 41). He is the Destroyer of idols and idol worship (v. 30). Idolatry and its attendant rituals in the ancient Near East involved the concept that the divinities were unable to be self-sufficient. In fact, idolaters were cast in the role of manipulators. They sought to manipulate the divinities behind the idols. Not so with Yahweh—Yahweh is controlled by no man. Yahweh controls history, nature, life, death, and man.

According to Leviticus 26, idolatry is powerless/empty; idolatry is man's product (v. 1). Idolatry is blatant, filthy, and deadly (v. 30). It is doomed to destruction and the idolater is destined to die. Idolatry is willful rebellion against the person of Yahweh. It is usurpation of Yahweh's rightful sovereignty. The one engaging in such activities against Yahweh is a covenant breaker, a rebel, an anarchist, and a conspirator. According to the treaties of the ancient Near East it was a capital offense to aid in the usurpation of a throne or to engage in intrigue aimed at supplanting the true heir to the throne.

It is a far more serious crime to defy the Creator of the universe and the God of all history. The ultimate reason for the prohibition of idolatry is succinctly expressed in the Selbstvorstellungsformel ("self-introduction formula"):13 "for I am Yahweh your God." This formula is the key phrase in Leviticus 18-26.14 The contrast is self-explanatory. Yahweh's inherent and exclusive authority makes idols worthless, powerless, anthropocentric, and void of any spiritually redeeming value. There is no room for divided loyalties. Yahweh insists upon exclusive lordship in the lives of His people. Awareness of Yahweh's existence, identity, and presence was central to the covenant relationship that Israel enjoyed.

The idolater chooses the way of the uncircumcised nations (cf. v. 41), therefore he will be eaten up by those nations (v. 38) among whom he will be exiled (v. 33). His guilt, his treason, will cause him great anguish (v. 39). The only way to be restored to Yahweh's favor will be by confession, humility, and restitution (vv. 40-41). Idolaters must confess their filthy idolatry. Humility must be produced by the realization that they

---


cannot manipulate Yahweh. Restitution must consist in allowing Yahweh and His land priority in their lives.

**Observance of Sabbaths**

"Sabbaths" is plural throughout the pericope (vv. 2, 34-35, 43). The reference is undoubtedly intended to include both weekly sabbaths and annual sabbaths (including the year of jubilee) that are mentioned in the preceding context (chapters 23-25).

Sabbath observance is theologically rich. It specially signified God's dominion over Israel. In His sovereignty Yahweh established the nation, granted them their land, and claimed His demand upon their time. The sabbaths were also a means of reminding Israel of their deliverance from bondage. "Any OT theology must pay attention to the way in which the faith of the OT hears the commandment of its God in its liturgical ordinances." Israel's liturgical calendar was Yahweh-oriented. Yahweh is the God of time as well as the God of space. The sabbath honored the Lord of time. The sabbaths taught the Israelites to trust the Lord of all things for their provisions. Lordship was the core of the sabbatical principle. By trusting the Lord to provide for the seventh day, the seventh year, and the forty-ninth and fiftieth years, Israel gave tangible witness to His power and wisdom. He who provided in the wilderness had already proclaimed the sabbatical principle while Israel was still at Mt. Sinai. The instruction for God's people was simple: "Trust me to provide. I am Yahweh. I will not lead you where I cannot care for you." God never demands what man is unable to do. He provides the way of service. He blesses the path of obedience. Sabbath in the OT was more than an expression of the vertical relationship to the Lord of all creation. It was also an expression of concern and care for those who were fellow participants in the covenant (cf. Leviticus 25).

The sabbatical principle was the test, the seal/sign, of the obedience demanded under the Mosaic Covenant (Exod 33:17-21). The legal covenant represented the legislative authority of Yahweh. The sabbath represented Yahweh's authority over time. It was the legislation of time.

Even the land needed restitution when the time that Yahweh demanded for it was not granted by Israel (Lev 26:34-35, 43). Yahweh is Lord of the land as well as the people. The land was a promised possession in a time-space continuum. Breach of the sabbatical principle regarding the land was evidence of rebellion against the Lord of time and space. The violation of the land by denying its just recompense was a violation of Yahweh's gift of fruitfulness. It was robbery because it denied continued fruitfulness for future generations of Abraham's descendants. The liberty proclaimed in the sabbatical principle was an echo of the *Heilsgeschichte*. The God of history delivered Israel from servitude in Egypt so that the people would be free from oppression. To deny that freedom was to deny the Lord who brought them out of Egypt (v. 13; cf. 25:38, 42, 55).

---

16 Ibid.
Yahweh

In Leviticus 26 Yahweh is clearly depicted as God of the covenants. "Yahweh" (יהוה) is employed six times in the pericope (vv. 1, 2, 13, 44, 45, 46). Twice it is used absolutely (vv. 2, 46). Four times it is connected directly with or associated by context with "your/their God" (vv. 1, 13, 44, 45). In four of these occurrences, Yahweh is mentioned in relation to the Mosaic Covenant (vv. 1, 2, 45, 46). In two cases, Yahweh is associated with the Abrahamic Covenant (vv. 13 and 44).

Selbstvorstellungsformel

"Selbstvorstellungsformel" ("self-introduction formula") is one of the devices by which this particular pericope is set off from the surrounding context. It is often mixed with the heilsgeschichtliche Formulierung ("salvation-history formula"). In all cases (vv. 1, 2, 13, 44, 45), it is employed as a conclusion to a section of the pericope. The precepts of verses 1-2, the blessing of verses 3-12, and, also, the penalties of verses 14-45 are all marked by the Selbstvorstellungsformel. The only mention of Yahweh outside either one of these two formulas is in the postscript (v. 46) where Yahweh is the giver of the laws committed to Moses. The dual emphasis on Yahweh's identification in the section concerning precept (vv. 1-2) is an obvious contrast to the idolatry forbidden there.

Yahweh is the covenant name of the Covenant-Giver (cf. Exod 3:13-18; also, Gen 12:1, 4; 15:1-8); Exod 20:2, 7). "I am Yahweh" is the divine seal on the covenants involved in Leviticus 26. Covenant preservation is dependent upon Yahweh's identity (vv. 44-45). Yahweh is the author of the precepts (v. 46; cf. vv. 1-2), the author of the history (vv. 13, 45), and the author of the covenant (v. 44). His authority is absolute. His covenants are dependable. He is the author of both the blessing and the curses, the reward and the retribution.

Relation to Covenant

Yahweh's relationship to the covenants in Leviticus 26 is established by the following: (1) the Selbstvorstellungsformel, (2) the heilsgeschichtliche Formulierung, (3) the attribution of the source of the laws at Sinai (v. 46), and (4) the first person singular suffixes on "covenant."

Presence and Sanctuary

The presence of Yahweh is referred to by means of "presence" (פניך, v. 17), "walk among you" (ColumnsModeך, v. 12), "sanctuary" (מקדש, v. 2), and "tabernacle" (נ钤, v. 11). His presence works both weal (vv. 11-12) and woe (v. 17). His presence is both edifice-oriented19 (vv. 2, 11) and people-oriented (vv. 12, 17). His presence is holy (note the employment of the root מְסִדֶּה "holy" in מְסִדֶּה, "sanctuary"). The reference to holiness is particularly striking because it is in a context of precepts prohibiting of idolatry and commanding observance of sabbaths. Yahweh is holy because He is set apart from idols.

19 By "edifice-oriented" the writer does not mean that Yahweh is edifice-limited. The edifice was merely an accommodation to focus attention upon Yahweh's presence among His people. Cf Ezek 10:3-19; 11:22-23; 43:1-5.
and His presence is distinct from idols. Also, He is holy because sabbatical time is set apart for Him.

The implication of verses 14-45 is that when disobedient Israel is confronted by the punishment-dealing presence of Yahweh, He has ceased to "walk among" them or to tabernacle among them. Indeed, He is pictured as "walking in opposition" to them (vv. 24, 28).

Even though His presence or sanctuary is not with the exiles among the nations (at least not in the same fashion as when they were obedient and in the land), yet Yahweh will preserve His covenant with them (v. 44).

**Promise**

Promise here is being used in a very broad sense of the term. It is being employed to cover both the promise to bless and the promise to curse. It is in the sense of fulfillment or commitment as much as in the sense of hope or expectancy.

Promise in Leviticus 26 is identified with the solemn divine self-introduction (Selbstvorstellung) of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (vv. 1, 2, 13, 44, 45; cf. v. 42). It is a promise preceding the history of deliverance from Egypt (the Abrahamic Covenant) and the entrance into Canaan (the Mosaic and Deuteronomic covenants). It is not a reference to something inward and spiritual, but a reference to the tangible aspects of covenant life: productivity, peace, population, presence, and land. The promise includes a pledge to bless Israel for their loyalty to the covenant and to curse Israel for their disloyalty. Yahweh, the God of their ancestors, promises His own loyalty to His covenant with His people.

**Blessing and Curse**

The blessings and curses of Leviticus 26 are quite similar to those of Deuteronomy 27-28 as well as to those of the Esarhaddon vassal treaties and the Sefire stelas. The similarities involve both formal structure and traditional phraseology and vocabulary. By their very contexts in the biblical materials, the blessings and curses are distinctly covenantal.\(^{20}\) The blessings are directly related to the promised blessings and/or privileges of both the Abrahamic and the Mosaic covenants. Likewise, the curses are directly related to the nullification or removal of those same blessings and/or privileges.\(^{21}\)

The blessings and curses do not in themselves indicate the presence of the Deuteronomic Covenant in Leviticus 26.\(^{22}\) Any preview of that covenant in the pericope must maintain a continuity with the two previous covenants. In other words, a third covenant (whether here or in Deuteronomy 27-30) does not nullify the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants.

---


\(^{21}\) See above, 5-6, 8-9.

\(^{22}\) See above, 9-10.
Obedience and Disobedience

"Obedience to Yahweh, the one God, who delivered Israel out of slavery and is jealous of his own uniqueness, defines the fundamental nature of the OT faith.\(^{23}\) Obedience reflects respect for who and what Yahweh is personally and historically (Lev 26:1-3, 13-15, 39-45). Obedience involves the acceptance of the lordship of Yahweh in one's life in time and space (cf. vv. 2, 34-35, 43). Obedience produces participation in the covenant blessings (v. 9). The precepts reveal the will of God for Israel. The will of man must be yielded to the will of Yahweh in order to be loyal to the covenants (cf. v. 41).

Disobedience is the denial of the identity of Yahweh in history, covenant, and law. It is breach of covenant faith (v. 15). It is acting unfaithfully, disloyally, and treasonously (v. 40). It is blatant opposition to God (vv. 21, 23, 27). It is nonperformance of His commands (v. 14). It involves rejecting His statutes and despising His ordinances (v. 15). It is a matter that is concerned with the inner man (vv. 15, 41, 43; note "soul" and "heart"). Disobedience has frightful consequences. Even cannibalism is not beyond the capability of the disobedient (v. 29). It causes the unacceptability of the sacrifices which were the outward manifestation of faith (v. 31). Disobedience is worthy only of death (vv. 25, 33, 37, 38) and exile (vv. 33, 44). Death is separation from the body; exile is separation from the land.

Guilt

Guilt (נִשְׂפָּת) is a concept occurring in verses 39, 40, 41, and 43. It is mentioned only in the context of repentance, confession, humility, and restitution. The guilt resulting from disloyalty to the covenant had to be recognized before the breached covenant could be reinstated. The guilt was twofold: (1) the guilt of the ancestors of Israel ("the father," vv. 39, 40) and (2) the guilt of the current generation of Israelites (vv. 39, 40, 41, 43). Confession of both was required for restoration. The guilt of the current generation is given first consideration. Unless the current generation can recognize and deal with their own guilt, it would be pointless to recognize and attempt to deal with the guilt of their fathers.

This guilt was so burdensome that it led to severe anguish among the exiled peoples (v. 39). The guilt was real. The burden was real. It was not a temporary "guilt trip." Guilt, properly recognized, is an instrument of God to draw them back to the covenant relationship that they had enjoyed prior to their willful rebellion against Yahweh. The guilt had to be confessed (v. 40).

Retribution and Chastisement

The application of the curses/penalties of verses 14-45 are highlighted by two factors: (1) the gradation of the punishments in five stages of severity (vv. 16-17, 18-20, 21-22, 23-26, and 27-38)\(^{24}\) and (2) the recurring refrain, "seven times for your sins" (vv. 18, 21, 24, 28). The stages of chastisement are emphasized also by the occurrence of the term "discipline" (דָּקָה, vv. 18., 23, 28). The entire process, from start to finish, was


intended as a means of restoration. However, the primary purpose was not restoration, but the glorification of the covenant God, Yahweh (cf. vv. 44, 45).

Retribution may be terminal (cf. vv. 25, 30, 38), but chastisement may result in restoration through repentance (cf. vv. 39-45). Both are involved in Leviticus 26. Divine retribution will come upon those who fail to confess their sins. Chastisement will be administered to those who confess their sins.

In the refrain, "seven times"\textsuperscript{25} implies the sabbatical principle and "for your sins" indicates breach of covenant. "Sin" is also a term applied to breach of covenant in the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon.\textsuperscript{26} Leviticus 26 emphasizes the seal/sign of the Mosaic Covenant, the sabbaths. Since the sabbaths were related to the land (vv. 34-35, 43), the Abrahamic Covenant is at least implied. Yahweh would judge His people for their nonobservance of the sabbaths, for their worship of idols and for the resulting defilement of the people among whom He dwelt (cf. vv. 1-2, 29-31). Divine judgment is not a betrayal of the covenants (v. 44). On the contrary, judgment declares that disobedience is sin and that sin in rebellion against the Lord. Eventually, Yahweh's judgments would increase to such an intensity and nature that there would be no doubt that He had exercised His covenant rights to exact retribution from those who defy His authority.

**Exile**

Exile ("scattering among the nations," v. 33) was the ultimate penalty for breach of covenant. It meant removal from the land of promise. The landedness for which the nation had hoped would dissolve into the landlessness which had characterized their sojourn in Egypt. Servitude would once again engulf them. With their "uncircumcised heart" (v. 41) they would be placed among the uncircumcised--those who were outside the covenants. Exile was a living death, a living separation from the land of abundant life. Exile meant removal from the setting in which Israel could experience the blessings of the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. Exile, however, need not be terminal. Exile, landlessness, could be a condition that could give rebirth to hope (vv. 39-45). Landlessness was not synonymous with divine rejection or abhorrence (v. 44). As at Sinai, and in the wilderness, landlessness presented the people with a goal for life and a meaning for history. The landless ones must cast their cares upon the one who would guide them out of bondage to freedom. Even in the land of their enemies, Yahweh was still their God (v. 44). The covenant relationship per se knows no geographical or political boundaries. Yahweh's loyalty is unaffected by the landlessness or the landlessness of His people. He is above the circumstances of history, working for the repentance of His covenanted people so that His covenants might one day be fulfilled completely.

\textsuperscript{25} Seven is more than just a symbolic number: "It is an appropriate and evocative number in view of the importance of the seventh in Israelite religion" (Wenham, *Leviticus*, 331). Cf., also, Karl Elliger, *Leviticus*, HAT 1/4 (Tubingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1966), 375: "Naturlich ist 'sieben' eine schematische Steigerungszahl" ("Seven' is naturally a stylized number of intensity").

\textsuperscript{26} See D. J. Wiseman, *The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon*, Iraq 20/1 (London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1958), 42 (col. iii 160), 50 (col. iv 272), 52 (col. iv 292), 58 (col v 397).
Repentance

The Hebrew word for "repentance" (שׁוּחָה) does not occur in Leviticus 26. However, the concept of repentance is found in a threefold turning of the exiled people to Yahweh: (1) They would confess their guilt and the guilt of their fathers (v. 40), recognizing their personal and corporate culpability. (2) They would humble their "uncircumcised heart" (v. 41), bringing it into subjection to the precepts of Yahweh. Submission to the divine Suzerain is required of a covenanted people. They must submit to Yahweh's lordship. Their submission must not be mere external compliance externally in religious exercises; it must be internal and real. (3) They would make restitution for their guilt (v. 41), accepting the federal consequences of sin. Such restitution is not soteriological redemption. It is the evidence, not the cause, of repentance and expiation. The impact of sin would be felt until the land had enjoyed its restitution. Exile would continue after repentance until the penalty had been fulfilled. Getting right with God does not insure immediate blessing and a to solution uncomfortable circumstances. It does guarantee a restoration to the covenant relationship whereby promised blessings might be renewed once the land is regained.

Restitution

"Restitution" (חֵשֶׁב) not only involves the full application of the federal consequences of sin, but also the full application of that which is right in Yahweh's covenanted relationship to the land (vv. 34-35, 43). Therefore, restitution has a twofold character: positive (that which is right for the land-to enjoy its sabbaths) and negative (that which is the just consequence of sin-the period of Israel's removal from the land). Through restitution Israel learned that the inexorable will and way of Yahweh will be fulfilled within time and space.

Revelation

The very concept of law implies communication between its promulgator and its recipients. Commandments, statutes, ordinances, laws and instructions must be revealed since they cannot be intuitively perceived. In the ancient Near East the concept of covenant itself demanded a deposit or record of the pact for future generations. The diversity of covenant concepts and forms in Leviticus 26, as compared with the ancient Near Eastern treaties, is an evidence of the independent theology of Israel. Among many scholars there is "a remarkable unwillingness to appreciate the creative possibilities of Israel's own religious life and experience." The richness of Leviticus 26 lies, in part, in its uniqueness at that particular stage of progressive revelation. The

27 Leviticus 26 contains some elements distinct from the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon and Sefire: blessings (vv. 3-13), provision for reinstatement in case of transgression (vv. 14-45; esp. vv. 39-45), monotheism, and covenantal precedents (vv. 42,45). In the vassal treaties there are imprecations requested by a third party in the presence of a mediating deity and the employment of ritual magic--neither of which occur in the biblical covenants. For a more detailed study of this topic, see William D. Barrick, "Leviticus 26: Its Relationship to Covenant Contexts and Concepts" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation; Winona Lake: Grace Theological Seminary, 1981), 171-84.

28 Clements, Prophecy and Tradition, 21.
confluent nature of the revelation (i.e., drawing upon current vocabulary, style, forms, and cultural milieu) represents a desire on the part of Yahweh for revelation to be immediately understandable and applicable.

Leviticus 26 claims to be Mosaic in time, content, and composition. The self-witness of Scripture must suffice as the *prima facie* evidence. Unless equally ancient and authentic documentation can be produced to explicitly deny the claims and contents of this pericope, it must be allowed to stand. This must be true of both the historical claims and the theological concepts. The treaties of Esarhaddon and Sefire cannot be offered as contradictory testimony since they were composed 700 years too late and the differences in subject matter, purpose, and structure disqualify them as legal testimony against the biblical materials of Leviticus 26.

**Leviticus 26 and the New Testament**

The employment of verses 11-12 in 2 Corinthians 6:16 is the only concrete example of the influence of Leviticus 26 on the revelation contained in the NT. The passage from this pericope was employed in order that Paul might better emphasize the concept of identification with God. It is unfortunate that Wenham did not deal with this NT usage in his commentary. Wenham, however, does observe that the blessings and curses of Leviticus 26 are expressed at least in principle by Christ's teachings in His pre-cross ministry. The chastisement of Israel because of covenant disloyalty was a reality among the Jews of Christ's day. Jesus also spoke of the eschatological reality of that chastisement. Wenham claims that "many of the horrifying judgments described in Rev. 6ff. find their original setting in the covenant curses of Lev. 26 and Deut. 28." This is true insofar as they are directly related by the Book of Revelation to the nation of Israel. Application of the covenant blessings and curses to the Gentiles is unwarranted (with the exception of the blessing for all peoples mediated by Abraham's descendants; Gen 12:3). Technically, the covenants were made with Israel alone.

The principles of God's dealings with NT believers by means of reward and/or chastisement are basically the same as the principles by which He dealt with Israel under the covenants. This must not be construed, however, as meaning that the NT saints are under the same covenant relationship as Israel. The similarity is due to the same God, not to the same covenant. The very nature of God demands the federal consequences of sin be exacted from His people in all ages (cf. Gal 6:7-10; 1 Cor 11:30). The same God provides lessons for believers in every era based upon His historical deeds (cf. Rom 15:4; 1 Cor 10:11-13). The same God blesses in tangible ways those who are faithful (cf, 2 Cor 6). Paul's quotation of Lev 26:11-12 is paraphrastic. His emphasis was on the concept of identification with God (Lev 26:12b). The apostle's omission of Lev 26:1 lb is a clue to his intention. That phrase does not serve any purpose in Paul's discussion in the context of 2 Cor 6. Since he would omit Lev 26:1b ("and my soul will not despise you"), he paraphrased 11a ("I will set my dwelling place in your midst"--cf. 2 Cor 6:16, "I will dwell among them"). Having established the concept and the context, Paul proceeded to quote Lev 26:12. Elaborate discussions of conflation of OT texts, "pearl stringing," pre-Pauline usage, and 4Q LXX Lev are made unnecessary by the simple reading of the NT text alongside the MT.


Cf the postscript of Lev 26: "These are the statutes and the ordinances and the laws which Yahweh established between himself and the Israelites on Mt. Sinai through Moses" (v. 46). This same exclusivity is expressed in Exod 19:5-6 and Rom 9:4.
9:6-15). The same God is loyal even in the face of His people's disloyalty (cf. 2 Tim 2:11-13; Phil 1:6). The same God is Lord (cf. 1 Cor 12:3). The same Lord requires confession, humility, and restitution (cf. 1 John 1:9; 1 Pet 5:5-7; Phile 1-25). The same God promises that obedient service will be rewarded (cf. 1 Cor 15:58). The same God demonstrates that the believer has been delivered from bondage into a servitude that is totally unlike the bondage of fear and the curse (cf. Rom 6:12-23; Heb 2:14-15; Acts 26:18; Col 1:12-13).

The Lord who by means of Leviticus 26 revealed to Israel the continued authority and perpetuity of the Abrahamic Covenant after the ratification of the Mosaic Covenant, also confirmed that testimony in Galatians 3:17. NT believers must recognize that the authority of one covenant does not annul the authority of a previous one. Any exceptions are clearly revealed by God (e.g., Heb 7:11-14). The epistle to the Galatian churches teaches that Abrahamic faith in Yahweh was not replaced by law under Moses. Therefore, faith is still binding upon any man's relationship to the God of Abraham.

Conclusion

What then are the conclusions concerning the relationship of the Deuteronomic Covenant to Leviticus 26?

1. Leviticus 26 does not make any specific reference to the Deuteronomic Covenant.
2. Leviticus 26 has some similarities to Deuteronomy 27-30, the pericope involved in the Deuteronomic Covenant. However, similarity does not mean identity.
3. Leviticus 26 explains Israel's relationship to the land prior to occupation and subsequent to the revelation of the Mosaic Covenant.
4. Although Leviticus 26 contains revelation relating to Israel's exile and subsequent repentance under the Mosaic Covenant (v. 45), it is not a formal prophetic announcement.
5. Leviticus 26 emphasizes the Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants by direct reference. The terminology and theological concepts contain less direct references to those covenants. The relationship to these two covenants is so imbedded in the text that any connotation regarding the Deuteronomic Covenant must also involve a similar relationship between it and the previous two.
6. The affinities between Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 27-30 are far more intimate than any similarities to extrabiblical treaties. The common entities (subject matter, language, historical context, author, and intent) of the two pericopes tie them together. These affinities are the essence of the preview of the Deuteronomic Covenant in Leviticus 26. Leviticus 26 is transitional revelation for the nation of Israel between the Mosaic Covenant granted at Mt. Sinai and the Deuteronomic (or, Palestinian) Covenant granted on the plains of Moab. Being transitional, it does not embody the Deuteronomic Covenant itself. It embodies only the concepts necessary to prepare the nation for entrance into that covenant at a hater date.
The pericope, viewed in the context of the Sinai revelation and the Sinai apostasies, offers a perspective not found elsewhere in the Scriptures. That perspective regards the theological instruction of the nation of Israel on the threshold of its wilderness wanderings. Unlike Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 4, Leviticus 26 is not a mini-statement of the Mosaic Covenant. It is, instead, a compilation and synthesis of the combined truths of both the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. The synthesis takes the form of a parenesis for Israel regarding what Yahweh requires of His people. It provided Israel with another taste of promise tempered by precept. It wrapped up the Sinai experience by appealing to a continuity of authority and promise. Leviticus 26 is a theological treatise with implications for living. Many fell in the wilderness because they failed to heed this timely instruction. Because Israel failed so miserably, Paul was moved to confirm the teachings for NT believers struggling with apparent conflict between the Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants (Gal 3:17).

Two areas of covenant were not discussed in this study since they were not explicit in Leviticus 26: (1) the relationship of covenant to kingdom and (2) the relationship of kingdom and covenant to the calendar of Israel. These studies would complement the present discourse. The writer believes that both areas are necessary adjuncts to the theological core of Leviticus 26 if one is to understand properly the relationship of the prophets to Leviticus 26 (and, to Deuteronomy 27-30). Leviticus 26 explicitly proclaims the lordship of Yahweh in both time and space.
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Many scholars in modern Judaism have discerned universal dimensions to the Sabbath. However, few writers in earlier Judaism ever saw them. It is almost superfluous to add that non-Sabbatarian Christians have rarely seen these dimensions either.

This failure to see universal dimensions may seem surprising, for three passages in the Pentateuch affirm that the רע, "resident alien," is to rest on the weekly Sabbath, along with the Israelite (Exod 20:10; 23:12; Deut 5:14). However, rabbinic Judaism has traditionally identified the רע in these passages as the רע Saddiq, the circumcised "righteous alien," rather than the רע toshab, the uncircumcised "sojourning alien." The רע Saddiq was a newcomer to Jewish territory, but not to the Jewish religion.

By the rabbinic period, the רע was understood in terms of religious


2 Philo" has an extremely universal view of the Sabbath, as he has of the whole of Judaism, which he strives to present as nothing more than Greek philosophy in its purest form ("On the Account of the World's Creation Given by Moses," 89). Genesis Rabbah 11:5 teaches that if the Gentiles will not keep the Sabbath now, they will be forced to as they suffer in the afterlife. However, the general trend of early Judaism is in the opposite direction, as exemplified in the way the Babylonian talmud tractate Sanhedrin 58b and Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 forbids non-Jews from observing the Sabbath under pain of death. See also Exodus Rabbah 25:11. Jubilees has the seeds of universalism inherent in its claim that the Sabbath is first observed by God and the angels at Creation, but immediately restricts its observance on earth to Israel (Jub 2: 16-22, 30-33). This apocalyptic tradition is continued in Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 18-20; Pesikta Rabbati 26.3, 9. For more information see Roben M. Johnston, "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath," AUSS 12 (1974): 98-101.

conversion. The rabbinic distinction between the circumcised and the uncircumcised alien may at first sight seem to be an artificial contrivance to reconcile the apparently conflicting commands of Lev 17:15, 16 and Deut 14:21. For the historical critic, it would normally be enough to develop a theology of the alien and the law for just one of the supposed sources, rather than attempting to identify a coherent pattern across the board. However, the distinction cannot be dismissed out of hand, for while the word ּֽ֔́ sometimes does refer to the alien in general, at other times it seems to refer exclusively to the alien who has been circumcised. The question here is whether it is an appropriate distinction to draw in the context of the three Pentateuchal texts where the ּֽ֔́ is discussed in relationship to the weekly Sabbath.

John Calvin accepted that the ּֽ֔́ in these passages includes

4 Jacob Milgrom argues that in the priestly laws, the alien is required to observe the prohibitive but not the performative commandments (Jacob Milgrom, Numbers, JPS Torah Commentary [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990], 399-400). The fact that Deut 14:21 exempts the alien from a prohibitive commandment is a clear barrier to extending this maxim to the Pentateuch as a whole.

Lev 16:29 is a key peg in Milgrom's argument, since he accepts Ibn Ezra's contention that the phrase, "either the native-born or the alien who sojourns among you" qualifies the prohibition against working on the Day of Atonement, but not the immediately preceding performative command to afflict one's soul on this day. See Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB, vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1055. However, Ezra's distinction itself seems to be contrived. The grammatical pattern of a performative commandment followed by a prohibition of work then a list of who is included is also found in Exod 20:9-10 and Deut 5:13-14. However, no one claims that the dependents listed are prohibited from working on the seventh day, but are not included in the earlier permission to work the other six days.

5 Lev 18:26-27 forbids the native born and the alien alike from committing the sexual practices listed in the chapter, because the people already in the land have done these things and the land has become defiled. The fact that the present occupants of the land are not a part of Israel has not prevented their actions from defiling the land. Accordingly, the preservation of the land from the defilement under Israelite occupation must presuppose that the Israelites ensure that none of its inhabitants commit these acts, uncircumcised aliens included.

6 Exod 12:19 states that anyone who eats leaven during the Feast of Unleavened Bread will be cut off "from the congregation of Israel" (מולך שלם) whether alien or native-born. According to Milgrom's maxim, this command applies to aliens (whether circumcised or not) because it is prohibitive rather than performative. However, in Exod 12:47-48 uncircumcised aliens are not counted as part of the congregation of Israel, for in Exod 12:47-48 they are specifically prohibited from taking part in Passover in the same breath as all the congregation of Israel is commanded to observe it.

It is also possible that in Lev 16:29, the ּֽ֔́ includes only the circumcised alien, since in vs. 33 the priest is said to make for "all the people of the assembly" (בְּלֵי גְּדוֹל), an expression that includes only Israelites and assimilated aliens in Deut 23:3-8 (vss. 4-9, Heb.), just as (מולך שלם) does not include uncircumcised aliens in Exod 12:48.
uncircumcised aliens, but denied any universal dimensions to the Sabbath by adding that aliens and domestic animals are included not for their sakes, but lest anything opposed to the sabbath should happen beneath the eyes of the Israelites. . . . Besides, if the very least liberty had been conceded to them [the Israelites], they would have done many things to evade the Law in their days of rest, by employing strangers and the cattle in their work.\(^7\)

There seems to be no evidence in Exod 20:10 to establish whether the term רָד is being used in a restricted or a broad sense, or to indicate whether the alien's rest is merely incidental to that of the Israelite. However, there is evidence on both these points in Exod 23:12 and Deut 5:14. The purpose of this article is to explore the place of the alien in these two texts and to use the evidence as it arises to test the traditional rabbinic interpretation and the explanation given by Calvin.

*The Alien in Exod 23:12*

On the basis of the "catchword" principle, the scheme of six years followed by a seventh year in Exod 23:10-11 naturally lends itself as an introduction to the scheme of six days followed by a seventh day in v. 12.\(^8\)

Six days you must do your work, but on the seventh day you must stop, so that your ox and your donkey may rest, and the son of your female servant and the stranger may be refreshed.

The inclusion of the רָד in the Sabbath rest is clearly not incidental to the rest of the Israelites in this text. Indeed, the verse does not even mention the benefits of the Sabbath rest for "the addressee and his family."\(^9\) Instead, the


\(^9\) Dale Patrick, *Old Testament Law* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1985), 92. This fact does not mean that no benefit for the addressee of the command is envisaged at all, nor that the worship value of the Sabbath is being denied. Instead, it simply suggests that the Sabbath is here presented as having a distinctly humanitarian purpose. Exod 23:1-12 is a list of judgments outlining humanitarian obligations and Exod 23:14-19 contains a list of judgments outlining Israel's festal obligations, with v. 13 forming a boundary between the two. This structure may explain why in
addressee is to rest expressly "so that" (למה) his animals may rest and the son of his female servant and the alien may be refreshed.10

The inclusion of the uncircumcised alien in the statement of Exod 23:12 is confirmed by the fact that nearby in Exod 23:9, the term זא clearly includes all aliens, circumcised and uncircumcised alike:

Vous must not oppress the alien. You know the life of the alien, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.

The allusion to the Israelites as aliens in Egypt is suggestive of their erstwhile vulnerability as a dependent minority in a foreign land. It has nothing to say about their adoption of Egyptian religious practice.11 Conversely, the command not to oppress the זא must also have all aliens in view, not just those who adopt the Israelite covenant by being circumcised.

*The Alien in Deut 5:14*

The Sabbath commandment in Deut 5:12-15 stands at the heart of the Deuteronomic account of the Decalogue. Verse 14 lists those included in the prohibition against working on the Sabbath and concludes with a purpose clause:

You must not oppress the alien. You know the life of the alien, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.

The allusion to the Israelites as aliens in Egypt is suggestive of their erstwhile vulnerability as a dependent minority in a foreign land. It has nothing to say about their adoption of Egyptian religious practice.11 Conversely, the command not to oppress the זא must also have all aliens in view, not just those who adopt the Israelite covenant by being circumcised.

*The Alien in Deut 5:14*

The Sabbath commandment in Deut 5:12-15 stands at the heart of the Deuteronomic account of the Decalogue. Verse 14 lists those included in the prohibition against working on the Sabbath and concludes with a purpose clause:

Exod 23:10-12 "there is no allusion to the keeping of a sabbath unto the Lord. . . in connection with either the seventh year or seventh day," such as is found in Exod 20:10 and Lev 23:3 (C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *The Pentateuch*, 2 vols., Biblical Commentary, trans. James Martin, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 4th series, vol. 3 [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872], 146). It would also explain the absence of any mention of benefits for the addressee of the command.

10 It has been argued that the welfare of animals, slaves, and aliens is not primarily in focus in Exod 23:12. Instead, a sacral "return to the original state,' a *restitutio in integrum," is in view, and they are to rest simply because "they are an integral part of the creation which. . . ' is to return to its 'rest" (Martin Noth, *Exodus; A Commentary*, trans. J. S. Bowden, *Old Testament Library* [Philadelphia, P A: Westminster Press, 1962], 190). However, such a conclusion is not drawn from evidence in the passage itself. See Niels-Erik Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath; A Tradition-Historical Investigation*, SBLDS, no. 7 (Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature,1972), 135; Jay W. Marshall, *Israel and the Book of the Covenant: An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Law*, SBLDS, no. 140 (Atlanta, GA; Scholars Press, 1993), 159.

11 In view of the scattering of the Jewish exiles, it is understandable that the LXX translators would interpret the זא primarily as a newcomer to the Jewish religion, whenever possible. Nevertheless, their translation of זא in the last clause of Exod 23:9 as προσήλυτοι ("proselytes") is clearly anachronistic. It would have been more appropriate if the terms זא had been translated as παροικος/παροικοι ("sojourner/sojourners") in both verses.
However, the seventh day [is] a Sabbath to Yahweh your God. You must not do any work: [not] you, or your son, or your daughter, or your male servant, or your female servant, or your ox, or your donkey, or any of your cattle, or your alien who [is] within your gates, so that your male servant and female servant may rest like you.

"Although only the male and female slave are mentioned in the clause stating the rationale, it seems clear that they represent the entire list of dependents mentioned earlier in the command."\(^{12}\) Accordingly, the extension of rest to the household, the alien, and the livestock is not incidental to the rest of the Israelite householder. Instead, it is placed on a par.

The inclusion of the uncircumcised alien in the command of Deut 5:14 is confirmed by the fact that it is reinforced in v. 15 with an appeal to the Israelite experience of slavery in Egypt.

And you must remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt and Yahweh your God brought you out from there with a strong hand and with a stretched-out arm. Therefore Yahweh your God commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.\(^{13}\)

The fact that the Israelites were aliens in Egypt is not explicitly stated in this verse, but it is implied, in the same way that the inclusion of the alien in the rationale of v. 14 is implied. Accordingly, the issue of the alien's vulnerability is what is in view, not the question of his inclusion in the Israelite covenant through circumcision, just as in Exod 23:9.

**Conclusion and Implications**

A universal dimension to the weekly Sabbath is implied by the presence of three commands in the Pentateuch that specifically include the


\(^{13}\) The conclusion of this verse may seem to suggest that the deliverance from Egyptian slavery is being advanced as the reason for Sabbath observance itself, rather than as reason for extending its privileges to one's dependents. However, while Exod 20:11 has an introductory "for" (כִּי), the reference to Israel's redemption in Deut 5:15b begins with the "conjunction 'and' and simply enlarges the command" in v. 15a "to include remembrance of the Exodus on the sabbath" (Niels-Erik Andreasen, "Festival and Freedom: A Study of an Old Testament Theme," *Int* 28 [1974]: 284). The "therefore" (לְפִיכָה) of Deut 5:15b may thus simply be by "analogy of [sic] Exodus 20:8-11, for... no reason for the sabbath per se is really provided here" (ibid). On the other hand, even if Israel's deliverance from slavery did constitute one reason for Sabbath keeping, there is no reason to deny that contextually it also serves as a prod to show kindness toward one's dependents (see Martin Rose, 5. *Mose*, 2 vols., Zurcher Bibelkommentare, Altes Testament, no. 5.2 [Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1994], 431).
alien in the Sabbath rest (Exod 20:10; 23:12; and Deut 5:14). Traditional rabbinic interpretation has resisted this implication by claiming that the Hebrew word for alien in these verses is the *ger saddiq*, the circumcised "righteous alien," rather than with the *ger toshab*, the uncircumcised "sojourning alien," who is a newcomer to Jewish territory, but not to the Jewish religion. According to John Calvin, the uncircumcised alien is included, but simply to prevent any stumbling-block to Israelite Sabbath keeping, not because of any benefit he himself might gain. There seems to be no evidence as to the validity or otherwise of these arguments in Exod 20:10. However, an exegesis of the place of the alien in Exod 23:12 and Deut 5:14 provides strong evidence that these texts do include the uncircumcised alien in their perspective, and that his rest and refreshment is just as much apart of the purpose of the Sabbath as the rest and refreshment of the Israelite householder.

In Christian circles, the continued observance of a weekly Sabbath has generally received wider support than the continued observance of other OT sacred times. A number of reasons might be cited, not least of which is the fact that the Sabbath is the only sacred time that is specifically included in the Decalogue. Rarely has attention been given to the possible significance of a comparative study of the Pentateuchal laws governing the relationship of the alien to different sacred times, and it is beyond the scope of this article to undertake such a study in detail. nevertheless, on the basis of a preliminary investigation, it would seem that the Pentateuch itself does give the uncircumcised alien a special status in relationship to the weekly Sabbath, one that it does not afford to him in relationship to any other sacred time. This distinction may indeed

---

14 Because of its position in the substance of the "Ten Commandments," the weekly Sabbath retains its binding character on the recipient of the new covenant in a manner which does not apply to the sabbatical year or the year of jubilee" (O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* [Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1980], 74).

15 The uncircumcised alien is specifically barred from observing the Passover (Exod 12:43-49). The alien is prohibited from eating leavened bread during the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Exod 12:19, but the examination of context undertaken above (seen. 6) indicates that the circumcised alien is specifically in view in this verse. The examination of the context of Lev 16:29 undertaken above (nn. 5-6) suggests the possibility that just the uncircumcised alien may be specifically in view in commands given with reference to the alien is apparently permitted and encouraged to observe the Feast of Harvest/Weeks (Deut 16:11, 12;26:11), but he does not seem to be required to do so (Deut 16:16). The same situation seems to apply to alien observance of the Feast of Booths (Lev 22:42, 43; Deut 16:14, 16). In the Sabbatical Year, provision is made for the sustenance of the uncircumcised alien while the land lies fallow (Lev 25:6) and the uncircumcised alien attending the Feast of Booths that year is included in the comprehensive list of people who are to listen to the reading of the law (Deut 31:11, 12). The provision for the sustenance of the alien may be to ensure his survival as a landless individual during the fallow year. However, his debts are not remitted as the
offer one justification for the special place of honor sometimes accorded the Sabbath in Christian tradition vis-a-vis other OT sacred times.

Israelite's are, nor is the non-Israelite slave released after seven years, as the Israelite slave is (Deut 15:1-18). Likewise, in the Year of Jubilee, Israelite servants are to be released, whereas the slaves who are foreigners or the children of aliens may remain enslaved and be passed on from generation to generation (Lev 25:47-54). In none of these cases is there a categorical requirement for the uncircumcised alien to participate fully in the observance of a sacred time, such as we have found in this article with the weekly Sabbath.
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A Critique of Prohomosexual Interpretations of the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
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The contemporary debate surrounding homosexuality has many facets, including sexual behavior, public morality, law, civil rights, public health, and the interpretation of Scripture. The last facet is particularly important, for the way people perceive the relevance of the Bible on the issue will determine in large measure how the issue will be addressed from the other perspectives.

In recent years interpretations of the Scriptures have arisen that challenge traditional teaching regarding homosexuality. The "prohomosexual" interpretations are "revisionist" in that they either (1) fail to find homosexuality where it has been found before (Gen. 19; Judg. 19; Ezek. 16; 1 Cor. 6; 1 Tim. 1; etc.), or (2) claim that passages referring to homosexuality are irrelevant to the Christian church either because they concern Israel's special relationship to God (e.g., Lev. 18; 20), or because they concern a form of homosexuality (rape or pederasty) unlike the modern phenomenon of mutual adult relationships and hence have nothing to contribute.

Somewhat surprisingly, this "prohomosexual" position is founded on the witness of the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The claim is that the Scriptures, excluding 2 Peter and Jude, do not link homosexuality to Sodom, nor does the Old Testament Apocrypha. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha makes this connection for the first time in reactions to the homosexuality rampant in Greco-Roman society. The Pseudepigrapha subsequently in-
fluenced 2 Peter and Jude to connect Sodom with homosexual practices. Therefore, according to Bailey, "the traditional conception of Sodom receives little support from Scripture." Boswell and Scroggs have followed Bailey in this approach. Scroggs indeed believes that condemnations of Scripture concern pederasty, not mutual, adult homosexuality, on the basis of interpretations found in the Pseudepigrapha. The New Testament, like the Pseudepigrapha, is only reacting to the pederasty of the surrounding pagans.

The Old Testament Apocrypha consists of about 14 books or portions found in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament. These are books of history (1 Esdras; 2 Esdras; 1, 2 Maccabees); poetry and wisdom (Ecclesiasticus; Wisdom of Solomon); and fiction having an edifying purpose (Judith; Tobit; Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah; Prayer of Manasseh; three additions to Daniel; and additions to Esther). In 1546 the Roman Catholic Church canonized 11 of these books or portions, while Jews and Protestants have refused to view them as authoritative.

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha encompasses additional books, most of which were written, like the Apocrypha, between the Testaments of canonical Scripture. Most are named after Old Testament persons who purportedly authored the books, though no one was deceived by these false claims and no one considered these writings canonical. Nevertheless they provide encouragement and insight into the times, and many claim to set forth the course of future events in an apocalyptic genre.

It is clear that the proper interpretation of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is crucial to the interpretation of Scripture on the issue of homosexuality and to the modern debate over homosexuality, at least in its use of Jewish and Christian Scriptures. This study seeks to interpret all the references to Sodom and sodomy (homosexuality) found in this intertestamental literature and to critique "pro-homosexual" use of it.

The Apocrypha

ECCLESIASTICUS

This book was written in Hebrew about 180 B.C. and is also known as Sirach or the Wisdom of Joshua, son of Sirach. According to the

1 D. Sherwin Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (London: Longmans, Green, 1955), p. 10 (see also pp. 6-8, 27-28);
prologue it was translated into Greek by the grandson of the author in 132 B.C. Prohomosexual interpreters cite Ecclesiasticus 16:8 as making pride the sin of Sodom, not homosexuality. This is supposedly "a more ancient tradition." The pertinent lines are the following: "He did not spare the people among whom Lot was living, whom he detested for their pride."

In the context the author successively discussed the judgment of Israel, the giants at the Flood, Sodom, Canaan, and the 600,000 Israelites who died in the sojourn. It is obvious that he was not trying to be exhaustive in giving the reason for judgment in each case. For example only the rebellion of the giants (16:7) is given as the reason for the judgment of the Flood (saying nothing about violence, inter-marriage, etc., as Genesis 6 relates).

Since Genesis 19 says nothing of pride, it is clear that the author of Ecclesiasticus was interpreting when he assigned pride as the cause of the overthrow. Yet he was not incorrect to do so, as will be shown.

Moreover, the author of Ecclesiasticus had a special reason for giving pride as the cause of Sodom's downfall. He viewed pride as especially abhorrent throughout, whereas wisdom is extolled. Wisdom characterizes those who fear the Lord and those who master the Law (15:1). To fear the Lord is "the source of wisdom" (1:14) and "all wisdom comes from the Lord" (1:1; cf. 1:16; 14:20; 15:18; 16:4). Also wisdom is "far from pride" (15:8). According to Ecclesiasticus pride violates both wisdom and fear of the Lord. Thus in the context which includes Sodom, past causes of judgment are interpreted as "pride" (16:8), "obstinacy" (16:10), and being "stiff-necked" (16:11).

The author believed that God "will judge a man by his doings" (16:12; cf. 16:14). It must be assumed, therefore, that the author had some deeds in mind for which Sodom was judged, which were the expressions of its pride.

It is clear that "pride" cannot be limited to a state of being or disposition, but here must include "proud behavior," and perhaps even "sexual desire." The Greek term is ὑπερηφάνεια, which occurs as a noun here (often including actions: 10:7, 12-13, 18; 15:8; 16:8; 22:22; 48:18; 51:10) and in the Letter of Aristeas (262, 269) and in Mark 7:22. As the noun so the verb ὑπερηφανέω can mean both "be proud,

---

4 Boswell, Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality, p. 94, n. 7.
haughty," and "treat arrogantly and disdainfully, despise" (4 Macc. 5:21: "the law is despised"). So both aspects characterize these cognates.

The word "detested" ("whom he detested for their pride") is ἐβδελυγματο. In 15:13 it is said, "The Lord hates anything abominable" (βδελυγμα). Since these cognates are used in the Septuagint to refer to sodomy (Lev. 18:22; 20:13), it may well be that sodomy is referred to in Ecclesiasticus 15:13; 17:26; and 41:5 by this term (contrast 1:25; 11:2; 13:20, twice; 19:23; 20:8; 27:30).

It seems certain that sodomy is the meaning of the term in 49:2. In this verse the author praised King Josiah as a godly king. He wrote, "He succeeded in converting the people, and abolished the wicked abominations."8

The last two terms translate βδελυγματα ανομιας. These same terms are juxtaposed in Jeremiah 16:1.8 and are translated, "detestable idols and abominations" (NASB). Snaith renders the terms in Ecclesiasticus as "loathsome and lawless deeds."9

It is important to note the event referred to by the author in 49:2. The setting is 2 Kings 23:1-13, where the terms for "abolished" (vv. 5, 11) and "abomination" (v. 13) occur. In these verses Josiah, with whom Jeremiah was a contemporary, is credited with defiling the abominable high places of Ashtoreth, Chemosh, and Milcom (v. 13), and ending the idolatrous priests and other idols (vv. 5, 11). Yet the significant statement is Josiah's being credited with breaking down "the houses of the male cult prostitutes which were in the house of the Lord, where the women were weaving hangings for the Asherah" (v. 7). This is a reference to religious prostitution between males and constitutes sodomy (cf. 1 Kings 14:24; 15:12). Moses forewarned of such practices in Deuteronomy 23:17-18. It is not unreasonable to assume that the writer of Ecclesiasticus had in mind this


idolatrous, sexual vice when he used the term βδέλυγμα in 49:2. Yet probably the most significant passage for this study is 10:13-18. The author wrote of the judgment on pride:

For pride begins with sin, and the man who clings to it will rain down abominations. For this reason, the Lord brings unheard-of calamities upon them, and overthrows them utterly. The Lord tears down the thrones of rulers, and seats the humble-minded in their places. The Lord plucks up nations by the roots, and plants the lowly in their places. The Lord overthrows heathen countries, and destroys them down to the foundations of the earth. He takes some of them away, and destroys them, and makes the memory of them cease from the earth. Pride was not created for men, nor fierce anger for those who are born of women.10

The concepts here are similar to those in 16:8 ("whom he detested for their pride"). He wrote with sarcasm that on those who hold to pride, God will bring abominations (βδέλυγμα). The first line of verse 13 enforces the interpretation of 16:8 that other sins are implicit in the passage.

The second line of verse 13 is rendered by Box and Oesterley as, "And its source overfloweth with depravity."11 The idea is that sin pours forth every form of depravity.12 Another Greek manuscript reads, "And fornication is the source of both." Evidently the Hebrew term for "depravity" is הָזָיִן, used also in Ezekiel 16:27, 43, 58 ("lewdness"), and Judges 20:6, where the Levite accused the men of Gibeah of committing "a lewd act in Israel." They had desired a homosexual relationship.

Other verbal connections with Old Testament contexts dealing with Sodom occur. In Ecclesiasticus 10:13 ("For pride begins with sin") the noun ὑπερηφάνια occurs. In verse 17 the verb ἔχομαι occurs ("He takes some of them away"). Both of these words and the passage as a whole support the idea that the author alluded to Ezekiel 16:49-50 with its judgment of Sodom: "Behold, this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had arrogance. . . . thus they were haughty and committed abominations before Me. Therefore I removed them when I saw it." The words "arrogance" and "removed" in the Septuagint are from the same Greek terms as employed in Ecclesiasticus 10:13 and 17.

In Ezekiel 16:56-57 Judah's sin is identified as this same pride

12 Snith renders the second line of 10:13 as, "so persistence in it brings on a deluge of depravity" (Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach, p. 54).
(ὑπερηφάνια) in a verse linking Judah with Sodom: "As the name of your sister Sodom was not heard from your lips in your day of pride, before your wickedness was uncovered." Here in a context of harlotry, lewdness, and abominations (v. 58) Judah's sin is also identified as "pride" just as Sodom's is identified in verse 49! The Greek ὑπερηφάνια (used in Ezekiel only in 7:20; 16:49, 56) translates the Hebrew יִרְשָׁ. In similar contexts it means "arrogance, cynical insensitivity to the needs of others, and presumption. It is both a disposition and a type of conduct (both of which are inextricably connected)."13 The contexts of Ezekiel and Ecclesiasticus confirm this statement.

In Ecclesiasticus 10:12 the meaning of pride is given: "The origin of pride is to forsake the Lord, man's heart revolting against his Maker." Here "origin" has the sense of "essence" (cf. 1:14).14 Hence the essence of pride is revolt against God. Persistence in pride then increases the depravity (v. 13). Can there be any doubt that or this author "pride" includes conduct and disposition? Is this not an apt description of sodomy?

The graphic portrayal of God's judgment in 10:12-18, coupled with the Greek terms employed, and their Hebrew counterparts, makes an allusion to the overthrow of Sodom because of sodomy extremely probable. Even the translators suggest this as a possibility.15 The writer of Ecclesiasticus appears to be faithful to the account of Genesis 19 via Ezekiel 16. For his own theological purpose he interprets the sin of Sodom as pride in 16:8, a pride that includes arrogant conduct and a violation of wisdom. For Bailey and Boswell to limit their discussion to Ecclesiasticus 16:8 is unfortunate. And for them to limit the sin of Sodom to pride because of this passage is even more unfortunate.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON

The Wisdom of Solomon is by an unknown author and is probably a composite work dated 50 B.C. to A.D. 10, or as late as A.D. 40. The passage most frequently discussed regarding sodomy occurs in a list of vices in 14:23-26. The context deals with the origin and results of idolatry. For the author there is a deliberate connection between

15 "In 16b ('extirpateth them,' etc.) there may be an allusion to Sodom. xvi. 49" (Box and Oesterley, *The Book of Sirach*, 1:350, n. 16).
idolatry and sexual vice: "For the devising of idols was the beginning of fornication" (14:12; cf. v. 27). Then follows the catalog of vices (14:23-27):

For neither while they murder children in their rites nor celebrate secret mysteries, nor hold frenzied revels with alien laws do they keep their lives or marriages pure, but one man waylays another and kills him, or grieves him by adultery. And it is all a confusion of blood and murder, theft and fraud, depravity, faithlessness, discord, perjury, clamor at the good, forgetfulness of favors, defilement of souls, confusion of sex, irregularity in marriage, adultery, and indecency. For the worship of the unspeakable idols is the beginning and cause and end of every evil.16

It is often claimed by "prohomosexual" interpreters that the meaning of the phrase "confusion of sex" (γενεσέως ἑναλλάγη) is uncertain and should not be used to refer to homosexuality. The meaning is difficult to ascertain, primarily because the phrase apparently occurs nowhere else in Greek literature. Research shows that γενεσέως is somewhat common in classical and biblical Greek and means "birth, origin, kind, family, existence, generation, genealogy." "However, ἑναλλάγη, while frequent in classical Greek ("interchange, change, variation"), occurs nowhere else in biblical canonical or noncanonical literature (although Aquila used it at Psalm 9:12 and Isaiah 66:4). Several cognates exist, one with a sexual connotation, but only one cognate (Ἐναλλάξ) occurs in Scripture, and then only once (Gen. 48:14, "crossing").17

There may be some connection with ἐνδιήλαγμένου ("changed" of sex), used by Aquila and Origen at 1 Kings 22:47 (Eng., 22:46). The reference is to a male cult prostitute. There is no Septuagintal text to translate the Hebrew of 1 Kings 22:47-50.

The phrase seems similar to one found in Philo utilizing ἑναλλάγη: "change of the works of nature," according to Winston.18


He renders the phrase in 14:26 as "interchange of sex roles." He compares the phrase to "changed the order of nature" (Test. Naph. 3:4 discussed later) and to "women exchanged natural relations for unnatural" (Rom. 1:26, NIV). He notes that the preceding phrase in Wisdom 14:26, "defilement of souls," has a moral sense, and the following phrase, "irregularity in marriage," points to sensual excess, perhaps meaning "inordinate."

It seems that the phrase means "interchange, change of kind or sex." Bailey argues that it could mean anything from "changing of race" (a reference to Jewish apostasy) to self-castration, effeminacy, mixed marriages, homosexuality, or cultic transvestism. He argues that "there seems no reason to suppose that it has any special reference to homosexual acts."19

Yet Bailey seems to deal inadequately with the context. The Wisdom of Solomon clearly refers to Sodom on two other occasions (10:6-9; 19:13-17), making a reference to sodomy in 14:26 possible. Also the immediate context refers to immoral sexual practices. The list in 14:23-26 is a catalog of vices--a literary device occurring in both Testaments (e.g., Jer. 7:9; Rom. 1:29-31) and in other Jewish, Christian, and pagan literature.20 Homosexuality is often found in such catalogs. Also the majority of translators and commentaries translate the phrase in a way that allows a homosexual meaning. In Wisdom 19:13-17 Sodom is not explicitly cited but is clearly referred to.21 The passage reads:

And upon the sinners came the punishments not without tokens given beforehand by the force of thunders; for justly did they suffer through their own exceeding wickedness, for grievous indeed was the hatred which they practiced toward guests. For whereas certain men received not strangers who came among them, these made slaves of guests who were their benefactors. And not only so, but God shall visit the former after another sort, since they received as enemies them that were aliens; whereas these first welcomed with feastings, and then afflicted with dreadful toils, them that had already shared with them in the same rights. And they too were stricken with loss of sight (even as those others at the righteous man's doors), when, being compassed about

---

19 Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, p. 48. Scroggs thinks the passage refers to homosexuality, but that the text "puts no particular weight on homosexuality, or any other specific sin" (*The New Testament and Homosexuality*, p. 92). This seems to be beside the point.


with yawning darkness, they sought every one the passage through his
own door.22

Here comparison is being made between the reception given by
the Sodomites and the more bitter hatred of strangers exhibited by
the Egyptians in their treatment of Israel. Strong terms ("sinners," "wickedness," etc.) describe the Egyptians and their behavior.

It is hardly legitimate to infer from this passage that the be-
havior of the Sodomites was merely inhospitable. The contrast be-
ing made in the passage is not between the kinds of sins involved or
their severity. Rather the contrast is between the recipients of the
harsh treatment: Egypt persecuted guests and benefactors. At least
the Sodomites did not "add fickleness to their crimes."23 Sodom per-
secuted aliens and strangers. The judgment of blindness recorded of
both (19:17) heightens the perversity of both Egypt and Sodom (Gen.
19:11).

One other passage in Wisdom clearly refers to Sodom and its
sins. In the context (10:1-14) the author illustrated the saving and
punishing power of Wisdom by describing seven righteous heroes and
their wicked counterparts, including Lot and the Sodomites.24 None
of them is named, in keeping with the author's style. The passage
(10:6-9) describes Wisdom's deliverance of Lot from Sodom and the
latter's destruction:

It was she who rescued a righteous man when the ungodly were perish-
ing, and he escaped the fire that descended on the Five Cities, which
were turned into a smoking waste as a testimony of their wickedness;
with plants that bear fruit before they ripen, and a pillar of salt standing
there as a memorial of an unbelieving soul. For having passed Wis-
dom by, they were not only distracted from a knowledge of the good,
but also left behind for the world a monument of their folly, so that they
were unable to go undetected in their failure. But Wisdom rescued
her servants from troubles.25

The Five Cities in 10:6 are those five cities of the plain named
in Genesis (10:19; 14:2), including Sodom and Gomorrah.26 The refer-

22 Holmes, "Wisdom of Solomon," 1:567. Due to textual variations in 19:15 it may be
rendered otherwise. Goodspeed has, "And not only so, but those others shall have
some consideration, for the men they received with such hostility were aliens" (The
Apocrypha, p. 219). Yet Holmes believes that it is unjustified to weaken the word
ἐπισκόπησις to "consideration, allowance." He points out that this is the "only certain
reference in this part of the book to future retribution" (The Wisdom of Solomon, p.
567, n. 15).
25 The translation is that of Winston.
26 These same five cities from Genesis 14 are found listed in the same order in an Ebla
ence to unripened fruit as a witness to Sodom's "wickedness" finds its counterpart in Scripture (Deut. 32:32), Josephus, Tacitus, and throughout history.  

The passage describes the Sodomites by various terms, including "ungodly" (ἀσεβῶν) and "wickedness" (πονηρία). In Wisdom 10:8-9, which forms a unit marked off from the preceding and the following, the penalty for ignoring God and wisdom is given, followed by the benefit to righteous men. The "folly" is ἀφροσύνης, and "in their failure" is ἐσφαλῆσιν ("to slip, stumble, fall"; rendered "enormities" by one writer).  

It is clear that Wisdom of Solomon did not limit Sodom's sin to inhospitality. In fact its writer never used the term "inhospitable" to describe Sodom. It may characterize such a passage as 19:13-17, but the indictment of Sodom should not be limited to it. The phrase "confusion of sex" (or "interchange of sex roles") in 14:26 shows the author's acquaintance with sexual perversion, probably in the form of homosexuality in light of 10:6-9. For "pro homosexual" interpreters such as Bailey and Boswell to limit the sin of Sodom to inhospitality is unwarranted in light of the total witness of Wisdom. Their failure to discuss all the passages, or to quote them completely, is unfortunate and significantly distorts the witness.

The Pseudepigrapha

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha has even clearer references to sodomy and Sodom than those found in the Apocrypha. All such references are here brought together, but because of the limitations of this article, discussion will be kept to a minimum. The passages speak for themselves.

2 ENOCH

Also known as Slavonic Enoch, this book (dated as early as 100 B.C. but probably best assigned to the turn of the era) describes at 10:4-5a the place of torture between the third and fourth heavens. The longer recensions (P, J) read:

This place, Enoch, has been prepared for those who do not glorify God, who practice on the earth the sin which is against nature, which is child

29 The author of this article is unaware of any other one source where all these passages pertinent to homosexuality are quoted or discussed.
corruption in the anus in the manner of Sodom, of witchcraft, enchantments, divinations, insulting, coveting, resentment, fornication, murder-and who steal the souls taking away their possessions.

The shorter recension (A) has:
This place, youth, has been prepared for those who practice godless uncleanness on the earth, who perform witchcraft and enchantments, and who boast about their deeds. They steal souls secretly; who untie the yoke that has been secured; who enrich themselves by fraud from the possessions of others.31

It is clear that the words of the longer recensions, which so explicitly refer to Sodom and sodomy, find their counterpart in the words of the shorter recension, "who practice godless uncleanness on the earth." These words are clearly parallel to Jubilees 16:5-9, in which the men of Sodom are described as those who "work uncleanness on the earth" (discussed later). When these words are compared to the longer recensions the nature of the sin is made clear.

In 2 Enoch 34:1-3 (J) there are additional references to sodomy. God convicts the persons who are idol worshipers and sodomite fornicators, and for this reason He brings down the flood upon them.

For I know the wickedness of mankind, how they have rejected my commandments and they will not carry the yoke which I have placed on them. But they will cast off my yoke, and they will accept a different yoke. And they will sow worthless seed, not fearing god and not worshiping me, but they began to worship vain gods, and they renounced my uniqueness. And all the world will be reduced to confusion by iniquities and wickednesses and abominable fornications, that is, friend with friend in the anus, and every other kind of wicked uncleanness which it is disgusting to report, and the worship of (the) evil (one). And that is why I shall bring down the flood onto the earth, and I shall destroy everything, and the earth itself will collapse in great darkness.

The shorter recension (A) again omits the references to sodomy:
I know the wickedness of mankind, how they will not carry the yoke which I have placed on them. Nor do they sow the seed which I have given them; but they have renounced my yoke, and they will take on another yoke; and they will sow worthless seed, and do obeisance to vain gods. And they will reject my sole rule. And all the world will sin by injustices and crimes and adulteries and idolatries. Then I shall bring down the flood onto the earth, and the earth itself will be overwhelmed by a great quantity of mud.32

Several summary observations about these passages in 2 Enoch can be made. First, in 10:4-5 the reference seems primarily focused on pederasty, whereas adult sodomy is the concern of 34:1-3. In 10:4 (P,
The words "the sin which is against nature" remind one of Paul's condemnation of sodomy (Rom. 1). In addition, sodomy and idolatry are connected, as in Romans 1 and Wisdom 14:12. "A binding yoke" in 10:5 (A) and in 34:1 (both recensions) probably has a sexual connotation and perhaps refers to sodomy. The connection with idolatry (34:1) supports this. It seems that euphemism or other obscurity is employed so as not to offend sensibilities. The phrase "reduced to confusion" (34:2, J) supports the reference to sodomy in Wisdom of Solomon 14:12 ("the devising of idols was the beginning of fornication," cf. 14:27). The words "who boast about their evil deeds" (2 Enoch 10:4-5 in both recensions) seem to reflect the meaning of "pride" (ὑπερηφάνεια) discussed above as the sin of Sodom given in Ecclesiasticus 10:13; 16:8; and Ezekiel 16:49, 56. In 2 Enoch 34:1-3 (both recensions) the sins (including sodomy) are viewed as universal before the Flood and the cause for the Flood.

3 MACCABEES

This historical romance (100 B.C.) refers to Sodom and its crimes in 2:5 between references to the giants of the Flood and Pharaoh. It says, "When the inhabitants of Sodom acted insolently and became notorious for their crimes you burned them up with fire and brimstone and made them an example to later generations." The terms used to describe Sodom's sins, "acted insolently," "became notorious," and "crimes," are wholly consistent with the sin of Sodom elsewhere designated as "pride," as discussed earlier. Indeed in 2:3 all three examples (giants, Sodomites, Pharaoh) are indicted as those who "act insolently and arrogantly." Most significantly, the words used of Sodom ("acted insolently") translate the Greek terms ὑπερηφάνεια ἐργαζόμενος. The former is the very word for "pride" in Ecclesiasticus and Ezekiel. God's dealing with Sodom is viewed as having universal significance.

JUBILEES

This midrashic rewriting of biblical history (about 105 B.C.; or as early as 160 B.C.) records the cause for Sodom's destruction in 16:5-6. And in that month the Lord executed the judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah and Zeboim and all of the district of the Jordan. And he burned them with fire and sulphur and he annihilated them till this day just as (he said), "Behold, I have made known to you all of their deeds that (they were) cruel and great sinners and they were polluting themselves and they were fornicating in their flesh and they were causing

33 So Andersen comments to this effect (ibid., pp.119, 158).
pollution upon the earth." And thus the Lord will execute judgment like the judgment of Sodom on places where they act according to the pollution of Sodom.35

In 16:7-9 the sins of Lot and his daughters are described. Lot's seed would undergo judgment "just like the judgment of Sodom" (16:9). This is the fourth mention of Sodom.

The five phrases used to describe Sodom's sin are appropriate to homosexuality. R. H. Charles renders Wintermute's "causing pollution upon the earth" as "work uncleanness on the earth." This parallels the phrase in 2 Enoch 10:4-5a (shorter recension), "practice godless uncleanness on the earth." The longer recension of Enoch elaborates the phrase as sodomy in explicit terms. The terminology argues for the dependency of 2 Enoch on Jubilees, or that both draw on a common tradition.

Jubilees 13:17 includes another reference to Sodom: "And in the fourth year of this week Lot parted from him, and Lot dwelt in Sodom, and the men of Sodom were sinners exceedingly."

In Jubilees 20:5 it is written of Abraham and his children: "And he told them the judgment of the giants and the judgments of the Sodomites just as they had been judged on account of their evil. And on account of their fornication and impurity and the corruption among themselves with fornication they died."36 In 20:6 Abraham warns that they not be cursed like Sodom and Gomorrah.

Here the five phrases describing Sodom's sins are similar to those in 16:5-6, with "corruption among themselves" perhaps even more suggestive of homosexuality. The giants and Sodomites are linked here as both culpable for such sins. When these phrases are compared with those in the following passage (7:20-21) describing the sins of the giants, the reference to inordinate sexual practice seems even more convincing. Indeed, a reference to bestiality ("they sinned against beasts") seems to occur in 7:24 and reminds one of the same connection with sodomy in Leviticus 18:23 and 20:15-16. These are the words in Jubilees 7:20-21:

And in the twenty-eighth jubilee Noah began to command his grandsons with ordinances and commandments and all of the judgments which he knew. And he bore witness to his sons so that they might do justice and cover the shame of their flesh and bless the one who created them and honor father and mother, and each one love his neigh-

and preserve themselves from fornication and pollution and from all injustice. For on account of these three the Flood came upon the earth. For (it was) because of the fornication which the Watchers, apart from the mandate of their authority, fornicated with the daughters of men and took for themselves wives from all whom they chose and made a beginning of impurity.37

4 EZRA

Three brief references to Sodom occur in 4 Ezra, self-designated 2 Esdras (so the AV and RSV). The original, middle section was composed about A.D. 100, with chapters 1-2, 15-16 added later.

In 2:8-9 the unrighteous people of Assyria are warned to remember what God "did to Sodom and Gomorrah, whose land lies in lumps of pitch and heaps of ashes." In 5:7 a sign of future judgment is that "the sea of Sodom shall cast up fish." In 7:106 Ezra, when told that prayers are ineffective on the day of judgment, asked, "How then do we find that first Abraham prayed for the people of Sodom?"

The motif of being reduced to ashes (4 Ezra 2:8-9) has a variant reading: "it has sunk right down to hell."38 Both thoughts occur in the New Testament, and Sodom is in the context in each case (Matt. 11:23-24, "descend to Hades"; Luke 17:29; 2 Pet. 2:6; Jude 7).

TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs purport to be the last words of each of the 12 sons of Jacob (Gen. 49). The work is variously dated, from as early as 150 B.C. to 40 B.C., with several additions from the Christian era.39

The following are all the references to Sodom or sodomy found in the Testaments. In the Testament of Naphtali 3:4-5 and 4:1 the sin of Sodom is described as "changed the order of nature" and "wickedness," and is linked to the sin of the Watchers (angels) at the Flood--an association made in Jubilees 20:5.

But ye shall not be so, my children, recognizing in the firmament, in the earth, and in the sea, and in all created things, the Lord who made all things, that ye become not as Sodom, which changed the

37 Ibid., 2.69-70.
order of nature. In like manner the Watchers also changed the order of their nature, whom the Lord cursed at the flood, on whose account He made the earth without inhabitants and fruitless.

These things I say unto you, my children, for I have read in the writing of Enoch that ye yourselves also shall depart from the Lord, walking according to all the lawlessness of the Gentiles, and ye shall do according to all the wickedness of Sodom. Here for the first time the sin of Sodom is said to have "changed the order of nature" (ct. Rom. 1). In 4:1 this is summarized in the general term "wickedness."

Bailey and others believe this passage and those from Jubilees to be the sources of the "Christian interpretation of the Sodom story." Bailey believes that Jubilees departs from "the general tradition of Scripture" both in stressing the sexual nature of Sodom's sin and in linking it with the Watcher story and the Flood. Bailey faults the Testament of Naphtali 3:4-5 for making Sodom's sin homosexuality rather than heterosexuality.40 These claims will be evaluated later.

In the Testament of Asher 7:1 the Sodomites for the first time are said to have sinned against angels. The verse reads, "Become not, my children, as Sodom, which sinned against the angels of the Lord, and perished for ever." Interestingly 6:2 (ct. 2:3; 3:2) speaks about those who "both do the evil thing and they have pleasure in them that do it." This reminds one of Paul's words in Romans 1:32, also in a context of homosexuality.

The Testament of Benjamin 9:1 reads as follows: "And I believe that there will be also evil-doings among you, from the words of Enoch the righteous: that ye shall commit fornication with the fornication of Sodom, and shall perish, all save a few, and shall renew wanton deeds with women."

The last clause may allude to the outrage at Gibeah where the Benjamites attempted the sodomy of a Levite but had to settle for the rape and murder of his concubine (Judg.19-20).41

The Testament of Levi 14:6 prophesies that future, apostate Israel would take Gentile women as wives, "purifying them with an unlawful purification; and your union shall be like unto Sodom and Gomorrah." Kee renders the last clause as, "your sexual relations will become like Sodom and Gomorrah."

In 17:11 occurs the only use, apparently, of the term "pederast" (παιδεύομαι) in the intertestamental literature. The passage prophesies the corruption of Jewish priests: "In the seventh week

41 Bailey rejects a homosexual interpretation of the sin at Gibeah (ibid.)
there will come priests: idolators, adulterers, money lovers, arrogant, lawless, voluptuaries, pederasts, those who practice bestiality." Interestingly the terms "arrogant" and "bestiality" occur here also. In 17:8 the author wrote that there will be "pollution such as I am unable to declare in the presence of human beings, because only the ones who do these things understand such matters." This too perhaps refers to sodomy.

Many of the Testaments refer to the "abominations of the Gentiles" and the like (Testaments of Judah 23:1-4; Issachar 6:1-2; Zebulun 9:5-6; Dan 5:5, 8; Gad 8:2; Simeon 5:4; Levi 10:1-3; Reuben 5:6-7; 6:8). It seems that references to sodomy are implicit in many of the Testaments.

THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS

This letter, purportedly explaining the origin of the Septuagint, is dated probably about 170 B.C., if not earlier (250 B.C.).42 The reference to sodomy occurs in verse 152. The passage reads (151 b-152):

This moreover explains why we are distinct from all other men. The majority of other men defile themselves in their relationships, thereby committing a serious offense, and lands and whole cities take pride in it: they not only procure the males, they also defile mothers and daughters. We are quite separated from these practices.43

The clause, "they not only procure the males," is translated by Andrews as, "they not only have intercourse with men." The context makes clear that sodomy is meant by the Greek term (προαγωγεύω). The passage probably alludes to Leviticus 18 and 20, in which sexual vices, including sodomy and incest, are condemned.

Scroggs believes that the passage is a reaction to pagan Greek pederasty and refers to this practice, not to adult sodomy.44 Yet the letter makes no use of terminology for pederasty, and it identifies the vice as "men" with "males." The terminology is influenced by the Old Testament, not Greek practices.


Summary and Conclusions

"Prohomosexual" interpreters, such as Bailey, Boswell, and Scroggs, make several claims regarding the relationship of the intertestamental literature to the canonical Scriptures on the issue of homosexuality. These were briefly mentioned in the introduction. The claim that Sodom is associated only with pride or inhospitality in the Apocrypha has been shown to be false. The full meaning of "pride" or "arrogance" and the use of such terms as "abominations," "sins," "ungodly," "wickedness," "folly," "failure," and "confusion of sex" in Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom of Solomon argue against the "pro-homosexual" view. The failure of this view to consider all the pertinent passages where Sodom or sodomy is explicit or implicit contributes to the gravity of the misinterpretation.

The claim that the Pseudepigrapha, particularly Jubilees and the Testament of Naphtali, associate sexual sin, and particularly sodomy, with Sodom for the first time has been shown to be false. The association is implicit in the Apocrypha, as demonstrated in this article. The sexual, homosexual meaning originates in Genesis 19 itself. Also terminology in both the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is sufficiently similar to support a unified witness throughout the intertestamental period.

It is true that the Testament of Naphtali uses unique, explicit terms such as "changed the order of nature," but these words are a legitimate interpretation if the Old Testament narrative (Gen. 19) means sodomy. Jubilees is not any more explicit than Ecclesiasticus. Indeed 2 Enoch is the most explicit of all (in its longer recensions), with certain Testaments and the Letter of Aristeas being quite explicit as well. These observations seem valid whatever the dating and interdependency of these books may be.

The claim that Jewish reaction to Greek pederasty influenced the Pseudepigrapha to associate (wrongfully) sodomy with Sodom is false. Only in one place does the term meaning "pederasty" occur (Test. Levi 17:11), and there is no link with Sodom. By contrast, Philo used several terms for pederasty. Indeed, perversion of adults with adults is assumed virtually everywhere (even 2 Enoch 34:1-3 balances the reference to "child corruption" in 10:4-5). Old Testament terminology, including euphemism (beginning with "know" in Genesis 19 and Judges 19), influenced the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, as one would expect (e.g., in the use of "abominations," "pride," etc.).

The claim that the Pseudepigraphal books of Jubilees and Testament of Naphtali influenced 2 Peter and Jude to associate (wrongfully) sodomy with Sodom is false. These New Testament
books should be viewed as part of a stream of tradition regarding the sins of Sodom which began in the Old Testament itself. These writers used terminology consistent with the Old Testament: "lawless deeds," "ungodly," "sensual conduct," "fornication."

Even a study comparing the series of judgments found in 2 Peter and Jude with those in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha argues against any certain dependence. Peter and Jude have a different order of judgments; Peter omits entirely a reference to Pharaoh; Jude puts events of the wilderness first (out of chronological order, contrary, it seems, to the intertestamental books); and neither makes reference to giants before the Flood (angels take their place).

Those who wish to use the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha to eradicate sodomy from passages of the Old Testament or to eradicate condemnation of it where it cannot be denied (Lev. 18; 20) are proposing an extreme interpretation. It is so radical in its tenets, so serious in its consequences for ethics, so contrary to a reasonable interpretation, that it may be properly termed "revisionist" in a sense not unlike revisionist interpretations of recent history.
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THE SCAPEGOAT OF LEVITICUS SIXTEEN

By Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

It is admitted on all hands that Leviticus 16 is one of the mountain peaks of the Scriptures. With striking clarity and force the ceremonies and ordinances of the Day of Atonement are depicted by Moses. Delitzsch has well called the Day of Atonement the Good Friday of the Old Testament. No more significant truths could possibly engage the mind of the believer than those set forth in this chapter of Leviticus (C. H. Mackintosh, Notes on Leviticus, pp. 277-302). Mackintosh says: Notes on rank the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus amongst the most precious and important sections of inspiration. . . ." (ibid., p. 277). The Day of Atonement was the most important in the Mosaic system, because on that day the removal of sin was given its highest expression. The situation can best be explained thus. In Israel many sins were committed wilfully and unwittingly. For the first kind there was no sacrifice possible (Ps. 51:16); for the second type trespass and sin offerings were specified according to the nature of the offense, when the sinner was aware of his sin. However, when the sinner remained unaware of his guilt, no offering was brought and those sins remained in a sense unaccounted for. If this condition were to be unrelieved, the sacrificial system would fall short of its ultimate purpose. To meet this pressing and everpresent need in Israel the Lord instituted the Day of Atonement with its impressive ritual (cf. Keil and Delitzsch, The Pentateuch in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, II, 394-95). Kellogg has stated with clarity: "In it the sacrificial law of Moses attains its supreme expression;
the holiness and the grace alike of Israel's God, their fullest revelation. For the like of the great day of atonement, we look in vain in any other people. If every sacrifice pointed to Christ, this most luminously of all. What the fifty-third of Isaiah is to his Messianic prophecies, that, we may truly say, is the sixteenth of Leviticus to the whole system of Mosaic types,—the most consummate flower of the Messianic symbolism. All the sin-offerings pointed to Christ, the great High Priest and Victim of the future; but this... with a distinctness found in no other" (S. H. Kellogg, *The Book of Leviticus*, p. 272).

At the heart of the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement was the ritual of the sin offering of the two goats. This ceremony, which is described with such fulness, is never mentioned again in the Old Testament (E. Langton, *Essentials of Demonology*, p. 44). As a matter of fact, it has no parallel in the Mosaic legislation or in the heathen world. It is unique, most singular, and impressive (Kellogg, op. cit., pp. 263, 265). But what the exact meaning of this ritual was, continues to be one of the most vexing questions in the exposition of the entire book. The answer lies in the significance attached to the term "scapegoat" (from escape goat) or the more accurate, azazel (ibid., p. 266. Apart from the etymological discussion later, diacritical marks will be omitted in the spelling of the word).

**THE RITUAL**

Only one person ministered in the priestly office on the Day of Atonement, Aaron himself. Bathed and properly attired (v. 4), he took the designated offerings. "And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two he-goats for a sin-offering, and one ram for a burnt-offering. And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin-offering, which is for himself, and for his house. And he shall take the two goats, and set them before Jehovah at the door of the tent of meeting. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot
for Azazel. And Aaron shall present the goat upon which the lot fell for Jehovah, and offer him for a sin-offering. But the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall he set alive before Jehovah, to make atonement for him, to send him away for Azazel into the wilderness" (Lev. 16:5-10, ASV, margin of which reads “removal” for "Azazel").

The bullock of the sin offering Aaron offered for himself and his house; in the incense-filled holy of holies he sprinkled of the blood of the bullock on the mercy seat seven times, an indication of complete atonement. The goat for the Lord was then slain, and the same ritual was carried out with its blood in the holiest of all, this time for the sins of the children of Israel. After the sacrifice of the first goat, Aaron laid both his hands on the head of the live goat, confessing over him the sins and transgressions of Israel. Then the goat was sent away into the wilderness by a man ready for the occasion.

Aaron alone had witnessed atonement in the innermost sanctuary; now he must set it forth in another manner. In order to leave no doubt that sin had been taken away, there must be a removal of it which all Israel could witness (Andrew A. Bonar, *A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus*, p. 311). It is basic to our entire discussion to realize that the two goats together constituted one sin-offering. Verse 5 of our chapter leaves the matter beyond dispute (R. Govett, *The Scapegoat*, p. 4). Analogous to this ritual was the one with the two birds (Lev. 14:4 ff.) in the purification of the leper. The Talmudic Tractate Yoma (6:4) reveals the great popularity of the goat ritual. The people cried, "Take (them) and get out" (according to this Talmudic portion the goat was ultimately pushed over the cliff).

Some scholars seek to find the origins of the ritual among Israel's pagan neighbors. Albright feels that "In order to obtain a clear perspective for Deutero-Isaiah's concept of vicarious suffering, a brief survey of pertinent germinal conceptions and of the development of belief in theodicy is necessary. Among these germinal concepts may be noted in the first place the wide-spread primitive custom of charging some object, animal, or person with
the sin or suffering of a group, after which the object, animal, or person is sacrificed or driven away in order to carry the sin and suffering of men away with it . . . The Hebrew ceremony of the 'scapegoat for Azazel' may perhaps have had a Canaanite origin. Sumerians and Babylonians also believed that man was created by the sacrifice of a god or gods, who were killed that man might live" (W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 252; cf. J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, p. 540, for the transference of evil to goats and other animals. On scapegoats in general--although he does not treat the Biblical material--compare Frazer's work, pp. 574-77, and his extended material in *The Scapegoat*). If one finds the origin of the ritual in these sources, his interpretation of the entire transaction and the parties involved will inevitably be colored thereby. We may admit outward similarities among other peoples, but the objective of Moses, and the Spirit of God behind him, was entirely different. At the most, the practices of the heathen can be explained as perversions of an objective originating in the mind of God alone.

The manner in which the regulations for the scapegoat were carried out in Israel, is of interest to the Bible student. When the Second Temple was in existence, the two goats chosen had to be alike in value, in size, and of the same color. The lot which was to decide the goat for the Lord and that for Azazel, consisted of two small tablets of box or ebony wood, later of gold, kept in a wooden chest. On one tablet were inscribed the words, "For Yahweh" and on the other, "For Azazel." After shaking the chest, the high priest put his hands into the urn and drew out both tablets, one in each hand. The tablet in his right hand was placed on the goat at his right, while that in his left hand was laid on the goat at his left (C. D. Ginsburg, *Leviticus*, pp.149-50). Josephus makes mention of the ceremony in this statement: "And besides these, they bring two kids of the goats; the one of which is sent alive out of the limits of the camp into the wilderness for the scape goat, and to be an expiation for the sins of the whole multitude" (F. Josephus, *Antiquities*
of the Jews, Book 3,10,3; the statement is noncommittal as to the problems involved in the ceremony). It must not be overlooked that this is the only passage in the Bible where the significance of the imposition of hands on the head of an animal is clearly explained as the symbolical transference of the people's sins to the victim (R. Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and D. Brown, Commentary, I, 480). As for the conclusion of the ritual Volck informs us: "According to the Talmudic tractate, Yoma, the high priest, knew by a sort of telegraphic communication between Jerusalem and the wilderness,—the waving of cloths by set watchers, at regular distances,—whether and when the goat arrived in the wilderness, as was necessary, for the other sacrifices were not to be offered until it arrived there (Lev. 16:23-24)" (W. Volck, "Azazel," in Schaff-Herzog, Encyclopedia of Religious Knolwedge, I, 183). That the goat was accompanied by someone and was led to a desert place was meant to show that there was absolutely no possibility for its return. Thus the guilt of the nation was symbolically forgiven and carried away. All this was executed with a manifest objectivity difficult to forget (W. Moeller, "Azazel," in International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, I, 344).

Any explanation of the ritual must necessarily incorporate three basic facts. First, both of the goats, as already stated, are called "a sin-offering," a term applicable to the one as well as to the other. Secondly, the live goat was as much dedicated and set apart to the Lord as the sacrificial goat. No interpretation of the facts relative to the second goat dares to overlook that it is meant for the use of the Lord. Most explanations ignore this significant factor. Finally, the live goat was meant to picture to Israel the complete removal of their transgressions from the presence of the Lord (S. H. Kellogg, op. cit., p. 266).

ETYMOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This phase of our subject will not detain us long, because all students of the Scripture readily admit that
The etymology of the word 'az'azel is obscure (E. Langton, *op. cit.*, p. 44. F. W. Grant, *Numerical Bible*, I, 341, states: "Azazel is mere adoption of the Hebrew word, as to the meaning and application of which there have been so many different thoughts, that some are content to leave it as an insoluble enigma."). The French translation is "pour Azazel" which is a transliteration of the Hebrew term. Luther renders it "der ledige Bock" (the free goat). The Aramaic Targum Onkelos on Leviticus reproduces the Hebrew exactly. It has been suggested that the word is probably for 'azarzel in the sense of removal, to be related to the Arabic 'azala, to remove. The difficulty is increased, because the name occurs nowhere else in Hebrew. In the Syriac version it is pronounced 'azaza' il, and interpreted by the lexicographers as a name for the archangel Michael (E. Nestle, "Azazel" in J. Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, II, 283). In the discussion below other etymologies will be given as they are related to various interpretations as to the identity of Azazel.

A PLACE

The word" Azazel" has been variously interpreted, both impersonally and personally. It has been explained, as a place, a thing, a person, and an abstraction. If a special spot was intended, that place would have served a very limited purpose for a people constantly on the march, as Israel was during the years of the wilderness wanderings (F. Meyrick, *Pulpit Commentary*, II, 239-40). The Talmud explains, "Azazel means the hardest of the mountains" (Yoma, 67 b; cf. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim*, II, 1060, col. 2, who explains the term as "a rough and rocky mountain"). A solitary place in the desert or a distinct locality in the wilderness has been suggested, but this interpretation is not tenable, because constant change in campings was surely taken into consideration when the regulations of Leviticus 16 were given. No specific place or locality has been offered by any advo-
A THING

There are many who favor the position that Azazel refers to a thing, specifically, the live goat or the escape goat. According to some authorities, the Azazel of Leviticus 16 is to be classed with demonic animals. T. K. Cheyne has come forward with an elaborate theory which explains that the object of the ritual, partially at least, was to do a way with the cultus of the impersonal and dangerous se 'irim, mentioned in Leviticus 17:7; Isaiah 13:21; 34:14 (Encyclopedia Biblica, I, col. 394 ff.; with this S. R. Driver agrees; cf. J. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible I, 207; E. Langton, op. cit., p. 46). The view is said to be supported by the form of the name, supposedly altered from 'zz‘l ("God strengthens") to its Biblical form 'z’zl (goat departs). The Vulgate renders the term caper emissarius, and, as has been seen, Luther offers "der ledige Bock."

It is possible, however, that these renderings intend only to give the sense of the context instead of a translation of the word azazel (W. Moeller, op. cit., p. 343). The second goat has on occasion been called hircus redivivus. Bonar, after discussing objections to rendering azazel as scape-goat (a translation which he favors), says: "If the clause, 'the one lot for the Lord,' intimate that the goat is appropriated to a person, so should the next clause, 'the other lot for . . . Azazel,' also signify appropriation to a person. But the answer to this is, that the proper sense is not appropriation to, or designation for, persons. The proper sense is designation for use, viz., the one for the purpose of being killed at the Lord’s altar; the other the purpose of being sent away to the wilderness" (A. Bonar, op. cit., p. 303; italics by Bonar). With the exposition of the LXX, the mediate Greek versions of Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, the Vulgate, Luther's version, and the King James version, Meyrick favors the interpretation that makes azazel the live goat. Says he:
“The interpretation is founded on sound etymological grounds, it suits the context wherever the word occurs, it is consistent with the remaining ceremonial of the Day of Atonement, and it accords with the otherwise known religious beliefs and symbolical practices of the Israelites. The two goats were the single sin offering for the people; the one that was offered in sacrifice symbolized atonement or covering made by shedding of blood, the other symbolized the utter removal of the sins of the people, which were conveyed away and lost in the depths of the wilderness, whence there was no return. . . . The eighth verse should be translated as it stands in the Authorized Version, or, if we ask for still greater exactness, And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and one lot for the remover of sins” (F. Meyrick, op. cit., pp. 239-40; italics by Meyrick).

Is this interpretation tenable? Buxtorf in his Hebrew Lexicon derived the word from 'ez a goat, and 'azal, to depart. Thus he referred it to the goat itself. This is scarcely possible when the goat itself is sent to Azazel. It is Ginsburg who has the sufficient answer to this position. He states: "The rendering, scapegoat, is contrary to the manifest antithesis of the verse. . . the translation scapegoat cannot be admitted in the next verse but one, where, if adopted, it would literally be 'to send the goat to the scapegoat in the wilderness' (see v. 10), or in verse 26, where it is, 'and he who taketh away the goat to the scapegoat' " (C. D. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp.150-51). This rendering, too, is inadmissable.

A PERSON

The majority of the expositors, both orthodox and liberal, prefer to understand Azazel as a person. However, there is no agreement as to what person is meant. It has been said: "After Satan, for whom he was is some degree a preparation, Azazel enjoys the distinction of being the most mysterious extrahuman character in sacred literature. Unlike other Hebrew proper names, the name itself is obscure" (Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 365).
One view takes the goat as a personification of wickedness in contrast with the righteousness of God. The rite is thus said to resemble somewhat the vision of Zechariah (Zechariah 5:6-11; Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 366). From the concept of personified wickedness it was easy to move on to the idea of a person generally feared, and even further, to the thought of the head of the supernatural beings of the desert (ibid., pp. 366-67). A number of lexicons define the name as that of an evil spirit (Gesenius-Buhl, Lexicon; German, S.V.: "Wahrscheinlich bezeichnet er einen in der Wueste hausenden boesen Geist." E. Koenig, Lexicon; German, S.V.: "boesen Geist, der als in der Wueste hausend gedacht wurde. . . ").

In the apocryphal Book of I Enoch 6:7; 9:6; 10:4-6, Azazel is portrayed as the leader of the fallen angels. In the Apocalypse of Abraham he is an unclean bird, which is the embodiment of ungodliness. He is supposed to have been one of the sons of God mentioned in Genesis 6:1 ff. As the leader of the rebels in the time before the flood, he taught men how to wage war, he instructed them in the art of making swords, knives, shields, and coats of mail, and he revealed to women the art of deception by ornamenting the body, dyeing their hair, and painting the face and eyebrows. He disclosed to the people the secrets of witchcraft, leading them astray into wickedness and immorality. Finally, at the command of God he was bound hand and foot by the archangel Raphael, and chained to the rough rocks where he awaits in darkness the day of judgment (the place in the desert where he is cast is designated Dudaæ; on the day of judgment he will be cast into the fire. Cf. Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 366. Also R. H. Charles, ed., Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, II, 191, 193-194.).

Because Azazel occupied a place in Mandaean, Sabean, and Arabian mythology, it has been maintained that it is probable that Azazel was a degraded Babylonian deity (Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 366). Too often students of the Old Testament are satisfied to equate features of the Old Testament with the religion and mythology of Israel's pagan neighbors. The pages of the Old Testament are strikingly free of any trace of pagan mythology (G. E.
Wright, *Biblical Archaeology*, pp. 102-3). In this direction the meaning of the ritual of the live goat cannot be gleaned.

A large number of Bible scholars feel that Azazel is simply a demon whose habitat was in the desert and who predated the Mosaic religion. He is to be classed with the *se 'irim* or satyrs, the worship of whom was expressly forbidden (Lev. 17:7). Those who favor the view argue that the ritual does not contradict Leviticus 17:7, because Azazel played only a passive part in the ceremony.

Cheyne, as already seen, supposed that the objective of the ritual of the Day of Atonement was to give the people a visible evidence of the removal of their sins, and to abolish the cultus of the ‘irim (*Encyclopedia Biblica*, I, col. 394 ff.; other relevant Scriptures are 2 Chron. 11:15; Isa. 13:21; 34:14). There is no instance in the Old Testament where God abolished one unlawful practice by the substitution for it of another unlawful ceremony. This is contrary to the genius of the entire Old Testament. Heinisch reasons for this position thus: "But since Azazel was given a goat he must have been regarded as a personal being; and since the sins of the people were consigned to him, a demon. He stands opposed to Yahweh as Satan does in Job 1 and 2 and the serpent in Genesis 3. Because the people thought that demons dwelt in desert places, the scape goat was driven out into the wilderness. And because it was a goat that was given to Azazel, Azazel was believed to be goatlike in form similar to the *Se 'irim*. Animal sacrifices necessarily required the sprinkling of blood, a fact which would exclude the notion that the scapegoat was a sacrifice to Azazel; besides the law had condemned such practice" (P. Heinisch, *Theology of the Old Testament*, p.137; this is the position of G. F. Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 159, although he also favors an identification with Satan, p. 450).

cit., pp. 269-70--who explains the ritual as a sending of the goat to Satan to announce symbolically that he has no power over forgiven Israel; C. D. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 150-51; Keil and Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 398; Nestle, op. cit., p. 283, is sure that 'if one reads Lev. 16 with an open mind, the impression is that Azazel must be a being related to Jahweh in something of the same way as Ahirman to Ormazd, or Satan--Beelzebub--to God'). If one were to judge the case before us on the basis of the number of eminent expositors favoring this view, the position now under consideration would carry the argument. But Biblical matters are not decided by a counting of aye votes. Is this view consistent with the general testimony of the Scriptures? There are weighty arguments against taking Azazel as a name for Satan. It cannot be shown that the name Azazel occurs in the Old Testament as the name of Satan or any evil spirit for that matter. There is proof that a Jewish belief in the existence of a demon called Azazel reaches back to the days of Moses. The rabbis themselves are for from agreement in assigning the name to Satan, many of them rejecting it on traditional grounds (S. H. Kellogg, op. cit., p. 266; cf. Volck, op. cit., p. 183).

Another cogent argument against this interpretation is that the goat can have nothing whatever to do with Satan, for the Scriptures state clearly that the live goat, equally with the sacrificial goat, was a sin offering to the Lord. The first goat set forth the means of reconciliation with God, whereas the second goat represented the effect of the sacrifice in removing the sins from the presence of the holy God, thus illustrating Psalm 103:12 and Micah 7:19 in a striking manner (Kellogg, loc. cit.). Meyrick has marshalled pertinent evidence against the view that Satan is referred to. He argues: "The objections to the theory that azazel means an evil spirit are of overwhelming force. It will be enough to name the following. 1. The name azazel is nowhere else mentioned. This could not be, if he were so important a being as to divide with Jehovah the sin offering of the congregation of Israel on the great Day of Atonement. 2. No suitable etymology
can be discerned. The nearest approach to it is very forced--'the separated one.' 3. The notion of appeasing, or bribing, or mocking the evil spirit by presenting to him a goat, is altogether alien from the spirit of the rest of the Mosaic institutions. Where else is there anything like it? 4. The goat is presented and offered to Jehovah equally with the goat which is slain. To take that which has been offered (and therefore half sacrificed) to God and give it to Satan, would be a daring impiety, which is inconceivable" (E. Meyrick, op. cit., pp. 239-40). We cannot but agree with the position that "it cannot appear otherwise than strange that, in the most sacred rite of the old covenant, Satan should be so formally recognised as, according to this view, he must have been; that he should there be recognised under a name which suggests a quite different idea concerning him than that under which he is elsewhere presented; and that, notwithstanding he was so publicly and so regularly associated with this name, it should never again be employed as a personal designation" (McClintock and Strong, IX, 398; for this same position see O. T. Allis, "Leviticus," in New Bible Commentary, p. 149).

Now, since the view that makes Azazel a place leaves it ambiguous and indefinite as to location, and since the position that it refers to the live goat itself confuses the passage in Leviticus 16, and since the theory that interprets it of a person--an evil spirit, a degraded deity, a fallen angel, a demon, or Satan--dishonors the Scriptures and degrades the Old Testament religious institutions, it is imperative that we seek for a solution to the problem in another direction.

AN ABSTRACTION

Could Azazel refer to an abstraction or an abstract idea? Brown-Driver-Briggs gives this definition: “entire removal (redupl. intens.). From ‘zl – Ar. ‘zl remove, n. pr. of spirit haunting desert, entire removal of sin and guilt from sacred places into desert on back of goat, symb. of entire forgiveness” (Lexicon, p. 736).
To regard this word as signifying dismissal or removal (as in the ASV and ERV margins) would preserve the concept of the escape goat, although it would avoid the pitfall of equating Azazel with the live goat which is not possible, as we have already seen above (*Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 52). Moeller favors the concept of removal on the basis of the wording of the LXX, *apopompaios, diestalmenos*, and the renderings of the Aquila and Symmachus (W. Moeller, *op. cit.*, pp. 342 f.) This view is splendidly expressed by Meyrick in these words: "That la-azazel means 'for removal' is the opinion of Baehr, Tholuck, Winer, and others. There is nothing objectionable in this interpretation, but the form of the word azazel points rather to an agent than to an abstract act (the refutation of this statement follows in the latter part of his own quotation). Azazel is a word softened (according to a not unusual custom) from azalzel, just as kokav is a softened form of kav-kav, and as Babel is derived from Balbel (Gen. xi. 9). Azalzel is an active participle or participial noun, derived ultimately from azal (connected with the Arabic word azala, and meaning removed), but immediately from the reduplicate form of that verb, azazal. The reduplication of the consonants of the root in Hebrew and Arabic gives the force of repetition, so that while azal means removed, azalzal means removed by repetition of acts. Azalzel, or azazel, therefore, means one who removes by a series of acts. . . . 'It properly denotes one that removes or separates; yet a remover in such sort that the removal is not effected by a single act or at one moment, but by a series of minor acts tending to and issuing in a complete removal. No word could better express the movement of the goat before the eyes of the people, as it passed on, removing at each step, in a visible symbol, their sins further and further from them, until, by continued repetition of the movement, they were carried far away and removed utterly' (Sir W. Martin, *Semitic Languages*)" (F. Meyrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-40). This position has more to commend it by a process of elimination. Thus, the conclusion is this: Both goats were a sin offering to the Lord; one
was sacrificed, whereas the other was sent off into the wilderness to convey visibly and strikingly the truth of complete removal and dismissal. The escape goat does not represent Christ any more than it stands for Satan. That which was symbolized by both goats pointed to the finished work of Christ on Calvary. Blessed be our sufficient Sin Offering.
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The Relation of Ezekiel to the Levitical Law.

BY PROF. FREDERIC GARDINER, D. D.

In the discussions which have arisen of late years about the origin and date of the Mosaic legislation it has been generally recognized that the book of Ezekiel, especially in its later chapters, has a peculiar importance. The traditional view regards the laws of the Pentateuch as having been given through Moses to the Israelites soon after their Exodus from Egypt, and as having formed in all subsequent ages their more or less perfectly observed standard of ecclesiastical law and religious ceremonial; the view of several modern critics, on the other hand, is that this legislation was of gradual development, having its starting point, indeed, quite far back in the ages of Israel's history, but reaching its full development only in the times succeeding the Babylonian exile. Especially, the exclusive limitation of the functions of the priesthood to the Aaronic family, and the distinction between the priests and their brethren of the tribe of Levi, as well as the cycle of the feasts and other like matters, are held by these critics to be of post-exilic origin.

The writings of a priest who lived during the time of the exile, and who devotes a considerable part of his book to an ideal picture of the restored theocracy, its temple, its worship, and the arrangement of the tribes, cannot fail to be of deep significance in its bearing upon this question. Certain facts in regard to Ezekiel are admitted by all: he was himself a priest (i. 3); he had been carried into captivity not before he had reached early manhood; and, whether he had himself ministered in the priest's office at Jerusalem (as Kuenen positively asserts, Relig. of Israel, vol. ii. p. 105) or not, he was certainly thoroughly conversant with the ceremonial as there practiced and with the duties of the priesthood; further, he began his prophecies a few years after Zedekiah was carried into captivity, and continued them until near the middle of the Babylonian exile, the last nine chapters being dated "in the 25th year of our captivity," which corresponds with the
33d of Nebuchadrezzar's reign. If any development of Israel's religion, therefore, were going on during the captivity, it must have been already well advanced at the time of this vision. So far there is a general agreement. The main point necessarily follows:--that in such case Ezekiel's vision must present an intermediate stage on the line of progress from that which we certainly know to have existed before to that which we know, with equal certainty, was practiced afterwards.

It is indeed theoretically conceivable that in the course of this development of religion Ezekiel may have been a strange, erratic genius, who was both regardless of the traditions of his fathers and was without influence upon the course of his successors; but such strange estimation of him is entertained by no one, and needs no refutation. It would be contradicted by his birth, his position as a prophet, his evident estimation among his contemporaries, and his relations to his fellow prophet-priest, Jeremiah. It may be assumed that his writings were an important factor in whatever religious development actually occurred.

This argument is the more important on account of the great weight attached by some critics to the argument *e silentio*. This argument can be only of limited application in regard to historical books, fully; occupied as they are with other matters, and only occasionally and incidentally alluding to existing ecclesiastical laws and customs; but it is plain of great importance in this prophetical setting forth of quite a full and detailed ecclesiastical scheme. The omission of references to any ritual law or feast or ceremony in the historical books can occasion no surprise, and afford no just presumption against the existence of such rites and ceremonies, unless some particular reason can be alleged why they should have been mentioned; but a corresponding omission from the pages of Ezekiel is good evidence either that the thing omitted was too familiar to require mention, or else that he purposely excluded it from his scheme. In other words, it shows that what he omits, as compared with the mosaic law, was either already entirely familiar to him and to the people; or else that the law he sets forth was, in these particulars, different from the Mosaic law. To illustrate by an example: There can be no question that circumcision was a fundamental rite of the religion of the Israelites, practiced in all ages of their history; yet, after the Pentateuch and the few first chapters of Joshua, there is no mention of it, and the words *circumcisum, circumcised, circumcision*, do not occur in the sacred literature down to the time of Jeremiah; neither does the word *fore-skin*, except in connection with David's giving the foreskins of the
Philistines as dowry for Michal (I Sam. xviii. 25, 27; 2 Sam. iii. 14). Even uncircumcised, as a designation of the enemies of Israel, occurs only nine times (Judg. xiv. 3; xv. 18; I Sam. xiv. 6; xviii. 26, 36; xxxi. 4; 2 Sam. i. 20; i Chron. x. 4; Isa. lii. 1) in the interval, and several of these passages are considered by the critics to be of later date; neither is there any allusion to circumcision in Ezekiel, except the mention of the stranger “uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh” (xliv. 7, 9). Of course, the reason for this, in both cases, is that the law of circumcision was so familiar and the practice so universal that there was no occasion for its mention. On the other hand, the fast of the day of atonement is not mentioned either in the historical books or in Ezekiel. We are not surprised at its omission from the former, nor "can this cast any shade of doubt on its observance, unless some passage can be shown in which it would have been likely to bespoken of; but we can only account for its being passed over in the cycle of the festivals in Ezekiel on the supposition that it formed no part of his scheme, while yet, as will be shown farther on, there, are indications that he recognizes it, in his other arrangements, as existing in his time.

While abundant references to the Mosaic law may be found in every part of Ezekiel,* it has seemed best to confine the present investigation to the last nine chapters, both because these are by far the most important in this connection, and also because these have been chiefly used in the discussion of the subject. Unfortunately, there is a difference of opinion in regard to the general interpretation of these chapters. Some will have them to be literally understood as the expression of the prophet's hope and expectation of what was actually to be; more generally the vision is looked upon as a figurative description of the future glory of the church, clothed, as all such descriptions must necessarily be, in the familiar images of the past. A determination of this question is not absolutely necessary to the present discussion, but is so closely connected with it, and the argument will be so much clearer when this has first been examined that it will be well to give briefly some of the reasons for considering Ezekiel's language in this passage to be figurative. †

It is evident that Ezekiel's description differs too widely from the past to allow of the supposition that it is historical; and written at a

---

*For a very ample list of quotations and allusions to the law in Ezekiel, see pp. 105-110 in A Study of the Pentateuch, for Popular Reading, &c. By Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D. (Boston, 1881).

† This question is treated more fully in my notes upon these chapters in Bp. Ellicott's Commentary for English Readers.
time when the temple lay in ashes and the land desolate, it cannot refer to the present. It must then have reference to the future. The presumption is certainly that it portrays an ideal future, because the whole was seen “in the visions of God” (xl. 2), an expression which Ezekiel always applies to a symbolic representation rather than to an actual image of things (cf. i. I; viii. 3; also xi. 24, and xliii. 3).

Moreover, if it is to be literally understood, it must portray a state of things to be realized either in the near future, or else at a time still in advance of our own day. If the former, as is supposed by a few commentators, it is plain that the prophecy was never fulfilled, and remains a monument of magnificent purposes unaccomplished. The attempt to explain this by the theory that the returning exiles found themselves too few and feeble to carry out the prophet's whole designs, and therefore concluded to postpone them altogether to a more convenient season, must be regarded as an entire failure. For one of two suppositions must be adopted, both of them leading to the same result: either that of the negative critics—that certain great features of the Mosaic law, such as the distinction between the priests and Levites and the general priestly legislation, had their origin with Ezekiel; and in this case it is inconceivable that, while adopting this, no attention should have been paid to the authority of this great prophet in other matters; or else we must accept the commonly received view, that the Mosaic law was earlier, and is here profoundly modified by Ezekiel. In the latter case, however much the returning exiles might have been disappointed in their circumstances, yet if they understood the prophet literally, they must have looked forward to the accomplishment of his designs in the future, and would naturally have been anxious to order the restored theocracy on his plan, as far as they could, from the first, to avoid the necessity of future changes; and a large part of the scheme, such as the cycle of the feasts, the ordering of the sacrifices, &c., was quite within their power. In either case, if the vision is to be taken literally, it is inexplicable that there should be no reference to it in the historical books of Ezra and Nehemiah and the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, which all relate to this period, and describe the return and settlement in the land, and the rebuilding of the temple.

It is scarcely necessary to speak of a literal fulfilment still in the future. Ordinarily it is difficult to say that any state of things may not possibly be realised in the future; but here there are features of the prophecy, and those neither of a secondary nor incidental character, which enable us to assert positively that their literal fulfilment would be a plain contradiction of the Divine revelation. It is impos-
sible to conceive, in view of the whole relations between the old and new dispensations, that animal sacrifices can ever be restored by Divine command and with acceptance to God. And, it may be added, it is equally impossible to suppose that the church of the future, progressing in the liberty wherewith Christ has made it free, should ever return to "the weak and beggarly elements" of Jewish bondage here set forth.

Having thus alluded to these general presumptions, we are prepared to look at those particular indications which have been introduced into the prophecy itself as if to show that it is to be understood ideally. I do not propose to speak of those more general indications, such as the regularity of proportions and forms, the symmetry of measurements &c., which here, as in the later chapters of the apocalypse, give to almost every reader a somewhat indefinable but very strong impression of the ideality of the whole description; but will confine myself to statements which admit of definite tests in regard to their literalness.

In the first place, the connection between the temple and the city of Jerusalem in all the sacred literature of the subject, as well as in the thought of every pious Israelite, is so close that, a prophecy incidentally separating them, without any distinct statement of the fact or of the reason for so doing, could hardly have been intended, or have been understood literally. Yet in this passage the temple is described as at a distance of nearly nine and a half miles from the utmost bound of the city, or about fourteen and a quarter miles from its centre.*

A temple in any other locality than Mount Moriah could hardly be the temple of Jewish hope and association. The location of Ezekiel's temple depends upon whether the equal portions of land assigned to

*This holds true, however the tribe portions of the land and the "oblation" are located; for the priests' portion of the "oblation," in the midst of which the sanctuary is placed, (xlviii. 10) is 10,000 reeds, or about nineteen miles broad; to the south of this (xlviii. 15-17) is a strip of land of half the width, in which the city is situated, occupying with its "suburbs" its whole width. These distances, in their exactness, depend upon the length of the cubit which is variously estimated. For the purposes of this discussion it is taken at a convenient average of the conflicting estimates, viz: 20 inches. If it were a little more or a little less the general argument would remain the same. There should also be noticed the view of a few writers (Henderson on xlv. 1; Hengstenberg on xlv. 1, and a few others) that the dimensions given in this chapter are to be understood of cubits and not of reeds; but this is so generally rejected, and is in itself so improbable that it seems to require no discussion. Even if adopted, it would only change the amount of the distance and would still leave the temple quite outside the city and separated from it by a considerable space.
each of the tribes in ch. xlviii. were actually equal in area, or were only strips of equal width. The latter view is, so far as I know, adopted by all commentators. On this supposition Ezekiel's city would be several miles north of Jerusalem, and the temple, still north of that, would be well on the road to Samaria. On the other supposition, it would fall nearly in the latitude of Hebron.

In either case, the temple, with its precincts, is described as a mile square, or larger than the whole ancient city of Jerusalem. In xliii. 12 it is expressly said "that the whole limit thereof round about" is "upon the top of the mountain." But without pressing this, it is hardly possible that the precincts of any actual temple could be intended to embrace such a variety of hill and valley as would be involved.

Moreover, the description of the "oblation" itself is physically impossible. The boundaries of the land are expressly said to be the Mediterranean on the one side and the Jordan on the other (xlvi. 15-2 1). The eastern boundary is not formed by an indefinite extension into the desert, but is distinctly declared to be the Jordan, and above that, the boundaries of Hauran and Damascus. It is substantially the same with that given in Num. xxxiv. 10-12, and in both cases excludes the trans-Jordanic territory which was not a part of Palestine proper, and in which, even after its conquest, the two and a half tribes had been allowed to settle with some reluctance (Num. xxxii. ). Now, if the portions of the tribes were of equal width, the "oblation" could not have been extended so far south as the mouth of the Jordan; but even at that point the whole breadth of the country, according to the English "exploration fund" maps, is only 55 miles. Measuring northwards from this point the width of the oblation, 47 1/3 miles, a point is reached where the distance between the river and the sea is only 40 miles. It is impossible therefore that the oblation itself should be included between them, and the description requires that there should also be room left for the prince's portion at either end. It has been suggested that the prophet might have had in mind measurements made on the uneven surface of the soil or along the usual routes of travel; but both these suppositions are absolutely excluded by the symmetry and squareness of this description.

Again: the city of the vision is described as the great city of the restored theocracy; but, as already said, it cannot be placed geographically upon the site of Jerusalem. Either, then, this city must be understood ideally, or else a multitude of other prophecies, and notably many of Ezekiel which speak of Zion and of Jerusalem, must be so interpreted. There is no good reason why both may not
be figurative, but it is impossible to take both literally; for some of them make statements in regard to the future quite as literal in form as these, and yet in direct conflict with them. Such prophecies, both in Ezekiel and in the other prophets, in regard to Jerusalem, are too familiar to need citation; yet one, on a similar point, from a prophet not much noticed, may be given as an illustration. Obadiah (according to some authorities, a contemporary of Ezekiel) foretells (ver. 19) that at the restoration "Benjamin shall possess Gilead"; but according to Ezekiel, Gilead is not in the land of the restoration at all, and Benjamin's territory is to be immediately south of the "oblation." Again, Obadiah (ver. 20) says, "The captivity of Jerusalem" (which in distinction from "the captivity of the host of the children of Israel," must refer to the two tribes) "shall possess the cities of the south"; but according to Ezekiel, Judah and Benjamin are to adjoin the central "oblation," and four other tribes are to have their portions south of them. Such instances might easily be multiplied. It must surely be a false exegesis which makes the prophets gratuitously contradict each other and even contradict themselves (as in this case of Obadiah) almost in the same sentence.

The division of the land among the twelve tribes; the assignment to the priests and the Levites of large landed estates, and to the former as much as to the latter; the enormous size of the temple precincts and of the city, with the comparatively small allotment of land for its support, are all so singular, and so entirely destitute of either historical precedent or subsequent realization, that only the clearest evidence would justify the assumption that these things were intended to be literally carried out. No regard is paid to the differing numbers of the tribes, but—as if to set forth an ideal equality—an equal strip of land is assigned to each; and, the trans-Jordanic territory being excluded and about one-fifth of the whole land being set apart as an "oblation," the portion remaining allows to each of the tribes only about two-thirds as much territory as, on the average, they had formerly possessed. The geographical order of the tribes is also extremely singular, and bears all the marks of ideality. Moreover, nearly the whole territory assigned to Zebulon and Gad is habitable only by nomads.

A further difficulty with the literal interpretation may be found in the description of the waters which issued from under the eastern threshold of the temple (xlvi. 1-12). This difficulty is so great that some commentators, who have adopted generally a literal interpretation, have found themselves constrained to resort here to the figurative; but on the whole, it has been recognized that the vision is essentially
one, and that it would be unreasonable to give a literal interpretation to one part of it and a figurative to another. The waters of the vision run to the "east country," and go down "to the sea," which can only be the Dead Sea; but such a course would be physically impossible without changes in the surface of the earth, since the location of the temple of the vision is on the west of the water-shed of the country.* They had, moreover, the effect of "healing" the waters of the sea, an effect which could not be produced naturally without providing an outlet from the sea, and Ezekiel (xlvii. 11) excludes the idea of an outlet. No supply of fresh water could remove the saltiness, while this was all disposed of by evaporation. But, setting aside minor difficulties, the character of the waters themselves is impossible, except by a perpetual miracle. Without insisting upon the strangeness of a spring of this magnitude upon the top of "a very high mountain" (xl. 2; cf. also xliii. 12), at the distance of 1,000 cubits from their source, the waters have greatly increased in volume; and so with each successive 1,000 cubits, until at the end of 4,000 (about a mile and a half) they have become a river no longer fordable, or, in other words, comparable to the Jordan. Such an increase, without accessory streams, is clearly not natural. Beyond all this, the description of the waters themselves clearly marks them as ideal. They are life-giving and healing; trees of perennial foliage and fruit grow upon their banks, the leaves being for "medicine," and the fruit, although for food, never wasting. The reader cannot fail to be reminded of "the pure river of water of life" in Rev. xxii. 1, 2. "on either side" of which was "the tree of life," with "its twelve manner of fruits" and its leaves "for the healing of the nations." The author of the Apocalypse evidently had this passage in mind; and just as he has seized upon the description of Gog and Magog in chaps. xxxviii., xxxix., as an ideal description, and applied it to the events of the future, so he has treated this as an ideal prophecy, and applied it to the Church triumphant.

Finally, it should be remembered that this whole vision is intimately bound together, and all objections which lie against a literal interpretation of any one part, lie also against the whole. Additional reasons for spiritual interpretation will incidentally appear in the following pages.

If it is now asked--and this seems to be the chosen ground of the

*This is true with any possible location of the "oblation"; for the central point between the Jordan and the Mediterranean is well on the western water-shed at every locality from the head waters of the Jordan to the extremity of the Dead Sea.
literal interpreters—why then is this prophecy given with such a wealth of minute material detail? the answer is obvious, that this is thoroughly characteristic of Ezekiel. The tendency to a use of concrete imagery, strongly marked in every part of his book, merely culminates in this closing vision. The two previous chapters, especially, have abounded in definite material details of the attack of a great host upon the land of Israel, while these very details, upon examination, show that they were not meant to be literally understood, and that the whole prophecy was intended to shadow forth the great and final spiritual conflict, prolonged through ages, between the power of the world and the kingdom of God. So here, the prophet, wishing to set forth the glory, the purity, and the beneficent influence of the church of the future, clothes his description in those terms of the past with which his hearers were familiar. The use of such terms was a necessity in making himself intelligible to his contemporaries; just as to the very close of the inspired volume it is still necessary to set forth the glory and joy of the church triumphant under the figures of earthly and familiar things, but no one is misled thereby to imagine that the heavenly Jerusalem will be surrounded by a literal wall of jasper 1,500 miles high (Rev. xxi, 16, 18), or that its 12 gates shall be each of an actual pearl. At the same time the prophet is careful to introduce among his details so many impossible points as to show that his description must be ideal, and its realisation be sought for beneath the types and shadows in which it is clothed. It may be as impossible to find the symbolical meaning of each separate detail as it is to tell the typical meaning of the sockets for the boards of the tabernacle although the tabernacle as a whole is expressly said to have been a type. This is the case with every vision, and parable, and type, and every form of setting forth truth by imagery; there must necessarily be much which has no independent signification, but is merely subsidiary to the main point. Ezekiel's purpose was so far understood by his contemporaries, that they never made any attempt to carry out his descriptions in the rebuilding of the temple and the reconstruction of the State. The idea of a literal interpretation of his words was reserved for generations long distant from his time, from the forms of the church under which he lived, and from the circumstances and habits of expression with which he was familiar, and under the influence of which he wrote.

With this unavoidably prolonged discussion the ground is cleared for a comparison of the *cultus* set forth in this vision of Ezekiel with
that commanded in the Mosaic law, and an examination of the relation between them. This discussion is embarrassed by the difficulty of finding any historical data which will be universally accepted. If we might assume that any of the older historical books of the Old Testament were as trustworthy as ordinary ancient histories making no claim to inspiration, or that the books of most of the prophets were not pious frauds, the task would be greatly simplified. As it is, I shall endeavor to conduct the examination on the basis of such obvious facts as would be admitted by the authors of what seem to the writer such strange romances as Kuenen's "Religion of Israel" and "Prophets and Prophecy in Israel."*

The first point to which attention may be called is the landed property of the priests and Levites. According to the Mosaic law, they had no inheritance of land like the other tribes, but merely scattered cities for residence; and were to depend for support, partly upon their portion of the sacrifices, and chiefly upon the tithes of the people. While the payment of these tithes was commanded, there was absolutely no provision for enforcing their payment. This rested entirely upon moral obligation, and the condition of the whole Levitical tribe was thus dependent upon the conscientiousness of the Israelites. When the sense of religious obligation was strong, they would be well provided for; when it was weak, they would be in want. And this is exactly what appears from the general course of the history, as well as from such special narratives as are universally admitted to be of great antiquity. (See Judg. xvii. 7-18, &c.) Now, after the exile, at a time when there can be no question in regard to the facts, we find the priests and Levites similarly unprovided with landed property. The Mosaic law, the condition of things before the exile and after, agree together; but Ezekiel represents a totally different state of things. He assigns two strips of territory, one to the priests and the other to the Levites, each of nearly the same size as the allotment to any of the tribes (xlviii. 9-14). This very small tribe would thus have had almost twice as much land as any other; and such a provision would obviously have profoundly modified the whole state and relations of the priestly order and of the subordinate Levites. In this point, therefore, we find that if any process of development was going on in the ecclesiastical system of Israel, it was such as to

*Substantially the same views, especially in relation to Ezekiel, are taken by Graf (Die Gesehichtl. Bucher des alien Test.), Smend (Der Prophet Ezechiel), and others, with sundry variations in detail; but as Kuenen is the author most widely known, and presents his theories in the most favorable point of view, the references of this paper will be confined to his works.
leave the final result just what it had been before, while the system of Ezekiel, which, on that supposition, should be a middle term between the two, is entirely foreign to both of them.

There are other noteworthy points involved in the same provision. According to Deut. xix. 2-9 three cities, and conditionally another three, and according to Num. xxxv. 9-15 the whole six, were to be selected from the cities of the Levites and appointed as cities of refuge in case of unintentional manslaughter. The same provision is alluded to in Ex. xxi. 13, 14, and it plainly forms an essential feature of the whole Mosaic law in regard to manslaughter and murder. After the conquest, according to Josh. xxi. this command was executed and the cities were distributed as widely as possible in different parts of the land, three of them on either side of the Jordan, the eastern side being considered as an extension of the land not included in the original promise and therefore bringing into force the conditional requirement of Deuteronomy.* But by the arrangement of Ezekiel, the Levites were not to have cities scattered through the land, and their central territory could not afford the necessary ease of access from the distant parts. There is here therefore an essential difference in regard to the whole law in reference to manslaughter and murder, and it is plain that the Mosaic law in this point could not have been devised from Ezekiel.

But besides this obvious inference, it is in the highest degree improbable that this provision of the Mosaic law could have originated after the captivity, when it would have been entirely unsuited to the political condition of the people. Still more, it is inconceivable that the record of the execution of this law by Joshua could have been invented after the time of Ezekiel; for neither in his vision is any such selection of cities indicated, nor in the actual territorial arrangement of the restoration was there any opportunity therefor. Yet the same account which records the selection (incidentally mentioned in connection with each city as it is reached in the list) clearly recognizes the distinction between the priests and the Levites (Josh. xxi.) This distinction then must have been older than Ezekiel.

In quite another point Ezekiel's assignment of territory, taken in connection with Numbers and Joshua, has an important bearing upon the antiquity of the distinction between priests and Levites. According to the Mosaic law the priests were a higher order ecclesiastically

*Deuteronomy was indeed written after the conquest of the trans-Jordanic territory; but it was immediately after, and when this territory was yet hardly considered as the home of the tribes. Some writers prefer to consider the number of six cities as fixed and the three conditional, which in their view were never set apart, as making nine.
than the Levites and in accordance with this position, were provided with a more ample income; for being much less than a tenth of the tribe, the priests received a tenth of the income of all the other Levites (Num. xviii. 25-28). Both these facts are in entire accordance with the relations of the priests and Levites in post-exilic times; but they are at variance with those relations as set forth in Joshua, if that be post-exilic, and also with Ezekiel considered as a preparatory stage of the legislation of the Pentateuch. Of course, the whole body of the Levites must have been originally many times more numerous than the members of the single family of Aaron, and if Joshua xxi. be very ancient we need not be surprised that the 48 Levitical cities provided for in Numbers (xxxv. 1-7) should have been given, 13 to the priests and 35 to the other Levites (Josh. xxi.); for this gave to the priests individually a much larger proportion than to the Levites. The same thing is true of the provision made by Ezekiel. The equal strips of land given to the priests collectively and to the Levites collectively, gave much more to the former individually. But all this would have been entirely untrue after the exile. In the census of the returning exiles, given in both Ezra and Nehemiah, the number of priests is set down as 4289 (Ezra ii. 36-38; Neh. vii. 39-42), while that of the Levites—even including the Nethinim—is 733, or but little more than one-sixth of that number (Ez. ii. 40-58; in Neh. vii, 43-60 the number is 752).* It may indeed be argued that Ezekiel has no regard to the actual numbers of the two bodies, but writing at an early stage of the process of separation between the priests and the Levites, intends to put them upon a precise equality; and that only at a later period was the pecuniary provision for the Levites made inferior to that of the priests. If this be so, then Joshua xxi, must be post-exilic; for in its whole arrangement it clearly recognizes the distinction and the superiority of the priests. Yet this gives 35 cities to the very few Levites and only 13 to the comparatively numerous priests-

*Kuenen (Relig. of Isr. Vol. II. p. 203, 204) and his school undertake to explain this disparity of numbers by the supposition that the Levites were "degraded priests" of which he thinks he finds evidence in Ezek. xliv. 10-16. For the present point this is quite immaterial; all that is here required is admitted by him—the fact of the great disparity in numbers. But the supposition itself is quite gratuitous, and rests upon two unfounded assumptions: (1) that "the Levites" in ver. 10 cannot be used κατ' ἐξοχήν for the priests—a point to be spoken of elsewhere; and (2) that the "sons of Zadok" ver. 15, is synonymous with "sons of Aaron," which is not true. The simple and natural explanation of the passage in Ezekiel is that the prophet means to degrade the priests who have been guilty of idolatry. (See Curtiss' The Levitical Priests p. 74-77.)
in other words is self-contradictory. In this respect the bearing of Ezekiel is plain; it makes the Mosaic law and the history of Joshua, consistent if they were ancient, but inconsistent and self-contradictory if Ezekiel's vision was a stage in the late differentiation of the priests from the Levites.

We are now prepared to go a step further. It is agreed on all sides, that Ezekiel recognizes a distinction between the priests and the Levites. To an ordinary reader of his book it appears that he makes this recognition incidentally and as a matter of course, as of an old, familiar, and established distinction. He nowhere states that there shall be such a distinction, nor gives any grounds upon which it shall rest, nor describes who shall be included in the one body and who in the other, except that he confines the priests to "the sons of Zadok", (xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11), of which more will be said presently. Certainly this does not look, upon the face of it, like the original institution of this distinction. But Kuenen (Relig. of Isr. vol. 2 p. 116) asserts that at the time of Josiah's reformation, "all, the Levites, without exception, were considered qualified to serve as priests of Jahweh," and that "Ezekiel is the first to desire other rules for the future;" and that the priestly laws of the Pentateuch, of which he had no knowledge, were subsequent. Again he says (ib, p. 153) Ezekiel, in uttering his wishes as to the future, made a beginning of committal to writing of the priestly tradition. The priests in Babylonia went on in, his footsteps. A first essay in priestly legislation—remains of which have been preserved to us in Lev. xviii-xxvi. was followed by others, until at last a complete system arose, contained in an historical frame. Possessed of this system, the priestly exiles, and among them Ezra in particular, could consider themselves entitled and called upon to come forward as teachers in Judea, and to put in practice the ordinances which hitherto had been exclusively of theoretical interest to them."

* These passages are cited from Kuenen simply to bring distinctly before the mind the theory which has recently gained acceptance with an intelligent school of critics; it is the bearing upon this of the vision of Ezekiel which we are to consider. The question to be asked is whether the more careful examination of this vision bears out the prima facie impression produced by it, or confirms the somewhat elaborate theory of Kuenen.

There can be no manner of doubt that in Ezekiel's time they already existed two classes of persons known respectively as “priests”

* He admits that the distinction is recognized in 1 Kings viii. 4, but says this is merely in consequence of a clerical error. Relig. Isr. vol. II. p. 301.)
and as "Levites." Whatever may have been the ground of the dis-
tinction, and whether or not all were equally entitled to offer sacri-
fices, Ezekiel certainly recognizes the two classes as existing, since he
could not otherwise have used the terms without defining them. The
Levites, of course, may be considered already well known as the
descendants of the tribe of Levi; but why not the priests in a similar
way? How could he have used the term in distinction from the
Levites, if no such distinction had been hitherto known?

But further: Ezekiel assigns to the priests the functions of offering
the sacrifices and of eating the sin offering, while to the Levites he
gives the duty of "ministering in the sanctuary." Of course the
mere expression "minister" (xlv. 11) might, if it stood alone, be
understood of any sort of service; but the whole context shows it is
meant of a service inferior to the priests, and the existence here of the
same distinctions as those of the Mosaic law has been so universally
recognized as to lead some scholars to argue that the provisions of this
law must have been derived from this prophet. It is found however,
that precisely the same distinction appears, and precisely the same
duties are assigned respectively to the priests and to the Levites in the
ages before Ezekiel. There is no occasion to speak of the functions
of the priests since there is no dispute about them; in regard to the
Levites, I will refer only to a single passage already cited by Kuenen
(ubi sup. p. 304) as pre-exilic, and of especial interest because it is
taken from Deuteronomy (xviii. 1-8), and is partly in the same words
as those used by Ezekiel. At first sight it appears to join the two
classes together, but on closer examination is found to make a clear
distinction between them. "The priests the Levites, all the tribe of
Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; they shall eat
the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and his inheritance" (vs. 1).
This statement has been thought to show that the whole tribe was
here treated as a unit, with no distinction between its members. If it
stood alone it might be so regarded; but the lawgiver immediately
goes on to speak separately of the two parts of the tribe: "And this
shall be the priests' due from the people, from them that offer a sac-
rifice," specifying the parts of the victim and also the first fruits; "for
the Lord thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to
minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons forever." So far
about the priests. Then follows, "And if a Levite come from any of
thy gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all
the desire of his mind unto the place which the Lord shall choose,
then he shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, as all his
brethren the Levites do, which stand before the Lord. They shall
have like portions to eat, besides that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony." There is here nothing, as in the case of the priests, about sacrifice; but the Levites appear to be inferior ministrants, just as in the Book of Numbers; and it is provided that any of the tribe, wherever he has before lived, may come and join himself to their number and share in the provision for their support, without regard to his private property. The supposition that the Levites referred to in these last verses were also priests, i.e. entitled to offer sacrifice, would be exegetically inadmissible; for they are said to "come from any of thy gates out of all Israel," while in Josh. xxi. 9-19 the cities of the priests (described also as the sons of Aaron) are confined to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon. Consequently those who were to offer sacrifice could not "come from any of thy gates out of all Israel."* But independently of this fact, the priests are mentioned in Deuteronomy with their duties, then afterwards the Levites separately with their duties, which are not the same; and the point would require to be otherwise most clearly proved before it could be admitted that the persons were the same. Of course Ezekiel's vision, while it separates clearly the priests from the Levites, yet in assigning to each of them a compact territory, looks to an entirely different state of things from that contemplated in Numbers or fulfilled in Joshua.

Again: the expression "the priests the Levites" used seven times in Deuteronomy (xvii. 9, 18; xviii. i; xxi. 5; xxiv: 8; xxvii. 9; xxxi. 9) and twice in Joshua (iii. 3; viii. 33) has been relied upon as a proof that the two classes were not distinguished when these books were written. That this argument will not apply to Joshua has already appeared, and Curtiss in his "Levitical Priests"† has shown that the same expression is used in the post-exilic books of Chronicles; but our concern is with Ezekiel. He has the expression twice (xlii. 19; xlv. 15) and each time with an addition which leaves no possible doubt of his meaning: "that be of the seed of Zadok" and "sons of Zadok." Hence the same reasoning which would make all Levites into priests in Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Chronicles, would make them all into "sons of Zadok" in Ezekiel.

But this leads to another fact in the prophet's description of the priesthood. As already said, he recognizes as the priests of the future

*This difficulty might be avoided by supposing Joshua to be later than Deuteronomy; but it has already been shown that this would only involve other and no less formidable difficulties on the other side.

†"The Levitical Priests, a contribution to the criticism of the Penta
only "the sons of Zadok (xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11).
Kuenen indeed seems to assume (ubi sup. p. 116) that "sons of
Zadok" and "sons of Aaron" are synonymous terms; it needs no
argument to show that they are really very different. By universal,
agreement, the priesthood was not of old restricted to the "sons of
Zadok," and it may be added, I suppose by the same universal
agreement, it was not so restricted afterwards. The return of other
priests is mentioned by Ezra (ii. 36-39) and Nehemiah (vii. 39-42),
and I do not know that there has ever been any question that priests
of other families served in the temple in later ages. Here then the
prophet is found, as in so many other cases, to be at variance alike
with the earlier and the later practice and with the Mosaic law, instead
of constituting a link between them. If it be alleged that he pro-
posed to restrict the priesthood to the family of Zadok, but that this
was found impracticable and his successors carried out his plan as
far as they could, by restricting it to the wider family of Aaron, it may
well be asked, where is the proof of this? Where is the thought or
suggestion anywhere outside of Ezekiel that such a narrower restric-
tion was ever desired or attempted? If we look upon the prophet's
description as ideal, the whole matter is plain enough. "The sons
of Zadok," in view of the facts of history, are the faithful priests, and
only such would Ezekiel have to minister; but as a scheme for a
change in the actual and literal priesthood, the whole matter is inex-
plicable.

Another point in which Ezekiel differs from the Mosaic ritual is in
regard to the persons who were to slay the ordinary sacrificial victims.
According to Lev. i. 5, 11; iii. 2, 8, 13; iv. 4 (cf. 15), 24, 29, 33,
the victim was to be killed by the one who made the offering, and
according to Ex. xii. 6, the same rule was to be observed with regard
to the Passover. This was apparently the custom in all ages. The
language of Josephus (Ant. iii. 9. § 1), although not very clear,
favors this supposition, and the record in 2 Chron. xxix. 20, ss., 34;
xxx. 17 seems decisive. In this post-exilic book, in the account of
the purification of the sanctuary under Hezekiah, the exceptional
sacrifices of the purification are said to be slain by the priests, and the
assistance of the Levites in flaying the victims is expressly excused on
account of the insufficiency in the number of the priests, while at the
subsequent Passover it is said "the Levites had the charge of the
killing the Passovers for everyone that was not clean." These excuses
for these acts imply that, in the time of the Chronicler, it was still the
custom for the people to kill their own sacrifices and for the priests to
flay them. The Levitical law and the post-exilic custom (as well as
the pre-exilic) here agree as usual; but Ezekiel, is quite apart from them and provides (xliv. 11) that the Levites "shall slay the burnt offering and the sacrifice for the people." Here again he is not at all in the line of a developing system. It may be added incidentally that the Samaritan Pentateuch shows what would have been the actual progress of development if it had existed in these matters in Israel; for, by changing the number of the pronouns and verbs in Leviticus, it makes the priests the slayers of the victims in all cases.

It has often been noticed that the office of high-priest is ignored in this vision, and an argument has been based on this fact to show that the writings of Ezekiel mark an early stage in the development of the Jewish hierarchy, when the precedence of the high-priest had not yet been established. The fundamental statement itself is not strictly true, and it will appear presently that the prophet, in several different ways, incidentally recognizes the existence of the high-priest and of some of the principal laws in relation to him. But the high-priest fills a prominent and important place in the Mosaic legislation, and if it could be shown on the one hand that there was no high-priest before the captivity, and on the other, that Ezekiel knew of none, it would certainly create a presumption that the laws of the priesthood might be of later origin. But the facts are so precisely opposite, that the maintenance of such propositions seems very strange. It may be well to refer again to Kuenen, as a fair exponent of this school of critics, to show that the non-existence of the high-priesthood before the captivity is distinctly maintained by them. He admits, indeed, "that one of the high-priests, who bore the title of Kohen hagadol ['the high-priest'] or Kohen rosch ['the head-priest'], at any rate from the days of Jehoash; stood at the head of the Jerusalem priests," but he associates him in honor and rank only with the three door-keepers," and tells us that the various passages cited "teach us that one of the priests superintended the temple, or, in other words, kept order there, in which duty he was of course assisted by others"; and that "it follows, from 2 Kings xi. 18; xii. 12; Jer. xxix. 26, that this post was instituted by Jehoiada, the contemporary of King Jehoash" (Relig. of Isr. vol. II. p. 304). Again he marks emphatically, as one of the evidences of the late origin of the high-priesthood, that "the distinction between the duties of the priests and the high-priest, Lev. xxi. 1-9 and verses 10-15, does not occur at all in Ezekiel" (ib. p. 190). And still again (ib. p. 214), he represents that, even in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the duties and authority of the high-priest were still in a vague and unsettled condition.

The point here to be determined is whether we have evidence of
the existence before the captivity of a high-priesthood as an important, regular office, transmitted by inheritance, and forming one of the fundamental features of the Israelitish polity. Of course, we could not expect to find in such histories as have been preserved other than meagre and incidental allusions to the details of the high-priest's duties, his dress, and such matters. Such allusions do occur, as in the case of Ahimelech at the time of David's flight (I Sam. xxvi. 1-9), and of the ephod of Abiathar (I Sam. xxiii. 6, 9—observe that in ver. 9 it is הָאָפָדָה with the definite article), in connection with David's enquiry of the Lord. (Comp. also the charge against Ahimelech that he "enquired of the Lord" for David. I Sam. xxv. 10, 15). But the question is not about these matters of detail; the main point is, that in Israel the priestly order had, and almost of necessity must have had, especially in the times before the monarchy, an authoritative and real head, as was the case with other nations of antiquity. Even the exception here proves the rule, and we find that temporarily, in one anomalous period of the history, during the reign of David, there were two heads or high-priests, Zadok and Abiathar. The latter, after the slaughter of his father and kinsman by Saul, had fled to David in his outlawry and had become, as he was entitled to become by inheritance, his high-priest. Meantime the office could not be left in abeyance under the regular government, and when David ascended the throne he found the high-priesthood occupied by Zadok. He did not presume to displace him, and neither would he displace the faithful sharer of his own adversity; so it came about that both were recognized. This anomalous state of things was the more tolerable because at the same time, according to the history, the ark and the tabernacle were separated, while the duties of the high priest were connected with both of them.

The high priest, or during the period just mentioned, the two high priests, are mentioned in the following passages which are expressly cited by Kuenen (Relig. of Isr. Note II. on ch. viii. Vol. II., p. 304) as pre-exilic: 2 Sam. viii. 17; xx. 25; I Ki. iv. 4; ii. 22, 26, 27; 2 Ki. xii. 10; xxii. 4, 8; xxiii. 4; xxv. 18; Jer. xx. I. It is well known how greatly this list might be extended, and also how often the high priest is mentioned in the books of Joshua and I Samuel, the names of Eleazar, Phinehas, Eli or Ahiah, being often given in connection with the office, besides those of Ahimelech, Abiathar, Zadok, and Ahitub. It would be hard to find any single fact in the whole compass of Israelitish history in itself more probable or more abundantly attested than the existence of the office of a real high priest, an important functionary
in the kingdom, the counsellor of the rulers, and whose especial office it was to "enquire of the Lord" and communicate His commands at important national emergencies. There is also perfectly clear and ample evidence of the continued existence of the same office after the captivity. Jeremiah (lii. 24-27) and the author of the second book of Kings (xxv. 18-21) give the name of the person who held the office at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, Seraiah, who was put to death by Nebuchadnezzar; while Ezra (ii. 2; iii. 2, 8, g; iv. 3; v. 2; x. i8) and Nehemiah (vii. 7; xii. 1, 7, 10, 26) unite with Haggai (i. 1, 12, 14; ii., 2, 4) and Zechariah (iii. 1, 3, 6, 8, 9; vi. 11) in mentioning Joshua, or Jeshua, the son of Josedeck, as the high priest of the restoration. But Ezekiel's vision, it is said, recognizes no such office, and as will be seen presently, intentionally excludes it. Once more then, this vision not only gives no countenance, but is in direct opposition to the theory, that Ezekiel originated or was a direct link in the development of the priesthood from an earlier to a later differing form.

There is however, one curious point incidentally occurring in the vision which shows that Ezekiel was familiar with the office of high priest. In the various measurements of the temple and all its details given in chaps. xli., xlii., the prophet everywhere accompanies the measuring angel until he comes to the holy of holies. There the angel enters alone, as is shown by a sudden change in the language (xli. 3). This certainly has the appearance of a consciousness on the part of Ezekiel, the priest, that he might not enter there, and (since it cannot be supposed that this part of the temple was not to be entered at all) an allusion to that provision of the law by which entrance into the holy of holies was forbidden to all, save to the high priest only on the great day of atonement. I do not know of any other explanation, and if this be the true one, it shows that not only the high priest, but the principal Mosaic law in regard to him and also the day of atonement was known to the prophet.

That the omission of the high priest from this vision is not accidental but intentional is shown by the laws of the priesthood here set forth. These laws treat the priesthood as a single body without distinction and, considered only in themselves, admit of either of two interpretations: (1) on the development hypothesis, that they are original and general laws which were subsequently differentiated into the special stricter ones for the high priest, and the less strict for his brethren; or (2) that the specific laws were actually older than Ezekiel, but when he omitted the high priest from his scheme, he combined them into a certain mean between the two. The choice
between these two hypotheses is at once determined in favor of the latter if, as has already been shown, there was a real high priest in the previous ages. All reasonable ground of argument from these laws in favor of the development hypothesis is thus taken away; and not only so, but it is evident from the vision that Ezekiel knew of those stricter laws in regard to the high priest which did not apply to the priesthood in general. Besides the allusion already mentioned, the peculiarity of the prophet's laws appears especially in two points: in regard to marriage, and in regard to mourning. For the former, the Levitical law allowed the marriage of the ordinary priest to any but a profane or divorced woman, laying no restriction upon the marriage with a widow (Lev. xxi. 7); but it restricted the high priest to marriage with "a virgin of his own people " (ib. 14). Ezekiel makes a general compromise law for all, allowing marriage with a widow in case her former husband had been a priest (xlv. 22). The same thing is true of mourning. Ezekiel in general repeats literally the law of Lev. xxi. 1-3, 11-14, but while there is there a distinction between the high-priest and the ordinary priest, here there is one intermediate regulation. In Leviticus the ordinary priest might be "defiled for the dead" "for his kin that is near unto him," while this is in all cases whatever forbidden to the high-priest; in Ezekiel (xlv. 25-27) such defilement for the dead that "is near of kin" is allowed to all, but must be followed not only by the ordinary cleansing after contact with a dead body (see Num. xix. 11-17), but also by a second special period of seven days closed by a sin offering before the priest again enters upon the discharge of his duties. It will be noticed that there is here not only allusion to the laws of Leviticus, but also to a cleansing, apparently that prescribed in Numbers.

The regulations for the priests' dress (xlv. 17-19) require no especial notice. They are very brief; and as far as they go, are a simple reproduction of the provisions of Lev. xxviii. They have altogether the air of presupposing a knowledge of that law and specifying only a few particulars to recall the whole. As far as any inference is to be drawn from them, it is decidedly in favor of a recognition of the detailed precepts of Leviticus as already familiar.

We may now pass to the feasts and sacrifices and under this general head two points are to be considered: 1st, the changes in the ritual of the particular feasts and sacrifices, and 2d, the changes in the cycle of the feasts themselves. Under the former head the change which, if literally carried out, would have been the most striking one to the Israelite because most constantly before his mind, was that in the daily burnt offering. Ezekiel requires that there shall be a burnt
offering every morning; he says nothing whatever of an evening sacrifice and his language is justly thought to exclude the idea of one (xlvi. 13-15). The Mosaic law commanded that there should be a burnt offering both morning and evening (Ex. xxix. 38, 39; Num. xxviii. 3, 4; cf. also Lev vi. 8, 9). Is this an enlargement of, and therefore later than Ezekiel's prescription? Of course this will depend upon whether there is evidence of the custom of evening sacrifice before the time of the exile. There are two passages which, as they stand in our version, are clear and decisive upon this point. In 1 Ki. xviii. 36 it is said in connection with the controversy between Elijah and the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel, "It came to pass at the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that Elijah" &c. Here this is evidently regarded as so fixed a custom as to suffice in itself to make the hour. Again, in 2 Ki. xvi. 15, when Ahaz had introduced his own idolatrous altar and yet wished the legal sacrifices to go on as usual, he "commanded Urijah the priest, saying, upon the great altar burn the morning burnt offering, and the evening meat offering" &c. Either of these passages, much more both of them, would be entirely decisive were it not for the fact that the word used for the evening sacrifice in both cases is הָּמִּנַּה and it is urged that this means an unbloody sacrifice. After the restoration also, when Ezra on one occasion "sat astonied until the evening sacrifice" (Ezra ix. 4) the word is the same. It is therefore suggested by some interpreters that before and after the exile, as far as the time of Ezra, the custom may have been to offer a burnt offering in the morning and an unbloody oblation in the evening; and this interpretation is thought to be confirmed by Ps. cxli. 2, "Let my prayer be set before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening הָּמִּנַּה". From this it is argued that the Mosaic law, being at variance with this custom, and also with Ezekiel, must be of later origin; but if so, it must be also later than the book of Daniel, (which these critics place at 165 B. C.) for he also describes the hour of evening sacrifice as "the time of the evening הָּמִּנַּה (ix. 21). As far as Ezekiel is concerned, this argument is seen, on a moment's reflection, to have no force; for it is just as difficult to account for his omission of a regular evening oblation as of a burnt offering. But the matter cannot be left here, for the whole interpretation is wrong. The technical meaning of הָּמִּנַּה as an unbloody oblation belongs to the Levitical law, and if this law be of later origin, as is claimed by some critics, this sense cannot be carried back to an earlier time. Besides, this
oblation was never offered alone except in certain peculiar cases which
do not bear upon the question;* it was always an accompaniment of
the bloody sacrifice. If, therefore, it could be proved--which it can-
not--that in 1 and 2 Kings and Ezra the unbloody oblation was
meant, it would yet remain that the mention of it implies and
involves also the animal sacrifice. But the sense of the word outside
of the technical language of the law is very general, being applied to
an ordinary present (Gen. xxxii. 13 [14], 18 [19], 20 [21], 21 [22];
xxxiii. 10; xlii. 11, and frequently), or to tribute (Judg. iii. 15-18,
and frequently); and when this is a present to God, or sacrifice, it is
applied indifferently to the unbloody or to the animal sacrifice.
Thus it is used of the animal sacrifice of Abel as well as of the
unbloody offering of Cain (Gen. iv. 3-5); in I Sam. ii. 29 it is clearly
meant to include all sacrifices, but with especial reference to those of
animals; in I Sam. iii. 14 it is used with הַבָּשָׂךְ of a propitiatory sacri-
fice; in Mal. i. 13 it clearly refers to an animal sacrifice, since the
"torn, and the lame, and the sick" are mentioned. In fact, it is a
general word for sacrifice of any kind, and while, following the
technical language of the law, it is often used specifically, and applied
to the unbloody, as distinguished from the animal sacrifice, yet it is
also used of sacrifice in general in such a way that it must be sup-
posed to include the animal sacrifice. (see I Sam. ii. 17; xxvi. 19;
I Chr. xvi. 29; Ps. xcvi. 8; Zeph. iii. 10; Mal. i. 10; ii. 12, 13;
iii. 3, 4). There is therefore no ground for the theory that the eve-
nings מִנָּה of 1 Kings xviii. 29; 2 Kings xvi. 15; and Ezra ix. 4,
refers to an unbloody offering. In fact, the argument would prove
too much; for the same expression is used also of the morning sacri-
fice in 2 Kings iii. 20, "it came to pass in the morning, when the
הָנָה was offered." It remains, therefore, that here, as elsewhere,
Ezekiel's provisions stand quite apart from the law and the custom,
and give no indication of being a step in the development of a cultus.

*The only certain exception is the offering of jealousy (Num. v. 15-26).
In addition, the unbloody oblation was allowed (Lev. 11. 1-9; vii. 9, 10)
as a voluntary offering, although this was probably in connection with
the other sacrifices. Also it was a special offering of Aaron and his
sons in the day of their consecration" (Lev. vi. 20-23 [13-16]) in con-
nection with their other offerings. Further, an offering of the first
fruits of vegetable products was allowed (Lev. ii. 12--16; vi. 14-18 [7, 8] ),
but in so far as this was "the first fruits of the harvest" it was to be
accompanied with a lamb for a burnt offering (Lev. xxiii. 10-12, 17, 18).
The sin offering of fine flour of the very poor (Lev. v. 20-13) is expressly
distinguished from the הָנָה.
We regard these divergences, on the contrary, as intentional and
designed to show the people, familiar with the Mosaic law, that his
vision was to be understood ideally and not literally.

There is another point in connection with this daily offering. According to the law (Num. xxviii. 3-5) with each of the lambs,
morning and evening, a meat and drink offering was to be made of
1-10 of an ephah of flour, 1/4 of a hin of oil, and 1/4 of a hin of strong
wine. As Ezekiel speaks of but one offering he increases the accom-
panying meat offering to 1-6 of an ephah of flour, and to 1/3 of a hin
of oil. This is the same sort of change as in the case of the priests'
memory and mourning: the omitted provision is compensated for by
an increase in what remains. And in this case also, the omitted
provision having been certainly customary before the time of Ezekiel,
this compensation has a manifest reference to the familiar, and there-
fore previously existing provisions of the Mosaic law.

An objection may be here interposed that the non-observance of
the detail of Ezekiel's ritual in the subsequent ages is no more sur-
prising than the corresponding non-observance of many particulars in
the detail of the Mosaic ritual, which is very evident in the time of
the judges and the early monarchy. There is really no parallel be-
tween the two cases. The times of the judges and of the early
monarchy were a period of disorder and anarchy, in which the gen-
eral confusion of society forbids the inference that such laws did not
exist; but the times after Ezekiel were times of over-scrupulous and
even superstitious observance of the minutest details of ritual, when
it is inconceivable that his scheme should have been neglected through
mere inadvertence and carelessness.

The ritual of the great feasts is considerably changed. Pentecost
and the Day of Atonement are entirely omitted. In regard to the
comparative value of these omissions in the historical books and in
Ezekiel, the same thing is to be said as before: the omission in the
former may have been merely accidental, and proves nothing; in
Ezekiel it must have been intentional. It will appear presently,
however, that while omitting the Day of Atonement from his scheme,
he does probably allude to it in a way that shows familiarity with its
observance. There remain to be considered the Passover, the feast of
Tabernacles, and the "New Moons."

The Passover, according to Ezek. xlv. 21-23, is to be kept at the
same time and for the same number of days, as in the Mosaic law,
but there is no mention of the Paschal lamb itself; the sin-offering
by the Mosaic law (Num. xxviii. 17, 22) was to be a he-goat for each
day, here (vs. 23) a bullock for the first day and a he-goat for each of
the other days; the burnt offering for each day by the law was to be
two bullocks, a ram and seven yearling lambs, here seven bullocks
and seven rams; the meat offering by the law was to be 3-10 of a
ephah of meal mixed with oil for each bullock, 2-10 for each ram,
and 1-10 for each lamb, or in all 1 1/2 ephahs daily--here a whole
ephah for each victim, or in all 14 ephahs daily and as many hins of
oil (vs. 24). The offerings in Ezekiel therefore are richer than those
required by the law. The same thing is to be said of the special sac-
rifices for the Sabbaths. According to the law (Num. xxviii. 9)
these were to be marked by two lambs for burnt offerings, each with
the usual meat and drink offering; but according to this vision
(xlvi. 4-5) the Sabbath burnt offering was to be six lambs and a ram,
with an ephah for a meat offering with the ram, and that for the
lambs dependent upon the ability and generosity of the prince, and
in all cases a hin of oil to each ephah. (Nothing is said of the drink
offering.) It is difficult to assign reasons for these details. They
plainly do not agree with the Mosaic law, and it is well known that
the custom of later ages was founded upon that law. We have no
data in history before the exile to determine the custom in these
details one way or the other; but the presumption is that here as else-
where the prophet has intentionally varied from the known law and
custom in order to mark the ideal character of his vision. Certainly
this is no beginning or early stage in a developing cultus; for other-
wise, in these details, which could as well be arranged one way as
another, the authority of the prophet would have been followed; but
there never was any attempt even, so far as history shows, to realize
his ideal.

The feast of Tabernacles, which has no name given to it in Ezekiel,
but is simply a feast of seven days in the seventh month (xlv. 25), is
greatly simplified. Here the sacrifices are to be the same as in the
case of the Passover,--an entire change from the elaborate ritual of the
Mosaic law (Num. xxix. 12-24)--with, on the whole, a great diminu-
tion in the number of victims and an omission of the extra eighth
day added to the feast in Lev. (xxiii. 36, 39) and Num. (xxix. 35),
and which in the law was expressly characterized as an addition,--
sometimes included and sometimes not in the mention of the feast.
In regard to these changes the same remarks are to be made as in the
case of the Passover, with only this addition, that it appears from
both 1 Kings viii. 65, 66 and 2 Chron. vii. 8-10 that this eighth day
was always looked upon in the same way--as a part, and yet not a
part, of the feast. Solomon keeps the feast to that day inclusive,
and then he makes a solemn assembly, and yet on that day dismisses the people to their homes.*

In regard to the New Moons, or the first day of every month, the Mosaic law prescribes (in addition to the burnt and meat offerings) a he-goat for a sin offering (Num. xxviii. 15). In Ezekiel's scheme of the feasts, these new moons are entirely omitted, except for the first month, though afterwards incidentally alluded to. The Mosaic law also provided on the tenth of the seventh month for a day of atonement, with special and very peculiar sacrifices (Lev. xvi.). All this is condensed, as it were, in this vision, into two sacrifices, each of a young bullock, one upon the first and one upon the seventh day of the first month, with particulars in regard to them (to be mentioned presently) which seem to refer to the day of Atonement. Now, it is certain from the history of David (i Sam. xx. 5, 18, 24) and from other historical records (2 Kings iv. 23; 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; xxxi. 3), as well as from allusions in the pre-exilic prophets (Isa. i. 13, 14; [lxvi. 23; Ps. lxxxi. 3); Hos. ii. 11; Amos viii. 5) that the new moons were kept as sacred feasts in the ages before the exile, as it is known that they were also afterwards (Ezra iii. 5; Neh. x. 33). The omission of these new moons from this description of the feasts is particularly instructive, because Ezekiel himself, in other parts of the vision (xliv. 17; xlvi. 3), incidentally, but repeatedly, mentions the "new moons" (in the plural) as days to be sanctified by special sacrifices, and requires the prince to provide the same offerings for them as for the Sabbath (xlvi. 6).† He thus shows that he was familiar with them and expects them to be continued, but in this setting forth of the cycle of the feasts he does not mention them. This cannot be taken then for a part of the development of a priestly law.

He differs from the Mosaic law also in the ritual of the blood of these sacrifices on the first and seventh days of the first month. The Levitical law gives no directions for the blood of the offerings on the first day of the month, doubtless because it followed the ordinary rule and was simply sprinkled on the side of the altar; but it required

*The inconsistency which Kuenen (Relig. of Isr. Note II. on chap. viii. Vol. ii. P. 296, 7) thinks he finds between the passages above cited is wholly imaginary. Solomon observed seven days for the dedication of the altar in imitation of Lev. viii.-x., and then kept the feast for seven days after the altar had been consecrated. Hence I Kings vii. 65 speaks of "seven days and seven days, even for fourteen days, and then of the following "eighth day"; while 2 Chron. viii. 9 explains more fully "they kept the dedication of the altar seven days and the feast seven days."

† The word is, in this last case, in the singular, as is also the Sabbath; but both are evidently used collectively.
the blood on the day of Atonement to be brought within the 
Holy of Holies and sprinkled before and upon the mercy seat. 
Ezekiel again compromises and directs that the blood of the sin 
offering on the first and seventh days of the first month shall be put 
"upon the posts of the house, and upon the four corners of the settle 
of the altar, and upon the posts of the gate of the inner court." 
There may be here a reminiscence of the day of Atonement, 
but nothing like a generic law which could have been specialized into 
the particular observances of the Mosaic law. It is rather a purely 
ideal ritual, which nobody ever thought of reducing to practice. 
There is no such congruity between it and the Levitical regulations 
as a development hypothesis would require.

We may now consider, in a few words, the general cycle of the 
feasts. As is well known, the Mosaic law prescribes three great feasts, 
that of the Passover for seven days, preceded by the putting away of 
leaven and the killing of the Paschal lamb; that of "weeks" or 
Pentecost, lasting only one day; and that of Tabernacles, lasting 
seven days, and with an eighth special day added; these three great 
annual festivals are all expressly recognized in Deuteronomy (xvi. 
1-16), which is held by all to be pre-exilic. Besides these, the first 
day of every month, the weekly Sabbath, and the day of atonement 
were to be kept holy and marked by special sacrifices. The observ-
ance of nearly all of these is recognized in the historic and the older 
prophetic books: The cycle of Ezekiel's vision is very different. 
He omits the feast of weeks, the Day of Atonement, and the new 
moons (except that of the first month.) and inserts a new feast on the 
seventh day of the same month. This last, in connection with that 
on the first day of that month, he seems to intend as a compensation 
for the missing Day of Atonement; for he describes the sacrifices of 
the two (xlv. 20) as "for every one that erreth, and for him that is 
simple: so shall ye reconcile the house." If this interpretation is 
correct, we have here an incidental recognition of the older observ-
ance of the Day of Atonement, although it is not mentioned. But 
however this may be, Ezekiel's cycle of feasts accords neither with 
what went before nor with what followed after him. Yet, as already 
said, it is plain from his incidental allusions to the New Moons that, 
in this point at least, he knew of the old order, and expected it to go 
on; and it is noticeable that the sacrifices prescribed for the New 
Moons (xlvi. 3-6) are not the same as the special sacrifices of the first 
month (xlv. 18-20). Those were to be in each case "a young bul-
lock" for a sin offering; these, six lambs and a ram for a burnt offer-
ing (xlvi. 4). It is clear, therefore, that he did not intend this vision
to form the basis of an actual cultus; but knowing the old observances, expected them to continue.

Before leaving this part of the subject, it may be well to refer briefly to a few other places in which Ezekiel evidently recognizes the Mosaic law, although either altering or omitting its provisions. In xlii, 13 he requires the priests to eat in the appropriate "holy chambers" "the meat offering, and the sin offering, and the trespass offering." He says nothing of the peace offerings, though he elsewhere repeatedly mentions them (xliii. 27; xliv. 15, 17; xlv. 2, 12), nor does he anywhere give the ritual for them. On the other hand, in the following verse (and also in xlv. 18, 20) the prophet is more explicit than the law, requiring that "the priests' garments wherein they minister "shall not be carried" out of the holy place into the outer court. There is no such general direction in the Levitical law; but the same thing is required in certain special cases, and may therefore be thought to be implied in all (see Lev. vi. 10, 11). Now, whatever theory is adopted concerning the relation of Ezekiel to the Mosaic law must equally explain this omission and this insertion. The theory of the later development of the law does neither; for, in the one case, it would be a violent supposition that the ritual of the peace offerings and the directions about eating them were evolved from the prophet's silence, and in the other case, it would be very strange that in such a matter as the care of the priests' robes the later law should be the less definite. But the hypothesis of the greater antiquity of the law explains both facts satisfactorily; Ezekiel had no occasion to repeat important provisions of the law with which both he and the people were familiar, but it was natural that in a matter of detail, he should express what was probably the common understanding of the law.

In xliii. 11 it is required that the priests' sin offering should be burned "in the appointed place of the house, without the Sanctuary." This refers to a building "in the separate place" which is provided only in Ezekiel's vision (xli. 12-15; xlii. 1, 10, 13), and of which there is no trace either in the Pentateuch or in the temple of the restoration. In such cases it was simply required in the law that the body of the victim should be burned "without the camp" (Lev. iv. 12, 13, 21; xvi. 27, &c.). No doubt such a building as Ezekiel provided would have been a great convenience; but it was never erected.

The provision for large landed estates for the priests has already been mentioned; but in view of this the statement in xlv. 28, that the priests' office and perquisites "shall be unto them for an inherit-
ance: I am their inheritance: and ye shall give them no inheritance
in Israel," can only be looked upon as a reminiscence of the expres-
sions in the Mosaic law, without any nice regard to the other parts of
the vision.

The provision for the Sabbatical year was distinctly pre-exilic, since
it is given at length in Deut. xv.; yet there is no trace of its observ-
ance before the exile, and its non-observance is given by the Chron-
icler (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21) as the determining reason for the length of
the captivity. We know that it was observed after the restoration
(I Mace. vi. 49; Jos. Ant. xiv. io, § 6; Tacitus, Hist. lib. v. 2, § 4).

Here again is an important and characteristic institution, certainly
forming part of the Hebrew legislation before the captivity, neglected
until that period, and observed afterwards. Exodus (xxiii. 10, 11)
and Leviticus (xxv. 2-7) contain the commands for it, but Ezekiel
does not mention it. He certainly is not in this respect a bridge
between Deuteronomy and Leviticus, between pre- and post-exilic
legislation.

The omission of all mention of tithes in Ezekiel, a provision cer-
tainly in force from the earliest to the latest times, can only be
accounted for on the supposition of its familiarity.

In the Mosaic law all the males of the people were required to pre-
sent themselves at the sanctuary at the great annual festivals (Ex. xxiii.
14, 17; xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16); there is no such command in
Ezekiel, doubtless because it was already entirely familiar. But in
xlvi. 9, while speaking of the gate by which the prince shall enter,
he incidentally recognizes the custom, "But when the people of the
land shall come before the Lord in the solemn feasts," &c. He has
made no provision for this, but recognizes it as a matter of course.
The omission in ch. xliii. is not only very striking in itself, but is
of especial importance in its bearing upon the main question under
discussion. In vs. 18-27 a detailed order is given for the seven days
consecration of the newly erected altar, at once recalling the similar
consecration of the altar in Lev. viii. But in that case the consecra-
tion was a double one,—of the altar and of the priests; here the
priests are entirely omitted. Why? Evidently because the altar only
was new and required to be consecrated; the priests had been conse-
crated of old.

But the question may be asked in regard to the changes of ritual,
Why could there not have been deviations by the later priests from
the scheme of Ezekiel, just as well as by Ezekiel from the laws of
Moses? Simply because there is a good reason for them in one case
and none at all in the other. If Ezekiel wished his description to be
understood ideally, it was important that he should introduce arbitrary variations from the recognized law and custom; but if he intended to set forth a scheme of actual future worship, there is no known reason why his successors should have deviated from it.

Passing now to what may be called the economic, or political features of the vision, there are only three points which call for especial attention, and even these but briefly; the provision for the cost of the sacrifices, the division of the land, and the regulations respecting the prince.

There is no distinct provision in the Mosaic law for defraying the cost of the general sacrifices, and we are told that this was still one of the many questions in dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees at a much later date. But it is fully and clearly settled in Ezekiel's vision. The cost is to be wholly borne by the prince (xliv. 17, 21-26; xlv. 4-7), who is to be provided with ample territorial possessions (xlv. 7, 8; xlviii. 20-22). As far as we have any record, this arrangement was quite new, and it was never followed out. It was, however, so wise and excellent a solution of the difficulty that we can only wonder at its never having been adopted, if any Israelite had ever looked upon this vision as a basis for theocratic legislation.

The division of the land has already been spoken of in connection with the evidence of the ideal character of this vision; but there are one or two other points which require mention. A striking feature of it is the ample provision here made for the prince with the proviso that it shall belong inalienably to him and his sons (xlvi. 17-18); for in connection with this assignment it is said (xlv. 18) "And my princes shall no more oppress my people," and again (xlvi. 18) "the prince shall not take of the people's inheritance by oppression." A vivid remembrance of the exactions and oppressions of former kings was evidently in the prophet's mind, and he provides a new and wise remedy. It was unfortunate for his people that they never thought of making this the basis for actual legislation, and so avoiding once for all the evils under which they continued to suffer.

Another very curious provision is that at the southern end of the "oblation" a strip of land is reserved, 5,000 by 25,000 reeds (xlviii. 15-19), in the midst of which is to be the city with its "suburbs" 5,000 reeds square. The remainder, i. e., two pieces of land, each 5,000 by 10,000 reeds, is set apart that "the increase thereof shall be for food unto them that serve the city. And they that serve the city shall serve it out of all the tribes of Israel." It is quite unnecessary to point out the purely Utopian character of such an arrange-
ment in actual life; it is sufficient to call attention to the fact that neither this nor any other of these economic regulations ever formed a part of the Mosaic law, or were ever in any degree attempted to be carried out.

The law of the tenure of the Levites' land is considerably changed from that of the Mosaic legislation. According to Lev. xxv. 32-34 the Levites might sell their houses and even their cities (only retaining the right of redeeming them at any time, and their reversion in the year of jubilee)--but they might not sell at all the fields of their suburbs. This last provision is here (xlviii. 15) extended to all their landed property in the most emphatic way, and changes the whole tenure of the Levitical land. It is certain that it was never carried into effect, for there never was any such territory assigned to the Levites. It is remarkable that nothing of this kind is mentioned in connection with the priestly territory.

One other particular must be noticed in connection with the division of the land. Under the Mosaic law this was to be wholly parcelled out among the tribes of Israel; and although frequent reference is made to the "sojourning" of strangers among them, no provision is made for allowing them any interest in the soil of the holy land. Ezekiel, on the other hand, expressly commands (xlvii. 22, 23), "Ye shall divide the land by lot for an inheritance unto you and the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you; and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel. And it shall come to pass that in what tribe the stranger sojourneth, there shall ye give him his inheritance." Both these provisions were adapted to their different times: in that of Moses, the land was looked upon as the sole and peculiar possession of the chosen people, and if strangers came among them it should be as "sojourners" only; in the time of Ezekiel matters were greatly changed, and large numbers of foreigners had long had their permanent residence among the tribes of Israel. It is only for these permanent residents "which shall beget children among you" that Ezekiel provides. It is very difficult to suppose that the Mosaic legislation should have been subsequent to his arrangements. But by far the most important laws of this vision in political matters are those concerning the relation of the prince to the temple worship. A brief mention of these will close this paper. It is plain that under the old theocracy the monarch had no properly ecclesiastical standing. He had great influence of course, either like David in advancing and improving the worship, or like Ahaz in corrupting and
injuring it. But he was not recognized at all in the laws of the
Pentateuch except that, in Deut. xvii. 14-20, it is declared that, in
case a king should be afterwards desired, his otherwise arbitrary
power must be checked by various limitations. Quite in accordance
with the supposition of the great antiquity of that legislation, it is
found that the monarch never had any other than a purely political
position. This obvious fact is certainly very remarkable if the
Mosaic law was subsequent to the introduction of the monarchy;
indeed it is almost inconceivable that the laws of a theocratic state,
if written when there was a monarch upon the throne, and prescribing
the duties of all other officers, should take no notice of the
monarch himself. But the difficulty is still greater if it could be
supposed that these laws were inaugurated or largely developed by
Ezekiel who gives such a prominent place in his scheme "to the
prince." It is certain that the arrangements here suggested were
never carried out, even when such an excellent prince as Zerubbabel
was the leader of the restoration. At a subsequent time the offices
of prince and priest were indeed combined in the Maccabees, but this was in
virtue of their priestly descent and ended with their family; it has nothing to
do with the vision of Ezekiel who, while he makes the prince very prominent
in his ecclesiastical system, yet assigns to him no priestly functions.

Let what Ezekiel says of "the prince" be carefully noted. His
large landed estate, given expressly to prevent oppressive exactions
from the people,* and to enable him to furnish all the victims and

* In this connection general provision is made (xlv. 10, 11) for just
weights and measures among the people. No one can read the passage without
observing a connection between it and Lev. xix. 36 and Deut. xxv. 13. The
question of priority is indicated by the terms employed. The words used here and
in various parts of the Pentateuch are: (i) Ephah. This occurs in all ages of Hebrew
literature from Exodus to Zechariah. (2) Homer, in the sense of a measure, found
in the law (3 times), in Isaiah and Hosea (each once), and in Ezekiel (7 times).
(3) Hin. This is found only in the middle books (Ex.-Num.) of the
Pentateuch (16 times) and in Ezekiel (6 times). (4) Omer, יַלְדוֹן, in the
sense of measure, in Exodus only (6 times). (5) Gerah, in the sense of
a measure of value, only in Ex.-Num. (4 times) and in Ezekiel (once).
(6) Bath, as a measure, does not occur earlier than Kings (twice),
Chronicles (3 times), Isaiah (once), but in Ezekiel 7 times. (7) Cor.
In Kings and Chronicles 7 times, in Ezekiel once. That is to say, all
these terms which are used in the law, with the exception of Omer, are
also used in Ezekiel, while Hin and Gerah appear to have gone out of
use and are found afterwards only in this vision, and Homer only else-
where once each in Isaiah and Hosea; on the other hand, Bath and
Cor, which came into use at a comparatively late date, are not found
in the law, but are used by Ezekiel.
other offerings for the national sacrifices, have already been men-
tioned. Besides these things he is to take a very active and peculiar
part in the *cultus* of his people. The east gate of the court of
the temple had been, according to this vision, peculiarly sancti-
fied by the entrance through it of the glory of the LORD (xliii,

It may not be amiss to give here—a list of other words found only in the
Pentateuch and in Ezekiel: תוארש; כפל; זימח; צפת; אדמ; אבר; מירם;
 Lump, in the sense of species. (Stebbins,—*A Study in the Pentateuch,
p. 169,—has noticed that it occurs in this sense 30 times in the Penta-
teach.); מלה; מזגמה; למל; נפש; ינק; זימח; נשמ; תינוק; הבש; the word נפש is a
very common one, occurring nearly 800 times, but in the sense of lower
animals it is found only in the Pentateuch (about 18 times) and in Ezek.
xlvii. 9 except once in Isaiah (xix. 10); וסב; מכסה (Hoph. part from
יסב; ירדה לישין (this occurs 4 times in the Pentateuch and 6 times in Eze-
kiel; but of the other words for *naked* only *נירומ* is found once in the
Pentateuch and not at all in Ezekiel, though the more common word in
the later books); וחישה, a very peculiar word for darkness; ירצח;
ינש; פּר; סיר; סיר; ברו (kal part. pass.); זא יב a peculiar word for
which other derivatives of אֶזֶא are commonly used; אֶזֶא
in the Pual;
קרבה; זא; זא; זא (in the Pent. 56 times); זא (in the
Pent. 50 times); כּשָׁה (this occurs also in i Sam. xvii. 5 but in a dif-
ferent sense); קָב; קָב; קָב; קָב. To these should be added such
words as occur elsewhere only in passages referring to the Pentateuch,
as; יפרובה (3 times in the Ps.); יפרניה (Ps. cv. 30). There are also a
number of words found only once elsewhere, as: יפרובה, Pent. 7 times,
Ezek. 11 times and Jer. xii. 9; יפרניה (Judg. x.i. 37, 38); יפרניה (Neh.
xiii. 20); יפרניה (Judg. xix. 29); יפרניה (Judg. xvi. 9); יפרניה (Isa. lxvi. 17).
The usage of two different words for prince should be noted in this
connection: אֶזֶא occurs 70 times in the Pentateuch, 13 times in
Joshua, 34 times in Ezekiel, and only 13 times in all the other books put
together; while the more general word for prince, כֹּפֶר (occurring in all
43 times) is used but once in Ezekiel and not at all in the Pentateuch.
Delitzsch has noted (Pref. to *The Lev. Priests*, p. xiii., xiv.) that the
word כֹּפֶר which occurs elsewhere, is used only in Ex. xxiv. 10; Ezek.
i. 26; x. 1 to indicate that blue of the heavens of which there is such
rare mention in all antiquity. These instances must be considered numerous
enough to establish some connection between the Pentateuch and Ezekiel,—they
can hardly be quite independent of each other. The archaisms of the former and
the aramaisms of the latter mark their comparative antiquity.
in consequence it was to be forever after shut, except for the prince (xliv. 3). He was to enter and go out through it on the Sabbaths and the new moons (xlvi. 1-3), and was to worship at the threshold, of this gate while the priests were offering his sacrifices, "the people of the land" meantime worshipping without "at the door of this gate." On these occasions the gate, although not to be used by any one else, is to stand open until the evening. In these cases, when few of the people were expected to be present, the prince seems to have been looked upon as their representative, and it was his duty to be always present and offer the required offerings. When the prince saw fit to offer any "voluntary burnt offering or peace offerings" the same gate was to be opened for him, but immediately shut when he had gone out (ib. 12). On occasion of the "solemn feasts," on the other hand, when the mass of the people were expected to be present, the prince was to take his place among them, and to enter "in the midst of them" by the north or south gate, and go out by the opposite one (ib. 9, 10).

There is also another provision which puts the prince in the same light of the religious representative of the people. To enable him to furnish the required sacrifices and oblations he is to have not only the large and inalienable landed estate already mentioned, but also is to receive from the whole people regularly a tax in kind of the things required for these purposes. This tax is prescribed in detail in xlv. 13-16, and was to consist of one sixtieth of the grain, one hundredth of the oil, and one two hundredth of the flock. The connection shows that it was to be used by him for supplying the offerings. This is an entire change from both the older and the later custom whereby the people gave directly to the sanctuary, and it again brings forward "the prince" as the representative and embodiment, as it were, of the people in their duties of public worship.

The argument from all this is clear and has already been hinted at. If Ezekiel thus presents the civil ruler as a representative of the people and an important factor in their temple worship, it is simply impossible that any actual legislation, influenced by his vision, should have so totally ignored "the prince" as is notoriously done in the Levitical laws. It would seem that even if the priests and the people had not insisted upon their sovereign's occupying his proper position in their worship, every pious prince would have claimed it for himself. The conclusion is obvious: the Levitical laws are older than Ezekiel, and his vision had no direct effect upon the polity of the Jewish people.

All the more important features of the vision of Ezekiel, so far as
his relation to the Mosaic law is concerned, have now been passed in review. Others, such as the detailed arrangements of his temple, with its various peculiar outbuildings, and its large "precincts," &c., would require too much time to examine in detail, as I have elsewhere done,* and would only add fresh illustrations of the fact which has been everywhere apparent. If we compare the customs of the Jews as they are known after the exile with those which are known to have existed before, they are found perfectly to agree in everything, except negatively in so far as data are wanting to show in some respects what were the customs of the more ancient time. This deficiency was of course to be expected in dealing with matters of such antiquity, where the records we have are almost wholly occupied with other matters. Moreover, both the ancient custom as far as it was regulated by law and can be traced, (making allowance for some small difficulties in understanding such very ancient legislation), and the later practice perfectly agree with the Mosaic legislation. But quite late in the history of Israel, during the captivity in Babylon, the prophet Ezekiel comes forward and in a remarkable vision sets forth a general scheme of theocratic laws and worship. His scheme presents incidentally many obvious allusions to the Levitical laws, but in its direct enactments is quite at variance with both former and later custom and also with the Mosaic law. It is in no sense, and in no point on the line of development from what existed before to what existed afterwards. Yet we are asked to believe that the Levitical law only existed in a very imperfect and inchoate form before him, that he gave the great impetus to its development, and that within 40 years afterwards the nearly perfect scheme was accepted as their ancient law by his nation. The thing required is beyond our power.

*Com. on Ezekiel in Bp. Ellicott's commentary for English readers.
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AZAZEL IN EARLY JEWISH TRADITION

ROBERT HELM
Louisville, KY 40204

The term "Azazel," which appears four times in the prescriptions for the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:8, 10, 26), has elicited much debate. Although many scholars have identified Azazel with a demonic figure to whom the sin-laden scapegoat was dispatched, the term remains undefined in the biblical text. This article will attempt to demonstrate that two noncanonical Jewish works, *1 Enoch* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, reveal a tradition in which Azazel was regarded as a demon, and in which the scapegoat rite was utilized as a symbol of demonic expulsion. Hence it will be argued that a segment of ancient Jewish apocalypticists found a symbol of eschatological victory over demonic forces in the rite involving Azazel and the scapegoat.

**Azazel in 1 Enoch**

Although *1 Enoch* is attributed to the antediluvian prophet by that name, its pseudonymous nature is readily apparent. In reality, it is a composite work, produced by several authors who probably wrote during the three centuries preceding the Christian era. In its current form, *1 Enoch* is a collection of five smaller documents: "The Book of Watchers" (chaps. 1-36), "The Book of Parables" (chaps. 37-71), "The Astronomical Book" (chaps. 72-82), "The Book of Dreams" (chaps. 83-90), and "The Epistle of Enoch" (chaps. 91-108). It is not known

---


3 Ibid.
when these five "books" were combined, nor is it entirely clear in what language or languages they were originally composed.\footnote{It is generally believed that \textit{1 Enoch} was composed in Aramaic. See D. S. Russell, \textit{The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Patriarchs and Prophets in Early Judaism} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 26. However, Charles argues that "The Astronomical Book" was originally written in Hebrew; see \textit{The Apocryphal Old Testament}, 176.} The complete text of \textit{1 Enoch} is known only in Ethiopic, although Greek, Latin, and Aramaic fragments survive as well.\footnote{Leonhard Rost, \textit{Einleitung in die alttestamentlichen Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen einschliesslich der grossen Qumran-Handschriften} (Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1971), 103. See also Paul D. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in \textit{1 Enoch} 6-11," \textit{JBL} 96 (1977): 220.}

In common with the general tenor of apocalyptic literature, the view of reality presented in \textit{1 Enoch} consists of a sharp contrast between the present evil age, which will end in judgment, and the new age of bliss that is to follow.\footnote{George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Construction of Reality in 1 Enoch," \textit{Mysteries and Revelations}, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 9, ed. John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 58.} The book also stresses the relationship between the locus of human activity and the cosmic or heavenly realm.\footnote{Ibid., 54.} Thus it contains both temporal and spatial dimensions.\footnote{Ibid., 53.} The spatial dimension becomes evident in the narrative of Semyaza (chaps. 6 and 7), in which Semyaza leads his angel cohorts into rebellion by cohabiting with the daughters of men, thus giving birth to giants and defiling the earth. The background for this story is obviously Gen 6:1-4.

The figure of Azazel is abruptly introduced in \textit{1 Enoch} 8:

\begin{quote}
And Azazel taught men to make swords, and daggers, and shields and breastplates. And he showed them the things after these, and the art of making them: bracelets, and ornaments, and the art of making up the eyes and of beautifying the eyelids, and the most precious and choice stones, and all kinds of colored dyes. And the world was changed. And there was great impiety and much fornication, and they went astray, and all their ways became corrupt. (\textit{1 Enoch} 8:1-3)\footnote{\textit{Apocryphal Old Testament}, 190-191.}
\end{quote}

This sudden interruption of the Semyaza narrative is usually attributed to the editorial fusion of two independent traditions.\footnote{Ibid., 54.} However, Hanson offers an alternative hypothesis. He takes it to be a case of...
paronomasia, in which the name of one of Semyaza's subordinates, Asael, invited a comparison with the Azazel of Lev 16.\textsuperscript{11} Regardless of which of these positions is favored, it is apparent that the appearance of the name" Azazel" in the Enoch passage functions as a significant link with the Day of Atonement ritual described in Lev 16.

It must be admitted that the demonic nature of Azazel is only implicit in Lev 16. However, 1 Enoch 8:1-3 depicts him in terms that are explicitly demonic. In fact, his characteristics approach the satanic in this passage, although he is never identified as Satan.\textsuperscript{12} Nevertheless, he is portrayed as a corrupter and tempter of humanity, and the main source of antediluvian impiety.

First Enoch 10:4-6 describes the eschatological punishment of Azazel:

And further the Lord said to Raphael, Bind Azazel by his hands and his feet, and throw him into the darkness. And split open the desert which is in Dudael, and throw him there. And throw on him jagged and sharp stones, and cover him with darkness; and let him stay there forever, and cover his face, that he may not see light, and that on the great day of judgment he may be hurled into the fire.\textsuperscript{13}

This quotation is worthy of careful consideration, as Hanson finds a direct link between the binding of Azazel in 1 Enoch 10 and the rite of purgation associated with the scapegoat in Lev 16.\textsuperscript{14} These two passages do indeed exhibit a number of striking parallels.

First, it should be noticed that just as a man was appointed to lead the scapegoat away to the desert (Lev 16:21), so the angel Raphael was directed to bind Azazel and banish him to the desert which is in Dudael (1 Enoch 10:4). Second, both passages are concerned with purification from sin. Hanson rightly recognizes the close relationship between Lev 16:21 and 1 Enoch 10:8.\textsuperscript{15} According to Lev 16:21, the sins of Israel

\textsuperscript{11} Hanson, 221.

\textsuperscript{12} The terms "demon" and "demonic" are to be distinguished from "Satan" and "satanic." A "demon" is any malevolent spirit being. However, in Judeo-Christian tradition, Satan is regarded as the demonic leader of the angels who fell from heaven, God's primary adversary, and the chief tempter of humanity, including Adam and Eve. First Enoch 8:1-3 contains a description of Azazel's masterful temptation of the entire world; in this, his characteristics approach the satanic. Also 1 Enoch 69:1-2 lists him among the fallen archangels. See Apocryphal Old Testament, 190-191, 251.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 194-195.

\textsuperscript{14} Hanson, 221-222.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 224.
were transferred to the scapegoat through the laying on of hands.\(^{16}\) Thus the removal of the goat resulted in cleansing and renewal for the entire camp. Likewise in *1 Enoch* all sin was to be "written down" against Azazel; his expulsion would usher in the restoration of the earth, which had been ruined by the angel rebellion.

Notice God's command to Raphael:

> And restore the earth which the angels have ruined, and announce the restoration of the earth, for I shall restore the earth, so that not all the sons of men shall be destroyed through the mystery of everything which the Watchers made known and taught to their sons. And the whole earth has been ruined by the teaching of the works of Azazel, and against him write down all sin. (1 Enoch 10:7-8)\(^{17}\)

Hanson argues for the existence of a further parallel between *1 Enoch* 10 and the rendition of Lev 16 in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* (also known as Jonathan Ben Uzziel or *Targum of Palestine*).\(^ {18}\) He believes that the formulation, "... split open the desert which is in Dudael, and throw him there" (1 Enoch 10:4), is related to *Pseudo-Jonathan's* use of רֶפֶת (send or cleave) instead of הָלָא (send), in reference to the expulsion of the scapegoat from the camp of Israel (Lev 16:22).\(^ {19}\)

Inasmuch as רֶפֶת can denote "to cleave" or "break open," as well as "to send,"\(^{20}\) Hanson suggests that the author of the Enoch text employed a subtle paronomasia by playing alternate word meanings over against each other, thus attaining the notion of the desert being opened to receive Azazel.\(^ {21}\) It is of interest that in certain Akkadian texts, demons are said to inhabit desolate wastelands after leaving the netherworld through a crack or hole in the ground.\(^ {22}\) Hence this Akkadian literature


\(^{17}\) *Aprocrphal Old Testament*, 195.

\(^{18}\) According to Hanson, this particular Targum "bears close affinities with *1 Enoch*" (223). Although the date of Pseulo-Jonathan has been debated, its foundations apparently go back to pre-Christian times. See Ernst Wurthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987),78. Thus it is likely that both *1 Enoch* and the original form of Pseudo-Jonathan were approximately contemporaneous in development.

\(^{19}\) Hanson, 223.

\(^{20}\) Ibid. Also see "רֶפֶת" in BDB.

\(^{21}\) Hanson, 223.

may represent an ancient source parallel to the thought expressed in both Lev 16 and 1 Enoch 10.

These foregoing comparisons suggest that the imagery associated with Azazel's punishment in 1 Enoch 10 is adapted from the description of the scapegoat's expulsion in Lev 16. But why does the author of the Enoch text link the goat designated "for Azazel" with Azazel himself? That the scapegoat was regarded as the focus of evil, a visible representative of the demonic, is a probable solution to this problem. It should be recognized that the Hebrew דְּעֵזֶן can denote either a male goat or a demon. 23 Perhaps this fact influenced the author of the Enoch text in his perception of the scapegoat as a demonic figure. Also, the possibility that לֶאֶזֶזֶן can be understood as "in behalf of Azazel" is worthy of consideration. 24 If this rendition of the Hebrew noun and its inseparable preposition is accepted, the scapegoat may be regarded as representing Azazel himself. Thus the expulsion of the goat from the camp would serve as a model for the banishment of sin and its demonic source.

Several additional references to Azazel also appear in 1 Enoch. 25 However, they all describe him as fulfilling the role of a fallen archangel, intent on deceiving the human race. Thus 1 Enoch confirms the fact that "Azazel" was understood in demonic terms by a segment of Jewish apocalypticists. Furthermore, it appears that they regarded the scapegoat rite of Lev 16 as a representation of Azazel's eschatological punishment.

It is possible that the authors of 1 Enoch developed the Azazel tradition directly from data contained in Lev 16. Alternatively, it may be that a larger, unpreserved tradition served as a source for certain elements appearing in both Lev 16 and 1 Enoch. That the figure of Azazel is introduced without explanation in Lev 16 suggests the existence of some type of background source.

Gen 6:1-4 is another source which may underlie the references to Azazel in 1 Enoch. The "sons of God," described in the Genesis pericope as cohabiting with the "daughters of men," are interpreted in the Enoch material as fallen archangels, including Semyaza and Azazel (cf. 1 Enoch 6; 69:1-2). 26 Also, the fact that Azazel is portrayed in

23 See BDB.
1 Enoch 8:1-3 as corrupting humanity by teaching certain arts of civilization probably reflects the influence of the culture-hero myth, which was widespread in ancient society.\textsuperscript{27} The culture-hero myth posits the appearance of supernatural beings in early history, who taught the arts of civilization to humanity. In most versions of the myth, the culture-heroes act as the beneficiaries of human beings. However, negative versions also exist, which describe the teaching of destructive arts, as in 1 Enoch.\textsuperscript{28} It seems likely that a combination of elements derived from these diverse sources explains the enlarged role played by Azazel in the Enoch material.

\textit{Azazel in the Apocalypse of Abraham}

The origin of the Apocalypse of Abraham is even more obscure than that of 1 Enoch. Currently, it is only represented in the Codex Sylvester and in certain manuscripts of the Palaea interpretata, all of which are in the Slavonic language.\textsuperscript{29} Some scholars believe that the Apocalypse was first composed in Hebrew and later translated into Slavonic, in the 11th or 12th century A.D. However, this has been disputed.\textsuperscript{30} Charlesworth proposes A.D. 80-100 for the period of its composition,\textsuperscript{31} but these dates are likewise uncertain. The fact that the burning of the temple is mentioned in chapter 27 probably indicates that at least a portion of the book is to be dated after A.D. 70.\textsuperscript{32} In any case, it seems apparent that the book existed in its present form by the fourth century A.D., as it is mentioned in the Clementine Recognitions.\textsuperscript{33}

Uncertainty also exists in regard to the authorship of the Apocalypse of Abraham, although it is usually considered a composite work. Most of the material in the Apocalypse derives from Jewish

\textsuperscript{27} For the relationship between the culture-hero myth and the development of the Azazel tradition in 1 Enoch, see Hanson, 226-231.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 229.
\textsuperscript{29} Apocryphal Old Testament, 364.
\textsuperscript{32} Apocryphal Old Testament, 366.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
sources. However, Charlesworth and others posit chapter 29 as a Christian interpolation.

A number of references to Azazel appear in the *Apocalypse*. The first of these is introduced in chapters 13 and 14, where Azazel is described as an unclean bird which flies down on the carcasses of the animals that Abraham has sacrificed (cf. Gen 15:9-11). But he is no ordinary bird, for he enters into a verbal dispute with Abraham. His demonic character soon becomes evident, as an angel refers to him as "wickedness" (*Apocalypse of Abraham* 13:7). The angel goes on to utter an interesting rebuke against him:

Listen fellow, be ashamed of yourself and go. For you were not appointed to tempt all the righteous. Leave this man alone: you cannot beguile him for he is your enemy, and the enemy of those who follow you and dote on what you want. The garment that of old was set apart in the heavens for you, is now set apart for him; and the corruption that was his has been transferred to you. (*Apocalypse of Abraham* 13:12-15)

These verses depict Azazel as an evil spirit who tempts the righteous. Furthermore, they imply that he has fallen from heaven, and that his celestial office is subsequently to be given to Abraham. Particular attention should be devoted to the last part of v. 15, as the transference of Abraham's corruption to Azazel may be a veiled reference to the scapegoat rite (cf. Lev 16:21).

Azazel also figures prominently in Abraham's vision of the temptation of Adam and Eve:

And I looked into the picture, and my eyes ran to the side of the garden of Eden. And I saw there a man, immensely tall, alarmingly solid, such as I had never seen before, who was embracing a woman that was the man's equal both in her appearance and her size. And they were standing under one of the trees in Eden; and the fruit on that tree looked like a bunch of dates. And behind the tree there

---

34 Ibid., 365-366. However, this does not prove indisputably that the author or authors of the *Apocalypse* were Jewish. See p. 366. Nevertheless, it is convenient to classify the work as a part of early Jewish tradition.
35 Charlesworth, 69. Some, however, would argue that this chapter suggests Christian authorship for the entire *Apocalypse*.
36 *Apocryphal Old Testament* makes use of the variant spellings, "Azazil" and "Azazail," in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.
38 Ibid., 378.
39 Ibid.
stood what looked like a snake, with hands and feet like a man's, and wings on its shoulders, three on its right and three on its left. And they held in their hands a bunch from the tree; and they were eating—the two I had seen embracing. And I said, Who are these who are embracing each other? Who is it who is between them? And what is the fruit they are eating, Mighty Eternal One? And he said, This is the human world: this is Adam, and this is their desire upon the earth: this is Eve. And what is between them is the wicked path they started on towards perdition, namely Azazil.  

(Apocalypse of Abraham 23:3-9)\(^{30}\)

Once again, Azazel assumes the role of tempter, appearing in the form of a winged snake, and beguiling the couple into eating the forbidden fruit. Thus his demonic nature is apparent in this passage as well. Additional minor references to Azazel are found in chapters 20, 22, and 29;\(^{41}\) however they are quite incidental and have no real bearing on the issues addressed in this article.

That Azazel is portrayed as a demon in the Apocalypse of Abraham cannot be denied. In fact, the Apocalypse associates him with two themes which Judeo-Christian tradition applies to Satan, namely, his expulsion from heaven and his temptation of Adam and Eve under the guise of a snake. These constitute further significant developments as the figure of Azazel progressively merges with what might be termed the satanic.

The Influence of the Mishnah and the Targums

Only three direct references to "Azazel" appear in the Mishnah, none of which sheds any light on the meaning of the term.\(^ {42}\) However, Tractate Yoma is helpful in elucidating the practice of the scapegoat rite in early Judaism, as it treats this topic fairly extensively.

Yoma 6:8 has special pertinence to the present discussion, as it identifies ידידתי מָטָה (house of sharpness), the desert location outside Jerusalem to which the scapegoat was driven.\(^ {43}\) Hanson and Driver both link ידידתי מָטָה (house of sharpness) with "Dudael," mentioned in 1 Enoch 10:4 as the place of Azazel's banishment.\(^ {44}\) Although the

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 385.

\(^{41}\) Apocryphal Old Testament, 383, 384, 389.

\(^{42}\) These references merely refer to the casting of the lot which was designated "for Azazel." Cf. Yoma 4:1; 6:1, The Mishnah, trans. Herbert Danby (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), 166, 169.

\(^{43}\) Yoma 6:8; see the variant readings contained in footnote 6. (cf.n. 47)

Mishnaic traditions did not exist in written form when *1 Enoch* was composed, they probably had an oral history reaching back to that time. Hence it seems likely that a common element exists in both of these passages, in which case yet another connection between the expulsion of the scapegoat and the banishment of Azazel is established.

*Targum Onkelos* offers minimal relevant data to this study. However, its rendition of Lev 16:8 deserves consideration: "Then Aaron should place lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Name of the Lord, the other for Azazel."45 The use of the Aramaic phrase, "for the Name of the Lord" (or "Yahweh") (ץ יִדְּהוֹ),46 is interesting and calls for explanation. It is possible that "Name" was inserted into the text to act as a kind of buffer between Yahweh and humanity, as is often done in the targams to minimize anthropomorphism.47 This sentence structure no longer contains a direct parallelism between Yahweh and Azazel. This could indicate that the compilers of the Targum regarded the term "Azazel" as denoting something other than a personal being. However, the evidence for this deduction is so scanty that it can hardly be held with any certainty.

*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan's* use of יִתְנְשַׁף (send or cleave) in connection with the scapegoat's expulsion has already been considered in the section devoted to the Enoch material.

A quotation from this Targum's version of Lev 16 contains additional data pertinent to the discussion:

And Aharon shall put upon the goats equal lots; one lot for the Name of the Lord, and one lot for Azazel: and he shall throw them into the vase, and draw them out, and put them upon the goats. And Aharon shall bring the goat upon which came up the lot for the Name of the Lord, and make him a sin offering. And the goat on which came up the lot for Azazel he shall make to stand alive before the Lord, to expiate for the sins of the people of the house of Israel, by sending him to die in a place rough and hard in the rocky desert which is Beth-hadurey.48

It is clear that *Pseudo-Jonathan's* description of the choosing of the goats is far more innovative than that of *Targum Onkelos*. The insertion of

---

46 *Targum Onkelos*, ed. A. Berliner (Berlin: Gorzelanczyck and Co., 1884), 128.
47 See footnote 4 in *The Aramaic Bible*, 33.
the phrase, "for the Name of the Lord," appears here as well; however, there are also more significant additions which resemble the Mishnaic and Enoch texts. In particular, Pseudo-Jonathan parallels the Mishnah, in that the scapegoat is destined to die.49

The reference to the scapegoat's death in "a place rough and hard in the rocky desert which is Beth-hadurey" merits careful scrutiny, as it closely parallels the description of Azazel's punishment in 1 Enoch 10:4-5. Hanson equates "Beth-hadurey" with the "Dudael" of the Enoch passage.50 Moreover, Pseudo-Jonathan's "rocky desert" has its counterpart in the "desert which is in Dudael" and "jagged and sharp stones" of Enoch. Thus it is clear that the author of the Enoch passage, in his account of Azazel's banishment, was dependent on certain traditions involving the removal of the scapegoat, which were recorded in Targum Pseudojonathan.51

Conclusion
From the preceding analysis, it is evident that the authors of the apocalyptic texts known as 1 Enoch and the Apocalypse of Abraham regarded Azazel as a demon. In fact, a number of attributes commonly associated with Satan appear in the depictions of Azazel contained in these works. Furthermore, the author of 1 Enoch 10 apparently conceived of the scapegoat rite (especially as it is formulated in the Mishnah and in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan) as a paradigm of Azazel's banishment. Thus ancient Jewish traditions appear to be in agreement with the interpretation which finds in the expulsion of the scapegoat a type or model of the eschatological defeat of demonic power.

49 Compare Yoma 6:6, The Mishnah, 170, with The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch, 196, 198. However, Yoma 6:6 describes how the scapegoat was pushed over a cliff to its death, while Pseudo-Jonathan specifies that it would be carried to its death by a tempestuous wind.

50 Hanson, 223-224.

51 Hanson also draws attention to Pseudo-Jonathan's "close affinities with 1 Enoch" (223).
The Go’el in Ancient Israel: Theological Reflections on an Israelite Institution

ROBERT L. HUBBARD, JR.
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In his delightful book *Hunting the Divine Fox*, theologian Robert Farrar Capon warned of a special danger--overfamiliarity with the Bible:

Mere familiarity does not necessarily produce understanding. It is perfectly possible to know something (or someone!) all your life and still never really comprehend what you're dealing with. Like the Irishman in the old joke who received a brand-new toilet from his American cousins: He used the bowl for a foot washer, the lid for a breadboard, and the seat for a frame around the Pope's picture. \(^2\)

Among Bible scholars, there is nothing more familiar than the concept of *go’el* or "kinsman-redeemer." Proper interpretation of the book of Ruth requires its treatment, \(^3\) and Leggett has devoted a major book to it. \(^4\) As Capon warned, however, familiarity does not automatically mean understanding. Indeed, recent scholarly discussion reveals that, though understood in broad outline, some details of the *go’el*-institution still elude precise definition. \(^5\)

Preoccupation with its legal and sociological background, however, has shunted aside reflection on its theology. In my view, discussions in Old Testament theologies and theological dictionaries are distressingly brief and untheological. Thus, in this paper I aim to explore the theology of that Israelite institution. First, I will define and describe Israel's idea of go'el in general terms. Second, I will explore the theological insights of two key texts-applicable sections of Leviticus 25 and the book of Ruth. Time constraints, however, require that the examination of others be left for another occasion. Finally, I will attempt to summarize the results gained from the exegesis of those texts. Hopefully, a deeper appreciation and theological understanding of the go'el practice will replace that dangerous overfamiliarity of which Capon warned.

I


7. For what follows, cf. Ringgren, TDOT 2.351-52; Stamm, THAT 1.384-87. The term's heaviest concentration occurs in Leviticus 25 and 27, Ruth, and Isaiah. In Isaiah, the term refers exclusively to Yahweh as go'el.
the *go’el* was to avenge the death of a relative--the so-called "redeemer of blood" (*go’el haddam*; cf. vv. 16-21). He did so by tracking down and putting the killer to death, provided, of course, that the gates of a city of refuge did not get in his way.\(^8\) Also, as head of his clan, the *go’el* would receive any monetary restitution due a deceased relative for a wrong committed against him (Num 5:8). Finally, the *go’el* also assisted his relatives in obtaining justice in a lawsuit.\(^9\) As for its purpose, the institution served one main goal--to keep tribal solidarity intact by recovering its losses, whether of people or property.\(^10\)

II

Leviticus 25 falls near the end of the so-called "Holiness Code" (Lev 17-26).\(^11\) Literally, it consists of Yahweh's commission of Moses at Mt. Sinai to instruct Israel (vv 1-2). Instructions concerning the *go’el* duties fall within the treatment of the Jubilee Year (vv 8-55).\(^12\) Though the date of the chapter's final form is a matter of dispute, the issue need not detain us here.\(^13\) Whatever its date, most scholars concede that the


\(^9\) The word's metaphorical usage suggests this; cf. Job 19:25; Ps 119:154; Prov 23:11; Jer 50:34; Lam 3:58.

\(^10\) Scholars commonly refer to the union of Ruth and Boaz as a levirate marriage (cf. Gen 38; Deut 25:5-10). In my view, however, the book portrays their relationship as marriage of *g’ulla* or "redemption," not levirate. By definition, the term levirate describes the marriage of a widow to a brother of her late husband (Latin levir, "brother-in-law"). Boaz, however, is not Elimelech's brother nor is Ruth his widow. Further, the book uniformly describes the marriage in the language of redemption (*g’l*), not levirate (*ybm*). For discussion, see Hubbard 50-51, 57; cf. E. Kutsch, "the legal institution involved is not levirate marriage but *g’ulla*, 'redemption'" (*ybm*, *TDOT* 5.371); contrast Leggett, "there is nothing which is in contradiction to the law of levirate in Deuteronomy" (290).


\(^13\) Most literary critics trace the chapter's final form to exilic or postexilic priestly editors; cf. the analyses in K. Elliger, *Leviticus* (HAT 4; Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966) 14-20, 338-49; R. Kilian, *Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligungsgesetzes* (BBB 19; Bonn: Hanstein, 1963) 130-48; H. Graf Reventlow,
chapter represents concepts and practices which Israel observed during the monarchy if not earlier.14

Vv 23-28, the instruction concerning the redemption of property, concern us first.15 Structurally, the section divides into two parts: the twofold orders (vv 23-24) and the instruction itself (vv 25-28). Formally, the instruction begins with a casuistic--that is, conditional-clause, ki yamuk 'ahika umakar me"uzzato ("if your fellow clansman becomes poor and sells some of his property").16 This statement raises two questions. First, what circumstances underlie it? As the case of Naboth's vineyard shows (1 Kgs 21), Israelites clung to their ancestral property even in the face of royal pressure.17 Thus, one suspects the direst of circumstances here. The formula ki yamuk 'ahika ("if your kinsman becomes poor," cf. vv 35, 39, 47; 27:8) provides a clue.18


14. According to Reventlow, the Jubilee practice originated soon after Israel's conquest of Canaan (125); cf. J. van der Ploeg, "There can be no doubt indeed, that most of the contents of the Law of Holiness must be very old, and must have been practiced in ancient times" ("Studies in Hebrew Law," CBQ 13 [1951] 39). Others believe the Jubilee law reflects legal practice during the monarchy; cf. Elliger 349; Elliot-Binns 39-40 (late monarchy but pre-Josiah); M. Noth, Leviticus (E.T.; rev. ed.; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977) 185; J. R. Porter, Leviticus (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1976) 197; H. Wildberger, "Israel und sein Land," EvT 16 (1956) 404-22. On the other hand, many believe it to be an ideal practice created during the exile; cf. Kilian 146; E. Kutsch, "Jobeljahr," RGG, 3.800; Thiel, "eine sehr jungen Potenzierung der Sabbatjahridee" (61).

15. Most commentators believe that v 23 opens the following section rather than closes the preceding one; so North 12; Leggett 83; Elliger 338, 354; Porter 200, 201; Wenh 316, 320; et al.; against Noth 188-89; N. H. Snaith, Leviticus and Numbers (NCB; Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1967) 164.

16. As in other Semitic languages, here 'ah means not "brother" but more generally "kinsman, close relative"; d. E. Jenni, "'al," THAT 1.99-100; Leggett 83 n. 3. Reventlow believes that the laws in Leviticus 25 which begin similarly once formed an independent corpus of casuistic laws (136, 141).

17. H. Brichto has shown that, in a metaphysical sense, Israel understood the quality of afterlife to be tied to the possession and size of one's inheritance. He comments, "Death does not constitute dissolution but rather a transition to another kind of existence, an afterlife in the shadowy realm of Sheol. The condition of the dead in this afterlife is, in a vague but significant way, connected with proper burial upon the ancestral land and with the continuation on that land of the dead's proper progeny" ("Kin, Cult, Land, and Afterlife--A Biblical Complex," HUCA 44 [1973] 1-54, esp. 23).

18. For the form, see G. Liedke, Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze (WMANT 39; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1971) 22, 31-32, 35 n. 1.
Unfortunately, the root *muk* occurs only five times in the Old Testament, four times in Leviticus 25 (vv 25, 35, 39, 47), once in Leviticus 27:8. Ugaritic, however, offers a suggestive cognate (*mkk* or *mk*) meaning "to become weak" or "to deteriorate."\(^{19}\) A parallel line in v 35 here confirms the validity of that cognate and further illuminates the meaning of *muk*. Taken literally, *mata yado* means "his hand shakes" (root *mut* "to waver, shake"), a metaphor which probably refers to economic weakness.\(^ {20}\) Hence, in this context, the root *muk* means--in modern terms--to become "shaky" financially, to be unable to support oneself.

Thus, a case of severe indebtedness probably lies behind the surrender of land here.\(^ {21}\) Apparently, to repay a debt which has come due, the landholder has mortgaged his inheritance. A measure of his desperation, he preferred to suffer the loss of land rather than the cruel consequences of an unpaid debt. This leads to a second question: what is actually sold here, the land itself or something else? Vv 14-15 suggest that the landholder sold only the land's revenue--its produce or yield--not the property itself (cf. also v 27). In effect, the person only rented out the land--at most, for forty-nine years until the next Jubilee--but did not surrender its title. He received the rent in advance, a single lump sum payment just as if there had been a sale.\(^ {22}\) The difficulty, of course, is how to get his mortgaged land out of hock later.

The instruction (vv 25-28) provides the answer. (To borrow a Latin expression, we might call them *ad hoc* provisions!) First, a *go'el* of the "mortgage buyer" may "redeem" (*ga'al*) the property (v 25). Presumably, he is one of the relatives listed later in vv 48-49--a brother, an uncle, a cousin, or any blood relative.\(^ {23}\) Second, if he lacks *go'el*, yet somehow gathers the necessary means, he may redeem

---

19. J. Aistleitner, *Worterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1974) no. 1561 (p. 184); cf. UT no. 1473 ("to be vanquished"); BDB 557 ("be low, depressed, grow poor"); KB 526 ("to become poor," i.e., to come down, deteriorate).

20. So KB 526; NIV ("is unable to support himself"); but cf. BDB 556 ("of feebleness"). That the expression also implies weakness is clear from the verb which follows (*wehehezaqta*, lit. "and you shall strengthen"). In other words, the fellow Israelite who "becomes weak" (*yamuk*) must receive strength from someone else (*hehezaqta*).

21. So most scholars; cf. Noth 187; Leggett 88; Wenham 317. The partitive *min* in *me'ahuzzato* shows the sale of only some of the land.


23. But cf. Porter, who believes that the redeemers in vv 48-49 come from a wider than the one in v 25 (206). For a critique of the view that v 25 deals with the right preemption as in Jeremiah 32 and Ruth 4, see Leggett 89-92.
himself (v 26). Most likely, he would acquire the funds through some sort of inheritance rather than by frugally saving some of his wages. The cost of living would probably leave little, if any, of his earnings to be saved—a predicament typical of modern life as well. In this case and presumably in the first case as well—he must repay the buyer part of the rent originally advanced him (v 27). Based on the number of years left until Jubilee, the amount would be the sum first borrowed less the amount which the mortgage holder had earned from the land during his tenancy. The third case concerns the "worst case" scenario. If the mortgage buyer lacks a *go'el* and fails to amass sufficient funds to redeem himself, the property remains with the buyer until the year of Jubilee (v 28). Only then does the original landholder regain full possession of it.

This brings us to consider the twofold theological basis for the legislation (vv 23-24). The first is a prohibition against the permanent sale of land: "The land shall not be sold permanently for the land is mine, for you are resident aliens and settlers with me." Obviously, the statement outlaws the permanent transfer of ownership of real estate in Israel. Strikingly, however, to support it, Yahweh appeals to an ancient social analogy, the contrast in status between a landowner and a resident alien. Yahweh is the landowner, he says. Yahweh alone holds title to the property; Israel only works it on his behalf. Yahweh alone enjoys the full rights and privileges of ownership; Israel only lives there by his grace. By contrast, Israel is just a resident alien (ger) and settler (*tosab*). Now, in Israel, a resident alien enjoyed a status somewhere between the full rights of a citizen and the few rights of a foreigner.

---

24. As Daube points out, "Once you were ruined to such an extent that you had to sell your land... the chances of recovery by your own, unassisted exertions were, it is to be supposed, slender" (D. Daube, *Studies in Israelite Law* [reprint; New York: Ktav, 1969] 44). The poverty of such a person would leave little left over to be set aside toward redemption.

25. In this context, the verb *ys*’ may be a technical term of release; so Leggett 84 n.11; F. Horst, "Das Eigentum nach dem Alten Testament," in *Gottes Recht* (TBU 12; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1961) 220 (*Terminus der Haftungsauflosung*); vv 28, 30, 31, 33, 41, 54. Leggett ably argues the case that the property reverts, not to the *go’el*, but to the original owner (92-95).

26. According to Elliger, this fundamental sentence is very old (*uralt*) (354); so also Porter, "probably the old basic law" (201); cf. J. J. Rabinowitz, "Biblical Parallel to a Legal Formula from Ugarit," *VT* 8 (1958) 95.


Significantly, however, the alien could not possess land; only full Israelite citizens could. Hence, for work, he had to hire himself out, and for food, to glean in the fields (Lev 19:10; 23:22; Deut 24:14, 19-21). The point, then, is that Israel lives, not on her own land, but on land that belongs to someone else. Since she holds no title, she has no right to sell it. Only Yahweh, the true owner, does. Thus, to sell it permanently is to infringe on Yahweh's rights.

The second basis for the instruction is the command (v 24): "Throughout the land of your possession, you shall permit (titnu) redemption (ge'ulla) for the land." If the prohibition outlaws the permanent sale of property, the command permits its return when temporarily separated from its holder. The three cases discussed above implement its permission. In one sense, the command logically follows up the prohibition: the latter implicitly establishes Yahweh's authority as landowner, the former articulates his policy concerning it. On the other hand, one wonders why such an order need be issued. What would the situation be like without it? Apparently, without it, Israel was not likely to permit such redemption. Indeed, quite the opposite scenario seems probable. Unforeseen, unavoidable bankruptcy would compel the poor to mortgage some of their land just to survive.

In turn, the rich would bankroll such mortgages and increase their land holdings. Over time, they would reap a handsome profit, a profit to be turned into other purchases, perhaps of more land. Eventually, a great social division would result--on one side, a few wealthy land barons, on the other, the landless poor who work for them. In short, it is that accumulation of property and economic power which the redemption requirement here seeks to prevent. Whether accomplished by the go'el, by self-redemption, or by Jubilee, Yahweh intends redemption to maintain a social and economic equilibrium in Israel.

In addition, the chapter also legislates the redemption of persons (vv 47-55). This additional "ad hoc provision" resembles that concerning the land. Here, too, repayment of a debt probably stands behind the crisis (umak 'ahika, "and your brother becomes poor," v 47). In this case, however, the source of capital is not an Israelite but a settler, a

29. According to R. North, v 23 does not mean that private property was excluded or unlimited. Rather, it simply regulated property relationships between people so that everyone, not just a few, could live in true freedom ("jobel," TWAT 3.558).

30. For God's ownership of the land, see Josh 22:19; Jer 16:18; Ezek 36:5; Hos 9:3; Ps 85:2. Interestingly, Yahweh asserts, but does not explain, the basis for his claim. Other texts based ownership on his creation of the world (Ps 24:1-2; 95:5), and that idea may underlie this statement.

31. So Wenham 317.
resident alien, or a member of his family. To obtain funds, the threatened Israelite "sells himself" (nimkar) into servitude to his foreign financier. In other words, he agrees to "work off" the monetary advance by laboring in the alien's employ. Now the fact that he sells himself rather than land may be significant. It may imply that he has already mortgaged his property since his only remaining asset appears to be his labor. If so, his case represents an even more extreme example of insolvency than the one in vv 25-28.

As before, the problem is how to regain his economic independence. In response, v 48 dictates that the Israelite still has the right to redemption (ge'ulla; cf. v 24). The same three avenues that vv 25-28 offer make it possible (vv 48b-54). First, his relatives--one of his brothers, an uncle, a cousin, or any blood relative--may redeem him from servitude (vv 48-49). Second, if he comes into money, he may redeem himself (v 49b). In this case--and probably in the first case as well--the number of years between the start of his servitude and the next Jubilee form the basis for calculating his redemption price (v 50a). Though vv 50b-52 lack some needed details, essentially the price amounts to what, at the going rate, a hired man would earn in the years left before Jubilee. The text views it as a refund of that part of the original cash advance which the borrower had not yet worked off. Once the financier is paid off, the person goes free. Finally, as in the case of mortgaged land, if the above two means fail, the next Jubilee effects his release (v 54).

Now two other comments enable us to gain some theological insight. First, v 53 specifies the special treatment due an enslaved Israelite. It forbids the boss to treat him harshly. He is to handle him, not

32. Precisely why the debtor sought that source is unclear. Further, one wonders how the foreigner rose to such affluence. As noted above, the law forbid foreigners from owning land in Israel. Thus, the aliens probably obtained their wealth through business ventures or through personal technological expertise (e.g., metalworking, etc.). Deut 28:43 also foresaw the rise of foreigners to wealth.

33. Vv 39-43 offer instruction concerning the case where an Israelite sells himself to a fellow Israelite. For some reason, however, nothing is said of his redemption, as if the latter did not apply (so Daube 43). Self-indenture for financial insolvency was common in the ancient Near East. For details and bibliography, see Leggett 98-101. For more recent studies, see I. Cardellini, Die biblischen 'Slaven'-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Slavenrechts (BBB 55; Bonn: Hanstein, 1981). For an ancient Near Eastern parallel see R. Yaron, "A Document of Redemption from Ugarit," VT 10 (1960) 83-90.

34. So Wenham, "a last resort in cases of serious debt" (322). For the relation of these slave laws and others in the Pentateuch, see North, Jubilee 135-57. For additional bibliography, see Leggett 102 n. 75.

35. Noth suggests that the regulation may reflect Israel's inability to impose on foreigners the requirement for manumission of slaves after six years (192).

36. So Leggett 101, 105. The key phrase is yasib ('et)-g'ulla (vv 51, 52). Here g'ulla means "price of redemption" (so Elliger 343).
like an ordinary slave, but like a *škfr*, a "day laborer," an employee hired for a fixed period of time (cf. Deut 24:14-15). In other words, Yahweh places the Israelite under protection, limiting his master's control and defining the rules of the workplace (cf. vv 39-40). Put differently, Yahweh decrees that, despite his misfortune, the Israelite is still a full citizen under hire, not a lowly, foreign slave. More important, in v 55 Yahweh gives the twofold reason for the Israelite's release. Says Yahweh, "The children of Israel are mine; they are my servants whom I brought out of the land of Egypt . .." (v 42). Obviously, Yahweh recalls the famous liberation of Israel at the Exodus (Exod 14). Simply put, an enslaved Israelite should go free at Jubilee because Yahweh owns him as a servant.

This statement is striking in several respects. First, it implies that for the foreigner not to release the Israelite infringes on Yahweh's rights as master. Whatever business binds the two men, ultimately the Israelite is Yahweh's property, subject to his wishes. No less than any Christian, no Israelite could serve two masters (Matt 6:24). Second, the statement implies that the Jubilee release is the social mechanism whereby Yahweh protects his interests. It is a social statement that he owns Israel and defends his rights. Third, there appears to be an important wordplay between two forms of the verb *ys'* in the context. According to v 54, the redeemed Israelite is to (lit.) "go out" (*w*yasa', qal)--that is, to go free. According to v 55, at the Exodus, Yahweh "brought out" Israel (*hose*’i, hiph.)--that is, set her free. Implicitly, the wordplay links the Exodus with the institution of *g*’*ulla*. It portrays the redemption of this chapter as a follow-up to what Yahweh did in Egypt.37 Now, if this is so, two additional insights into the nature of redemption follow. Put simply, redemption amounts to an institutional Exodus in Israel. On the one hand, it perpetuates the first liberation—that from Egyptian slavery—within later, settled Israel. It frees her from unending servitude to later Pharaohs within her own ranks. On the other, each instance, of redemption amounts to a fresh moment of divine liberation—as it were, a miniature Exodus.

That insight, in turn, casts the role of the Israelite *go’el* in a different theological light. In essence, the human kinsman carries out the redemption policy of the "Great Kinsman," Yahweh himself.38 One might even say that the human kinsman personally represents Yahweh

37. Cf. Exod 6:6; 15:3, 13 where *g*l describes the rescue. Daube even believes the way the Old Testament pictures the Exodus (i.e., a redemption of slaves) derives from teaching about g’*ulla* (39-62).

38. The expression is that of McKenzie, who says, "the idea of a Great Kinsman who defends the life, liberty, and property of his kinsmen is very probably a reflection of an early idea of Yahweh; it can scarcely be anything but an archaism in Second Isaiah, biblical writer who uses the term most frequently" (237).
in such transactions. On the other hand, when human redemption, whether by *go'el* or by oneself, fails to free an enslaved Israelite, the Jubilee provision intervenes. In effect, at that moment, the Great Kinsman himself steps in to perform redemption, just as he did at the Exodus.

Let us sum up the theological insights gained from Leviticus 25. First, the *go'el* institution implements Yahweh’s rights and policies toward his land and his people. Specifically, he decrees limits on the human inclination toward greed and power. Since he owns Canaan, his policy is that families retain, not lose, their inherited land. Since he owns Israel, his policy is that his people never see perpetual slavery again. He is their only master, a God of liberation. For Israel, the implications are twofold. On the one hand, she must accept economic dependence on Yahweh. She must content herself with the portion of Yahweh’s land allotted her by him. While citizens of neighboring nations expand their holdings, Yahweh calls her to trust him to make those assigned plots productive. On the other hand, Yahweh calls her to live out the "Exodus ethos." Once she was an impoverished victim of Pharaoh. Should she attain wealth, however, her mandate is to not play Pharaoh against her fellow former slaves. Rather, she is to allow and to effect their redemption.

Second, the purpose of the institution is restoration. As North put it, “In the jubilee the dominant note is home-coming.” In this regard, the key Hebrew expression is *sub ‘el/le *ahuza*, "to return to (one's) possession" (vv 27, 28; cf. vv 10, 19, 41). In this context, "ahuza ("possession") refers specifically to the property inherited by an Israelite from his ancestors. Whether "to return to (one's) possession" connotes an actual reoccupation of ancestral land or simply its repossessio is uncertain. In any case, the point is that, either through redemption or Jubilee, the Israelite recovers the family property previously mortgaged. He returns to the state of affairs before

39. Cf. Wenham, who compares the servitude assumed here to modem imprisonment, that is, a means to work off a fine in confinement (322).
41. The word *deror* ("liberty," v 10) is related, although it envisions a broader restoration, that of both property and personal freedom. For the word, see R. North, "*deror,∗" *TDOT* 3.265-69.
43. Apparently, Noth favors the former (187), Porter the latter (199). Twice the return also entailed a return to one’s "clan" (*mispaha;* vv 1a, 41). That might confirm that “return” referred to actual physical reunion of land and landholder.
circumstances forced its surrender. However achieved, redemption
gives Israelites with financial woes a chance to start over. In that
regard, Wenham has observed that the average Israelite would prob-
ably live to see one Jubilee observance in a lifetime.44 By implication,
if not freed earlier, an Israelite would enjoy a fresh financial start once
in a lifetime. From a human standpoint, one should not underestimate
what a giant relief that offers. It would lift an otherwise impossible
burden of debt from poor, sagging shoulders. In that moment, he
would experience his own Exodus--the sweet taste of economic free-
dom at last!

In short, through this institution, Yahweh provides--to borrow a
modern phrase--a “safety net” for vulnerable Israelites. In so doing,
he shows himself to be the Great Kinsman, the powerful protector of
the weak. Through redemption, he saves hopelessly poor citizens from
an endless cycle of poverty.45 He prevents a reversal of the Exodus--
a relapse into the cruel hands of Israelite Pharaohs.46 In effect, he pro-
vides Israel with what Moore called a “cultural gyroscope,” a guidance
system to maintain her social equilibrium--her sense of wholeness,
well-being, or salom.47 The institution enables Israel to live out her two
great national charters--the promise of blessing to Abraham (Gen 12)
and the Sinai covenant of freedom (Exod 19-24).

III

In the book of Ruth, we enter quite different literary terrain. We leave
the craggy slopes of Sinai for the fertile fields, fragrant threshing
floor, and buzzing city gate of Bethlehem. Suddenly, the stem, divine
voice which lectured at Sinai gives way to a narrative about Naomi,
Ruth, and Boaz. Immediately, two things are striking. First, in Ruth
one sees, not abstract legislation, but actual legal principles--the

44. Wenham 317. There seems to be no evidence, however, that Jubilee was ever ac-
tually practiced (so Wenham 318). North, however, offers this argument in favor of its
having been observed: "The very formulations of Lv 25 . . . imply that the proclamation
was to be merely normative; and that in fact most of the bankrupt tenants would have
been already rehabilitated with the help of more prosperous relatives. Of the cases
which remained strictly subject to the law, presumably the number of holders who re-
 fused to obey was neither smaller nor larger than the predictable mean for violations of
this kind. Hence neither a miraculous unanimity of observance nor a conspiracy of con-
tempt is to be imagined from the lack of historical record. . . ." (Jubilee 209). Alterna-
tively, B. Uffenheimer argued that, though only fully realized in the Kingdom of God,
the legislation challenged Israel continually to seek maximal approximation of its ideal
(cited from Meinhold 15-16).
45. A. Daum, "'Sisterhood' Is Powerful," in Spinning A Sacred Yarn (ed. A. Aber-
46. Wenham 323.
application of legal background to a live situation. One may wonder whether Israel ever observed Jubilee, but Ruth leaves no doubt that Israel observed ge’ulla.48 Second, one observes that God hardly seems present at all in the story.49 He directly intervenes in only two places--he gives Judah food (1:6) and Ruth conception (4:13). Were Yahweh not occasionally invoked by characters, one might presume him to be totally absent from the story.50 Closer inspection, however, reveals that God is very much present. Though hidden behind the scenes, his is the firm hand quietly guiding events.51

To begin, we consider the emergence and role of the go’el in Ruth. Chapter 1 confronts us with the book's main problem, the lack of an heir. Pointedly, v 5 stresses that only Naomi survived her family's sojourn in Moab.52 Her bitter outcry (vv 11-13) drops a painful hint: what this story needs is a husband to produce a child (cf. also vv 20-21). The word go’el first appears, however, in 2:20 where Naomi applies it to Boaz. Though ambiguous, the reference at least introduces the prospect of his future action on behalf of the two widows.53 Further, it occurs in a significant context, Naomi's praise of Boaz for his hesed. In 3:9, it is Ruth herself who petitions the action implicit in 2:20 when she proposes marriage to Boaz as go’el. This is not the place to review the discussion concerning that verse.54 The point is that Ruth sought to marry Boaz in order to give Naomi the heir she needed. In response, Boaz introduced a surprise--the existence of another go’el with a prior right to the duty (3:12)--then promised to arrange her redemption one way or the other (3:13). The important scene at the city gate reports how Boaz legally obtained the redemption right for himself (4:1-12). Finally, 4:14 provides the last mention

48. As T. and D. Thompson point out, legal narratives actually provide better evidence for ancient practices than legal instructions. The former portray actual legal activities, the latter only practices on the day of promulgation ("Some Legal Problems in the Book of Ruth," VT 18 [1968] 83-84); cf. M. Burrows, "Law is often artificial and sometimes idealistic, and it is not uncommonly more consistent than custom" ("The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth," JBL 59 [1940] 452).


50. For examples of such invocations, see 1:8-9, 20-21; 2:19-20; 3:13; 4:11-12, 14.

51. For more details, see Hubbard 68-71; Hals, Theology 3-19.

52. wattissa’er ha’issa missene’ yeladeyha ume’isah.

53. Most scholars believe that go’el anticipates the eventual provision of an heir. In my view, however, her primary concern is with the happy prospect of a marriage for Ruth (cf. 3:1-2). For details and bibliography, see Hubbard 186-88.

of go’el, specifically, praise of Yahweh for giving Naomi the newborn son of Boaz and Ruth as her go’el.55

Now several important things emerge in this survey. First, like Leviticus 25, it is a tragic human crisis which eventually summons the go’el to action. The family line of Elimelech lacks an heir to continue itself. Hence, it teeters perilously on the brink of annihilation.56 As is well known, Israel regarded such an event as a great tragedy, one to be avoided at all costs. When a family died out physically, it ceased to exist metaphysically. That robbed Israel of one of her most prized possessions, her tribal solidarity. A secondary crisis, however, is the possibility that Naomi faces old age without anyone to care for her. That potential tragedy is implicit in her angry outcries (1:11-13, 20-21), and explicit in the joyous exclamation of her neighbors (4:14-15). They rejoice that the newborn will "revive [her] spirits and sustain [her] in old age." In short, as in Leviticus 25, here the go’el delivers an unfortunate Israelite, not from loss of land or lengthy servitude, but from annihilation.57

Second, the book sets this redemption in a theological framework different from that of Leviticus 25. In the latter, ge’ulla formed a part of the practice of the Jubilee year. In Ruth, it forms part of what I call "the life of hesed," the ideal lifestyle which the book reveres.58 This is evident in 2:20 where Naomi first identifies Boaz as a go’el. In the preceding line, she praises Yahweh for the fact that Boaz had "not abandoned his kindness (hesed) toward the living and the dead."59 The juxtaposition of hesed and go’el here implies that, should Boaz later carry out go’el duties, such actions would constitute acts of hesed. Though hesed nowhere else occurs with reference to Boaz, two other evidences imply that the book views his performance as fulfilling that

55. This is the only instance in the Bible where an infant bears the title go’el. Set beside Leviticus 25, Ruth also expands our understanding of the go’el institution by providing details about the practice unattested elsewhere. For example, only in Ruth does a go’el marry a widow to provide the heretofore childless family an heir. Further, the linking of that marriage to inheritance of ancestral land (4:5)—sadly, the cause of much scholarly discussion!—is also unique to this lovely book (see Hubbard 52-62).

56. As is well known, the threat of starvation also plays a large role in the story (1:1, 6, 22; chap 2; 3:15, 17). In my view, it is secondary to the problem of familial survival (cf. 1:11-13, 20-21; 3:9; 4:5,10,13-17). The same may be said of the ancestral land, which appears in the story almost as a surprise (4:3).

57. As Brichto notes, the go’el "was not merely a close-kinsman obligated to blood-vengeance or privileged to redeem property. The go’el is he who redeems the dead from danger to his afterlife by continuing his line" (21).

58. For details, see Hubbard 72-74; Campbell 29-30.

59. Here I depart from the consensus which sees Yahweh, not Boaz, as the antecedent of the ‘‘ser clause. For a defense of this view, see B. Rebera, "Yahweh or Boaz? Ruth 2:20 Reconsidered," BT 36 (1985) 317-27. Hubbard provides bibliography of the alternate-view (186 n. 28).
ideal. In 3:18, Naomi again lauds Boaz, this time for his conscientious follow-through. He promised Ruth redemption (3:13), and he will not relax until she has it. In addition, the closing genealogy lists Boaz seventh in the list, a position of honor second only to that of the tenth place. In sum, according to the book, by serving as go’el, Boaz performs an act of besed worthy of honor.

Now this is what is particularly striking about the hesed-framework in Ruth: contrary to expectations, it seems to rest theologically, not on a covenant basis, but on a cosmic one. That is, its roots lie more in Yahweh's role as king of the universe than as Israel's Covenant God. Two evidences point in this direction. First, a cosmic basis for hesed seems to underlie Naomi's petition in 1:8 that Yahweh repay Orpah and Ruth for their hesed toward her. At that point, neither woman is a member of Israel's covenant Community. Indeed, Naomi herself expects them to worship Moabite gods if they obey her urging to "go back" (1:15). Her plea assumes that Yahweh rewards all peoples, not just Israelites, for hesed. Thus, the book understands hesed as a constituent element of the world's underlying moral order, the order which Yahweh oversees and of which Israel's own hesed-ideal (cf. Mic 6:8) is a specific expression. Further, it assumes (as does the entire Old Testament) that Yahweh himself is a God of besed. Naomi appeals to him to dispense hesed because he is that kind of God.

The second evidence is the divine title Shaddai which Naomi twice invokes (1:20-21). A brief review of the Old Testament usage of Shaddai confirms that it reflects the idea of Yahweh's cosmic, not just covenant, rulership. By nature, Shaddai is great and mysterious (Job 11:7). He not only promised the patriarchs great destinies (Gen 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14), but decrees appropriate fates for the righteous and the wicked (Job 27:14; 31:2). As cosmic ruler, he maintains justice in the world (Job 8:3; 24:1; 27:2), hears appeals for legal intervention (Job 8:5; 13:3; 31:35), and metes out terrible punishments (Job 6:4; 23:16; 27:14-23). In sum, the Old Testament associates Shaddai with Yahweh in his role as cosmic ruler. Now if this is so, I would argue that the above two cosmic references, concentrated as they are in chapter 1, create a subtle literary effect. Should Yahweh later act in the story,

61. Cf. Gen 21:23; Josh 2:12, 14; Judg 8:35; Ps 33:5-9; Prov 3:3; 11:17; etc.
whether to reward or to punish, the reader assumes that he does so in the same role as king of the cosmos.  

Two final observations conclude our analysis of the theology of the go’el in Ruth. First, the book assumes that Yahweh acts in the acts of the story's human characters. Though supportive evidence is plentiful, one example must suffice. I refer to the clever repetition of the word kanap ("wing, garment-corner") in chapters two and three. In 2:12, addressing Ruth, Boaz wishes that Yahweh would repay Ruth for her actions. He specifies that Yahweh is the God "under whose wings" (kenapayim) Ruth has sought refuge. The word "wings" probably conjures up the image of a bird tenderly protecting its young. Like a defenseless starling, Ruth sits securely under Yahweh's mighty wings. In Ruth's marriage proposal (3:9), she asks Boaz to spread his kanap-here, meaning "garment comer"--over her. Like "wings" of 2:12, this gesture probably also symbolizes protection of the woman (and perhaps sexual readiness as well). By repeating the key word from his own lips, Ruth essentially asks Boaz to answer his own prayer! Now theologically, the word repetition implies a relationship between the two petitions. Thus, by covering Ruth with his kanap--that is, to marry her--Boaz implements Yahweh's kanap--that is, his protection of Ruth. Or, to weave in a thread dropped earlier, the hesed of Boaz toward Ruth is the form in which Yahweh conveys his hesed to her.

The second and final observation is that, in the end, Yahweh receives the credit for the story's happy ending. In the closing scene, Naomi's neighbors exult, "Praise the Lord! He has not left you without a kinsman-redeemer today!" (4:14). For our purposes, the

64. Cf. 2:4,12,19,20; 3:13; 4:11-12,14.
67. The idiom paras kanap 'al ("to spread a garment-cover over [someone]") means "to marry" (Ezek 16:8; cf. Deut 23:1 [22:30]; 27:20; Mal 2:16).
69. Similarly, Campbell 29, 138; d. L. Morris, "Ruth had put herself under Yahweh's 'wing' when she came to Judah. Now she seeks also to put herself under that of Boaz" ("Ruth," in A. Cundall and L. Morris, Judges and Ruth [TOTC; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1968] 290).
70. Insightfully, Sasson observes that the Hebrew phrase lo' hisbit lak (lit. "did not cause to cease for you") portrays Yahweh's intervention as preventative; that is, it prevented the end of Elimelech's line (Ruth 162-63).
significant point is that the women credit Yahweh with directly giving the go’el to needy Naomi. Now in the preceding verse (4:13), the narrator had said that "Yahweh gave her [Ruth] conception." Thus, at first glance, the women's praise seems simply to reinforce the point that Yahweh had provided the newborn. In my view, however, it offers a terse theological commentary on the book's entire prior chain of events. Granted, Yahweh's help enabled Ruth to conceive. But there would be no birth at all without human actions-sexual consumption by the newlyweds (4:13), Boaz's day in court (4:1-12), the meetings of Ruth and Boaz (chaps. 2 and 3), and her migration to Judah (chap. 1). In short, the book implies that divine guidance lay behind everything, even the actions of human characters.71

Finally, let us summarize the theological insights concerning the go’el gleaned from Ruth. As with Leviticus 25, ge’ulla responds to desperate human need—a bitter widow facing old age alone and, worse, a permanent breach in tribal solidarity. Significantly, however, the book understands the basis of that redemption to be a cosmic one, the universal idea of hesed. The implication is that, in the book of Ruth, the Israelite institution implements that larger ideal. Specifically, the human go’el is the means whereby Yahweh, the Great Kinsman, achieves his purposes. On stage, Ruth and Boaz faithfully live the lifestyle of hesed. Backstage, however, behind them, moves the Great go’el, pained by famine, death, and old age, gently acting to alleviate them. His broad, powerful wings protect those, like Boaz and Ruth, who please him.

Before leaving Ruth, however, I must add a speculative footnote. Since the story's ultimate climax is the birth of David, I wonder if the neighbors' joyful cry in 4:14 literarily anticipates that event. In other words, did the author view David, grandson of Naomi's go’el Obed, as the greatest go’el of all? Did he anticipate his redemption of Israel from the slavery evident in Judges-tribal jealousies, idolatry, and foreign oppression?

IV
In his Studies in Biblical Law, David Daube observed that,

the idea of God or Jesus redeeming mankind from sin and damnation, apparently a purely religious idea, derives from those ancient rules on insolvent debtors and victims of murder, on the preservation of the existing clans and the patrimony of clans.72

71. In addition, the infant represents part, perhaps even the climactic part, of Yahweh's reward of Ruth for her hesed (1:8; 2:12; 3:10).
72. Daube 59.
Clearly, Daube spotted the fingerprints of the old Hebrew *ge'ulla* on the pages of the New Testament. As we have seen, the Israelite *go'el*-institution guarded Yahweh's rights to his land and expressed his policy concerning the liberty of the poor among his covenant people. It also sought to reward those who lived the life of *hesed* among them. It offered the Exodus in institutional form--the Exodus in miniature--to perpetuate the freedom originally won from Pharaoh. Through it and its human *go'alin*, the Great *go'el* freed Israelites from poverty, old age, and even lost afterlife. At the same time, the institution threw Israel a provocative challenge to give up greed, hubris, and apathy for the Exodus ethos. It presented her a more excellent way and called for a kinder and gentler Israel. Thus, from a New Testament perspective, it anticipated the advent of the Great Redeemer, the one who paid for redemption with his own life. Similarly, the challenge thrown Israel remains relevant today. The world could use more *go'alin*--protectors of the weak, defenders of the poor. Indeed, knowledge of the Israelite *ge'ulla* makes even more provocative Paul's familiar exhortation, "You are not your own; you were bought with a price. Therefore glorify God with your body" (1 Cor 6:19-20).

73. Specifically, he cited 1 Cor 6:29; 1 Pet 1:18-19; 1 Tim 2:6; Tit 2:14 (cf. Daube 73, n. 168).

74. Cf. Daube, "... it is hardly going too far to say that all those commands, which have had an enormous stabilizing effect and led to the alleviation of much dis-if carried into practice, during the greater part at least of the nation, were a social rather than actually functioning as law" (45).
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The Purpose of Israel's Annual Feasts
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The feasts of the Lord were days of high importance for Israel. They punctuated her calendar with seasons of joyous celebration, sharing in agricultural abundance, and reprieve from the daily routine. But they were also religious events. Their importance is evidenced by the fact that three passages in the Mosaic legislation describe the feasts: Leviticus 23; Numbers 28-29; and Deuteronomy 16.

What was the significance of these annual religious festivals? Hulbert suggests that their significance was primarily eschatological and that they "were types which prophesied God's redemptive program in Israel." However, as Chafer points out, for a type to be valid, it must have "continuity of truth" in both testaments. So for


2 The idea of joyous celebration is particularly strong in the Deuteronomy account. See the discussion on Deuteronomy 16 in Gilbert George Braithwaite, "The Doctrine of the Central Sanctuary in Deuteronomy" (ThD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978), pp. 125-26. The abundance of the land, represented by the freewill offerings (Deut. 16:10, 17), was to be shared with the unfortunate (vv. 11, 14). For the reprieve from the daily routine, see the discussion later on the sabbatical rest.

3 The religious nature of these feasts may be seen in the Numbers account. Each individual feast had its own set of offerings. Furthermore these feasts were said to belong to the Lord (תָּחֹן מָעָרָם).

4 Terry C. Hulbert, "The Eschatological Significance of Israel's Annual Feasts" (ThD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1965), p. i.

5 Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 8 vols. (Dallas, TX: Dallas Seminary...
the annual cycle of feasts to have the eschatological significance that Hulbert proposes, it must first speak commemoratively to Israel of her past redemption before it can speak typologically of her future redemption. Hulbert recognizes this, but he gives little attention to the historical function.\(^6\) Both are needed, and the historical significance must be considered first. Stated in another way, before an Old Testament event can have a forward-looking typological function, its historical and retrospective significance must be seen.

### How Do the Feast Passages Differ?

The three passages that describe the feasts differ in their emphases. Deuteronomy 16 stresses the pilgrimages to the feasts, Numbers 28-29 emphasizes the offerings, and Leviticus 23 focuses on the feasts themselves. Why are these emphases given?

**DEUTERONOMY 16**

In Deuteronomy 16 the pilgrimage (נַחֲלָה) occupies a prominent place.\(^7\) That chapter mentions only the three pilgrimage-feasts, during which attendance before the Lord for all male Israelites was required.\(^8\) "These annual feasts would keep the people aware of the importance of the central sanctuary and of its role in maintaining their unique spiritual relationship with" the Lord.\(^9\) The recurring phrases, "the place which the Lord your God chooses" and "(appearing) before the Lord your God," readily identify the organizing prin-

---

\(^{6}\) For example he states that "this retrospective idea was certainly valid, for the feasts involved true memorials, of deliverance from Egypt, or harvests, of past sins to be confessed, etc." (Hulbert, "Israel's Annual Feasts," p. 108; cf. similar statements on pp. 3, 109). He adds that from the premillennial point of view one must accord to these feasts "a genuine historical function" (ibid., p. 17).


\(^{8}\) The three pilgrimage-feasts are the feasts of Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and Booths. Even though the Passover is mentioned in this chapter, that feast "and Unleavened Bread are in effect the two constituent parts of a single major festival," of which "the second part... [is] the center of attention" (Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976], p. 242). Incidentally this is the same orientation found in Leviticus 23.

\(^{9}\) Braithwaite, "The Doctrine of the Central Sanctuary in Deuteronomy," p. 125.
The purpose of this passage. Verses 16-17 conveniently summarize this literary unit. The pilgrimages of the people to the central sanctuary would contribute to national unity.

NUMBERS 28-29

Numbers 28-29 is a section of the Mosaic legislation whose purpose "is to define the periodical public offerings." The inclusion of the list of the feasts of the Lord is only incidental. These two chapters prescribe the kinds of offerings for various occasions--daily offerings (28:3-8), sabbatical offerings (28:9-10), and festive offerings (28:19-29:39). The literary clue for the whole section (hence also for the segment governing the feasts of the Lord) is in Numbers 28:2. The Israelites were instructed to "observe" (םָחַר) to present the offerings. The word מָחַר means "to exercise great care over." In Deuteronomy this word is used of the people's careful observance of the Lord's commandments. It is clear then that Numbers 28-29 contains an instructional manual for the priests on the offerings in the feasts of the Lord.

LEVITICUS 23

A cursory reading of Leviticus 23 reveals that no such convenient organizing principle may readily be found. The feasts are treated at various lengths, and various details are given for each of the feasts, as seen in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasts</th>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>23:5</td>
<td>1 verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unleavened bread</td>
<td>23:6-8</td>
<td>3 verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firstfruits</td>
<td>23:10-14</td>
<td>5 verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>23:15-22</td>
<td>8 verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpets</td>
<td>23:24-25</td>
<td>2 verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Atonement</td>
<td>23:27-32</td>
<td>6 verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booths</td>
<td>23:34-43</td>
<td>10 verses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 For the phrase "the place which the Lord your God chooses" see verses 2, 6-7,11, 15. For the phrase "before the Lord your God" see verses 11 and 16 (without the preposition ל).
12 Ibid., pp. 402-3. "Incidentally it also, and of necessity, contains a list of Jewish fixed feasts or sacred seasons."
13 Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, s.v. "םָחַר," by John E. Hartley, 2:939. "Secondly it expresses the careful attention to be paid to the obligation of a covenant, to laws, statutes, etc. This is one of the most frequent uses of the verb."
Even the instructions for the offerings differ in length (compare the instructions for the Feast of Firstfruits and the Feast of Weeks with the instructions for the other feasts\textsuperscript{15}).

These differences in length have led critics to conclude that "this chapter is not a self-contained unity."\textsuperscript{16} Snaith, for instance, sees two sources for this chapter.

This chapter is composite, as is clear from the double introduction, verse 2 and verse 4. Scholars who carry literary analysis into minute details find they have to speak of more than one P-editor, apart from the allocation of verses between H and P. It is generally agreed that 1-8, 21, 23-38, 44 belong to P, though of different strata, and that 22, 39-43 are H, with the rest mixed, basically H but with P-elements of varying degrees of recognizability. Generally speaking, the agricultural emphasis is characteristic of H, and the ecclesiastical element of P. Indeed, it is these differences that are used as criteria.\textsuperscript{17}

Elliger also sees at least two layers of material in this chapter, the second of which has its own special sources.\textsuperscript{18}

Noth, on the other hand, feels that the various "incongruities are not easily explained by the literary-critical assumption of different sources."\textsuperscript{19} He attempts to explain the formation of this chapter along a historical line. He suggests that verses 9-21 have an earlier tradition that he calls the Jerusalem tradition. This tradition is then combined with "the threefold agrarian feasts still preserved in Deuteronomy." These all came together about the time of the Exile and remained so until after the Exile when they became normative (in Num. 28-29). So the Leviticus list occupies somewhat a middle position between the other two accounts.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{15} Noth makes this point: "On the one hand there are fairly short regulations for the celebration of particularly and precisely dated times in the course of the year (so especially vv. 5-8; also vv. 23ff.); on the other hand there are very detailed precepts for carrying out festival customs on some not exactly dated occasions (so especially vv. 9-21; also vv. 40ff.)" (Martin Noth, \textit{Leviticus: A Commentary} [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965], p. 166).

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{18} These two layers are his Ph\textsuperscript{3} and Ph\textsuperscript{4}. For the so-called "literary history" see Karl Elliger, \textit{Leviticus}, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966), pp. 311-12.

\textsuperscript{19} Noth, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 166.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid. Hulbert, on the other hand, puts the Leviticus account as the first historical account. He considers the other two accounts as "restatements and emphatic reminders given to the new generation on the plains of Moab as they prepared to enter the land," The addition of certain details peculiar to each of the other two accounts was because of "historical circumstances" (Hulbert, "Israel's Annual Feasts," p. 2). Perhaps it is
Kaiser points out that for hermeneutical exercises such pursuits of "hypothetical sources" are fruitless. He believes that the task of an exegete is not to investigate the "pre-history of the text" but to explain "the meaning of the present text."\(^2\) Pursuit of prehistory often leads to ludicrous dismemberings of the text.\(^2\) Wenham warns:

> The tentativeness of all attempts to discover sources in Leviticus must be underlined. Even if one admits their presence it does not necessarily follow that they ever circulated independently of each other. Analyses which purport to distinguish between an original source and the work of later redactors should be treated more warily still. We do not know enough about the development of Hebrew language, law, and religion to make the elaborate analyses offered in some works anything more than conjectures.\(^2\)

The presupposition of the present writer is that Moses penned this chapter as well as the rest of the Pentateuch. Leviticus 23 is an original composition. From a careful examination of the text itself one can determine its unifying principle.

**Does Leviticus 23 Emphasize the "Appointed Time" or "Rest" and "Gathering"?**

Hulbert, in his typological study of Leviticus 23, suggests that the emphasis of this chapter revolves around the term "appointed time" (דְּמוֹא).\(^2\) However, that would be a rather weak unifying center, as the Hebrew word "frequently designates a determined time or place without regard to the purpose of the designation."\(^2\) This center is not only weak lexically, but it also fails to account for most of the divergences in length and in the amount of details.

A more likely unifying principle is suggested by Wenham. He states that "the whole emphasis lies on the days that must be ob-

---


\(^2\) See the translation of Leviticus 23 by Elliger. In order to demonstrate the two layers and the various sources of each layer he employs seven different type faces (Elliger, *Leviticus*, pp. 302-3).


\(^2\) "The Leviticus 23 account, on the other hand, was given in the form of a schedule of appointed observances. This is borne out by the four pointed occurrences of moadim in Leviticus 23:2, 4, 37, 44" (Hulbert, "Israel's Annual Feasts," p. 28).

served as days of sabbath rest." The calendrical purpose is supported by the phrase "in their seasons" (�אום, v. 4). The lack of clarity as to the beginning of the 50-day period before the Feast of Weeks militates somewhat against this center.

Keil states that the annual cycle of feasts has "its centre and starting point in the Sabbath." Wenham interprets Keil as saying that "the sabbatical principle informs all the pentateuchal laws about the festivals." In this view Leviticus 23:3, set between the so-called "dual introductions," supplies the controlling idea(s) for this chapter. The repetition of the demonstrative pronoun נַחַש which appears at the end of verse 2 and at the head of verse 4, indicates that verse 3 is a purposeful insertion. The addition of the phrase "in their seasons" to verse 4 (but not in v. 2) makes that verse, perhaps, the introduction proper.

This sabbatical principle incorporates two ideas: the Sabbath is to be a time of rest (ךותבש תבש), and the Sabbath is to be a time for religious gathering (ש"לפ אקנ). If this is a valid center, then one should expect the literary clues (i.e., the details) of this chapter to expand these two concepts of rest and holy convocation.

26 Wenham, Leviticus, p. 3.
27 "On the day after the sabbath (vv. 11, 15, cf. v. 16)--the meaning of this phrase has been the subject of much controversy. Is the sabbath in question the ordinary sabbath, i.e., the first Saturday after the beginning of the festival of unleavened bread? Or is the sabbath the first day of unleavened bread when heavy work was forbidden? According to the first interpretation 'the day after the sabbath' means Sunday; according to the second it means the sixteenth day of the month.

"Orthodox Judaism and most modern commentators favor the second suggestion. Some Jewish sects, however, and a few modern writers favor the first suggestion. The exegetical arguments are finely balanced. It seems slightly more natural to equate 'the sabbath' with Saturday than with the first day of the feast. Furthermore, if one accepts that: Leviticus is based on the Jubilees Calendar, it would seem more likely that the first sheaf was offered on Sunday (the day after sabbath) than on Thursday (second day of the feast)" (Wenham, Leviticus, p. 304).

Van Goudoever suggests two additional ways of counting the 50 days: (1) count from the day after the week of Unleavened Bread, which ends with a Sabbath, or (2) count from the Sunday after the week of Unleavened Bread (Biblical Calendars, pp. 18-29).
29 Wenham, Leviticus, p. 301.
30 Keil feels that the repetition of the title points out the distinction between the "Sabbath" and the feasts. "As a weekly returning day of rest, the observance of which had its foundation in the creative work of God, the Sabbath was distinguished from the yearly feasts in which Israel commemorated the facts connected with its elevation into a people of God" (C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, 3 vols., Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament [reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.], 2:438).
Sabbatical Rest

The concept of the sabbatical rest is often associated with Creation. The Lord's rest from His creative activities is the reason behind Israel's keeping of the fourth commandment (Exod. 20:11). In the reiteration of this commandment (Deut. 5:15) a different reason is given: to commemorate Israel's redemption from the bondage of Egypt. The writer of Hebrews linked these two ideas as he spoke of the rest (טבָּעָה) in Genesis 2:2 and the rest (חֲנַנָּא) in Psalm 95:11. In other words he associated this rest with the entrance of Israel into the Promised Land, which the Israelites (the first generation of the Exodus) forfeited because of their unbelief. Rest, in this context, was the repose of the Lord from His completed work; and He shared this repose with the nation of Israel in their entrance into the Promised Land. The sabbatical rest is then a commemoration of the Lord's finished work of redemption.

Viewing the sabbath as "a periodical memorial of Israel's deliverance from Egypt" finds further support in the fact that some of the festive Sabbaths cannot fall on the weekly Sabbath. Instead of having significance in reference to Creation, these festive Sabbaths point to the completed work of redemption, which is a form of creation.

Of the seven feasts of the Lord described in Leviticus 23, five include a specific prohibition from work (לֹֽא זֶבַע הַגָּדוֹל). They are the first and the seventh days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (vv. 7-8), the Feast of Weeks (v. 21), the Feast of Trumpets (v. 25), the Day of Atonement (vv. 28-31), and the first and eighth days of the Feast of Booths (vv. 35-36). During the Feast of Unleavened Bread the two Sabbaths are only six days apart. The Feast of Firstfruits takes place on the day after a Sabbath. The 50th day from that day can-
not possibly be another Sabbath. Thus the Feast of Weeks would not be on a weekly Sabbath. Between the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement the interval was 10 days; thus one of them could not fall on a weekly Sabbath. The significance of the sabbatical rest went beyond the general commemoration of the Lord's repose from His completed work of creating the world to the specific commemoration of His completed work of redeeming the nation Israel.

Two of the seven feasts include no prohibition from work. They are the Passover and the Feast of Firstfruits. The Passover, according to verse 5, is basically an evening event. The next morning begins the first Sabbath of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. So the Passover is, in effect, the beginning of or the introduction to the Feast of Unleavened Bread. In the description of Deuteronomy 16 the "Passover and Unleavened Bread are in effect the two constituent parts of a single major festival."35

The Feast of Firstfruits took place after a religious Sabbath (Lev. 23:10-11). There is no mention of a Sabbath observance or a prohibition from work in the instructions for this feast. There are some indications that this and the Feast of Weeks should be considered as "the two constituent parts of a single major festival" like the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The Feast of Firstfruits marked the beginning, and the Feast of Weeks marked the end, of the harvest season.36 Both included the wave offering (vv. 11, 17). In the first case what was waved is the sheaves, but in the second case what was waved is two loaves of bread baked with yeast (leaven). It signified the completion of the harvest and the leisurely preparation of meals. At the Feast of Firstfruits no such leisure could be offered. It began the harvest and no special time was taken for rest. A literary parallel to this phenomenon is in Genesis 1:7. At the end of the second day of Creation there was no pronouncement of approval. That did not come till the third day. It is suggested that the work performed on both days should be taken as a unit.37

The feasts may be grouped into three units. The first two feasts belong together, as mentioned earlier. The second two feasts are also to be taken together. The last three would naturally be taken to-

37 "The words it was good were not appropriate at this state, in as much as the work of water had not yet been completed. The situation was not yet good; for had it been good, there would have been no necessity for another separation on the third day" (U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, part 1: From Adam to Noah: Genesis I-VI 8 [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961], p. 34).
gether because they are in the seventh month. Some modifications of this group may be necessary as will be revealed in the study of the term "perpetual statute" (םֵעְדִּיָּה תַּחַת). Only four of the seven are so designated in Leviticus 23: Feasts of Firstfruits, Weeks, Booths, and the Day of Atonement. The first two feasts--Passover and Unleavened Bread—are so designated in Exodus 12:14, 17. But the perpetual statute statement is really not necessary because they were instituted and kept before the Mosaic Law was given at Sinai. The Feast of the Trumpets is considered a memorial (נְצָר בְּיָד), not a perpetual statute (Lev. 23:24). It was not equal to the other six, because it was an introductory Sabbath for the Sabbath month (seventh month). Thus the feasts may be seen as three groups of two, with the third group having an introductory Sabbath.

Since the first two feasts are not mentioned as perpetual statutes because they were established before the giving of the Law at Sinai, what then is the significance of such a designation for the last two groups of feasts? One factor that seems to be common to them is that they could not be properly observed until the nation of Israel was in the Promised Land. Obviously they could not celebrate the beginning or the end of the harvest season so long as they lived a nomadic life in the Sinai wilderness. The feasts of Firstfruits and of Weeks would be meaningless if Israel continued the wilderness sojourn. The Feast of Booths commemorated the wandering of Israel and the living in tents during that period (Lev. 23:43). Such commemoration would be unlikely until the wandering itself had ceased and the nation was dwelling in houses and not tents. The Day of Atonement gives no indication one way or the other. Some sense of permanence seems to be indicated for the tabernacle in Leviticus 16. Taken together, the idea seems to point toward the completed redemption. The feasts of the Lord emphasize not the leaving of Egypt, but the entrance into the Promised Land, which completed the Lord's redemptive work for Israel.

**Holy Convocation**

The second concept of the sabbatical principle relates to the calling of a holy convocation. The purpose for such gatherings was religious—"for the worship of Jehovah." They were special occasions for fellowship and communion between a holy God and His holy people. This concept is conveyed in the details that Leviticus 23 gives for the Feast of Firstfruits and the Feast of Weeks.

The following table summarizes their treatment:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasts</th>
<th>Offerings Specified</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unleavened Bread</td>
<td>Offering (using the general verb בָּרָא) (^{39})</td>
<td>Made by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firstfruits</td>
<td>Wave offering</td>
<td>Sheaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnt offering</td>
<td>Yearling male lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without blemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meal offering</td>
<td>Two-tenths ephah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of fine flour, mingled with oil, made by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink offering</td>
<td>Fourth of a hin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>Wave offering</td>
<td>Two loaves of bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>made of two-tenths ephah of fine flour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>baked with leaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnt offering</td>
<td>Seven yearling lambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without blemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One young bullock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two rams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meal offering</td>
<td>Made by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink offering</td>
<td>Made by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sin offering</td>
<td>One male goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace offering</td>
<td>Two yearling lambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpets</td>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>Made by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atonement</td>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>Made by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booths</td>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>Made by fire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third and fourth feasts—the Firstfruits and the Weeks—receive extended treatment here. The regulations for the offerings during the other feasts are recorded in Numbers 28-29. However, one must consider the reason for singling out Firstfruits and Weeks in Leviticus 23 and the types of offerings that are prescribed. Four types of offerings were common to these two feasts. Wave offerings signify consecration or dedication.\(^{40}\) The concept behind burnt offerings is multifaceted. In light of the event (harvest), one should consider

\(^{39}\) This verb means basically "being or coming into the most near and intimate proximity of the object (or subject)." But it is also used technically to connote "every step man performs in presenting his offering to God," but without specifying the type of offering (Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, s.v. "בָּרָא," by Leonard J. Coppes, 2."811-12).  

\(^{40}\) Wenham, Leviticus, pp. 126-27. Rainey sees a communal significance for the wave offering. But he feels that the "technical term (נְפִּיָּה) was applied to offerings other than communal sacrifices: . . . the sheaf of First Fruits (23:15), the two loaves at the Feast of Weeks (vv. 17, 20)" (Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, S.v. "Sacrifices and Offerings," by A. F. Rainey, 5:208).
them as dedicatory.\textsuperscript{41} The same notion probably also lies behind the third and fourth types of offering, the meal and drink offerings.\textsuperscript{42}

Numbers 28:26-31 also prescribes offerings for the Feast of Weeks, called the "Day of the Firstfruits."\textsuperscript{43} When the two lists are compared, the last three of the above four types of offerings are common to both. The portions seem to be more generous in Numbers.\textsuperscript{44}

Leviticus 23 adds mention of sin and peace offerings. In Numbers 28:30 a male goat is specified for the purpose of making atonement. The type of offering, a sin offering, is not mentioned. Its emphasis is noteworthy. The concept of the removal of sin, or the requirement of holiness, on the part of the worshiper is clear. The fact that this type of offering is followed by a peace offering further clarifies that only after the removal of sin can one have communion or fellowship with the Lord.\textsuperscript{45} This is the only occasion among the seven feasts when a peace offering was required. It spoke of the special relationship between a sanctified people and their Lord. This is further supported by requiring observance of the Feast of Booths by "all the native-born in Israel" (Lev. 23:42). The purpose of that feast was to instruct them that they were to have a special relationship with their Lord (v. 43).

The concept behind the holy convocation is not so much the sacredness of the occasion but rather the "sacredness" of the people. It is a holy convocation because of the "holiness" of the people gathered together. The precision with which they kept these feasts was not what the Lord sought if they persisted in sin.\textsuperscript{46} Without a holy people, there could be no holy convocation.

In this section on the harvest feasts, the poor and the foreigners were not forgotten (v. 22). Perhaps this is an indication that Israel needed to be reminded of her own disenfranchisement in Egypt.\textsuperscript{47} The

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p. 205.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 206-7.
\textsuperscript{43} Keil considers that the Day of the Firstfruits is the same as the Feast of Weeks (Keil and Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, 3:221). The equation is rather evident in that the Day of the Firstfruits comes at the end of the weeks (Num. 28:26).
\textsuperscript{44} The Numbers passage mentions two bulls. Numbers has only one ram instead of two. Numbers has at least five-tenths ephah of fine flour specified, plus several more tenths not specified.
\textsuperscript{45} Though the significance of this is disputed, one may agree with Delitzsch, Stade, and Wellhausen in understanding it to be "fellowship between God and worshipers" (Brown, Driver, and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, s.v. " 없다", p. 1023). This notion is also the first of three given in Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, s.v. " 없다," by G. Lloyd Carr, 2:930-32.
\textsuperscript{46} Cf. Amos 5:21-22; Micah 6:6-8.
\textsuperscript{47} Cf. Deuteronomy 24:19-22.
abundant harvest at the same time reminded them not only of the harvest's completion but also of the completeness with which the Lord had redeemed them.

**Conclusion**

Keil suggests that the Sabbath is the governing principle in the feasts of the Lord. The annual cycle of feasts, he says, had "its centre and starting point in the Sabbath."\(^{48}\) The literary clues from Leviticus 23 vividly demonstrate this point. These feasts were to be "celebrated by a Sabbath cessation from work, and a special assembling for religious purpose."\(^{49}\) This celebration was retrospective. The commemoration was made by a holy people who were the beneficiaries of the Lord's completed work of redemption.

Hasel points out that the work of Old Testament theology is not complete unless it is related to the New Testament.\(^{50}\) One may also say that an exposition of an Old Testament passage is not quite complete without seeing how it relates to New Testament believers in their walk with the Lord. Because of the feasts' emphasis on the sabbatical principle, some may assume that the application is to the Lord's day--Sunday--and its various activities. However, since the Sabbaths involved in the Feasts were not the weekly Sabbaths, such a connection is weakened. The two ordinances of the New Testament church provide a better parallel. Both baptism and the Lord's Supper commemorate the completed work of redemption of Christ on the cross.\(^{51}\) The idea of cleansing is embodied in baptism, and the Lord's Supper calls for self-examination.\(^{52}\) But both also signify an identification with Christ.\(^{53}\) So whenever believers gather for these events, they should look back, as a holy people, to the completed work of their Lord.

---

49 Ibid.
50 "The Biblical theologian understands OT theology as being more than the 'theology of the Hebrew Bible.' The name 'theology of the Old Testament' implies the larger context of the Bible of which the New Testament is the other part. An integral OT theology must demonstrate its basic relationship to the NT or to NT theology" (Gerhard F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues In the Current Debate* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972], pp. 94-95).
51 On baptism see Romans 6:1-10 and Colossians 2:11-13, and on the Lord's Supper see 1 Corinthians 11:24-26.
52 On baptism see Acts 22:16, and on the Lord's Supper see 1 Corinthians 11:28.
53 On baptism see Romans 6:3, and on the Lord's Supper see 1 Corinthians 10:16.
THE SO-CALLED ‘LEPROSY’ LAWS
AN ANALYSIS OF LEVITICUS, CHAPTERS 13 and 14.

By MORRIS JASTROW, University of Pennsylvania.

I

THE composite character of the two chapters--Leviticus 13 and 14--comprising the laws and regulations for the diagnosis and treatment of various skin diseases, and of suspicious spots appearing in garments and houses, together with the purification rites, has long been recognized. Indeed, the mere enumeration of the variety of subjects treated of in these two chapters, which form a little code by themselves, furnishes a presumption in favour of the view that the chapters represent a gradual growth. A closer study of the two chapters not only confirms this presumption, but also shows that the growth betrays an even more complicated process than is the case in other little groups of laws and regulations, such as Lev. 1-5.

We not only find that the two chapters may be subdivided into numerous smaller sections, each representing a supplement added to the basic stock of the little code, but that within these sections, glosses, comments, and illustrations are introduced which point to a treatment of the older Hebrew codes, not unlike that accorded to the later Code of

1 See especially Baentsch's remarks on p.364 of his Kommentar zu den Buchern Exodus und Leviticus
Judaism, known as the Mishnah, and which by the addition of a steadily-growing commentary and continuous elaboration, known as the Gemara, grew into the Talmud. In other words, we can distinguish in Leviticus 13 and 14 (as in other groups within the Priestly Code) elements which correspond to the division between Mishnah and Gemara in the great compilation of Rabbinical Judaism, and we can also trace in the growth of the two chapters the same process which produced the Gemara as a superstructure to the Mishnah. The intrinsic importance of the two chapters, and the frequency with which they have been treated because of their medical interest, justify the endeavour to carry the analysis by a renewed study somewhat further than has yet been done, particularly as this analysis is a *conditio sine qua non* for an understanding of the medical aspects of the chapters. While it is not my purpose to discuss in detail these medical aspects, I shall touch upon them at the close of this article, chiefly with a view of showing the manner in which they should be considered, and also to furnish the reasons for the conviction that I have gained that physicians who have occupied themselves with these two chapters have approached them from a wrong starting-point, and hence have reached conclusions which, are correspondingly erroneous. To put it bluntly, before discussing the fundamental question whether *sara'at* is ‘leprosy’ or not, one must settle which verses of the two chapters deal with *sara'at*.

2 See the literature is Baentsch'a *Kommentar*, p. 364, and in Munch's *Die Zara'ath der Hebr. Bibel*, to which further additions may be made, such as Jay F. Schamberg's article on ‘The Nature of the Leprosy of the Bible’, Phila. Polyclinic. VII (1898), Nov. 19-26, or *Biblical World*. March. 1899; pp. 162-9. See further, note 144.
II.

In a formal--not a documentary--analysis of the two chapters, we may distinguish--leaving aside headings and subscripts--the following:

1. 13.2-46, diagnosis and treatment of various symptoms of pathological phenomena on the skin: (a) נֶאֶשׁ (se’et),
   (b) נְפִּמָה (sappahat), (c) בָּהֶרֶת (baheret), (d) סְרָאָת (sara’at),
   (e) מִשְׁפָּת (sehin), (f) מִקְוָה (mikwah), (g) נֶטֶק (netek), (k) בֹּחַק (bohak), (i) קְרָא (kere’ah), (h) גִּבְּבָּה (gibba’ah).

2. 13.47-59, sara’at in garments.

3. 14.1-31, purification ritual at the time when the healing process of sara’at on persons was complete.


5. 14.48-53, purification ritual for the case of sara’at in houses.

It appears, then, that suspicious marks or spots--to use the vaguest and most indefinite kind of terms--may appear on persons, garments (in stuffs), and in houses, and that in connexion with each of these categories the diagnosis, treatment, and purification ritual are set forth. Throughout the two chapters, the term (נֶאֶשׁ sara’at) is constantly introduced, and by the side of this fuller term two abbreviated expressions sara’at and nega’.

3 In order to make the results of the investigation accessible to others than specialists in the Old Testament. I transliterate most of the Hebrew terms introduced.

4 nega’ sara’at, Lev. 13.2, 3, 9, 20, 25, 27, 47, 49, 59; 14.3, 34, 54; Lev. 13.3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 17, 22, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54-58; 14.35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 43, 48; sara’at, Lev. 13.8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 25, 30, 42, 43, 51, 52; 14.7, 44, 55, 57. The synonymity of the three expressions is shown by the Greek text, which occasionally has sara’at, e. g. 13-20, where the Hebrew has nega’ sara’at, or adds sara’at, e. g. 13.29, where the Hebrew has merely nega’. The word nega’ (‘mark’ or ‘spot’).
Taking up the first section, one is struck by the large number of medical terms introduced, supplementary to \textit{sara’at}. In connexion with each term \textit{nega’} is used, which is thus shown to be a general term for any kind of a disease of the skin, indicated by a mark or marks. Clearly these supplementary terms represent attempts to differentiate been pathological phenomena which in an earlier, less scientific age were either grouped under \textit{sara’at} or under the general designation of ‘marks’ (\textit{nega’im}). A closer inspection of the second verse of the thirteenth chapter furnishes the safe starting-point for a correct analysis.

The verse reads as follows: ‘If a man has on the skin of his flesh a swelling (\textit{se’et}), growth (\textit{sappahat}), or a bright spot (\textit{baheret}), and it becomes on the skin of his flesh a \textit{nega’ sara’at}, he is brought to Aaron the priest, or to one of his sons, the priests.’ The name Aaron occurs in this verse only. Throughout the two chapters merely ‘the priest’ is used. We may, therefore, cut out ‘Aaron’ as well as the phrase ‘or one of his sons the priests’ as comments--corresponding to our foot-notes to explain what is meant by the term ‘the priests’. In the second place, the repetition of ‘on the skin of his flesh’ is open to

has the general force of a ‘plague’ or a ‘disease’, from the stem \textit{naga’} ‘to strike down’. The etymology of \textit{sara’at} is somewhat obscure, though indications point likewise to the meaning ‘strike’ for the underlying stem which would make \textit{sara’at} a general term like \textit{nega’}, and not a specific designation.

\textit{5 se’et} from \textit{nasa’}, 'to raise', clearly indicates a rising on the skin, i. e. a swelling of some kind.

\textit{6 sappahat}, of which \textit{wispahat} (vers. 6, 7, 8 is a. synonym, from \textit{sapah} 'to add, supplement', refers to something added to the skin, i. e. a growth.

\textit{7 baheret}, from \textit{bahar}, ‘to shine’, is an inflamed bit of skin, i. e. a shining spot (to use an indefinite term), intended to describe the prominent feature of an inflammation.
suspicion, which is reinforced by the awkward construction
l’nega’ sara’at, i. e. 'to a nega’ sara’at'. A glance at the
various commentators will show us the difficulties involved
in getting a satisfactory meaning.\(^8\) If now we remove
the three terms 'swelling', 'growth', and 'bright spot',
and assume that the verse in its original form spoke of
the sara’at only, the construction becomes perfectly simple,
to wit: 'If a man has on the skin of his flesh a sara’at
mark (i. e. nega’ sara’at), and he is brought to the priest.
The proof of the correctness of this view is furnished by
the third verse, which reads: 'And the priest sees the mark
(nega’) on the skin of his flesh, and the hair at the mark has
turned white, and the mark (nega’) appears deeper than
the skin of his flesh, then it is a sara’at mark, and\(^9\) he shall
declare him unclean.' Here, then, we have the beginning
of the chapter in its original form a diagnosis of what
constitutes sara’at, and a simple means of determining
whether a man has sara’at or not. It is just the kind of
diagnosis that we may expect in an age in which medical
knowledge is based on observation merely.

With these two verses as a starting-point, we can proceed
without much difficulty to pick out other verses which
belong to the older stratum of the chapter. Verses 9-13

\(^8\) To translate as Strack, Baentsch, and others, 'and it develops in the
skin of his flesh to a nega’ sara’at', meets with a fatal objection through
the circumstance that it is a nega’ sara’at only after the priest has pronounced
it as such, as indicated in ver. 3.

\(^9\) The text adds, 'and the priest shall see it', which is superfluous, since
the words 'and the priest sees' stand at the beginning of the verse. Either
the repetition is the addition of some pedantic scribe who wanted to make
it perfectly clear that the words 'he shall declare him unclean' refer to
the priests declaration, or it is a gloss that has slipped into the wrong
place.
furnish further details regarding the *sara'at*. They read, exclusive of glosses and comments, as follows:

'If there is a *sara'at* mark on a man, and he is brought to the priest: and the priest sees that there is a white swelling (seen on the skin that has turned the hair white,\textsuperscript{10} is a chronic\textsuperscript{11} *sara'at* in the skin of his flesh, and the priest shall declare him unclean.\textsuperscript{12} But if the *sara'at* steadily spreads in the skin until the *sara'at* covers the entire skin,\textsuperscript{13} and the priest sees that the *sara'at* covers the entire flesh,\textsuperscript{14} [then the priest] shall declare the mark clean.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{10} The text adds, anticipating the diagnosis in the next section (14-17), 'and there is raw flesh (*basar hay*) in the swelling'. As a synonym to *basar hay*, another version or a commentator used the term (מִיחָיָה miyahu) 'a raw spot'. A later scribe embodied the synonym in the text which thus became redundant.

\textsuperscript{11} *nosenet* (of old standing), which I believe conveys the idea that we attach to 'chronic'. The ordinary rendering 'recurrent' misses the nuance and is without warrant.

\textsuperscript{12} Additions. 1) 'without shutting him in', harking back to the 'shutting in' as a test in the case of baheret (vers. 4-5; (a) 'for he is unclean', אֲלֹהֵי פֵּיתוֹ אָבָהוֹ אֲלֹהֵי פֵּיתוֹ (a) 'for he is unclean', אֲלֹהֵי פֵּיתוֹ אָבָהוֹ אֲלֹהֵי פֵּיתוֹ, a second comment to explain why he is not shut in. These brief comments are just in the style of the Gemara. If amplified, vers. 10-11 could easily be put in the form of a Mishnah and a Gemara as follows; The law is that if the priest sees that a white swelling on the skin has turned the hair white, it is a chronic *sara'at*. Now since in the case of a 'white shining spot’ it is said (Lev. 13. 4) that the victim is shut in for seven days, you might suppose that in the case of a 'white swelling' this should also be done. It is not required. Why not? Because a 'white selling' of itself makes him unclean.

\textsuperscript{13} Two comments are added: (1) namely, 'the mark (extends) from his head to his feet'; (2) 'according to the complete inspection of the priest', i.e. it is only upon the inspection of the priest, not upon the report of the victim or of any other person, that the diagnosis of the whole body being covered with the we can be established.

\textsuperscript{14} Instead of, all his flesh' (כָּל תַּאַשְׁרוֹ) the Greek version has ‘all his skin’.

\textsuperscript{15} Two glosses: (1) 'all turned white’ to the word ‘flesh’; (2) 'he is clean';--the final decision. This decision, 'he is clean' or ‘he is unclean',
It is clear that we have here (vers. 9-11) a second diagnosis involving, just as the first, the determination of the question whether the suspicious mark is a genuine sara'at or not; and since in the original form of the diagnosis the decisive indication is, as in the first diagnosis, the change of colour in the hair to white, the two cases would be identical but for the addition in the second case of the symptom of a 'white swelling'. This 'white swelling', it would seem, is the basis for the decision that it is a case of chronic sara'at, as against a simple form of sara'at in the first diagnosis, where we have the contrast to the 'swelling' on the mark expressed as 'deeper than the skin', i.e. high-relief in one case and bas-relief in the other. Placing the two decisions side by side, we can follow the process which gradually led to the present complicated form of the two chapters. The introduction of the 'swelling' as a new factor suggested a consideration of further symptoms appearing in the skin, and accordingly the first diagnosis or decision was amplified (ver. 2) by the addition of (a) a sappahat (טַחַת), i.e. 'growth'; (b) baheret, i.e. 'bright spot'; and this naturally leads in turn (vers. 4, 5) to a diagnosis of baheret and (vers. 6-8) of what constitutes a mispahat, involving in both cases the determination after a test or after a double test whether it may develop into a genuine sara'at or is a harmless manifestation.

To the second decision, however, there is also added (vers. 12, 13) a diagnosis of a case in which the mark is frequently added in Lev. 13 and apparently as a quick means for reference on the part of the priests, who would naturally consult the legal compilations when cases were brought before them.

The 'swelling' se'it in ver. 2 thus appears only upon the second diagnosis.
suspected of being *sara'at* turns out to be harmless or, to use the technical language of the decision, 'it is clean'. The diagnosis rests manifestly again upon pure empiricism: a mark spreading over the entire body is an innocent rash, or at all events 'clean'.

We thus have as a part of the original form of the *sara'at* Torah three decisions: (a) 'unclean', i.e. genuine *sara'at*, in case the hair at the mark turns white and 'the mark is deeper than the skin; (b) ‘unclean' and 'chronic', in case the hair turns white and there is a white swelling, i.e. the mark is higher than the skin; (c) 'clean', if the mark spreads over the whole body. Verses 14-17, detailing the case in which 'raw flesh' appears on the skin, evidently do belong to the original part of the *sara'at* Torah but represent an addition of the same nature as vers. 24, due to a further question raised in the course of the discussion on the three original ordinances, to wit, how about the case when the flesh becomes raw at the suspicious spot? The 'Gemara' to the original decisions answers. (vers. 14, 15) that the moment raw flesh appears the man is unclean, but that as in the other cases the decision must be rendered by a priest and after an inspection. Just as in the Talmud one question leads to the other, so in the implied discussion on the Biblical laws together with the decisions by the priests or by the later redactors of early codes, the situation is further complicated by the question: How about the case in which the raw flesh disappears and

---

17 See above, note to, where it is suggested that the term ‘raw flesh’ and is synonym *mihyah*, at the end of ver. 10, are additions due to the combination of the original decisions with the superimposed ones, i.e. of a Mishnah with a Gemara.

18 The words (ver. 15) 'the raw flesh is unclean' represent a further amplifying gloss.
the spot becomes white? The answer is 'clean' upon the inspection and the declaration of the priest.

The balance of the chapter, with the exception of vers. 45, 46, represents further additions to the original Torah verses 18-39 taking up various skin troubles suggested by the consideration of the sara'at. Within this supplement, verses 18-23 take up boils, verses 24-28 burns, raw flesh, bright marks, &c., verses 29-37 marks on the head or beard (netek), verses 38-9 very white marks (bohak), and 40-44 baldness of the head and the dropping off of the hairs of the eyebrows accompanied by the appearance of suspicious marks. With ver. 47 an entirely new subject--marks on garments or stuffs--is introduced, which is discussed up to the end of the chapter. These references, therefore, are entirely independent sections, so that the Mishnah and Gemara for sara'at on the skin of a man or of a woman ends with ver. 44. The last two verses of this section (45-6) represent, I venture to think, a part again of the original sara'at Torah. They read as follows

'And the one afflicted with sara'at who has a mark, his garment shall be torn and his hair shall grow wild, and he shall cover the moustache and cry "unclean, unclean". As long as he has the spot he shall be unclean; outside of the camp shall be his dwelling.'

19 The word ha-nega' must be supplied after יָֹוֶּנֶּ in ver. 16, just as it is found in ver. 17.

20 sarua' (םֶֶֶָָָָָָָרֶָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָּ
The last verse of the chapter contains the subscript, and it is probable that the first part of the verse, ‘This is the law of the sara’at mark’, belonged to the original form of the section, and was subsequently amplified into the subscript for the section on marks on garments. Be this as it may, we have at the beginning of the fourteenth chapter the second part of the original Torah, dealing with the purification or dismissal of the one whose mark has healed. This part, covering 14. 2-8a, reads:

‘This the law of the one who has had sara’at, on the day of his purification when the priest has none to (the place) outside of the camp, and has seen that the sara’at mark of the sarua’ is healed. Then the priest shall order two living birds to be taken for the one to be purified, [and cedar wood and scarlet thread and hyssop;] and the priest shall order the one bird to be killed over

a view of adapting the decision to later social conditions when people dwelt in cities and not in camps. The addition is an answer to the question put in the style of the Gemara: ‘How about the case of a sarua’ who lives in a city?’ The general principle is in reply enunciated that the stricken individual must ‘dwell apart’, away from the habitations of his fellows. In similar fashion the Greek text to Lev. 14. 8, by changing outside of his tent to 'outside of his house', adapts the older law to later conditions. See below, p. 375, note 45.

25 The addition and he shall be brought unto the priest' is again added as a Gemara to adapt the law to the later conditions when the diseased person is merely isolated, and naturally must be brought to the priest. In the earlier social stage, however, when the diseased dwells outside of the camp, the priest goes to the place outside of the camp where the sarua’ dwells, and where the purification ritual is carried out, be it noted not in a sanctuary.

26 The more natural construction would be: instead of.

27 Additions: (a) ‘clean’, and (b) then 'cedar wood, scarlet thread, and hyssop'.
an earthen pot\textsuperscript{28} at running water;\textsuperscript{29} and the living bird
he shall dip into the blood of the slaughtered bird,\textsuperscript{30} and
he shall sprinkle over the one to be purified seven times
and declare him clean, and send off the living bird into
the open.\textsuperscript{31} And the one purified shall wash his garments,
and shave all his hair, and wash in water, and after that
come to the camp.'

Simple and primitive in character as this ritual appears
to be, it is possible by a further analysis to detect several
component elements pointing to the combination in the
ritual itself of features that do not necessarily belong
together. In the first place, the introduction of 'the cedar

\textsuperscript{28} i. e. slaughtered so that the blood drops into an earthen pot.

\textsuperscript{29} מִיָּם מֵיָּם 'living water', which I take here in the sense of 'running
water', i.e. at a stream, just as in the Babylonian-Assyrian purification
ritual water from streams was used; e.g. Maklu Series, ed. Knudtzon,
Tablet VII. 116, 'pure water of the deep which springs up in Eridu', or
\textit{Cun. Texts}, XVII, Pl. 38, 30-34, 'take an earthen vessel which has come
from a large kiln, at the meeting of the streams draw water', &c. Cf. also
Haupt, \textit{Sumer.-Akkad. Keilinschrift}, p. 90, III, 3-4, 'pure water, clear water,
sparkling water', all in connexion with incantation and purification rituals.
Langdon \textit{Transactions of the Third International Congress for the Hist. of
Religious}. I, 249) has called attention to the fact that what he calls 'services
for private devotion' were performed frequently by the banks of a river.
The expression 'living water' was also extended to waters flowing into
a well Gen. 26. 19; Jer. 2. 13; 17.13, but in the ritual I believe that
'running water' is always intended; so, e.g., Num. 19. 17. The use of
מִיָּם מֵיָּם in Lev. 15. 13 is inaccurate, and the Greek (Codd. BA fin. omits
מִיָּם reading 'he shall wash his body in water', as throughout the chapter
verses 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 21, 27, and elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{30} The awkward construction of the first half of verse 6, 'the living bird
he shall take it', and its incongruity with the second half of the verse betray
attempts at combination and re-editing. I believe that the verse originally
read: אֶבֶל הַגֹּזֶר הַגָּזָּר הַגָּזָּר הַשָּׁחַחַה, to which an amplifying
gloss added מִיָּם מֵיָּם מֵיָּם.

\textsuperscript{31} Literally. 'over the face of the field', in the sense of allowing it to fly
away.
wood, scarlet thread, and hyssop' has no apparent connexion with the ritual of the two birds. Outside of our passage we encounter these three objects together, (a) in the ritual for 'atonning' the house that has been affected by marks (Lev. 14. 49-53), which ritual is bodily taken over from our passage, and, therefore, has no independent significance, and (b) in the ceremony of the red heifer (Num. 19. 6) where 'the cedar wood, scarlet thread, and hyssop' are thrown into the 'burning heap of the heifer'--not even used for sprinkling, as is implied in the sara'at ritual. The objects do not in fact seem to serve any particular purpose, and the ritual in all three cases is complete without them. The use of the hyssop alone (Num. 19. 14) in the case of the purification of the house and contents or furnishings belonging to some one who has become unclean through contact with a corpse or a grave, in which case the hyssop is dipped into water by 'a clean man', and sprinkled over the tent, the furniture and the inmates, shows that the main idea connected with hyssop is cleansing.\textsuperscript{32} The cedar wood in the sara'at and in the 'red heifer' ritual appears to be a subsequent addition, both hyssop and cedar wood suggesting by their fragrance purification, like the burning of frankincense which in the case of minhah or cereal offering, is entirely burnt on the altar.\textsuperscript{33} The scarlet thread, presumably for tying the mass together, introduces a further symbolism by nature of the red colour,\textsuperscript{34} into which, however, we need

\textsuperscript{32} Note also the use of hyssop in Exod. 12. 22, where the 'purification' idea passes over into that of 'protection'.

\textsuperscript{33} e. g. Lev. 2. 2, whereas of the meal and oil, and subsequently of the wine, only a handful is offered, while the rest is given to the priest.

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. Isa. 1. 18, 'if your sins be red as scarlet', &c., suggested by a Jewish commentator in the Mikraot Gedolot.
not enter here. The hyssop\textsuperscript{35} and cedar wood being thus
associated with a cleansing process of a distinctive character,
whereas the use to which the two birds are put is purely
symbolical, the thought naturally suggests itself that hyssop
and cedar wood were employed in the case of the person
afflicted to afford him bodily relief—in other words, they
formed part of the medical treatment in an early cultural
stage, and on this account were combined with a ceremony
intended to transfer the disease from the individual to an
animal—in this instance a 'scape-bird'. That manifestly
is the purpose to be served by the bird, to be sent off at
large carrying with it the \textit{sara'at}. We thus have two
distinct ideas introduced into the purification ritual in its
present form: (a) a quasi-curative ceremony, and (b) a
transfer of the disease. This combination further suggests
that this part of the ritual itself was originally intended
actually to free the afflicted from the \textit{sara'at}, and by the
conservative force of established custom was retained as an
ingredient of a later 'atonning'\textsuperscript{36} ritual through the blood
of a sacrificial animal. This double intent is confirmed
by the usage of \(\text{לְמִשְׁאוֹר} \) in Lev. 14. 4, and 7 for 'the one
to be cleansed',\textsuperscript{37} whereas in ver. 8 it is 'the one who has
been purified'. We thus obtain three distinct ceremonies
(a) a primitive well-known method of exorcising disease
by transferring it to an animal, for which we have so many
instructive parallels among Babylonians\textsuperscript{38} and other peoples,

\textsuperscript{35} Note also Ps. 51. 9. ‘purge me with hyssop’.

\textsuperscript{36} Note that the term \(\text{אֲשֵׁר יָמֹל} \), i. e. 'to remove the sin', is used in
Lev. 14. 49, 52, as well as in the passage in Ps. 51. 9, the latter evidently
based on the ritual.

\textsuperscript{37} The expression \(\text{בַּיְחָלוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל} \) is, therefore, to be rendered as 'the day
on which he is to be purified'.

\textsuperscript{38} See \textit{Cun.. Texts}, XVII, Pl. 10, 73, 1-1; 11, 85, and the latest discussion.
(b) a primitive remedial device, which consisted perhaps in rubbing the diseased person with hyssop, or in his inhaling the fragrance of hyssop; to hyssop, cedar wood was subsequently added, and the scarlet thread as a symbol of the sin or uncleanness; (c) an atoning ceremony by means of the 'blood' of a sacrificial animal with which the diseased individual was sprinkled.39 By combining the three rites we obtain: (a) two birds; (b) the dipping of the cedar wood, hyssop; and scarlet thread, as well as the dipping of the live bird into the blood of the one to be killed; (c) the sprinkling of the one to be declared clean with the blood--presumably through the cedar wood and hyssop tied together with the scarlet thread, though this is not specific stated; (d) the dismissal of the live bird. The awkward construction of ver. 6, to which attention was called above, as well as the meaningless ceremony of dipping the live bird into the blood of the killed one, clearly shows that the introduction of the second bird is an after-thought. Once introduced, however, some means had to be found of connecting it with the first bird, and accordingly it was provided that the one bird should be dipped into the blood of the slaughtered one, and similarly the hyssop &c., were to the dipped in the blood so as to connect this rite also with the killing of the second bird. It is obvious that the bird to be slaughtered is introduced as a result of the extension of and other passages in the incantation texts by Langdon in the Expository Times. vol. 24 (1912), pp. 40 ff., though Langdon's translations, it ought to be added, leave room for further study.

39 ‘Seven times' seems to have become the standing formula, though it is notable that not infrequently no number is specified, so, e. g., Lev. 5. 9; 16. 15; Num. 19. 18. Presumably in such cases seven was assumed as the number prescribed.
of the principle of killing a sacrificial animal of some kind in connexion with every atonement, or, to use the technical term, with every hattat (הַטָּתָא)\(^{40}\)--and the purification offering of the one who has had sara 'at falls within this category--demanding the killing of an animal. The old and primitive custom of using a bird as a scape-animal to which the sara 'at was transferred, would suggest by analogy the choice of a bird as the sacrificial animal. Lastly, the washing of the garment, the shaving of the hair of the body and the washing in water, were added to the ritual in accord with the general principle that after a period of uncleanness rites symbolical of the cleanly state upon which the individual now entered had to be performed. It is, of course, an open question whether in the earliest form of the purification ritual for the sara'at this elaborate washing and shaving\(^{41}\) was included, but certainly at the

\(^{40}\) The hattat or 'sin-offering' rests on title same idea of the transfer of the disease to an animal, but the regulations regarding the hattat represent a more advanced stage when the killing of the animal to which the disease was transferred had taken the place of merely sending it away, as was done with the wild goat of the Azazel rite. A bird or an untamed animal could be sent at large, but the domesticated sheep or bullock or ox would, of course, come back. This, together with the rise of an organized priesthood around a sanctuary and the practical need of providing an income for the priests, led to the change, involving the killing of the hattat, the burning of those parts regarded as the vital organs, while the rest was given to the priests. Naturally, in the case of the 'sin-offering' for the high-priest or for the people, the entire animal was burned,

\(^{41}\) 'The washing of the garments and the bathing in water' is ordained throughout Lev, 15, for cases of bodily uncleanness; Lev. 17, 15 for one who has eaten 'abomination' or a 'torn' object (תְּרֵפָּה terephah); Lev. 16. 26-8 for the one who sends off Azazel and who burns the carcase of the sin-offering' bullock, and Num. 19.8 for the one who burns the 'red heifer', and ver. 19 for the one who has come in contact with a corpse, as well as Num. 17. 21-2 for the one who has touched anything contaminated by a woman during her period. The shaving of the hair of the body is peculiar
stage when the three originally independent ceremonies were combined, the washing and shaving were also made a part of the ritual. Taking, therefore, the ritual as it stands we may distinguish in it earlier and later elements. The earlier elements are rites that originally were intended to exorcise the disease either by driving out the demon, as the cause of the disease, through the hyssop and cedar wood, or by transferring the disease (or what amounts to the same thing, transferring the demon) to some animal. Purification from the 'unclean' demon leads to the use of these rites as symbols of the ritualistic 'purification' at a later stage, when a ritual was compiled to mark the return of the victim to intercourse with his fellows. Instead of the diagnosis and cure, we have as part of the religious code the diagnosis and the official dismissal, both done to the case of the one afflicted with sara'at. In the case of the Nazarite (Num. 6. 18) only the hair of the head is to be shaved on the completion of the vow, though the underlying idea is the same as in the case of the sara’at ordinance.

42 No sharp distinction can be drawn in the medicine of primitive peoples between an attempted cure by certain remedies and the exorcising of the demon through these remedies. The primary purpose of medicaments was to force the demon out through bad smells or to coax him out through fragrant odours. The benefit to the patient followed as a natural corollary. A cure was thus a release from the throes of the demon, but no doubt in time the positive aspects of medicaments as the common-sense view must have come to the front, though in the background there still stood the old conception of disease due to some unclean spirit which of its own accord or through the machinations of some sorcerer or witch had found its way into the body and was causing the trouble. It is rather strange how in this way the most primitive theory of disease touches modern pathology with its germ theory as an external substance that has found a favourable condition for growth in the body. Similarly, the crude belief of the savage, that death is not a necessary part of the order of nature but was introduced through special circumstances, anticipates to a certain extent the views of some modern biologists. See Frazer. Belief in Immortality, I, p. 84.
through the priest. The more distinctly religious element, which is also the later one, is the bringing of a sacrifice, and probably the ritual bath an shaving of the hair.

The *sara’at* code in its oldest compiled form thus consists of Lev.13. 2-3, 9-13 and 14. 2-8 a, minus (a) the subsequent additions, comments, and glosses in both the diagnosis and the dismissal, and minus (b) the combination in the ritual of dismissal of four originally distinct elements, two of them of earlier and two of later origin.

In order to furnish a summary of the results thus far reached, I add the original\(^43\) *sara’at* legislation, forming a little Torah by itself:

\[\text{תַּנְפִּיצָתָּא בֵּשָּׁרָא מַעְטַרֵתָהּ גַּלֶּקֶן הָרֹאשׁ סָרָאָּתָא בֹּשָּׁרָא, יְרֵהָא הַשָּׁמְשֵׁר אֲלִילֵהֶנָּא, סָרָאָּת הָאֵצְכֶּס הָאֲדַמָּא.}\]

\[\text{גַּנְנָא הָרֹאשׁ סָרָאָּתָא בֹּשָּׁרָא, יְרֵהָא הָאֲדַמָּא, לִבְטֶה הָרֹאשׁ סָרָאָּתָא בֹּשָּׁרָא, יְרֵהָא הָאֲדַמָּא.}\]

\[\text{אָמָּה פּוֹרְחָה חְפִכְתָּא בֹּשָּׁרָא מַעְטִירָהּ חֶסְבָּחָה תַּנְפִּיצָתָּא הָאָלָלְכָּא הָאֲדַמָּא.}\]

\[\text{הָאָלָלְכָּא חְפִכְתָּא בֹּשָּׁרָא מַעְטִירָהּ חֶסְבָּחָה תַּנְפִּיצָתָּא הָאָלָלְכָּא.}\]

\[\text{יְצָרָאְזָא אָלָלְכָּא בֹּשָּׁרָא מַעְטִירָהּ חֶסְבָּחָה תַּנְפִּיצָתָּא הָאָלָלְכָּא.}\]


\(^43\) Original, in a qualified sense, for we are not in a position to restore the original character of the 'purification' or 'dismissal' section beyond the point above indicated, namely, that originally the rite was remedial and purificatory through the transfer of the disease or of the demon of the disease into the bird sent out at large. The ritual in this stage probably consisted of incantation formulae pronounced over the afflicted person with rites of sympathetic magic to induce the disease to pass over into the bird.
'If a man has on the skin of his flesh a sara’at--mark and he is brought to the priest, and the priest sees the mark on the skin of his flesh, and that the hair at the mark has turned white, and that the mark appears deeper than, the skin of his flesh, then it is a sara’at mark, and he shall declare him unclean.

‘If there is a sara’at mark on a man, and he is brought to the priest, and the priest sees that there is a white swelling on the skin which has turned the hair white, it is a chronic sara’at on the skin of his flesh, and the priest shall declare him unclean.

But if the sara’at gradually spreads on the skin until the sara’at covers the entire skin, and the priest sees that the sara’at covers the entire flesh, then the priest shall declare the mark clean.

‘And the one afflicted with sara’at who has a mark, his garments shall be torn, and his hair shall grow wild, a he shall cover his moustache, and cry 'unclean, unclean'. As long as he has the spot he shall be unclean; outside of the camp shall be his dwelling.

This is the law of the one who has sara’at, on the day of his purification when the priest has gone to (the place) outside of the camp, and has seen that the sara’at mark of the one afflicted with sara’at is healed. Then the priest shall order two living birds to be taken for the one to be purified; and the priest shall order the one bird to be killed
over an earthen pot at running water; and the living bird
he shall dip into the blood of the killed bird, and he shall
sprinkle over the one to be purified seven times, and declare
him clean, and send off the living bird into the open. And
the one purified shall wash his garments, and shave all his
hair, and wash in water, and after that come to the camp.
This is the law of the sara’at.44

III
A significant feature of this original form of the sara’at
code is its disassociation from any sanctuary. The victim,
to be sure, is brought to the priest, but no ceremonies are
enacted in any sanctuary, and the rite of purification or
dismissal is carried out outside of the camp where the
isolated victim dwells. Even the sacrificial bird is not
killed at any altar. The case is different in a second ritual
of purification beginning with Lev. 14 8b, and extending
to 16. The independent character of this second ritual
has, of course, been recognized by commentators.45
This second code reads, exclusive of comments and
additions, as follows:
‘And he shall dwell outside of his tent46 seven days,47

44 Subscript now at the end of Lev. 14. 7. See below, p. 399.
45 See, e. g., Baentsch, Leviticus, p. 371.
46 The Greek translation, evidently with a view of adapting the ritual
to later social conditions when people dwelt in cities, reads 'outside of his
house'. See above, note 24.
47 Verse 9, reading 'And on the seventh day he shall shave all his hair
[explanatory comment: his head and his beard and his eyebrows, and all his
hair he shall shave], and wash his garments, and bathe his body in water,
and be clean', is an addition taken from verse 8a in order to make the
second ritual conform with the first. The additions, 'his head', &c., are
again in the nature of a Gemara, and represent the answers of the priest
to the questions that would be asked as to what constitutes 'all his hair'.
Does it mean the hair of the head? Yes. The beard? Yes. How about
and on the eighth day he shall take one lamb and three-twentieths of fine flour mixed with oil, and the priest shall place the one to be declared clean before Jahweh. And the priest shall take the lamb and offer it as a guilt-offering, and he shall kill the lamb in a holy place. And the priest shall take of the blood of the guilt-offering, and the priest shall put (it) on the right ear-lap of the one to be declared clean, and on the right eyebrows? Yes. Some one not satisfied with this added, 'All his hair he shall shave'--to include the hairs on the breast, abdomen, legs, arms, and no doubt a strict construction in the spirit of Talmudical casuistry would include the hair around the privates.

48 It is quite evident that originally only one lamb as a sin-offering was sacrificed. The brief manner in which the second lamb is introduced in ver. 19a, 'and the priest shall carry out the sin-offering and atone for the one to be cleansed' [addition: from his uncleanness], shows that the second lamb as a sin-offering is an after-thought, just the 'ewe, one year old, perfect' (ver. 10b), and which (19b) he shall afterwards slaughter as a burnt-offering, are further additions in regard to which it is specified (ver. 20). 'and the priest'shall offer up the burnt-offering [addition: and the meal-offering at the altar], and the priest shall atone for him, and he shall be clean'. The repetition of the phrase, 'he shall atone for the one to be cleansed', or 'he shall atone for him' in the case of the second lamb, and in the case of the one-year-old ewe is in itself sufficient to show that the ritual has been elaborated at a later period. The additions, 'and the minhah and at the altar', are again answers to the questions, (1) Is there to be a cereal-offering also with the burnt-offering? Yes: and (s) Shall it be offered at the altar just as the burnt-offering? Yes.

49 Addition, 'one log of oil'.

50 Explanatory comments: (a) i. e. 'the man to be cleaned', and (b) addition, 'and them'.

51 Explanatory comment: 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting', in answer to the question, 'What does "before Jahweh" mean?'

52 Addition, 'one.'

53 Additions, (1) 'and the log of oil', and (a) 'wave them as a waving before Jahweh.'

54 Explanatory comments: (a) 'in the place where one (usually) daughters the sin-offering', to which some one added, (b) 'and the burnt-
thumb and on the right (large) toe.\textsuperscript{55} And the priest shall sprinkle\textsuperscript{56} of the oil seven times before Jahweh\textsuperscript{57} . . . and the priest shall atone for him before Jahweh.'

The addition of an official sacrifice animal in cases involving purification from uncleanness to an earlier ritual, in which the leading idea was the exorcising of the unclean spirit, is a characteristic feature of the Priestly Code. So in Lev. 15, dealing with purification in the case of an unclean flow, the sacrificial regulations for the eighth day, vers. 14-15 and

offering', i.e. the 'holy place' means the altar on which sin- and burnt-offerings are usually brought. Other commentators added (c) 'for the guilt-offering (דָּם) is like a sin-offering (נֵפֶשׁ)', i.e. the two are on a level and to be treated alike. Cf. Lev. 7. 7. (d) 'It a holy of holies', (e) 'it is the priest's'. All five comments are, therefore, again in the nature of a Gemara to the Mishnah, answering such questions as (a) where is the 'holy place'? (b) why does he say 'guilt-offering' and not 'sin-offering'? (c) to whom does the guilt-offering belong? &c. &c.

\textsuperscript{55} Ver. 15, 'And the priest shall take of the log of oil, and pour it on the left palm of the priest', is clearly a later addition harking back to the 'one log of oil'. Note the awkward repetition of the word 'priest'.

\textsuperscript{56} Addition, 'with his finger'.

\textsuperscript{57} Ver. 16a, 'And the priest shall dip with his right finger of the oil which is on his left palm', is an explanatory amplification superinduced by ver. 15, and representing the attempt to combine the oil of the minhah with the 'log of oil'. Ver. 17 is a further specification of what is to be done with the remaining oil; an answer, therefore, to a question, 'How about the oil that is left in the palm of the priest?' Answer, 'The rest of the oil which is on his palm, the priest shall put on the right ear-lap of the one to be purified, and on his right thumb, and on his right (large) toe'; taken over, therefore, from ver. 14. An explanatory comment further adds, 'over the blood of the guilt-offering' that has been placed on the parts named (ver. 14). Then some one asks, Suppose there is still some oil left in the palm of the priest, what then? Answer; (ver. 18a). 'And what is left of the oil which is in the palm of the priest, he shall pour on the head of the one to be purified'. It is to be noted that the Greek text occasionally omits the word 'priest'; so e.g. at the beginning of vers. 15 and 16, and occasionally inserts it; so e.g. in ver. 18, after 'he gives' (ἔφη), where the Hebrew omits it, pointing to considerable manipulation of the formal language of the ordinances.
29-30, are clearly insertions, shown to be such by the preceding verse which in each case (ver. 13 and ver. 28) ends by stating that the individual is 'clean'. Again in the 'atonement' ritual, Lev. 16, the second goat as a sin-offering (ver. 5) is an addition to the far older goat for Azazel, i.e. the goat to which the sin or uncleanness is to be transferred, just as the ram for the burnt-offering and the bullock of the sin-offering represent further layers. Similarly, in the Holiness Code, we come across this latter 'sacrificial' layer over an older one in which the sacrifice of an animal for the benefit of the priestly sanctuary does not enter into consideration.

The twenty-third chapter of Leviticus, detailing festival regulations, the ordinances for the Passover, of unleavened cakes, abstaining from work on the first and seventh day, and the waving of the Omer, as set forth in vers. 5-11 and ver. 14, constitutes the earlier stratum, whereas verses 12-13, adding a lamb as a burnt-offering, and a minhah, are insertions of a much later date. The same applies to the sacrificial ritual, vers. 18-20, which clearly represents an artificial attempt to connect an earlier ritual of 'waving' a cereal offering at the end of the grain harvest with the 'waving' of sacrificial animals. In the case of the 'Atonement' festival (vers. 23-32), it is noticeable that no sacrifice is mentioned at all, again pointing to the late addition of the goat introduced in Lev. 16. 5, &c., for the day.

The fact that the sacrificial ritual is prescribed for the eighth day after everything is over shows that the older

58 Ver.8a, 'Ye shall bring a fire-offering to Jahweh for seven days' is an insertion to conform with the Priestly Code, Num. 28.19-24, where the fire-offering is fully set forth and in great detail.
59 Just as in Lev. 15. 14-15 and 29-30.
and essential element in this second ritual is the washing of the garments, the bathing and the shaving, as in the first ritual. Furthermore, the many additions in the case of the sacrificial ritual point to the tendency to emphasize the sacrifice as the essential element. The one animal as a sin-offering, which according to the present law (ver. 21) is permitted as a substitute only in case the individual is poor, was all that the sacrificial ritual in its earlier form required; and we are probably right in assuming that this earlier form followed the regulation of Lev. 4. 32, which prescribes a ewe as the guilt-offering.\textsuperscript{60} To this a lamb as a burnt-offering (חֶלֶף) was added and not satisfied with this, an entirely unwarranted differentiation was introduced between a guilt-offering (משה) and a sin-offering (חטאת).\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{60} The little section (Lev. 4. 3a-3) represents a different practice from the sections (a) Lev. 4. 3-12, (b) 4.13-21, (c) 4. 22-26, (d) 4. 27-31, prescribing, according as the transgression is one committed by an anointed priest, by the whole people, by a chief, or by an ordinary Individual, a bullock for the first two cases, a young goat for the third instance, and a young female goat for the fourth case.

\textsuperscript{61} The three offerings, חָמֶשׁ, חָטַאת, and מְשָׁשׁ, are found in Ezekiel (e. g. 40. 39, but in the Priestly Code (Lev. 5 and 7) no distinction is recognizable between חָטַאת, and מְשָׁשׁ, and a commentator is, therefore, free to admit (Lev. 7.7) that 'a sin-offering (חטאת) is like a guilt-offering (משה)---one law. Evidently, the difference between the two was originally merely one of local usage of the term; in on locality, now represented by ch. 5. 1-16, חטאת being used, in another place, now represented by the little section 5.17-26, and ch. 7, מְשָׁשׁ was employed. Of the two terms, מְשָׁשׁ (‘asam) seems to represent the older usage. The חטאת, therefore, is the one added in Lev. 14. in accord with the tendency to increase sacrifices though the result is a double sin-offering, since there is no distinction between ‘asam and hattat. The regular addition of the olah (burnt-offering) to hattat (sin-offering) is again an illustration of this tendency, though here a factor involved is the consciousness that the sin-offering rests upon the old notion of the transfer of the disease or sin to the animal, whereas the 'burnt-offering' is the tribute to the angered deity who is to be appeased by the 'pleasant fragrance,' which is what the phrase
and thus another lamb was added; and lastly, a cereal offering (חֵן נְחֵית) was attached, making, therefore, no less than four separate sacrifices. Even with this the process of heaping up one layer after the other upon the sacrificial ritual was not completed. The ordinary cereal offering for a lamb consisted of one-tenth of an ephah of fine meal, mixed with oil, but in our case the amount is raised to three-twentieths, and besides the mixture of the flour with oil, a special quantity (log) of oil is added (Lev. 14. 10c, 12b, 15a). The 'waving' of the sacrificial animal is prescribed (ver. 12b), the elaborate ceremonial of touching the ear, finger, and toe of the individual with the oil, the sprinkling seven times 'before Jahweh', again a touching of the ear,

תְּלוֹוי נַחְיָה originally connoted. The 'substitute' offering (Lev 5. 11; of one-tenth of an ephah of fine meal in the case of one too poor to offer two turtle-doves or two young pigeons belongs, of course, in a different category. It is not attached to another offering, nor is it ever technically designated as a חֵן נְחֵית but as חַטַּת (ver. 12), though a misplaced note; 'it shall be for the priest as a minhah' (ver. 13b), shows that some pedant could not tolerate a bloodless offering to be called a hattat. In Num. 6, a compilation of various layers dealing with the one who has made a vow, the cereal-offering is added to the burnt-offering, sin-offering, and peace-offering at the termination of the vow period (vers. 15-18), though the word חֵן נְחֵית only introduced in the gloss or comment at the end of ver. 15. This is heaping up sacrifices with a vengeance, due to the endeavour to legitimize an old custom of temporary consecration by giving to the one who makes a vow the temporary status of a priest.

62 There is no minhah attached to the hattat or 'asam in Lev. 4. 5, 7.
63 The mixture with oil is a constant factor of the minhah, expressed (Lev. 2. 1, 15, by 'oil poured upon it'. On the other hand, the 'frankincense' (כָּנָא לְכָנָא) also prescribed with the minhah was not carried out, at least not in the practice, which is set forth in Lev. 2.
64 Also Num. 15. 9; 28. 12, 20, 28; 29. 14.
65 This measure of oil occurs in this chapter only.
66 part of the ceremony of initiation of priests, Exod. 29. 20; Lev. 8. 23, 24, though here the blood is used to make the priest immune against demons.
67 The expression 'before Jahweh' is evidently looked upon as identical with 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting' and; therefore, the latter
&c., of the individual with oil, and anointing the head with what is left (ver. 18). Verse 19 specifies the addition of a 'sin-offering' and a 'burnt-offering', and verse 20 is a comment in the nature of a Gemara to indicate that the burnt-offering is to have its cereal offering accompaniment, just as the sin or guilt-offering. We thus find this section overloaded with sacrificial regulations in accordance with the tendency towards a steadily-increasing elaboration of sanctuary ceremonials, so characteristic of the later layers of the Priestly Code.68

This rather lengthy discussion was necessary to show

phrase is added as a gloss in ver. 11, and so also Lev. 15. 14, as well as Lev. 4. 5, where the gloss has been placed before the words 'before Jahweh'. In Exod. 29 and Lev. 8, furnishing the rites for the initiation of priests in two recensions, the expression used is 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting', from which we may conclude that the section is prescribing the wafers and the basket of unleavened bread, together with the ‘waving’ (Exod. 29. 23-4; Lev. 8. 26-7) where 'before Jahweh' is used, represent elements from some other source. In Lev. 1-7, therefore, as well as Lev. 13-16, the characteristic expression is 'before Jahveh', and wherever the other appears (e.g. also Lev 15. 29) it is to be regarded as an explanatory addition. In the Holiness Code, likewise, פָּנִים אֲחֹלָה מְאֹד appears to be the later addition, though this Code uses by the side of פָּנִים יְהוָה (19. 22; 23. 11; 20-28; 24. 4-6) the simple phrase הֵלֵא לְהוֹז (Lev. 17. 5b, 9; 19. 21.; 22. 22, 27; 23. 5, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20, 25, 27, 38, 41; 24. 7, &c.). Even Lev. 17. 4, 9, the words 'to the entrance of the tent of meeting', despite their position, are explanatory glosses, in the former passage to פָּנִים יְהוָה in the latter to הֵלֵא לְהוֹז. Sections in which the phrase 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting' is the original reading (e.g. Exod. 29 and Lev. 8; represent an older stratum of legislation, and may very well date back in substance to a very early period; whereas the phrase ‘before Jahweh’ shows that the compiler has in mind the sanctuary of Jerusalem, the gloss being added to conform to the theory that the entire legislation reverts to the day of Moses.

68 A good illustration of this tendency towards overloading is furnished by a comparison of the sacrifices for the new moon prescribed in Ezek. 46. 6 with the additions made in Num. 28. 11, one young bullock as against two, six lambs as against seven. See Carpenter and Battersby, The Hexateuch, I, p. 128.
the wide abyss between the first ritual (Lev. 14. 1-8), not performed in a sanctuary and with but little added to the exorcising rites though converted into a purification or dismissal ceremony, and the second ritual, which attaches to a simple cleansing ceremony a most elaborate series of sacrificial rites.

In the same spirit the substitute ritual, vers. 21-27, is conceived, permitting the poor man to bring merely one lamb, reducing, the amount of the meal to one-tenth, and replacing the second lamb and the ewe by two turtle-doves or two pigeons. I have suggested that what is here permitted as a substitute may have been the offering prescribed for an earlier period. Be that as it may, the dependence of this section upon the preceding one is instanced by the introduction of the log of oil (vers. 22, 24), and the ceremony of sprinkling and touching the ear-lap of the individual (vers. 25-29), identical with vers. 14-19, and taken over bodily from the latter, just as the wording in vers. 30-31 is taken from ver. 19. Then follows a separate subscript for this section (vers. 21-31), but in which the words are probably an addition, so that the subscript belonging originally after ver. 20, or perhaps after 8a, once read 'This is the Torah for the cleansing of the one who has a nega ’ sara’ at.

Above, p. 379. Cf. the substitute which is provided for the guilt-(or sin-) offering, Lev. 5. 7-10 (two turtle-doves or two pigeons without a minhah), and a further substitute for the one who cannot even afford this (vers. 11-12) of one-tenth of an ephah of meal without oil or frankincense. This, of course, is not a minhah in the ordinary sense. The word at the end of ver. 13 is clearly a late addition.

The correct construction is . To this a commentator adds as a note, 'the one', namely, 'of the turtle-doves or of the pigeons which he can afford'.
Having now discussed the original form of the diagnosis and treatment of the *sara’at* and the purification or dismissal rites of the one who has been healed of it, we may proceed to an analysis of the remaining sections of Lev. 13-14, namely, (a) Lev. 13. 4-8; (b) 14-17; (c) 18-23; (d) 24-28; (e) 29-37; (f) 38-39; (g) 40-44; (h) 47-58; (i)14. 33-53.

The first section deals with the 'shining spot' (*baheret*) on the skin and the ‘growth’ (*sappahat* or *mispahat*). In contrast to the case (ver. 3) where the hair at the mark has turned white and the mark is deeper than the skin, in which case it is pronounced a *sara’at*, or (ver. 9) where the swelling on the skin (i. e. a mark higher than the skin) has turned white, in which case it is likewise *sara’at* of a chronic type, the case is put forward (ver. 4) of white mark not sunk in the skin (i. e. even with the surface) and where the hair has not turned white. Such a case is regarded as a 'suspect', and the individual is put under guard for seven days. If after seven days there is no change another seven days' observation is ordained. After that two contingencies are instanced, either (a) the mark has grown fainter and not spread, in which case it is pronounced a harmless 'growth' and the suspect is dismissed as clean, or (b) the growth after the formal dismissal spreads, in which case the suspect is unclean. According to the close of ver. 8 it is declared

71 See above, p. 360. In ver. 1 the terms *שאָת אָתָא מְעֶה* are an insertion to make the heading conform o the contents of vers. 1-13. The *נָאָפָא* is treated ver. 10 seq. The more natural order of the insertion would have been, *baheret, sappahat, and se’et*. An interesting reference to the various kinds of *nega’im* is found Deut. 17. 8.

72 Addition (ver. 6c), 'he shall wash his clothes'. The addition probably read in full 'he shall wash his garments and bathe in water', but it is here given in an abbreviated form.
to be sara'at, but I am inclined to regard this as a later addition made at a time when sara'at was used in a very general sense for any skin disease which was regarded as unclean. At all events, the spreading growth is not of the same order as the sara'at described in vers. 3 and 10.

The second section (vers. 14-18) takes up the case where raw flesh appears in connexion with a mark which (vers. 14-15) is declared unclean. The double decision (a) שָׁנַח אֵל 'it is unclean', and (b) שָׁנֶשׁ אֵל 'it is sara'at' at the end of ver. 15 is suspicious, and I am inclined to regard the second decision again as a later addition to be explained as the one at the end of ver. 8. Correspondingly, the decision 'he is clean' is rendered in case the raw flesh turns white, and after the priest has satisfied himself that the spot has turned white. The raw flesh turning white simply means, therefore, that the skin assumes its natural appearance. These two sections, therefore, are in the nature of a Gemara to the original form of the sara'at Mishnah, as above set forth. Precisely as in the talmudical discussions, various questions are asked, such as how about a white shining mark which is not deeper than the skin, and where the hair has not turned white? Answer: Such an one is to be observed for seven days. Suppose the mark remains unchanged? Answer: Observe him for another seven days. If it grows faint and does not spread? Answer: שָׁנַח 'he is clean'. Suppose it comes back and spreads? Answer: שָׁנַח 'unclean'. How about raw flesh on the skin? Answer: שָׁנַח 'unclean'. Suppose the raw flesh turns white? Answer: שָׁנַח 'clean'. In a practical hand-book the discussions are omitted and the decisions alone are given.

The third section continues the 'Gemara', and like the

73 See below, pp. 389, 390, and 400f.
talmudical Gemara grows in complication as question follows fast upon question. How about the case of a boil. (sehin) that is healed, but after the healing process 'a white shining spot'\(^{74}\) even with the surface appears?\(^{75}\) Verse 20 gives the answer: 'The priest shall examine (it), and if it is deeper" than the skin and the hair has turned white, the priest shall declare him unclean'.\(^{77}\) The commentator quotes the established diagnosis. Nothing is added to the law--merely an answer given to a question that appears to be asked from a theoretical rather than from a practical motive--an early variety of the 'hypothetical question'. The question, however; having once been asked, the other case as in ver. 4, must be considered: suppose the hair has not turned white, and the spot does not appear lower\(^{78}\) than the skin. The answer is: The priest is to shut him up as a suspect for seven days, just as in ver. 4. Verse 22, corresponding to ver. 7, decides that if the spot spreads,\(^{79}\) it furnishes the decision 'unclean' with the usual subsequent addition \(\text{נֶּגַא} (nega')\), i. e. abbreviated for 'it is a \(\text{sara'at} \) mark'.\(^{50}\) Similarly, the question is also put here: Suppose

\(^{74}\) Some commentator who wanted to be very exact added (v. 19) 'reddish', since as a matter of fact a shining spot, even when it appears to be white, is tinged with red. The words 'white' and 'swelling' are also added.

\(^{75}\) An explanatory comment, misplaced at the end of ver. 20, says 'spread where the boil (was)'.

\(^{76}\) The text uses \(ןֶּפֶל \) for 'deep' instead of \(כֶּפֶל\) in vers. 3-4, indicative of another writer, or of a different stratum.

\(^{77}\) Once more the later addition 'it is nega’ sara'at,' as above (see note 4.

\(^{78}\) The words \(קְרֵיחַ \) (ver. 21; 'and it is faint' are not in place. I suspect an abbreviated note to indicate, as in ver. 6, that if after seven days 'the spot has grown faint and has not spread' the suspect is dismissed.

\(^{79}\) Again given in abbreviated form. We must supply 'reappears and spreads' after the dismissal, as in ver. 7.

\(^{80}\) The very fact that we encounter the abbreviated form in the decision
the 'shining spot' remains stationary, and does not spread? The answer should be as in ver. 5—a further observation of seven days. Here, however, a new diagnosis is given. When such a spot appears on the skin where there had been a boil the stationary character after seven days shows that it is the scar of the boil (ךירצוי), and the decision, therefore, is 'clean'. The same lengthy discussion follows in the next 'Gemara'—the fourth section (vers. 24-28)—where the case is put of a white spot appearing in connexion with a burn. The hypothetical question originally read as follows:81 'If there should be on his skin a burn, and the healed burn82 should become a white shining spot.'83

Once more the ordinary diagnosis is repeated: If the hair has turned white at the shining spot, and the spot is deeper84 than the skin, it is unclean.85 If neither of these symptoms appears,86 the suspect is observed for seven days; if, at the end of that time, the spot spreads, he is unclean:87 if the shining spot remains stationary, with-

sara'at (vers. 8. 15), by the side of nega' sara'at (ver. 20) and nega' (ver. 22), shows the very general and conventional usage acquired by sara'at as a generic term, and not as a specific designation.

81 Hebrew text Ḥ "or", whereas the Greek version has 'and'.

82 Text הָלִיתָה which appears to be a semi-technical term for the burn that has been healed, corresponding to the healed boil in the fourth section.

83 Addition again (ver. 24) as above in ver. 19, 'reddish', i.e. 'reddish white', to which another commentator added 'or white', to indicate that a 'white' sara'at includes a shining spot entirely white, or reddish, i.e. white tinged with red.

84 Here (ver. 25) דֹּר is used as in ver. 3-4, but immediately thereafter ver. 26) צִּוַּח.

85 Again the usual conventional addition, 'it is a nega' sara'at', i.e. a 'sara'at mark'.

86 "The words 'and it is faint' are again out of place here, as above note 78.

87 With the addition, 'it is a nega' sara'at'.

81 Hebrew text Ḥ "or", whereas the Greek version has 'and'.

82 Text הָלִיתָה which appears to be a semi-technical term for the burn that has been healed, corresponding to the healed boil in the fourth section.

83 Addition again (ver. 24) as above in ver. 19, 'reddish', i.e. 'reddish white', to which another commentator added 'or white', to indicate that a 'white' sara'at includes a shining spot entirely white, or reddish, i.e. white tinged with red.

84 Here (ver. 25) דֹּר is used as in ver. 3-4, but immediately thereafter ver. 26) צִּוַּח.

85 Again the usual conventional addition, 'it is a nega' sara'at', i.e. a 'sara'at mark'.

86 "The words 'and it is faint' are again out of place here, as above note 78.

87 With the addition, 'it is a nega' sara'at'.
out spreading in the skin, the priest pronounces him clean, since it is a (mere) 'scar of a burn'.

The fifth section takes up and discusses in great detail (vers. 29-37) the various symptoms connected with marks or sores on the head or beard to which the generic designation of netek is given, and which are evidently open sores of some kind. The introductory statement reads:

'If a man has a mark (nega') on the head or beard, and the priest sees it, and it appears deeper than the skin, and there is thin shining hair in it, then the priest shall declare him unclean--it is a open sore:

The two tests of the diagnosis: (I) that the spot is deeper than the skin; (2) the appearance of a yellowish hair indicating that the sore has changed the colour of the

88 Two comments, (a) 'it is (also) faint' to make the verse correspond to ver. 6; (b) 'it is the swelling (se'et) of the burn' (ha-mikwah), as a variant to 'it is a scar of a burn'.

89 The Greek renders it by 'wound'. The underlying stem means 'to pull off violently', showing that nelek must be an open sore through the pulling away of the skin, a kind of ulcer. Just as we have and , so (ver. 31) is used by the side of ; and is used to designate (ver. 32) as well as .

90 The text adds 'or woman', but the continuation shows that only man was here referred to, though naturally the law, as all laws dealing with disease or sin, applies to both sexes. In ver. 38, on 'the other hand, the words 'man or woman' belong to the original form of the little section, which is moreover misplaced; similarly, Lev. 20. 27 or Exod. 35. 29, but, on the other hand, 'woman' is added by later hand in Num. 6. 2, as is shown by a comparison with Lev. 27. 2, while Num. 5. 6 both 'man' and 'woman' are added, the text reading simply, 'speak to the Bene Israel', as in ver. 2 'command the Bene Israel'.

91 sahob used only in this chapter and in Ezra 8. 27, in the latter passage of a copper vessel.

92 Addition, 'it is a sara'at on the head or beard', clearly marked as such by the repetition of the word.
it at the spot, are precisely of the same character as given
is the preceding section, with the comparatively unimportant
difference as to the nature of the change in the colour of
the hair. The difference between white or reddish white
or shining might easily be a subjective differentiation, the
fact being that the change in the pigment of the hair
brings about a colour that is not pure white, and may,
therefore, be designated as reddish, or reddish and white,
or simply shining.

The following verses 31-37 again show traces of many
later additions and of re-editing. The original text must
have run as follows:

‘If the priest sees that the netek93 as mark is not deeper
than the skin, and there is no shining94 hair in it, then
the priest shall shut up the netek for seven days, and if
on the seventh day the priest sees the mark and behold
the netek has not spread,95 then he shaves himself,96 and

93 Test, נטיק. See note 8g.
94 The Hebrew text has 'black hair' (perhaps a variant that has re-
placed sahab, for which the Greek version has the correct form 'shining hair'.
95 Addition, 'and there is no shining hair in it, and the netek is not
deeper than the skin'; the inversion pointing to the fact that it is a later
explanatory amplification or note.
96 The Greek version says 'he shaves his skin'; evidently a cleansing
ceremony like washing the garments and bathing in water if the mark is
on the body. A second procedure in the case of a suspected mark pro-
vided that the victim 'must not shave the netek' (ver. 33), and must be
shut up for seven days. The two procedures were erroneously combined,
and so we have in ver. 33, for no reason whatsoever, a second period of seven
days' observation. It maybe, too, that the second test of seven days is
misplaced, and belongs in connexion with ver. 37, where the netek, after the
first seven days, remains unchanged, and which would then correspond with
ver. 5. At all events, vers. 33-4, beginning with deh הלהי טמק לorno רדנהיו and
extending to אנהל את אנהל ידני, are originally a duplicate of ver. 32 with the
addition of the words אנהל ידני, which belong to the first
procedure.
washes his garments and is clean, but if the priest sees that the netek, has spread in the skin, he is unclean.'

To this a later and quite superfluous corollary--forming an answer to the question, 'how about a netek that remains unchanged and a black hair springs up in it, i. e. hair of the natural colour?'--adds (ver. 37):

'If the netek remains the same and a black hair springs up in it, the netek is healed—he is clean.'

Now it will have become evident that in none of the five sections so far considered is there any reason to assume that we have variants of a particular disease known as sara’at. The term when introduced in these sections has been shown to be a later addition, and is, moreover, taken in a generic sense as an 'unclean' skin trouble, and not as a designation of any specific disease. The same is the case with the two remaining sections--(6) vers. 38-39 and (7) vers. 40-44--before we reach the point where the thread of the original and genuine sara’at legislation is again taken up. In fact, in the case of the sixth section the term sara’at is not even introduced, and it is evident that this little section, consisting of only two verses without the

97 See the preceding note.
98 Ver. 35. 'If the netek has spread on the skin after his purification', is entirely superfluous, added in view of the erroneous combination of the two procedures. Ver. 36a is a doublet to ver. 35a.
99 Comment, ver.36,'The priest need not (even) hunt for the shining hair', for it would make no difference in the decision that the victim is 'unclean'. The comment is an answer to the question, Why is nothing said of the shining hair in case the netek has spread?
100 A superfluous comment or a misplaced gloss adds, ‘and the priest declares him clean'. It is to be noted that in ver. 37, as in ver. 8, the phrase 'stands in his eyes’ is used to express the idea that the mark is unchanged, as against the phrase in ver. 28 'stands under it', pointing again to the different editors or commentators from whom these additions and comments and answers to implied questions emanate.
amplification, as in the preceding five, is a supplement to verses 4-8 and 24-28 dealing with 'shining' marks in the skin. The text originally read:

'If a man or woman has shining marks\textsuperscript{101} on the skin\textsuperscript{102}--it is clean.'\textsuperscript{103}

The seventh section deals with baldness, and various kinds of bald spots, and certainly has nothing to do with the real sara’at. In its original form the section read:

‘If a man loses the hair of his head\textsuperscript{104}--he is clean. If there is a white mark\textsuperscript{105} at the bald place,\textsuperscript{106} and the priest sees that there is a white swelling mark,\textsuperscript{107} the priest shall surely declare him unclean.’\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{101} A gloss adds 'shining white marks'.

\textsuperscript{102} The first part of ver 39, 'And the priest sees the shining spots' (gloss, 'faint white marks'), is a 'Gemara' to point out that the priest is the one who must determine the harmless character of the spots.

\textsuperscript{103} Explanatory comment, 'It is a tetter (bohak) that has broken out on the skin'. On bohak corresponding to the modern Syriac bohak, see the note on p. 76 of Drivers Book of Leviticus in the Polychrome Bible, ed. Haupt.

\textsuperscript{104} Comment, 'he is a bald person' (רָעַה). To thin ver. 41, in the nature of a Gemara, adds, 'If the front part of his head is bald he is forehead bald (מים), he is unclean'.

\textsuperscript{105} Additions, (a) 'reddish', like ver. 19, &c. See notes 74 and 83.

\textsuperscript{106} Addition, in view of ver. 41, 'or at the forehead baldness'. There follows the further comment, as in the above discussed five sections, 'it is sara’at', to which some other commentator adds 'in his baldness' or 'his forehead baldness' (i. e. 'a sara’at of his baldness or of his forehead baldness'), again in view of ver, 41. The Hebrew text also has 'breaking out'

(בַּרְחָה יָדָא); but the Greek properly omits this, which is clearly added in view of the addition 'breaking out' in ver. 39. See notes 120 and 121.

\textsuperscript{107} יָשָׁא הַנִּנְכֵה לְבָנָה, to which again are added (a) 'reddish' and (b) 'in is baldness or forehead baldness'.

\textsuperscript{108} No less than four further comments are added: (1) 'like the appearance of sara'at of the skin of the flesh' (שָׂרָא וָנָה), harking back to vers. 2-3;

(2) 'he is a man afflicted with sara'at', where the combination of 'man' with saru'a, as against saru’a alone in ver. 43 (forming art of the original sara’at legislation, points to the artificial addition;
The result, therefore, of our investigations so far has been to show that none of the symptoms detailed in the seven sections superimposed upon the original sara'at legislation have anything to do with the disease described in the original portion of the two chapters, and that these superimposed sections are to be regarded merely as an index of that natural tendency to differentiate among a large variety of skin troubles due in part to advancing medical knowledge—though medicine in a primitive state—and in part to the interest, partly practical, partly theoretical, in legal enactments, prompting questions to which answers must be given, and suggesting legal niceties that need to be discussed—a process in short, that, as has been emphasized above, is of the same general character as that to be noted in the great compilation of Rabbinical Judaism, and which led to the growth of an enormous Gemara about a comparatively simple series of enactments grouped together as Mishnah.

This process is continued and, carried still further in the two sections of Lev. 13 and 14 that still remain to be discussed: (8) Lev. 13. 47-58, regarding suspicious spots or marks on garments and stuffs; (9) Lev. 14. 33-47, to which verses 48-53, a cleansing ritual corresponding to 14. 4-7 is attached.

(3) רָעִי רֵעַ 'he is unclean', quite superfluous, and added merely as a conventional phrase; (4) His mark is on his head, again in the style of a 'Gemara' in answer to the question, Can nega' be applied to the head as to the rest of the body? The first comment is in the nature of an explanation of the phrase 'a white swelling mark', to suggest a comparison with the diagnosis of the 'a white swelling' (ver. 10), and on the erroneous assumption, prompted by the conventional addition of sara'at throughout these sections, that all these skin troubles are forms of a specific sara'at disease.
Taking up the former, the use of the term *nega' sara'at* (vers. 47, 49, (or *sara'at*) 51, 52) for such spots on garments and stuffs is a further proof, if one were still needed, that *sara'at* had lost any specific meaning that it may once have possessed, for such a thing as 'leprosy', or any disease peculiar to man is a manifest absurdity in the case of garments or stuffs. The reference must be to moulds of some kind or other. Moreover, as in other sections, נג׳ סרגא alternates with נג׳ סרגת, the fuller or the abbreviated expression being synonymously used for a mark that is suspicious or unclean. The section shows distinct traces of dependence upon the original *sara'at* legislation, and represents, therefore, the further natural extension of the general subject of marks or spots outside of the human body. just as in the other sections, we are here also in a position to separate the original portion from subsequent accretions, again offering analogies to the 'Gemara' superimposed upon the 'Mishnah'. The section begins:

‘If there is a mark on a garment, and the mark is greenish or reddish, the priest shall see the mark and

109 e.g. in the shutting up of the suspected garment, &c., for seven days; in the diagnosis, whether the mark has spread or remained steadfast; in the washing of the garment, corresponding to the washing of the body and the shaving of the head.

110 Text, yyn פְּנֵי, where, however, yyn פְּנֵי is an erroneous addition, as shown by the consistent use of yyn פְּנֵי alone in the portion of the following verses dealing with the merely suspected mark. It is only in case the mark by the test is proved to be unclean that the word *sara'at* can properly be added. There is added (a) the explanatory Gemara 'in a garment of wool or in a garment of flax', and then (b) the further amplification in answer to the questions. How if it appears in the warp or in the woof only? Does this apply also to wool and flax? How if it appears on a prepared skin, i.e. leather or on something made of a skin? The answer is, 'or in the warp or in the woof of wool or flax [so the Greek text], or in a skin or in anything made of skin'.

111 'Greenish' maybe a later addition, since in the other sections 'reddish
shut up the mark for seven days. If the priest\textsuperscript{112} sees on the seventh day that the mark has spread on the garment,\textsuperscript{113} the mark is unclean; and he shall burn the garment\textsuperscript{114} in which is the mark;\textsuperscript{115} but if the priest sees that the mark has not spread in the garment,\textsuperscript{116} the priest shall command to wash\textsuperscript{117} the (part) where the mark is,\textsuperscript{118} and the priest shall inspect the mark after it has been washed, and if the mark has not altered its appearance\textsuperscript{119}--it is unclean\textsuperscript{120} alone is introduced. Once more the addition 'or in a skin, or in the warp or in the woof or in any object made of a kin'. Then follow the two further additions, (1) 'it is a sara'at mark', in the preceding sections, and (2) 'it shall be shown to the priest'.

\textsuperscript{112} So the Greek text.

\textsuperscript{113} Two comments, (a) the customary addition 'or in the warp, or in the woof, or in a skin, including whatsoever is made of the skin', and (b) \textit{וריה kopimria}, meaning probably 'persistent sara'at', corresponding to 'chronic sara'at (ver.11).

\textsuperscript{114} Again, 'or in the warp, or in the woof, in the flax or the wool or any object made of skin'. The variations in this conventional addition, such as the omission of the 'skin', the change in the order of enumeration, the variant usage to indicate anything made of leather, clearly point to the supplementary character of the insertions.

\textsuperscript{115} Explanatory comment, 'because it is a "persistent" mark it shall be burnt in the fire'.

\textsuperscript{116} Or in the warp, or in the woof, or in any object made of skin.'

\textsuperscript{117} Hebrew text plural (\textit{nakh\textsuperscript{1}m}), whereas the Greek text has the singular.

\textsuperscript{118} At this point the original text has been more seriously interfered with by the addition of a second period of seven days' observation, added evidently to bring about a correspondence with Lev. 13. 5, where, however, the point is that the mark has remained steady. The ordinance, in its original form prescribed the washing of the pot as a further test.

\textsuperscript{119} Explanatory comment, 'though the mark has not spread'.

\textsuperscript{120} Two additions, (1) 'in the fire thou shalt burn it' (note the variant usage), and (2) it is a pehetet (\textit{pay\textsuperscript{1}t}), which, according to the tenor of the Greek rendering (\textit{e\textsuperscript{1}sthe\textsuperscript{1}p\texti{eta}a}), designates 'deeply ingrained mark'. The further addition, (3) 'in its baldness or its forehead baldness', is evidently a misplaced addition belonging somewhere in the seventh section (vers.40-44). It is strange that none of recent commentators, neither Driver, nor Carpenter, nor Baentsch, nor Bertholet, has noticed this. The Greek version reads
But if the priest sees that the mark has grown faint after the mark has been washed, he shall tear it out of the garment\textsuperscript{121} and the garment\textsuperscript{122} which has been washed, and from which the mark has disappeared,\textsuperscript{123} it is clean.' The beginning of ver. 59, 'This is the torah of the sara'at mark', belongs, as clearly indicated, to the original sara'at legislation, to which a final redactor who had merely this eighth section before him, and which must have once occupied an independent position, added, 'a garment of wool or flax, or the warp or the woof, or any object of skin, with reference to its being clean or its being unclean'.

Taking up, finally, the ninth section (Lev. 14. 33-53) we have its originally independent character (as has been recognized by commentators)\textsuperscript{124} indicated by the special introductory clause: 'When you come to the land of Canaan, which I give you as an inheritance,\textsuperscript{125} and I put

\begin{itemize}
\item ['in the garment, or in the warp, or in the woof', which is at least intelligible. 'Baldness' and 'Forehead baldness' become, of course, nonsensical when applied to garments. The entire gloss, מְבַשְׁרָה מֶאָה קֶּפֶרָה אוֹ קֵפֶרָה is a variant of ver. 42b, and מְבַשְׁרָה may be simply a corruption for מָכָּבָה in ver. 42.]
\item Additions, 'or from the skin, or from the warp, or from the woof'.
\item The entire fifty-seventh verse represents a group of additional comments, as follows: (a) 'If it should reappear in the garment, or in the warp, or in the woof, or in any object of skin, it is a spreading mark' (מָכָּבָה); (b) 'In the fire thou shalt burn it'; (c) 'where the mark is', the latter again a misplaced comment.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{121} Addition, 'or from the skin, or from the warp, or from the woof'.

\textsuperscript{122} Addition, 'or the warp, or the woof, or any object of skin'.

\textsuperscript{123} Explanatory comment harking back to the addition in ver. 54 (see note 118), 'and washed a second time'.

\textsuperscript{124} See, e.g., Carpenter and Battersby, Hexateuch, II, p. 162, note 33 Bentsch, P. 374; Driver, Leviticus, p. 77, note 22, &c.

\textsuperscript{125} A similar phrase in Lev. 18. 23; 25. 2 and Num. 15. 2 marks the introduction of an independent little Torah and, as it would appear, either
a mark\textsuperscript{126} in a house,\textsuperscript{127} and the one to whom the house belongs comes and tells the priest, to wit: "something like a mark has appeared in my house." Then follows (ver. 36) a curious provision, that before the priest comes the house is to be cleared of the furniture so as to save that from also being pronounced unclean. This practical device, which shows that questions of sanitation could not have a been uppermost in the minds at least of those who commented upon the legislation, looks very much again like an answer to the question whether one may remove one's furniture before the mark is examined, and thus save it from possible destruction in case the whole house is condemned. At all events, verse 35 must be joined directly to verse 37.

‘And when the priest sees that the mark\textsuperscript{128} on the walls of the house forms greenish\textsuperscript{129} or reddish patches, and that they are deeper than the wall, then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the house,\textsuperscript{130} and close up the house for seven days; and the priest shall return on the seventh day, and if he sees that the mark has spread on the walls of the house, the priest shall order the stones where the mark appears to be removed, and to be thrown of a supplementary character, as in our case and in Lev. 19. 23 and as 25. 2, or in the nature of a general summary, as Num. 15. 2. In all cases the legislation thus introduced is late, representing, in fact, the latest stratum in the Priestly Code.

\textsuperscript{126} Text, מְרָבָּת נַעַר, here again, a Lev. 13.4, sara’at is out of place and anticipates the result of the diagnosis.

\textsuperscript{127} Addition, 'of the land of your possession'; Greek versions read ‘houses’.

\textsuperscript{128} The Hebrew has a superfluous 'and behold the nega’’, which is omitted in the Greek version.

\textsuperscript{129} ‘Greenish’ may be a later addition. See note 111.

\textsuperscript{130} Note the discursive style, characteristic of, this ninth section.
outside the city,\textsuperscript{131} and other stones to be taken and brought in place of the stones.\textsuperscript{132} And if the mark reappears and spreads on the house after he has removed the stones, as then if the priest comes and sees that the mark has spread in the house\textsuperscript{134}--it is unclean. And one shall tear down the house,\textsuperscript{135} and all the dust shall be carried outside of the city.\textsuperscript{136} But if the priest comes and sees that the mark has not spread in the house, the priest shall declare the house clean, for the mark is healed.\textsuperscript{137}

Here the first part of the section ends, and there follow (vers. 49-53) the ritualistic provisions which are manifestly a transference of Lev. 14. 4-8a--the first procedure in the

\textsuperscript{131} Addition, 'to an unclean place', which suggests the unsanitary dust and rubbish heaps characteristic of Palestinian towns even at the present time. A 'Gemara' adds (ver. 41) 'And the house shall be scraped all ground, and the scraped dust deposited outside of the city at an unclean place'.

\textsuperscript{132} Addition, 'And he shall take other dust, and plaster the house', in answer to the question, What is to be done to the house?

\textsuperscript{133} Addition to conform to the earlier additions, 'And after the house has been scraped and after the plastering'.

\textsuperscript{134} Addition as in the former section, 'It is "persistent" \textit{sara}'at} in the house'. Cf: note 115.

\textsuperscript{135} Addition, 'Its stones and its wood', a detailed specification added in answer to the question, Does 'house' mean perhaps only the stone, or does include the wood-work? The Greek version omits 'its wood', pointing clearly to the manipulation of the Hebrew text.

\textsuperscript{136} Addition again 'to an unclean places. Then follow two purely ritualistic ordinances, which clearly represent the endeavour to connect a ritualistic observance with the 'house' spot as with other kinds of marks. Therefore, we are told (ver). 46-7), 'And whoever enters the house during the days that it is closed shall be unclean till-evening; and he who sleeps in the house shall wash his garments ['and be unclean till evening', so the Greek text]; and be who eats in the house shall wash his garments ['and be unclean till evening', so again the Greek text]. Verse 47 evidently represents the superstructure upon ver. 46 to bring about a conformity with Lev. 14. 8 and with passages like ver. 9 based thereon.

\textsuperscript{137} \textit{עָשַׁרַת}, corresponding to Lev. 14. 3 in the original \textit{sara}'at Torah.
original sara'at Torah--to the 'hour' mark, and a most awkward transfer at that, as will presently appear. Before taking up this second part, let us not how in the first part the diagnosis follows slavishly in the path of the original sara'at legislation in the following points: (1) the emphasis on the change of colour at the place where the mark is; (2) that the mark or marks must be beneath the surface; (3) the seven days' quarantine; (4) the decisions resting upon the spread of the mark. The new point, though corresponding in a measure to the tearing out of the mark on the garment (Lev. 13.56), is the removal of the stones containing the suspicious marks (to which later commentators added still further directions). Here, evidently, we have a piece of legislation specially devised for the case in question, and not based upon an attempt to provide in the case of the mark on the house something analogous to an unclean mark on an individual. The same applies to the provision to tear down the house and to remove the dust to another place in case of a reappearance, or of a spread of the marks after the first attempt to heal the house had failed.

Taking up the second part of the section, the dependence upon Lev. 14. 4-8a, as has already been suggested, is self-evident. The adaptation of the latter ritual in its elaborated and not in its original form to the house declared clean, leads to the substitution of the interesting phrase אסומח, literally, 'to remove the sin' (Lev. 14. 49 and 52), "in the sense of purifying--what we would call 'fumigating'--for למתהו 'to declare or dismiss as clean' (14. 4, 7). The

138 The Piel of the verb in this sense is found in Exod. 29, 36; Lev. 8, 15; 9, 15; Ezek. 43, 22-23, applied to the altar; also Ps. 51, 9 in the direct sense of cleansing; but quite differently Gen. 31, 39.
comparison between Lev. 14. 4-8 with 49-53, moreover, justifies the analysis given of the former, since some of the additions in Lev. 14. 4-8 are actually not found in 49-53. So we have in the latter merely ‘the two birds’ without the addition of living clean’. Similarly, verse 51 is nearer to the original form than 14. 4, especially in the Greek text, which reads:

‘And he shall take [addition: “cedar wood and hyssop and scarlet thread ”] the living bird and dip it [so the Greek text] in the blood of the killed one [addition: the running water”—so the Greek text] and sprinkle\textsuperscript{133} the house seven times.’

Verse 50 corresponds to verse 5, but on the other hand, verse 52 represents a redundancy over the original \textit{sara’at} Torah. It sums up:

‘And he shall purge\textsuperscript{140} the house through the blood of the bird, and through the running water, and through the living bird, and through the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet thread.’ This is evidently added to emphasize the elaborateness of the ritual. Verse 53 reading: 'And he shall send off the living bird outside of the city\textsuperscript{141} and atone for the house',\textsuperscript{142} corresponds to the second part of verse 7. The substitution of ‘city’ for ‘field’ indicates the change in social conditions intervening between the period of the original \textit{sara’at} Torah and the late supplement modelled upon it. It is perhaps worth while to note that the second ritual (vers. 8b-20) is not

\textsuperscript{139} Greek text adds 'with them'.

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{kaph}, see note 138.

\textsuperscript{141} The dependence of this ritualistic ordinance upon Lev. 14, 4-8a is shown by the meaningless addition of 'over the face of the field', merely because this phrase is used in Lev. 14.7.

\textsuperscript{142} Addition. 'and it is clean'.

\textsuperscript{133} \textsuperscript{138}.
carried over to the 'cleansing' ritual for the house. The older exorcising ceremony alone was adapted to the case of a ‘mark’ in a house, and that after the test had been made and the house declared clean. In view of this adaptation it is no longer possible to say whether in the case also of the house, the ritual originally represented the means of exorcising the disease, and was subsequently connected with a symbolical ceremony of formally declaring the house clean. The lateness of this transferred ritual suggests that in the mind of the one who so transferred it, the ritual was regarded merely as ‘dismissal’ ceremony.

The subscript, verses 54-57, is particularly elaborate. As already pointed out, we may regard the second half of verse 57, ‘This is the law of the sara'at’--as the closing formula of the original sara'at legislation. If this be so, it will be the simplest solution of the problem to divide the remaining verses into a series of originally independent subscripts that have been here repeated and united. In this way verse 54, 'This is the law for every nega' sara'at, and for the netek, would be the subscript for Lev. 13. 1-17 and 29-57; [This is the law for the sara'at] 'of the garment' (ver. 55 a) for Lev. 13. 7-58; [This is the law for the sara'at] of the house' (ver. 55b) for Lev. 14. 33-53, while verse 56, 'for the swelling, growth, and shining spot' (taken from Lev. 13. 2), represents an amplification to verse 54-and is, therefore, a comment or note which has gotten a little out of place. Of special interest is verse 57a, 'to teach [i.e. to set forth the law] for the day of (pronouncing) unclean and for the day of (pronouncing) clean', which again is obviously a 'Gemara' to explain that the Torah includes the diagnosis and the decision-whether unclean or clean. The subscript through the
repetition and the union of five subscripts: (I) all kinds of nega’ sara’at [i.e. the swelling, growth, and shining, pot]; (a) netek; (3) garment; (4) house; and (5) that of the original legislation, thus aims to unite the two chapters that we have analysed into one Torah—viewed under the aspect of sara’at, but we have seen that this term, representing everywhere outside of the original sara’at legislation an addition, is used in the generic sense of any unclean spot or mark on a human body, or on a garment, or on a stuff, or on a house. We must therefore, exclude the nine sections superimposed upon the original legislation from consideration in any attempt to determine what the sara’at really and originally meant.

V

It is needless for our purpose to enter into a detailed discussion of the various views regarding sara’at that have been brought forward from a medical point of view. All of these investigations, valuable though they are as medical discussions, suffer from the defect that they assume the unity of Lev. 13 and 14, and particularly of Lev 13. 1-37,

143 It will be observed that there is no subscript for the section on boils burns (Lev. 13. 18-28), or for the one on baldness (Lev. 13. 40-4), which raises the question whether these sections may not have been inserted after the first union of Lev. 13 and 14.

144 It is sufficient to refer to G. N. Blanch, Die Zamath (Lepra) der hebräischen Bibel, Hamburg; 1893 (with full bibliographical references); R. Bennett, The Diseases of the Bible, London 1891, chap. I; Ebstein, Die Medizin im Alten Testament, pp. 75-95; Preuss, Biblisch-Talmudische Medizin, pp. 369-go; and Jay F. Schamberg, The Nature of the Leprosy of the Bible (see note a). Some of these writers, especially Ebstein (l. c., p. 89), recognize that sara’at includes a variety of skin diseases.

145 It was, of course, natural that ancient writers like Philo and the rabbinical authorities in the Talmud, under the ban of the tradition which scribed the entire Pentateuchal legislation to one period and one man,
which portion naturally occupies the most prominent place in medical discussions of sara'at. The above analysis has, however, shown that verses 18-37, deal with boils, burns, and sores, and their symptoms, and that they are pronounced clean or unclean according to tests that are suggested by, and dependent upon those applied to sara'at in the original sara'at legislation, but that otherwise they have nothing to do with sara'at. The application of the term sara'at to these diseases represents a late addition made at a time when sara'at had acquired an entirely general designation, so that it could be applied even to 'bald spots' (Lev. 13. 42). The fact that the diseases mentioned in Lev. 13. 17-37 have their specific designation as 'boils', 'burns', and particularly netek, and that even the symptoms described have technical designations ('scab of boil', 'scab of burn') strengthens the thesis that the application of sara'at to them is of secondary origin; and this is further borne out by the substitution of nega' for sara'at, to which attention has been directed.

In Lev. 13. 1-17 the 'growth' (ספַּחַת sappahat) has its specific name, namely mispahat (מִסָּחַת vers. 6-8), which if it spreads does not become sara'at, but makes one unclean. In the case of mispahat it is particularly clear that the application of sara'at has no medical significance or justification--the point involved being to determine whether it is a 'clean' or an 'unclean' variety of disease. The addition at the close of ver. 8 'it is sara'at', can only have the force of a convention--a non-medical identification, should have started from this point of view, which led Philo (de Posteritate Cain', I, §13) to define sara'at as a 'multiform and complicated disease', and the Rabbis in the Talmudical Treatise Nega'im to go to even greater lengths in the application of a term that must once have had a very specific meaning.
and at the very most can be taken to mean that the 'unclean' *mispahat* is to be put on the same plane as *sara‘at*. In a medical discussion, therefore it is erroneous to start from an identification of the two, or to regard *mispahat* as a variety of *sara‘at*. This view of *sappahat* carries with it *baheret* (shining mark), which is treated merely as a symptom, and therefore introduced with *sappahat* (ver. 4), with boils (ver. 19), and with burns (vers. 24, 28), and with *bohak* (ver. 39). On the other hand, 'the white swelling' implied in ver. 2, and treated in ver. 10—a part of the original *sara‘at* legislation—belongs to the symptoms of *sara‘at*, and apparently is the means, or one of the means, of distinguishing between ordinary *sara‘at*, which may be healed, and chronic *sara‘at*, which is pronounced unclean even without the test of an isolation for purposes of observation (ver. 11).

In verses 38-9 the description of a specific disease *bohak* (tetter) is given as a caution against regarding numerous white spots on the skin as 'unclean'. The term *sara‘at* is not even introduced here—the verdict being 'clean'—while in verses 40-43, dealing with two forms of baldness, the occurrence of 'white swelling', alone suggests a comparison with the diagnosis of *sara‘at*. While, no doubt, this section is secondary to the original *sara‘at* legislation, the possibility that the symptom here described may belong to *sara‘at* in the original sense must be admitted. The peculiar usage, 'like the appearance of a *sara‘at* of the skin of the flesh' (Lev. 13-43), shows, at all events, the intention of the author to add this symptom under the head of the genuine *sara‘at*. Even though not belonging to the original *sara‘at* legislation, verse 43 must be considered in a discussion of the original force of *sara‘at*. 
We may, of course, dismiss without a further word the application of *sara'at* to garments, stuffs, and houses—which if taken seriously would lead to medical conclusions of an absurd character. Even those who wish to save the original integrity of Lev.13 and 14 will hardly go so far as to assume that the legislator had in mind the modern 'germ' theory, according to which a disease can be carried to a person through clothes or through the walls of a house. Such germs—difficult often for modern medical science to determine—are not so considerate as to manifest themselves in big patches. The non-scientific application of the name of a disease to which man is subject to an inanimate object shows conclusively that *sara'at* is not used in its specific and original sense.

Excluding, therefore, *mispahat*, as well as 'boils', 'burns', *netek* (open sore), *bohak* (tetter), and, of course, mere baldness and marks on garments and stuffs and houses, what then is *sara'at*?

Thrown back upon the original *sara'at* legislation, the answer, from a symptomatic point of view, is quite simple. It is a skin disease, which appears in a milder and curable form and in a severer chronic form—or what was considered at the time as chronic. In its milder form the symptoms are a spot (or a mark) with a tendency to spread, appearing deeper than the skin, and changing the hair at the spot to white; the other as the chronic form is marked by the 'swelling' character of the spot, i. e. the inflammation produces a spot in 'high-relief' against 'bas-relief'. Besides, there is also the symptom of the hair at the spot turning white, and the appearance of raw flesh in the

\[146\] Note, however, the 'Gemara' (ver. 12) that if it spreads over the whole body it is merely a 'rash', and, therefore, 'clean'.


swelling. From a modern medical point of view, these symptoms must appear somewhat naive and decidedly insufficient. It is not surprising that students of medicine should disagree as to the precise disease indicated, and that the perfectly relevant question should have been raised whether sara’at ever indicated any specific disease.

That sara’at was never intended as a designation of leprosy or elephantiasis Graecorum\textsuperscript{147} is now so generally admitted as to require no further discussion. Indeed, there is no proof that the disease was known in Palestine in early days any more than in Egypt or in other parts of the near Orient.\textsuperscript{148} The consistent Greek rendering of sara’at as lepra--followed by the Vulgate--is a most valuable tradition, carrying us back to at least the second century B.C., for the current view of sara’at, just as a misunderstanding of lepra is responsible for the opinion still popularly current that the disease described as sara’at is leprosy. The manner in which the confusion between lepra and ‘leprosy’ arose is fully set forth by Bennett and others.\textsuperscript{149} In Greek medical usage lepra designates ‘a cutaneous disease varying in its features, but the essential characteristic of which is a rough, scabrous or scaly eruption on the skin, with more or less evidence of surrounding redness or superficial inflammation’.\textsuperscript{150} Three varieties of lepra are distinguished by Greek writers, and it is therefore reasonable to suppose

\textsuperscript{147} See, especially, Munch’s exhaustive discussion of the point, chaps. I and III-VI, and Bennett’s Diseases of the Bible, pp., 40ff.

\textsuperscript{148} So, e. g., Munch’s conclusion, p. 145. If it had been known, it would certainly have been enumerated among the diseases threatened as ‘curses’ in Deut. 28, where it is noticeable that sara’at is not mentioned, whereas the 'boils' of Egypt (sehin) (ver. 27) are included.

\textsuperscript{149} See Bennett, pp. 16-19; Munch, pp. 88.

\textsuperscript{150} Bennett, p. 19.
that several varieties also existed in Palestine. Curiously enough—if the above analysis is correct—there would be also three varieties in Lev. 13, 1-17; (1) the 'bas-relief' sara‘at; (2) the 'high-relief' sara‘at; and (3) the misphahat, which latter certainly stands in a close relation to the first and second. In any case sara‘at, is definitely narrowed down to this portion of the chapter—'boils', ‘burns’, netek, bohak, &c., being entirely excluded. Too much stress must not be laid upon this quite unexpected result that Lev. 13. 1-17 should contain three varieties of sara‘at, for the agreement with the three varieties recognized by Greek medical writers may be a pure coincidence, and would have a value only in case the diagnosis of the three varieties would be identical among Greeks and Hebrews.151 This does not appear to be the case. The essential characteristic of lepra seems to be, according to the testimony of Greek and Latin medical writers,152 scabrous or scaly eruptions on the

151 This suggestion that three varieties of lepra are described, corresponding to the three varieties of vitiligo as set up by Celsus, was made long ago (see Bennett, pp. 31-3) by Drs. Mason, Good, and Belcher, but their identifications are very arbitrary, and rest upon the erroneous supposition that all diseases enumerated in Lev. 13 come under sara‘at. Moreover, the fact that the same three designations (alphos, melas, and leuki) are described as varieties of vitiligo by Celsus (de Medicina, V, 27.19), whereas writers apply the three terms to varieties of lepra (psoriasis), or to diseases allied to lepra, points to a further confusion in early medical nomenclature, which an additional warning against drawing definite conclusions from the vague and unscientific diagnosis in Lev. 13.

152 See the passages from Hippocrates gathered by Munch, Die Zaraath (Lepra) der Bibel, pp. 3-4. Since Hippocrates used the plural form, leprai (cf. 'certain leprai', V, 98, § 17, ed. Littre) it is evident that he recognized several varieties, but it is to be noted that he nowhere enumerates three varieties, alphos, niclas, and leuke. In fact, melas is not mentioned by him at all, whereas alphos (also used in the plural as well as in the singular) occurs by the side of lepra, but distinct from it (lepra, leichenes, and alphoi, V, 701, § 502; lepra and alphos, V, p. 179; IX, 105. § 20, &c.), and the same
skin as the name *lepra*, which means 'rough' or 'scaly', indicates. The three varieties, *alphos, melas, leuke* are distinguished from one another by the colour of the eruption, which in the case of *alphos* is white, in the case of *melas* black and shadowy, and in the case of *leuke* whiter than the *alphos* variety. Moreover, only in the case of the *leuki*, is there in Celsus a specific mention of white hairs in connexion with the eruption. The *leuke* penetrates more deeply into the skin than the *alphos* and *melas*, which agree—except in the matter of the colour—'in being roughish and not confluent, looking as though scattered in drops with wide interspaces between the drops'.

By general consent, the *lepra* of the Greeks is identified with *psoriasis*, or at all events, the different varieties of *lepra* are classed under the head of *psoriasis*. The important stress which is laid upon the hair turning white in Lev. 13, suggests that the only form of *lepra* which the original *sara'at* legislators had in mind was the *leuke* variety, and the description given in verse 3 of the appearance of the mark 'deeper than the skin' might accord also with the express mention in the case of *leuke* that the eruption penetrates more deeply into the skin. It is noticeable also that the *leuke* variety is the only one of the three which has a serious import, and was on the whole not regarded as curable, whereas the *alphos* and *melas* are cured without great difficulty. The objection, however, against the identification of *sara'at* in Lev. 13. 3 with *leuke* is that no

is the case with *leuke* (*leichenes, leprai*, and *leukai* (plural); IX, p. 75, § 43). There is, in fact, no passage where even *lepra, leuke*, and *alphos* occur together, showing that each was regarded as a distinct disease by Hippocrates, and that in the case of each, as the, use of the plural form shows; several varieties were recognized.

153 Bennett, as above note 149.
reference is made to the rough or scaly symptom of the eruption. Such a reference may, however, be recognized in the second variety of sara’at (ver. 10) where the eruption is in 'high relief'. The 'white swelling' would be a close approach to leuke, and the 'raw flesh', added as another symptom, might well be a further description of a 'rough' eruption. The description of leuke that it 'penetrates more deeply' would, therefore, not represent the equivalent to being 'deeper than the skin', and this is perhaps natural, since in the case of lepra the eruptions are rough and scaly in all three varieties. The omission, therefore, of 'deeper than the skin', in ver. 10, adds strength to the view, here set forth, that se’et (ןְָּבָּי) refers to a 'high relief' or a 'rough’ eruption—'raising' the skin as it were. The absence of any reference to a 'rough eruption,' in the case of the first variety of sara’at, and the emphasis upon its being on the contrary, 'deeper than the skin', suggests an identification with the skin disease vitiligo, which—common in tropical countries—is characterized by bright white spots, the hairs of which lose their colour and become white'.

154 In the description of this first variety of sara’at the stress is laid upon the hair at the spot turning 'white', and the expression 'deeper than the skin’ would be a natural way of describing a spot that seems to be in the skin, in contrast to an eruption that appears, over the skin. The addition represented by verse 4, where the phrase 'shining white' spot is introduced; suggests, by implication, that in verse 3, the nega’ is white and shining, since the point in verse 4 is that the spot is not clearly defined as in the skin, i.e. too faint as yet to be recognized as such,

and that the hair has not turned white. The conclusion thus reached, and which is here submitted to students of medicine, is that the Biblical sara'at in the original form of the sara'at Torah consists of two varieties, and that these two varieties represent a confusion of two distinct skin diseases: the first variety, regarded as less serious, while rendering the victim for the time being 'unclean', is vitiligo; the second variety, characterized as chronic sara'at (Lev. 13. 11), is the leuke: or the most serious variety of lepra or psoriasis. Verses 6-8, forming a later addition, would represent a further attempt to differentiate the leuke from other varieties, and the emphasis laid upon its 'being faint', in verse 6, naturally suggests a description of alphos, which case, the white colour of the eruption is not as pronounced. Lastly, verses 12-13 representing again other addition for purposes of further differentiation, and describing marks which spread over the whole body, 'turning it all white', as the gloss in verse 13 explains, would represent a form of vitiligo in which the disease spreads until large areas of the body are involved, and even the entire body. Cases are on record of negroes affected by this disease turning entirely white. The affection is an entirely harmless one, and in accord with this we find the verdict in Lev. 13. 14, 'he is clean'.

To sum up, then we have two forms of genuine sara'at in the original sara'at legislation; one, the milder form, being a form of vitiligo, the other, the chronic form; being leuke. In the later additions to the original sara'at section,

155 Vera. 6-8 representing an addition to the original sara'at legislation; naturally no special reference is made to the spot being a a rising eruption or a mark that appears on the skin.
156 Schamberg, l. c.
we have (a) a form of *alphos* apparently described, which if it spreads is pronounced as 'unclean', and (b) a form of *vitiligo*, in which the whole flesh turns white, and which is pronounced 'clean'. In the balance of the chapter, Lev. 13, as well as in the additions to Lev. 14, represented by verses 33-47, the use of *sara'at* is erroneous, or rather represents the later use of the term as a generic one-synonymous with *nega*', ‘mark’--to designate any kind of a spot, whether on any part of the human body, or on a garment, on a stuff, or on the walls of a house, which is regarded as ‘unclean’. So far as 'marks' on a human being are concerned, Lev. 13. 18-43 includes boils and burns, open sores on the head or beard, baldness in various stages, and 'faint white spots' that form merely a tetter (*bohak*). Boils and burns that leave ‘eruptions’ (*se'et*), white or shining, or reddish, showing symptoms of the second variety of *sara'at*, i. e. *leuke*, are unclean, whereas the mere scabs from boils or burns are clean. The sore (*netek*) which shows the symptoms of the first variety of *sara'at* (*lepra alphos*)--marks appearing to be in the skin and the hair turning yellowish--is unclean. Baldness and a mere tetter (*bokah*) finally are clean, but the appearance of an 'eruption' (*se'et*) on the bald spot raises the suspicion, according to what is probably a very late addition to the texts (ver. 42), of its being *sara'at*, presumably of the second variety.

The oldest ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8a, which in its original form, as has been shown, was a method of exorcising *sara'at*, when it became a purification ritual performed at the time of healing, could have been applied only to the curable variety of *sara'at*--i. e. to *vitiligo*, and, if we include the later addition to the legislation, also to *alphos*. 


It was then naturally extended to all the other skin troubles mentioned in Lev. 13, which made the victim unclean until he was healed. On the other hand, the law of being excluded from human society, warning the people of one's approach by calling 'unclean', keeping one's mouth covered, allowing one's hair to grow long, not changing one's clothes--while applicable to all during the period of their being 'unclean' must have been devised originally for those who suffered from the 'chronic' and incurable variety of lepra, i.e. leuke. For those suffering from vitiligo, isolation outside of the camp until the demon had been exorcised, i.e. until the healing had taken place, was presumably all that was required.

We are now in a better position to consider the other passages in the Old Testament where sara'at is mentioned. In accord with the original sara'at legislation, the one so afflicted (Num. 5. 2, sara'at) is to be removed from the camp, but the fact that he is mentioned together with one having a 'running' sore (2159--also discussed in Lev. 15) indicates, not only that Num. 5 assumes the existence of Lev. 13-15, but also that the one who suffers from sara'at is not necessarily a chronic or even a very serious sufferer. Deut. 24.8 also assumes more or less detailed regulations regarding the sara'at, and since verses 8 and 9 interrupt the order of subjects in this chapter, it may be safely assumed that we here have later insertions. Verse 9 is a reference to the punishment of Miriam with sara'at, which is described Num. 12. 10-13. If the phrase (ver. 10b) 'and Miriam was stricken with sara'at like snow' belongs

157 Num. 12. 14-16 is a reference to Lev. 13. 4, though another disease, which seems; to be 'jaundice', is indicated in ver. 14 a that is not mentioned in any of the codes.
to the original text, then we could say with reasonable certainty that the sara'at in this case was of the first and milder variety—a form of vitiligo; but the words stricken with sara'at like snow" (םצרות חשל) seem to be quoted from Exod. 4. 6, and are therefore in all probability a gloss to the latter part of Num. 12. 10, 'And Aaron turned to Miriam and behold she was stricken with sara'at'. To this a commentator added as an explanation the case of Exod. 4. 6, where the hand of Moses is described as becoming 'white as snow' (מצלות חשלה), and then is instantly restored to its normal condition—as one of the signs to be used by him in case he should meet with unbelief in his mission upon reaching Egypt. The reference to 'snow' in the case of Gehazi, the attendant of Elisha (2 Kings 5. 27) would seem to show that vitiligo was intended in this case which would, therefore, apply also to Naaman' (2 Kings 6. 2), since it is the latter's disease which is transferred as a punishment for greed to Gehazi and his offspring (ver. 27). We may perhaps assume this also to be the case in 2 Kings 7. 3, though the text is vague in its tone. On the other hand, King Azariah (or Uzziah, as he is called in 2 Chron. 26) appears to have been smitten with the second and chronic variety of sara'at, i. e. leuke, for he remains afflicted till his death, and is obliged to dwell in a separate house (2 Kings 15. 5; 2 Chron. 26. 21).158

There is, of course, not the slightest reason for assuming that Job's sickness, or the one with which Hezekiah is smitten, represented any form of sara'at, and much less leprosy. In both cases the disease is specified as 'boils'

158 So special importance needs to be attached to the statement in Chron. 26. 19, 20 that the sara'at 'broke out on his forehead'.

Just as in the case in one of the plagues of Egypt (Exod. 9. 10), where moreover the technical term *aba'bu'ot* (an Egyptian word?) is added. Indeed, it is noticeable in the large list of diseases which are threatened as a curse (Deut. 28) in case of a disobedience to the laws, that *sara'at* is not mentioned, whereas 'boils'--specified as 'Egyptian boils'--are included (ver. 27) with others that are expressly declared to be 'incurable'; a valuable indication that *sara'at* after all was not counted among the most serious diseases, and that the special legislation is rather a reflex of the common occurrence of the disease in its two (or possibly more) varieties, which made it necessary to make provisions for those so stricken, and who were regarded as unclean merely because every real disease--due to demoniac possession--made the victim unclean. An affliction that was 'clean' was not really a disease, according to medical science in this primitive stage of empirical knowledge.

A question that should at least be touched upon at the close of this analysis is the one raised by Eerdmans's recent investigation of the entire book of Leviticus as to the age of the legislation in Lev. 13-14. With Eerdmans's general thesis that Leviticus, as in fact the whole of the

\[159\] The case of Job and Hezekiah are, therefore, exceptional, and are portrayed as miraculous through Divine intervention.

\[160\] *Alttestamenliche Studien*, IV, 'Das Buch Leviticus' (Giessen, 1912). See especially pp. 68-73. The grounds on which Wiener, *Origin of the Pentateuch*, p. 76, assumes an early origin for Lev. 13 and 14 do not seem to me to be of any value. In many points, especially when he pleads for the early character of many of the laws, Wiener is right, but he is not as 'original' as he thinks he is in his opposition to the critical school, and his method of argumentation, even where his conclusions are correct, is most defective, and sometimes unfair. I shall take up Wiener's contentions at some future time.
THE SO-CALLED 'LEPROSY' LAWS--JASTROW

legislation in the Priestly Code, contains pre-exilic elements, I am in full accord. The analysis of Lev. 13-14, as set forth in this article, lends further support to Eerdmans's thesis, which as a matter of fact, has been held even by those who claimed post-exilic dates for the final form of the Priestly Code. It is evident that a purification ritual such as Lev. 14. 1-8a, which contains distinct traces of having once been a method of exorcising a disease, must revert to a very ancient period; and even as a purification ritual it belongs to a time anterior to the period when a sacrifice of some kind was regarded as essential to a removal of 'uncleanness'. Indeed, the whole conception of disease as a state of 'uncleanness' belongs to the time when disease was supposed to be due to some 'unclean' demon that had found its way into one's body; and the 'uncleanness' at this stage of thought has nothing to do with hygienic impurity, as little as the demon theory of disease has anything to do with the modern germ theory of disease, albeit the former seems to suggest the latter. The references to the 'camp' and 'tent' in Lev. 14 also point to early social stages, and there is no reason to assume that these terms are introduced into a late legislation with a view of giving the impression that they are old, or in other words, as a deliberate invention to uphold a tradition of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuchal legislation. If such had been the deliberate intent of the compilers they would not have committed the inconsistency of introducing the word 'city' in the same chapter (Lev. 14. 40, 41, 45). The naive and non-scientific manner of describing the two varieties of sara'at and the almost total absence of technical terms in the original sara'at legislation, with merely feeble attempts to differentiate two totally different
diseases, are further indications that point to an early, certainly to a pre-exilic origin, for the beginnings of the \textit{sara'at} legislation. Even the additions in Lev. 13. 1-43 may in large part belong to the pre-exilic period. This appears to be certainly the case with the additions to the first part of the chapter, Lev. 13. 1-18, with the possible exception of some glosses and of the general use of \textit{sara'at} for any unclean ‘spot’ on the skin, which I believe to be of comparatively late origin, while the supplementary sections, Lev. 13. 47-58, concerning spots on garments, &c., and certainly the still later section on spots on walls of houses, Lev. 14. 33-48, may, with great probability, be put down as, post-exilic. This applies also to the ritualistic sections prescribing the sacrifice of animals as an integral part of the purification ceremonial, Lev. 14. 10-20, as well as to Lev. 14- 21-31, which is of the same character though possibly embodying, as above suggested,\textsuperscript{161} traces of an earlier and simpler sacrificial ritual. Naturally, the purification ritual attached to Lev. 14. 33-48 ('spots' on walls of houses), though taken over from the old and certainly pre-exilic ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8a, forming, part of the original \textit{sara'at} legislation, represents an addition that cannot be earlier than the section, Lev. 14. 33-48, itself.

As for the chronological sequence of the numerous sections superimposed upon the original \textit{sara'at} legislation, it seems safe to regard Lev. 14. 33-47, and the attached ritual, verses 48-53, as the latest additions made after the insertion of the sections in Lev. 13, i.e. verses 18-44, between the diagnosis of the two forms of \textit{sara'at} and the purification ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8a; otherwise, the section of \textit{sara'at} marks on walls of houses would have found a place

\textsuperscript{161} See above, p. 379f.
before or after the section, Lev. 13. 47-58, treating of marks on garments, &c. The absence of any ritual for the purification of marks on garments and stuffs would indicate an earlier date than the elaborate ritual, Lev. 14. 10-20, added to the second ritual, Lev. 14.8b-9, and superimposed upon the first ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8a. This, of course, carries with it the later date for the ‘substitute’ sacrifice, Lev. 14. 21-31, though, as indicated, this may embody a simpler and, therefore, earlier ‘sacrificial’ ritual than the more complicated one. The order, therefore, would be (i) Lev.13. 47-58; (2) Lev. 14. 21-31; (3) Lev. 14. 10-20; (4) Lev. 14. 33-53. As for the remaining sections, the insertions in Lev. 13. 1-17 represent the earliest attempts at elaborating the original sara'at legislation, while the five sections in Lev. 13. 18-44 may very well have been added in chronological sequence in the order in which the sections are now arranged. It is not, of course, possible to go further and specify any definite period at which the one or the other of these nine sections was added, beyond the general impression one receives from the larger use of technical terms (such as netek, bohak, &c.) and the more detailed diagnosis in the case of ‘boils’ and ‘burns’, that the sections belong to a considerably advanced period of medical observation and are, therefore, presumably post-exilic. This would carry with it the four sections: (1) Lev. 13. 47-58; (2) Lev.14. 21-31; (3) Lev. 14. 30-20; (4) Lev. 14. 33-53--all certainly later than the five sections--and the post-exilic character of which is suggested by internal evidence. I venture, therefore, to claim as pre-exilic not only the original sara'at legislation and the original purification rituals, Lev. 14. 1-8c and 8b-9, but also the elaborated section, Lev. 13. 1-17, in which the additions are dovetailed into the original sara'at portions.
Eerdmans, to be sure, would go much further and place the entire two chapters in the pre-exilic period, but his argumentation is not convincing because he underestimates the complicated character of the composition of Lev. 13-14. The fact, e. g., that the style and language of the section on marks in garments, &c. (Lev. 13. 47-59), agree with Lev. 13. 1-46 is due to direct imitation precludes its use as an argument for the unity of Lev. 13; and in the same way, Lev. 14. 33-53 ('marks' on walls of houses) imitates Lev. 13, and intentionally introduces so far as possible the same terms. Even if my analysis of Lev. 13-14 should not prove to be correct in all details, I feel safe in saying that the existence of an original sara'at legislation consisting of Lev. 13, 2-3; 9-11 (with some additions), 45-6, and followed immediately by a 'purification' or 'dismissal' ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8 a, has been definitely demonstrated. No less significant is the fact that this has been proved of the distinction between a ritual performed outside of a sanctuary and one that is to be performed at an altar. This points not only to a very early age for the original sara'at legislation, but also to a considerable interval, of time between the age of the two rituals. Moreover, the 'sacrificial' ritual is based on a totally different point of view. The fact that provision is made for carrying out the later sacrificial ritual in Jerusalem only, without regard to occurrences of sara'at in other parts of the country, is due, of course, to the theoretical basis of the Priestly Code that there is only one legislative centre at which sacrifice can be brought. Instead of concluding, as Eerdmans does, that the legislation originated in pre-exilic days in sole connexion with the sanctuary at Jerusalem, because a post-

162 l.c., pp. 38-73.  
163 See above, p. 375.
exilic legislation would necessarily have regard to Jewish settlements outside of the capital, the more obvious deduction would be that the Priestly Code is to a large extent an 'ideal' compilation made with the express purpose of adapting the older and younger practices to a theoretical centre. That animal sacrifices were brought in pre-exilic days, and at a very early period must, of course, be admitted, and the emphasis on the 'tent of meeting' in the ritual of Lev. 14. 10-31 may be taken as an indication that the basis of the ritual is pre-exilic; but the frequent substitution of 'before Jahweh' in the section would have no meaning unless one assumed that it represents the endeavour again to apply older practices--considerably elaborated and transferred to Jahweh's one and only legitimate sanctuary at Jerusalem; so that we are once more brought face to face with the distinctly post-exilic ideal that underlies the legislation of the Priestly Code in its present form. It is characteristic of the gradual growth of legislation to retain in a conservative spirit the language and the form of earlier legislation, even when inconsistent with later conditions. Just as laws are never actually abrogated in ancient codes, but carried along with modifications that at times totally change the character of ancient statutes even 'to the point of virtually abrogating them' so formulas are carried over and given a new interpretation through glosses or explanatory comments. The substitution of 'before Jahweh'

164 A good case in point is the legislation regarding slants, in the so-called Book of the Covenant. Exod. 21. 1-6, which theoretically recognizes slavery, but changes it practically to an indenture of six years. The old law remains, but it is so modified as to receive an entirely different character. In the same way it is theoretically assumed (vers. 8-11) that the old law allowing a man to sell his daughter as a 'handmaid' remains in force, but it is practically abrogated by conditions that chance its nature.
for ‘tent of meeting’, together with the frequent addition of the one phrase to the other is, therefore, an illustration of the way in which the old is carried over and combined with the new. It is impossible at this point to enter into further detached criticism of Eerdmans's position, but enough has been brought forward, I think, to make it clear that, while he has shown more satisfactorily than his predecessors how much in the Pentateuchal legislation is old, his main contention that the critical theory associated chiefly with the names of Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen\(^{165}\) must be set aside because based on erroneous assumptions, is not acceptable, partly because he has not carried the analysis of the Pentateuchal laws far enough, and, therefore, under-estimates their complicated character, and partly because he draws untenable conclusions from the material itself even as he has set it forth. The critical theory is of course subject to modification through further researches, but its basis rests on too firm foundations to be seriously menaced by the recent attacks made upon it.

\(^{165}\) See Eerdmans's Introduction to *Alttestamentliche Forschungen*, I.
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The Levitical Dietary Laws
in the Light
of Modern Science

Thomas D. S. Key and Robert M. Allen

Leviticus 11 presents dietary laws, specifying which animals are "clean" (edible) and "unclean" (inedible). Nine major theories to account for these dietary laws are described in this paper, giving arguments pro and con regarding each. The theories discussed are the Obedience Testing, Arbitrary Divine Command, Assertion of Divine Authority, Moral Discipline, Hygiene, Spiritual Symbolism, Pagan Worship, Religious Badge, and Eclectic theories.

The authors conclude that more evidence is needed, especially from archaeology, to come to a definite conclusion regarding the validity of any of these theories. They feel that if the original purpose of these dietary laws can be determined, then perhaps we can make modern applications of lessons from them.

Introduction
One of the most obvious characteristics of orthodox conservative Jews as well as of Moslems and of the Christian groups who emphasize the Old Testament is the influence of the Levitical dietary laws on their eating habits. Yet, when one questions those who adhere to these dietary laws about the reasons for them, he receives a variety of answers.

Leviticus 11 describes "clean" animals (i.e., those which may be eaten) as follows: any animals that "part the hoof, are cloven-footed, and that chew the cud." Also, all aquatic animals that have fins and scales, and winged insects that leap (i.e., locusts, crickets, and grasshoppers) are "clean" or permitted for food.

"Unclean" animals (i.e., those that are forbidden for food) were listed as follows: camel, rock badger, hare, swine, aquatic animals lacking fins and scales, eagle, ossifrages, osprey, kite, falcon, raven, ostrich,
nighthawk, sea gull, hawk, owl, cormorant, ibis, water hen, pelican, vulture, stork, heron, crawling insects, hoopoe, weasel, mouse, great lizard, gecko, land crocodile, bat, lizard, sand lizard, and chameleon.

While the Bible nowhere states specifically why the dietary laws were given, several theories have arisen to account for them. Below are brief descriptions of nine of these theories, along with some arguments for and against their acceptance.

**Obedience Testing Theory**

This view asserts that the choice of animals was arbitrary, but that God's purpose was to evaluate the spirituality of the faithful. The obedience testing theory also considers the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil (Genesis 2) to have been arbitrarily selected, and that it was the act of disobedience that imparted the knowledge of good and evil rather than any physiological effect of the chemicals present in the fruit.

*Pro:* The Scriptures indicate in several places where the faith of people was tested (Job, I Kings 19, Genesis 2 and 3, etc.).

*Con:* The choice of animals does not appear to be arbitrary as the animals classified are consistent in certain ways as discussed below.

**Arbitrary Divine Command Theory**

It seems strange to some that most strict adherents of the Levitical dietary laws accept this theory, though
they may not refer to it by this name. According to this theory, the animals were arbitrarily classified by God as clean or unclean with no specific reason whatever. We are told that to raise questions about the reasons or advantages of these laws is to evade the issue. We are to accept these laws by blind faith. The point is that God commanded, and we are to obey. “God said it. I believe it. And that settles it. Period."

_Pro:_ If God had reasons for the laws, or if it were important for us to know of them, they would have been recorded. But such is not the case. The fact that no reasons are given is evidence that they are unnecessary for us.

_Con:_ It seems inconsistent with a loving, just, omniscient God to be arbitrary, or to command just for the sake of commanding. The fact that the animals hold certain traits in common (shown in some of the following theories) would tend to rule out the concept that they were haphazardly or arbitrarily chosen.

**Assertion of Divine Authority Theory**

The purpose of these laws was to establish God's authority, and to serve as a continual reminder of His authority over and concern for His people, according to this theory. These laws are beneficial in that they tend to establish a habit of thinking frequently about God and His place in our lives.

_Pro:_ The concept of God's establishing His authority and reminding others of it is certainly consistent with many Scripture passages, for example, the requiring of phylacteries, and redeeming each first-born donkey with a lamb (Exodus 13:13-14); the Sabbath (Exodus 20:8-11); the rainbow (Genesis 9:11-17); stars (Genesis 1:14); the mark on Cain (Genesis 4:15); Miriam's leprosy (Numbers 12:10); circumcision (Genesis 17:11); and labor pangs, toil and thorns (Genesis 3:17-19). The fact that no reasons are given means none are needed. Reasons would weaken His authority.

_Con:_ The selection of animals would seem to indicate that there was more to it than this (as indicated in certain of the following theories). It would seem arbitrary and superficial for God to assert His authority in such an unproductive fashion. Would it not be more profitable for God's kingdom and the spiritual welfare of countless people if God required His people
to seek to win others to His ways? If God's purpose for these laws is simply to assert His authority, why would He not make useful laws, such as requiring the faithful to be neighborly?

**Moral Discipline Theory**

According to this concept, the laws were to teach moral discipline, much as it was once believed that mathematics and Latin should be taught to discipline the intellect. For similar reasons some military academies have required certain patterns of eating (i.e., special ways of holding silverware, of sitting erect while eating, etc.) in order to remind cadets constantly of their discipline.

*Pro:* The Bible is consistent with moral disciplinary techniques. The fact that the price of a whore and of a dog (Sodomite) were unclean tends to favor the moral interpretation of these laws. In numerous passages the Hebrews were reminded that they "came up out of the land of Egypt." (Deut. 23:4). These dietary laws would serve as similar daily reminders of their moral discipline. Nazarites were to remain unshaved and to abstain from alcohol for disciplinary reasons (Numbers 6:2-20). Paul beat his body into subjection (I Cor. 9:27). "The rod" is to be used for discipline in certain circumstances (Proverbs 10:13; 22:15; and, 26:3).

*Con:* As with the preceding theories, the particular animals selected to be clean or unclean appear to have enough in common to warrant other explanations than this. To limit what foods may be eaten merely for reasons of moral discipline, and to allow no exceptions, could result in malnutrition, death, or forcing an immoral beaking of the laws in the event of famine, poverty, or other problems.

**Hygiene Theory**

The adherents of this theory point out that there is close correlation between clean animals and those that are less likely to transmit zoonoses (diseases spread from animals to man), and between unclean animals and those that are most likely to transmit worms, bacteria, and other pathogens to man.

*Pro:* Hogs are particularly likely to spread disease, e.g., trichinosis and Ascaris. Buzzards can transmit many of the diseases that kill the animals on which
they feed. Rat meat could give those who eat it trichinosis and other diseases.

On the other hand, while cattle can give us tuberculosis, tapeworms, undulant fever, for example, they are much less likely to give us more serious diseases. Essentially the same can be said for sheep.

Any fish that "looks like a fish" is considered clean, while oysters, clams, and other sea creatures are unclean. It is noteworthy here that true fish as a rule are less likely to be carriers of zoonoses than are other aquatic animals.

Not only does the hygiene theory account for the particular selection of clean and unclean animals, but also accounts for the listing of other unhygienic things as unclean. For example, human wastes were unclean! (Deut. 23:12-14), as well as cooking utensils and other solid objects which were contaminated by people with running sores (Leviticus 13:47 and 14:34-55).

Paul wrote to Timothy that he should not drink water, but should drink wine (I Timothy 5:23). Paul's reason obviously favors the hygiene theory, as water was often polluted by human wastes, carcasses and other bacteria sources.

Con: A much more sensible and practical regulation would be to specify that all animals in sanitary environments are clean, while those that are raised in unsanitary environments are unclean. Or, better still, properly cooked meat is clean, while raw or rare meat is unclean, regardless of the animal from which it comes. If this were the regulation, not only could beef, mutton, and true fishes be eaten without fear of zoonoses, but the same would be true even of pork and other animals listed as unclean. This theory also faces the difficulty that unclean animals were let down from heaven to Peter (Acts 10:9-29 and 11:5-12), and God responded to Peter's refusal to eat with, "What God has cleansed, you must not call unclean." The fact that menstruating women and women who had just given birth were considered unclean (Leviticus 12), showed that the designation of unclean does not necessarily imply a potential source of contagion or infection. The fact that the price of a whore or of a dog (or Sodomite) was un-
clean shows the same. Although there are numerous poisonous plants, none is listed as unclean. And although water could be polluted by carcasses, human wastes, and other contaminants, nothing is discussed regarding clean or unclean water. Even in those days water was a main source of the spreading of disease. Paul's advice to Timothy not to drink water was of course written many centuries after the dietary laws of Leviticus, and under the circumstances of Timothy going on missionary journeys in which water could be polluted.

Some object to the Hygiene Theory on the grounds that little was then known about hygiene, while others insist that these hygiene laws prove divine inspiration. (See also Matthew 15:11).

**Spiritual Symbolism Theory**

It is pointed out by those who favor this theory that the clean animals have in common the fact that they all symbolize spiritual virtues, while the unclean animals symbolize spiritual vices.

**Pro:** It should be emphasized that the Bible is an Oriental book, and that Orientals have long been noted for symbolic and figurative speech. The Bible uses several symbols for Christ: e.g., lamb (John 1:35), lion (Revelation 5:5), root (Revelation 5:5), and grapevine (John 15:1). The Holy Spirit is symbolized by the dove (Luke 3), fire (Hebrews 12), and water (Acts 11:16). God, Satan, Israel, the church, the rebellious wicked, the Gospel, sin, and other persons and concepts are represented by still other symbols, and many of the symbols were animals. Cattle and oxen are clean animals because they represent honest hard work and obedience to duty. Donkeys are unclean as they symbolize stubbornness, spiritual stupidity, and selfishness. Snakes are unclean because they depict Satan and sin (Genesis 3:1-15). Hogs are unclean because they are greedy and look down. The horse is unclean as it symbolizes pride and human military conquest.

**Con:** While the Spiritual Symbolism Theory is intriguing, it has some fatal inconsistencies. The lion is unclean, yet it is used to represent Christ (Revelation 5:5) and the righteous (Proverbs 28:1). The pearl represents the church (Matthew 13:46), yet is produced by unclean clams and oysters. The symbolism in
the Bible is not intended to be consistent and clear-cut as this theory would assume. Thus, while doves illustrate the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:22), they also illustrate wicked Ephraim (Hosea 7:11). The donkey is an unclean animal, yet was chosen by Christ to ride for His "triumphal entry" into Jerusalem (Matthew 21). The serpent was a symbol of Satan, but was also used for salvation (Numbers 21:9). Grapes are clean, but their juice was warned against when it is fermented (Ephesians 5:8 and I Timothy 3:3), and was forbidden to Nazarites under most circumstances (Numbers 6:3-20). The eagle is unclean, yet is used to symbolize God's power (Revelation 4:7). The lion is used to symbolize Christ (Revelation 5:5), Satan (I Peter 5:8), the righteous (Proverbs 28:1), and the rebellious wicked (Joel 1:6).

Pagan Worship Theory

It is noteworthy that the Hebrews spent centuries living among neighbors who worshipped animal-like gods. Part of the worship rites of these religions some-

While the Bible nowhere states specifically why the dietary laws were given, several theories have arisen to account for them. Given here are brief descriptions of nine of these theories, with arguments for and against their acceptance.

times included the eating of these animals. Thus, the sacred animals of these pagan religions were unclean, while animals not sacred to these religions were clean.

Pro: The eagle was sacred to the Egyptians. The snake, hawk, hog, goat, and horse were sacred to other neighboring religions. Sheep, camels, true fish, and most plants were not sacred to the nations and tribes around the Hebrews, and hence were clean. The faithful were to avoid all appearance of evil (I Thessalonians 5:22). They were forbidden to eat food sacrificed to idols (Revelation 2:14, 20). It is interesting that even today Arabs consider eating with someone to be a close form of fellowship.

Con: Several plants were sacred to the pagan religions, but were not unclean (II Kings 23:4). Cattle were sacred to several groups (II Kings 17:16), yet
were clean. There have long been fish gods and sea
gods, yet true fish were clean. In fact, fish deities are
more common than clam, oyster, or shrimp deities, yet
the fish were clean while the latter were not.

**Religious Badge or Mark Theory**

Many peoples have done or worn certain things to
distinguish themselves from others. The uniforms of
certain occupations are partly for this purpose, as are
some greetings, gestures, hairdos, and customs. The
Jews were God's earthly chosen people (Deuteronomy
7:6), chosen to witness for Him.

*Pro:* The Jews were required to do several things
as religious marks or badges to make them stand apart
as witnesses for God: circumcise their boy babies
(Genesis 17:10-27), rest on the Sabbath (Exodus
20:8-11), wear phylacteries on their foreheads (Exo-
dus 13:16) and the like. The dietary laws were a log-
ical extension of these religious badges. The Bible
describes several other marks or badges of spiritual
significance. Paul was blinded on the road to Damascus
to get Paul's attention and to show God's mark of
approval of Christ (Acts 9:3-9). Zechariah was struck
speechless for several days as a mark of God's relation-
ship to Christ's birth (Luke 1:18-23). Moses' sister,
Miriam, was marked with a whitish skin disease to
show God's disapproval of her objecting to Moses'
put a mark on Cain's forehead as a warning that no
one was to seek revenge against him (Genesis 4:13-
15). The Nazarites wore long hair and beards and ate
a strict diet (Numbers 6:1-21).

*Con:* The selection of clean and unclean animals
does not appear to be haphazard, but to fit certain
patterns (as discussed in some of the foregoing
theories). To prohibit certain wholesome foods merely
as religious badges could result in malnutrition or death
during famines. It could severely handicap the poor or
physically disabled. It could result in financial exploi-
tation and monopolies of the few clean species. It could result in upsetting the balance of nature due to extermination of some species and the ignoring of others. A more practical badge would appear to be some kind of ritual associated with food preparation or eating.

**Eclectic Theory**

Some Bible students prefer to combine parts of two or more of the above theories to account for the reasons behind the dietary laws. Actually, there are many variations of the eclectic theory. They obviously differ on which of the above explanations are regarded as valid, and to what extent the accepted explanations are considered to account for each animal.

**Pro:** The fact that the Bible does not indicate any one reason might be due to the fact that several explanations are necessary. The fact that several of the preceding theories appear to be partially valid, yet no one of them is capable of accounting for each animal indicates that some eclectic explanation is necessarily the correct one.

**Con:** It is difficult to evaluate the eclectic theory as its variations are so numerous. Yet, the con arguments for each of the preceding theories are sufficient to show that none is valid as understood at present. If all the links in a chain are weak, simply adding more links will not make it stronger. Adding more straw to a straw house does not make it more fireproof. Likewise, simply adding useless theories together does not make a valid explanation.

**Conclusions**

In the light of the above the authors conclude that present evidence is not sufficient to warrant total acceptance of anyone of the nine theories. More evidence is needed, especially from possible future archaeological discoveries. In the meantime, it would appear that, in the light of the different kinds of dietary and other "hygiene" laws given, that some eclectic interpretation is probably correct.

It should be noted that many Christians feel that it is no longer necessary to obey the Levitical dietary laws as the Old Testament Law was our "schoolmaster" to bring us to Christ (Galatians 3:24-25). Their interest in them is primarily historical. Yet if we are
able to determine the original purpose of the laws, perhaps we can make modern applications of lessons from them. For this reason it is recommended that further study be made on this subject.
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1 A tenth important theory was inadvertently omitted: the Social Mores Theory. It argues that all societies have certain customs and taboos, and that the dietary laws are no more than this.
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THE ANOINTING OF AARON: A STUDY OF LEVITICUS 8:12 IN ITS OT AND ANE CONTEXT

GERALD KLINGBEIL
Peruvian Union University
Lima, Peru

Introduction

Lev 8:12 forms an integral part of the ritual of ordination of Aaron and his sons and the consecration of the Tabernacle and is shaped after the commandment section found in Exod 29, dealing with the technical and procedural aspects of the ordination and consecration ritual. This study first

1The present article is a revision of one originally published as 'La uncion de Aaron. Un estudio de Lev 8:12 en su contexto veterotestamentario y antiguo cercano-oriental,' Theologika 11/1 (1996): 64-83. (Theologika is a biennial theological journal of Universidad Peruana Union, Lima, Peru.) The study is partly based on research undertaken for the author's D .Litt. thesis at the University of Stellenbosch. See G. A. Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual: On the Symbolism of Time, Space, and Actions in Leviticus 8," (D. Litt. diss. University of Stellenbosch, 1995). A revised version of the dissertation has been published in 1998 by Edwin Mellen Press under the title A Comparative Study of the Ritual of Ordination as Found in Leviticus 8 and Emar 369. The financial assistance of the South African Center for Science Development toward this research is hereby acknowledged. Furthermore, the author would like to thank the University of Stellenbosch for awarding him the Stellenbosch 2000 bursary, which constituted a substantial help in the financing of the doctoral studies.

2This study will concentrate upon Lev 8:12, which describes the anointing of Aaron only. Verse 30 of the same chapter includes a short note as to the anointing "with blood and oil" of Aaron and his sons. In a recent article, D. Fleming suggested that the existence of two anointing rites in the ordination ritual (8:12 describing the anointing of Aaron and 8:30 describing the anointing of him and his sons) indicates the existence of two distinctive customs. However, it could also be argued that the division indicates two different ritual states of the participants ("More Help from Syria: Introducing Emar to Biblical Studies," BA 58/3 [1995]: 143-144).

3Concerning the relationship between Exod 29 and Lev 8 one can find three main viewpoints in the literature: (1) Lev 8 is the older document and therefore Exod 29 is dependent on Lev 8. See B. A. Levine, "The Descriptive Ritual Texts of the Pentateuch," JAOS 85 (1965): 311-312; K. Elliger, Leviticus, HAT 4 (Tübingen:J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966), 107ff.; and M. Noth, Das dritte Buch Mose: Leviticus, 4th ed., Am 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1978),56. (2) There exists an intricate interrelationship between Exod 29 and Lev 8 suggesting some kind of literary dependence, but-in line with modern communication theory-there is no benefit in separating "earlier" and "later" sources. This mediating position is held by H. Utzschneider, Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz: Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Exod 25-40; Lev 8-9), OBO 77 (Fribourg: Universit:itsverlag, 1988), 37; and J. E. Hartley, who assume that both Exod 29 and Lev 8 were dependent on an
investigates the meaning of the anointing rite in its context of the ordination ritual. Then follows an analysis of a new text from Emar describing an ordination ritual of the high priestess of IM (the god IM) with special regard to the anointing rites encountered in this text. Finally, a comparative section will deal with similarities and dissimilarities between the rites and the relevance of this comparison in the broader context of Pentateuchal studies.

The Anointing of Aaron in Lev 8:12

One can detect a similarity regarding the involved actions (of anointing) in the structures of Lev 8:10-11 and 8:12, although the objects and persons involved are dissimilar. Three different consecutive actions are encountered in Lev 8:10 that could be understood in terms of a staircase structure based upon content rather than literary structure. The verbs include הָעַל ("and he took"), הָעַל ("and he anointed"), and שָׂרֵא ("and he consecrated"). All these actions have Moses as their subject and the Tent of Meeting and its utensils as their object. The first action constitutes the moving of the object that effects the final action of 8:10 (namely the consecration), while the center action ("and he anointed") describes the way and means the final action is achieved, i.e., anointing results in consecration. Therefore it appears that הָעַל (take) would function like הָעַל ("put") in the clothing act, initiating, the intended action.

ancient Vorlage containing the ordination ritual (Leviticus, WBC 4 [Waco, TX: Word, 1992], 109-110). (3) Exod 29 is the older document and thus Lev 8 is dependent upon Exod 29. Representatives of this position include J. Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991); idem, "The Consecration of the Priests. A Literary Comparison of Leviticus 8 and Exodus 29," in Ernten was man sat. Festschrift fur Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, ed. D. R. Daniels (Neukirchen-Vlyen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 273-286; and G. J. Wenham, The Book of Leviticus, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 131ff. The contextual and comparative evidence (i.e., the usage of prescriptive and subsequently descriptive texts in the ANE as found in the Samsu-Iluna B inscription; see Milgrom, Leviticus, 553) adduced by Milgrom seems to favor this interpretation. Thus as the point of departure for this study the dependence of Lev 8 on Exod 29 is assumed.

4 For the bibliography of the text and commentaries on the text see below.


6 This has also been suggested by H. Seebass, who has observed the fact that about three-fourths of the occurrences appear in sacrificial descriptions (or prescriptions) and in the narrative literature of the OT. He writes: "Vielmehr deutet der uberaus haufige Gebrauch des Verbs in Vorbereitung eines weiteren, den eigentlich intendierten Akt darstellenden . . . auf einen Sinn,
It is interesting to note that Lev 8:10-12 (and also elsewhere)\(^7\) includes the anointing of both objects and persons. Ritual space plays an important role, since Moses appears to have taken a circular route when performing the anointing rites. In Lev 8:11 the text mentions twice הַמָּלֶאכָּה "the altar," and it is feasible to argue that Moses actually sprinkled the anointing oil first on the incense altar\(^8\) and the other objects in the first section of the sanctuary and then went straight to the altar of burnt offering in the courtyard.\(^9\) The sequential nature of this action is expressed by the usage of the wayyiqtol forms that express succession of action.\(^10\) "The suggested route stresses the differentiation between the profane and holy of the geography of the Tent of Meeting."\(^11\)

The repeated usage of the anointing oil on the objects of the sanctuary and the priests and the usage of the same verbal form of הָנַח ("anoint") suggests similar ritual states of both "entities." As F. Gorman writes:

This anointing with the special anointing oil serves to pass objects and persons into a similar ritual state. . . . The common anointing also serves to emphasize that these are the primary "spaces" of Aaron's cultic officiating as high priest. This is not to say that all of the anointed objects are the private domain of the high priest; rather, it is to indicate the primary places of his service and to mark the outer bounds of his service.\(^12\)

\(^8\) This interpretation is not solely based upon the double occurrence of הַמָּלֶאכָּה "the altar," but also on the usage of the verbal action connected with the first reference to the altar. הָנַח ("to sprinkle") seems to consecrate the altar (instead of purifying it as in other instances—see Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 194, and also V. P. Hamilton, הָנַח, NIDOTTE, 3:69). T. C. Vriezen has suggested that "the degree of sanctification is directly proportional to the distance of the place in which the hizza-rite is performed from the ark" ("The term hizza: Lustration and Consecration," Oudtestamentische Studien, ed. P. A. H. de Boer [Leiden: Brill, 1950], 215). If this suggestion is correct, it would support the interpretation that the first altar mentioned in Lev 8:11 in connection with the sprinkling rite could have been the incense altar, since it was much closer to the Holy of Holies and thus required sevenfold consecration with the anointing oil.
\(^11\) Klingbeil, "Ritual Space," 73.
\(^12\) F. H. Gorman Jr., The Ideology of Ritual Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology,
It would, therefore, appear that the term marks a connection between ritual space or location and ritual function of the involved persons. It is significant that the anointing of the Tabernacle and its objects precedes the anointing of the High Priest. This might provide a clue for the importance of ritual space in OT ritual.\footnote{Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 192.}

The final verbal form in Lev 8:11, לְדוֹן ('to consecrate them'), provides an explanation of the two previous acts of sprinkling\footnote{The verbal root used is יָדַון which appears some twenty-four times in the OT (see A. Even-Shoshan, A New Concordance of the Old Testament (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1985), 750). On the usage of the verb see the discussion in Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 193-194, Hamilton, NIDOTTE, 3:69-70, and Vriezen, "hizza," 201-235.} and anointing (טָמַם). The infinitive construct לְדוֹן would be in accordance with the use of מְדִינ in Lev 8:10 that explained the previous ritual action on the Tabernacle.\footnote{Concerning the meaning of מְדִינ in the OT, see J. A. Naude, מְדִינ, NIDOTTE, 3:877-887, and Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 192, and the references given there. It is interesting to note that forty-five of the seventy-five occurrences of the Piel form of מְדִינ can be found in the Pentateuch, predominantly in the books of Exodus (twenty-two times) and Leviticus (fifteen times). This is in agreement with the content of these books, i.e., the construction of the sanctuary and initiation of "proper" sacrificial service. Cf. also P. P. Jenson, Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World, JSOT SS 106 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).} After the objects are anointed, the ritual personnel are to be ordained. Lev 8:12 displays a structure similar to that found in 8:11, but instead of sprinkling the anointing oil, Moses pours some on Aaron's head.\footnote{Anointing was not only utilized in religious rituals, but also appears in secular and legal contexts (although it is not always easy to differentiate between these categories). Concerning the anointing with oil as an expression of joy, see G. A. Anderson, A Time to Mourn, A Time to Dance: The Expression of Grief and Joy in Israelite Religion (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 45-47. A. Viberg discusses the legal function of anointing in the OT context. He suggests that the "priestly anointing served to consecrate priests to their cultic service. The legal function of the act was therefore p~ of cultic law" (Symbols of Law: A Contextual Analysis of Legal Symbolic Acts in the Old Testament, ConBOT 34 [Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1992], 119). While one should not neglect the legal aspect of the anointing procedure (as found in other OT contexts-specifically concerning the king's anointing), it would appear that the close proximity of the priestly anointing and the anointing of the Tabernacle would suggest rather the consecratory aspect of the rite. Perhaps it is possible to combine both aspects, since by anointing both Aaron and the Tabernacle (and its objects) it was publicly stated that they were to be considered as belonging to YHWH, which certainly has legal undertones. At the same time, it is important to keep in mind the stated purpose of the procedure as found in Lev 8:10-12, where the process of מְדִינ is referred to several times and thus underlines the importance of the consecratory aspect.} מְדִינ occurs fifty-five times in OT\footnote{Even-Shoshan, Concordance, 487.} and is used in the JSOT SS 91 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 118-119.}
context of pouring fluids in everyday situations (as, for example, in 2 Kgs 4:4; Ezek 24:3, etc.), but occurs predominantly in cultic contexts. Five times the verb appears together with מָשַׁה, namely, in Exod 29:7; Lev 8:12; 1 Sam 10:1; 2 Kgs 9:3, 6. The first two references concern the ordination of priests and are clearly cultic. 1 Sam 10:1 describes the anointing of Saul by Samuel. It is significant to see a similar sequence of actions, namely, לָקַח ("take"), מָשַׁה ("pour"), and מָשַׁה ("anoint"). The final מָשַׁה contains an interpretation of the act of pouring the oil upon Saul's head by Samuel.

2 Kings 9:3 utilizes the same sequence and occurs in the context of Jehu's anointing by Elisha. While 2 Kgs 9:3 contains the prescriptive part of that procedure, v. 6 describes the actual performance. From these examples it would appear that the anointing of priests and kings was similar, the only difference being the fact that the oil to be used for the priests was מֶשֶׁה מַה-מֶשֶׁה "anointing oil," whereas the references to the anointing of Saul and Jehu mention only מַה כְּפֶת as the fluid agent. The combination מֶשֶׁה מַה כְּפֶת "anointing oil" occurs sixteen times in the OT. The oil used מֶשֶׁה מַה כְּפֶת was a mixture of specific spices and olive oil (Exod 30:22-33). It was used in rituals of consecration for priests (Exod 29:7, 21; Lev 8:12, 30), the Tabernacle (Exod 40:9; Lev 8: 10) and possibly also kings. Special consideration should be given to the fact that the anointing oil was to be a mixture of specific strong-smelling spices, which should be interpreted in the context of the importance of smells in the cultural environment of Israel.

18 Compare here also the discussion found in B. Johnson, קָנַפ, ThWAT, 3:827.
19 Ibid., 3:827-828.
20 J. N. Oswalt, מָשַׁה, NIDOTTE, 2: 1124, assumes that the oil utilized for both rituals of anointing was to be the same, although he does not discuss the differing terminology mentioned above.
21 Namely in Exod 25:6; 29:7,21; 31:11; 35:8,15,28; 37:29; 39:38; 40:9; Lev 8:2,10,12, 30; 21:10; and Num 4:16. Another similar phrase מֶשֶׁה מַה כְּפֶת occurs either with the apposition קָנַפ (Exod 30:25 [two times] and 31) or without the apposition (Lev 10:7 and 21:12).
22 See more specifically N. M. Sama, Exodus, JBS Torah Commentary 2 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 197-198. The following ingredients were used: liquid myrrh (NRSV) [Sama translates it as solidified myrrh], sweet-smelling cinnamon, aromatic cane, and cassia. Cf. also Y. Feliks, "The Incense of the Tabernacle," in Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom, ed. D. P. Wright, D. N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 125-149, concerning the nature of some of the ingredients involved. It should be noted, however, that the anointing of King Solomon described in 1 Kgs 1:39 does not explicitly mention מֶשֶׁה מַה כְָלָה, but rather מֶשֶׁה כָּלָה, "the oil from the Tent." It could thus be possible that the procedure and material used for the anointing of kings was not exactly the same procedure as the one used for the anointing of the priests and the sanctuary.
the ANE.\textsuperscript{24} This applies specifically to the composition of הדשן המשיח, which includes parts of cinnamon, myrrh, cane, and cassia and should be expected to give off a pleasant smell.\textsuperscript{25} Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that the OT forbids the use of the anointing oil for cosmetic or other uses apart from the prescribed acts of ritual anointing.\textsuperscript{26} It appears that by this prohibition YHWH reserves the special fragrance for himself.

By anointing "his" fragrance is transmitted to his dwelling and its inventory (Exod. xxx 26-9) and to the priests, devoted to his service (Exod. xxx 30). So YHWH's fragrance becomes attached to his house and his attendants. So they are marked by his personality [emphasis supplied]. Their exclusive belonging to YHWH is expressed for an organ of sense in a perceptible way.\textsuperscript{27}

As has been noted above by Houtman, smell is an extension of one's personality, and thus the priests and the sanctuary are marked by YHWH's personality. That in turn gives them a special status in society.

The anointing of Aaron (and later in v. 30 that of his sons as well) marks a crucial point inasmuch as it puts both the location and its objects and the person(s) on a par.\textsuperscript{28} Taking the parallel anointing of the Tabernacle and its objects and the High Priest into consideration, Milgrom\textsuperscript{29} has argued that this practice resembles similar practices in "old portions of the Pentateuch" (such as Gen 28:18; 31:13; and 35:14) and thus would suggest an early origin of the practice of anointing the High Priest and not a later modeling of the ritual after the practice of anointing a king.

\textsuperscript{24} See C. Houtman, who argues that smells/breath are often understood as the extensions of the personality of the carrier. "The breath is an extension of the personality. . . . In the light of the remarks made above about man and his emanations, it is plausible that for an Israelite odors were not only either pleasant or unpleasant, but also carriers of either life or death" ("On the Function of the Holy Incense [Exodus XXX 34-8] and the Sacred Anointing Oil [Exodus XXX 22-33]," \textit{VT} 42/4 [1992]: 460-461). Cf. also B. Gibbons, "The Intimate Sense of Smell," \textit{National Geographic} 170 (1986): 324-362, concerning the importance of smells in human life.

\textsuperscript{25} The unique composition of the anointing oil-similar to the composition of the incense also described in Exod 30--reflects a pattern (M. Haran, \textit{Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting the Priestly School} [Oxford: Clarendon, 1978], 243), namely, that material uniqueness corresponds to "sacral-ritualistic distinctiveness."'

\textsuperscript{26} Exod 30:32-33 emphatically states that no unqualified person should have contact with the oil, lest he should be "cut off from his people." This differentiation is also clearly indicated by the use of verbal forms. Whereas the ritual anointing is always expressed by the root המשיח cosmetic anointing is indicated by the root 110. Cf. Oswalt, \textit{NIDOTTE}, 2:1124.

\textsuperscript{27} Houtman, "Function of Holy Incense," 465.

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. also Jenson, who maintains that "the holiness of the priests. . . .was of the same order as that of the holy areas of the Tabernacle (Graded Holiness, 119)."

\textsuperscript{29} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus}, 554.
The Anointing of the NIN.DINGIR at Emar

Emar, or modern Tell Meskene (some 90 km east of Aleppo) in Syria, was excavated during five salvage campaigns between 1973 and 1976. The city existed on this particular site between the fourteenth and twelfth centuries B.C.E., after which it was destroyed. Among the numerous tablets and fragments is a section of Emar 369 that contains the description of the ritual of ordination of the NIN.DINGIR of dIM, of which there are six tablet fragments representing four manuscripts. The relevant sections of the ritual texts are lines 3-4 and 20-21, which read as follows:

3. i-sa-ba-tu₄ DUMU.MI a-i-me-e DUMU ³u₄-E-marr it-tar-ra-a i-na u₄-mi sa-a-su-ma I.DU₁₀.GA is-tu E.GAL-li
4. u is-tu E dNIN .KUR i-laq-qu-mi a-n[a] SAG .DU-si i-sak-kan-nu 1 UDU 1 dugqu-u-u 1 hi-zi-bu KAS.GESTIN
20. a-na pa-ni nu-ba-at-ti I.DU₁₀.GA sa E dNIN.KUR u[a] a-n[a] KA dIM luHAL i-[ na SAG.DU]
21. sa NIN.DINGIR i-tab-bu-uk u LU.MES sa qi-da-si is-t[u E dIM E-ma a-na E a-bi-si u-se-e]r (?) -ra-bu-si

31 Margueron suggests that several references to Emar found in the literature from Ebla, dating the city back to approximately 2400 B.C.E., must be understood in terms of the rebuilding of the same city on a different site due to the meandering movements of the Euphrates. "The movement of the river condemned the city to destruction; the only solution was to abandon the city and rebuild it nearby." This would also explain why the excavations suggested that Emar/Tell Meskene was a relatively newly established city ("Emar," ABD, 2:489). Cf. J.-C. Margueron, "La recherche sur le terrain," in Meskene-Émar: Dix ans de travaux 1972-1982, ed. J.-C. Margueron (paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1982), 12-13. See also H. Klengel's review of D. Arnaud's Recherches au pays d'Astarta: Emar VI; vols. 1-2: Textes sumeriens et akkadiens, Planches. vol 3: Textes sumeriens et accadiens, Texte (paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1985) in OLI 83 (1988): 646-651; and his summary of the allusions to Ernar /Imar found in cuneiform literature of the second millennium B.C.E. and the references given there. For more references to the history and archaeology of Emar see Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 280-281.
3. The daughter of any son of Emar may be identified. On that same day they will take fine oil from the palace
4. and from the temple of dNIN.KUR, and put (it) on her head. They will offer before dIM 1 sheep, 1 qu’u-jar, (and) 1 hizzibu of wine
20. Just before the evening watch, they will take fine oil of the temple of dNIN .KUR and of the palace, and at the gate of dIM the 1nu.HAL
21. will pour (it) on the NIN.DINGIR's [head], and when the men of the qidasu leave the temple of dIM, they will [brin]g her [into the house of her father].

The two references to the anointing act occur during the actions prescribed for the first and second days. After the initial identification of the future high priestess by means of a lot (line 2), the chosen "daughter of any son of Emar" is anointed with "fine oil" from the palace. The introductory time reference to the second occurrence a-na pa-ni nu-ba-at-ti, "just before the evening watch,"34 refers to the second day of the ritual,35 which is one of the key days of the nine-day ceremony.36 It is significant to note that on each of the important days of the ritual, reference is made to the time before the beginning of the night, which seems to introduce an important part of the ritual preparing for the following day (cf. lines 20, 40, and 62).

The origin of the oil is from the "palace" and from the "temple of dNIN.KUR." The act of anointing is often found in both legal and ritual contexts in Mesopotamian texts37 and possibly also in connection with the

35 Line 7 reads "on the next day." Regarding the discussion of ritual time in the ordination ritual of the NIN.DINGIR, see Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 322-332.
36 The other important days include the second day (shaving ceremony), the third day (enthronement ceremony), and the final or ninth day (procession from house of the father of the NIN.DINGIR to the temple of dIM and ascension upon the bed). See also Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 328. Dietrich, "Einsetzungsritual," 87-89, interprets the ritual as a seven-day ritual which is based upon the recurring phrase U₄.7.KAM, "for seven days" (lines 46, 48, 51, 54, 57, and 83). Fleming, Installation, 63, has speculated that "perhaps comparison with the week-long Israelite festival or simply the magic of the number itself produces a disposition toward the seven-day length, but various details of the text suggest the alternative scheme elaborated below [referring to the nine-day duration of the festival]." The key to this problem is the usage of the prepositional phrase i-na and the noun denoting "day." It appears that when a temporal phrase is introduced by i-na, it indicates "time when" rather than "how long." However, the inclusion of a seven-day period into the larger framework of the nine-day festival indeed underlines the importance of the seven-day unit in the ritual practice of the ANE. Cf. also G. A. Klingbeil, "Ritual Time in Leviticus 8 with Special Reference to the Seven-day Period in the Old Testament," ZAW 109/4 (1997): 500-513; and Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 131-139.
37 CAD, S/1, 325-327.
anointing of high officials, although Thompson has recently argued convincingly against this interpretation in Egyptian texts.\textsuperscript{38} The different places of origin of the "fine oil" seem to indicate two different aspects of the social dimension of the election of the high priestess, namely, the public and religious dimensions.\textsuperscript{39} This interpretation is further supported by the use of two different verbal forms, namely \textit{sakanu}, "pour" and \textit{tabaku}, "pour",\textsuperscript{40} the common word used for pouring oil on the head. Alternatively, the different terms in connection with the rites of anointing could indicate differing grades of "separation," which is one of the main motifs of the first days of the ordination rites of the NIN.DINGIR.\textsuperscript{41}

It is interesting to note that there is one more anointing rite in the ritual: line 35 mentions that on the third day the NIN.DINGIR anoints the top of the \textit{sikkanu} of the goddess Hebat. The text utilizes the same verbal root as used for the description of the second-day anointing, namely, \textit{tabaku}.\textsuperscript{42} The parallel performance of anointing (first the NIN.DINGIR and then the \textit{sikkanu} of Hebat) possibly suggests that the later rite is an imitation of the earlier one. The motivation behind the choice of the stele of Hebat for the anointing rite concerns the role Hebat apparently played in the pantheon of Emar--at least in the pantheon "visible" in the ordination ritual of the NIN.DINGIR. The close proximity to \textit{dIM}: would suggest that Hebat was his

\textsuperscript{38} See D. B. Redford, \textit{Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 368; and P. Dion, "Institutional Model and Poetic Creation: The First Song of the Servant of the Lord and Appointment Ceremonies," in \textit{Ascribe to the Lord. Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie}, JSOT SS 67 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988),334. However, S. E. Thompson, after discussing the five pieces of evidence frequently cited in support of the concept that officials were anointed in Egypt (Florence Stele 1774, TT90; P. Rylands IX 8/15-18, reward scenes, and EA51:4-9), concludes that only in EA 51 an Egyptian king undoubtedly anointed a vassal--which should possibly be interpreted that the king was "engaging in a custom common among Asiatics, rather than that he was introducing an Egyptian custom into Syria-Palestine" ("The Anointing of Officials in Ancient Egypt," JNES 53/1 [1994]: 25).

\textsuperscript{39} The election first has to be ratified by the palace, while the second anointing indicates the actual religious aspect of the rite.

\textsuperscript{40} W. von Soden, \textit{AHW}, 1295-1296.

\textsuperscript{41} Fleming has suggested a third possibility: "When the priestess is selected anointing is the rite that first marks her as \textit{dIM}'s. Perhaps the second anointing, before she returns to her father's house after the shaving day, renews this identification, since she is now effectively on loan back to her father. It is possible that the shaving itself makes necessary the repetition, if her anointed hair has been removed. Finally, the fact of two anointings further emphasizes the separation of the shaving day as a ritual event unto itself" (\textit{Installation}, 177).

\textsuperscript{42} There are other occasions involving the anointing of a stele with oil or blood, e.g., Emar 373.57-58; 373.32; and 375.14. Cf. Fleming, \textit{Installation}, 78, esp. n. 36.
By anointing $d$IM's divine consort, the human consort dedicated herself to $d$IM for life. Furthermore, the immediate context of the third day should be taken into consideration: before the NIN DINGIR can sit upon her throne and be presented with the credentials of her office, both the human (and the divine consort have to be brought into a similar ritual state.

Comparison and Contrast

The anointing rites found in Lev 8 and at Emar have both similar and dissimilar features. Obviously they involve two different sexes, although [the interchangeability of male and female ritual specialists in ANE rituals has been shown before. While in the biblical account the necessary ritual space is prepared and consecrated before the consecration of the human participant, at Emar this order is reversed. Immediately after the election rite, the future NIN.DINGIR is to be anointed-with oil from the palace--indicating her special status and sanctioning her election. This is followed by another anointing rite at the evening of the second day with oil from the temple, which clearly carries religious connotations. Only on the third day is the stele of the consort of $d$IM to be anointed.

Both M. Noth and R. de Vaux have argued that Israelite priests were (not anointed until after the Exile. They based their arguments upon their conception of the literary development of the Pentateuch, and more specifically, on their dating of the "Priestly Source." However, Emar 369 provides an early ANE instance of anointing a priest, while there are many known examples in the Mesopotamian material of this period describing the

---

43 See here K. van der Toorn, "Hebat," DDD, 744-746.
44 Against the Interpretation see K. van der Toorn, "Theology, Priests, and worship in Canaan and Ancient Israel," CANE, 3:2052. Cf. also W. von Soden, who indicates the presence of $en$-priests and $en$-priestesses, although he asserts that the priestesses were predominantly employed in the Sacred Marriage rite (The Ancient Orient, An Introduction to the Study of the Ancient Near East [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994], 195). In the particular function of the office of the NIN.DINGIR at Emar see Fleming, Installation, 81-83, who suggests that at Emar the priestess may not have been seen primarily as the wife of the god she served, but as the head of the divine household.
47 This is also postulated in the review article on "Salbung" in the reference work Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Kutsch writes, for example, in relation to the ANE evidence: "Salbung von Priestern bei der Amtseinsetzung ist weder fur Agypten noch fur Mesopotamien und das Hethiterreich belegt." And regarding the OT: "Nach dem Exil wurde die Salbung auf den Hohenpriester ubenragen (Lev 21, 10; Exod 29,7; Lev 4, 3; 8, 12)" ("Salbung," RGG, 5:1330-1332).
use of anointing in legal or political contexts. Fleming writes:
The biblical testimony to anointing Israelite priests should be re-evaluated.
Emar's NIN.DINGIR of $^{41}$IM is a person delivered into service of a god
and the Israelite record of anointing priests may derive from this ancient
legal tradition applied to divine service, and may not be a late application of
defunct royal tradition [sic] to post-exilic high priests [emphasis
 supplied].

What is of even more importance, however, is the fact that the texts from
Emar are dated to the fourteenth/thirteenth century B.C.E., thus describing a
religious reality in Syria at that time. Given the problematic nature of the
dating of the Pentateuch, it appears useful to utilize comparative material that
can help to establish historical patterns. The state of the dating of the
Pentateuch is in some degree of academic upheaval, since old paradigms (like,
for example, the JEDP sequence) are being abandoned and new models are
being proposed. The tendency to date texts late creates an interesting and
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49 Ibid., 179.
50 Cf. also L. Schmidt, "Zur Entstehung des Pentateuchs: Ein kritischer
predominantly German studies (with the exception of two English works) and concedes that
there indeed exists a "Pentateuchkrise" (4), regarding the different (often conflicting) models
of interpretation. A similar evaluation can be found in B. Seidel, "Entwicklungsli nien der
appears as if Seidel concentrates predominantly on continental critical scholarship.
Concerning the state of Pentateuchal research with special reference to the study of the Book
of Exodus see H. Utzschneider, "Die Renaissance der alnestamentlichen Literaturwissenschaft
und das Buch Exodus," *ZAW* 106 (1994): 197-223. Cf. also his earlier statement:
"Moglicherweise ist die 'Krise' der alten, den gesamten Penta-, hexateuch ubergreifenden
Erk lassungsmo delse, zu denen die 'Priesterschrift' gehort, tatsachlich zu schwerwiegend, wie
es den Anschein hat. Gerade dann aber darf im Getummel um die Gultigkeit der alten die
Moglichkeit der neuen Erk lassungsmo delse das Eigengewicht der Texte nicht verloren gehen"
(Heiligtum und das Gesetz, 2-3).
51 R. Rendtorff remarks regarding the validity of the Wellhausen-paradigm: "The
Wellhausen paradigm no longer functions as a commonly accepted presupposition for Old
Testament exegesis" ("The Paradigm is Changing: Hopes and Fears," *Biblical Interpretation*
scholars on Genesis has become something of a joke. . . . With astonishing rapidity, previously
held 'assured results' and seemingly invulnerable positions are being not modified but abandoned
altogether. Widely practiced methods of analysis, indeed methods which are currently being
taught, are falling from favor as scholars on the leading edge of research pronounce them to be
presumptuous or even useless" (Rethinking Genesis: The Sources and Authorship of the Pint
Book of the Pentateuch [Grand Rapids, W: Baker Book House, 1991], 7). Against this, see J.
Friedman, who maintains that the "documentary hypothesis has remained intact in its essentials,"
although there has been developments concerning (1) improved understanding of the historical
circumstances and concerns. Of the authors, (2) improved understanding of the editors and the
editorial processes, and (3) shift in the dating of P ("Torah [Pentateuch]," *ABD*, 5:618). On the
methodological downfalls of the documentary hypothesis see R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the
Pentateuch. A Methodological Study*, JSOT .SS 53
surprising phenomenon: it suggests a vast spectrum of religious life, beliefs, and thinking in the time before, during, and after the Exile. But besides this tendency of "late dating" one also encounters the problematic inclination to change and reorganize the accepted scholarly consensus (which seemed to have been a mirage anyway), as can be seen in the dating and redating of the P source. On methodological grounds, however, it is precarious to base far-reaching conclusions on a theory whose foundations have been so severely modified and altered.

Besides the methodological uncertainties, an overview of the relevant works on Israelite priesthood and the history of Israelite religion shows clearly that the actual biblical data has been abandoned in favor of models that were believed to be infallible. Since the argument against a preexilic and even

52 It should be noted, however, that among historians this period is still fairly "misty"—at least in terms of the history of Palestine itself. See G. A. Klingbeil, "The Aramaic Epigraphical Material of Syria-Palestine during the Persian Period with Reference to the History of the Jews," M.A. Thesis (Stellenbosch, South Africa: University of Stellenbosch, 1992). Cf. also I. Eph' al, who Comments that the history of Syria-Palestine in the Persian period "is extremely difficult to reconstruct, primarily because of the paucity of our information concerning the region" ("Syria-Palestine under Achaemenid Rule," C4H; 4:141). E. Stern comes to a similar conclusion in The Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Penian Period (WarminSter: Aris & Phillips, 1982), xv. Cf. also the pertinent remarks of K. Kitchen, who writes: "To attribute all, or any, of this to Hebrew 'priestly' circles living humbled in exile in Nebuchadrezzar's Babylon, six or severi centuries after such usages in our data, involves belief in some kind of magical 'telepathy' across nearly 1000 miles and several centuries later! ...'P', it should be remembered, is strictly pure fiction—there is no such document extant, other than in the scholarly imagination. ...Hence scholars need to revise drastically the ragbag of inherited 19th century conceptions that 'P' contains and symbolizes. Specific entities within 'it' need to be taken out, each examined on their merits in their proper ancient context, and re-evaluated as necessary" ("The Tabernacle-A Bronze Age Artifact," Eretz Israel 24. Avraham , Malamat Volume, ed. S. Ahituv and B. A. Levine Gerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993), 126*.

53 Milgrom ascribes to the priestly source an eighth century B.C.E. date (Leviticus, 3-8). Milgrom is heavily indebted to A. Hurvitz, who worked on the terminological comparison between what has been designated the priestly source and the book of Ezekiel (A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, CahRB 20 (paris: J. Gabalda, 1982). For more bibliographic data on Hurvitz' work see Klingbeil, "Ordination and Ritual," 68 and the references given there. Cf. ilio M. Haran, who follows Kaufmann's suggestion of the priority of P over D and dates the writing of P during the reign of r Hezekiah (Temples and Temple-Service, 326-333).

Mosaic *Sitz im Leben* of the ordination ritual of Lev 8 has often utilized the lack of comparative material from the ANE (regarding the anointing of priests), the contrary argumentation should be permissible as well. Since the ordination of the NIN.DINGIR with its anointing sub-rites provides a backdrop to the ordination ritual of Aaron and his sons, the date of the Emar ritual could help to establish a date for the emergence of specific ordination rites, which, together with internal chronological data, could help to establish the date of composition of a given biblical book. In the case of Leviticus (which according to the classic Wellhausenian definition includes predominantly strands of the Priestly source), a Mosaic date during the fourteenth century B.C.E. is thus thinkable.


56 After this study had been submitted for publication in *AUSS*, D. E. Fleming published a very convincing study reaching similar results ("The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests," *JBL* 117/3 [1998]: 401-414). Fleming focuses both upon the biblical material and the extra-biblical evidence, drawing attention to the cuneiform material from Mesopotamia and Syria (additional to the Emar evidence). His conclusion emphasizes the apparent important difference in settings between the Emar and the Israel anointing rites. While Emar's social context reflects an urban society, Israel's textual evidence testifies to a less centralized societal context.
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Reading and Hearing Leviticus

Arie C. Leder and David A. Vroege

The apostle Paul's instruction that "all Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16) is, in its original reference, a description of the literature that the church today knows as the Old Testament. This, of course, includes Leviticus. In practice, however, Leviticus is generally not a major item in the church's teaching of righteousness. It is also not the object of the usual devotional literature prepared for God's people. Although certain texts receive regular attention—chapter 19, which summarizes the law, and chapter 25 on the year of jubilee—the rest of Leviticus tends to be heard in the church indirectly, if at all, through the book of Hebrews.

There are reasons for the silence of Leviticus in the church. First, its practices and rituals are strange; they are not of our world. Few people experience the smells and sounds of sacrifices; our blood and other body fluids do not play a role in our religious obligations; our dining practices are not prescribed; we do not need priests. This, coupled with a hermeneutics that teaches Christ's fulfillment of the law and its ceremonies, appears to legitimize Leviticus' silence. Second, Leviticus' ritualistic life is difficult for Christian traditions that since the Reformation are decidedly iconoclastic and antiritualistic. Julius Wellhausen and Max Weber have contributed to this notion by arguing that genuine religion and religious leadership is spontaneous and charismatic, and that ritualistic religion and institutionalized, priestly leadership reflects a deterioration in personal religion and charismatic leadership.¹ Contemporary charismatic views take the spontaneous to be spiritual, the prepared uninspiring. Third, the rituals and practices of Leviticus are not explained for the reader. Thus, in

¹ For an extensive discussion of these issues see Rodney R Hutton, Charisma and Authority in Israelite Society (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), especially chapters 1 and 6.
an a-ritualistic culture where the capacity for understanding the depicted
divine-human relationship by means of a complex vocabulary of symbols is
anorexic, Leviticus' speech falls on deaf ears.

These and other reasons for the silence of Leviticus in the church merit seri-
ous response, but that would take us beyond the limits of a brief discussion. In
this article, Leder proposes to begin a reading and hearing of Leviticus for the
church by means of a sermon based on Leviticus 24:10-23, a text that instructs
Israel to stone to death an Israelite-Egyptian who had blasphemed God's name.
The sermon was prepared by Calvin Theological Seminary student David A.
Vroege as part of a class assignment for an exegetical course on Leviticus. First
Vroege presents the text of his sermon in its entirety; after that Leder focuses
on aspects of the sermon that provide an entrance to the reading and hearing
of Leviticus.

"Crime and Punishment": A Sermon on Leviticus 24:10-23

Sisters and brothers in Jesus Christ,

After losing the two opening games in the NBA finals this year, Larry
Johnson of the New York Knicks was... well you could say, not in the mood to
talk about it. And so, when reporters hounded him with questions about his
performance, he launched into a verbal tirade. The newspapers described it as
uncalled for and loaded with expletives.

At times, haven't we all felt the way Larry Johnson felt? And just maybe
we've reacted the same way occasionally? At the end of a long day or at the end of
our rope, we just let it all out--and when it comes out the sounds ain't sweet. Some
of us, when we were younger, might have had our mouths washed out when we
cussed. Others of us, who still have to watch our mouths around our parents
and teachers, may have to endure other punishments. We can all identify.
When words are offensive, punishment follows.

And this is what Leviticus 24 is about. Leviticus as a whole strikes as a
strange book--perhaps one of the strangest in the Bible. But at least something of
this passage ought to resonate with us: cursing and consequences; crime and then
punishment. As strange or unfamiliar as the book of Leviticus may be, this pas-

gage reminds us of some key items in God's redemptive plan. We'll touch on a few
of them. But what we see at the core is that when God's name is blas-
phemed, the appropriate punishment must follow. And even more generally
than that, whenever people sin against God’s law, the Lord requires the appro-
priate punishment.

To get at the core message of Leviticus 24:10-23, we'll simply follow the three
scenes of the text. Scene 1, verses 10-12, reports the sin; scene 2, verses 13-22,

2 This article will not engage Vroege about the hermeneutics, exegesis, or homiletical
strategies that inform his sermon; that would produce a different article.
relates the instruction of the Lord concerning the sin (as well as other sins); and scene 3, verse 23, describes Israel's obedient response to that instruction. Sin. Instruction. Obedience.

Scene 1 describes the sin, but if we're going to follow the story as we read it in Leviticus 24, I suppose we had better think a bit about the sinner, the perpetrator of the sin. The sinner is, well, a man who both fits in and doesn't fit in. He fits in because he is half-Israelite, and his mother's family tree is provided in verse 11 to prove it. He has a right to be there among the Israelites. But, in a way, he doesn't fit in, too. He doesn't fit in because he's half-Egyptian. And the fact that he's half-Egyptian means that, when he sins, the people of Israel are kind of at a loss. What do you do with this guy? I mean, he sinned, but do the rules apply to him? Where does his ethnic background leave him: an outsider or an insider? If you go to, say, England, is it immoral to still drive on the right side of the road? When do which rules apply to you? If you're a citizen of both God's kingdom and of America, when is it wrong to attend which movies, or to vote for which candidates, or to listen to which music?

So the sinner is a mixture: He's a gray area when it comes to loyalties and responsibilities. What about the sin? The sin, unfortunately, is all too clear; it's black and white. One writer has described how sins can be placed into two categories: sins of attack or sins of flight. Sins of flight are those in which you evade God, you flee from him and from doing what's right--think of Jonah. Sins of attack, on the other hand, are those in which you attack God or his good creation--think of greed or lust or anger. Scene 1 clearly presents us with a case of a sin of attack: blasphemy against "the Name." In fact, it's a vicious attack: the combination of the words blaspheme and curse right next to each other in verse 11 indicates that this man was ruthless with God's name; he dragged it through the mud. In ancient times even more so than today, a name was intimately connected with one's character, with one's person, with who you were. So, for this man to "diss" God's name was, in effect, to say, "God--and let everyone around me hear it--you mean nothing to me." He may have been fighting another Israelite, but the attack really fell upon God.

The Israelites, then, don't know quite what to do with this guy. He's not fully Israelite; yet he's attacked God's name and by doing so, has threatened their own sense of who they are. He's done wrong, but maybe he doesn't fit under their rules. Maybe he belongs under someone else's jurisdiction. And here, the Israelites get it exactly right. Verse 12 says they wait for the will of the Lord to be made clear to them. That's exactly it. One thing this passage shows us is that the Lord makes the rules. Rules and punishment aren't the Israelites' problems, they don't come from Moses--they're the Lord's and his only.

That's scene 1: the sinner, the sin, and a dilemma. Scene 2 brings us the instruction, God's law, what we all think about when we think of Leviticus! But this scene, verses 13-22, teaches us something about the whole of Leviticus. Notice that these laws in these verses are surrounded by a single story. It's a "law sandwich." There they are--these laws from God sandwiched between a story.
I read in one place that "these laws in verses 13-22 are an independent set of laws." The setting here in chapter 24 cries out, "NO! Not true!" These aren't independent laws. None of the laws in Leviticus are. They all arise out of real-life situations. In Leviticus, law and story shape each other, dialogue with each other, and comment on each other. They're a tandem; can't have one without the other somewhere nearby; like other meals need salt and pepper, meat and cheese, bread and wine, so a diet of Leviticus will fill you with law and narrative sandwiches. The laws in scene 2 are no "independent set"; they're intricately related to the story that surrounds it on both sides.

Verses 13-16, then, deal with blasphemy. First, take him outside the camp. In Leviticus, the camp was where the Lord's people lived and, more importantly, it was where the Lord dwelt. The Lord camped among them. And this camp needed to be kept clean--clean and holy. This is another huge part of what Leviticus is about. Consider how the Lord now gathers his people in a church and that the Holy Spirit dwells right here among us as believers, We have to keep ourselves clean.

The church is God's; it's not for us to decide what to do with it or how to keep it. When we reach out to Prospect Park with the Good News, we're calling people to something real, something holy. And just as we're holy now because of the Spirit's presence, so Israel's camp was holy because of God's presence there and then. Israel, in Old Testament times, was where the holiness was, that's where it was at. And what was unclean had to be dealt with, it had to go--outside the camp.

It's interesting, to say the least, how they were to deal with the sinner; interesting because it sounds an awful lot like a... sacrifice. If you read just the first few verses of the beginning of Leviticus, you'll read about how to offer a sacrifice. And one crucial element in a sacrifice was for the worshiper, not the priest, to lay his hands on the animal being slaughtered. Here in Leviticus 24, all the people who heard the sinner verbally attack the Lord are to lay their hands on his head. It's as if the guilt spreads. It's as if everyone within earshot is polluted. It's as if... everyone within range becomes unclean, "levitically" speaking. This is another important concept in Leviticus. And it's not as foreign to us as it might sound at first. Think of so-called evils that have a social aspect like racism or pornography or environmental waste. What about when your ears burn
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3 Vrogege prepared this sermon for the congregation of Unity Christian Reformed Church, Prospect Park, NJ., the church in which he is serving as an intern during the academic year 1999-2000. In an introductory note to the assignment Vroege writes that "Unity is located about twenty miles from New York City and is a congregation intent on connecting with its local community (under the vision 'Presenting and Advancing Good News for Prospect Park and Beyond.' I think, at this point, I would almost certainly not preach this text (Lev. 24:10-23) on its own; rather, I would preach it as part of a series on Leviticus and thus it would already have a context, i.e., as a later installment in the series. This sermon, however, does not assume a series; i.e., it could be preached 'on its own.'"
because someone waiting in the line beside you at McDonald's uses the "f" word and Christ's name every ten seconds? Don't you feel a little upset by it? Maybe you even feel a little affected by it? Especially if you've got your young children with you? Even if this doesn't make you guilty, at least it shows how sin begins to spread, how uncleanness begins to spread. And so all the Israelites with burning ears are to transfer their guilt and sin to the blasphemer so as to rid themselves and the holy camp of this uncleanness.

And so that's the Lord's will concerning the blasphemer. There's the instruction. But . . . surprise! Scene 2 doesn't end there. There's more instruction. And this instruction seems so out of place. The story is dealing with a blasphemer as scenes 1 and 3 show. Scene 2 begins with the punishment for the blasphemer. But, in verses 17-22, we get instruction for . . . another problem, it seems. It seems as if we've got an answer here, but we don't have a question!

But there are some links and there are some reasons for these instructions. First, the laws deal with killing--the killing of humans versus the killing of animals--in verses 17-18 as well as 21. The obvious here is that the punishments for these two actions are different. The punishment for killing a human is much more severe; it demands the death of the killer. Killing an animal requires death but only of another animal. Now, we must remember a couple of things here. Remember: Humans are made in the image of God. We can debate till the cows come home, what that means exactly (there are some things the Bible says about it, but that's another sermon), but from beginning to end, Scripture is clear that humans are God's image-bearers. Remember, too: who a person is is intricately intertwined with his or her name. And so, coming at it one way, we see that killing a person is an offense to God because we mirror him. Coming at it the other way, playing fast and loose with God's name, with who he is, includes attacks on his imagebearers, his walking, talking "mirrors." See how these two connect? Dealing with how to treat God's imagebearers (humans) as well as his creation (the animals) falls under the category of how to treat God's name with honor. The table of contents of "Honoring God's Name" includes at least these two chapters: 'What to Do When Humans Kill Humans" and 'What to Do When Humans Kill Animals." There's our reason then for why these so-called extra (or independent!) laws are also in this passage.

Now, also in the midst of these unexpected laws on killing is another law--a rather famous one. All I have to say is "an eye for an eye" and you know what I'm talking about. What we have here is the law of revenge. This is a law we're all familiar with. We didn't learn it from the Bible; this one just comes naturally for us. These days it's most frequently practiced on the streets and highways in what's become known as "road rage." At the same time, we Christians are pretty accustomed to the notion that "an eye for an eye" isn't the law to live by anymore. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus tears it apart, right? "Don't resist an evil person," he reinstructs. "Instead, go the extra mile; turn the other cheek; give away your coat." On the one side, then, the "eye-for-an-eye" law is a nat-
ural—we don't have to learn it, we “just do it.” If anything, our problem is having to unlearn it. On the other side, though, we resist it. We keep alive the reminder to "turn the other cheek" (usually we like to remind others, not ourselves), and we bless it with: “Jesus said so.”

However, there's a bit of a misunderstanding here. What's important to notice is that in Matthew 5, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus doesn't completely trash the eye-for-an-eye rule. What he does trash is the prevailing practice in his day to follow that law with a rigid legalism. The law was never intended for that. It wasn't meant to be taken literally: "Oh, you poked my eye out when you went for that rebound; now I get to poke yours out." People got so legalistic about following this law that they forgot what compassion was, what mercy was, what loving your neighbor was all about. What the law was meant for in Leviticus was to teach that breaking God's law requires due and just punishment—that, whenever people sin against God's law, the Lord requires the appropriate punishment. That's the message of this law, and, not so surprisingly, that is the message of this passage. God requires the appropriate punishment. Jesus wasn't rejecting this law in Leviticus. What he was rejecting was legalistic conduct that missed the spirit of the law. God's people--Israelites, Christians--aren't supposed to live tit for tat. We live in loving service to God and to neighbor.

Notice one more thing in scene 2. It closes with the words of verse 22: "You are to have the same law for the alien and the nativeborn. I am the Lord your God." The same law for the alien as for the native. This is an echo of verse 16. Again, further evidence that these "extra" laws in verses 17-22 fit with the passage. There is one law. And it is God's law. The basis for the law is God himself. Israelite society wasn't ultimately about laws; it was about rule by a person, by God himself. The laws were grounded in a divine person and directed toward human persons. The laws are not abstract; they're not impersonal. They come from real situations (as we discovered earlier) and they're "for the people." That's what Leviticus is about.

So, God requires a just punishment, whether it's for blasphemy or for murder. That's scene 2. And this leads perfectly into scene 3. For here the people simply do what God wants. They're obedient. Stoning a blasphemer sounds crazy to us; it doesn't fit with our way of thinking. But the point is: Israel obeyed. As God's people, there are many things we're not necessarily called to: for example, worldly success, fame, and popularity. However, we are called to obedience, to faithfulness, to doing the Lord's will. These are the marks of a follower.

So where do we stand in all this? Where does Leviticus 24:10-23 fit in the scheme of things for us? If the message of this passage is, “whenever people sin against God's law, the Lord requires the appropriate punishment,” what do we do with that in Prospect Park where we want to reach this community with the Good News? Well, the principle of that law hasn't changed, of course. Where there's crime, there has to be punishment. When Larry Johnson flew off the
handle, he had to pay $25,000. Our sin also requires a payment. It's an Old Testament law and we're New Testament believers, but God's will never changes. God still wants sin punished. His justice requires it. But, as New Testament believers, we know and possess a great truth: It's been punished.

How does this passage fit into our lives? Well, let's see if we can't make a familiar law just a little bit more familiar. We noted how the phrase, "an eye for an eye" is so familiar that that's all I have to say and we all know what it's about in an instant. But, what about another phrase in this passage that gets at the same thing, but in a different way. . . a deeper way: "a life for a life." Come at sin from that angle: that it requires life for life; that as much as humanity has been killing itself with sin ever since the Garden of Eden, lives have to pay the price. Then consider this: Consider what Jesus did on the cross; that he gave his life. We talked about the Israelites' obedience--Jesus was obedient to death, death on a cross. We talked about how the Israelites with "burning ears" had to rid themselves of guilt, the guilt for blasphemy, and that it was done rather. . . sacrificially--Jesus was the perfect sacrifice, the perfect offering. We talked about cleanness--Jesus washes us clean in the waters of baptism. It amounts to this: God requires the appropriate punishment for the sin of blasphemy, and Jesus Christ paid it for us. He paid it for people who believe in Him.

That's the Good News that we bring to Prospect Park. Leviticus might have been the last place you expected to see it, but there it is: Good News. In this passage we learned about crime and punishment; the Christian understands that, in Jesus, the relation between these two is good news; "Good News for Prospect Park and beyond."

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Amen.

Reading Leviticus Through the Sermon

The exegesis brought into the sermon deals with problems typical of Leviticus: the mixture of narrative and instruction, the juxtaposition of an instruction that appears to be out of place, an unfamiliar vocabulary, a sin that appears quaint for postmoderns, and a terrible punishment for this "quaint" sin. Vroege does not ignore these phenomena, nor does he treat them as obstacles to be overcome by a sophisticated approach to the text. Rather, he allows the unique configuration and phenomena of the text to contribute to an illuminating hearing of its message for God's people today.

Vroege's sermon also provides us with the following entries into the reading and hearing of Leviticus: the mixture of narrative and instruction, the distinction of holiness and the Israelite-Egyptian's blasphemy, and the terrible task of cleansing the camp.

Narrative and Instruction

Vroege does not separate the instruction (Lev. 24:13-22) concerning blasphemy from the narrative that surrounds it (vv. 10-12 and 23); and for good rea-
sons. The instructions make no sense without the narrative: What is the reason for the death sentence? Why go to God in this case? Did Israel obey the instruction? Nor, for that matter, is the narrative complete without the instructions: What is the consequence for blasphemy? Who will execute the punishment and how? The narrative relates an event; the instruction gives shape to that event. In its combination of narrative and instruction, Leviticus 24:10-23 mimics the larger book of which it is a part: Leviticus is a narrative intersected by divine instruction.

From the perspective of the Pentateuch this seems obvious: Leviticus forms part of the narrative that tells of Israel's antecedents that go back to Abraham and before, of its salvation from Egypt, and its journey from Egypt through the desert to the plains of Moab opposite Jericho. Closer examination of Leviticus itself shows that it continues the narrative with which Exodus ends. After the glory cloud fills the Tent of Meeting (Ex. 40:34-35), the narrative continues in Leviticus 1:1: “The Lord called to Moses and spoke to him from the Tent of Meeting. He said: . . .” The speeches of Leviticus, then, are part of the narrative event of Sinai that begins in Exodus 19; they give shape to that event as do the instructions of Exodus 20-23 (covenant laws) and Exodus 25-31 (tabernacle building instructions). The crucial difference is that in Leviticus God no longer speaks from the top of Mt. Sinai, but from tabernacle in the midst of the camp of Israel’s daily living. The narrative has moved on God has moved: He has become "incarnate" in his people's midst. The consuming fire Israel saw if from afar (Ex. 24:17) is now very near (cf. Heb. 12:28-29). Thus, the entire Leviticus narrative must now be read in terms of the last narrative event related in Exodus: God's indwelling of the tabernacle.

The God who turned obstinate Egypt upside down with his presence, and who would have destroyed stiff-necked Israel were it not for Moses' intercession, now resides in Israel's midst. And that makes all the difference for reading and hearing Leviticus, for Leviticus answers the question: How can God's people survive his blazing glory? The answer: It lets all the generations of Israel hear, through Moses, the divine instructions that will keep it holy and clean in his presence, whether in the desert (Num. 5:3), in the land (Num. 35:34), or beyond (Luke 9:35).

4 The syntax of Ex. 40:36-38 defines these verses as an aside that looks ahead to Israel's travels from Mt. Sinai. The narrative does not describe these travels until Num. 9-10. Thus, all of Leviticus takes place at Mt. Sinai, and after the divine indwelling of the tabernacle. See footnote 5 on the strategy of sequential reading.

5 James W. Watts ("Public Readings and Pentateuchal Law," *Vetus Testamentum* 45, no. 4 [1995]: 543) argues that "laws were intended to be heard in the context of other laws and narratives surrounding them. . . . Unlike law, narrative invites, almost enforces, a strategy of sequential reading, of starting at the beginning and reading the text in order to the end. The placement of law within narrative conforms (at least in part) the reading of law to the conventions of narrative."
This is the God to whom Israel turned in Leviticus 24:10-23 to solve the problem of blasphemy by the Israelite-Egyptian, as Vroege points out. This is the God whose presence in Israel's midst will not allow his name to be blasphemed by anyone. It is this narrative that now gets uniquely informed by an instruction concerning the alien (24:16) that, as Vroege argues, fits with the passage and is not out of place. And so, the Israelite-Egyptian dies for his sin, as did Nadab and Abihu (10:1-2), for "among those who approach me I will show myself holy; in the sight of all the people I will be honored" (10:3).

The pentateuchal narrative contextualizes the divine speeches of Leviticus. It lets the reader know who speaks (a compassionate and jealous God), to whom he speaks (a stiff-necked and undeserving people), and describes the history of the relationship between the two (salvation and grace upon grace). Reading Leviticus independently from this account, as a mere collection of instructions, not only robs the instructions of their narrative rationale but also obscures the grace and justice of the God who speaks to his own as he leads them on their pilgrimage to the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Life in God’s Presence: The Distinction of Holiness

Leviticus assumes a clear separation between the covenant people and the rest of the nations. This teaching has its roots in God's acts going back to Abraham, whom God separated from the nations, even from his own family (Gen. 12:1). From that point on, Abraham and his descendants were called to live separate, holy lives (Gen. 17:1). At Sinai, God redefined this separation from the nations when he revealed that Israel, by maintaining his instructions, would be his "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Ex. 19:6). Leviticus teaches Israel how to be this holy nation by instructions in being distinct or separate (The key word is to separate or to distinguish [Hebrew: bdl / hbyl]):

You must distinguish between the holy and the common, between the unclean and the clean, and you must teach the Israelites all the decrees the LORD has given them through Moses. (Lev. 10:10-11, my emphasis)

You must distinguish between the unclean and the clean, between living creatures that may be eaten and those that may not be eaten. (Lev. 11:47, my emphasis).

But I said to you, "You will possess their land; I will give it to you as an inheritance, a land flowing with milk and honey. I am the LORD your God, who has I set you apart from the nations. You must therefore make a distinction between clean and unclean animals and between unclean and clean birds. Do not defile yourselves by any animal or bird or anything that moves along the ground--those which I have set apart as unclean for you. You are to be holy to me because I, the LORD, am holy, and I have set you apart from the nations to be my own. (Lev. 20:24-26, my emphasis)
Leviticus 20 shows that the distinctions by which Israel would live parallel the distinction that God made between it and the nations. These distinctions God impresses upon Israel's daily life: They will shape its sacrifices (Lev. 1-7); involve its diet, diseases, birth, and bodily functions (Lev. 11-15); regulate its work in the fields (Lev. 19, 25); define its sexual relationships (Lev. 18, 20); and layout the requirements for its priests (Lev. 8-10; 21-22). Nothing escapes God's instructions, not what Israel puts into its mouth (Lev. 11) nor what comes out of it (cf. Mark 7:14-23), as we see with the Israelite-Egyptian's blasphemy of God's name. And it did not matter that he was not a "regular" Israelite, as Vroege says. He got no special treatment. Even though the sinner was a mixture, his sin was not. And so Israel receives God's instruction to deal with this "strange mixture" and learns that the "extra" law about aliens in Leviticus 24:16 not only fits the narrative context, but also, as Vroege argues, that it is part of the one law that rules life in the presence of the lawgiver himself.

Blasphemy of God's name is a terrible problem for the Israelite-Egyptian because he, with the rest of Israel, is subject to all the distinctions God placed upon the people who live in his presence. The distinctions God has given Israel protect it in God's inescapable presence. So, for example, after instructing Israel in how to deal with the uncleanness of the bodily discharges of men and women, God tells Moses: "You must keep the Israelites separate from things that make them unclean, so they will not die in their uncleanness for defiling my dwelling place, which is among them" (Lev. 15:31, my emphasis). Later on he instructs Moses: "I will set my face against that man and I will cut him off from his people; for by giving his children to Molech, he has defiled my sanctuary and profaned my holy name" (20:3, my emphasis).

Sin, uncleanness, unholiness, however defined for Israel in the levitical instruction, is not primarily an offense against a neighbor because it causes personal, social, or environmental brokenness. Uncleanness offends God; it defiles his dwelling place and it mocks Israel's status as a distinct people. Thus, even as Adam and Eve were expelled from Eden for having defiled the place where God walked, so now God's people, when they defile God's presence, suffer the consequences. That is why the Israelite-Egyptian blasphemer was taken outside the camp (Lev. 24:14). Levitical instruction seeks to keep the children of the covenant from repeating the sin of Adam and Eve by teaching them what makes them different from the nations, and why (cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19-20; 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1). Life in God's presence has consequences, especially if we forget the distinction of holiness.

Cleansing the Camp: A Priestly People

General impressions notwithstanding, Leviticus is not a book by priests for priests alone; it is priestly instruction for a priestly people. From the opening instructions about the burnt offerings to the last chapter about redeeming what belongs to the Lord, the ordinary Israelite is taught how to live in God's presence. There are things only the priests are allowed to do: sprinkle sacrificial
blood on the sides of the altar, place the sacrifice on the altar, or declare someone clean or unclean. Nevertheless, the Israelite must place his hand on, and himself slaughter, the victim at the time of the burnt offering (Lev. 1:4-5), and the person who has been affected by uncleanness has the responsibility to present himself to the priest for the declaration of uncleanness and cleanness (Lev. 13). Thus the priestly people and its priestly leadership together live out die Lord's instructions. The priests teach Israel the Word of the Lord (10:10-11) by which all Israel, including the priests themselves (21-22), will live clean and holy lives in the presence of God. Whatever defiles the presence of God must be dealt with accordingly. Israel does so willingly because of its declared submission to the covenant Lord (Ex. 19:8; 24:3, 7), as we see in Leviticus 24:10-23.

God's instructions concerning the blasphemy of the Israelite-Egyptian included the terrible task of cleansing the camp, a cleansing that involved the people themselves: those who heard the blasphemy are to place their hands on the offender's head, and all the assembly must participate in the sentence of stoning. At this point in his sermon, Vroege reminds the congregation of the burnt offering instructions in Leviticus 1 and the responsibility of the individual Israelite to acknowledge his guilt. This is not the priest's burden. In Leviticus 24, however, "it's as if everyone within earshot is polluted. It's as if . . . everyone within range becomes unclean," says Vroege. Thus the narrative ending of the text reminds all readers and hearers: "Then Moses spoke to the Israelites, and they took the blasphemer outside the camp and stoned him. The Israelites did as the LORD commanded Moses" (Lev. 24:23). Similar inclusion in the guilt of sin and the responsibility of the community to maintain the camp clean in God's presence is related in the case of those who give their children to Molech, when God declares that "if the people of the community close their eyes when that man gives one of his children to Molech and fail to put him to death, I will set my face against that man" (20:4-5).

Leviticus articulates the gritty cost of the priestly people's personal and communal discipline. Distinguished from the nations, this holy nation will not let the nations define its identity or public activities (cf. 1 Peter 2:9-12). Rather, it accepts the priestly calling that all God's people are responsible to work out their holiness with fear and trembling for it is the God in their midst who will work in them both "to will and to act according to his good purpose" (Phil. 2:13).

Conclusion

Although Leviticus is a strange book, it is not unpreachable. Nor is it beyond the reach of God's people if we read it in its narrative context and if we keep in mind the importance of God's separation of his people from the nations and their stated commitment to live out the priestly instruction heard through God's chosen servant. There are many other issues that need to be addressed: the strangeness of the rituals and symbols, the reasons for separating certain animals for Israel's menu as well as other distinctions and the prohibition of
certain mixtures (Lev. 15:32; 19:19). Good commentaries can take us further.\textsuperscript{6} Commentaries will also help us understand what Richard Lisher calls a "linguistic base camp," the biblical vocabulary that defines a worldview and identifies God's separate people in the world to keep it sheltered from the free market of ideological pluralism. With such an awareness of our linguistic base camp we need not be creative or sophisticated; it will not be necessary to reread Leviticus in the light of our own experiences or feelings, for "our effectiveness as preachers depends not on the originality of our rhetorical choices but our conformity to the language that has been given us."\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{6}The best commentary for work in the church is still Gordon J. Wenham, \textit{The Book of Leviticus}, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), This is so because Wenham is not only careful to let Leviticus itself speak, he also links it with the New Testament throughout: This is not the case in the otherwise useful commentaries by John E., Hartley (\textit{Leviticus}, Word Biblical Commentary [Dallas: Word Books 1992]). Frank H. Gorman Jr. (\textit{Divine Presence and Community} [Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997]), or E. Gerstenberger (\textit{Leviticus} [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1996]).
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HYGIENE AND DISEASE IN PALESTINE IN MODERN AND IN BIBLICAL TIMES. (Part I)

By Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject of the diseases mentioned in the Bible has always been a difficult one and it is not expected that this present effort to elucidate it will have anything of finality about it. The writer will be content if he clears up some obscure points, and if incidentally he is able to present to his readers a considerable mass of facts which have not hitherto been co-ordinated. The basis of any correct views on the subject must be our knowledge of the conditions of life in Palestine in Old and New Testament times. Though doubtless much may be gathered from literature it is reasonable to suppose that the physical environment of the modern peoples of this land as regards climate, food, houses and mode of life being probably much the same as of old, a study of these will be likely to prove at least as important. Then the diseases rife in the land to-day may also be considered. It is quite possible that some diseases have changed their type or even become extinct, and it is certain that some diseases occur which were unknown before the Middle Ages, but as some popular information on the modern diseases of Palestine may be opportune at this time, this section will be complete in itself, though necessarily brief. Twenty years' residence in various parts of the Holy Land in actual medical practice enables the writer to treat this part of the subject with the authority of experience, and he does so with greater assurance, inasmuch as he has discussed various points here mentioned with other practitioners in the land, both personally and in conferences.

The literature of this subject was until recently extraordinarily scanty, but in the last few years a number of medical papers from those practising or making researches in the land have been published which do much to add to our knowledge. This is notably the case with regard to tropical
diseases in which, thanks to the researches of the workers in the "International Health Bureau," established in Jerusalem in 1913, we have scientific reports of the greatest value. Although a full Bibliography will be published at the conclusion of these papers, I may mention here a few recent papers which give information about diseases in modern Palestine in a fuller manner than will be possible here:


Dr. HUNTEMULLER.--"a Neuartige Parasitenbefunde bei der Jericho-beule," *Centralblatt fur Bakteriologie*, Berlin.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN.-" Notes on Some Tropical Diseases in Palestine," *Jour. of Hygiene*, 1913 and 1914; "Hirudinia as Human Parasites in Palestine," *Parasitology*, 1908; "Haemoglobinuric Fever in Syria," B. M. Jour., 1906, etc.

Prof. P. MUHLENS.--"Bericht uber eine Malariaexpedition nach Jerusalem," *Centralblatt fur Bakteriologie*, Abt. 1, Orig. Bd. 69, Heft. 1, Jena. (The most authoritative statement yet published.)


With regard to using modern scientific medical literature it must however be always remembered that from the point of view of old writings it is less helpful than might be hoped, as the scientific recognition of many specific diseases is comparatively modern and until quite recently such general terms as "fever," "consumption," "palsy," were used in a broad and general sense, and each included what we now know to be many varieties of disease. Perhaps more help will be found from study--such as will be attempted here--of the primitive ideas of disease and its cure, such as is still to be found abundantly among the people of the land. Some light on the conditions of life and health in early times, which may be gathered from the results of Palestine excavations, will form the subject of a special chapter.

Finally, an endeavour will be made to get as near as possible to the true meaning of the various terms used in the description of disease and to investigate the actual relation of the Mosaic laws to health. Here then is a considerable body of Biblical and theological literature to which reference will be made in the Bibliography.

1 The author would be grateful for any references to medical or Biblical papers bearing on the subject.
PART I.--DISEASES OF MODERN PALESTINE AND SYRIA.

CHAPTER I.

Race, Habit, and Food as bearing on Disease.

It is not necessary to discuss here the very complicated ethnological relations of the various and mixed races inhabiting Palestine and Syria; for practical purposes it is sufficient to recognize three distinct classes of people distinguished by such special habits of life as to have a somewhat different liability to disease. These are

1. the nomads or bedawin, who dwell in tents all the year round and live a pastoral as contrasted with an agricultural life; (2) the peasants or fellahin, who are primarily agriculturalists; and (3) the town dwellers or hader, whose occupations are various. Each class shades off into the other. Thus, some of the local bedawin live in rough houses or old ruins in the winter, and do a certain amount of primitive agriculture, housing their cattle and stores of tibn in the winter; and a considerable number of the fellahin, particularly in recent years, though making their homes in their villages, spend so much of their time in occupations in the towns as to expose them to all the disease-risks of the townsfolk.

1. The bedawin are popularly credited, on account of their entirely open-air life, with great soundness of constitution, but it cannot be said that this is the case with the nomads of Palestine. They are exceedingly scantily clad, the poorest in actually nothing but a shirt, and their skins are exposed to all the extremes of heat and cold; their goat-hair tents are but little protection from the heat of summer or the cold and wet of winter; while, during the latter season, the atmosphere of their dwellings is commonly saturated with the irritating smoke from wood or dung. It might be supposed that the smoke would at least afford some protection from insect pests, but the truth is that, under such conditions, lice, mosquitoes, and other insect pests are found in abundance. Doubtless, in the days when the bedawin possessed considerable wealth of cattle, camels, and horses, and were able both to feed well and to keep themselves in good physique by martial exercises, they enjoyed greater robustness, but now a large proportion of the bedawin of Palestine are sallow in complexion, and constantly suffer from malarial fever, and even from pulmonary tuberculosis (consumption), from which it might bethought their out-door life would save them.
Even their nomad habits do not deliver them from epidemics of small-pox, typhus, enteric, measles and whooping-cough; and the mortality is very high, especially among the young. While it is probably true that the great desert tribes are largely free from venereal diseases, this is certainly not the case with the mongrel bedawin in the neighbourhood of the towns of Palestine, who have very low morals: syphilis and gonorrhoea are extremely common among them, and it is said that the same is the case with some of the nomads of Sinai. These same bedawin are described as being peculiarly liable to rheumatism. No class are greater fatalists, and in the larger number of cases of illness the patient is left uncared for, even, as the writer has witnessed, when the sick one is a cherished son. The bedawin have remedies of their own, but many appear to be the result of the inspiration of the moment rather than of any tribal lore. The food of these nomads consists of unleavened bread, made of coarsely ground wheaten flour, burghul (bruised wheat, boiled), rice, leban (sour milk), cheese, dates and fresh fruit when they can be obtained; occasionally, as on a feast, a sheep is killed and there is a gorge of meat. A great number of them suffer from chronic dyspepsia, the pangs of which they usually ascribe to intestinal worms; these, it is true, they also have in plenty. Childbirth is, as a rule, accomplished with extraordinary ease. Although these nomads, in a remarkable manner, survive injuries received in their fights, their constitutions present very little resistance to acute diseases, particularly perhaps to pneumonia, and they succumb to what any soundly constituted European would successfully resist.

(2) The fellahin are ethnologically a very mixed race, and distinctive physical characteristics are found in certain villages or groups of villages. In general, the poorest both in physique and in possessions are found in southern Palestine. The great masses of the fellahin--like the bedawin--are nominally Moslems, but they know but little of the religion which they profess, and follow a cult of traditional religious customs, often quite at variance with their orthodox belief. There is a certain number of Christian villages scattered about the land where, as a rule, the houses and surroundings are more comfortable than in the villages of the Moslems. In northern Palestine, particularly, the most varied races and classes dwell side by side--Christians (in several distinct sects), Jews (in “colonies”), Sunnite Moslems, and Metaweleh, Druzes, Moslem Circassians, Turkomans, and Algerians. Even those
occupying villages within sight of each other will often have but little social intercourse. All over the land the custom of inter-marriage within the very narrow circle of a single village, or of a small group of villages, is the rule. This constant interbreeding is naturally prejudicial to health, and must greatly concentrate the tendency to inheritance of disease. The houses of the fellahin are usually constructed of very loosely built walls, with flat mud roofs, unprovided with parapets (Deut. xxii, 8), and in many parts of the land without even chimneys. These ill-made walls, however, have the advantage of allowing free ventilation even when, as is the rule, all windows and doors are closed at night. Most dwellings swarm with vermin. In some parts of the land (e.g., Hattin, Banias, etc.) the inhabitants sleep in booths constructed on the roofs during the summer months, when the vermin are most active. A witness to the commonness of the presence of body lice is supplied by the exclamation frequently used in northern Palestine, "May God not remove them [i.e., the lice] from me!" because the sudden departure of these pests from anyone is considered a sign of mortal sickness. The village streets are narrow and very irregular. Heaps of refuse accumulate in corners, and a huge dung heap--the breeding-place of countless myriads of flies--dominates the habitations. There are, with very few exceptions, no sanitary arrangements, and the whole village is often surrounded by a narrow area of human excreta which the fellahin never take the trouble to cover with earth, and which, when the rains come, is, in many cases, carried into the source of the water supply. Although the native of the land has a keen appreciation of good water when he sees it, and will laud the virtues of fine springs in extravagant language, he is often very careless about his domestic supply. In many places water is very scarce over much of the year, and little can be spared, or is used, for personal cleanliness. On the other hand, the young lads, in many villages, bathe daily in the tank or pool which supplies water for domestic use. The house-floors, being usually of beaten earth, can never be properly cleansed and harbour the accumulated filth of years. The fellah has the advantage neither of the nomad's periodical migration to a clean site nor of the thorough cleansing which the town-dweller is able to give periodically to his stone-paved floor. From want of personal cleanliness and the impregnation with sewage of the food, especially the salads, intestinal worms are exceedingly common. The food of the villager,
in addition to the articles mentioned as eaten by the nomad, includes a large amount of fresh and dried fruits, especially figs, grapes, apricots and dates, and in their seasons, fresh melons, gourds and cucumbers. Cooked with meat he has rice, vegetable marrows, egg-plant (solanum), barmeyeh (Hibiscus esculentus), tomatoes, etc. Eggs, chicken, and meat in general are eaten more commonly than with the bedawin, and in certain districts fish is also a usual article of diet; but the majority of the villagers never touch it. As with the bedawin, so with these people, there is a great prevalence of dyspepsia, due partly to the common custom of making but one large meal daily, in which half-cooked bread and unripe fruit largely figure, partly to the over-eating which occurs at feasts, and perhaps most of all to the perpetual over-drinking of water (a habit in itself often due to dyspepsia), which distends the stomach and dilutes the gastric juices. This last is even more true of the bedawin, who have often to wait for a long time before getting a satisfactory drink. The fellahin suffer much from the cold and wet in winter, the majority make but little change of raiment, and those who can do so cower over their small charcoal fires during the long, heavy, rains of the winter months. They need sunshine for their natural life, darkness and wet are things to be got through as well as possible--preferably in slumber.

Then we turn to the hader, or townsfolk. It is necessary to distinguish to some degree between the Moslems, the Christians and the Jews, and, in the case of the last two, to differentiate between the true Orientals and the more or less orientalized Europeans, because each class has different social customs and modes of life, leading to a different liability to disease. For example, venereal diseases are distinctly rare among the Jews of Palestine, not very common among the oriental Christians, but fairly common among the more well-to-do Moslems. This is said to be increasingly true the nearer we approach to Egypt; at Gaza, for example, a very high percentage of the people, according to the late Rev. Canon Sterling, M.B., suffer from syphilis. The morals of the Jews of the Holy Land, particularly of the European immigrants, are good; they, as a class, are much held in check by religious motives. Public vice is uncommon everywhere, but on the other hand a large proportion of the more notorious “public women,” especially in Damascus, are Jewesses. Among the Moslems, unnameable vices are deplorably common, and they are viewed by the rank and file
with but little horror. The kidnapping of boys for vile purposes is
done in some of the larger Moslem centres in broad daylight, and
the victims, not uncommonly native Jews, have but little redress.
The writer has had many such cases under his care.

As a whole the towns-people enjoy better houses, better clothes
and better food than the fellahin; and perhaps, as a class, oriental
Christians know best how to live comfortably. Food is much the
same as with the fellahin, with the addition of great quantities of
sweets and nuts, sweet sherbets and coffee, the first mentioned,
particularly, leading to rapid decay of the teeth. The villager with
his coarse food has usually excellent teeth, but a few months of
town life leads to rapid deterioration. Milk is, by a long-standing
instinct, always boiled--a custom which doubtless saves many lives
from Malta fever, enteric and tuberculosis. In the towns, dyspepsia
is also somewhat common, much of it being due to the habit of
cooking food with oil, olive or sesame, instead of, as with the
fellahin, with semen (boiled butter). The orthodox Jews, always,
and the native Christians, at fast seasons, are obliged to cook
their meat and vegetables in this way, and experience shows that
food so prepared is not easily digested.

The sanitary arrangements of all the towns are still extremely
primitive. Drain traps are practically unknown, except in European
houses and institutions. The “waterclosets” are usually in close
proximity to the front door, or the kitchen, or both; and the
entrance to the main drain or cesspool, where there is often an
accumulation of years, being quite untrapped, the effluvia is at
times almost unbearable. In Jerusalem, which should be a place
easily drained, a water-carriage system of main drainage has been
made, ancient sewers being utilized, but as there is no system of
flushing these badly constructed, stone-built channels, sewage
stagnates in them during the whole dry season, poisonous gases
make their way freely into the houses and streets, and the liquids
impregnate the surrounding soil for a considerable distance, and,
without doubt, in places reach the neighbouring cisterns. When
the heavy winter's rains fall, the accumulation of months is carried
down the main sewer, emerges in the valley of the Kedron just
below the village of Silwan, and flows down the valley in close
proximity to the Bir Eyyub (Job's well--the ancient ' en-Rogel), the
water of which is carried to the city for many domestic purposes.
Much of the fresh sewage is distributed over the gardens to the
south of the city, in which are grown quantities of the salads, cauliflowers, and other vegetables supplied to the city. One effect of these and such-like arrangements is the universal occurrence of “round worms” among the native population, and here too we have all the necessary antecedents for the propagation of enteric fever and cholera.

(To be continued.)
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HYGIENE AND DISEASE IN PALESTINE IN MODERN
AND IN BIBLICAL TIMES. (Part II)

By DR. E. W. G. MASTERMAN.

(Continued from Q.S., 1918, p. 20.)

CHAPTER II--The Climate and Water Supply in relation to Health and Disease.

IT is not always realized that Palestine belongs to the sub-tropical zone, and lies farther south than not only every part of Europe but also of most of Morocco and Algiers, of all Tunis, and of the whole of the United States of America with the exception of Florida and parts of Texas and Louisiana. The latitude of Jaffa (32° N.) is practically that of Amritsar in India and Shanghai in China. Moreover, in the great central rift of the Jordan Valley the climatic conditions must be described as tropical.

The land as a whole is fairly well supplied with rain, but the rainfall is very unequally distributed throughout the year, extending as it does over little more than six months. January, February, December and March are--in this order--the wettest months; there may be fairly heavy showers in October, November, April and, exceptionally, even in May. It is very unusual for any rain to fall in June, July, August and--except quite at the end of the month--in September. The amount of the rainfall is liable to considerable annual fluctuations and varies with the altitude. In Jerusalem, regular daily observations have been taken since 1860. The heaviest season's rainfall was 42.95 inches in 1877-78, and the lightest 12.5 inches in 1869-70. The mean annual fall is about 26.5 inches. There seem to be cycles of greater and lesser falls, dry spells and wet coming in groups, but no definite rhythm has been observed. In the Maritime Plain, observations have been taken at Jaffa (P.E.F.) and at the German colonies of Sarona and Wilhelma, and in the
Jordan Valley at Tiberias (P.E.F.) and at the Jewish colony of Melhamiyeh. The rainfall in the Maritime Plain is less than in Jerusalem--perhaps about 25 per cent. less--and that in the neighbourhood of the Lake of Galilee still less. Fortunately, these regions are far less dependent upon rainfall than the mountain districts. We have no regular observations recorded in the Dead Sea district, but the rainfall is very much less than in any other part of Western Palestine. On the edge of the eastern plateau there is a rainfall comparable with that on the highlands to the west, but it is only a fringe of a few miles which is so benefited. Where once the water-parting is passed and the gentle eastward slope begins, the rainfall rapidly diminishes in amount, and it is very scanty indeed east of the Hedjaz Railway.

In the late summer heavy clouds come up from the west, and during many nights the higher lands--especially in the north--are drenched in "dew" which does much to fatten the grapes and olives.

In the highlands the springs, though not infrequent, are seldom copious, and in many parts the people of the land have from early historic times resorted to cisterns to store the rain, both for their domestic use and for their vineyards. In Jerusalem, the water of the intermittent spring 'Ain Umm ed-Deraj, "the Virgin's Spring" (Gihon of the Old Testament), and of the deep-lying spring in Bir Eyyub (En-Rogel of the Old Testament) is brackish and impregnated with sewage. I have examined samples of both these waters and found abundant chlorides, free ammonia and nitrites. The main source of drinking water is consequently the numerous rain-filled cisterns--public and private--which have been excavated in the rock or, in parts of the city, in the overlying soil. In Roman times--perhaps even somewhat before--two systems of aqueducts, known respectively as the "High Level" and "Low Level" aqueducts, brought water from the neighbourhood of Wady Artas, where to-day the three great reservoirs known as “Solomon's Pools” now much out of repair, bear witness to the thoroughness of these great "waterworks." Wady Artas is 7 ½ miles directly south of Jerusalem, but the low level aqueduct, which alone remains more or less complete, ran 13 miles along the hill sides to reach the city. Two additional systems of aqueducts brought a supply also to these pools, a chain of wells connected up by an aqueduct, known as a khariz, which enters the Wady Artas by a deep rock-cut tunnel, and an aqueduct, similar in construction to the low level aqueduct, which
runs 28 miles along the hill sides from Wady Arrub—only 5 miles to the south in a direct line. Both these extensions have been long out of repair, but from the springs in Wady Artas, by utilizing the low level aqueduct in part and replacing it with a 4-inch iron pipe elsewhere, a feeble stream of water still (at any rate before the war) reaches Jerusalem. From this pipe the inhabitants of the city are able to fill their vessels with water of a fair quality, but it is a poor enough supply for a great city. Before this 4-inch pipe supply was introduced, an attempt was made to supply the needs of the city—then urgent through a poor season's rainfall—by bringing water in tanks by rail from the spring at Bittir—the next station to Jerusalem on the Jerusalem-Jaffa Railway. European residents were accustomed in years gone by to have water brought in jars or tins from the abundant fountain at 'Ain Karim, but this has often proved unsatisfactory as the bearers are untrustworthy.

As far as health is concerned there is not much wrong with well-stored cistern water. It is a little "flat" but has none of the disagreeable taste of rainwater in European cities, which is contaminated by a smoky atmosphere. Careful people ensure cleanliness of the roofs by allowing the first day's rainfall in each season to run away for a few hours. Cisterns must be periodically cleaned out, but it is surprising how small is the sediment deposited in even the largest cistern, where only the roof-water is collected. Most cisterns are rock-cut and carefully cemented with an impermeable cement, in the making of which the ground-up fragments of broken—often ancient—pottery are used. Water so stored, if originally pure, keeps sweet and good for a long while and, when the sediment is settled, is quite bright and clear, although a Pasteur filter shows that there remains constantly a small quantity of undissolved earthy impurity. In some respects, the system of private cisterns is probably safer than a doubtfully-managed public supply. A water-borne disease, such as enteric fever, cannot be carried all over the city. On the other hand, the small cisterns in the houses of the poor not infrequently leak, and those in the city, being often made in the soil, may become infected with sewage. They are also mostly open and, on this account, liable to contamination from many sources. Mosquitoes—*Anopheles, Culices* and *Stegomyeyer*—breed in them in countless numbers, and the Anopheles are especially dangerous as the carriers of malaria. Cisterns should be systematically inspected, repaired and kept closed to the entry of mosquitoes. The only satisfactory plan
is to provide them all with pumps instead of the primitive hand-buckets let down through a wide, open well-mouth.

The Syrian native esteems "living" (spring) water very highly, but I have known people, accustomed to the soft rainwater of Jerusalem, who were digestively upset by drinking from the beautiful springs of Nablus, the water of which is very hard from a high percentage of lime and magnesium salts.

In the villages water is, if possible, brought from springs, even at a considerable distance, for drinking purposes, but in the late summer in many places the fellahin and bedawin have to make shift with water of a very inferior quality, obtained from anywhere they can get it.

With regard to the temperature, there is a great difference between various parts of the land. Upon the high mountain plateaux of Judaea and Galilee, in parts of Central Palestine, and in much of the higher lands east of the Jordan, the winter months are bracing, though the spells of heavy rain, lasting often a week or more at a time, are trying in a land where the dwellings are built rather for heat than cold, and where fuel is scarce. To many of the poor the winter is a time to be endured with the reflection that it does not always rain. Between the bouts of rain are spells of bright sunshine and pleasant warmth. At times at Jerusalem, Hebron, and such mountain elevations, snow falls heavily, and occasionally lies on the ground for some days. It is welcomed by the agriculturalists, as the slowly melting snow thoroughly moistens the soil.

The mean temperature in the shade in Jerusalem during the three colder months (January, February and March) is 48°•7 F.; in the Maritime Plain (Wilhelma) 56°•4, and by the Jordan (Kasr Hajla) 69°•2. During the six months for May to October (inclusive) the mean in Jerusalem is 71°•6, in the Plains 76°•9, and by the Jordan 91°, but this hardly conveys an idea of the actual heat experienced. The mean of the maximum temperatures in the shade of the four hottest months is 84°•3 in Jerusalem, 96°•4 in the Plains, and 112°•5 at the Jordan. In Jerusalem itself, though temperatures over 90° are common in the summer, temperatures over 100° are infrequent.

The heat in the higher parts of Palestine is much mitigated by the cool westerly breezes which, with considerable regularity, blow from the middle of the forenoon until some time near sunset, and a north-westerly breeze is very common all the summer night,
making the hours of sleep refreshing. The most unhealthy and
disagreeable days are those when the dry, hot sirocco blows from
the south-east ("a dry wind of the high places in the wilderness,"
Jer. iv, 11), sometimes for several successive days and nights. At
such times those who have good stone houses keep the windows
and doors closed, and to step outside from such a house is like
stepping into the neighbourhood of a furnace. The wind is intensely
dry and, at times, loaded with fine desert dust, producing a haze;
vegetation languishes, the leaves droop, and most people--especially,
perhaps, Europeans--feel varying degrees of discomfort. During and
after a bout of such a wind, the increase in "fever" and other illnesses
is marked. May, just after, and September and October just before
the rains, are the worst months. In midsummer sirocco is rare, and
in the winter the south-east wind, though dry, is cold and bracing.

Taking Palestine as a whole, for those who do not mind a fairly
high temperature in summer, the clear pure air and cloudless sun-
shine are very enjoyable. Compared with Egypt the highlands of
Palestine enjoy a better summer climate for Europeans, though
falling far short of some parts of the Lebanon. But even so, in my
experience, all the Europeans I have known have been benefited
by occasional change to the more temperate zone, and some ladies
find residence in high altitudes, such as Jerusalem, trying to the
nervous system. In winter the coast and the Jordan Valley, e.g.,
Tiberias and Jericho, are delightful; the latter, however, for three
or four months only, and even then special precautions must be
taken against malaria.

Mention must be made here of local means provided by nature
of treating disease. Many have found the Dead Sea water beneficial
for rheumatism, but more definitely medicinal in their properties
and more sanctioned by the custom of centuries, are the hot
sulphurous springs which occur at many places in the land. The
groups of springs at Tiberias, the valley of the Yarmuk, and in the
Wady Zerka Ma'an, a valley opening into the Dead Sea from the
east, were all famous in Roman times as health resorts, and are
all still used by the indigenous inhabitants. Only at Tiberias has
any attempt been made at providing accommodation for the bathers,
and that is ill-managed and far from clean. It is to be hoped that
any new regime in Palestine will recognize the value of these sites
for the sick, and make arrangements that they may be used to full
advantage under proper medical supervision.
The question may well be asked at the present time how far has Palestine a climate suitable for Europeans wishing to make permanent homes there? At present malaria and other diseases are recurring scourges which greatly increase the danger and discomfort of those who would live there. But supposing these can be in places banished and in others mitigated, what is likely to be the effect on the European and his family who make the land their home? My impression is that in the higher mountain regions many Europeans may with care live comfortably, if they learn to restrain their energies, especially in the hot months, and their children can, with special precautions, be reared in health. I have my doubts as to whether a succession of generations, where the children do not have the benefit of visiting Europe for a period of years in their youth—as is the case with most Europeans to-day—would grow up such a sturdy stock as those reared in northern climes. In the Maritime Plain European families, especially young children, would probably suffer from the much prolonged sub-tropical heat, and visits to the highlands part of each summer is desirable if possible. Schools for such children might advantageously be situated in the mountains.

Most of the Jordan Valley is quite unfit for European families. It is intensely malarious, and this disease is unlikely to be eradicated here. Though the individual—the hardy adult workman, whose work lies there—may, by living in a mosquito-proof house and taking quinine, protect himself, it is no place for a family except for a few months in winter. The families of those whose work lies there should live in the mountains, and ready means of access, by tram or train, should be provided for the overseers. In the deepest parts of the Jordan Valley, e.g., round Jericho, etc., the actual manual labourers should, I suspect, be of negro stock, as are so many of the people there to-day.

CHAPTER III.—The Common Diseases of Palestine and Syria.

The most characteristic and important of the diseases of Palestine is Malaria in its various manifestations. Practically speaking, it occurs all over the land and affects every class of its inhabitants. It is very prevalent in Jerusalem, especially in late summer. Recent investigations have shown that during these months (August to October) 27.30 per cent. of all the children actually attending school have malarial parasites in their blood; and on examination,
the blood of 7,771 persons of all classes and conditions revealed parasites in 26.7 percent. The percentages were remarkably divided, being 40.5 per cent. among the poor Jews, 31.1 per cent. among the Moslems, 16.4 per cent. among the native Christians, and 7.2 per cent. among the Europeans. Practically, the percentage is an index of social environment and hygienic surroundings, the Europeans in particular having learned the lesson of prevention and early cure. Malaria occurs, though as a rule to a lesser extent, in all the towns and villages in the mountain region, especially those bordering on the Jordan Valley.

The incidence of malaria is now known to depend very largely on the water supply of a district and the nearness to areas where the fever lingers longest throughout the year, because the healthy are infected from the sick through certain kinds of mosquitoes, which pass the larva and pupa state of their lives in water. Five species of the sub-family *Anopheinae* have been identified in Palestine, all of which are probably malarial-parasite carriers, viz., *Anopheles Maculipennis* (the common Anopheles of Jerusalem), *Pyreto- phorus Palestinensis*, *Pyretophoris Sergentii* (only as yet identified in Galilee), *Myzorhynchus Pseudopictus* (common in the Huleh marshes), and *Cella Pseudopictus*. Of these the first two are the most widely distributed and important. The usual situations of breeding of the larvae of these mosquitoes are the marshy pools and sluggish streams of the low lands; in the neighbourhood of Jaffa and at many places on the coast, especially around Caesarea and the neighbouring district, such semi-stagnant pools occur in numbers. In Jerusalem, the larvae of the two first-mentioned varieties breed in countless numbers in the semi-closed rainwater cisterns attached to almost all the houses, and it is therefore little wonder that malarial fevers are there continuously propagated. There are many villages and small towns where there are no suitable breeding grounds, and in such places malarial fevers are rare. The forms of malaria are the Tertian (occurring every third day, that is, with one day's interval), the Quartian (with two days' interval), and the Tropical, or double Tertian, where the fever is remittent but not intermittent. The only satisfactory means of distinguishing the three forms lies in microscopical examination of the blood in all cases. This we did for one whole year in all cases coming to my hospital, as far as possible on the first occasion of any given attack of fever. Out of 2,166 such cases, we found parasites in 46.5 per cent., and of these cases
25.5 per cent. had Tertian parasites, 27.4 per cent. Quartian parasites, and 47.1 per cent. Tropical or malignant malarial parasites. Many cases were doubly infected, and some had all varieties at one time. Almost all the Tropical cases occurred in the hot months, July to November, and no fresh infections occurred in the cool weather, because this particular parasite cannot develop in the body of the mosquito in so cool a temperature. Were it not for the continual re-infection of the inhabitants by people returning fever-stricken from the tropical Ghor, this, by far the most dangerous form of malaria, would die out in the mountains. The closing of cisterns, the destruction of the larvae by putting a small quantity of petrol on the surface of the water (which in no way spoils the water for drinking purposes if the water is taken from some depth by means of a pump, and in any case evaporates in a few hours), and the isolation of the sick within mosquito-proof curtains or buildings, are some of the means which have already been introduced to diminish infection. The prophylactic use of quinine has also been tried with considerable success. In the case of many European houses, the use of wire netting for windows and doors has greatly reduced the number of these pests and almost entirely prevented malaria. The systematic carrying out of well-recognized measures might reduce malaria, in Jerusalem at any rate, to a minimum. The loss of life, particularly infant life, through malaria is terrible; in many districts every infant in arms will be found to have an enormous "ague cake" (enlarged spleen), to be anaemic and often dropsical. The anaemia caused by malaria lays the victims open to infection by various other diseases on account of their reduced constitutional resistance, and makes them anxious cases for surgical operations as they are specially liable to haemorrhage. Malaria is thus directly and indirectly responsible for more deaths among children and young adults in many parts of these lands than any other disease. During recent years a number of cases of Blackwater fever have occurred: they have been almost exclusively among Europeans-Germans and immigrant Jews—and chiefly in the "colonies" around Jaffa or in the upper end of the Jordan Valley. In some years the disease has assumed a great virulence and the mortality has been very high. Even in Jerusalem cases occur from time to time among the residents.

Enteric fever, always endemic, at times occurs in epidemics. It is particularly fatal to Europeans; doubtless many of the native
children suffer from mild attacks in infancy and are, later in life, more or less immune. Of other fevers, typhus, influenza, and (on the coast) Dengue fever all occur in epidemics. Sporadic cases of Malta fever are seen at times, and also *Spirillum* (relapsing) fever. Measles, rubeola, mumps, whooping-cough, and chicken-pox are almost always to be found among the children; the first-mentioned at times bursts forth with startling severity.

**Smallpox** when it sweeps through the land, has a very high mortality; vaccination is but half-heartedly carried out even in the large towns, and scarcely at all in the villages. I have known cases of unvaccinated Europeans—travellers and residents—being fatally attacked. Inoculation is still resorted to at times, with terrible results.

**Scarlet fever** appears to have been recently introduced, and its toll of victims in the towns has been enormous.

**Diphtheria** occurs from time to time, but probably less so—paradoxically enough—than in the more sanitary cities of Europe.

**Dysentery** is most commonly a complication of malarial attacks, but acute (amoebic) dysentery also occurs not infrequently, a large proportion of the cases being fatal. Tropical abscess of the liver is by no means uncommon, as a sequela of dysentery.

**Cholera**, known to the natives as *howa el-asfar* ("the yellow wind"), appears in severe epidemics at intervals, with an enormous mortality. In nothing does the fatalism of the ignorant natives appear more prominently than in their attitude towards this disease. In spite of all warnings, they will wash the clothes of cholera patients in the village water-supply; at Tiberias, during the terrible epidemic of 1902, many of the people could not be induced to drink the boiled water freely and liberally supplied to them by the resident Scotch doctor, but used this for washing their clothes and drank of the sewage-infected lake-water at their doors. It is not wonderful that the epidemic decimated the town. Fortunately, epidemics of this disease have been rare during the last half-century.

**Plague** has not occurred in epidemic form in Palestine since the first third of the nineteenth century, though sporadic cases have been detected and isolated at the ports; in earlier ages it swept over the land with terrible effect.

**Erysipelas** is by no means uncommon among the town-dwellers, many cases contracting infection at the site of the "issues" the people make and keep permanently open on their arms and elsewhere
with the idea of benefiting their chronic eye-diseases. Tetanus occurs occasionally, and cases of hydrophobia from the bites of camels, jackals and cats, as well as pariah dogs, occur annually. The Turkish Government, through the local authorities, assist all such cases, when needing financial help, to go to Egypt or Constantinople for treatment by the Pasteur method, and just before the war the “International Health Bureau” established a small "Pasteur Institute" in Jerusalem, but the fellahin have but little belief in any European assistance in this disease.

Acute rheumatism is fairly common, and is responsible for a large proportion of the cases of valvular disease of the heart. Such cases do badly on account of the poor food, the anaemia produced by malaria, and, in the cases of women, the very youthful age of marriage, frequent child-bearing, and hard life generally. The closely allied disease, chorea (St. Vitus's dance), is not uncommon. Chronic rheumatoid arthritis is commoner among the Jews and other European residents than among the fellahin. Next to malaria the disease germ most responsible for death in Palestine and Syria to-day is Tubercle. The increase in tubercular disease in the land during the last few years has been appalling. Tubercular disease of the lungs (phthisis), of the bowels (tabes mesenterica), of the bones and joints (producing caries of the spine, hip disease, etc.), and of the lymphatic glands, occur everywhere. Cases of Phthisis (consumption) are often exceedingly acute, even when pure air and a semi-outdoor life are secured. This is due, doubtless, in many instances, to the mistaken kindness of friends, who quietly allow patients to refuse nourishment when there is a disinclination for food. There is a growing dread of infection in this disease, and many poor sufferers are shockingly neglected by their relatives, who are afraid to associate with them. There might be a fine field for philanthropic effort in the establishment of efficient sanatoria for such cases. There is already one such in Syria, in the mountains north of Beirut. The increase in phthisis is no doubt partly due to the great number of cases of this disease which have been sent to the land from other countries. Jews from Russia, so infected, used constantly to arrive, advised by their doctors to try the pure air of Syria. Doubtless, too, many dwellings become riddled with tubercle bacilli from cases of advanced disease, who pass months crouched up in dark corners, spitting infective sputum all over the floor, and in a state of filth and neglect. A great deal of tuberculous
meat, which is rejected as *tarif* (ritually "unclean") by the Jews, is freely sold among other classes. Oxen and cows are not readily killed while useful, and their failure of strength in ploughing or in milk-production is often due to tuberculous disease; they are thus peculiarly liable to come into the hands of the butcher in that condition. With respect to tubercle of glands, bones and joints, it is safe to say that the majority of the severe operations performed by surgeons in Palestine are for the treatment of such conditions. Caries of the spine, producing the crook-backedness of Lev. xxi, 20, is by no means rare. It would appear to be considered a merit among the Jews for a man to marry such a deformed woman.

**Leprosy** is not a common disease but it infects all classes—Moslems, Jews and Christians: there are in all Palestine not more, perhaps, than 250 lepers, most of them segregated in Jerusalem, Ramleh, Nablus, or Damascus, where they live in houses provided by the Government. The fact, however, which the writer has recently observed, that a good many cases are to be found unsuspected among the villagers in some parts of the land, makes the above estimate a little uncertain. The disease occurs very sporadically without any evident cause. For practical purposes it may be considered incurable, though the rare cases of the pure "anesthetic" form—where the peripheral nerve trunks are chiefly involved—live many years, and, after a time, the disease may cease to progress. Tubercular or "mixed" forms, in which the skin is invaded by nodules of new inflammatory deposit produced by the presence of masses of leprosy baccilli, are much more rapidly fatal. Seven or eight years is the average length of life from the time when the symptoms are first recognised. The later stages of this disease are, in this--the common--form of the disease, attended by horrible mutilation. The fingers and toes, and sometimes portions of the arms and legs, ulcerate away; the eyes are always affected and the eyelids are distorted: the nose, cheeks, mouth and especially the palate, are swollen and ulcerated; the face gradually loses its expression, and often becomes an object of horror; the voice becomes hoarse, and, at times, reduced to a whisper, through ulceration of the vocal cords. In the last stages the man is really a "mass of corruption," but fortunately for him the intellectual powers are gradually dimmed, and the poor victim does not realize his position. In purely "anaesthetic" cases unsightly contractions of the hands and feet due to paralysis of certain groups of muscles occur, and
the condition, though permanent, sometimes remains without further progressive deformity for years. The disease, though in a low degree infectious, is not hereditary, and the children of lepers, if isolated from their parents early enough, may entirely escape the disease. This has been demonstrated many times in connection with the Moravian Leper Hospital in Jerusalem.

**Rickets** is a disease by no means uncommon in the towns, particularly among some classes of Jews. Infantile diarrhoea is a cause of great mortality. Syphilis, while by no means so prevalent as in European lands, is not uncommon among the town-dwelling Moslems of the middle and upper classes, but on the whole it is of rather a mild type. The relative infrequency of this disease has without doubt much to do with the rarity of chronic nervous diseases such as locomotor ataxia.

**Nervous diseases** as a whole are much less prevalent among the indigenous inhabitants of these lands than in the homes of higher civilization and more strenuous life. Hemiplegia, due to arterial sclerosis or embolism, infantile paralysis, epilepsy, and paralysis agilans are all, however, fairly frequently met with. Among members of the Jewish race, hysteria, hypochondriasis, sciatica and other neuralgias and migraine are all common.

**Diabetes** appears to be peculiarly common among this people. The writer has, however, seen several cases among Armenians and also, to a less extent, among the native Syrian Christians and even the fellahin. Diabetic gangrene is a common complication. Reference has previously been made to the extreme prevalence, among all classes, of chronic dyspepsia. Haemorrhoids (piles), due to portal congestion, are very common, particularly among the Jews, who are accustomed to the regular use of alcohol. Appendicitis is a rare disease among the bedawin and fellahin; among foreign residents it is quite as common as in home lands.

**Intestinal worms** of all sorts are frequent in every class. "Round worms" occur in some individuals in such quantities as to give rise to the most alarming symptoms--suggestive even of peritonitis. Tape worm (*Taenia saginata*) is exceedingly common, and difficult of real cure. It is introduced by means of under-cooked (diseased) meat, and it is noticeable that the Jews, although their meat is inspected by butchers certified by the Rabbis as competent, are very liable to it. Hydatid disease, due to the *Taenia echinococcus*, is by no means unknown. These are not however the only "worm-
like" human parasites in Palestine. Wounds and “running ears” not uncommonly become full of maggots; ticks from dogs and horses occasionally attach themselves to the skin of the negligent; leeches (*Limnatis nilotica*), which abound in many wayside springs, are in some districts not uncommonly introduced with the drinking water, lodging themselves at times in the mouth, naso-pharynx, or larynx and giving rise to intermittent buccal haemorrhages, and in some cases to extreme dyspnoea. The "guinea worm" (*Dracontiasis etedinensis*), though almost certainly not indigenous, is not uncommonly found in the feet and legs of those who come from Arabia or Central Asia.

With regard to non-tubercular Lung diseases, spasmodic asthma is very prevalent in Jerusalem; pneumonia is a common cause of death, especially among the bedawin and the fellahin; pleurisy and empyema are likewise frequently met with. Chronic bronchitis and emphysema are common, the latter being sometimes due to the excessive use of the *narghile* ("hubble-bubble").

Bright's disease and, in some districts, calculus of the kidney and bladder, are all familiar diseases, even in children.

True **Cancer** (*Carcinoma*) in all its forms appears to be less common among the natives of this land than in our home lands, though evidently the climate has nothing to do with this, because Europeans suffer from it quite as frequently as in Europe. Sarcoma is found in all classes.

**Congenital deformities**--club feet, cleft palate, hare-lip, abnormal numbers of fingers and toes, etc.--all occur much as in Europe. There is no doubt that many children with severe congenital deformities are "put away" at birth. With regard to supernumerary fingers and toes, there appears to be a feeling that to remove such, even when very unsightly and worse than useless, is an impious act. Hernia, both congenital and acquired, is frequently met with, and in recent years great numbers of people all over the land have submitted to "radical cures"; they do not take kindly to trusses.

Skin diseases, so often a result of continued want of personal cleanliness, are very common. Eczema, lichen, impetigo contagiosa, ringworm, favus and scabies are ever present in all the town population. Herpes, erythema nodosum, urticaria, and lupus also occur.

**Oriental boil**--the so-called "Aleppo button"--is extremely frequent in Aleppo and its neighbourhood, and also at Baghdad; but cases of this disease in Palestine are almost always from these localities. The writer never saw a genuine case which originated in Palestine. There is a peculiar eruption known as the "Jericho boil,"
which is common in the summer months in the neighbourhood of Jericho and among some of the bedawin living near the Jordan. In its chronic nature and subsequent scarring, it bears some resemblance to the true Oriental boil. The destruction of tissue is, however, much less, the lesions are usually multiple, and they are by no means exclusively on the exposed parts of the body.

Eye diseases are, and probably always have been, very prevalent in the Holy Land. The great majority of the cases of blindness are due to the results of acute ophthalmia or to smallpox; others are from injuries, cataract, glaucoma, or leprosy. *Ophthalmia neonatorum* (a common cause of blindness among infants in Europe) is exceedingly rare in Palestine.

The number of blind beggars about the towns is extraordinary; among the Moslems they occupy a privileged position, being employed to walk in front of funeral processions, chanting the Qur'an, led by a boy who can see; they also make similar recitations at the graves, being so employed because their condition is supposed to render them safe companions to the women-mourners who congregate there. They are prepared carefully for their duties by a shaikh, who ensures that they know the passages of the Qur'an correctly.

Among all classes these beggars receive a considerable degree of compassion and charity, and they have, in this respect, a better time than many equally poor who suffer from other diseases--except, perhaps, lepers.

The prevalent *Ophthalmia* of Palestine is ascribed by the natives to figs or prickly pears (cactus), and by Europeans to dust, flies, dirty water, etc. Until recent years Egyptian (and Palestinian) ophthalmia (acute muco-purulent conjunctivitis) was supposed to be something sui generis, but recent investigation has shown that this disease is due to the same specific germs as the ophthalmia of Europe. Four bacilli have been identified as commonly occurring—the gonococcus, the *pneumococcus*, the *Morax-Axenfeld*, and the *Koch-Weeks bacillus*. The first two are answerable for a considerable proportion of the most severe cases, in which the cornea becomes ulcerated and the whole eye sometimes becomes destroyed in a few hours. The Koch-Weeks bacillus is the special cause of the great exacerbation of ophthalmia (66 per cent. of all cases, Butler) which occurs annually in July and October. Although the epidemic is in these months, the severest cases often occur later, in: November or even December. Closely associated with this acute ophthalmia, though probably an entirely distinct disease, is the widely prevalent
trachoma, or "granular lids." This is the chief cause of defective sight and chronic filthy eyes; it appears to be a disease for which the Semitic races have a special proclivity. Like the ophthalmia mentioned above, it is, in its early-stages, highly infectious, and it is the commonest thing to find every member of a numerous family suffering from this unsightly complaint. The disease frequently begins insidiously, and is hardly noticed until a thickening of the upper lid, giving the appearance of the eye being half closed, and a smarting of the lids calls attention to it. In severe cases the whole of the conjunctiva lining the eyelids is found to be covered with "granulations" varying in size from a pin's head to a hemp seed or even larger. The "granulations," when neglected, are disastrous to the eye. In time they produce (directly or indirectly) "pannus," a kind of opaque growth over the cornea and--more serious still--these inflammatory growths commence, after a time, to cicatrize, and in so doing cause the eyelashes to become turned inwards towards the eye (trichiasis). These inverted eyelashes, by constantly playing up and down against the already irritated cornea, set up chronic inflammation, causing it to lose its transparency and leading gradually to diminishing sight and eventual blindness.

The proportion of people with defective sight is enormous, and in many districts it is the exception to find a person with two really sound eyes. Among the middle-aged most eyes will be found to have upon their corneae white patches (leucomata), the cicatrices of old ulcers, or a general loss of transparency due to trachoma, or to be suffering from a chronic discharge of muco-pus from the eyelids. Flies, though not the real cause of these diseases, without doubt act as carriers of infection from the diseased eyes to the sound, and this is more easily done because the afflicted, especially the young children, do not seem to mind the dozens of flies which collect upon their discharging lids. Loss of sight, which to us seems such a terrible affliction, in the East is taken with extraordinarily stoical impassiveness. One old Moslem, for example, who had travelled far to seek the advice of a British practitioner, when told that nothing could be done, merely exclaimed "el hamd el'illah" ("the praise to God!").

Sunstroke, especially among children, is by no means uncommon. Many Europeans get mild attacks from the heat in the Ghor.

Serpents' bites are fairly frequent, and in the Jordan Valley not seldom fatal; the majority of the snakes in the land, however, are harmless. Scorpions abound, but their stings, though painful,
are not usually dangerous; a weakly child may die from one unusually severe.

Various forms of Idiocy and Insanity are by no means uncommon, but suicide is distinctly rare. Idiots and the chronically weak-minded are treated with a certain respect and kindness, their minds being conceived of as engaged elsewhere than on earth. The acutely insane are frequently treated with great harshness—beaten, for example, or chained up in darkness and seclusion—with a view to driving out the supposed demon who causes the affliction.

A word may be added in conclusion regarding Childbirth. The age of marriage is very early in the Orient—twelve or thirteen is no uncommon age for a girl to be married and even to become pregnant. Childbirth among the bedawin and fellahin is a very primitive affair, and labour is short and easy; even when the mother is immature, the worst, as a rule, that happens is the death of the infant at birth. In the towns, too, the "uncivilized" Arab women and the Jewesses have easy labours. European doctors are only very exceptionally called in, as the larger towns, where such doctors reside, are also well supplied with skilful midwives. The old obstetric chair, which goes back to the most ancient times, is still in use in Jerusalem, but is now rapidly passing out of fashion. The period of suckling is long—among the Jews commonly two, and among the Moslems even three, years. Considering the hard lives and often poor fare, it is marvellous how the mothers contrive to suckle for so long, but the babies suffer terribly, and infant mortality is enormous. Abscesses of the breast are common, and if they occur in both breasts early after childbirth, the infant commonly dies. Infantile diarrhoea and dysentery and the results of malaria account for many deaths. It is quite a common thing to meet women who have had a dozen or more children, but who have succeeded in rearing but one or two. Although the parents will display a good deal of spasmodic anxiety over the infant while it is ill, they take its death with philosophic resignation. This is especially the case if the deceased is a female, for girls are not considered a subject of much congratulation, and "May God give you a boy," or "May God give you many sons," are the ordinary good wishes for a married couple. Many a wife who produces an unbroken succession of girls has a bad time of it with her husband and his relations.

To be continued.)

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: thildebrandt@gordon.edu
HYGIENE AND DISEASE IN PALESTINE IN MODERN AND IN BIBLICAL TIMES. (Part III)

By DR. E. W. G. MASTERMAN.

(Continued from Q.S., 1918, p. 71.)

CHAPTER IV.--The Ideas among the Natives of Palestine regarding the Causes and Cure of Disease.

THE ideas of the modern fellah or bedawi regarding the causes and cure of disease are derived from a number of traditions that have survived from various successive ages. First of all, there is a stratum of folklore belief which is universally respected to-day, but which, from its wide distribution and quaint unreasoning nature, is evidently extremely primitive; then there are beliefs connected in some degree with the orthodox religions, especially with the Kur’an and the official interpreters of these Scriptures; a later stratum, which accounts for disease on rational grounds, belongs to mediaeval medical lore; while in some parts of the land modern ideas of sanitation and of medical and surgical treatment are slowly coming to be recognized.

Belonging, doubtless, to really primitive beliefs, we have the cult of the Evil eye, an influence which is to-day considered by the majority in the land as the most potent of all causes of disease and death. “The eye fell on him and he died,” is the way a mother will narrate the death of her firstborn. In the Orient the most dreaded eye is a blue one; the owner of such may, quite innocently, bring misfortune, disease, or death at any time. A look or a word of admiration bestowed, however casually, may prove disastrous unless the owner of the eye checks the influence by muttering the name of God. Children and horses are particularly liable to fall under this curse. It is to avoid the glance of the evil eye that many a child is kept unwashed, or dressed in the shabbiest clothes--often only in garments given by or begged from...
strangers. For fear of this or of a very similar malignant influence not defined, children will be called by displeasing names, such as "wolf," "jackal," "bear," or "leopard," or given such names as "forsaken." In other cases a child will be allowed to remain unnamed, being addressed as either "boy" or "girl," as the case may be. Sometimes the mother pretends to sell the child to another woman, who gives her, perhaps, a sum equivalent to a farthing for it. To guard against the evil eye, amulets are worn by most children and by horses. In the latter case, bright blue beads are considered sufficient; but around a child's neck there is frequently a necklace of assorted charms--in some cases a veritable museum. Thus, a large lump of alum is added to the collection because it is a substance irritating to "the eye"; bright coins or beads are employed because they attract "the eye" away from the child's face; the bone of an owl because this bird's keen sight at night invests its bone with peculiar virtue as a guardian; or we find such objects as a hedgehog's hoof, the vertebra of a wolf or dog, or a small dog's tail. Commonly, too, an amulet called a hajab, a small metal or leather case containing an extract from the Kur'an, or a cabbalistic charm, written by a kateb, is worn; in the Jerusalem district it also often contains a piece of the black "stink stone" of Nebi Musa. The Oriental Jews also frequently add small metal plates with some Hebrew words, and metal, or other material, moulded into the form of a hand--the "hand of might." Besides the special amulets, the fellahin adorn a child for whose safety they specially fear with a cap (tukeyeh) of some bright colour--red, yellow, or green--while the Oriental Jews further ornament such a cap with blue beads, often arranged in a Hebrew device. All these things may be considered as part of the prophylaxis against disease.

When, on account of a child wasting away, it is suspected that the "eye has fallen on him," various magical means are resorted to in order to ascertain who is the guilty owner and to destroy his power. Such a ceremony is called a rakweh. A "wise woman" --the modern survival of the "witch"--is called in; she takes a little barley, salt, alum, meriamiyeh (an aromatic plant), and olive leaves, and, placing them together in an earthenware dish over a fire, she allows the fumes to come over the sick patient, while she

1 This is the account of one ceremonial--the details vary in different localities and religions.
mutter: "O God! prayer in the name of the Prophet, from every blue eye and from all divided teeth.\(^1\) The Prophet has charmed his female camel and followed his companions. O God! prayer in the name of our Lord Muhammad. Let there be fire in the eye of the neighbour; let there be a \textit{khish}\(^2\) in the eye of the maiden; let there be a sword in the eye of the guest; and let there be a \textit{shurshura}\(^3\) in the eye of the woman and in the eyes of all that saw you and made no prayer to the Prophet." The lump of alum by this time has melted in the heat, and the woman exclaims that the crackling sound that it makes means the destruction of the offending eye; while she professes to recognize in its shape, as it hardens, the features of the individual who has bewitched the child. The next step is to destroy his or her influence. To do this it is necessary to secure part of his clothes or other personal property, and to burn it before the afflicted child. Pieces of the straw mat from the room--preferably taken from the four corners--or a fragment of the palm leaf carried on Palm Sunday, may also be burnt as curative fumigators. For this purpose the Oriental Christians cherish these leaves from one Palm Sunday to another.

A child wasting away is sometimes declared to be a changeling, and a "wise woman" recommends various remedies to right matters for example, letting the child down a well, or burying it up to its neck in a dungheap.

Another common cause of disease, according to native medical lore, is fright. A sleeping person must be very gently and slowly aroused, lest the start of a sudden awakening should cause disease. For one who has undergone a severe shock of any kind, the popular remedy is to make him drink for seven days--a mouthful at sunrise and sunset--from the \textit{tasat er-ra'beh} (lit. "cup of fear"). This cup must be kept all night in the rays of the moon; no sunlight must fall upon the liquid. The ritual must commence with the appearance of the new moon: The cup is properly made from the vault of the skull of a murdered man, and is lined with silver or copper, and such cups are brought to the villages by the pilgrims from Mecca. But, failing that, a copper cup may be used. Among some of the villagers, an elaborate ceremony is substituted, in which the patient

\(^1\) Divided teeth are a secondary characteristic of the bearer of the evil eye.
\(^2\) \textit{Khish}, a long splinter of wood used by the fellahin to close a sack when they have nothing wherewith to sew it up.
\(^3\) A small sickle used for cutting grass.
is steamed in a vapour arising from a cooked fowl stuffed with some forty different herbs.

Of the peculiar ideas regarding the causes of special diseases, a few selected examples may be given here. Leprosy is considered to be due to contact with the gecko, which, in consequence, is known as *Abu baras* ("the father of leprosy"). Sore heads (ringworm, etc.) are ascribed to the excrement of bats falling upon them in the dark. Enlarged spleen is often due to swallowing fragments of the finger nails, and this disease--known as *tahal*--is in turn considered a cause of hernia. Warts are said to be the result of trying to count the stars. Haemorrhoids, or "piles," called *bowaser*, are considered as the source of troubles all over the body; for example, a Druze woman under the writer's care asked whether her nasal polypus was not due to *reh bowaser* (lit. "the breath of piles"). Rheumatism is called *reh* (lit. "wind") in the joints. Tetanus, epilepsy, and all forms of lunacy are ascribed to possession by evil spirits. A person must never step across a child lying on the floor, or it will cease to grow; if this has been done by accident, the individual must carefully retrace his steps.

Of the extraordinary number of *remedies* recommended for various diseases, only a few specimens, carefully verified, can be given here. Of the nature of charms we have: the hyoid bone, or canine tooth of a wolf, worn as a sure protection against whooping-cough; a small metal frog, a charm against the "evil eye" in general, is worn particularly against ranula, a cystic swelling beneath the tongue; the fat from the neck of an ostrich is a potent application in rheumatism; a particular rounded red stone, called *bazleh*, is constantly worn suspended from the headdress over the eyebrow of a chronically reddened eye--when the eye gets better, the stone is believed by some to turn white. Red appears to have peculiar healing virtues, because the wearing of a red coral necklace is a remedy against fever, and this, too, is said to become white when it has worked its cure. A calcined calf's foot, powdered and applied in a piece of red material, is a good local remedy for *prolapsus ani*. The urine of a fasting boy, and fasting saliva--a well known remedy--are recommended as cures of ophthalmia. Ear wax is used for ringworm. The hairs taken from the forehead, between the eyes, of a perfectly black donkey, if burnt, are a remedy for eye and other diseases. The hoof of a mule, charred, powdered and mixed with fat is useful in baldness, as is also the gall of an old he-goat. For
"shock"--due to a fall or other accident--a remedy much believed in is quickly to kill and skin a sheep and wrap the patient in the smoking hot skin, while the meat is distributed to the poor; for enlarged spleen, goat's dung, dried and dissolved in vinegar, is applied locally; a fever patient may be strengthened if fed on camel's milk which has been stirred with the camel's tail until the milk is dark in colour. For barrenness there are, naturally, many remedies, among which may be mentioned the claws of a hoopoe burnt and dissolved in syrup, or a diet of donkey's brains. The eye of an owl enclosed in a piece of the skin of a wolf will drive off poisonous insects, the penis of a fallow deer is a protection against serpents, and boiled Egyptian vulture is thought (by the bedawins of Sinai) to be a remedy for snake-bite. Ointment of crabs is, in some districts, a favourite remedy for lumbago. For this disease it is also considered good to pull up a mandrake from the roots (a feat requiring considerable exertion); when the last fibres give way, the root emits a shriek, but the man who does this will be childless, and so it is a remedy only to be recommended to the old. To cure a "stye" in the eye, some dough must, be begged from three Fatmehs or three Miriams, and the eye poulticed with it. For fever, a piece of bread and some bits of candle are taken to the centre of cross roads, a rough enclosure of stones is built over the bread, and the candles are lighted; when a dog comes and knocks over the construction the fever will be cured. Should a woman have a miscarriage or premature delivery, the dead child must be buried below the threshold of the door to prevent the recurrence of such a misfortune.1

Belonging to another class are the "charms" made for particular diseases, written by the sheikhs in a decoction of saffron or in ink. The majority of these consist of little more than sentences of the Kur'an, especially the fathah (opening sentences), repeated over and over again, the spaces between the sentences being filled up with scrawled Arabic letters with no meaning. In some cases the patient is directed either to wear the charm in the cap (e.g., in a case of headache), or to wash off the ink and drink the liquid, to dissolve the paper and swallow it, or, in yet other instances, to burn the paper and inhale the smoke. Occasionally, the directions are to dissolve one half and drink it, and to fumigate with the other half.

1 An account of many more such remedies will be found in the Q.S., 1906, pp. 97-102.
One patient was directed to cut his "charm" into strips to put daily one strip into a cup and leave it outside the house that the "dews" of night might fall upon it; he was to drink the water so collected, using a new strip every night for a week, after which he would be cured of his cough. Other charms consist of strings knotted in a particular way, a verse of the Kur'an being recited as each knot is tied.

The sheikhs are very specially consulted for the exorcism of spirits, for which they profess to have great gifts; they pretend, before the assembled patient's friends, to concentrate the demoniacal power gradually into one limb, say a leg, and then gradually make it leave by a particular toe. There is no question that some hysterical cases are "cured" by psychical influence. There is an elaborate ritual for the exorcism of demons called *indulca*, which is well known among the Spanish Jews of Jerusalem. It is performed by a "witch."

For all diseases the *weltyos* and other sacred shrines are visited. Vows and sacrifices are made for the recovery of the sick. The plants from such shrines are considered valuable for fumigation of the sick, and the dry earth from the neighbourhood is curative of many diseases (cf. Numb. v, 17). Many springs and wells are credited with healing properties. Some, like 'Ain es-Sultan (Elisha's fountain) at Jericho, are beneficial to all diseases; some are useful for the cure of special diseases. Naturally, the hot springs at Tiberias and at el-Hammeh are much resorted to: that there is a supernatural influence believed to be present is shown by the fact that the name of God must not, so it is taught, be uttered while bathing.

Some shrines, particularly those devoted to *el-Khuder*, are credited with special virtues for the cure of insanity. Here, too, there is plenty of evidence that "cures" of certain functional nervous affections do actually take place.

To a different class of treatment belong the bleedings, cauterizings, and issues which are universally used; they are, no doubt, survivals of the orthodox treatment of a past age. Bleeding is commonly done by barbers for fever, and some of the Syrians are accustomed to be bled every spring--a habit to the omission of which in some special year the writer has frequently heard many ills ascribed. The cautery is a constant and universal remedy. The usual spots chosen are the centre of the cranial vault for headache, between the
breasts for cough, over the epigastrium for dyspepsia and enlarged spleen, over the throat for diphtheria, and so on. For other pains, such as lumbago, a number of small cauterizations, in sometimes quite an elaborate pattern, are made; or the part is tattooed. Issues, kept open for years by inserting a pea, are exceedingly common on the arm for chronic trachoma; and other issues are made in the neighbourhood of painful joints.

With regard to vegetable remedies, a number of indigenous herbs are credited with curative virtues, but are of quite secondary importance to amulets and the magic of the sheikhs. In the towns a number of old prescriptions are used, by which such substances as pepper, ginger, saffron, honey, and garlic are mingled in varying proportions. More effective than these prescriptions is the method of treatment known as *el-'ushbeh*, which is used for Syphilis. The patient is isolated for forty days in a tent or room, fed on unleavened bread (without salt), honey and raisins, and is made to drink great quantities of a decoction of sarsparilla, with which he is also steamed. The method is also tried for other diseases which have failed to yield to treatment.

In connection with childbirth there are many customs. The most noticeable is that firmly and universally held in belief by Oriental Jews of the danger threatening mother and child from the malignant influence of Lilith, a female demon about whom there are innumerable tales. To protect against her influences, mother and child must not for a moment be left alone, but be watched night and day, preferably, it would seem, by a noisy crowd of relations and friends; copies of an amulet printed in Hebrew are hung on the bed and about the room; a bunch of garlic, one of rue, a Passover cake shaped like a hand, and some bright blue beads are also commonly hung on the bed. Among the fellahin the midwife is usually responsible for the child the first forty days of its life. When she cuts the navel cord the infant receives its name and, with boys, in many cases the name of his future bride (the "daughter of So-and-so") is also mentioned, such a betrothal being binding. Hence the proverb "Your navel was not cut in my name" means "I am not bound to do this or that thing." As soon as the navel is cut the midwife rubs the child all over with salt, water, and oil, and tightly swathes it in clothes for seven days; at the end of that time she removes the dirty clothes, washes the child and anoints it, and then wraps it up again for seven days--and so on till the
fortieth day (cf. Ezek. xvi, 4). Among the bedawin of Sinai a male child is often made to swallow the ashes of a scorpion mixed with milk, or the finely-chopped feather of the long eared owl; the former is considered to be a protection against scorpion bites; the latter brings luck. Both must be taken before the mother's milk is first tasted.
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Preliminary Lexical Considerations

Some lexicographers divide the meaning of ga'el into two concepts. Koehler and Baumgartner\(^1\) and Gesenius\(^2\) assign two separate meanings to the word. The first centers around the idea of "redemption"; the second, around the concept of "defilement," suggesting a possible affinity with ga'al, "to reproach or rebuke."

Others claim to see a single root meaning,\(^3\) a meaning which corresponds to its usage in the Hebrew Old Testament, i.e., "to cover, or protect." To illustrate, in Ruth 3:9 Ruth asks Boaz to spread (parash) his wings over her, for "you are go'el." That is, Boaz was the young widow's protector. He had already used this protection idiom by assuring her that the God of Israel, the God to whom she had come for refuge in 2:12, would spread his wings over her. This example, then, would illustrate a positive usage of this basic root, "to cover."

In the Old Testament, however, one can be covered with all sorts of things, good or bad. Whereas Ruth was covered with the wings of her protector (go'el), Job uses the term to lament the day upon which he was born:

Let that day be darkness. May God above not seek it, nor light shine upon it.
Let gloom and deep darkness claim it (yig'aluhu). (Job 3:4, 5, RSV)

G. Beer further suggests, "ga'al=ga'al, cf. Mal 1, 7," a passage in which Malachi spoke about polluted food on the altar of God. Here

again ga'al is the term used (lehem mego'al).  

The Job passage has been a thorny problem for translators. The RV, following LXX, Theodotian, and Symmachus, translates yig`aluhu "claim it for their own." Can this be the meaning? Can gloom and deep darkness even metaphorically reclaim the day of Job's birth? Perhaps. On the other hand, the AV, following Aquila and the Targumim, translates the phrase "... let darkness and the shadow on death stain it." This choice, however, disregards the context. Job wants the clouds, darkness, and gloom to blot out the light God was to shine upon the day of his birth, not stain it.

Johnson's view may shed light on the problem. Following the Peshitta Syriac and Latin Vulgate, he translates "... let darkness, let utter blackness cover it." In sum, Johnson would define go'al thus: Qal- "to protect;" Niphal- "to be protected," later coming to mean in negative contexts "to be covered over; to be coated"; then Piel- "to coat something intensively, pollute, desecrate"; Hithpael- "to stain."  

The argument for one root meaning for ga'al is interesting, if not conclusive. It deserves consideration from a lexical standpoint, even if such consideration leads one to conclude no more than that such an argument proves more palatable than the various attempts which have been made to link ga'al with ga'al. Ringgren concludes: "It seems better to begin with actual linguistic usage than to postulate an original meaning."  

Go'el in the Old Testament  
Several models have been proposed to break down the meanings of this word by its various contexts in the Old Testament. Ringgren suggests it should be examined in the two broad categories of secular usage and religious, figurative usage. Lieber deduces five basic activities of the go'el in the Old Testament:

(1) He acquires the alienated property of a kinsman (Lev. 25:25)

6 Johnson, op. cit., pp. 73, 74.  
8 Ibid., pp. 350-355.
(2) He purchases property when it is in danger of being lost to a stranger (Jer. 32:6ff.)
(3) He is morally, if not legally, obligated to support the widow of his next-of-kin in the event of her becoming dependent on this estate for her livelihood (Ruth 4:4ff.)
(4) He redeems a clansman who has been reduced to slavery by poverty (Lev. 25:47ff.)
(5) He avenges blood when it has been shed (Num. 35:17ff.).

Spiritual Equilibrium

Leviticus 25 is the usual starting point in discussions concerning the meaning of *ga'al.* Predictably, all the legal material which deals with the duties of the *go'el* is predicated by Israel's relationship to Yahweh. Israel is to perform Yahweh's statutes and ordinances (25:18). If this is done, Israel will experience economic and social equilibrium as Yahweh's chosen people (25:17, 20ff.). Yahweh owns the land; Israel merely sojourns there (25:23). This land (*'eres*) is to be treated as a *ge'ullah* by Israel (25:24).

In the book of Isaiah, Israel is reminded of this peculiar relationship. In Isaiah 41:14; 43:14; 44:6 and 24, the writer refers to Yahweh as Israel's *go'el,* i.e., he whose responsibility entailed that of protecting, restoring, and bringing Israel back into a state of spiritual equilibrium with himself. This spiritual relationship was foundational to the Israelite's social and economic existence.

Luzbetak defines equilibrium thus:

>a state of balance...a feeling of "well-being" characterized by an over-all steadi-

---

10 One has to decide however, if the Leviticus material is a compilation of ancient or contemporary laws. In addition, one's concept of the relative personality or impersonality of Yahweh enters the picture here.
11 The inclusion of all these elements, land, cult, clan, and security, led H. C. Brichto to conclude that these elements make up a Biblical complex (an anthropological technical term), "Kin, Cult, Land, and Afterlife--A Biblical Complex," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44 (1973): 1-54.
11a On Job 19:25 cf. Marvin H. Pope, *Job,* The Anchor Bible, Vol. 15 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1973), p. 146: "It is not clear here whether Job has in mind a human agent who will act as his vindicator. The strongest point in favor of taking the vindicator and guarantor as God is the specific reference to seeing God in 26b... The application of the term *go'el* to God in this context is questionable since elsewhere in Job's complaint it is God himself who is Job's adversary rather than defender."
13 Brichto, *op. cit.,* p. 23: "Death does not constitute dissolution but rather a transition to another kind of existence, an afterlife in the shadowy realm of Sheol. The condition of the dead in this afterlife is, in a vague but significant way, connected with proper burial upon the ancestral land and with the continuation on that land of the dead's proper progeny." In Brichto's schema, then, the *go'el* "was not merely a close-kinsman obligated to blood-vengeance or privileged to redeem property. The *go'el* is he who redeems the dead from the danger to his afterlife by continuing his line," p. 21.
One feels justified in using this technical term for several reasons, but it is not the purpose here to enter into an extended anthropological analysis of ancient Hebrew society. This paper is primarily a philological study of the meaning of a particular word and its usage in the Old Testament literature. Luzbetak is an anthropologist and “equilibrium” is an anthropological term, yet the overall usefulness of this term ought to be evident after further inspection. “Equilibrium” incorporates the many analogous meanings attested by a solid consensus of Biblical scholarship on the matter.

Social Equilibrium

Interfamilial, interclan, and intertribal relationships can better be understood in terms of social equilibrium, as ramifications of Israel’s spiritual relationship with Yahweh. Again, several analogous concepts can be found in the relevant literature. Johnson talks about the Israelite’s nephesh as something which was extended spatially and temporally, through one’s bayith, ‘ebhed, or mal’ak; temporally, through one’s dabhar (including either berakah or ‘ararah), and the Israelite sem. “Corporate personality,” “grasping of a totality,” “vitality of extended family group,” “total contents of the soul,” “interests of his kinsman”—these are some of the parallel phrases one finds.

Is it not more accurate today to posit that where manslaughter occurs, or where one’s husband or male children perish, or where one is forced by poverty to sell his ancestral real estate—that where anything of this nature occurs in the Old Testament—that these are characteristics of social dysfunction, i.e., social disequilibrium? When this has been established, the function of the go’el can be more clearly seen: to work through the proper channels, whether spiritual, social,

15 Ibid., p. 3.
17 Encyclopedia Judaica, s.v. "Redemption."
18 Pedersen, op. cit., p. 382.
19 Pope, op. cit., p. 146.
or economic\textsuperscript{20} and serve as the society's "cultural gyroscope."\textsuperscript{21} The solidarity of the Israelite family, clan, and nation depended upon his assuming this responsibility.

The \textit{go'e}l functions as a restorative agent whenever there is a breach in the clan's corporate life. In Lieber's model, this would include his obligations a) to support an Israelite widow who is a blood relative and b) to redeem a clansman who has been reduced to slavery by poverty.\textsuperscript{22} In this paper only the first of these obligations will be examined.

H. H. Rowley's study on the book of Ruth reveals how entangled this problem has become.\textsuperscript{23} His survey shows that some are divided over whether Ruth's marriage was levirate or \textit{ge'ullah}. I. M. Epstein sees it as \textit{ge'ullah}; J. A. Bewer does also, even to the point of dismissing all references to the levirate law in the book as interpolations by partisans of Ezra and Nehemiah. On the other hand, H. A. Brongers believed that one of the book's purposes was to bring the two institutions together. J. G. Frazer and J. F. McLennan even see polyandry or group marriage as having evolved into levirate and \textit{ge'ullah} arrangements. A. Bertholet and G. Margoliouth see ancestor worship behind all of this.\textsuperscript{24}

Rowley concludes that, if one dates Deuteronomy late,

the law of Deut. 25:5-10 reflects a limitation of something that was once wider in Israel, and this view is further supported when we look beyond the question of the childless widow to the wider duties devolving on the next-of-kin.\textsuperscript{25}

Within the schema of this paper it is irrelevant as to whether levirate marriage is separate from or included in \textit{ge'ullah} or whether the book of Ruth represents a "transitional stage between redemption-marriage as an affair of the clan and levirate-marriage as an affair of the

\textsuperscript{20} These divisions reflect a Western tendency to catalogue and fragment. The Hebrew \textit{go'e}l probably perceived no such distinctions.
\textsuperscript{21} Cultural gyroscope" is Luzbetak's phrase, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 221.
\textsuperscript{22} Cf. above, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{24} Any further discussion of this point is outside the bounds of this inquiry, except to note that Brichto, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 50, draws a sharp distinction between the Jewish and pagan models of afterlife: a) Pagan belief (incl. ancestor worship) was magical, mechanical, amoral; b) Hebrew belief was based entirely upon the individual's moral relationship' to Yahweh.
\textsuperscript{25} Cf. Rowley, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 170ff., for all pertinent information, explanations, and bibliographical data concerning these many diverse points of view.
family," as M. Burrows suggests. Broader perspectives are called for--"wider duties," to use Rowley's terminology.

Naomi's role in the story of Ruth has perhaps been misunderstood or underplayed. After all, it was Naomi who first encouraged Orpah and Ruth to find husbands of their own, houses of their own a people of their own, and gods of their own (Ruth 1:8-15). In other words, the Israelite widow wanted her non-Israelite daughters-in-law to find some semblance of normality and well-being again. It was Naomi who mourned the true depth of her calamity by stating to the women: "I went away full and the Lord has brought me back empty"; i.e., the bayith and the sem of Elimelech were in danger of being wiped out in Israel. The depth of this disgrace must have been communicated to Ruth, for Boaz quickly recognized that Ruth was a woman of worth (3:10, 11) and was delighted that she had come to him as her go'el for help (3:9).

The writer points out that Boaz was Naomi's kinsman (2:1), a fact Naomi joyfully proclaims to Ruth (2:20). Boaz was their "near one" (qarobh), the one who was able to restore their family, ravaged by famine and death, to a state of equilibrium. It was Naomi who engineered Ruth's meeting with Boaz (3:2-5), and it was Naomi whom the women congratulated, not Ruth, because the Lord had provided her with a go'el. Some of the other elements necessary for social equilibrium are mentioned also: sem (4:14); restoration of the clan's nephes (4:15); a male heir has been born to Naomi (4:17). Indeed, one of the main themes of the book is God's kindness to the living as well as the dead by mercifully restoring Elimelech's family to a state of equilibrium, a theme which is all the more dramatized when one realizes in genealogical perspective who Obed, Naomi's go'el, really was.

One of the most interesting functions of the go'el was the responsibility to restore justice. Murder, manslaughter, and war are crimes punishable by the State in western society, i.e., by an external system of justice. Hebrew culture was much different. J. Pedersen discusses the difference:


25 N. B. (as per Brichto's thesis) Naomi is grateful that Yahweh has not forgotten the living remnants of the family as well as the dead; viz., the sem of Elimelech, extended through Mahlon, and later extended through Obed (Ruth 4:14).
The law of restoration belongs to a community which is not held together by external powers above it, but by inner forces creating the harmony. When that harmony is disrupted by any of these crimes, it is again the responsibility of the go’el to see to it that equilibrium is restored. Two examples may be cited.

Whenever possible, revenge was to be systematically carried out against the individual who robbed the offended party of part of the clan's nephes as stated in the Torah (Num. 35:19). Yet, because an individual's nephew extends through his bayith, sem, and personal possessions in Semitic cultures, there are instances in the Old Testament where the avenger of blood (go’el haddam) not only kills the guilty party, but also all of his family, as well as confiscating or destroying his possession's. In 1 Kings 16:11 Zimri destroys the whole house of Baasha, leaving him no kinsman to wreak counter-revenge. In a similar case, Yahweh directs the camp of Israel to stone Achan with his family and his personal possessions for disobeying his clear command (Josh. 7:1ff.). Such total vengeance is difficult for western minds to comprehend and may underlie much of the Occidental world's attempts to see a different God in the Old Testament from the God revealed in the pages of the New Testament. To Hebrew minds, however, the disruption of social equilibrium meant simply that it had to be restored. The principle remained the same. Whereas western societies restore justice by means of external laws imputed by the State, ancient Israelite society restored justice by means of the divinely appointed agent of restoration (Lev. 25:25ff.).

Ancient Near Eastern Parallels

Although there are no cognate forms for ga’al in the contemporary Near Eastern texts which have been discovered so far, the redemption of property and persons is fairly commonplace.

In the Laws of Eshnunna, for example, paragraph 39 states:

---

28 Pedersen, op. cit., p. 392;
29 Cf. T. B. Kiddushin 20b. In commenting on Lev. 25:47, 48 R. Ishmael suggested that even though the human tendency is to reject an idolater who happens to be an Israelite, maybe Yahweh commanded his redemption so that he would not be absorbed by the heathens.
30 However, cf. H.B. Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 179, for an exception found in the Amorite personal name Ga’alalum.
If a man is hard up and sells his house, the owner of the house shall (be entitled to) redeem (it) whenever the purchaser (re)sells it.\textsuperscript{39} This law is similar to that of Leviticus 25, except for the conditional character of this law compared with the unconditional right in Leviticus for the original owner to redeem what was originally "given" to him by Yahweh. Khafajah text 8231 places another qualification on the reselling of property. Under this legal code one cannot "redeem the field with money belonging to another person."\textsuperscript{33} Again, the Levitical law makes no such demand.

A closer parallel can be found in the Laws of Hammurabi,\textsuperscript{34} where the sale of patrimonial land is banned altogether. Greenberg comments that this custom might have been based on a feudalistic economy in which all land belonged to the king and was held only as a grant or fief by his subjects: "They had possession, but not ownership of the property entrusted to them."\textsuperscript{35} In contrast, Israel's God claimed to own the land himself (Lev. 25:23) and was unwilling for Israel to set up a monarchy like their Near Eastern neighbors (1 Sam. 8:10-18). Several other examples of property redemption could be cited, but perhaps Stamm's summary can suffice:

The \textit{ge'ullah}, as a right or duty to buy back lost family property or slaves, was not limited to Israel. The Babylonian law knows this with regard to land which was sold, as well as persons. In Babylonia the verb "paturu"-"to release, redeem," takes the place of the Hebrew \textit{ga'al}.\textsuperscript{36}

Yahweh never unconditionally gave the land of Canaan, modern-day Palestine, to Israel. He merely allowed them to take possession of it, to be stewards of it as strangers and sojourners in it with himself, according to the covenant agreement they ratified through Moses. There is a world of difference, practically speaking, between giving something to someone and temporarily loaning it, until the time for the giving of a much greater gift.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., p. 97.
\textsuperscript{34} Pritchard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 163.
\textsuperscript{37} Heb. 12: 18-24.
Conclusion

It is hoped that this fresh treatment of the word \textit{ga'el} as well as the institution for which it stands can clear away some of the misconceptions orbiting around it and allow it to be seen in a clearer light: a referent for the divinely appointed agent of restoration; a cultural gyroscope in an amphictyonic confederacy built on the cornerstone of a firm relationship with Yahweh and extending through the family, tribe, and providing solidarity, security, and justice for Israel.

It is further hoped that the anthropological concept of equilibrium can serve to provide an investigative framework broad enough in perspective to allow the institution to be seen more distinctly in its various spiritual, social, and economic dimensions. In this way others continue their investigations within a more scientifically accurate schema.
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THE HOLINESS-CODE AND EZEKIEL

Lewis Bayles Paton

In Lev. xvii-xxvi a body of laws is found which is formally distin-
guished from the rest of the legislation of the Book of
Leviticus by having its own special hortatory conclusion
(chap. xxvi) and its own subscription, “These are the statutes
and judgments and laws, which the Lord made between him
and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses"
(xxvi. 46). This code contains almost entirely moral and religious
precepts. Ceremonial matters are introduced only when they have
some peculiar social or national importance. The commandments
are addressed, not to the priests, as is the case in the enclosing
Levitical legislation, but to the individual Israelite; and, as
in the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant, the second person
singular is used throughout.

On the negative side this legislation views morality as opposition
to the practices of the heathen: "After the doings of the land of
Egypt wherein ye dwelt shall ye not do, and after the doings
of the land of Canaan whither I bring you shall ye not do"
(xviii. 3, cf. xviii. 24-26, xx. 23f., 26, xxii. 25). On the positive
side it regards all duty as summed up in the idea of holiness: "Ye
shall be holy for I the Lord your God am holy" (xix. 2, 8, 24,
xx. 3, 7, 26, xxi. 6f., 8, xxii. 32). This thought of the essential
unity of ethical obligation and of its basis in the holiness of God
is so strikingly characteristic of this body of laws that in 1877,
in an article in the Zeitschrift fur Lutherische Theologie, Klos-
termann gave it the happily chosen name of the" Holiness-Code."
The name has since come into general use, and, for convenience
of reference, I shall employ it in this article to designate the entire
legislation which is contained in Lev. xvii-xxvi, and shall represen-
t it by the abbreviation H.

The style of this code is succinct to the last degree. The laws
are arranged in smaller and larger groups with great logical
exactness, and these groups are closed with the formula, "I am the
Lord" (twelve times); "I am the Lord your God" (eleven
times); "I am the Lord who sanctify you" (six times); or "I
am the Lord your God who have brought you out of the land of
Egypt " (six times). Within each subdivision the method is to lay down at the beginning a general proposition, and then to give an exhaustive enumeration of the cases in which the principle holds good. In the grouping of these minor items great skill is displayed, and instances are few where one feels that the development of thought might have been improved by another arrangement of the individual laws.

The most striking phenomenon, however, which one encounters in a study of this legislation is its unique relation to the book of the prophet Ezekiel. Ezekiel displays an affinity in thought and in expression with it which he has with no other portion of the Pentateuch, not even with Deuteronomy. The most elaborate discussion of this affinity has been given by Horst in his treatise *Lev. xvii-xxvi und Hezekiel*, Colmar, 1881. Here it will be be sufficient to call attention merely to some of the more striking correspondences in diction and in thought. In the list which I subjoin I have marked with an asterisk expressions which are found only in H. and in Ezekiel.

The list is as follows: "Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel" (Lev. xvii. 3, etc.: Ez. xiv. 4, 7); "Shed blood" (xvii. 4: Ez. xxii. 7); "To go whoring after" (xvii. 7, xx. 5, 6: Ez. xx. 30, xxiii. 30, etc.); "And I will set my face against" (xvii. 10, xxv. 3, 5, 6: Ez. xiv. 8, xv. 7); "I will cut him off from the midst of his people" (xvii. 10, xx. 3, 5: Ez. xiv. 8); "He shall bear his iniquity" (xvii. 16, etc.: Ez. xiv. 10, etc.); imitation of the customs of Egypt (xviii. 3: Ez. xxv. 7f.); "My judgments shall ye do and my statutes shall ye keep to walk therein" (xviii. 4, etc.: Ez. xcviii. 9, etc.); "Which if a man do he shall live in them" (xviii. 5.: Ez. xx. 11, etc.); "Uncover the nakedness of one's father " (xviii. 7: Ez. xx. 10); "Thy sister the daughter of thy father" (xviii. 9, Ez. xxii. 11); marriage with a daughter-in-law (xviii. 14: Ez. xxii. 11); "It is wickedness" (xviii. 17, xix. 9, xx. 14: Ez. xvi. 23, 48, xxiii. 48f.); "Unto a woman in the defilement of her uncleanness thou shalt not approach" (xviii. 18: Ez. xviii. 6); "Defile oneself with a neighbour's wife" (xviii. 20: Ez. xx. 11); "Cause to pass through the fire" (xviii. 21: Ez. xvi. 21, xx. 26, 31); "Thou shalt not profane the name of thy God" (xviii. 21, etc.: Ez. xx. 26, xxvi. 20, 22); "The land is defiled" (xviii. 25,27: Ez. xxxvi. 17f., xxxvii. 23); "Abomination" (xviii. 22, 27: Ez. vii. 3, 4, 8, etc.); "My sabbaths" (xix. 3, 30, xxvi. 2: Ez. xxii. 8, etc.); "Corruption" (xix. 7: Ez. iv.14); "Thou shalt not rob" (xix. 13: Ez. xviii. 7); "Ye shall do no iniquity in judgment" (xix. 15: Ez. xviii. 8); "In righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour " (xix. 15:
Ez. xviii. 8); against slander (xix. 16: Ez. xxii. 9); "Stand against the blood of thy neighbour" (xix. 16: Ez. xxii. 9); "Ye shall not eat with the blood" (xix. 26: Ez. xxxiii. 25); "An alien shall ye not afflict (xix. 33: Ez. xxii. 7); just weights and measures (xix. 35f.: Ez. xlvi. 10); "He shall surely be put to death" (xx. 2, 9, 27, xxiv. 16, 17, 21: Ez. xviii. 13); "The people of the land" (xx. 2: Ez. xxii. 29); "Stone with stones" xx. 2, 27: Ez. xvi. 40, xxxiii. 47); "Curseth his father or his mother" (xx. 9: Ez. xxii. 7); "Defile my sanctuary" (xx. 3: Ez. v. 11, xxxiii. 38); "Hide the eyes" (xx. 4: Ez. xxii. 26); "Children of thy people " (xx. 17: Ez. xxxiii. 1); "His blood shall be upon him " (xx. 9, etc.: Ez. xviii. 13, xxxiii. 4, 5); "Separate between the clean and the unclean " (xx. 25: Ez. xxii. 26); defilements for the dead (xvi. 2f.: Ez. xlvi. 25); "Make bald" (xxi. 5: Ez. xxvi. 31); "They shall not shave the edge of their beard" (xxi. 5: Ez. xli. 20); purity in the priest's wife (xxi. 7: Ez. xli. 22); "Profane the sanctuary of his God" (xxi. 12, 23: Ez. xxiv. 21, xxviii. 18, xli. 7); "That which dieth of itself or is torn of beasts he shall not eat" (xxii. 8: Ez. xli. 31); "Keep my charge" (xxii. 9: Ez. xli. 8, 16); "To be your God " (xxii. 33: Ez. xi. 20, xiv. 11); "Branches" (xxiii. 40: Ez. xvii. 8, 23); "Ye shall not wrong one another" (xxv. 14, 17: Ez. xvii. 7); "Ye shall dwell in the land in safety" (xxv. 18, 19, xxvi. 5: Ez. xxviii. 26, xxixiv. 25, 27, 28, xxviii. 8, 11, 14, xxxix. 26); "The land shall yield its crop" (xxv. 19, xxvi. 4= Ez. xxxiv. 27); "Ye shall eat your fill" (xxv. 19, xxvi. 5: Ez. xxxix. 19).

In Lev. xxvi the coincidences of H. with Ez. are even more numerous and striking than in the chapters which we have just examined. The similarity which exists here is without a parallel in Old Testament literature. The coincidences are as follows: "I will give your rains in their seasons" (xxvi. 4: Ez. xxxiv. 26); "The trees of the field shall yield their fruit" (4: Ez. xxxiv. 27); "None shall make you afraid" (6: Ez. xxxix. 26); "I will cause evil beasts to cease out of the land" (6: Ez. xxxiv. 25); "The sword shall not go through your land" (6 = Ez. v. 17, xiv. 17); "I will turn unto you" (9: Ez. xxxvi. 9); "Make you fruitful and multiply you " (9: Ez. xxxvi. 11, xxxvii. 26); "I will establish my covenant with you " (9: Ez. xvi. 60, 62); "I will give my dwelling among you" (11: Ez. xxv. 4, xxxvii. 27); "Abhor you" (11, 15, 30, 44: Ez. xvi. 5, 45); "Walk among you" (12: Ez. xix. 6, xxviii. 14); "Broken the bars of your yoke" (13: Ez. xxxiv. 27); "Break my covenant" (15: Ez. xvi. 59, xvii. 15f., 18f., xli. 7); "The pride-of your,
power" (19: Ez. xxiv. 21, xxx. 6, 18, xxxiii, 28); “I will send the beast of the field among you which shall rob you of your children" * (22: Ez. v. 17, xiv. 15); “Cut off your cattle" (22: Ez. xiv. 13, 17, 19, 21, xxv. 13, xxix. 8); “Make you few” (22: Ez. xxix. 15); “Bring a sword upon you" (25: Ez. v. 17, vi. 3, xi. 8, xiv. 17); "Send the pestilence upon you" (25: Ez. xiv. 19, 21, xxviii. 23); “Break your staff of bread" (26: Ez. iv. 16, v.16, xiv. 13); “They shall deliver your bread by weight " * (26 : Ez. iv. 16); "Ye shall eat the flesh of your sons and daughters" (29: Ez. v. 10); “Destroy your high places" (30: Ez. vi. 3, 6); “Cut down your obelisks" (30: Ez. vi. 4, 6); "Cast your carcases upon the carcases of your idols" * (30: Ez. vi. 4, 5); “Make your cities a waste" (31: Ez. vi. 6); “The savour of your sweet odours" (31: Ez. vi. 13, xvi. 19, xx. 28, 41); “Your enemies shall be astonished" (32: Ez. xxvi. 16, xxxii. 10); “I will draw out the sword after you" (33: Ez. v. 2, 12, xii. 14); “Your land shall. be desolation" (33: Ez. vi. 14, xv. 8, xxix. 9, 12); “The land of your enemies" (34, 36, 39, 41, 44: Ez. xxxix. 27); “The land of your enemies shall eat you up" (38: Ez. xxxvi. 13, 14); “Those that are left shall pine away in their iniquity" * (39: Ez. iv. 17, xxiv. 23); “Trespassed" (40: Ez. xxxix. 23, 36); “Uncircumcised heart” (41: Ez. xliv. 7. 9); “Because even because" (43: Ez. xiii. 10, xxxvi. 3); “In the sight of the nations” * (45 : Ez. v. 8, xx. 11, 14, xxii. 16, xxviii. 25, xxxviii. 23, xxxix. 27).

The list which we have now completed is a remarkable one. Here are some ninety cases in which the expressions of H. are found in Ez. also and in which the legislation of H. is reproduced in Ez., often in the same language. Of these at least twenty are phrases which are found only in H. and in Ez. It is evident, that similarity of this sort cannot be due to a general correspondence of age or standpoint in the two writers, but points to some special literary relation between them. What is this relation?

The purpose of this article is to consider some of the modern theories on this subject and to endeavor to determine which is the most probable. The bearing of the question on Pentateuchal criticism is too obvious to require any special comment, nor does the importance of the answer which we give to it need to be emphasized. Accordingly, we may proceed immediately to the review and the critique of the several theories.

I. Graf, who first exhibited at length the correspondences between H. and Ez., came to the conclusion that they could be explained only by the supposition that Ezekiel himself was the author of Lev. xvii-xxvi; and in his famous work, Die geschicht-
lichen Bucher des Alten Testaments (pp.81-83), he advocated this theory with a great deal of ingenuity and learning. In a review of Graf's book (Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theologie, 1866, p. 150 sq.), Bertheau announced his adherence to the hypothesis. It was also adopted by Colenso (Pentateuch) and by Kayser (Vorexilisches Buch der Urgeschichte Israels).

The difficulty with this theory is, that, while it explains the similarities between H. and Ez., it does not explain the differences. The diction of H. is not the same as the diction of Ez. There are a large number of words and phrases which occur frequently in each but are not found in the other. H. differs also from Ez. in its legislation (cf. Noldeke, Untersuchungen Zur Kritik des A. T., p. 63; Kuenen, Onderzoek, p. 277; Klostermann, Zeitschrift fur Lutherzsche Theologie, p. 433 sq.). I will not discuss these differences in detail, for Graf's hypothesis has found no general acceptance. It is now conceded with practical unanimity among the critics, that there are too many differences between Ez. and H. to suppose that Ezekiel was the author of H.

II. A modified and much more tenable form of the Grafian theory has been proposed by Horst in the treatise entitled Leviticus xvii-xxvi und Hezekiel. He regards Ez. not as the author of this code, in a strict sense of the word author, but as merely the collector and editor of laws which were already in existence. This theory allows for all the differences in diction and in legislation between H. and Ez., and at the same time explains the fact that Ezekiel's closest resemblances are with the hortatory portions of this code, particularly with the great closing exhortation in Lev. xxvi. There is scarcely a hortatory phrase of H. which is not found in Ez., and Lev. xxvi seems to be, as Smend calls it, "essentially a combination of phrases of Ez." A closer examination, however, reveals the fact that this theory also cannot explain all of the phenomena.

1. It does not explain the fact, that the most characteristic editorial formulre of Ez. are absent from H. If Ez. wrote H. we have a right to expect that the commandments of the Lord will be introduced here in much the same way in which they are introduced in the book of his prophecy. There is nothing in the nature of the contents of H. to compel him to abandon those set phrases with which he introduces his message to Israel in his oracles. If he was the collector, he must have put his material in some sort of a framework, and that framework we should expect to be similar to the one in which he sets his prophetic utterances. This, however, is not the case. Ez. has a number of formulae, which he uses constantly, which are never found in H. For instance, he begins more
than a hundred times with the phrase, "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah." The words, "Son of man," introduce the address of the Lord about ninety times. The introductory formula, "And the word of Jehovah came (was)," occurs thirty-nine times; "The oracle of the Lord Jehovah," eighty times; "As I live," sixteen times. None of these phrases, however, occur in H., although all are perfectly appropriate for use in that code. The last one in particular we should certainly expect to find because of the constant use by H. of "I" with some appositional expression.

Other frequent formulæ of Ez. which are not found in H. are the following: "The hand of Jehovah was upon me" (i. 3, iii. 14, 22, viii. 1, xx:iii. 22, xxxvii. 1, xl. 1); "Lift up my hand" (xx. 5, 6, 15, 23, xxxvi. 7, xliv. 12, xlvi. 14); "Whether they will hear or whether they will forbear" (ii. 5, 7, iii. 11); "And thou hast delivered thy soul" (iii. 19, 21, xxxiii. 9, cf. xviii. 27, xxxiii. 5, xiv. 20), "For my name's sake" (xx. 9, 14, 22,44).

2. The hortatory passages in H. (Lev. xix. 25-30, ch. xx., xxii. 31-33, xxv. 18-22, xxvi. 3-45) certainly come from the hand of the collector of the legislation, and if that collector was Ez., they should correspond closely with his style. It is true, that many of the phrases of these hortatory passages are found scattered through the book of Ez., but there are also wide differences between these exhortations of H. and those of Ez. which forbid the assumption that they come from the same hand. The most fundamental difference is, that Ezekiel's exhortations are found in connection with his prophecies and not with his legislation. The code for the restored Israel in Ez. xl-xlvi is accompanied by no warnings or exhortations of any sort. How does it happen, then, that this code in Lev. xvii-xxvi, although it contains laws in regard to sacrifice and other matters which could not be obeyed in Ezekiel's day, is provided with terrible denunciations in case of disobedience?

Granted, however, that Ez. might have omitted the exhortation in Ez. xl-xlvi, where it was more appropriate, and have appended it in Lev. xvii-xxvi, where it was less appropriate, the difficulty still remains unexplained, that the most frequent and most characteristic hortatory phrases of Ez. are wanting from H. A number of Ezekiel's expressions are, it is true, found in H., but they are not the expressions which are most frequent in his book and which we should most expect to find in any exhortation which he had written. Some of these recurrent phrases are the following: "My eye shall not pity and I will not spare" (v. 11, vii. 4, 9, viii. 18, ix. 10, cf. ix. 5, xx. 17); "My hand is stretched out" (vi. 14, xiv. 9, 13, xvi. 27, xxv. 7, 13, 16, xxxv. 3); "For they are a rebellious house"
ii.5, 6, iii. 9, 26, 27, xii. 3, 25). "Behold I am against" (v. 8, xiii. 9, xxviii. 22, etc.); "I will do judgments" (v. 10, xi. 9, xxx. 14, 19); "Finish my anger upon thee" (v. 13, vi. 12, vii. 8, xx. 8, 21); "Judge according to one's way (deed)" (vii. 3, 8, xxiv. 14, xxxvi. 19); "Give one's way upon one's head" (ix. 10, xi. 21, xvi. 43, xxii. 81); "Pour out my indignation" (vii. 8, ix. 8, xiv. 19, xx. 8, 21, 84, xxii. 22, 81, xxx. 15, xxxvi. 18); "Fall by the sword" (v. 12, vi. 12, xi. 10, xvii. 21, xxii. 25, xxiv. 21, xxv. 18, xxx. 5, 17); "Into the hand of strangers" (vii. 21, xi. 9, xxviii. 10, xxx. 12); "Go into captivity" (xii. 11, xxx. 17, 18); "And I will spread my net" (xii. 18, xvii. 20, xxxii. 8); "Scatter to every wind" (v. 2, 10, 12, xii. 14); "Scatter among the lands" (vi. 8, xii. 15, xx. 20, xvi. 15, xxix. 12, xxx. 28, 26); "Remove among the nations" (xii. 16, xii. 15, xx. 28, xxxvi. 19, cf. xi. 17, xx. 34, 41, xxv. 7, xxx. 14. 12); "Turn from one's evil way" (xii. 19, xiii. 22, xxxii. 11, cr. iii. 18; xxx. 8); "Give rest to my fury" (v. 18, xvi. 42, xxi. 22, xxiv. 18); "Loathe oneself" (xxi. 36, xxii. 21, 31, xxxviii. 19, cf. xxxvi. 5); "I will cut off man and beast" (xiv. 13, 17, 19, 21, xxv. 13, xxix. 5, cf. xxxvi. 11); "Remember thy way" (xvi. 61, xx. 43, xxxvi. 31); "The fire of my wrath" (xxi. 36, xxii. 21, 31, xxxviii. 19, cf. xxxvi. 5); "I will cut off man and beast" (xiv. 13, 17, 19, 21, xxv. 13, xxix. 14, 5, cf. xxxvi. 11); "The beast of the field. . . . the fowl of the heavens" (xxx. 5, xxx. 6, 13, xxxii. 4, xxxviii. 20); "Bear shame" (xxxii. 24f., 30, xxxiv. 29, xxxvi. 6f., 15, xxxix. 26, xliv. 18); "Turn the fate" (xvi. 53, xxix. 14, xxxix. 25).

This list is very significant. None of these phrases are found in H., but they are Ezekiel's commonest hortatory expressions and occur in his book more frequently than the phrases which he has in common with H. Evidently this fact is adverse to the hypothesis that Ez. was the author of the Holiness legislation.

Still more important is the fact, that H.'s most characteristic hortatory formulre are not found in the book of Ez. The most frequent and most characteristic hortatory formula of H. is the simple, "I am Jehovah," which closes the minor groups of laws. Remarkably enough, this is never used by Ez. The simple formula, "His blood upon him," which occurs six times in Lev. xx, is also not used by Ez. The striking exhortation, "And thou shalt be afraid of thy God" (Lev. xix. 14, 82, xxv. 17, 36, 48), is also lacking. Other recurrent phrases of the hortatory passages of H. which are not found in Ez. are, "Eat old store" (xxv. 22, xxvi. 10); "When none pursueth" (xxvi. 17, 36, 37); "Walk contrary to me" (xxvi. 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 40, 41); the sevenfold punishment for sin (xxvi. 18, 21, 24, 28); the depicting of flight before the enemy (xxvi. 7f., 36f.); the description of the horrors of war (xxvi. 16).

Accordingly, a comparison of the hortatory passages in H. and in
3. A further argument against this theory may be drawn from the difference between the personal characteristics of Ez. and the editor of H. Ez. is singularly unmethodical. Accidental association of ideas seems to determine the sequence of topics in his prophecy. His legislation shows none of that fine analysis and grouping of laws which we find in H. He has a sensitive conscience and a vivid imagination, but he is not conspicuous for intellectual vigor, and there is nothing in his book to indicate that he possessed the ability to construct so clear and succinct a code as H.

Another marked characteristic of Ez. is his sense of personal responsibility (ii. 17-21, xxxiii. 1-9). In all his exhortations the thought shines through, that he warns, not only for the sake of the nation, but for his own sake, that he may "deliver his soul whether they will hear or whether they will forbear." No trace of this subjective standpoint appears in the exhortations of H. Here the preacher is wholly objective; he thinks only of the penalty which will fall upon Israel if it continues in sin, and his own personality disappears behind his message.

The differences of Ezekiel's literary method from that of the editor of H. are also unfavorable to the theory that the two are identical. It may not be fair to compare his prophecies with H. since it is natural that the styles of prophecy and of legislation should be different; but it is surely allowable to compare the legislation of Ez. xl-xlviii with H., and to expect, if Ez. was the author of both, that the literary form will be the same. The characteristic form of Ezekiel's legislation is the apocalypse. His enactments are prefaced with visions accompanied with angelic interpretation in which he receives the communications that are to be imparted to the people and beholds the objects which he afterwards describes in writing. In H. there is not a suggestion of all this. Here without any scenic preliminaries or machinery of revelation, the lawgiver simply announces the commandments in the name of the Lord.

Again, the Holiness Code is expressly assigned to Moses, but Ez. never puts his legislation into the mouth of another lawgiver. Kuenen's remarks on this subject (Onderzoek, p. 277) are apposite: "We are not in a position to say that Ez. would have felt a scruple against ascribing legislation to Moses, but we can say that as far as we know he never made use of this form of expression, and that a priori we have no right whatever to expect it of him. In xl-xlviii he makes Yahwe himself announce the regulations of the restored theocracy. What could have induced him, a few years earlier or later, to relegate similar precepts to the Mosaic age?"
The style of the hortatory portions of H., in which we should expect to find the closest resemblance to Ez., if he were the editor of this legislation, is so much superior to anything that we find in his book that it is impossible to believe that he has written these passages. Lev. xxvi in particular is one of the most dramatic and impressive addresses in the Old Testament, and although we find most of its phrases in Ez., we search his book in vain for any passage where they are combined with the literary skill which is here manifested. It is not without reason that Kuenen regards this “difference in artistic skill" as decisive against the theory that Ez. was the editor of H.

If now it be true that Ez. was neither the author nor yet the collector of H., his coincidences with this code must be explained by some theory of literary dependence of one upon the other. Which one then is dependent? On this question modern criticism is divided. Perhaps there is a majority at present in favor of the view that Ez. is the earlier, and for this reason I shall review this theory next.

III. According to the Grafian school, H. forms the bridge from Ez. to the Priestly Code, just as Ez. forms the bridge from Deuteronomy to H. In support of this theory Kuenen (Onderzoek, p. 279) says: “Ezekiel's assumption of the legislator's office in xl sq. is best explained on the supposition that the priestly toroth had not been codified before his time. He thus appears to be the elder." Similarly Cornill (Einleitung, p. 78) asks: "If Ezekiel knew H., why did he publish his own code for the future?" But one may ask quite as appropriately, why H. should have given his code after Ezekiel if the legislation of that prophet were known to him. The difficulties which arise from the differences of the two legislations are equally great, whether we suppose Ezekiel or H. to be the earlier, and it is no more unlikely that Ez. should have made laws superseding H. than that H. should have given laws superseding Ez. From general considerations of this sort nothing can be proved in regard to the relative age of the two works.

A much stronger argument is found in the fact that Ez. says nothing about a high priest and apparently has no place for him in his system of legislation, while H. discriminates sharply between the high priest and the ordinary priests and requires a degree of sanctity in the former which is not required of the latter. This, it is said, indicates a development in the direction of the Priestly Code. Ez. knows no distinction in the priesthood; in H. "the priest that is greater than his brethren "appears; and in P we find the high priest, the magnificent ruler of the sacerdotal caste. On this point more than any other emphasis is laid by the school of Graf in support of the proposition that H. is later than Ez.
This argument would be a strong one, if there were no indications of the existence of such a functionary as the high priest of H. before the time of Ez., and if there were no reason why Ez. should ignore the high priest in his system. That there was a high priest of some sort long before the time of Ez. is certain. The presiding priest, who in preexilic times was the intermediary between the king and the ordinary priest, and who in Samuel and Kings bears the name of "the priest," καρτεξοχήν, held an hereditary office and was the leader of the sacerdotal class. Granted that he was only primus inter pares, the high priest of H. also is simply הבן הנדวล פָּחָן. This greater priest of H. agrees in all the main features with the presiding priest of Samuel and Kings, and, therefore, one must either deny the truthfulness of the representation of these books, or else admit that Ezekiel's silence does not prove that the high priest had not yet come into existence. As Baudipsen very appropriately remarks (A. T. Priesterthum, p. 128): "It is unhistorical to infer from this absence of the high priest, as well as from the silence of Deuteronomy, that down to the Exile there was no high priest at all. The book of Kings is against it, and from the nature of the case it is evident, that for practical reasons there must have been early a head priest at Jerusalem as well as at the centres of the cultus of other peoples. At the head of the returning exiles the high priest Joshua stands with undisputed prerogatives."

The fact then is; that the absence of the high priest from Ez. does not indicate that this functionary was not yet developed, but simply that he is intentionally omitted. The reason for the omission is obvious. Ezekiel's "prince" נְשֵׁי is meant to take the place of the high priest. The preexilic kings never exercised such functions as Ez. assigns to this ruler, and the facts, that the prince's land adjoins the priests', that he has the right of entering the temple through the holy eastern gate, and that he has charge of the providing of sacrifices, show that he is given a quasi-priestly function. Inasmuch as he is himself brought into direct relation to the priests, there is no longer any need for the old high priest as an intermediary, and Ez. drops him out of his scheme of legislation. This omission, therefore, is due merely to an individual peculiarity of Ez. (cf. Kayser, Jahrbucher fur protestantische Theologie, 1881, p. 547; Horst, p. 95).

The case is similar in the law of the sabbatical year of rest for the land. Ez. apparently does not know of this institution, while H. elaborates it at great length. Here again Kuenen (Onderzoek, p., 278) says, that "H. shows an advance on Ez." But the sabbatical year is already enacted in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxiii.
10f.), and, therefore, the absence of this institution from Ez. does not indicate that it had not yet been developed but only that Ez. accidentally or intentionally omitted it. With just as much propriety Kuenen might argue that H. is in advance of Ez. because he has the feast of Pentecost which Ez. never mentions. Pentecost, however, is an integral part of all the oldest legislation; and, therefore, Ezekiel's silence is without significance. The fact is, that Ez. does not attempt to give a complete code, but presupposes a body of institutions as already in existence to which he alludes in an incidental manner. His silence, therefore, can never be construed as an indication of ignorance of any institution, particularly when, as in the case of the high priest, a reason can be seen for the omission.

These are the only particulars in which it is claimed that H. shows a more developed legislation than Ez. Apart from this supposed development, there are no literary or historical reasons for thinking that H. is later than Ez. This argument, as we have just seen, is not conclusive, and, on the other hand, there are a number of points in which it is generally conceded that the legislation of Ez. is an advance upon H. In the distribution of priestly functions, in the classification of the "holy things," in the enumeration of the sacrifices, and in the treatment of the feasts Ez. is certainly more developed than H. This fact need not be exhibited in detail, inasmuch as it is conceded by Kuenen, Baentsch (Heiligkeitsgesetz, Erfurt, '93), and other advocates of the priority of Ez. These critics explain it by the assertion that in these cases H. "adhered to the older tradition" (Kuenen, Onderzoek, p. 279).

This claim, it seems to me, destroys all value of the argument from the development of legislation. If in these cases H. followed the older tradition, although he is later than Ez., why may we not suppose that Ez. followed the older tradition in those cases in which his legislation appears to be more primitive than H.? If a more developed legislation is to be construed as an indication of a later date, when it suits the purpose of our argument, and to be dismissed as a relic of an older tradition, when it does not suit us to date the document in accord with this indication; then no certain conclusion is possible. Baentsch sets all these indications of the priority of H. aside with the remark (p. 114), that the absence of the high priest from Ez. is so much more important an indication of age that it outweighs these contrary indications and proves that H. is later than Ez. This is a striking instance of the power of a foregone conclusion. The fact is that, as far as any development is traceable in legislation, Ez. shows the later form. This fact cannot lightly be set aside by the assertion that H., although later, adheres to the older tradition.
IV. We are thrown back, accordingly, upon the only remaining hypothesis, namely, that H. is the older document and that Ez. makes use of it in his prophecy. This is the theory which is advocated by Noldeke, Klostermann, Hofmann, Riehm. In its defense the following arguments may be urged:

1. The theory has antecedent probability from the fact that Ez. is an habitual quoter. No Old Testament writer is more dependent upon his predecessors than this prophet. Lists of quotations have been given already by Noldeke (p. 68 sq.), Klostermann (p. 417 sq.), Hoffmann (Mag. f. d. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums, vii), Smend (Ezechiel, p. xxiv). It is not necessary, therefore, to prove this here in detail. On the other hand, H. has no striking points of similarity with any other Old Testament writings than Deuteronomy and Ez. If we suppose the author of H. to be the quoter, we must assume that he intentionally ignores all the rest of the Hebrew literature except these two books and that, although he had before him the complete legislation of Deuteronomy, he preferred to cull the scattered precepts of Ez. and combine them into a law code. Why he should have done this is inexplicable. On the other hand, it is easy enough to see why Ez. should have used H. more frequently than other works, if we suppose that this code was in existence in his time. Dealing specially with moral and religious duties, this code had a value during the period of the Exile which was not possessed by the ceremonial legislation, for the latter depended upon the existence of the national sanctuary. The duties prescribed in H. were such as could be carried out by those living in a foreign land. The sins against which it warned were those into which a people living among the heathen would be most likely to fall. The situation here assumed, that Israel has just come out of the land of Egypt and is about to enter the land of Canaan, had many points of analogy with the situation of the exiles. What was more natural, accordingly, than that Ez. should find in this code more material suited to his purpose than elsewhere and that he should quote from this document more frequently than from any other?

The antecedent probability, therefore, is all in favor of Ezekiel being the quoter, and it is astonishing when Cornill says, "It is as unlikely as possible that an author of the originality and scope of Ezekiel should have modeled his style on a single chapter of the Pentateuch (Lev. xxvi)." In reality Ezekiel is perhaps the least original of all the Old Testament writers. His style is similar not only to Lev. xxvi, but to all of H., and, instead of it being improbable that he should use this portion of the Pentateuch, there is nothing which he would be more likely to use.
2. Passing now from these general considerations to specific reasons for thinking that H. is prior to Ez., we observe, that the characteristic expressions of H., almost without exception, are found in Ez., while only a small proportion of the characteristic phrases of Ez. are found in H. In other words, there is a fund of expressions which are common to Ez. and to H., but outside of this fund H. has scarcely any characteristic phrases while Ez. has a large number. A list of Ezekiel's phrases which are not found in H. has been given already. This list is by no means complete, and yet how disproportionately great it is in comparison with the list of characteristic expressions of H. which are not found in Ez.! Now what is the most natural construction to put upon this fact? If H. quotes Ez., then it is hard to see why all of Ezekiel's favorite phraseology should not be used in H.; but if Ez. quotes H., then it is perfectly evident why practically all of H.'s characteristic expressions are found in Ez. One must admit, therefore, that the proportion of similarity in these two works is decidedly in favor of H. being the older work.

3. The similarity of Ez. to H. is sporadic, and this can be explained more naturally by the supposition that Ez. occasionally made use of H. than that H. selected portions of Ez. for quotation and ignored other portions which were just as important and just as appropriate. Ezekiel's coincidences with H. are found chiefly in chaps. v, vi, xiv, xviii, xx and xxii. Outside of these chapters there is an occasional use of certain stock phrases of H., but no close parallelism of thought. The similarity of H. to Ez., on the other hand, extends throughout the entire code, and although Lev. xxvi is more closely parallel to Ez. than any other portion of the code, it cannot be said that H.'s resemblance to Ez. is sporadic. How are we to interpret this? Surely it is more natural to suppose that Ez. used H. as a whole, but saw fit to quote it only occasionally, rather than that H. selected a half dozen sections of Ez., which he quoted almost entire and ignored the rest of the prophecy.

In a number of cases the standing phrases of H. occur but once in Ez. They are as follows: "Any man of the house of Israel " (Ez. xiv. 4-7), אֲנָדֹקמ "vanities " (xxx. 13), "I am the Lord who sanctify" (xx. 12), נְגַד "redemption" (xi. 15), "And I will cut him off" (xiv. 8), "food of God" (xliv. 7), מֵנָדֹקמ "sale" (vii. 13), "bear sin" (xxiii. 49), מֵנָדֹקמ "corruption" (iv.14), "turn unto" (xxxvi. 9), הַכֵּל "revile " (xxii. 7), "draw near to a woman" (xviii. 6), "loathsome thing" (viii. 10). Which is the more probable, that H. has hunted out these isolated words and phrases of Ez. and has adopted them as his standing expressions, or that
Ez. in his quotation of H. happened to insert these expressions but once?

4. Even when Ez. is most closely parallel to H. he exhibits a greater fullness of expression, which indicates that he has amplified H. First of all we may note this amplifying tendency in the case of the recurrent formulae of H. The most striking instance is Ezekiel's use of the phrase הוהי נא. In this simple form it never occurs in Ez., but is always accompanied with some appositive expression. One cannot help thinking that the tendency in language is for phrases to lose their force and to require to be strengthened by additional words, so that antecedently it is probable that הוהי נא is more primitive than נא והוהי אלפליך. Some additions to the primitive formula are found in, H. itself. These all recur in Ezekiel, and besides them there are other additions of considerable length which are not found in H. The only fair inference from this fact is, that the process of intensifying the simple original formula has gone further in Ez. than in H. Moreover, R. uses the formulae "I am the Lord" and "I am the Lord your God" absolutely, but in Ez. they are never found without connecting words such as "for," or "ye shall know that," or the infinitive construction with ב which is peculiar to Ez. Here again it is more natural to suppose that the abrupt epigrammatic form of expression, as we find it in H., is the more primitive, and that Ezekiel's finished form with all of its syntactical exactness is the later.

The forceful brevity of the judgment pronounced so often in Lev. xx, יב ימלוך, is impaired in Ez. by the addition of והוהי and this need of inserting the copula indicates a later linguistic development. The characteristic formula of H., "walk in the statutes and keep the judgments (commandments) and do them" (xviii. 3, 4, xx. 23, xxvi. 3), occurs with great frequency in Ez., but in Ez. the formula seldom stands alone, but is usually accompanied with an additional hortatory phrase (cf. Ez. v. 7, xi. 12, 20, xviii. 9). These additional phrases are also found in H., but not in combination with the formula in question. Here again it is more probable that Ez. for increased emphasis has combined two expressions of H. in his quotation rather than that H. has secured that the formula should always occur in its simple form by cutting the formulre of Ez. in two and putting the second halves in other connections. In a similar manner the simple phrase והוהי ננת of Lev. xvii. 7, xx. 5,6, is not strong enough for Ez., but must be intensified by the addition of a variety of synonymous phrases (cf. xx. 30, xxxiii. 3, 5, 19).

The formula" to profane the name of thy God"; or "to profane
my holy name," occurs in H. with stereotyped regularity (cf. Lev. xviii. 21, xix. 12, xx. 3); but in Ez. it is employed with the utmost flexibility of form and of grammatical relation. It is enlarged, it is strengthened by phrases which state in what the profanation consists, it is paraphrased in other language. Here also it is perfectly clear that H. furnishes the original upon which Ez. rings the changes.

The standing phrase of H., "And I will cut him off from the midst of his kinsfolk," is apparently more original than the two forms which occur in Ez., "I will cut him off from the midst of my people," and" I will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel." In general it may be said that all of the recurrent formulae exhibit a simpler form in H. than in Ez., and that the only natural construction which can be put upon this fact is that H. is older than Ez.

Moreover, when we compare the individual passages in which H. and Ez. correspond in thought or in diction, we find the same relation which exists in the hortatory passages. Ez. has an amplified form which shows that he has used H. as a text on which he has based his comments. For instance, in Lev. xviii. 3 we read, "After the doings of the land of Egypt wherein ye dwelt shall ye not do, and after the doings of the land of Canaan whither I bring you shall ye not do." This simple, unqualified prohibition is made the subject of the twentieth chapter of Ez. In verses 5-26 the prophet amplifies upon the theme of doing according to the doings of the land of Egypt, and in verses 27 sq. he develops the other theme of doing according to the doings of the land of Canaan. In the first section he shows at great length the circumstances under which God first gave the commandment, the details being drawn from the narratives of Exodus and Deuteronomy. He shows how Israel disobeyed the command in the wilderness and how God punished them. In H., however, we meet but this one allusion to imitation of the Egyptians. It is quite incredible, therefore, that a legislator who was following Ez. should have limited himself to this single brief proposition, if he had before him all of Ezekiel's wealth of exhortation and of historical illustration. The dependence of Ezekiel in this instance is proved by the fact that the law which forms the main theme of the chapter is combined by him with other enactments and other expressions of H. which are not combined with it in Leviticus, and which are not strictly relevant. The contrast of the Lord's statutes and judgments to the statutes and judgments of the heathen is found in H. and is natural. Ezekiel imitates this in xx. 11, 13, 16, 19, 21, 24, but he adds to it the duty of hallowing the Sabbath, which forms no true contrast to
imitation of the heathen and is not inserted in this connection in H., but among the more specific ordinances of worship at the beginning of chap. xix.

Ez. xx is full also of the phrases of Lev. xxvi, and in all of these cases it is easier to suppose that Ez. in his exhortation has brought together things which were disconnected in H., than that H. has divided up and scattered in different portions of his code sets of phrases which are regularly combined in Ez. The wearisome repetitions of this chapter of Ez. and its extraordinary diffuseness are alone sufficient evidence that it is not the original of the epigrammatic utterance of Lev. xviii. 3, particularly when we observe that nearly all in this chapter which differs from H. is borrowed from the Pentateuchal history or from Jeremiah.

Moreover, the prophet refers to this commandment not to imitate the heathen, in such a way as to show that he had in mind a definite system of legislation which contained this precept. In verse 10f. he says that God brought Israel out of Egypt into the wilderness and gave them His "statutes and judgments which if a man do he shall live by them." Here obviously Ezekiel has specific enactments in mind. What other enactments can they be than the ones in Lev. xvii-xxvi, which uniformly speak of themselves as statutes and judgments, and of which it is said in Lev. xviii. 5 that if a man do them he shall live by them? Among these statutes and judgments given in the wilderness was the prohibition of Egyptian idolatry (Ez. xx. 7). This stands in immediate connection with the command to keep all of God's statutes and judgments in Lev. xviii. 5, and it does not occur in this specific form in any of the other codes to which Ez. might have referred. The legislation which Ez. had in mind spoke of "hallowing my sabbaths," but this is an expression which is characteristic of H. Throughout this chapter, accordingly, Ez. speaks as only a man could speak who had the legislation of H. before him in written form (cf. Baentsch, p. 86f.).

The chief coincidences of Ez. with the legislation of H. are found in chaps. xviii and xxii. Chap. xviii is little more than a different arrangement of precepts which are found in H. Chap. xxii enumerates many of the same precepts which are found in xviii and adds others which are also found in H. In both of these cases certain collocations of duties are favored by Ez., and are frequently repeated together with duties which are not found in H., that of giving bread to the hungry, of covering the naked with a garment, and of abstaining from eating upon the mountains or lifting up one's eyes to the idols of Israel. Now we may ask, if this catalogue of duties in Ez. is the basis of the legislation of H., why
are the laws not found in somewhat the same order in H. in which they are found in Ez., and why are they not found in combination with the other duties which Ez. emphasizes? On the supposition that Ez. quotes H., we cannot explain why the precepts of Ez. should have been scattered through H. so effectually that no two stand together, nor why the commandment to aid the poor and the prohibition of high-place worship should have been omitted. If, on the other hand, we suppose that Ez. quotes H., we can readily see how he should have made a selection out of the wealth of material offered by H. of those particular precepts which seemed to him most important.

In neither of these chapters does Ez. promulgate his precepts formally as a system of legislation, but in xviii he brings them in as illustrations of the kind of duties for which men shall be held individually responsible, and in xxii as illustrations of the crimes perpetrated by the princes of Jerusalem). Which is more likely, that a prophet in calling sinners to account should quote the words of the law, or that a lawgiver should go to the exhortations of the prophet in order to find material for his new code?

Again, in these chapters Ez. enumerates without logical order or principle, while in H. the laws are grouped with fine analytical skill; and once more we may ask, whether it is more natural to suppose that H. has classified and enlarged Ezekiel's rambling statements of duties or that Ez. in quoting the law code from memory abandoned its formal exactness of structure.

For these reasons we must admit, it seems to me, that Ez. xviii and xx necessitate the supposition that the prophet had before him at least the legislation of Lev. xviii-xix. This is admitted by Baentsch, the most recent critic of the holiness-legislation, in the following words, "On the basis of the most conscientious investigation of details, I have reached the certainty that Lev. xviii-xx is really older than Ez., and, in fact, in certain passages underlies the statements of this prophet, I mean Ez. xviii, xx, xxii, xxiii."

Even those critics who claim that Ez. is earlier than H. are compelled to admit that these particular chapters of Ez. demand the assumption of an older system of legislation as their basis. Thus Kuenen says (Onderzoek p. 279), "It is perfectly true that Ez. xviii. 6, 7 and xxii. 7-12 respectively imply that the commandments now contained in Lev. xviii. 19, 20, xix. 13, 15, 35, xxv. 14, 17, 36, and Lev. xix. 16, 30, 33, xx. 9, 10, etc., were by no means evolved after Ezekiel's time, but could be assumed by him as known to his cotemporaries in pretty much the same form in which we have them in P." This admission Kuenen hastens to
qualify, however, by the claim that here Ez. is not quoting from H., but from the sources of H. This is a weak evasion of the force of the facts. Every indication favors the view that Ez. quotes H., and there is nothing that is really adverse to this hypothesis; it is, therefore, wholly unwarranted to assume earlier sources of H. for which there is no historical evidence. This method of arguing cuts the foundation from under all historical criticism, for it makes it impossible to prove that any document is dependent upon another. By the same method it would be possible to argue that the Book of the Covenant is later than Deuteronomy, and that the apparent quotation of it in Deuteronomy is due to use, not of it, but of its sources. Until the existence of these hypothetical sources can be rendered probable, we are bound, it seems to me, to recognize that H. as we now have it was used by Ez.

I conclude this investigation, therefore, with the claim that the only theory which will explain all the facts of the relation of Ez. to Lev. xvi-xxvi is that Ez. had this legislation before him as a written code. The other questions which rise immediately when this one is settled, whether Ezekiel knew any more of Leviticus than these chapters, and how long before Ez. the holiness legislation was written, are problems which cannot be discussed within the limits of this article.
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1. Introduction. Current View of Woman's Relation to the Cult.

THE opinion has found considerable currency that woman, on account of her sex, was disqualified to perform the duties of the religious cult among the Hebrews; that in the absence of males in the family, the cult of the deceased could not be perpetuated. The chief representatives of this view are Stade, Schwally, Benzinger, and Nowack. Benzinger (Hebraische Archologie, p. 140) has given it amplest expression; and, in order to have it clearly before us, I quote his words in full: “Noch an einem anderen Punkt zeigt sich die Inferioritat der Frau deutlich: die Frau war nicht fahig zur Ausubung des Kultus. Die Sitte der Schwagerehe setzt die Anschauung voraus, dass Frau and Tochter nicht im Stande sind, den Kultus des Toten zu pflegen. Aus demselben Grund kam ihnen nur ein sehr beschränktes Erbrecht zu, ebensowenig wurden der Frau nach dem Tod kultische Ehren zu teil. Nur als Ehefrau war ihr eine gewisse Teilnahme am Kulte des Mannes gestattet. Bis auf den heutigen Tag hat sich bei den Juden diese Vorstellung erhalten: die Frauen dürfen dem Gottesdienst in der Synagoge anwohnen, die Madchen sind davon ausgeschlossen. Nicht minder wird im Islam die Frau als unfahig zur Kultusubung betrachtet. Dass schon frühe einige Frauen als Prophetinnen auftreten, ist eine Ausnahme, welche die Regel bestätigt.”

Nowack (Hebräische Archologie i. 344 f., 348) is less sweeping in his statements, but also affirms that the levirate law had for its main object to provide male descent for the dead, because woman was unqualified to participate in the cult; that this disqualification also lay at the basis of the Hebrew laws of inheritance; and that
only the son, or the nearest male, and not the female, was qualified to transmit the cult of the testator.

The expression of this view reaches, it seems to me, the strangest height, when Schwally (ZATW. xi. 176 ff.) endeavors to explain the word הָדָר בֵּשָׂ בֵּשָׂ אָלַיִם, 'male,' as connected with הָדָר, 'to call in cult upon God,' and meaning therefore first 'a cultic person,' then, on the assumption, according to the view in question, that this cultic person can be in all Israelitish and Semitic antiquity only a. man, meaning, secondly, 'a male.' This sexual meaning was then, thirdly, transferred from men to animals, and reached the highest point of development in the Arabic and Aramaic in the meaning, fourthly, "das mannliche Glied." Leaving out of consideration the assumption as to cult, such a view of an etymological development from a distinct spiritual meaning to the lowest physical will never commend itself as an improvement on the older view represented by Gesenius, s.v.

None of the three authorities mentioned seems to speak from independent investigation of the subject of woman's relation to the Hebrew or Semitic cult. All three are evidently dependent upon Stade, and simply follow him.

Stade reaches his conclusion in a peculiar manner. He is dealing with the Hebrew family in pre-prophetic time, and he finds in the customs of mourning evidences of a cult of the dead and indications of ancestor-worship. He concludes from these indications that ancestor-worship was a prime factor in the formation of the ancient Israelitish family. Here he begins to call attention to similarities in the organization of the ancient Greek, Roman, and Indian families, and to draw parallels between them and the Semitic. The ancient Indo-Germanic family was a "Cultgenossenschaft," held together by the common bond of worship of the ancestors of the family, whose altar is the family altar, and whose priest is the father and the lord of the house. This cult explains the most ancient laws of the people. Can similar ancient Hebrew laws find a similar explanation? In answering this question affirmatively Stade proceeds to instance the law of inheritance. This law among the ancient Hebrews, as among the ancient Greeks and Romans, was originally that of agnates. In ancient Israel the son only is the heir, not the daughter. Stade asserts that wherever this law of inheritance is found, the ground for it is that only the son, or the nearest male relative, taking his place as the heir, can perpetuate the cult of the testator (Geschichte i. 388-391).
It is important to observe that Stade's conclusion, denying woman her share in the ancient Hebrew cult, is not based upon any direct evidence derived from the Old Testament itself, but upon a remote and supposed analogy which connects a question of cult with that of the law of inheritance, and upon an utter disregard of all phenomena in the Old Testament that may point the other way.

The connection of the law of inheritance with the admission to the cult, and the explanation of the former from this source, are entirely forced and unsatisfactory. That the inheritance in old Israel was restricted to agnates is true enough (Nowack, *Arch. i.* 348f.); but we may well ask whether there is not a simpler explanation of the fact. The weakness of Stade's position becomes very apparent when, in his attempt to support his view of the dependence of the right to inherit upon admission to the cult, he refers to Gen. 15. 2f as the solitary evidence. Now, the ancient custom that in default of a son the slave of the master becomes heir may prove that Abraham had no son, but how it can prove that Eliezer was the last representative of the family cult, save on the assumption of that which Stade endeavors to prove, I cannot see.

But the fact of woman's exclusion from the Hebrew laws of inheritance does not need explanation from her relation to the cult. There is a better way. W. Robertson Smith mentions a similar law among the Arabs. Smith shows that antique Arab society had its basis not in the patriarchal authority, the family, but in the stock or kinship tribe, an organization that has for its object offence and defence, and that the whole law of the old Arabs resolves itself into a law of war, in which blood-feud, blood-wite, and booty are the points on which everything turns. The law of inheritance there follows the law of booty. The tribe owned the property of which the individual had only a usufruct, and which fell to be divided after his death like the spoils of war. The right of inheritance belonged to the active members of the tribe. This explains the relation of woman to the law of inheritance, and is in accordance with the old law of Medina, quoted by Smith, in which women were excluded from inheritance on the principle that "none can be heirs who do not take part in battle, drive booty, and protect property." See W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, pp. 33-58, and his note on "Law of Inheritance," p. 263.

Now, it is a well-recognized fact that the affinity in social organization and ancient law is far greater between the Arabs and the Hebrews than between the Semites and the Greeks and Romans. And so woman's exclusion from inheritance finds here, it seems to
me, a natural, reasonable, and more direct explanation, and does not need the assumption that woman was excluded from the ancient Hebrew cult. It thus appears that the current opinion on woman's relation to the Hebrew cult is by no means based upon a special and direct investigation of the subject. This phase of Hebrew antiquity has so far received no critical treatment. Because in later Levitical legislation man is made prominent in the cult, and later Judaism has in Herod's Temple a "Court of Women," and the Mishna exempts woman from reading the Shema' and the ritual of the phylacteries (Berakoh 33), and in the Middle Ages woman was relegated to the galleries of the synagogues, and Jewish men now pray "Blessed art thou, Lord, our God, King of the world, that thou hast not made me a woman" (Hebrew Prayer Book: part of the daily morning prayer), and because Islam excludes woman from the cult, it has been taken for granted that this exclusion was from the beginning a distinctive feature of Semitic cult. The facts on the subject, as contained in the Old Testament, and supplied by other Semitic religions, have not been collected and squarely looked in the face. To supply this evident lack is the object of this essay. My method of treatment is to collect, arrange, and explain some of the more prominent facts in regard to woman's position in other Semitic cults in general, but more especially, all the facts bearing upon woman's position in the ancient and later Hebrew cult as contained in the Old Testament. The conclusion to which the facts thus treated have led me, if I may here anticipate, is that the Semites in general, and the Hebrews in particular, and the latter especially in the earlier periods of their history, exhibit no tendency to discriminate between man and woman so far as regards participation in religious practices, but that woman participates in all the essentials of the cult, both as worshipper and official; and that only in later time, with the progress in the development of the cult itself, a tendency appears, not so much, however, to exclude woman from the cult, as rather to make man prominent in it.

1 Schechter, in his Studies in Judaism, under the caption, "Woman in Temple and Synagogue," touches lightly, and in a popular way, upon some of the surface facts of the subject. His essay cannot be regarded as a critical contribution to the subject, and in fact he does not lay claim to such a contribution. See p. 313-

2 Cf. Israel Abrahams, Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, p. 25 f.

3 I hope, at some future time, as a second part of the subject, to treat fully of the causes of woman's later inferior position in the cult, and her final, apparently entire, exclusion from it.
2. Woman in Other Semitic Cults.

That we have reason to look to other Semitic cults for light has been fully demonstrated by the researches of W. R. Smith, embodied in his *Religion of the Semites*. The fundamental institutions of the Israelites had a common origin with those of the other Semitic peoples. The relation of woman to the other Semitic cults has therefore a vital bearing on our question, and must all the more receive some attention, since Schwally (*ZATW*. xi. 178) claims that "im israelitischen, überhaupt im ganzen semitischen Altertum," man only possessed the qualification to perform independently the duties of the religious cult.

1. Woman in the Arabic Cult.

Islam is no such ancient nor unadulterated source as to supply much that is helpful in the investigation of the early Hebrew cult. It is far different with pre-Islamic, Arabic heathenism. Here we may well go with confidence for analogies and explanations. We are not, therefore, like Benzinger, so much concerned with the relation of woman to the cult of Islam as with her relation to the cult of Arabic heathenism. Fortunately, meagre as the source in general is, it yields material enough to leave beyond any question woman's relation to Arabic cult. The facts, as collected mainly from Wellhausen's *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*, lead to the conclusion that this relation is one of almost perfect parity with that of man, there being not the slightest indication that the question of sex from a religious point of view ever comes into consideration.

(I) Female Divinities. -- Female divinities are numerous, and play a very important role in Arabic heathenism. The Jinns even were mostly feminine (Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 135). Local divinities of Mecca were Isaf and Naila, man and wife (p. 73). In the Ka’ba at Mecca stood a dove of aloe wood, a fact pointing to the great Semitic goddess (p. 70). Suva’, one of the five "idols of the people of Noah," was worshipped by the Beni Hamdan, and in the form of a woman; so a late tradition says, which, however, according to Wellhausen, is not reliable (p. 16). According to Epiphanius the worship of Dhu IShara was associated with that of his virgin mother (p. 46). Shams was a goddess (p. 56). But chief of all are "the three daughters of Allah," the goddesses Al Lat, Manat, and Al ‘Uzza, whose worship possessed more vitality and importance than that of all the male divinities, Allah only excepted. All Arabia was most zealously
devoted to them, the polemic against them in the Koran being but a small part of the evidence of this fact (p. 21ff., p. 71). A religion that pays such homage to female divinities is not likely to discriminate against woman in matters of cult; at any rate only the most positive testimony can carry any weight in the matter.

(2) Women as Devotees.--Women frequented the places of worship. At the annual Hajj at Mecca married and unmarried women were present (p. 85). The reference in Yaqut to the backs of the women jostling at Dhu I Khalasa is an indication in what throngs the women attended the sanctuaries (Wellh., p. 43; Smith, *Kinship*, p. 295).

But the women's devotion was not confined to simple attendance they brought their votive offerings. There is ancient testimony to the fact that the women worshipped Al 'Uzza "daily with sacrifices and gifts" (Wellh., p. 37; cf. also pp. 112, 101).

The two principal acts of Arabic worship, the 'stroking' (tama-massuh), and (most important of all) the tawaf, or act of encircling the sacred stone, were participated in by the women as well as by the men (Wellh., pp. 52, 105f., 118).

In the cult of the dead the women had even more than their share. It was theirs to chant the rhythmical dirge; the institution of the professional mourning men is later than that of the mourning women (p. 160).4 The regulation that woman during the period of her purification must not approach the sanctuary (pp. 52 and 118) is but the evidence of the single exception that proves her inclusion in the cult. For an interesting story of the conversion of a Dausite and his wife, illustrating many points of the intimate association of man with woman in religion, see Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 45.

(3) Woman as Cultic Official.--Arabic heathenism had two chief cultic officials: sadin (temple watchman), or hajib (doorkeeper), the temple servant or priest, and kahin, seer, prophet. In the latter class women are numerous (Wellh., p. 130); but of the woman sadin there is not a single instance that I can find. But this fact finds a simple explanation as soon as the nature of the office is examined. The sadin was not a priest whose specific prerogative it was to officiate at the altar. Such an official the Arabs never had. He was not needed for sacrificing, and, though the sacred lot was in his keeping, and he, in general, officiated at the casting of the sacred

4 Circumcision was practised, among some tribes, upon girls (p. 154f., 168). But this custom, found also among certain uncivilized tribes in Africa, was merely one feature in the consecration of all the members of the tribe to the deity.
lots, even that could be done without him (Wellh., p. 129). The sadin or hajib, as the names indicate, was the watchman, the doorkeeper of the sanctuary. Arabic nomadic life had given a peculiar form of duty to this office. In general the sanctuaries did not wander with the tribes, but remained stationary; but there are cases where the idol did share in the nomadic life, and was carried into battle like the ark of Jahveh (Wellh., pp. 18 and 129). Cases of theft of idols, even, are not unheard of (p. 18). The sadin became in this manner the resident, the defender, and, in time, the actual possessor of the sanctuary. By a natural law of selection, the office of watcher, protector, and possessor would fall to man and not to woman. The absence of woman from this office cannot therefore be taken as implying a discrimination against woman in reference to the cult.

This view is confirmed by the fact that woman was not excluded from the office of kahin, which carried with it far greater cultic significance. This significance becomes all the more apparent when the original position of the kahin is recognized. There is every reason for accepting the conclusion of W. R. Smith, Wellhausen, and most moderns, that the office of the sadin was originally included in that of the kahin, which corresponded very nearly to that of the early Hebrew kohen. In course of development the kahins branched off from the general priestly body, carrying with them the principal part of its duty and the ancient title of honor, and leaving behind them a class of officials who sank into mere aeditui (Wellh., p. 134; W. R. Smith, Journal of Philology xiii. 278). The kahin therefore was originally the great official of the cult, and women, as stated, are frequently found holding this office.

It thus appears that the testimony of Arabic heathenism on woman's relation to the cult is comprehensive, clear, and uniform. Whether as divinity, devotee, or cultic official, woman shares cultic duties with man, and in matters of religion there is no sign of any discrimination against her on account of her sex.

2. *Woman in Assyro-Babylonian, Phoenician, and other Semitic Cults.*

Babylonian and Assyrian cults do not furnish altogether as safe a basis for comparison with the Hebrew cult as that of Arabic heathenism. Babylonian and Assyrian religions, as is generally held, are syncretistic, mixed with non-Semitic elements, and developed under physical and moral conditions different from those which determined
the Hebrew development. This is in great measure true also of the Phoenician cult—a result due, no doubt, to its close relation to the Assyro-Babylonian. One feels the need, therefore, of caution in the use of material from these sources. Yet there are certain general features which recur with striking uniformity in all parts of the Semitic field, as W. R. Smith has said (Rel. of Sem., p. 14 ff.). The relation of woman to the cult, it may be safely asserted, is one of these. As my purpose is simply to allow a side light from this direction to fall upon the main question, it will not require an exhaustive treatment.

(i) Female Divinities.—It will not be necessary to name all of the numerous female divinities of the Assyro-Babylonian pantheon. As the representative of them all, we may call to mind the Babylonian Ishtar, who was venerated as the mother goddess, the queen, head and firstborn of all gods. (Cf. W. R. Smith, Rel., p. 56 ff.) Among the other female divinities may be named Damkina, Nana, Nin-gal, Gula, Anunit, and Zarpanit. In pairs often occur the divinities: as, Bel and Belit; Ea and Damkina.

The Phoenicians have by the side of כִּיָּלָה בֵּטַל, both distinguished by many additional names, expressing either attributes or names of cities devoted to their worship. Besides, they worshipped אתֶּרֶת, Astarte, the great Semitic goddess, and תַּנִית, Tanith. Cf. Baethgen, Beitrage, pp. 29, 31, 26 ff.; Baudissin, 191. s.v. Astarte, Baal; Pietschmann, Geschichte d. Phoenizier, p. 182 ff.

The Moabites worshipped by the side of כִּיָּלָה חַמָּשׁ חַמָּשׁ who was most probably a female divinity. (Cf. Baudissin, 191. ii. 150, 156, and Baethgen, pp. 14, 256.) To her Mesha, according to his inscription, devoted the Israelitish captives. Cf. the inscription of King Mesha on the Moabite stone, 1. 17.

The Aramaeans worshipped by the side of Hadad the female divinity Atargatis, who was the great Syrian goddess, even outranking Hadad. Cf. Baethgen, 68, 74.

(2) Women as Devotees.—It would be safe to let this question rest on a priori grounds: that cults which pay such homage to female divinities cannot discriminate in matters of cult against the female sex. But there is all the direct testimony that is needed. Woman's intimate relation to the divinity finds expression in some of the female names, viz. אַמְתַּלְקָרָה אַמְתַּלְקָרָה אַמְתַּלְקָרָה “Handmaid of Melkart”; אַמְתַּלְקָרָה אַמְתַּלְקָרָה אַמְתַּלְקָרָה, “Sister of Melkart”; אַמְתַּלְקָרָה אַמְתַּלְקָרָה, "Grace of Melkart"; cf. Euting, Sammlung Karthag. Inschriften, 153, 320, 213, 165, quoted by Baethgen, p. 21; so also אַמְתַּלְקָרָה (CIS. 46), אַמְתַּלְקָרָה (CIS. 231), אַמְתַּלְקָרָה (CIS. 41).
But the most abundant evidence we find in the Old Testament itself in the numerous allusions to woman's participation in foreign cults, of which I treat further on. See p. 120.

(3) Woman as Cultic Official.--Meissner, in his Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht (pp. 8 and I I I, § 12), speaks of financial functions of priests and priestesses, the latter's official position in the temple being indicated by SAL (or UD) Samas; cf. also Peiser, Babylonische Verträge d. Berl. Mus., pp. xvii-xxix.

There were priestesses of Ishtar at Uruk (cf. Jeremias, Izdubar-Nimrod, p. 59 f.).

Prophetesses, who tell the messages of the gods, are mentioned in connection with the 'seers' in the text of Gudea. Cf. Amiaud, "The Inscription of Telloh," Records of the Past, New Series, i. 42, ii. 78.

To the same class of officials belong, most probably, also the priestesses or prophetesses whose names are attached to the oracular responses of Istar of Arbela. Cf. Pinches, "The Oracle of Istar of Arbela," Records of the Past, New Series, v. 129 ff.; Tiele, Gesch. d. Rel., p. 195.

These scattered references have led me to go carefully through Delitzsch's Assyrisches Handworterbuch in quest of designations of these female officials. To give this subject the thorough treatment it needs would require too, long a digression, and I therefore present these designations in a simple alphabetical order:--

(1) uhatu, eine weibliche Hierodule, naher Dienerin der Gottin Istar von Erech. They appear also as "Klagefrauen beim Tammuz-Fest" (Del., p. 41).
(2) epistu, fem. of part, episu, Hexe (p. 119).
(3) asiptu, fem. of asipu, Beschworer (p. 247).
(4) zirznasitu, ein Epitheton, bez. Name der Zauberin oder Hexe (p. 264).
(5) harimtu auch harmatu, eine weibliche Hierodule, naher Dienerin der Gottin Istar'zu Erech (p. 290).
(6) kassaptu, fem. of kassapu, Zauberin, Hexe (p. 360).
(7) mahhutu, fem. of mahhu, der von Ekstase befallene, von Sinnen seierende (vgl. מספיע), Prophet, Wahrsager, מסאטר, bez. Prophetin (p. 397).
(8) kadistu (gadistu), Hierodule, eine dem Dienste der Gottin Istar geweihte and dadurch entweihte Jungfrau (vgl. קדרה). The term is also used of the Zauberin and Hexe (p. 581).

On woman's position as official in Phoenician cult, the Eshmunazar inscription furnishes a word that is of the highest import. The Sidonian king, naming his mother, calls her not only אמאתרת (בענת), but he designates her also זנות תשגר, the feminine form of חבנת, found here for the first time. Cf. CIS. 3, l. 14 f.
3. *Old Testament References to Woman's Relation to other Semitic Cults.*

As furnishing us with a view of the relation of woman to other and especially Semitic cults, the allusions in the Old Testament must not be overlooked. These allusions cover two points: (1) The worship of strange gods by devotees who were either Canaanites or immigrants on Israelitish soil, and (2) the worship of strange gods by the Hebrew women themselves. The chief means by which the first could establish itself alongside of the Hebrew cult was intermarriage. As Professor Moore says: "The connubium in itself involved the recognition of one another's religion, and was naturally followed by participation in the cultus" (*Judges*, p. 83). Hence, the result of such unions is uniformly stated to have been the establishment of the foreign cult (cf. Ju. 3:5f. 1 Ki. 11:1-8). But our chief interest here lies in the intense zeal which the strange wives of the Hebrews manifested in the observance and propagation of their native cults. Here, of course, Jezebel will first come to mind. But that she was by no means the only instance can be easily gathered from such notices as that which speaks of Solomon's readiness to provide the means for the worship of his "strange wives which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods " (1 Ki. 11:8), and more still from the numerous Deuteronomic passages which ascribe the spread of idolatry to these intermarriages, and strictly forbid them on that ground (Ex. 34:15f. Dt. 7:3f; Jos. 23:12f). It will be seen that these facts gathered from the Old Testament confirm the view arrived at from the more direct sources, that woman's part in the other Semitic cults was intensely active.

But this activity was not confined to non-Hebrew women. Even before Jezebel, Maacah, the mother of Asa (1 Ki. 15:13), had manifested her zeal for the Canaanitish cult of Astarte (cf. Stade, *Gesch*. i. 355; Baethgen, *Beitrage*, p. 218; Baudissin, *PRE*ι. s.v. Astarte, Aschera) by erecting to her worship a ממלת אסתר, which was probably nothing else than an הנזרה, which Asa in the progress of a religious reformation hews down, and burns in the valley of the Kidron, and at the same time punishes his mother's idolatrous tendencies by depriving her of the rank of the queen-mother. As the Jezebel of the southern kingdom appears Athaliah, probably Jezebel's daughter (cf. Stade, *Gesch*. i. 524, note 2). That her zealous endeavor to establish the Phoenician cult on Judoean soil was not void of suc-

5 Cf. 1 Ki. 16:31ff. 18:4, 13, 19; 19:2; 2 Ki. 3:13; 9:22b.
cess is evident from the bitterness with which she is mentioned (cf. 2 Ki. 8:18, 26f; 2 Chr. 21:6; 22:2f; 24:7).

In the time of the prophet Jeremiah (7:18; 44:15ff) the Hebrew women vied with one another in their devotion to the Assyrian cult of Ishtar, whom they worshipped under the name of מלכת השמיים (cf. Baudissin, *PRE* 3, s.v. Astarte), claiming it to be a well-established cult, the practice of which had always been a source of prosperity, and its neglect the cause of adversity (44:17f.). One feature of the cult is characteristically feminine: while the children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, the women knead the dough, and bake the cakes in the moon-shaped form to portray the goddess (cf. v. Orelli), *Jeremia*, on 44:19; Wellhausen, *Heid.*, p. 38 f.)

To this cult most probably belongs the reference 2 Ki. 23:7b, where the Massoretic לא יהנה might well be corrected (on the basis of Cod. Alex. χεττέσσεται probably for לא יהנה (Lucian στολας), *tunica* (cf. Klostermann in loc.), pointing to an activity on the part of some of the women (perhaps the ותredo) in providing garments probably used in the act of the worship of Astarte; for the custom of changing garments in preparation for the approach of the divinity, and of priests supplying such garments, finds illustration in other cults (cf. Wellh., *Heid.*, pp. 52, 106; Gen. 35:2; 2 Ki. 10:22). This explanation of the passage, it seems to me, will furnish the best answer to Stade's rather too ready expedient that the second half of the verse is a "naive Gloss eines Späteren " (*Gesch.* i. 653, note 4).

To Ezekiel (8:14) we are indebted for the bare mention of the Hebrew women's devotion to the worship of Tammuz. The phraseology with which he describes the worship, "there sat the women weeping for Tammuz," leaves its identity with that of Adonis under his Babylonian name, the characteristic of which was lamentation, without a doubt (cf. Baudissin, *Studien* i. 35, 3ooff.).

Woman's part as devotee in the worship of Melek, the sacrificing of children in the Valley of Hinnom, which dates back as far as Ahaz, and reached frightful dimensions in the dark days of the seventh century, is not directly stated in the Old Testament. Professor Moore, in his article, "The Image of Moloch " (in this JOURNAL, xvi. 163), cites a passage from Plutarch (*De Superstitione*, c. 13),

6 That Zechariah's "mourning for Hadadrimmon " (Zech. 12:11) has no connection with Tammuz or Adonis worship has been shown by Baudissin (Sludien i. 295 ff.).

according to which the Carthaginians used to sacrifice their own children, and those who had no offspring of their own used to buy children from the poor, and slaughter them, as if they were lambs or birds. At these sacrifices the mother stood by, unmoved, without a groan. That there was also no distinction of sex in that cult as far as the victim itself was concerned is evident from the recurring phrase "to make one's son or daughter to pass through the fire to Moloch" (2 Ki. 23:10; Jer. 32:35, etc.). There is sufficient reason to suppose, then, that the general terms "children of Judah" (Jer. 7:30), "inhabitants of Jerusalem " (19:3), "this city " (19:8), used by the prophets condemning the practice include both men and women. (Cf. Jer. 32:32; Ez. 16:2ff, and compare Jer. 19:13 with 44:15.)

It appears then that the facts thus collected from the Old Testament on woman's relation to the foreign cults give very clear testimony, and that it is throughout to the effect that woman, whether native or Hebrew, shared in all the religious activities, and often excelled in manifesting religious zeal. Well might the Deuteronomic lawgiver, aware of woman's religious interest and zeal, provide the most drastic measures for its destruction (cf. Dt. 13:7-12(6-11); 17:2-5).

3. Woman as Devotee in the Jahveh Cult.

I. The Presence of Women at the Sanctuary and Religious Gatherings.

Hannah and Peninnah, as also the daughters of Elkanah, were accustomed to go up to the yearly religious gathering before Jahveh in Shiloh (I S. 1:1ff.; 2:19). How general this custom was among women is indicated in the question which the husband of the Shunamite woman asks: "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? it is neither new moon, nor sabbath" (2 Ki. 4:23). The rape of the Shilonite maidens is planned in expectation, and carried into effect in the realization, of the fact of the presence of the daughters of Shiloh at the annual feast of Jahveh (Ju. 21:6-25). At the feast that David makes in honor of the removing of the ark of Jahveh, the religious character of which is confirmed by the offering of sacrifices, women are present (2 S. 6:19). The legislation of Deuteronomy definitely

8 As the Philistine religion seems to have been strongly influenced by Semitic religions (cf. Baethgen, Rel., p. 65), it is not altogether irrelevant to call attention to the fact that, little as is known of the Philistine Dagon cult (cf. Baudissin, PRE3, s.v. Dagon), it is nevertheless evident from Ju. 16:23ff, that men and women alike mingled in the temple precincts and participated in the festive occasions.
provides for woman's presence at the sanctuary at festal seasons (Dt. 12:12, 18; 14:26; 15:20; 16:11, 14). In like manner, at that great religious gathering, the reading of the law, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, woman appears side by side with man in all the solemnity and joy of the occasion (Neh. 8:2, 3; 12:43).

2. Woman's Participation in the Sacrificial Meals.

There is full evidence that women were by no means mere idle spectators at these religious gatherings, but that, on the contrary, they shared in every important cultic act. Chief among these were the sacrificial meals. When Elkanah sacrifices he gives to his wives and daughters "portions" (1 S. 1:4). If it were certain that רפּ in 2 S. 6:19 and its parallel I Chr. 16:3 means "a good piece of flesh," A.V., or "a portion of flesh," R.V., as some ancient versions render it, and as may well be expected here to complete the triad of such festival occasions, bread, flesh, and wine, it might furnish another instance in earlier times of woman's participation in the sacrificial meal. But the text is altogether too uncertain. But we have by no means need to depend upon uncertain data. The Deuteronomic legislation is as full as it is explicit upon woman's participation in the sacrificial meals and leaves it beyond any question. Regulating what was no doubt an antique custom, it specifies in a number of distinct passages that at the great sacrificial feast at the central sanctuary woman is to have her share (Dt. 12:12; 14:22-29; 15:19-23; 16:9-12, 13-15). An important illustration on a large scale, that this custom existed not simply in law but in actual practice, even in post-exilic times, is furnished by the sacrificial meal at the publication of the law in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. 12:43).

Additional evidence of a similar character comes to us from a somewhat different source. The Levitical legislation is much concerned with the disposition of that part of the sacrifice which fell to the priest. The material is divided into רפּ and שָׂדַרֶפּ.

9 In view of this definite provision, the regulation "Three times a year shall all thy males appear in the presence of Jahveh" (Ex. 23:17; 34:23; Dt. 16:16), can not possibly imply the exclusion of woman. But more on that subject below.

10 The word רפּ is a technical term almost exclusively used of the portion of sacrifice that falls to the priest, or of the sacrificial meal that falls to the worshipper (Ex. 29:26; Lev. 7:33; 8:29; 2 Chr. 31:19; 1 S. 9:23). When in later usage the term is widened to cover portions of other meals, the festival character of the meal is still apparent (Neh. 8:10, 12; Esth. 2:9; 9:19, 22). 

11 Cf. Klostermann, Samuelis, in loc.

12 Cf. Driver, Text of Samuel, p. 207 f.
The first class may be eaten by the male members of the Aaronic family only; the second class may be eaten by the female members as well (Lev. 10:12-15; 22:1-16; Nu. 18:8-19). The question, why in the later legislation the women of priestly families were excluded from sharing in the most holy things, need not detain us at this point. The fact that they were permitted to share in the holy things, which was strictly forbidden to outsiders, is in line with the fact of their sharing in the sacrificial eats in general.

Woman's participation in the festal meals has, of course, always been recognized; but its relation to her position in cult has so far not been deemed worthy of notice. The tendency has been to speak of these sacrificial meals, either in a general way, as of a 'family' feast, without recognizing specially, or else ignoring, the female element, or else as of 'feasts' without any particular religious significance (Keil, Deut., 359 f.; Oehler, O. T. Theology, Engl. Transl., p. 291; Driver, Deut., p. 143; Benz., Arch., 438; Nowack, Arch. ii. 213). Woman's share in them clearly defined, it is yet necessary to call attention to and emphasize the cultic significance of these sacrificial meals.

Eating as an act of worship in connection with sacrifice is a familiar fact in Semitic as well as in other religions. W. R. Smith has made it probable that Semitic religion, as it appears in historical times, is founded on the conception of kinship between the god and the worshipper, and the leading idea in the animal sacrifices of the Semites is that of an act of communion in which the god and his worshipper unite by partaking of the flesh and blood of a sacred victim. This idea finds its fullest expression in the Hebrew ritual. As is known, a distinction is made there between sacrifices which are wholly made over to the god and sacrifices which the god and the worshipper share. To the latter class, with which we are mostly concerned, belonged the שָׁלֹם וּמְלָכִים, that is, all the ordinary festal sacrifices, vows, and free-will offerings, of which the deity received the blood and the fat of the intestines, while the rest was left to the worshipper for a social feast.

The participation in these sacrificial meals, it is to be noticed, is hedged about with severe restrictions, and invested with the utmost

---

13 Cf. Lev. 22. This stands out all the more clearly when the exceptions are taken into account; viz., when the priest's daughter had married a stranger, or was a widow, or divorced and had a child, and so had retired outside of the priestly circle. Cf. Lev. 22:12f.
14 Rel. of Sem., Lectures vi.-viii. 15 Ibid., p. 51. 16 Ibid., p. 209.
solemnity. Levitical legislation emphatically provides that the food must be eaten within a specified time, that is, before there was any danger of putrefaction; otherwise it is to be burned; nothing ceremonially unclean must touch it; the person, ceremonially unclean, who eats of it "shall be cut off" (Lev. 7:15-21; 19:6-8; 22:30). Similar precautions surround the eating of the priest's portion. That the eating of the priest's portion of every sacrifice constituted a sacrificial meal like that of the worshipper may well be questioned (cf. Benz., *Archaol.*, p. 456 f.), but is of no essential importance in our inquiry. Apart from that, there is every evidence of the sanctity of the food. It is called *qôq*, it must be eaten in a holy place, the ceremonially unclean are forbidden to eat it, and members of the Aaronic family and household only are allowed to partake of it.

The reason for all these precautions is obvious: sacrifice and the sacrificial meal were acts of communion between the god and the worshipper, and approach to it, or partaking of it, was surrounded by all the possible safeguards that surrounded the approach to the god. Yet woman, as has been shown, had free access to it. It is obvious that the participation in an act of such cultic importance finds a far better explanation in woman's inclusion in the cult than any ignoring or belittling of such inclusion can possibly furnish.

3. Woman's Participation in the Sacrificial Act.

In approaching this phase of the question it is necessary to call to mind what is now well recognized, that the act of sacrifice in the Hebrew cult had its own history of development. At first all slaughter was sacrifice; no priest was needed to perform the sacrificial act, the worshipper was in this respect his own priest. Later, with the growth of the ritual and a priestly caste, sacrificing becomes the business of the priest, the worshipper recedes from the altar, and his share in the sacrificial act is confined to the laying of the hand upon the victim, which, if we may judge from the analogy of Lev.

17 The reason that W. R. Smith assigns for this requirement, viz., that the old sacrificial feasts occupied but a single day, or at most two days, and as the act of eating is part of the service it is to be completed before men break up from the sanctuary (*Rel. of Sem.*, P. 221), does not seem to me to be altogether plausible, and I prefer to follow his view on the same point as expressed in another connection. See p. 203, note 8.


19 Lev. 3:2, etc. On the meaning of the custom cf. Smith, *Rel.*, pp. 135 and 401 f.; Benz., p. 453.
16:21, was, accompanied by a confession of sins. But, whether in its earlier simplicity or in its later limitation, the share of the worshipper in the act of sacrificing cannot but be regarded as an act of the highest cultic significance.

That women brought sacrifices in old Israel and also in later time is so evident that an attempt to prove it seems an act of supererogation. But it is with this point as with many others connected with the whole question: facts otherwise well known have been either forgotten or ignored.

An illustration from old Israel is the sacrifice of Manoah and his wife (Ju. 13:15-23), the latter's share in which is expressed in her words [לֹא לְוָאֲלָה מִדְוַנָּה סוֹלַח] (vs. 23). Of like import perhaps are the words about Hannah (I S. 2:19) [פֹּלְנָה אַת אִשֵּׁה לְבָבָה] (vs. 21). A valuable testimony to the prevalence of the custom is furnished by the prophet Jeremiah, who speaks of the women of his time as performing the various acts pertaining to sacrifice they bake cakes, pour out drink offerings, and burn incense (Jer. 7:18; 44:15, 17ff). It is true they do not do this in the service of Jahveh; but it will be observed that they are censured by the prophet, not because they as women overstep their prerogative, but rather because they do it "unto other gods."22

For later times we have the clearest testimony to the custom in the Levitical legislation which provides, as is well known, for sacrifices of purification for women (Lev. 12 and 15:19-33).

In the absence of definite information on the point, it is not easy to say precisely with what action on the part of the worshipper in bringing a sacrifice according to the Levitical ritual the strictly cultic act began. Oehler, with good reason, as it seems to me, maintains that the sacrificial act began with the presentation of the victim. Benzinger considers it to begin with the laying on of the hand. But in view of the fact that in the sacrifice when the victims are birds the "pressing on of the hand" (מָסְרֵךְ דָּוִד) was omitted, as Benzinger rightly supposes, and as the priest in that case also did the slaughtering (Lev. 1:15), and there would so be left nothing of cultic significance for the offerer, it seems better to regard

20 Cf. Moore, Judg., in loc.
21 The construction of the sentence, it seems to me, makes Hannah the subject of לְבָבָה.
22 That the emphasis is on this is evident from the terms of 44:3 and the numerous repetitions of the phrase "unto other gods" (4:45, 8, 15, 25; 7:18).
23 Oehler, O. T. Theology, p. 274.
the presentation itself as a part of the sacrificiacl act.²⁴ But whether the presentation itself was a cultic act or not, it is agreed by all that the laying on of the hand was. If there were any need of evidence on this point, it might be furnished by the fact that the Mishna²⁵ explicitly denies woman the right to perform this act. This is characteristic of the Mishna's treatment of woman's position in the cult, on which more will have to be said in another connection. Here it is sufficient to say that however valuable the Mishna is as a witness to the views of the tradition, it is not a safe guide in the exegesis of any particular passage of Scripture. There is no basis in the text for such a discrimination against woman. The laying on of the hand is the regular feature of the הְלַחֵל (Lev. 4:24), and woman's offering is an הָלַחֵל which, judging from the words אֶלָּמֶת אֶת הָאֹלֶל הָמַיָּה, she herself was to present אל מֵהַת אָלֶל הָמַיָּה (Lev. 12:6-8). The absence of the specific mention of the laying on of hands cannot be urged against it here any more than it can where the offerer is a man (Lev. 14:19, 20).

From a source of greater value on this particular point than the Mishna it would seem that we have direct testimony that women did touch their sacrifices. In the complaint over the idolatry and sinfulness of the women (Baruch 6:29, the Epistle of Jeremy), the statement occurs: "The menstruous woman and the woman in child bed touch their sacrifices." The reference here is evidently²⁶ to what is prohibited in Lev. 12:4, and may point to the custom that the women like the men laid hands on the sacrifices which they offered. It is possible, however, that the term "touch," as Professor Toy suggests to me, may have reference to the eating of the sacrifices by the women of priestly families. But neither the context, which deals with such a variety of cultic acts, nor the term itself, ἄττοματα (in LXX generally for נֵס, נֵס), necessarily requires that meaning. We find, therefore, in ancient Israel and in the time to which the Levitical legislation bears witness that in the act of sacrifice women enjoyed equal rights with men.


The intimate relation which the terms שֶׁחַטֵּב and the Arabic

²⁴ The difficulty raised by Kohler (quoted by Professor Day in Oehler's O.T. Theol., p. 275), that the fitness of the animal was not decided until after the presentation, is easily overcome by the simple supposition that such examination preceded the more formal presentation.

²⁵ Menachoth 9:8.

The cultic significance of the vow, Naziritism, and the Kedesha are too well acknowledged by all to require restatement; we simply confine ourselves to woman's relation to them.

I begin with the Nazirite vow as furnishing the fullest and clearest illustration of woman's participation in the cult. The Levitical legislation contained in Nu. 6 aims evidently to regulate a custom that is very ancient (cf. Dillmann, *in loc.*). Now it is a remarkable instance of the truth of my contention that no discrimination is made against woman in her relation to the cult that the whole elaborate ritual with its solemn requirements, its abstinence from all products of the vine, the consecration of the hair, the separation from all defilement, the appearing before the door of the tabernacle with offerings, אֶלּוּ כָּלְתֵּא, and מַהְמָה וּפָה מִמֵּים, and more especially the hair offering (vs. 18), all this is introduced with הֵוָה וּפָהַי (vs. 2). The same fact meets us in the regulation of the estimation" by which a vowed male or female may be redeemed. The female is there, indeed, valued less than the male, but that this has no bearing on the question of cult is very evident.

In view of this clear evidence of woman's participation in the Nazirite vow, we have reason to suppose that woman is included in

27 *Heid*, p. 118.
28 In doing this, and doing it here, I deviate, in the interest of what seems to me correcter method, from Stade, followed by Benzinger and Nowack, who treat of vows under the head of cultic actions, and of Nazirites and Kedesha under the head of holy persons. This is evidently due to a tacit following of the opinion that the Nazirite and the Kedesha were officials. Oehler, who favors such a view (*O. T. Theol.*, p. 295), asserts clearly that Naziritism involved no priestly service, but urges Philo's and Maimonides' inference that there is an intimate relation between the Nazirite vow and the commands of abstinence imposed upon the priesthood. But this similarity appears to me slight ground on which to base the official character of Naziritism. These restrictions are evidently of the nature of taboos incident to a state of consecration, and similar to others, viz., the abstinence from women. (Cf. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, p. 462 ff.) They are of too general a character, covering the cases of worshipper and priest alike, to allow such an inference. On the other hand, the evident absence of any priestly service in Naziritism, the tenor of the laws, and the historical illustrations, point to the Nazirite as a devotee rather than an official. The single instance of Samuel, where the Nazirite vow is found in combination with prophetic and priestly functions is counterbalanced by the case of Samson and the Rechabites. The case is somewhat different with the Kedesha. Yet on foreign soil the Kedesha was mainly a devotee, and only in some cases became an official, of which there is no illustration in Hebrew cult.
29 Lev. 27:2ff.
the legislation of the ordinary vow (Nu. 15:1-16), although we find it
in a general way addressed to man without specific mention of
woman. In fact, this must be the case of the legislation in general,
unless we should suppose that the decalogue which is addressed to
man has no application to woman. That woman made the ordinary
vow is not only seen in the case of Hannah (I S. 1:11), but is taken
for granted and regulated in Nu. 30. The restriction this legislation
places upon woman's power to vow is of interest in that it affords a
glimpse of a contrast between her relations to society and to the
cult. If woman is independent, that is, a widow or divorced, her vow
is as binding as that of man; if she is still unmarried in her father's
house and her father hears her vow without opposing it, or if she be
married and her husband hears her vow without opposing it, it is
equally binding, but if her father or husband "disallow her in the day
that he heareth; none of her vows, or of her bonds wherewith she
hath bound her soul, shall stand; and Jahveh shall forgive her, because
her father (or husband) disallowed her" (vs.6). The meaning of all
this is clear: the cult knows here no distinction between man and
woman; it is the position of woman in society that introduces the
difference.

While it is very evident that the institution of the Kedeshim owes
its existence in the Jahveh cult to adoption, its prevalence is well
attested.30 It is not necessary to our purpose to do more at this
point than to call attention to the fact that in this lowest and most
unnatural form of devotion, as we have found it already in some of
the higher, woman appears side by side of man, the נֵבְשֵׁת by the
side of the נֵבֶשְׁתֶּפֶם.

5. Woman's Participation in Prayer.

If, as Stade does (Gesch. i. 487 ff.), we regard prayer equally
ancient with sacrifice, usually accompanying the latter, and while
permitted and practised elsewhere, properly offered at the sanctuary,
it is another important cultic act in which women participated. And
I gladly follow Stade in referring to Hannah (I S. 1:10ff.; 2:1) as an
example illustrating a number of important points connected with
the ancient custom of prayer.

And if again we may follow Stade in associating with prayer as

30 Cf. Stade, i. 479 f.; Benz., p. 428; Nowack, ii. 132; Driver, Deut., p. 264;
Dillmann, Deut., p. 349; W. R. Smith, Rel. of Sem., p. 133; Baudissin, REP 3, S.V.
Aschera, etc.
cultic acts fasting, the blessing, the curse, and the oath, we find woman again participating in them.

6. Woman's Participation in Consultation of the Oracle and in Theophanies.
That the oracle and its consultation occupied a very important place in the ancient Hebrew cult is a matter of course. The intimate relation in which the oracle stood to the priesthood speaks for the act of consultation as a cultic rite. That women were accustomed to go to inquire of the oracle is shown by the story of Rebekah (Gen. 25:22f), which furnishes us not only with the statement יִהוּדָה לְדָרֶךְ אֲתָ תֶּהוֹלֶל, but also with the quotation of a very ancient oracular response that could have been addressed to a woman only. Even if Stade's view, that the oracular response represents simply the legend of the origin of the oracle at Beersheba, could be established, which is rather doubtful, the legend itself would remain equally forceful as an evidence of the custom of women's participation in the consultation of the oracle.

In this connection, and as pointing to the same fact, that in the conception of the writers of the period no hindrance existed to the free approach of woman to the divinity, may be mentioned the theophanies to women, of which we have not a few illustrations (cf. Gen. 3:13ff.; 16:8ff; 18:9f, 15; 21:17ff.; Ju. 13:3ff.).

7. Other Indications.
There are some other facts in the Old Testament which, while not dealing directly with woman's relation to the cult, yet furnish indirectly an evidence that is very valuable. They are the evidences of a religious consciousness and influence of woman that are difficult to account for on the supposition of woman's exclusion from the cult, and, on the other hand, best accounted for by the fact that she shared in the general religious life.

(I) The Women's Naming of their Children.--It seems to have been a somewhat general practice in Old Testament times for women to give the names to their children.

Cf. Stade, Gesch. i. 489 ff.; Nowack, Arch. ii. 259-263, 270 ff.
Cf. Jer. 36:6; Lev. 16:29; 23:26-32; Est. 4:16; Gen. 24:60; 1 S. 1:17; 2:20; Ruth 1:9.
Cf. Stade, i. 471 ff.; Nowack, ii. 272; Benz., 407 ff.
Gesch. i. 474, note 2.
Cf. Dillmann, Genesis, in loco.
The following statistics on the point may not be without some interest.
The reason for this custom we need not here discuss. For we are interested at this point not so much in the fact of the naming itself as in the contents of the names given. A number of the names given by the mothers contain a decided religious element.

But the most striking illustration is the naming of Ḥūa Ḥabōd (1 S. 4:21). A very early tradition represents the wife of Phineas as being crushed by the news of the capture of the ark, and the death of her father-in-law and her husband. And when, in the moment of her death, she gives birth to a son, she names him with her dying breath Ḥūa Ḥabōd, “Inglorious,” saying Ḥūa Ḥabōd. Three times in the short passage is the emphasis laid upon the loss of the ark. There is no good reason to doubt this feature of the tradition. But, to say the least, we have here clear evidence that in the thought of the narrator of this early tradition it was quite natural for a woman so to feel the loss of the ark as to hand down to posterity her pain in the very name of her son. Can such deep religious feeling be associated with an exclusion from the cult?

(2) The Influence ascribed to Hebrew Women in Matters of Religion.--The Deuteronomic sentiment against women's pros-e-

Out of 44 cases in which the naming of the children is mentioned in the Old Testament, in 26 it is ascribed to women, in 14 to men, and in 4 to God.

Women name in Gen. 4:25; 16:11; 19:37, 38; 29:32f., 35 (all J) 30:6, 8 (E) 30:11.13 (J) 18, 20 (E) 21, 24 (J); 35:18a (JE); 38:3, 4, 5 (J); Ju. 13:24; I S. 1:20; 4:21; I Chr. 4:9; 7:16; Is. 7:14; Ruth 4:17; (Ḥūa Ḥabōd).

Men name: Gen. 4:26; 5:29 (J); 5:3; 16:15; 17:19; 21:3 (P); 35:18b (JE); 41:51, 52 (E); Ex. 2:22 (J); 2 S. 12:24; I Chr. 7:23; Job 42:14; Gen. 25:25 (Ḥūa Ḥabōd) (J).

God names: Is. 8:3; Hos. 1:4, 6, 9.

From the fact that P in the only three cases uniformly ascribes the naming to the father, and does so in the case of Seth (Gen. 5:3) in contradiction to J, who ascribes it to the mother (Gen. 4:25), it might be supposed that P represents a later custom or tendency. But J and E, and the other early sources, are by no means uniform in ascribing the naming to the mother, as may be seen from the enumeration above. All that can he justly claimed is that in the majority of cases the naming was done by the mother.

37 Since writing this my attention has been called to Mr. Gray's valuable Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. I find my view on the value of the Hebrew names as expressive of religious thoughts, and as throwing "light on the Hebrew religion, and more especially on the popular religion," fully corroborated by him. Cf. p. 10 ff.

38 It seems to me far better to take the Ḥūa Ḥabōd as the negative than with Klostermann (in loc.) as the exclamation Ḥūa Ḥabōd. Cf. Driver, Text of Samuel, in loco. Gray, Studies, expresses it as his opinion that it is not quite clear what Ḥūa Ḥabōd, as an element in a proper name, means. Cf. p. 246, note I.
lytism (spoken of more fully elsewhere) is here in point. While, of course, this proselytism is in behalf of foreign cults, it yet indicates an intense religious interest and influence, scarcely conceivable apart from her share in the cultic life.

Neither may we pass over lightly such expressions as Ruth's אֲלָה הָאֱלֹהִים. It was hardly an empty phrase. If it may be taken, as well as ought to be, and as is so generally done, as an evidence of the early conception of the close union of the god with his land, the personal pronouns are an equally strong indication of woman's share in the religious life.

4. Woman's Relation to the Jahveh Cult as affected by Some Ritualistic Legislation.

I. The Female in Sacrificial Victims.

According to the researches of W. R. Smith, a very vital principle underlies the selection of the sacrificial animal, which determines not only the species of the animal but also its sex. It is therefore not without meaning to our inquiry to note whether the sacrificial animal in the Hebrew cult was limited to the male. We should expect that a cult that proscribes woman on account of her sex would also not permit the use of a female victim in sacrifice. But that the latter is not the case in the Hebrew cult is very evident. In earlier practice the female victim predominates (Gen. 15:9; 1 S. 6:14; 16:2). In the Levitical legislation a discrimination is made in favor of the male in that it is preferred in the more solemn sacrifices, but even there the female victim is by no means excluded. A male is required as a passover-lamb (Ex. 12:5), for the הָאֱלֹהִים (Lev. 1:3, 10; 22:19); in the חֲנָכָה a male is required from an "anointed priest" (Lev. 4:3), from the whole people (vs. 14), from the ruler (vs. 23), while in the case of an ordinary Israelite a female is accepted (vs. 28, 32 and 56); in the מִלְחַמָּה the victim may be either male or female (Lev. 3:1, 6; cf. Mal. 1:14). I defer the discussion of the reason for this discrimination; for the present, let it suffice to mention this as simply another fact pointing to the conclusion that the Hebrew cult is not pervaded by any principle that excludes the female sex.

2. Woman as ceremonially "defiling."

Both the sexual approach to woman and her condition in childbirth or during her courses are regarded in Hebrew custom and legislation,

39 Rel. of Sem., Lecture viii.
40 As was the case among the Harranians, quoted by W. R. Smith, p. 280, note 2.
as among many other nations, as ceremonially defiling (I S. 21:5f Ex. 19:15; Lev. 12; 15:19ff.; Ez. 36:17; Is. 64:6 Baruch 6:29). The original ground for this legislation lies most probably, as is suggested by Stade, in animism, which regards as unclean and defiling all such persons who are under the influence, that is, possessed by spirits, viz., those that suffer from certain diseases or have done certain acts that stand under the protection of certain spirits. It is, however, perfectly evident that this condition of ceremonial unfitness is only temporary: its removal can be effected. And the very exception of woman's fitness for the cult under those conditions proves the rule of her ordinary inclusion.

3. Woman not excluded from the Three Yearly Feasts.

"Three times in the year shall all thy males see the face of the Lord Jahveh" (Ex. 23:17; 34:23; Dent. 16:16). That this is an old law, and has reference to the three yearly feasts, is evident from the connection in which it is found. But it may well be remembered that its origin, like the origin of all the earliest legislation, was not theoretic but consuetudinary, the result of actual cases presented to the priest for decision. And it may well have had its occasion in the fact that such a law could not be put in effect in the case of woman as easily as in the case of man, and not without contravening the other custom and legislation that excluded her from the approach of holy things at certain periods, just considered. To infer, therefore, from this law woman's exclusion from all cult would be more than it can bear, and is contradicted by all the facts so far adduced. Neither is it a parallel case, as it seems to me, to be cited in connection with the custom that certain holy parts of an ox must not be eaten by women. Smith, Rel. of Sem., p. 281, note 3.


The law of the firstlings with its emphasis upon the firstborn male might at first sight appear as a very formidable objection to woman's inclusion in cult; but upon careful examination the facts here will be found in harmony with those already adduced.

That the later legislation counts the males only as firstlings cannot be questioned (Nu. 3:40ff. [P]). But it seems to me altogether doubt-


42 Not "appear before"; cf. Driver on *Deut.* 16:16.
ful whether this was also the case in the earlier legislation. But as this has been assumed, without a dissenting voice, to have always been so, one feels the need of much courage to call it in question. Yet there are weighty considerations against this assumption that have a right to a hearing.

The origin of the consecration of the firstlings is found, as W. R. Smith has pointed out (Rel. of Sem., p. 444), in something of the nature of taboo of the first produce, having its proper parallel in the vegetable kingdom in the law of Lev. 19:23ff, which ordains that for three years the fruit of a new orchard shall be treated as 'uncircumcized' and not eaten. This being the case, and as we have found no discrimination against female victims in offerings in general, we might argue on general grounds against the probability of an original discrimination here. There is, however, far more direct evidence that no such discrimination existed in earliest times. I mention

(a) The term פֶסֶר שִׁבָּר, or פסֶר רָחָם. It is repeated so often that we can scarcely go amiss in seeing in it the central idea of the custom and the law. But if this be so, its limitation to a práctically annuls it by introducing an entirely different element which takes its emphasis. If there be any meaning or force in the פֶסֶר, the ḫכד dissipates it. It does, therefore, seem improbable that they both belonged to the original idea, and far more probable that that was contained in the פסֶר, irrespective whether it was male or female, in agreement with the idea of the taboo of the first produce. Cf. also the כָל פֶסֶר רָחָם כָל (Ex. 13:12; Ez. 20:26).

(b) W. R. Smith has also called attention to the fact that "in the period immediately before the exile, when sacrifice of firstborn children became common, these grisly offerings were supposed to fall under the law of firstlings (Jer. 7:31; 19:5; Ez. 20:26)." 43 But, this being so, the passage in Jeremiah, stating that that which was done to מַחַר ייִשְׂרָאֵל was also done to מַחַר ייִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵיהֶם shows that still at that time the female was included in the law of the firstling.

(c) A careful examination of the wording of the texts of the law reveals the fact that the word פֶסֶר has only a very doubtful place in them. To facilitate such examination, I present the following tabulated form of the law

1-- JE. Ex. 13:2:

בְּנֵי ייִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵיהֶם

43 Ibid., p. 445.
It is to be noticed, in the first place, that in passages 3 and 1, evidently the oldest form of the law, no specification is made that the consecrated firstborn must be a male. For I take it that מַעֲהַל may stand for "thy children" as well as for "thy sons," and, as the term בָּנָי has a feminine as well as a masculine plural, it may be either masculine or feminine. Cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, ed. 26, § 87, 3; and the feminines in וַגְוַי נִבְּלָא הָמוּנָא (in Gen. 4:4)

We note, secondly: If the syntactical position of מַעֲהַל in 2 and the corrupt מַעֲהַל in 4 be examined, and compared with the position of מַעֲהַל in 6, it will be seen that in the first two passages, as well as in 5, the word has all the appearance of not being an original part of the sentence but of being an afterthought, a gloss.

And, thirdly, the term מַעֲהַל is peculiar to P. JE, it is well known, uses מַעֲהַל in the place of P's מַעֲהַל (comp. Gen. 7:2 and 9), and the term nowhere else occurs in JE (cf. Brown and Driver's Gesenius's Lex., s.v. מַעֲהַל). The three facts together, as it seems to me, can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that the term מַעֲהַל in Ex. 13:12; 34:19, and probably also in Dt. 15:19, is due to a later glossing by a source related to P, and that its object was to bring into harmony the earlier with the later custom.

And altogether our examination of the law of the firstlings, far from pointing to an exclusion of the female from cult, is but another indication that in early times no discrimination was made against the female, but that perfect parity existed between the sexes in matters of the cult.

This does not apply to the peculiar form מַעֲהַל found in Ex. 23:17; 34:23.
5. Circumcision in its Relation to Woman's Position in Cult.

The prominence given to the rite of circumcision in the Old Testament will scarcely permit us to pass it without an inquiry as to such a relation. Von Orelli is probably right in his contention that circumcision was practised among the Hebrews in the pre-Mosaic times (cf. PRE, s.v. "Beschneidung," against Nowack, Arch. i. 168). But, as Smend says (Alttest. Rel., p. 37), it was not in ancient Israel a sign of a servant of Jahveh, nor did Moses make it such. Its meaning and application in Arabic heathenism is of service to us here.45

The Arabs circumcised the girls also, and made a feast as at a boy's circumcision (Wellh., ibid.). Wellhausen's supposition, that the circumcision of girls was not as generally practised as that of boys, seems very likely. But why it may not be regarded in the same light, and why it "hat eher eine naturliche Veranlassung und einen medicinischen Nutzen gehabt," is not apparent. In the absence of definite evidence on this point, the most reasonable supposition is that whatever cultic significance the act had in the case of man it also had in the case of woman. All the evidence we have to form our judgment on the question whether circumcision was practised on girls in early Israel or not is the analogy of the Arabic custom and the analogy, it seems to me, is stronger than the silence. At any rate, there is no ground to construe that silence into exclusion from the cult. Circumcision, with its religious significance as the sign of Jahveh's covenant with Israel, is a late, exilic view,46 and is no more a criterion, than the preceding case of the law of the firstborn, for the condition of ancient Israel. And in the same light we must regard all such exclusive prominence given to "males" in the priestly genealogies47 and laws of temple service.48

5. The Hebrew Woman's Relation to the Cult of the Dead and the Worship of Ancestors.

Attention has long since been called to the traces of an extensive cult of the dead in the ancient Hebrew religion, originating most

45 According to Wellhausen (Heidenth., p. 154 f.; cf. also W. R. Smith, Rel., p. 319), the etymology of חcdnjs and its Arabic equivalent points to a connection of circumcision with bridegroom. But perhaps the practice is, like the hair-offering, a representative sacrifice, by which recognition is made of the divine ownership of human life (cf. T. K. Cheyne, Encycl. Britannica, s.v. "Circumcision"). In either case we may suppose it to be of cultic significance.

46 Cf. Smend, Rel., p. 38 f.; Nowack, i. 169 f.

47 Jos. 17:2; Ezra 8:3ff.; 2 Chr. 31:16, 19.

48 Lev. 6:18, 29; 7:6; Nu. 3:15,22; 1 Macc. 2:18ff., etc.

I. Woman's Participation in the Various Mourning Rites.

Apart from such actions as were the natural expressions of grief over the dead, there are certain features in the prevalent mourning customs that had evidently cultic significance, in which women prominently participated.

Jer. 16:6-8 gives us a pretty complete list of the numerous mourning customs in vogue in Israel. Taking them up in that order we find

(a) The Lamentation.. The variety of terms used for the act of lamentation over the dead, נמות, נמות ספי, אול, אול, points to its general practice, but the specific technical meaning of נמות, with its peculiar rhythm and exclamatory beginning נמות, נמות, נמות, which has furnished the technical term מנות (Jer. 9:16) for the professional mourning women," met with both in ancient and modern Arabia (cf. Goldziher, p. 251; Trumbull, *Studies in Oriental Life*, p. 153 ff.; Stade, *Gesch. i.* 388), and in ancient Babylonia in the female kalu (*Records of the Past*, Second Series, ii. 78; Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 684), points particularly to woman's principal share in the act.

(b) Laceration, נמות (Dt. 14:1; I Ki. 18:28; Jer. 16:6; 41:5; 47:5; Mic. 4:14), finding its parallel in the custom of Arabic heathenism, where the women beat or scratched their faces till the blood flowed.


That these cultic rites were performed by men and women alike, and for men and women alike, is already clear from the references adduced. It will, however, not be altogether superfluous to empha-

---

50 Cf. also the term (2 Chr. 35:25), and נמות (Am. 5:16).
size the force of Jeremiah's words on this point. The calamity of unceremonial burial of which the prophet speaks is one "concerning the sons and concerning the daughters that are born in this place, and concerning their mothers that bare them and concerning their fathers that begat them" (vs.3), and for their fathers or for their mothers (vs.7).

If, while at this point, I may also call attention to the care and interest ascribed by tradition to the patriarchs in the burial of their wives (Gen. 23:2; 25:10; 35:8, 19f.; 48:7; 49:31f.), and to Barzillai's words to David: "Let thy servant, I pray thee, turn back again, that I may die in mine own city, by the grave of my father and my mother" (2 S. 19:38), it will appear how utterly unfounded and erroneous Benzinger's statement is that "ebensowenig wurden der Frau nach dem Tod kultische Ehren zu teil" (Arch., p. 140). It will appear also that the phrases like "to be buried with one's fathers" (1 Ki. 14:31; 2 Ki 12:22 (21), etc.) may be too narrowly interpreted.

The mourning customs just considered, on account of their being, cultic rites, have been taken as the evidences of early ancestor worship among the Hebrews. See the references cited on p. 137. It is not at all of moment to our inquiry to come to a decision on this question one way or the other. But as Stade, followed by Nowack and Benzinger, invariably and specifically asserts woman's exclusion from the cult of the ancestors," I shall endeavor to show that every fact taken by him as pointing to ancestor worship at all points with equal force to woman's inclusion in it. To woman's participation in the various cultic mourning rites, I add now

2. The Sanctity of the Tombs of Female Ancestors.

The grave, as is well known, became in some cases a religious shrine in ancient Israel; that it even became an asylum, and its precincts a τέμενος (hima) as in Arabic heathenism (Goldz., p. 235 f.), we do not know. As this sanctity of the grave is taken as pointing strongly to ancestor worship, it is important to call attention to the fact that prominently by the side of the accounts of the sacred burial places of the patriarchs, of Joseph, of Moses and Aaron, we read of the grave of Rachel with its נב.ResumeLayout (Gen. 35:20), of Miriam in Kadesh (Nu. 20:1), and of Deborah under the sacred tree near Bethel, the Allon-bacuth being most probably identical with the Deborah-Palm in Ju. 4. See Dillmann, Genesis, in loco, and Moore, Judges, in

52 Stade, Gesch. i. 390 f.; Nowack, Arch. i. 154, 344, 348; Benz., Arch., p. 140.
loco. In fact, there are more graves of female ancestors mentioned of pre-Mosaic times than of male, including besides those already mentioned those of Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah at Machpelah (Gen. 49:31). It is evident, therefore, that whatever religious significance there is, in the sanctity of the graves of the ancestors, woman shares in it. This appears also in another fact that may be mentioned here. If we may, with Nowack (i. 177), consider that the ceremony of boring the ear with an awl to the doorpost (Dt. 15:12ff.; Ex. 21:2ff.), whereby a slave becomes a permanent member of the family, is best explained as a remnant of ancestor worship, the מִחל֖א in these passages referring to the ancestors of the family, we have but another instance of woman's share in the cult, for Dt. 15:17b prescribes: "And also unto thy bondwoman shalt thou do likewise."

3. Woman's Access to and Possession of the Teraphimn.

While it may be true that the evidence that the teraphim were the images of the ancestors of the family, and their consultation a species of manes oracle (Stade, Gesch. i. 467; Nowack, ii. 23; Baudissin, Studien i. 57), is not altogether full enough to be conclusive, yet it seems to be going too far to the other extreme to say (Moore, Judges, p. 380) that there is no evidence. The inference from Gen. 31:19, 30, 34 I S. 19:13; Ju. 17:5 that the teraphim were household gods seems to me not much weakened by the reference to Ez. 21:21. At any rate, that they were images legitimately used in divination in ancient Israel (I S. 19:13; Ho. 3:4; Zech. 10:2; Ez. 21:21) is generally admitted. It is in this, after all, that the significance of the teraphim in our inquiry lies. Twice women are mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with the teraphim. Of course, Michal's use of the teraphim (1 S. 19:13) contains nothing of cultic significance; all that we may legitimately gather in this direction is that she evidently had free access to the image. But it is entirely different with the case of Rachel (Gen. 31:19, 30, 34). Why did Rachel steal the teraphim, the god (it was probably only one image, cf. Dillmann, in loc.) of her father מִחלא, vs. 30)? We may hardly ascribe it to any other than a religious motive, finding its most plausible explanation in the similar case of the Danites (Ju. 18), whose spies had consulted the oracle of Micah and had received a favorable reply (vs. 5, 6), and then had given the hint to the rest of the tribe to carry it away with them (vs. 14). The teraphim was employed as an oracle53: this explains Rachel's interest

53 Zech. 10:2; Ez. 21:21
in it, and so we meet here the Hebrew woman for the first time in our investigation not only as a worshipper but in the possession of the sacred objects employed in oracular inquiry. This leads us to consider next the intimately related question, 4. Woman's Relation to the Oracle of the Dead, Necromancy, and the other Cognate Forms of Divination.

As performing oracular functions cf. Wellh., *Heid*, p. 126 f.; Stade, i. 505; but especially W. R. Smith, *Journal of Philology* xiii. 276 ff.) of the oracle of the dead (described in Is. 8:19; Dt. 18:11 as דרש אל המית (Pouring out one who has a familiar spirit, in the woman of Endor (I S. 28). This official character of woman is worthy of special notice. That necromancy was a religious cult is clear from the terms which are used in connection with it. The woman of Endor describes her vision as seeing מים רדש אלים (vs.13), קסם דרש אלים and are the terms used in speaking of the consultation; the opposition to the cult brands it as מEffects (Dt. 18:12) and its approach with the technical terms לשל (Ez. 13:19) and תמאת (Lev. 19:31) as ceremonially defiling. The opposition it met with and its frequent mention show how widely and how deeply the cult had entrenched and retained itself in the popular faith. Whether its origin lies in ancestor worship, as Stade supposes, need not be here discussed. This is certain, that we find woman acting in a widespread popular cult in an official capacity, and, judging from the fact that Saul's order is בקש יאש בצלת אוב, occupying the leading position. The latter is confirmed also by the fact that in the often recurring phrase מEffects מ Effects (Lev. 19:31; 20:6; Is. 8:19; 19:3 etc.) the feminine מEffects מ Effects invariably comes first.


But here unquestionably belongs the practice of divination by

54 For these reasons I cannot follow Driver (*Deut.*, p. 226) when he says that the opposition to the cult was not due to its being considered idolatry but a superstition. It was a rival cult that the opposition fought, and one that was not altogether of foreign origin. Cf. Stade, *Gesch*. i. 425; W. R. Smith, *Jour. of Phil*. xiii. 273 f.

55 Schwally arrives at the original meaning of מEffects בור, viz. "Todtenbeschworer," by a combination of it with the Targumic the translation of the Hebrew מEffects מ Effects (ZATW. xi. 179 ff.), but he never mentions the Hebrew מEffects מ Effects and the numerous references to woman's activity in this religious sphere.
some women mentioned in Ez. 13:17ff. Upon this obscure form of divination the investigations of W. R. Smith (Jour. Of Phil. xiii. 286 f.) have thrown considerable light. The object of the practice was oracular. According to vs. 22, it was the means of obtaining responses, which according as they were assurances of divine favor or the opposite made man glad or sorry. The means employed were some kind of appurtenances tied to the arm and put on the head. The word הֵלֵתת Ephrem Syrus explains as 'amulets,' and ὀρατός in the Hexapla renders it φυλακτήρια. Now, as the Jewish phylacteries were amulets to make prayer more powerful, "we must take it here," says Smith, "that these women invoked the deity--obviously for an omen." Of the nature of the omen the explanation is found in the words: "Ye profane me with my people for (or with) handfuls of barley and crumbled pieces of bread" (vs.19). These were the αὐτὰρχαί, the altar gifts, or, perhaps more likely, the pay for divining, of the same elements as in Syriac divination, and pointing as in that case to "a kind of omen which in its first origin was drawn from the gift of firstfruits at a--Canaanite or Hebrew--sanctuary, with the aid of prayer, such as habitually accompanied rites from which an oracle was sought" (Smith, ibid.). If we now associate with this official capacity as the dispenser of the oracle that of the בֵּית אֶלֶה and Rachel's possession of the teraphim, we have found strong indications, to be corroborated later on, that not only did woman share in the cult as worshipper, but that she also occupied an official position in it.

The term הָאָמָה used by Ezekiel to describe this activity of the women suggests naturally a probable connection of it with the most important phenomenon in the question of woman's relation to the cult, namely, the order of the prophetesses.

6. Women as Officials in the Jahveh Cult.

I. The Prophetesses.

While the existence and activity of women as prophets in Hebrew religion cannot but be recognized by all, it is of interest to note how variously the fact is treated by moderns. Nowack, in his paragraph on "Seher and Propheten," passes it in silence (Arch. ii. 130 f.). Stade (Gesch. i. 178) and Montefiore (Hibb. Lect. 1892, p. 75) doubt its existence in ancient Israel. The former calls Deborah "eine wirkende weise Frau," and the latter says, "if Deborah was a seer." Professor Moore regards Deborah as a prophetess in the older sense
of the word, an inspired woman, and compares her with the German Veleda and Joan of Arc. Smend (Altest. Rel., p. 90f) more readily acknowledges the religious character of the earlier prophetesses. Of Miriam he significantly says that she was probably more prominent than the tradition represents. The only mention of the prophetess in relation to woman's position in religion is made by Benzinger (Arch., p. 140), and he dismisses it with the curt remark that it is the exception that only proves the rule of woman's exclusion from the cult.

But it is a matter of course that no view of woman's relation to the cult can have any weight that leaves out of due consideration such an important fact. And it is no wonder, on the other hand, in view of the isolation with which the phenomenon of the prophetess has been treated, that it should appear as it does to Professor McCurdy (Hist. Proth. and the Monuments ii. § 423) as an anomaly (which he mentions only with a word), yielding itself only a little more readily to an explanation (which explanation, however, he does not attempt to give) than her position as judge and queen. It will, therefore, prove no mean confirmation of the correctness of my view of the relation of woman to the cult if it furnishes an explanation, and the only one offered, of this anomaly. That we must in the consideration of this question draw the important modern distinction between the earlier and the later character of prophetesses is very evident. There is exactly the same difference between a Huldah and a Deborah as there is between a Jeremiah and a Samuel.

Of later prophetesses Huldah is the principal example. Noadiah is simply known to us by name (Neh. 6:14)

(1) Huldah (2 Ki. 22:14ff).--This prophetess comes into the foreground as the chief religious authority at the time of a most intense religious excitement, and in connection with an event that stands without a parallel in its effect upon the development of the religious thought and life of Israel. It is a remarkable fact that the person to whom, at the order of the King of Judah, Hilkiah the priest and Shaphan the scribe, and others equally prominent in state and church, should direct themselves to inquire concerning the meaning of the discovery of the Book of the Law, should be a woman. Equally significant is the nature of the oracular response. For, it must be remembered, it is not a political or moral issue that is up; neither does it concern religion in general. Deuteronomy has chiefly to do with the cult; it is therefore a question of the cult that is brought before the prophetess, and her response is altogether concerned therewith. This interest and authority of the prophetess
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Huldah in such a question, being also in perfect accord with the legislation of Deuteronomy itself, which, as has been pointed out above, recognizes woman's share in worship, has a momentous bearing on the question at issue. But important as this testimony is, the full force of it will be best perceived when the office of the prophetess is viewed as it existed in its earlier stages.

(2) Office of the Earlier Prophetesses.--There seems to me no sufficient ground to call in question the activity of women as seers in the pre-monarchic period in Israel's history, as has been done by Stade, Montefiore, and others. If early Hebrew tradition is of any historical value whatever, it certainly speaks of a prophetess Deborah as distinctly as of a prophet Samuel, whatever meaning that term may have. In like-manner do the earliest traditions prominently associate with Moses and Aaron as head of the Israelitish community their sister, the prophetess Miriam (Mi. 6:4 Ex. 15:20f. [E] Nu. 12; 20:1 [JE]).

But how are we to interpret the term נשים as used here? There can be but the one way, it seems to me, which has its basis in the explanation in 1 S. 9:9, and according to which the earlier Hebrew נשים was a נשים or נשים. To say this in the case of Samuel, and to call Deborah “eine weise Frau,” seems an inconsistent choice of terms in order to convey a different meaning of the word when used in speaking of woman. There is not the slightest reason for such a distinction, and, in fact, none is assigned; so it seems but fair to ask that the word be allowed to mean the same thing in both cases, in that of Deborah as in that of Samuel. And all the more so because the principal function of 'judge,' whether in the earlier sense of 'vindicator' or in the later sense of 'giving judicial decisions,' is ascribed to the one as much as to the other (compare Ju. 4:5 and 1 S. 7:16ff.; cf. Moore, Judges, in loco). If, as may be therefore justly claimed, Deborah was a seer, then all the light which recent investigation has thrown upon the origin and function of the seer is at our service. If the office of seer, as is held by Stade (Gesch. i. 468-473), had its origin in the belief that some persons were specially possessed by the divinity; if its function was, by means of visions, to reveal the divine will; if, as is illustrated by the case of Samuel, it was intimately connected with the sanctuary; if, as is indicated by the relation of the Hebrew and Arabic terms, קהינית, kahin, the offices of priest and seer were once identical, and the old Israelitish priesthood originated in the settlement of some seers at a permanent sanctuary (cf. Wellh., Heid., p. 130 ff., 167), then the function of the prophetess had an origin in common with the highest cultic function in Israel, the priest-
hood, and this function was, at one time, open to some extent to women. To claim this for Samuel seems perfectly natural, for, of course, we find in his case clear indications of such a fusion of seer and priest. But the inference that such was the case also when woman filled the same office is perfectly reasonable, and by no means lacks more definite confirmation. Woman's relation to the teraphim, the oracle of the dead, and divination, as developed above, is here in point, but additional evidence in the same direction and within the jahveh cult comes to us in the case of Miriam.

(3) 

Miriam.--In Nu. 12 (referred to also in Dt. 24:9), belonging to the earliest tradition (JE), we have a detailed account of an incident which purports to involve the question of the relative official rank of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam. The contention was occasioned by the marriage of Moses with a Cushite woman, and partakes of the nature of a family quarrel. "Hath Jahveh indeed spoken only with Moses? hath he not spoken also with us?" (vs. 2), say Miriam and Aaron; and as Dillmann has pointed out (in loc.), the feminine נְגֵדָה would show that Miriam was the instigator. The claim that her words imply is prophetic rank and authority for herself and Aaron equal to those of Moses. In the settlement of the dispute by the intervention of Jahveh, it becomes apparent that her claim of prophetic rank is not denied, and she, as well as Aaron, bears the title of 'prophet'; only to Moses is ascribed the official preeminence, while she, as the instigator of the insubordination, has to bear the brunt of the punishment. While the incident thus brings out Moses' preeminence, it at the same time asserts the official equality of Miriam with Aaron. That the whole incident is brought into intimate connection with the מַהֲלָה מַלְיִודֵי the centre of the religious cult, is certainly significant. If to this be added the facts, that occasion is taken to state that Miriam is the sister of Aaron (Ex. 15:20), and that in the earlier genealogical list her descent is traced back to Levi (Nu. 26:59; 1 Chr. 6:3; Ex. 6:20 [P] does not mention her), while throughout she is conspicuously associated with Aaron and Moses as a leader of the religious community, the conclusion can scarcely be avoided that, as Deborah like Samuel, so Miriam like Moses and Aaron, is an example of a seer in whom, in the manner of that time, the functions of prophet and priest are combined. The probability of this inference is heightened, if in this connection again we call to mind the activity of prophetesses in other Semitic religions, and woman's part as diviner in connection with the oracles later proscribed by the religion of Jahveh.
2. Women as Officials in the Tabernacle and the Temple.

I must now call attention to the direct testimony on woman's official position in the Jahveh cult as contained in the repeated mention of woman's service in the tabernacle.

The passages are הֹצֵבָאָה אָשֶׁר יָבֵאָה פַּתָּה אָלָל מוֹזָד (Ex. 38:8) and נֵשֶׁם הֹצֵבָאָה פַּתָּה אָלָל מוֹזָד (I S. 2:22b). The text in Samuel beginning with אָשֶׁר אָלָל is almost unanimously regarded as an interpolation. (See Driver, *Text of Sam.*., p. 26; Kittel in Kautzsch's *Heilzge Schrifte d. A.T.;* Klostermann's *Samuel;* Budde's *Samuel.*) The evidence that the context speaks of a לֹעַל and not of an אָלָל, and that the passage in question ascribes to the sons of Eli a sin entirely different from that of vs. 12ff. (see Stade, *Gesch.* i. 199, note 2), is far stronger than the absence of the passage from the LXX in Codex Vaticanus, which is, moreover, somewhat counterbalanced by its presence in Codex Alexandrinus and in Lucian's recension. The fact of the insertion of the passage in Samuel seems best explained as originating in a marginal note suggested by Ex. 38:8.

There is no such question of text connected with the reference in Exodus; it belongs to P, and is definite and clear enough for our purpose.

We must first determine, as far as possible, the meaning of the word הֹצֵבָאָ as used here. The versions exhibit a marked variation in translating the word. The LXX has for הֹצֵבָאָ in Ex. 38:8 τῶν ναστευσασσων αἱ ἐνηστευσασσαν; Cod. Alex. translates נֶשֶׁם הֹצֵבָאָ in I S. 2:22b by τὰς γυναῖκας τὰς παρεστῶσας (Swete, in loc.). The Vulgate translates in Ex. *quaes excubabant* and in S. *quaes observabant*; in Targ. and Pesh. it is paraphrased ‘who prayed’ and ‘who came to pray’ (see Driver, in loc.). But there can be no question that הֹצֵבָאָ has in the Priest's Code the very decided technical signification of ‘to render service in connection with, the tabernacle in a Levitical capacity’ (cf. Nu. 4:23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47; 8:24, 25); by its side is usually found the synonym הָעַל, and the LXX translates it by λειτουργεῖν and λειτουργία. The attempts, therefore, of the ancient versions, as also the A.V.’s ‘assemble’ (the R.V. correctly renders in Ex. 38:8 “the serving women which served at the door of the tent of meeting,” and refers in the margin to Nu. 4:23 and 8:24), must be regarded as inadmissible, and evidently due to a hesitancy to allow the word to mean the same thing when used in reference to women as when used in reference to men. And such attempts are not any more admissible when the term is limited to express the performance of "menial
duties" by the women (Driver); or when there is simply added to these the duties of performing the sacred dances and choral songs (Dillmann, Strack). The fact is, we do not know in what particular the service of the women consisted, but we do know that, whatever the nature of the service, it is described by the same term used for the Levitical service rendered in connection with the tabernacle.

The remark of Nowack (Arch. ii. 69, note) that we do not hear in the older accounts of women who serve in the sanctuary, suggests the inquiry whence the information contained in Ex. 38:8 and perpetuated in 1 S. 2:22b originated. To regard it as haggadic, late Jewish fiction (Popper; Wellhausen, Composition des Hexateuchs u.s.w., 1889, p. 147) is out of the question. There is in late Jewish history no indication of a tendency to place women in positions of the cult; both the low estimation in which woman is held and the high estimation with which increasingly the ritual is regarded are against such an idea; the tendency is all the other way. It seems to me that the reference to the service of woman in the passage in Exodus is to something antiquated, something that had long passed even in the time in connection with which it is mentioned. It seems a futile effort to contend, like Dillmann and Keil, over the notion of time the participle יֹאמְרוּבָּא conveys: Keil claiming that it does not imply that they had served there before the erection of the sanctuary, but only from that time forward they did perform service there; and Dillmann, that it does not mean that they served later, but that they served until now. It is the יֹאמְרוּבָּא that will more readily render service here, yielding itself easily to the tense of the pluperfect; the passage can be rendered: "And he made the laver of bronze, and the base thereof of bronze, of the mirrors of the serving women which had served at the door of the tent of meeting." In accordance with this, it is not to be supposed that the יֹאמְרוּבָּא contributed their hand-mirrors as a חָיוֹרָה (Dillm.), but on the analogy of Nu. 17:2-5 (Eng. Ver. 16:36-40), where the censers left by the Korahites, because of their sanctity through former use, are beaten out into plates for a covering of the altar, and are so turned into another sacred use, so here, the mirrors left behind by the women are put to another sacred service. It is very probable that in both cases we have to do with reminiscences, embodying Levitical traditions; attached to the sacred utensils of the sanctuary, which were in some cases termed בְּרֵא (Nu. 17:5). And, although this notice is found in P and is probably a later addition even there, that does not preclude its being based upon very ancient tradition. The אָדוֹל מִאֵצְד
in the Priest's Code is an elaborate affair and not historical, but E knows of an אַלֹהַ מָוִי, tells us of its erection, and gives its name (Ex. 33:7-11), and also, as has been shown above, brings Miriam in close connection with it. In view of these facts, it is safe to say that the passages in Exodus and Samuel, though late themselves, are in perfect harmony with, and probably embody, an ancient tradition according to which, in early times, women held some official position in the sanctuary of Jahveh.

A side light upon woman's official position in the Jahveh cult comes to us also from the references in the Old Testament to the women singers. There are four distinct classes of these, one of which, the שָׁרֵרָה, mentioned in passages like 2 S. 19:35; Jer. 31:4; Ec. 2:8 and Is. 23:16, sang evidently only for social amusement, and may here be passed by with the mere mention. The other three classes will find the simplest explanation when considered in their relation to the religious cult.

(I) The מַכּוֹנָה who chant the קִנּוֹת.--Their official relation to, and prominence in, the cult of the dead have been considered above. See p. 137.

(2) The בֵּית הָעַל, εὐαγγελιζομένης, is mentioned by that name only in Ps. 68:12(11), and the term is also applied to Jerusalem in Is. 40:9; but the function of the בֵּית הָעַל to announce and celebrate a victory by vocal and instrumental music and dances, finds frequent mention in the Old Testament (Ex. 15:20; Ju. 5:1; 11:34; 1 S 18:6; Ps. 68:26 (25); cf. also 2 S. 1:20). That these choral dances were at least of a semi-religious character will scarcely admit of doubt. These were the "wars of Jahveh," and He Himself is תַּחִיָּה נָא הַדַּעְרָה: the celebration of victory must have partaken of a religious character. This becomes all the more evident from the religious element contained in some of these songs preserved to us (see Ex. 15:21; Ju. 5:3ff. Ps. 68; Judith 15:12ff.; 16:1f.) These facts have naturally enough led some to suppose that the particular service that the women according to Ex. 38:8 and 1 S. 2:22 rendered was the sacred choral dances. It is very probable that the term בֵּית may cover, but there is no reason to suppose that it exhausts, this part of woman's service.

(3) Women Singers in the Temple Choir.--Neh. 7:67 and the parallel passage in Ezra 2:65 furnish a more direct reference to woman's participation in public religious song. In Neh. 7:67, a register which has every appearance of having been drawn up under Zerubbabel

56 "The Hebrew phrase for opening war is ‘to consecrate war’ (חָדֵשׁ מלַחַטים), and warriors are consecrated persons."--W. R. Smith, Rel. of Sem., p. 383.
and incorporated by Nehemiah in his Memoir (cf. Driver, *Introd.*, p. 513, and Stade, *Gesch.* ii. 98), the statement occurs that among the returning exiles were found "245 singing men and singing women." (In the parallel passage in Ezra, probably derived immediately from Neh., the number given is 200.) There is not the slightest reason to suspect the text, and Oettli's suggestion (Kurzgefl. *Komm.*, *Die geschichtlichen Hagiographen*, Ezra, in loco) that the context would lead us to expect 'animals' viz. שָׁוָא רוּאָן which, by a misunderstanding, was corrupted into מְשָׁרוּר וּמ and to which was then added the feminine, is entirely uncalled for and too clumsy. Neither is it a happy suggestion that the function of these singers was secular. Is it likely that this company of religious enthusiasts, returning to a desolate home, had carried with them this number of singers for secular amusement? Rashi supposes that they furnished the music during the glad procession in the return from the exile. If this be not more ideal than real, their service would scarcely have ceased with their arrival at Jerusalem.

This reference to women singers, it seems to me, finds its simplest explanation in the supposition that not only did women in early Hebrew history participate in religious song, but that they furnished such sacred music as was used in sacred worship, and that, even in this later time, women still held positions in the temple choirs. There is some Jewish tradition to this effect. Schechter (*Studies in Judaism*, p. 316) makes the statement that "if we were to trust a certain passage in the ‘Chapters of R. Eliezer,’ we might perhaps conclude that during the first temple the wives of the Levites formed a part of the choir." (Unfortunately Schechter's reference is too indefinite for verification.) It is therefore altogether probable that when we read of music at the religious festive occasions, e.g. the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. 12:27ff.), it will best harmonize with the statement concerning those ‘singing women’ to suppose that they contributed their share of music as members of the singer's guild, the בְּנֵי קִמְשָרוּר וּמ of that time. We have here, therefore, an additional indication of women's official position in the Jahveh cult.
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Scholarly work on Lev 16 has been mainly interested in the redactional history of the materials present in the chapter, and consequently little interest has been shown in the literary structure of this important passage. Questions related to the form and purpose of the supposedly original and independent rituals that are now embedded in the biblical text, as well as to the date for the creation or formulation of the day of atonement, are still lacking final answers.¹ It is not our purpose to look into those issues, but rather to explore the literary structure of Lev 16 in an attempt to illuminate the way in which its diverse sections constitute a single unity.²

It is no longer possible to argue, without introducing serious modifications to the statement, that "It is evident at the first glance that the chapter [Lev 16] is in its present form the result of a probably fairly long previous history that has left its traces in a strange lack of continuity and unity about the whole."³ Some scholars have found evidence of literary structures and beauty in Lev 16 which suggests a definite attempt on the part of the writer to integrate it into a whole. For instance, John E. Hartley speaks of the "remarkable tapestry" of the chapter, pointing particularly to the balance and unity created by the

² I would like to thank William Shea for going over the first draft of the literary structure proposed here and for his comments.
constant reference to the sacrifices of the high priest and the congregation and the objects of expiation (priests, people, and parts of the sanctuary). He even finds a chiastic structure in Lev 16 based on the general content of the passage rather than on linguistic parallels. Some scholars have found small chiasms within the chapter, but as far as I know, none of them has attempted to carefully explore the literary structure of the whole chapter.

**Literary Structure of Each Section of Lev 16**

A literary analysis of Lev 16 indicates that chiasms and synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic parallelisms, complete and incomplete, are found throughout. It is now well known in the study of biblical texts that repetitions do have specific functions and purpose. This is also the case in Lev 16, which is formed by legal materials artistically constructed. Our reading of the chapter indicates that it can be divided into five main sections, each one well structured. In order to assist the reader, we will provide first the result of our study, followed by comments and interpretations of the proposed findings.

**Lev 16:1-2: HISTORICAL SETTING**

"The Lord spoke to Moses. . . 'Tell Aaron. . . or he will die."

**Lev 16:3-5: INTRODUCTION**

A Aaron's Bull for a Sin-offering 16:3  
B Aaron's Ram for a Burnt-offering 16:3  
C Priestly Vestment and Ritual Bath 16:4  
A' People's Male Goats for Sin-offering 16:5  
B People's Ram for Burnt-offering 16:5

**Lev 16:6-10: FIRST DEVELOPMENT**

A Aaron Brings Near Bull for Sin-offering 16:6  
B Makes Atonement for Himself and His House 16:6  
C Places the Two Goats Before Yahweh 16:7  
D Casts Lot for Yahweh 16:8  
E Casts Lot for Azazel 16:8  
D' Lot for Yahweh - Sin-offering 16:9

---


5 He suggested the following structure: A narrative and introduction (vv. 1-2); B calendrical agenda (vv. 3-10); C liturgical regulations (vv. 11-28); B’ calendrical instructions (vv. 29-34a); A compliance report (v. 34b) (Ibid., 232).

6 E.G. Wright finds one in 16:29-31 (73), and Milgrom identifies another one in 16:14 (1033).
Lev 16:11-22: SECOND DEVELOPMENT

A Aaron's Bull: Sin-offering for Himself and His House 16:11-14
A1 Slaughtered 16:11
   A2 Bring Incense behind the Veil: Not to Die 16:12-13
   A3 Blood Manipulation 16:14
B Community's Goat for Yahweh: A Sin-offering 16:15
B1 Slaughtered 16:15
   B2 Bring blood Behind the Veil 16:15
   B3 Blood Manipulation 16:15
C Atonement for the Sanctuary, Tent of Meeting, the Priesthood, the Congregation of Israel, and the Altar 16:16-19
   C1 Atonement for Sanctuary and Tent of Meeting 16:16
   C2 Atonement for Priesthood and Assembly 16:17
   C3 Atonement for the Altar 16:18-19
C' Atonement Finished for the Sanctuary, the Tent of Meeting and the Altar 16:20
B' Community's Goat for Azazel 16:20-22
   B1 Live Goat Is Presented 16:20
   B2 Place Both Hands on the Head of the Live Goat 16:21
   B3 Confession of All Iniquities, Rebellions and All Sins 16:21
   B2' Place Them [the Sins] on the Head of the Goat 16:21
   B1' Goat Taken to the Wilderness 16:21
   B2'1 Goat Bears All Iniquities upon Itself to a Barren Land 16:22
   B1" Set Free in the Wilderness 16:22

Lev 16:23-28: CONCLUDING RITUAL ACTS

A Priestly Vestments and Ritual Bath 16:23-24
   B Atonement Performed through Burnt-offerings 16:24
   C Disposal of the Fat of the Sin-offering 16:25
A' Vestment and Ritual Bath: Person Handling the Live Goat 16:26
   B' Atonement and the Blood of the Sin-offering 16:27
   C' Disposal of the Flesh, Skin and Dung of the Sin-offering 16:27
A" Vestment and Ritual Bath: Person Handling the Flesh of the Sin offering 16:28

Lev 16:29-34: INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE RITUAL

A Everlasting Statute: Seventh Month, Tenth Day 16:29
   B Deny Yourselves 16:29
   C Do no Work 16:29
   D Atonement to Cleanse from All Sin 16:30
The five main literary units are carefully structured and integrated into each other through the use of specific terminology and by the flow of the different ritual acts. But before exploring those units we should define the function of the **Historical Setting** (vv. 1-2) and the **Concluding Remark** (v. 34d). From the literary point of view they form a literary envelope for the content of the chapter, singling it out as a unit by itself that can be separated from its immediate context for literary analysis. At the end of the chapter we are taken back to the beginning, hence informing us that the unit has come to an end. This is done in two ways. At the beginning Moses is ordered by the Lord to do something (dabber 'el 'aharon/'speak to Aaron"), and at the end we are told that he did exactly as he was told (wayya'as k "ser siwwah yahweh/"he did as the Lord commanded"). This "compliance report" closes the literary unit. In addition, we find in both sections the names Yahweh and Moseh together, something that is not found throughout the rest of the chapter. We find conceptual and linguistic connections between these sections.

"The **Historical Setting** contains additional information that is useful in determining its purpose. In its canonical form the institutionalization of the day of atonement is dated to the period of the Israelite Sinai experience soon after the death of Aaron's sons inside the sanctuary. The possibility of dying inside the sanctuary was a real one, even if the sin of Aaron's sons was not repeated. The purpose of the legislation is to avoid a similar experience in the sanctuary. This could happen particularly whenever the priest would go into the adytum of

---

the sanctuary (yabo' . . . 'el-haqqodes). The implicit question raised in vv. 1-2 is the one of the proper time for a rite of entrance,8 but it is not answered until the end of the chapter. In addition we also find in vv. 1-2 terminology that will be used in other sections of the chapter, as, for instance, the verb "to die" (mot), the nouns "adytum" (haqqodes), kapporet, and "cloud" (anan), and the phrase "behind the veil" (mibbet lapparoket). There is a clear terminological link between this section and the rest of the chapter.

Introduction (16:3-5)

The structure of this section is identified by the use of synthetic parallelism based on the repetition of the terms hatta 't/"sin-offering" (A//A') and 'olah/"burnt-offering" (B//B). The parallelism is incomplete because the C element is omitted in the second part and there is no compensation for it. The reason for the omission is obvious: The ritual act under C, the exchange of clothes by the high priest and his ritual bath, takes place only once before the beginning of the activities of the day. But the fact that this ritual is left without a balance in the literary structure serves to emphasize its importance. The high priest should wear this special vestment only in preparation to enter the adytum. This type of vestment is directly related to the rite of entrance during the day of atonement.

It would seem that the introduction is primarily defining the basic elements needed for Aaron's rite of entrance. In 16:2 we were told that "Aaron should not go into [yabo'] the haqqodes," but v. 3 begins, "With this Aaron should go in [yabo']." The introduction shows interest not only in the time element but also in the proper preparation for it (bezo't yabo'/'with this he shall come in'). The rite of entrance requires the use of a special priestly vestment and a specific number of sacrificial offerings. It is important to observe that the burnt-offerings are included in v. 3. The reason for this is that the Introduction provides also a listing of the sacrificial victims that are going to be involved, in one way or another, in the activities of the day.

First Development (16:6-10)

This segment is formed by a chiasm within a chiasm. The beginning and end of the chiasm (A//A') is framed by two opposite ideas, a case of antithetic parallelism. At the beginning we find the expression "bring near the bull"/wehiqrib 'et-par, and at the end "send it [the goat] to Azazel to the wilderness"/lesallah 'oto la'az'ela hammidbarah. One is

8 On rites of entrance, see Arnold van Gennep, The Rites of Passage (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 24-25; he suggested that they belong to the general category of rites of passage.
approaching the Lord, while the other is distancing or, better, being separated permanently from the Lord. The B lines in both sections of the chiasm contain the verb kipper. The meaning of the verb and the preposition in the case of the goat for Azazel is unclear, although it is recognized that the goat is not related to the cleansing of the sanctuary. Be that as it may, what is significant for us is that there is a parallelism between these sections. With respect to lines C, the parallelism is suggested by the use of the same verb, ‘amad/"to station," and the phrase lipne Yahweh/"before the Lord" in both cases.

Lines D and E are located at the pinnacle of the chiasm but in inverted position, creating, as indicated above, a chiasm within a larger chiasm. One would have expected D//D' instead of D//E. The parallelism is indicated by the term lots" (goral), used twice in association with Yahweh and twice in association with Azazel. The two goats that were introduced as a unit in 16:5 are now separated, and a specific function is assigned to each of them. The one for Yahweh is

The usage of the phrase kipper ‘al in 16:10 is indeed unexpected and difficult to interpret. The phrase usually means "to make atonement for/on behalf of" someone or something. Obviously, this meaning does not fit the context of that passage, even though it has been supported by C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary of the OT, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 683. It is true that in Israel purging rituals were performed on objects but never on animals, and this case does not seem to be the exception. In searching for a solution some scholars have suggested, without providing any supporting evidence, that the use of kipper ‘al here is a scribal error or mistake (Noth, 121; Elliger, 201; Bernd Janowski, Suhne als Heilsgeschehen [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983], 185). Others have argued that the preposition ‘al means, in this particular case, “in proximity to,” which is linguistically possible (Baruch A. Levine, In the Presence of the Lord [Leiden: Brill, 1974], 80; Gerhard F. Hasel, "Studies in Biblical Atonement II: The Day of Atonement," in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, ed. A. V. Wallenkampf and W.R. Lesher [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1981], 121). Another has suggested that in this phrase the preposition ‘al means "for/on behalf of" only when the object is human, but when it is inanimate means "on, upon"; it is then argued that the goat for Azazel is treated as an inanimate object (Milgrom, 1023). Whether the distinction in the use of the preposition ‘al is valid or not, it is quite clear that in Lev 16 the goat for Azazel is not treated as an inanimate object, but on the contrary it is called several times "the living goat" (vv. 10, 20, 21). The preposition has been also interpreted to mean "by means of," and kipper ‘al has been understood to mean that atonement is performed through it by sending it away to the wilderness loaded with the sins of the Israelites (Peter-Contesse, 253-254). But in that case one would have expected the verb to take the preposition be, which is used with the verb kipper to express instrumentality, rather than ‘al. Another group of scholars have looked for a solution in the antecedent of the third person singular pronominal suffix attached to the preposition (‘alakyw, "for it"). One has suggested that it refers to Aaron (N. Kiuchi, The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function ([Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987], 150-152); and another that it could be referring to the congregation (Hartley, 237); in both cases the syntax of the sentence makes the solution very unlikely. Finally, it has been suggested, based on the history of tradition and (redaction criticism, that what we find in 16:10 "is an attempt to assimilate an alien rite to the dominant priestly sacrificial practice and theology of expiation" (J. R. Porter, Leviticus: A Commentary [New York: Cambridge, 1976], 127-128). This is hardly a solution.
made a sin-offering (asahu hatta’t). Originally either one of them could have been offered as a hatta’t, but through the lot the one for Yahweh becomes the hatta’t.\(^\text{10}\) Since DE//D'E' are located at the center of the chiasm, we have to conclude that the elements listed there are being emphasized. The separation of the goats for different roles is an important aspect of the day of atonement because of their mutually exclusive roles. In the First Development the most important element is precisely the casting of lots to select the goat for Yahweh and the one for Azazel.

At the center of the chiasm we also find for the first time Yahweh and Azazel mentioned together. The parallelism suggests that they are both personal beings. They move in different spheres, which seem to be opposite to each other. Yahweh dwells with his people, but Azazel is located away from the Israelite camp, in the wilderness. Nothing more is said about the enigmatic figure of Azazel, but one senses that it is a negative power.

In the First Development two additional rites are introduced. We are told for the first time in the chapter that Aaron's bull will be part of a cleansing rite; it will be used to make atonement for himself and for his house (kipper ba'ad). The second rite is associated with Azazel. The second goat is "to be sent to the wilderness," an expression that implies the performance of an elimination rite. Both rites will be developed in more detail throughout the rest of the chapter.

Second Development (16:6-22)

This is the central section of Lev 16, in which the ritual for the day of atonement is described in detail and is, therefore, a full development of what was stated in the previous verses under First Development. The structure of the whole section is basically chiastic, with one of its members missing; there is probably a theological reason for the omission. The pattern is ABC//C' B', without a corresponding A'.

\(^\text{10}\) Some have concluded that the two goats together constitute the hatta’t (e.g., N.H. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers* [London: Oliphants, 1977], p. 112). We have argued that, according to v. 8, only the goat for Yahweh is selected to be a hatta’t (A.M. Rodriguez, *Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus* [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979], p. 113; see also Gorman, p. 97). Kiuchi, pp. 148-149, has rejected our suggestion, arguing that since the two goats were destined for a hatta’t in v. 5, none of them could later on cease to be a hatta’t (see also Baruch J. Schwartz, "The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells*, David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz, eds. [Winona Lakes, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995], p. 18). Yet that is precisely what v. 8 indicates when unpacking the statement made in v. 5. Besides, he is unable to explain in a convincing way how the goat for Azazel functions as a hatta’t, except by suggesting that its being sent away corresponds with the burning of the flesh of the hatta’t. One seems to be going beyond the evidence when applying the term "sacrifice," in the Levitical sense, to the goat for Azazel. This is not a cleansing rite but an elimination rite.
parallel at the end of the structure. Under A we find three main activities: A1--Slaughtering Aaron's bull for a sin-offering, A2--Going behind the veil with incense, and A3--Blood manipulation. A takes us back to v. 6, repeating it almost verbatim but adding a new element: "And he shall slaughter his bull for a sin-offering" (v. 11). The addition is significant in that it describes the performance of the second step in the procedure followed when sacrificing a sin-offering, the slaughtering (sahat) of the sacrificial victim (Lev 4:1-12).

The offering of incense is somewhat unexpected, but the text justifies it by associating it directly with the rite of entrance. We should look first at the structure of this activity. Its literary form is abcd//a' b'c'd'e'

a Censer Full of Live Coals of Fire 16:12
b From Altar Before the Lord 16:12
c Hands Full of Incense 16:12
d Brought inside the Curtain 16:12
a' Place Incense on Fire 16:13
b' Before the Lord 16:13
c' Cloud of Incense 16:13
d' The Kapporet 16:13
e' "And he will not die" 16:13

The parallelism is developmental or synthetic. The a//a' lines mention fire (‘es), which is placed in the censer and used to burn incense. Lines b//b' use the same expression, "before the Lord"/lipne Yahweh, while lines c//c' use the term "incense" /q’toret. The d//d' parallel is synonymous: "inside the curtain"/mibbet lapparoket is obviously the place where the kapporet is located. This last element is the most important one in the rite of entrance because it invades the most holy space to which the high priest could ever have access. Here the rite of entrance, reaches its highest point, its intended goal. It should not surprise us to find an extra element, line e', in the second set of lines in the structure: welo ‘yamut/"that he may not die." This is exactly the same expression found in the Historical Setting (v. 2), when the rite of entrance was introduced for the first time. The extra line e' (16:13) brings the rite to its climax and indicates that it can be successfully accomplished by using incense when approaching the awesome presence of the Lord.

The literary structure of the blood manipulation of Aaron's bull (A3) is clearly a chiasm:
a Some Blood of the Bull
b Sprinkle with Finger
c On the Front of the Kapporet
c' And Before the Kapporet
b' Sprinkle Seven Times
a' Some of the Blood

By opening and closing the chiasm with the term dam, "blood," the significance of this element in the cleansing rite is stressed. At the center of the chiasm is located the kapporet (c/c'), the place where the Lord manifests his presence (v. 2). It deserves to be at the center because it is, in terms of significance, the very center of the sanctuary and of the Israelite camp, and especially because it is against God, who manifests his presence there, that the Israelites sin.

The first B line follows in general the structural pattern of A, but this time the sacrificial animal is one of the goats of the people. This line will develop the thought contained in 16:9, under First Development, where the goat for Yahweh was designated as a sin-offering and parallels the development of Al-A3. B1 states that it is to be slaughtered (sahat), and B2 introduces the idea of going "behind the veil"/mibbet lapparoket, an expression found also under A2. In this case the main emphasis falls on the blood manipulation of the sacrificial victim and the kapporet. This hatta’i is part of the cleansing ritual performed during the day of atonement, and its blood is also taken to the adytum, behind the veil. The blood manipulation, B1, is not structured, as in A3, in a chiastic form, because according to the text a summary of the procedure is being provided. Yet, one can detect an ab/a’b’ pattern based on the fact that the verb hizzah, "sprinkle," seems to have a double-duty function.

a Sprinkling
b upon the Kapporet
a' [Sprinkling]
  b' before the Kapporet

Line C is at the center of the chiasm of the whole section. This is to be expected, because here we find an interpretation of the meaning of the rituals performed through the blood manipulation of the bull of Aaron and the goat of the people. This is the most important element in the instructions and deserves the center not only of this section but of the chapter itself. A word count of the chapter shows 229 words in

11 Roy Edwin Gane, Ritual Dynamic Structures: System Theory and Ritual Syntax Applied to Selected Ancient Israelite, Babylonian and Hittite Festival Days (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1992), has correctly argued that the rituals performed with Aaron's bull and the people's goat form "a ritual complex unit" (p. 211). He bases his conclusion on the fact that both of them are called the purification offering of purgations" (16:25), that the rituals "are interwoven with each other, i.e. the second ritual begins before the first ritual is completed and similar activities belonging to the two rituals alternate" (p. 210), and that the rituals are actually merged when the blood is applied to the altar (p. 211).
vv. 1-15 and 237 in vv. 20b-34; the exact center of the chapter is in vv. 17-18. We are indeed dealing here with the heart of the rituals performed during the day of atonement. The emphasis of this section is on the comprehensiveness of the kipper-acts performed that day.

Line C can be subdivided into three main sections (Cl, C2, C3), each one carefully constructed. Cl discusses the purgation of haqqodes and the ‘ohel mo’ed. The cleansing of these two apartments is described in parallel lines following the abc//a' b'c'.

a Thus He Shall Make Atonement
b for the Sanctuary
c because of the Uncleanness of the People

a' So He Shall Do [Make Atonement]
b' for the Tent of Meeting
c' in the Midst of Their Uncleanness

Lines a//a' are related to each other by the use of the verb kipper, which is clearly implicit in the parallel line. The next lines, b//b', refer to haqqodes and the ‘ohel mo’ed respectively. In c//c' the term "uncleanness"/tum'h, is used. The emphasis of the structure is placed on the reason for the purgation act: It is necessary because of the uncleanness of the people of Israel. It is not stated how the uncleanness got there; neither is the uncleanness limited to certain types of cultic or moral failures; purgation is called for because of all the sins of the people.

C2 deals with the cleansing of the priesthood and the assembly. In fact, v. 17 is phrased as a regulation forbidding anybody, except the high priest, to be inside the tent when the purgation rites are being performed. But while doing that, the cleansing of the people is also addressed. The structure of the regulation is a very simple one, ab//a' b'.

a Aaron Goes In
b to Make Atonement in the Sanctuary

a' Aaron Comes Out'
b' Having Made Atonement for the Priesthood and the Assembly of Israel

The a//a' lines describe Aaron going in (bo’) and coming out (yasa’), making the parallelism antithetic. The parallelism in lines b//b' is, on the other hand, synthetic. Aaron goes in to perform a cleansing rite in the sanctuary. The verb is kipper + b’, stating the space where the purgation rite is performed. The interesting thing were is that the kipper-act inside the sanctuary is at the same time a kipper-act on behalf of (cad) Aaron, his house, and all the assembly of Israel. What takes place

12 I consistently counted words united by a makkeph as two words. But even if we count them as one word, 16:18 would continue to be the center of the chapter.
inside the sanctuary is for the benefit of all the people of Israel, thus making the cleansing of the sanctuary in its totality directly related to the cleansing of the people. This element the structure of C2 seems to emphasize.

In 16:18-19, line C3, we find the regulation regarding the purgation of the altar. Its content is in some ways very similar to C1. Both begin with the verb kipper, and at the end we find the phrase "from the uncleanness [tum'ah] of the children of Israel." But the significant difference is found in the description of the blood manipulation for the cleansing of the altar. C3 is structured, like A3, in a chiastic form:

abc//c'b'a'

a Make Atonement for the Altar
b Some Blood of the Bull and Goat
c Placed on the Horns
c' Sprinkled on the Altar
b' Some Blood
a' Cleanse and Sanctify It from Uncleanness

Line a' explains the meaning of the purgation rite for the altar in terms of cleansing and sanctifying it from the uncleanness of the Israelites. The phrase "some blood"/middam, characterizes lines b//b'. Lines c//c' describe the blood application to the altar using the verb "to put"/natan and "to sprinkle"/hizzah. They are parallel actions performed on the altar. Lines c//c' are the center of the chiasm, making the blood application the most important element in the cleansing and sanctifying of the altar. Undoubtedly, blood is of extreme importance in Lev 16.

The parallel line C' is brief and covers only half of v. 2, which is a transitional verse summarizing what was said before and introducing a new development. We place under C' the statement, "When he has finished atoning for the most holy place, the tent of meeting, and the altar." This is precisely what was described under the previous Cline in vv. 16-19, which was interpreted as making atonement for the priesthood and the people. Since line C' is a summary, there is no need to develop its content, and that is exactly what has taken place.

The people's goat for Azazel, line B', is a development of 16:9-10, where Azazel was introduced for the first time. The passage is structured as an elaborate chiasm, which happens to be the same type of literary structure found in 16:9-10, the First Development. A literary envelope is used to set the limits to the section, using antithetic parallelism. At the beginning the goat is brought (hiqrib) to Aaron, line B1; but under B1", at the end of the section, it is sent (salah) to the wilderness. The phrase "on the head of the goat" 'al ro's hasa 'ir is used in lines B1//B1', and under line B1" we find the equivalent, "on
it [thegoat]"/alaw ("on itself"). At the center of the first chiasm is the confessional act standing by itself and, therefore, identified as possibly the most important element in that literary structure. In the second chiasm, which is a development of ideas already contained in the first, the center is occupied by the description of the goat bear iniquity upon itself to a barren land. This is the main idea expressed in that small chiasm. The two chiasms emphasize different but complementary ideas. The first is dominated by the idea of transfer of sin to the goat ("iniquities, transgressions, sins," 'awon, psa', hatta't) through the laying on of hands and the confessional act. The second chiasm puts the emphasis on the removal of sin to the wilderness (hammidbarah), to Azazel. These two acts, transfer and removal, belong to the very essence of the elimination rite. Sending the goat to the wilderness brings the elimination rite to a close and signifies that the sins of the people, which had been purged from the sanctuary, are being sent to their source of origin. Sin and impurity are here dissociated completely from Yahweh.

The chiastic structure of the Second Development is, as indicated above, incomplete; there is no A’ in parallel with A. The reason is obvious: The cleansing rite for the sanctuary and the people has already come to an end; the circle is closed. It is this element of completeness, finality, that the incomplete chiasm seems to stress through its abrupt end. Therefore, its incompleteness is not suggesting that something is missing, but on the contrary that nothing else needs to be added.

Concluding Ritual Acts (16:23-28)

This section is basically dominated by the ideas of clothes and ritual baths in which the high priest, the person who took the goat to the wilderness, and the one who burned the flesh of the hatta’t are involved. The structure of the section is built on synthetic parallelism with an ABC/ /A'B'C'/ /A" pattern. Lines A are characterized by the use of the noun beged/ "garment, clothes" and by the phrase werahas 'et-besaro bammayim/"and he shall bathe his body in water." These are repeated three times, opening and closing the literary structure, creating a literary envelope for it. This does not mean that this unit is totally independent of the rest of the chapter. Rather, it combines elements from the other sections, bringing all the activities of the day to a close. For Instance, A closes the circle of the high priest’s vestment for the day of atonement, which was introduced in the Introduction under line C (16:4). Having concluded the rite of entrance, described in the previous section, the high priest changes his vestments to the ones he regularly wears.
The parallelism in lines B is indicated by the use of the verb *kipper*. B' takes us back to the Introduction, lines $B//B'$, where the sacrificial victims for the burnt-offerings are introduced. Now we are told that the high priest offers them as expiatory offerings. The circle of the burnt-offering is finally closed. Line B' summarizes the expiatory or cleansing power of the blood of the sin-offerings of the people and Aaron, thus pointing back to the Second Development, lines $ABC//C'$. In 16:25 and 27, lines $C//C'$, the procedure for the disposal of the fat, flesh, skin, and dung of the sin-offerings is described. This closes the circle of the *hatta’t* which was opened in the Introduction, under $A$ (16:3).

The section under consideration is well constructed with in itself and at the same time directly related to the Introduction. In fact, one can identify a chiastic structure in the elements listed in 16:3-4 and 16:23-25:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:3-4</th>
<th>16:23-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Bull for Sin-offering</td>
<td>C Vestments and Ritual Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Ram for Burnt-offering</td>
<td>B Burnt-offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Vestments and Ritual Bath</td>
<td>A Sin-offering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The whole Introduction is summarized in 16:23-25 by bringing together the burnt-offerings of Aaron and the people. The reference to the fat of the sin-offering includes the fat of both sin-offerings, i.e., the ram of Aaron and the goat of the people. The items are listed in an inverted parallelism. We can also identify a parallel structure between the First Development (16:6-10) and 16:26-28, the second part of the Concluding Ritual Acts:

A Bull for the Sin-Offering (16:6-10)
- B Goat for the Sin-Offering
  - C Goat for Azazel
  - C Goat for Azazel (16:26-18)
- A Bull for the Sin-Offering

B Goat for the Sin-Offering

The listing of the animals creates a chiasm within a chiasm, suggesting that there is a relation between these two sections of the chapter. This seems to be the way the text testifies to its internal unity, pointing to previous acts and at the same time moving onward the activities of the day.

Institutionalization of the Ritual (16:23-28)

This section is nicely constructed and emphasizes two main ideas: the time for the celebration of the day of atonement and its fundamental meaning (cleansing the sanctuary and the people). From a literary point of view this unit is formed by the combination of three
chiasms. There are four $A$ lines, all of them dealing with calendric information. The first indicates that the celebration of the day of atonement is an "Everlasting Statute" to be celebrated once a year during the tenth day of the seventh month. Part of this information is used in $A''$ ("Everlasting Statute") forming the first chiasm and opening the second one, which closes with the same phrase (line $A'$). $A''$ functions as the initial element of the last chiasm, which closes with the phrase "once a year." It is undeniable that the stress is being put on the yearly celebration of the day of atonement and on its permanent character within the Israelite calendar.

Lines $BC//B'C'$ legislate what is expected of the people during this day. Until now the legislation has stressed only the activity of the high priest and of his assistants. Everything that the high priest does during that day is done on behalf of the people. What is required of them is to humble themselves and rest, not doing any work at all. Line $D$ is at the center of the chiasm and introduces the idea of atonement. This line summarizes the center of the chiasm under **Second of Development**, lines $C//C'$ (16:16-20a): The people are cleansed "from all their sins"/mikkol hatto'tekem (16:30). The idea of atonement is so important in the chapter that in this section it is further developed in vv. 32-33. In other words, the center of the chiasm, line $D$, is used to construct the next unit. The anointed priest is the one who performs the kipper-acts mentioned in $D//D'$. This time the all-inclusiveness of the cleansing rite is mentioned: It cleanses the adytum, the tent of meeting, the altar, the priesthood, and all the congregation of Israel. One could develop line $D'$ even more, revealing the care with which it was structured:

D He Shall Make Atonement  
E for ('et) the Adytum, and  
E' for ('et) the Tent of Meeting and the Altar  
D' He Shall make Atonement, and  
E" for ('al) the Priests and  
E"' for ('al) All the People of the Congregation  
D" He Shall Make Atonement

The first section in this verse deals with the cleansing of the sanctuary in its totality, specifically the inanimate objects; the second, with animate objects or persons, the priests and the Israelites. The reference is obviously back to 16:16-20a, where the verb kipper is used five times; here, in two short verses, it appears four times. The parallelism suggests once more that the purgation of the sanctuary through the cleansing rite of the sin-offerings cannot be separated from the cleansing of the people.
V. 34 contains a small chiasm in which the contents of lines $A$ and $D$ are combined. The long sentence in v. 29 is broken; between its parts is placed a reference to the *kipper*-act on behalf of the people. This small literary unit serves to summarize the section by bringing together the new development, i.e., the calendar for the celebration of the day of atonement, and the very essence of the meaning of the ritual, "to make atonement for [*al the people of Israel from/because of all their sins [mikkol-hatto ’tam]."

*Chiastic Structure of Lev 16*

It is always risky to attempt to identify chiasms on the basis of the general content of a text rather than on linguistic and structural similarities. That approach tends at times to reveal the creativity of the researcher rather than the literary skills of the biblical writer. Although it is not my main interest to demonstrate that Lev 16 is structured chiastically, after reading it carefully and noticing its many apparent repetitions, I was impressed by the fact that it does seem to be constructed in terms of a chiasm. We are suggesting the following literary structure:

----- “And Yahweh said to Moses"
|A  Aaron should not go into most holy place any time he wishes 16:2
| B  Aaron's sacrificial victims and special vestment 16:3-4
| C  Sacrificial victims provided by the people 16:5
|E  D  Aaron's bull, goat for Yahweh, goat for Azazel 16:6-10
|N  E  Aaron sacrifices his bull as a sin-offering 16:11-14
|V  F  Community's goat is sacrificed as a sin-offering 16: 15
|E  G  Make atonement 16:16-19
|L  G'  Atonement is finished 16:20a
|O  F' Community's goat for Azazel sent to the wilderness 16:20b-22
|P  E'  Aaron's closing activities 16:23-25
|E  D'  Goat for Azazel, Aaron's bull, goat for sin-offering 16:26-28
|C'  People rest and humble themselves 16:29-31
|B'  Anointed priest officiates wearing special garments 16:32-33
|A'  Anointed priest makes atonement once a year 16:34
----- "As the Lord commanded Moses"

Lines $A//A'$ deal with time elements as they relate to the sanctuary and particularly to the entrance of the high priests into the adytum. A general statement at the beginning of the chapter leads at the end to a more a specific one. Line $B$ legislates the sacrificial victims and the type of vestments with which Aaron was to approach the Lord. Its parallel line, $B''$ states that during the day of atonement the anointed priest was to officiate, wearing a special priestly dress. The involvement of the people in the activities of the day of atonement is mentioned only in
lines $C/C'$. They provided sacrificial victims ($C$) and humbled themselves and rested ($C'$) while the sanctuary was being purged.

In 16:6-10 we find a reference to Aaron's bull for his sin-offering and a description of the casting of lots to select the goat for Yahweh and the goat for Azazel ($D$). In 16:26-28, $D'$, we find its parallel in which the goat for Azazel, the bull of Aaron, and the goat for the sin-offering are mentioned for the last time in the chapter, suggesting that the main activities of the day have come to an end.

There is not an exact parallel for line $E$, because it deals with the sacrifice offered by Aaron to make atonement for himself and for his house, which brings that part of the ritual to an end, making their experience final. But in the overall structure of the chapter there is compensation for it in 16:23-25, line $E'$, where Aaron is mentioned for the last time in the chapter and his last activities for the day are described. Lines $F/F'$ describe how each of the goats provided by the people was used during the day of atonement. Lines $G/G'$ are located at the center of the chiasm, indicating that this is indeed the most important aspect of the chapter. The chiastic structure combines the main elements of the ritual of the day of atonement with its fundamental purpose, forming a well-structured literary unity.

**General Observations**

We have suggested that in Lev 16 we have three rites13 tightly integrated to create a new ritual complex unit with a very specific purpose. In its present form it is practically impossible to separate each of these rituals from the total activities of the day of atonement without damaging beyond repair the content of the chapter, its structure, and purpose. At the beginning of the chapter we find short summaries that are later on developed in detail, using the same terminology found in the summaries and introducing new elements in the discussion. We move from building block to building block until there is before us a well-structured, all-encompassing ritual complex.

It is interesting to notice how a circle of activity is introduced and then, at a rather slow pace, reaches its closure, taking us through a process in which each one of its parts is very significant. For instance, the circle of the burnt-offerings is initiated in 16:3, 5 and closed in 16:24, without any mention of it in between. The goat for Azazel is introduced in 16:5; the selection of the specific goat is recorded in v. 10. The laying on of hands, the transfer of sin to it, and the act of sending it away to the wilderness are found in 16:20b-22. But perhaps the most significant circle is that of Aaron's sin-offering. It is introduced in 16:3;

---

the sacrificial victim is presented in 16:6, slaughtered in 16:11; the blood manipulation is described in 16:14, the burning of the fat in 16:25, and the circle is closed with the disposal of the flesh of the victim in 16:27.

We find a similar situation with respect to the people's sin-offering, which is introduced (16:5), then presented to the Lord (16:9), slaughtered, the blood manipulation performed (16:15), its fat burned (16:25), and finally the disposal of the flesh brings the circle to an end (16:27). What was in the regular sin-offering a series of consecutive steps in the sacrificial process (Lev 4) is intentionally separated in the ritual of the day of atonement in order to make room for new details in this sophisticated and complex ritual unit. Thus, the unity of the chapter is emphasized.

In its present form Lev 16 combines, in a very well-balanced conceptual symmetry, the rite of entrance, the cleansing rite performed with the two sin-offerings, and the elimination rite. The rite of entrance makes it possible for Aaron to have access to the adytum in order to perform the cleansing rite through which sins and impurities are removed from the sanctuary on behalf of the priesthood and the people of Israel; finally, through the elimination rite the goat for Azazel takes them away to their place of origin, to the wilderness. The distinction between cleansing the impurities of the sanctuary through the sin-offerings and the sins of the people through the live goat is hardly present in the text of Lev 16 in its present form. The

14 It is significant that the laying on of hands is not mentioned in the case of the sin-offering of purgations. This omission should not be considered accidental or unimportant but seems rather to be intentional. The ritual was not performed on this occasion except on the goat for Azazel. This intentional omission appears to question the validity of the ownership theory of the ritual supported by some (e.g., David P. Wright, "The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in the Hittite Literature," JAOS 106 [1986]:436-439; and Milgrom, pp. 152, 1024), as well as the consecration/dedication and the manumission theories.

15 Milgrom has suggested that in its present form the cleansing of the sanctuary from its impurities in Lev 16 is performed with the expiatory sacrifices of Aaron and the people, but the sin of the people, the cause of the impurity, is removed through the goat for Azazel (ibid., pp. 1043-1044; also, David P. Wright, Disposal of Impurity [Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987], pp. 17-21). His most important argument is that in 16:21 the tum'ah/imparity was replaced by 'avon/iniquity, indicating that the goat bears the sins of the people but not their uncleanness. This radical distinction between tum'ah and 'avon does not seem to be valid. In 16:16 tum'ah had already been juxtaposed to sin (hatta'). This fact led Levine to comment, "Uncleanness is equated with sinfulness; thus, according to the biblical conception, sinfulness was regarded as a kind of impurity" (Leviticus, p. 105). This does not seem proper to conclude that the concept of tum'ah is completely foreign to 'avon (see Kiuchi, p. 145). The use of three key terms for sin in 16:21 serves the purpose of expressing the idea of totality, that is to say, any kind of sin committed by the people of Israel (Peter-Contesse, p. 257; Hartley, p. 241; R. Knierim, "Ht' sich verfehlen," in Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, vol. 1, ed. E. Jenn and C. Westerman [Munchen: Kaiser Verlag, 1971], col. 547).

11 Moreover, the distinction made between impurity and iniquity does not seem to be
sin/impurity placed on the goat for Azazel is the totality of the people's sin/impurity removed from the sanctuary through the *cleansing rite*. There is here a clear and direct connection between the rite of entrance, the *cleansing rite* and the *elimination rite* which contributes to the literary and theological unit of Lev 16.

operative in the regular *hatta'ī*. There is no mention there of two rituals, one to remove impurity from the sanctuary and the other to remove sin from the sinner. If the sin of the individual was removed from the person in the regular *hatta'ī* through remorse, as Milgrom has argued, one would have expected that the same would take place during the day of atonement when the people collectively humbled themselves before the Lord. In that case the goat for Azazel would not have been necessary. What we are suggesting is that, according to the present form of Lev 16, the goat for Azazel carried away the sin/impurities of the "sons of Israel," a phrase that includes Aaron and his family and the Israelites (with Milgrom, p. 1044; this fact was overlooked by Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 106). While two sacrificial victims were required for the cleansing rite, the rite of elimination required only one goat because it was not a sacrificial victim.

This material is cited with gracious permission from:
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, MI  49104
www.andrews.edu

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: thildebrandt@gordon.edu
THE CLEANSING OF THE LEPER

By Charles C. Ryrie, Th. D., Ph. D.

The healing of Peter's mother-in-law in Capernaum was followed rapidly by a sequence of events which led to the miracle of the cleansing of a leper (Matt. 8:2-4; Mark 1:40-45; Luke 5:12-16). That evening after Peter's mother-in-law was healed, the whole city gathered at Peter's door to beseech the Savior for deliverance from various maladies. It had already been a busy day, but the Lord healed many of them (Mark 1:32-34). In spite of His weariness of body, the next day He arose early to seek His Father's face in prayer but His disciples found Him and reported that many others back in town were seeking Him. Our Lord's reply was to remind them of the many others in other towns who also needed Him.

I. THE LEPROSY OF THE MAN

It was while the Lord was on this preaching tour through Galilee that a leper accosted Him. Leprosy is one of the oldest diseases known to man, for the Egyptians recognized it before 1500 B. C. It was evidently not at all uncommon in Palestine in Jesus' day (cf. Matt. 10:8; 11:5; Luke 7:22), but this incident is the first record of cleansing in Christ's public ministry.

The characteristics of leprosy. Leprosy is a disease which seems to know no climatic or social boundaries. Although today's three million lepers are found chiefly in tropical Africa, South America, India, and China, the disease has appeared and does appear in all parts of the world. "Race, occupation', social status and climate have no bearing on the incidence" (John M. Musser, Internal Medicine, 4th edition, 1945, p. 73).

Leprosy appears in two forms. One affects the nerves
and the other the skin. It is the latter which seems to be the type spoken of everywhere in the Bible, but neither type is a disease of the blood. The bacilli appear in the blood only during times of fever (ibid., p. 74; cf. C. I. Scofield, editor, *The Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 141: "Leprosy speaks of sin as (1) in the blood. . ."). A person may harbor the germs for years before the disease erupts. When it does appear, however, it takes the form of nodules or of swelling of the extremities and usually affects the face, legs, or feet first. From then on the disease runs a fearful and sometimes lengthy course. "As the nodules enlarge the skin becomes deeply furrowed; the ear lobes, lips and nose become thickened, tending to cause resemblance to a lion's face. . . [the skin] is often dusky or 'muddy,' dry or scaling. The nails are often striated. Ulcerations occur easily. Ulcers may heal, but often penetrate deeply and spread, causing appalling mutilation. Various digits may drop off. . . Destruction of the cornea and conjunctiva results in blindness" (ibid., p. 75; cf. also Sir Henry L. Tidy, *A Synopsis of Medicine*, 9th edition, 1949, p. 137).

The Jews evidently regarded the disease as contagious though it is not readily so. Methods of arresting the disease have been known for some time, and modern drugs can eliminate the germs from the body, but nothing can undo the toll the disease takes upon a body before it is either arrested or cured. These are the general characteristics of leprosy.

The consequences of leprosy. In the Old Testament certain very specific tests were given for the diagnosing of leprosy (Lev. 13). When it was discovered the afflicted person was rigidly cut off from the community. He was compelled to put on the marks of mourning as if he were dead. He had his clothes rent, his head uncovered, his lips covered, and wherever he went he had to shout "unclean" in order to warn others away (Lev. 13:45; Num. 12:12). Often a separate place was designated in the synagogues for lepers, and infraction of any of these regulations of separation was punishable with forty stripes.
It is these consequences that have caused leprosy to be regarded as a type of sin. Actually the nearest Biblical reference which would justify this type is Psalm 51:7 ("Purge me with hyssop"). Because the hyssop mentioned here is also a part of the cleansing ritual for the leper (Lev. 14:4), it is assumed that David's sin is being compared to leprosy and thus leprosy is a type of sin. In reality, David may more likely have had in mind the hyssop used in the ritual of cleansing in connection with the red heifer offering (Num. 19:18), and thus it seems doubtful at best to speak of leprosy as a distinct type. It can, however, certainly be considered as an illustration of some aspects of sin. Principally leprosy illustrates the defilement of sin which results in separation. Insidiousness, loathsomeness, uncleanness, separation, defilement, death, are all points of comparison between leprosy and sin, but resemblance does not constitute leprosy a type--only an illustration.

II. THE LOVE OF THE MASTER

The way the leper approached the Lord gives indication of his great faith in the power of Christ. "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." It was the love of Christ that motivated His action in this instance as in all His work, but it was love related to power. I might love to give each reader a million dollars but I am not able to do so. The Lord of glory not only loved this man and us but He was and is able to do something about his and our miserable condition. Salvation is not only related to the truth that "He loved the world" but also to the truth that "He is able."

However, love and power are not enough; there must be willingness, and the form in which the leper's question was cast shows that lie recognized this fact. The question was not, Could He do it? but, Would He do it? "There might be the ability without the will, or the will without the ability, but his hope was that in Christ there would be the combination of both, and all that was needed for that, in his estimation, was the will" (William M. Taylor, The Miracles of Our
Thus powerful and willing love resulted in active love, and the Savior touched the leper. The act of touching the defiled man, which normally would also have defiled the one who touched him, illustrates the deep mystery involved in the Savior's identifying Himself with sin. Who can fathom all that may be involved in the fact that He was made sin for us (2 Cor. 5:21)? And yet this touching of the leper may illustrate something of that mystery.

III. THE LAW OF MOSES

After the cleansing came the command: "See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them" (Mark 1:44). "Those things which Moses commanded" are recorded in Leviticus 14. Briefly, the ritual of cleansing was as follows: two clean living birds, a cedar rod, scarlet, and hyssop were taken; one bird was then killed in an earthen vessel over running water; the hyssop was then tied to the rod with the scarlet band and it and the living bird were dipped in the blood of the dead bird; next the blood on the rod was sprinkled over the leper seven times, and the living bird was loosed. At this point the leper was pronounced clean, but more was still required of him. He had to wash his clothes, shave, bathe, stay away from his house for seven days, repeat the ablutions and shaving, and finally on the eighth day offer at the temple a sin offering, a trespass offering, a meal offering, and a burnt offering. It is evident that the law was very detailed about this procedure, and doubtless, because it had seldom if ever been used, there would have been a lot of scratching of priestly heads had the leper obeyed the Lord and gone to them. Instead, he chose to disobey and publish his miracle abroad so that it actually hindered his benefactor's ministry.

The power of the law. Certain important doctrinal facts about the relation of the Savior, the sinner, and the Mosaic
law are illustrated in this miracle. The first is that the Mosaic law was powerless to cleanse. It could after a length of time pronounce as true the fact that a man was cleansed, it could not perform the cleansing itself. The nature of law has not changed; it still cannot cleanse the sinner no matter how admirably he may try to keep its “Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight” (Rom. 3:20). It was never given as a means of spiritual salvation, and great is the error of who so use it today.

*The purpose of the law.* The Lord’s reason for commanding this leper to go to the priests was that the law might be used as a testimony to them. In the process performing the ritual of the law they might have been led to the Savior. Such is a legitimate purpose of the preaching of the law today. It may be used to lead a man to Christ. It is for the unrighteous (1 Tim. 1:9), to shut him up to faith in Christ (Gal. 3:23-24). Our Lord used it this way (Luke 10: 25-37) and so may we.

Although the law may be used to show a sinner his hopeless condition, only Christ can save. What then is the place of the law in the life of the redeemed? Being saved does not exempt one from lawful living, but the law involved is no longer the law of Moses but the law of Christ. So it was for the cleansed leper (Mark 1:44), and so it is for the cleansed sinner in this age (1 Cor. 9:21). He is no longer under any part of the Mosaic law (including the Ten Commandments, 2 Cor. 3:7-11), but he is to live by the commandments of Christ under grace.

But, someone will say, Are not many of the requirements of the law (and especially the principles of the Ten Commandments) repeated substantially in the teachings of grace? The answer is obviously yes. Then, one will say, Why insist that the Christian is not under the Mosaic law (including the Ten Commandments)? We insist on it for the evident reason that the Scripture says so (2 Cor. 3:7-11; Rom. 10:4; Heb. 7:11-12), and for the very practical reason that even though
some of the standards may be similar under law and grace, no one will ever possibly reach any of those standards in his life if he tries to do so by keeping the law. The law can only motivate to sin (Rom. 7) and never to sanctification. Legalism is the greatest enemy of sanctification; thus to connect the believer's sanctification with the law is to defeat him before he starts.

Love is the only workable motive for sanctification, but love does not mean license. No doubt, the leper was so overpowered with love for his deliverance and his deliverer that he thought he was doing right by telling everyone else of Jesus. But that was not real love, for if he had had genuine, thoughtful love he would have obeyed. The law of Christ is tailor-made and perfect in every detail. The love of Christ brings perfect obedience to each and all of those details. May the lessons of this miracle be practice in a life of obedience motivated by the love of the one who loved us and gave Himself for us.

Dallas, Texas
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THE X-FACTOR: REVISIONING BIBLICAL HOLINESS

BRENT A. STRAWN

"Thus, law implements as social policy and social practice this articulation of God. God is not simply a religious concept but a mode of social power and social organization. . . . The reality of God's passion is mobilized in social policy."

--Walter Brueggemann

"Holiness calls"

--John G. Gammie

For Dr. Frank G. Carver in honor of his retirement from Point Loma Nazarene College

I. INTRODUCTION

Most students of the Bible would acknowledge that holiness is of critical importance to its subject matter. A text like Lev. 19:2: "Speak to all the congregation of the people of Israel and say to them: You shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy" aptly summarizes this perspective. Moreover, the fact that this text is cited in 1 Pet. 1:13-16 would seem to underscore that holiness is a concern, even a command, that runs throughout the text of the Christian Bible--that is, the Old and New Testaments. But this unity is not uniformity; and the problem of the significance of holiness--what holiness is and does or what holiness is supposed to be and supposed to do--often goes unexpressed and unexplained. The present study is an attempt to get at these issues and takes its cue from texts like Ezek. 20:41:

As a pleasing odor I will accept you, when I bring you out from the people, and gather you out of the countries where you have been scattered; and I will manifest my holiness among you in the sight of the nations.

Strawn is an assistant professor of biblical studies at Asbury Theological Seminary in Wilmore, Kentucky.
Or from the sentiment found in the Jewish prayer, the Amidah, benediction three:

To all generations we will declare your greatness, and to all eternity we will proclaim your holiness, and your praise, O our God, will never depart from our mouth, for you are a great and holy God and King. Blessed are you, a Lord, the holy God.

Put simply, these texts demonstrate that holiness has an external function. It can be manifested among the nations, as in Ezekiel, and is to be proclaimed to all eternity, as in the Amidah. In short, it can be and should be communicated. These two points--that holiness is of central import in Scripture but is diversely expressed therein and that holiness has a communicative function--comprise the central points of this paper and will be addressed sequentially.

II. HOLINESS MENTALITES VS. HOLINESS ESPRIT

The fact that holiness is a major concern of the biblical witness and as such runs throughout the biblical texts does not require extensive comment. Holiness has often been highlighted in critical research on the Bible and biblical theology. C. F. A. Dillmann in the late nineteenth century, for instance, determined that holiness was the essential characteristic of Old Testament revelation. He located this "principle" in Lev. 19:2 and regarded it as "the quintessence of the revelation, and to it he related all other ingredients of Hebrew faith and practice."

Somewhat later, J. Hanel also located the central idea of Israelite religion in the concept of holiness. And these two are not alone in the history of Old Testament scholarship. Other names could be added to the list: E. Sellin or T. C. Vriezen, for example. Even if scholarship is no longer locating holiness at the center of the Old Testament--and indeed, the quest for a or the "center" (Mitte) seems permanently defunct after Eichrodt--the topic of holiness continues to receive at least some attention in most theological treatments. And deservedly so.

What is more important for the purposes of this study, then, is not to discuss the centrality or prevalence of the holiness concern in Scripture--what might be called the Bible's esprit or spirit of holiness--but rather to discuss the diversity of ways this concept is appropriated or enacted in Israel. For lack of a better term, these latter may be called the various mentalites or mechanisms of biblical holiness.

The late John Gammie, in his monograph *Holiness in Israel*, has performed this task quite well and his work can be briefly summarized here. Gammie discussed three major strands in Israel's understanding of holiness: that of the priests, the prophets, and the sages. He went on to discuss variations on each of these understandings and then added a treatment of the apocalyptic writers; this produces a sevenfold perspective on how the Old Testament views holiness. Gammie found a unity running across the biblical material: "The holiness of God requires a cleanness on the part of human beings." But equally as important, Gammie found not a single doctrine of holiness but a diversity or, at least, "a unity with a diversity." That is, while cleanness may be a consistent requirement, each of the three traditions Gammie discussed would seem to stress a different kind of cleanness:

- For the priestly tradition, holiness entails a call to ritual purity, right sacrifice, and separation;
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Holiness for the prophets involves the purity of social justice; The wisdom literature stresses the cleanness of individual morality. Moreover, there is variation within each of these traditions. For example, even in those portions of Scripture that Gammie identified as "Variations on the Priestly Understanding of Holiness" (basically Ezekiel, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles), all of which stand in "remarkable continuity with the normative" Priestly perspective, there is nevertheless significant variation. In the prophetic material the differences are even more pronounced: according to Gammie, nowhere in Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, or the Deuteronomistic History, for example, are there passages that articulate that "the holiness of God requires the cleanness of social justice." Though Gammie went on to offer an apologia for this attenuation, there is nevertheless a clear difference at work in the understandings of holiness found in the various corpora that comprise the Old Testament. Hence, Gammie concluded:

In the light of the overview of the preceding pages it cannot be claimed that holiness in Israel is the central, major, or unifying concept of the Old Testament/Hebrew Scriptures. It is fair to claim, however, that the concept of the holiness of God is a central concept in the Old Testament, which enables us to discern at once an important unity and diversity.

Gammie's assessment is helpful. It should be added, however, that the complexity of the matter is compounded when one considers the New Testament materials. One can easily see the issues by comparing, say, Ezra's concern with separation with what many have identified as the radical inclusivity of Jesus and the early community gathered around him. Of course, one has to be careful here, as texts such as Matt 10:5-6 and 15:24 have led some scholars to say that the ministry of Jesus was originally only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. This certainly softens the inclusivity; even so, the Gospels as a whole, and especially Acts and the ministry of Paul, would seem to register a rather gross disparity with the concerns for ethnic boundary preservation found in Ezra-Nehemiah. Even so, holiness continues to be a concern in the New Testament texts--and period.

Still, the difference between Ezra and the early Jesus movement is instructive and gets to the heart of the matter. Simply put, different traditions, periods, situations, peoples, and so forth, manifest--even require--different understandings and appropriations of holiness. The struggle for self-preservation and economic stability that characterized the returnees from Exile under Ezra and Nehemiah is not equivalent to the pressures faced by the early Jesus movement. It is not surprising then, to find that Ezra-Nehemiah and the Jesus community have different appropriations or mentalites for holiness; nor is it surprising to find these to be, in turn, both similar to and different at points from priestly and prophetic understandings. In short, the manifold ways that the concept of holiness is appropriated is diverse and dependent to a large degree on different geo-political, sociological, and/or theological situations. As such, one might look at them as limited, time-bound manifestations or mechanisms by which holiness is enacted and lived out.

Yet this is not the whole story. The concept of holiness itself is more than the sum total of these mentalites. Biblical holiness is not, therefore, merely the various understandings and
implementations of holiness found in the Bible. Rather, there is an esprit that runs throughout the text. For Gammie it is "cleanness." I will shortly discuss difference in similar fashion. Whatever the exact identification, however, the diversity of appropriation itself is proof of the esprit’s existence. While the diversity may at first seem crippling on the practical level, the fact that holiness reappears in the various traditions and sections of the Bible--despite and in spite of the fact that it is differently manifested--underscores the point that holiness is a central biblical concern. Holiness is part of the Bible's fundamental grammar; to borrow Walter Brueggemann's terminology, it comprises part of Israel's core testimony about God.26

III. THE X-FACTOR: TOWARD AN APPROPRIATION OF THE HOLINESS ESPRIT AND THE HOLINESS MENTALITES

But what exactly is that testimony? What precisely is the esprit? After the preceding diachronic analysis, it seems more than a bit perilous to hazard a guess on what the notion of holiness might mean throughout the entire biblical witness. After all, even if a biblical esprit on the matter does exist, hypothetically or ideally, isn't it bound up inextricably with the same socio-political realities mentioned earlier? Perhaps so. But the synchronousness of the concept--above all exemplified by its ubiquity throughout and across the texts and testaments--urges the endeavor. To be sure, it may be that it is the consistent presence of holiness that is the only stable factor--the only esprit, as it were--that can be identified. But such an evaluation, while perhaps accurate on the descriptive level, is hardly adequate on a practical or prescriptive one. That is, if the biblical conception of holiness is to be recaptured, recovered, or revisioned for the twenty-first century, we must not only find the biblical esprit, we must also attempt to (re-)formulate it in a mentalite that is, while faithful to the esprit and within the appropriate range of biblical mentalites, simultaneously functional and faithful in our own contemporary context.

A clue for doing this can be taken from the second major point of the present paper: namely, that holiness has a communicative or proclamatory function. In Gammie's words: "Holiness calls."27 Gammie, of course, went on to specify this calling: the holiness of God summoned Israel to aspire to justice and compassion; thus, holiness calls for and calls forth cleanness. While this may be true, this calling is not restricted to the holiness of God. Holiness itself; I would contend, contains this aspect of calling or communication in its very nature. Sociological and anthropological studies are of paramount importance at this point,28 and it is unfortunate that their presence in biblical scholarship is still a relatively recent development29 While sociology and anthropology are critical tools in assessing all kinds of religious phenomena, holiness, in particular, is an excellent case in point. Social-scientific analyses may even help to explain the various factors at work in the different mentalites previously described.30

A basic and oft-cited characterization of holiness from the perspective of these disciplines, at least since the work of Rudolf Otto, is that holiness is fundamentally separation: The Holy is Wholly Other.31 Yet this insight is not only phenomenological; it is also found in Scripture as, for instance, in Lev. 10:9b-10: "It is a statute forever throughout your generations: You are to distinguish between the holy and the profane, and between the unclean and the clean."32 To be sure, holiness involves more than separation, Otto's analysis includes elements besides the mysterium, and the biblical material discusses holiness in
ways that lie outside Otto's scheme. Nevertheless, it seems to be consensual (if not consonantal) that one of the central aspects of holiness is separation.

Thus stated, separation, if not the biblical esprit of holiness, is certainly a major aspect and dominant part of that esprit. Unfortunately, most theory stops there. But this insight must be pressed: What does this separation do sociologically and theologically? Here the biblical texts must reenter the discussion. The notion of separation, or what be best called difference, can be illustrated by means of several texts in the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible. Before undertaking this task, it is necessary to point out that I think that the biblical esprit of holiness and its various mentalités can be encapsulated by the notion of "the X-Factor."

An X-Factor is something that differentiates two, otherwise identical, entities. Given the presence of the x, the term is somewhat mysterious. The letter X, as is well known, is often used in algebra and higher mathematics for a symbol of unknown or variable quality. The elusive quality of the X has passed over into everyday parlance as terms like "Generation x," "the X-Files," or even "Madame x," amply attest. Other examples could be added, but suffice it to say that the X-Factor is something that separates, that differentiates, that is mysterious, and as such fascinates and attracts. In so doing, it also testifies. In my estimation, this notion can be quite helpful in an attempt to understand the biblical conception of holiness.

"I Am Yahweh": The Holiness Code and Ezekiel

An obvious place to start this task is with Leviticus 17-26, commonly called the Holiness Code because of its predominant concern with holiness. While it may be an obvious place to start, it is not an easy one. The Holiness Code comprises a dizzying myriad of laws and commands, almost none of which immediately recommend themselves to the contemporary (at least contemporary Christian) situation. Or so it would seem.

What is clear, however, is that holiness is central throughout the Holiness Code and is manifested in a number of ways--indeed, in almost as many ways as there are laws--including regulations regarding sacrifice (Lev. 17:1-6), sexuality (Lev. 18:6-23), familial relations (Lev. 20:9), idol worship (Lev. 20:1-5), priesthood (Lev. 21:1-24), offerings (Lev. 22:1-23), festivals (Leviticus 23), and so forth. Leviticus 19 is a particularly interesting chapter, and probably the most well-known given v. 18b: "you shall love your neighbor as yourself." The juxtaposition of this verse with a prohibition against mixed breeding shows that this chapter serves as a microcosm for what one finds throughout the Holiness Code.

What is perhaps most striking about Leviticus 19, besides the rough juxtaposition already mentioned, is the refrain that echoes throughout the chapter: "I am the LORD" (19:3, 4, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37). It occurs, in fact, in the famous v. 18, which reads in full:

You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against any of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the LORD.

It is also found after other laws, such as "You shall not swear falsely by my name, profaning the name of your God: I am the LORD" (19:12) and "Do not turn to idols or make cast images for yourselves: I am the LORD your God" (19:4). But it is also found in several of those laws that seem exceedingly strange. For example, "YOU shall not make any gash-
es in your flesh for the dead or tattoo any marks upon you: I am the LORD" (19:28) or "But in the fifth year you may eat of their [the trees's] fruit, that their yield may be increased for you: I am the LORD your God" (19:25). What does this refrain mean? Why is it scattered throughout this chapter and elsewhere in the Holiness Code?

To answer this question we need to look to the other main locus for this type of phraseology, the Book of Ezekiel, and to the scholar who has thought longest and best on the topic, Walther Zimmerli. Zimmerli has demonstrated that the "I am Yahweh" (NRSV: "I am the LORD") formula, or what he calls variously the "demonstration/manifestation word," "recognition formula," or "proof-saying" (Erweiswort) functions to reveal God's being through God's action. In Ezekiel, this formula always precedes God's activity and Yahweh is always the subject. The purpose of the action in question is to produce recognition of God's revelation within it. The appropriate response is for Israel and the nations to recognize, acknowledge, and submit to God. Put simply, the action that accompanies the phrase "I am Yahweh" functions to reveal God's person and nature to those who encounter it.

This is a fascinating insight and one that has bearing on the instances of the formula in the Holiness Code, which Zimmerli unfortunately treats only briefly. The point is that this strange hodgepodge of laws that include both reverence for God, family, and neighbor, as well as prohibitions against wearing clothing made from two types of fabric and the like, somehow serves to reveal God and more specifically, God's nature and God's holiness. What an odd God, that God's holy being should be manifested in such ways! But the earlier question, "What do these laws do?" still remains: If this could be answered, perhaps it might explain what seems, on the face of it, so odd, arbitrary, and irrational.

In Israel, these laws would seem to bind the people together, uniting them as one people of God, serving and obeying that God in any and every way. Simultaneously, however, these laws serve to separate them and mark them as different from the outside world. In short, these laws are an X-Factor differentiating Israel from her neighbors.

This is no small point. Boundaries are of critical importance to societal and communal existence. Witness Ezra and Nehemiah, for instance. But this separation is not an end in and of itself, for and unto itself. The laws of the Holiness Code, after all, would separate Israel regardless of the self-revelation formula "I am Yahweh." But the presence of that formula gives the legislation motivation and reason for being. The formula is also what gives the laws their communicative function. After all, Israel—as separate, holy, and different as it was and could be—was hardly isolated on the geopolitical stage of the ancient Near East. Only rarely in its history was Israel sufficiently free of foreign domination to develop and flourish as it would. And even at those rare moments of independence, Israel constantly came into contact with nations great and small throughout the ancient world: Egypt, Aram, Phoenicia, Philistia, Assyria, Babylon, Ammon, Moab, Edom, and the rest. Furthermore, the major trade routes of the ancient world happened to run right through Syria-Palestine and thus through Israel. Israel could not be geographically separate then, and yet was called to be sociologically and theologically separate by virtue of its practices. Or better, Israel was called to be different. Again, the purpose for the difference does not seem to have been for its own sake or because of some unknown disease residing in pork, from which God wished to spare Israel. Rather, the purpose was יִהְוָה, I am Yahweh, and that means God
wishes to know and be known by humans. In short, in my judgment, laws like those found in the Holiness Code function both theologically and sociologically to simultaneously separate Israel unto itself and to attract and call others unto Israel. Furthermore, the recognition formula that serves as conclusion to and motivation for these laws shows that their communicative function is part and parcel of the divine economy and plan.


Though the communicative function of the Holiness Code can certainly be debated, the case can be made rather easily sociologically, if not historically. In brief, it is a naturally occurring result of the practices in question. Ironically, then, the very barriers that separate and thus exclude are also the very structures that make it (at least) possible to allow in and include. Thus, these laws that seem so obscure and strange in the Holiness Code, not to mention elsewhere in Scripture, have a sociological function that is communicative, perhaps one might even say missiological if not evangelical. This statement is true only if and as long as a means to transition from one side of the barrier to another exists or only if and as long as there is a message to communicate from one side to another and a means by which this can be done. This is obviously a source of intense debate in the history of Israelite religion. Even so, I am inclined to think that this difference is purposeful; that it did create a barrier but also made it a porous one—indeed, one that exists for penetration and crossing.

While some may remain skeptical, the communicative nature of the legal material can be demonstrated with even greater clarity within Israel. The problem of transgenerational value communication, for instance, is a case in point. Children, upon noticing these laws, often do not understand them and inquire about them. The laws thus produce their initial inquiry regarding the Law. The instructed parental answer is then given and is oriented, not toward the laws or the Law, but toward the Lawgiver. Note Deut 6:20-25:

When your children ask you in time to come, “What is the meaning of the decrees and the statutes and the ordinances that the LORD our God has commanded you?” then you shall say to your children, “We were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt, but the LORD brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand. The LORD displayed before our eyes great and awesome signs and wonders against Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his household. He brought us out from there in order to bring us in, to give us the land that he promised on oath to our ancestors. Then the LORD commanded us to observe all these statutes, to fear the LORD our God, for our lasting good, so as to keep us alive, as is now the case. If we diligently observe this entire commandment before the LORD our God, as he has commanded us, we will be in the right.”

In this text, the child first encounters the system but is then immediately introduced to the Savior. But the "system-first" situation isn't so bad--even if it isn't ideal--because the encounter with the system is designed to or at least functions to introduce the Savior.

Another example of or analogy to this dynamic is found in the symbolic activity of the prophets, especially Jeremiah and Ezekiel. In Ezekiel 24 we find the prophet engaged in yet another symbolic action-something of a personal specialty of his. This particular
example is especially disturbing. Yahweh says to Ezekiel:

Son of man, with one blow I am about to take away from you the delight of your eyes; yet you shall not mourn or weep, nor shall your tears run down. Sigh, but not aloud; make no mourning for the dead. Bind on your turban, and put your sandals on your feet; do not cover your upper lip or eat the bread of mourners (Ezek. 24:15-17).

The "delight of your eyes" (הֵמוֹן יָדֵי כָּלָה) is somewhat ambiguous. To what or to whom does the phrase refer? The suspense mounts as Ezekiel responds to the divine word: "So I spoke to the people in the morning" (Ezek. 24:18a). We are not told what Ezekiel said to the people, but presumably it was a verbatim repetition of the divine message. As such, perhaps the taking of the "delight of your eyes" applies to the people, not Ezekiel. But alas, no. The suspense is cut; simply and plaintively v. 18 continues: "and at evening my wife died. And on the next morning I did as I was commanded" (Ezek. 24:18b). The crux immediately follows:

Then the people said to me, 'Will you not tell us what these things mean for us, that you are acting this way?' Then I said to them: The word of the LORD came to me. . . (Ezek. 24:19-20a; emphasis added).

This is echoed in v. 24:

Thus Ezekiel shall be a sign to you; you shall do just as he has done. When this comes, then you shall know that I am the Lord GOD.

The prophet's activity thus symbolizes what will happen to the house of Israel: Ezekiel's wife is taken and so shall Jerusalem be taken. But it also does more: it produces the encounter with the word and thus the revelation of God--"then you shall know that I am the Lord GOD" (24:24; cf. 24:27).

Jer. 16:1-13 is functionally identical. There the prophet is told not to marry or have children (vv. 2-4) and not to mourn for the dead (w. 5-9) because God is bringing judgment and disaster on Israel. This leads to a turning point:

And when you tell this people all these words, and they say to you, “Why has the LORD pronounced all this great evil against us? What is our iniquity? What is the sin that we have committed against the LORD our God?” then you shall say to them. . . (Jer. 16:10-11a; emphasis added).

Here again the sign-action produces a confrontation. The people will inquire and Jeremiah will respond. Perhaps Israel should have known the reason for Jeremiah's celibacy, but the point is that they did not. The symbolic action becomes the vehicle by which they learn it--even if they (and the prophets themselves!) have to learn it the hard way. Apparently, the stubbornness of the people forces God and the prophets to reconsider their communication strategies and make their message even more severe.
The significance of all this is that God does not forbid Ezekiel to mourn or Jeremiah to marry because these things are wrong or harmful. On the contrary, it is exactly the commonality and normalcy of such activities that makes them ideally suited to produce a reaction or encounter, which the prophets then turn to their advantage in delivering the divine message. Marriage was altogether normal and standard, so much so that Jeremiah 16 is virtually the only example of bachelorhood in ancient Israel.61 Mourning for the dead is also a common human process and experience.62 But these are the things forbidden the prophets; again, not for any reason inherent in the practices themselves and at the same time not without any reason whatsoever; but rather in order to lead those unacquainted with the people or word of God to an encounter with exactly those subjects. This confrontation, in turn, functions to reveal Israel's God as the proof-saying formula ably demonstrates.63

Given the presence of "I am Yahweh" in the Holiness Code, the same processes seem to be at work there. Ancient Israel was demarcated from surrounding nations purposefully, in order to produce questions like: “Why don't you gash yourself for the dead? Why don't you sacrifice to Molek? Why don't you gather the fallen grapes in your vineyard why do you leave them for the poor?” The answer was not to be mumbled under one's breath after clearing one's throat ("Ahem, er, well, ah, because I am an Israelite. . .") and indeed ultimately has little to do with the Israelite qua Israelite. On the contrary, the answer is נָאֹהֵן יֵהוָה "he is Yahweh"—that is, "because Yahweh is our God" (see Ps. 105:7; 1 Chron. 16:14). The Holiness Code is thus like a giant symbolic activity on a nationwide or global scale that serves, as do the prohibitions in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, to assist Israelite children as well as foreigners come to the knowledge of Yahweh.64

As separation, therefore, the X-Factor serves to attract or to invite. But there is more at work in this notion and in these biblical texts than outside attraction. Furthermore, there is more to the Bible and to the legal corpus than "don't dos"—or what might be termed negative difference or separation.65 There are also positive injunctions (positive separation/difference) that may very well still attract, but that are primarily focused inwardly on Israel communal life together.66

“When You See It Then You Will Remember”: Num. 15:37-41 (Accountability)

Since the sociological cohesion produced by boundaries and common legislation is well-known,67 this aspect can be dealt with in briefer fashion. Moreover, in some ways it is subordinate to attraction because the dynamic is the same: positive separation also attracts but its main focus is internal—it attracts those already in the group and thus acts as a mechanism for accountability or memory. This can be nicely demonstrated by Num. 15:37-41:

The LORD said to Moses: Speak to the Israelites, and tell them to make fringes on the comers of their garments throughout their generations and to put a blue cord on the fringe at each comer. You have the fringe so that, when you see it, you will remember all the commandments of the LORD and do them, and not follow the lust of your own heart and your own eyes. So you shall remember and do all my commandments, and you shall be holy to your God. I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: I am the LORD your God.
Here we find an injunction as strange as those found in the Holiness Code. The Israelites are to put blue cords on the fringes of their garments (cf. Deut. 22:12) and when they see these blue fringes, which would presumably happen quite frequently throughout the course of a day, they are to remember the commandments. The situation works out rather logically, though perhaps a bit woodenly:

- you will see the blue cords,
- you will remember all the commandments,
- you will do them,
- and you will not turn away faithlessly.

Following the tassel, that is, instead of the lusts of the heart and eye, helps one follow God: "So you shall remember. . . and you shall be holy to your God."

In Numbers 15 we find a difference—an X-Factor—that serves as a reminder to inculcate a righteous and faithful lifestyle in the Israelites. This aspect, which has to do with accountability, comprises the second major purpose of the X-Factor. Again, separation or difference is not an end in and of itself; rather, difference is unto encounter and proclamation; and it is also unto remembrance and enactment. And, as is rather obvious in the case of Numbers 15, an X-Factor can oftentimes simultaneously do both.

IV. CONCLUSION: REVISIONING AND REAPPROPRIATING HOLINESS VIA THE X-FACTOR

In sum, then, the differences highlighted here under the rubric "the X-Factor" may involve abstention from normal involvements or may involve participation in atypical activities in order to produce twin aspects: attraction unto encounter and remembrance unto accountability. It is these aspects or purposes of the deep structure of the X-Factor that give it reason for being. That is, the X-Factor itself is not invariable. On the contrary, the X-Factor changes as often as the biblical mentalites do or as often as the symbol "x" signifies different values in algebra. In fact, the different mentalites are themselves different X-Factors, as long as they serve the purposes of attraction and accountability. So, the particular action chosen—be it Ezekiel's stoicism, Jeremiah's celibacy, the holy hodgepodge of Leviticus, or the blue cords of Numbers—will change and vary. These activities are situation specific and timebound, limited and temporary. But the difference encapsulated therein, the separation that produces (or should produce) attraction and accountability remains constant. The X-Factor, then, summarizes the esprit of holiness (difference), while also providing a grid that both explains and incorporates the mentalites content and method (their ongoing appropriations, revisioning. and so forth).

Several points need to be stressed, however. First, this grid of possible mentalites isn't infinite. It is certain that if holiness is to be revisioned and relived, it must be done in such a way that is both comprehensible and relevant today. The X-Factor permits this by showing how various persons, movements, and periods have lived out holiness in differing, and not always ideal, ways. We are on good ground, then, to say that the exact manner (mentalite) in which we enact holiness (the esprit itself) is of secondary importance to the fact that we live it out. Thus, as long as the X-Factor, the separation or difference, produces an encounter and reminds us who and whose we are, its focus and locus, its mech-
anism and appropriation, will and should vary. But the variation is limited, or should be, to the range demonstrated within Scripture itself. Or better: it is limited to the dynamic found within the Scriptural range of mentalites. This dynamic is properly one that comes from God. The word of the Lord came to Ezekiel and Jeremiah and told them what to do. I The commandments in the Holiness Code and Numbers 15, similarly, are stamped with the divine "imprimatur." So too modern appropriations of biblical holiness should follow the command of God, expressed above all in Holy Scripture.

This point already anticipates the second, namely, that the X-Factor should be purposeful. The X shouldn't be arbitrary: It should be designed to lead to the twin aspects and be subject to and take its origin from the command of God. It should also be tied to the character and holiness of God. Although separation does not exhaust the concept of holiness in Scripture or in the phenomenology of religion, it does prove helpful at this point, since God is nothing if not different—especially, the incarnation notwithstanding, different from us.

But Christ nevertheless plays a role here. It is not unimportant to note that our English letter "X" comes from the Greek letter X (chi), the first letter of Χριστός (Christos), the "Christ." Ultimately, for Christians, it is our relationship with Jesus Christ that makes and marks us apart—as separate and different One might say that the Gospel itself is our X-Factor. That is well and good and as it should be. The purpose of this paper has been to provide motivation for the concrete manifestations of that relationship and in so doing to fill holiness with meaning by appealing to the ultimate purpose of communication via attraction and accountability. The latter two, respectively, provide the opportunity and the message for the former.

To be sure, conceptions of the X-Factor, although not with that label, have long been around. Difference, separation, "coming apart from the world," refusing to be "of it," are all hallmarks of the Christian tradition—especially the holiness variety. But rarely, or so it seems, has the purpose of separation been expressed and unmotivated separation quickly becomes separatism. This scenario, while rather typical, is exceedingly problematic. But the X-Factor provides a way out of it. It can serve as a hermeneutical key that motivates and explains distinctive characteristics (both positive, e.g., care of the poor, and negative, e.g., abstentions from various practices) that are periodically undertaken by communities of faith. Moreover, the notion of the X-Factor can function on a transgenerational level, since its explanation and enactment of the esprit is independent of one particular type or even brand of mentalite.

If holiness is to be appropriated in the next century, I think it will have to be done in this sort of way. The X-Factor gets around the problem of unmotivated and thus lifeless difference and also holds promise for transgenerational and evangelistic communication. But the X-Factor also poses a threat to the way holiness has been traditionally conceived. Built into its structure is variability, openness, change—at least on the level of mentalite. This has not been a hallmark of the holiness traditions, nor of any other denomination for that matter, which have tended to demarcate their ethical conduct early in their histories and modify them only slightly over long periods of time. But, taking its cue from the biblical material, the X-Factor is more pragmatic than idealistic. It encourages, even requires, difference in mechanism of appropriation as long as these mechanisms produce the intended results: attraction and accountability, encounter and remembrance. As already stated,
communities of faith—holiness and otherwise—have long practiced these types of mechanisms whether intentionally or unintentionally, sometimes with remarkable effect.79 Still, what seems to have been missing is the theoretical support for these practices and especially the motivation (communication and memory) that lies behind them.

This, in sum, is what the X-Factor is about and what it does. In my judgment, it has the potential to help traditions maintain their distinctives while at the same time communicating their message to a broader audience and to the next generation. If so, maybe that nasty little X in "Generation X" will turn out to be positive after all. Who knows? Perhaps the notion of the X-Factor will help all generations "proclaim God's holiness to all eternally" (Amidah 3).80

NOTES
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4. The translation used here and throughout is the NRSV, though I have sometimes modified it. In this case, the emphatic (adjective-first position) word order for the term "holy" (דָּבֶד and פִּי, respectively) in the Hebrew text should be noted.

5. On this text, and especially its relationship to Leviticus and the issues discussed in this paper, see Paul J. Achtemeier, I Peter: A Commentary on First Peter; ed. E. J. Epp, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), pp. 117-22.

6. Many texts, of course, could be appealed to here. Cf., e.g., Lev. 11:44-45, 20:26; Matt. 5:48; 2 Cor. 6:17; Col. 1:21-22; 1 Thess. 4:1-9; 1 Pet 2:9-10; Heb. 12:14.

7. See also Ezek. 28:22, 25 (Oracle against Sidon); and 39:27. The only other instance of this particular verbal form is Lev. 22:32, a text that is also pertinent to the discussion.


15. Alternatively, one could use a linguistic analogy and use the terms "grammar" and "vocabulary" for *esprit* and *mentalite*, respectively. In this scenario, the grammar remains constant (or similar) across various dialects or languages even while the vocabulary changes. I thank Steven T. Hoskins for suggesting this alternative terminology.


19. Gammie, *Holiness in Israel*, pp. 69, 196-97. For instance, the first part of the Chronicler's History places "less emphasis on the typically priestly insistence on separation from other peoples than in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah" (p. 196).

21 Gammie, Holiness in Israel, p. 197 (emphasis his).

22. See, e.g., Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), passim, especially pp. 176-77: "It does not take long to show how sharply Jesus rejected all attempts to realize the community of the remnant by means of human striving or separation. . . . Jesus does not gather the holy remnant, but the all-embracing community of salvation of God's new people." More recently, E. P. Sanders has also underscored the inclusive; nature of Jesus' mission to and calling of "the sinners" (Jesus and Judaism [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], especially pp. 174-211).

23. E.g., Marcus J. Borg, Jesus: A New Vision: Spirit, Culture, and the Life of Discipleship (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1987), pp. 126-27. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, p. 220: "But the overwhelming impression is that Jesus started a movement which came to see the Gentile mission as a logical extension of itself" (emphasis his). Sanders goes on to say, however, that "[w]e need not think that Jesus imparted to his disciples any view at all about the Gentiles and the kingdom" (p. 221).


25. Cf. Gammie, Holiness in Israel, p. 196: "Each of these groups set forth its teaching in response to holiness and what holiness had impressed upon their hearts and minds. No claim of exclusive apprehension of holiness and the requirements of holiness is possible for anyone of the three groups. The lessons for contemporary religious denominations that look to the Scripture for guidance are obvious."


27. See note 3 above.
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ed. J. A. Emerton, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 41 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990), pp. 177-208. In addition to sociology and anthropology, psychological studies of religious experience can also be extremely illuminating in matters such as these.

29. For Old Testament studies see, among others, the work of Robert Wilson, Walter Brueggemann, and Norman Gottwald. Gottwald has been something of a pioneer in this area in Old Testament studies and has, in turn, provided impetus to scholars like Brueggemann. In addition to Gottwald's many articles on various subjects, note especially The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sodology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 B.C. (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979) and The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985). New Testament scholarship has also benefited from social-scientific approaches. See, e.g., the work of Gerd Theissen, Howard Clark Kee, Bruce Malina, Jerome Neyrey, Carolyn Osiek, and John Elliot to name a few.


33. See especially von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I:206 for this criticism of Otto.

34. It is often said that separation is part of the etymological meaning of Hebrew נָצַר (e.g., Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1979], p. 871; TDNT 1:89; Douglas, Purity and Danger, p. 49; and much secondary literature). More recent lexic, however, have rightly questioned this. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner (The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, rev. by Walter Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm, trans. M. E. J. Richardson, 4 vols. [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996-1999], 3:1072), for instance, indicate that נָצַר is "an original verb, which can only with difficulty be traced back to a root נָצַר 'to cut'; [nevertheless] if this is the case the basic meaning of נָצַר would be 'to set apart.'" Yet, even if the conception of "separate-ness" is etymologically debated for נָצַר, at the very least this notion is clearly involved on the semantic level.

35. This definition is more idiomatic or colloquial than Webster's which defines an X-factor as "a relevant but unidentified factor" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged, ed. Philip Babcock Gove [Springfield: Merriam-Webster, 1993], p. 2644) and The Compact Oxford English Dictionary [hereafter OED], 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 2353 which notes that the word was originally a military term, referring to "the aspects of a serviceman's life that have no civilian equivalent; pay made in recognition of these."

36. Perhaps, one of the more powerful and controversial X's in recent memory is found in the person of Malcolm Little who upon conversion to the Nation of Islam changed his last name to X. The X in Malcolm's case symbolized the renunciation of a former "slavemaster name" and the anonymity or loss of one's "true African family name that had been taken from every African brought
to America as a slave. Adding an 'X to one's name, therefore, is a public sign, a testimony against the legacy of slavery, where freed slaves either took on the names of their former slavemasters or created new names entirely" (Garth Kasimu Baker-Fletcher, Xodus: An African-American Male Journey [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996], p. 75; emphasis mine). Recently, Baker-Retcher has used the X, especially Malcolm's, as a symbol to invigorate African-American male spirituality "outside of the moral parameters and definitions of European space." See his "Xodus Musings: Reflections on Womanist Tar Baby Theology," Theology Today 50 (1993):38-44, especially p. 43 and, more recently, Xodus, especially pp. xv-xvi, 73-91, and 175-94. Note the proclamatory function of the X in his work.


38. Eg., Lev. 18:5, 6, 21; 20:7; 21:12; 22:2, 3, 8, 9, 30, 31, 33; 23:22; 24:22; 25:17; 26:2, 45; etc.; cf. 11 :44-45.


40. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, p. 38: "In his action in history Yahweh sets himself before his people and the world in his own person. All that which is preached by the prophet as an event which is apparently neutral in its meaning has its purpose in that Israel and the nations should come to a recognition, which in the Old Testament also means an acknowledgement, of this person who reveals himself in his name. All Yahweh's action which the prophet proclaims serves as a proof of Yahweh among the nations" (emphasis mine).

41. Cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, p. 40: 'The whole direction of the prophetic preaching is a summons to a knowledge and recognition of him who, in his action announced by the prophet, shows himself to be who he is in the free sovereignty of his prophecy."

42. Primarily in the essay "I am Yahweh" (in I Am Yahweh, pp. 1-28). Zimmerli does point out, however, that the presence of this formula in the Holiness Code makes the latter quite significant: "A comparison of the Holiness Code with Ezekiel 20:7 makes it clear that this indefatigable repetition of 'ny yhwh at the end of individual statements or smaller groups of statements in the legal offerings is not to be understood as thoughtlessly strewn decoration; rather, this repetition pushes these legal statements into the most central position from which the Old Testament can make any statement. Each of these small groups of legal maxims thereby becomes a legal communication out of the heart of the Old Testament revelation of Yahweh. Each one of these small units offers in its own way a bit of explication of the central self-introduction of Yahweh, the God who summons his people--or better, recalling Leviticus 18ff. (and Ezek. 20), the God who sanctifies his people" (I Am Yahweh, p. 12; emphasis mine). This should caution those Christians--scholars and otherwise--who would passover the Holiness Code too quickly and ignore it in theological (and even ethical) reflection.

43. Interestingly, Wenham, Leviticus, pp. 261-75 entitles chapter 19 "Principles of Neighborliness."


46. This is not to downplay the sociological and theological similarities that, as is well-known,
abound between Israel and her neighbors in the ancient Near East. The prophetic "cleanness" of social justice for instance (so Gammie) could also be incorporated under difference, but in so doing one would need to be cognizant that the emphasis on social justice is fairly typical in the ancient world (see, e.g., Moshe Weinfeld, *Social Justice in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995]). Even so, Psalm 82 may be an important text at this point.

47. See Lev. 11:7; cf. Deut 14:8. See further Douglas, *Purity and Danger* pp. 43-45 for "medical" and "meaningless/arbitrary/irrational" interpretations of Leviticus, especially the dietary laws. Douglas herself opts for reasons relating to locomotion. Firtmage ("The Biblical Dietary Laws," pp. 177-208) has challenged this and offered, in its place, an interpretation based on the connection (or lack thereof) of the entire animal world to established sacrificial animals. Whatever the case, one might note that, while pork was prohibited in Israel, it was eaten by persons in close proximity to Israel (notably the Philistines), apparently with no harmful result on the eating of pork in antiquity generally, see recently Brian Hesse and Paula Wapnish, "Can Pig Remains Be Used for Ethnic Diagnosis" in the Ancient Near East?" in *The Archaeology of Israel: Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*, eds. Neil Asher Silberman and David Small, JSOTSupp 237 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997). The point being stressed here, however, is that there may be no inherent reason for these laws other than to produce the dynamic outlined above.

48. The notion is certainly not altogether new. Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669), for instance, in his *Summa doctrina de foedere et tesamento Dei* (1648) included the Mosaic law in the covenant of grace, partially because "it separated the Hebrews as the bearers of the kingdom from the surrounding heathen groups and so preserved the people for Christ" (Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology*, p. 21). Note George Adam Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament* (New York: A C. Armstrong and Son, 1901), p. 142: 'We have seen that the gradual ethical development, which thus differentiated Israel from her neighbors, appears to have begun with the introduction to the nations of Jahweh as their God; and that every stage of its progress was achieved in connection with some impression of His character. It seems to me that there are here the lines of an apologetic, for a Divine Revelation through early Israel, more sure and clear than any which the traditional interpretation of the Old Testament ever attempted to lay down" (emphasis mine); and see also Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989), p. 257: 'The gulf between the sacred and the profane was not meant to be permanent The command to achieve holiness, to become holy, envisions a time when all nations would worship God in holiness. What began as a process of separating the sacred from the profane was to end as the unification of human experience, the harmonizing of man with his universe, and of man with God" (emphasis mine).

49. The communicative function of legislation is exponentially increased in the probable historical location of much of the Priestly writing namely, the Babylonian Exile. It is in that context that much of the legislation (certainly earlier than the sixth century in origin if not composition) takes on new significance as it functions to differentiate a small, foreign minority group from a larger, dominant host society. See further on this situation Smith, *The Religion of the Landless* and Rainer Albertz, "The. History of Israelite Religion in the Exilic Penod," in *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, 2 vols., OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 2:369-436. On this point, note Psalm 137 and Daniel 3 and 6--texts that indicate that worship itself was an X-Factor in the diaspora.


52. Even those skeptical of the argument here should note that in Ezekiel the proof-saying is often used for the nations' knowledge of Yahweh. Cf. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:236-37: "This 'manifestation' is therefore much more than simply something inward or spiritual; it is an event which comes about in the full glare of the political scene, and which can be noticed by foreign nations as well as by Israel. . . . The final goal of the divine activity is therefore that Jahweh should be recognised and worshipped by those who so far have not known him or who still do not know him properly."


54. I am indebted to Dr. Rueben Welch for this terminology.


57. Zimmerli is certainly right to caution against overinterpreting "the delight of your eyes" (Zimmerli, Ezekiel I, p. 505), but at the same time, the Hebrew is at least somewhat excessive. After all, might be could have been used just as easily.

58. Of course, the resulting oracle shows that it applies to both, but the second person forms in Ezek. 24:15-17 are singular, while those in 24:21-24 are plural.


62. This is rather obvious, but note also the "house of mourning" (דִּמְרָצ) in Jer. 16:5. The Hebrew term marze(a)h is rare in the Hebrew Bible. It does occur, however, in other ancient Near Eastern literatures, including that of Ugarit (2nd millennium BCE; see especially KTU 3.9), where it apparently refers to some sort of funerary association. What Yahweh forbids, therefore, is nothing less than a long-standing, cross-cultural tradition. See further Theodore J. Lewis, Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit, Harvard Semitic Monographs 39 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) and Brian B. Schmidt, Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and
Tradition (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995).


64. Note especially on this point that Jer. 16:14-21 switches to the theme of restoration and climaxes in w. 19-21 with the "conversion of the nations" (Craigie, Kelley, and Drinkard, Jeremiah 1-25, p. 216; cf. Wilham L. Holladay, Jeremiah I: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 1-25, ed. Paul D. Hanson, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986], pp. 480-81). Note also the use of the proof-saying in Ezekiel for the nations' knowledge of Yahweh and cf. above on the (heightened) significance of difference in Exile.

65. "Negative" primarily in that it involves abstention from practices engaged in by surrounding cultures. Even so, it goes without saying that at times separation is offensive and that part of the encounter with the holy may involve dread fascination.

66. See Douglas, Purity and Danger, p. 51 on the Holy as wholeness and completeness, not just separation.

67. See especially Douglas, Natural Symbols; Smith, The Religion of the Landless.


69. Cf. Budd, Numbers, 178: "In the wider context they [w. 32-36] function as a fitting conclusion to the section dealing with Israel's sin, specifically the rejection of the land in Num 14, but more generally the whole section of disaffection in Num 11-14. The tassels ought to be a safeguard against these besetting sins."

70. Budd, Numbers, p. 177 entitles this section "Tassels of Remembrance." Cf. the dual aspects of remembrance and encounter in Baker-Aetcher, Xodus, p. 75: 'The 'X' in this way is a prophetic symbol of retrieval and remembrance" and has impact not only for African Americans, but also for Euro-Americans.

71. Cf. Richard Valantasis' comments on asceticism and the Gospel of Thomas, which exemplify the kind of dynamic I am talking about here: "At the heart of asceticism is the desire to create a new person as a minority person within a larger religious culture. In order to create a new person, there must be a withdrawal from the dominant modes of articulating subjectivity in order to create free space for something else to emerge. A redefinition of social relationships must also emerge from the new understanding of the new subjectivity, as well as a concurrent change in the symbolic universe to justify and support the new subjectivity. These are all accomplished through a rigorous set of intentional performances. . . . My perspective on asceticism looks not only at the negative performances (rejecting wealth, or sexuality), [termed in this paper negative difference or separation] but primarily toward the positive articulation of the new subjectivity that the gospel presents ('becoming a single one,' for example) [termed in this paper positive difference or accountability]. This positive perspective promotes a constructive reading of the text, so that all performances (whether negative or positive) are interpreted in the context of the larger project of creating an alternative identity within a larger and more dominant religious environment" (Richard Valantasis, The Gospel of Thomas, New Testament Readings, ed. John Court [New York: Routledge, 1997], pp. 22-23).

72. I'd like to thank Shane Berg for bringing this point to my attention and discussing it with me. Jacob Milgrom, Levitiacus I-16, Anchor Bible 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), p. 230.

74. I hope in this way to get around the devastating critique of Christian interpretations of Old Testament legal material raised by Jon D. Levenson, The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), pp. 52-53, 54. My proposal does argue for an appropriation of the legal material that is, in some ways, a legal and therefore Christian/Protestant and subject to Levenson's critique. Yet at the same time, my proposal is also trying to do justice to those same laws and situations, especially the
dynamic at work within them and thus does not, or so it seems to me, fall under Levenson's judgment.

75. I'd like to thank David Stubbs for bringing this point to my attention and discussing it with me.

76. Cf. Lev. 20:26; Isa. 31:3, 8 (cf. 10:15); Hos. 11:9; etc., as well as Karl Barth's comments in the preface to the second edition of his Romans commentary: "My reply is that, if I have a system, it is limited to a recognition of what Kierkegaard called the 'infinite qualitative distinction' between time and eternity, and to my regarding this as possessing negative as well as positive significance God is in heaven, and thou art on earth" (Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns [London: Oxford University Press, 1968], p. 10). More recently, see Moltmann, The Source of Life, pp. 43-45.

77. See OED, p. 2352; cf. Baker-Fletcher, Xodus, pp. xvi, 8D-81. Note that Greek x, like XP, can be an abbreviation for Christ (OED, p. 2353).


79. Note, for instance, the Nation of Islam's moral code (for some of its forbidden and positive aspects, see Baker-Fletcher, Xodus, p. 77; cf. p. xvi) and the impact this group has made on some of the worst inner-city situations of urban America. I would also mention various practices found among the Mormons (the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints): special ("holy") undergarments (accountability?), OR ("choose the right") rings (attraction?), and so forth. Often Christian youth culture is effective at selecting these types of practices: witness the WWJD ('What Would Jesus Do?') paraphernalia for sale at Christian book stores. For a different example, cf. the comments of Richard Swinburne, "The Vocation of a Natural Theologian," in Philosophers Who Believe: The Spiritual Journeys of 11 Leading Thinkers, ed. Kelly James Clark (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), pp. 179-202 who discusses the practice of philosophy and the public identification of oneself as both a Christian and a philosopher in similar terms.
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Homosexuality and the Old Testament

P. Michael Ukleja

Only towering cynicism can pretend that there is any doubt about what the Scriptures say about homosexuality. The Bible has not even the slightest hint of ambiguity about what is permitted or forbidden in this aspect of sexual conduct.

God loves people and wants them to come to the wholeness and joy for which they were made. His prohibitions are not the house rules of a sadistic and capricious Deity who mocks mankind by tormenting him with desires and then forbidding him from doing anything about them.

Biblical prohibitions are bright signposts that point people straight toward fullness and joy. They warn people away from spiritual and emotional detours, mires, quicksand, and cliffs. All sexual sins represent some failure on society's part to stick to God's path. Fornication fails to honor the image of God in the other person, for it sees the other only as a commodity. Adultery violates the shrine of marital fidelity which houses and keeps sacred the sexual expression. Incest is the effort to achieve union with an image too close to oneself. The relationship is not sufficiently "other" to make the transaction valid. Beastiality is the effort to achieve union with an image too different from oneself. Masturbation, while not explicitly cited in Scripture as sin, involves a failure to appreciate fully the use of sex which is surely more than a matter of mere orgasm. And homosexuality is a confusion, since it involves the effort of achieving union with a "mirror" image of oneself. This "other" is not sufficiently differ-
Homosexuality and the Sin of Sodom

Two angels who came to Lot in Sodom were threatened by a mob (Gen. 19:4-11). What were the men of Sodom seeking when they called on Lot to bring out the men "that we may know them" (19:5, KJV)? Some conclude that the story has no reference to homosexual acts at all. Bailey seeks to justify homosexuality from the Old Testament in his work *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*. Others (for example, Boswell) use Bailey's arguments concerning this passage. Bailey was an Anglican scholar whose work influenced the change in British law regarding this issue. This work is fast becoming a standard reference work for the prohomosexual viewpoint.

Bailey believes that much of Christian prejudice against homosexuality is the result of misunderstanding the story of Sodom in Genesis 19. He argues that the men of Sodom were anxious to interrogate the strangers to find out if they were spies. Therefore, he argues, the story does not refer to homosexuality at all. The sin involved was not homosexuality, but gang rape. Lot had angered these residents by receiving foreigners whose credentials had not been examined. The men were angered by this omission, and were showing extreme discourtesy to these visitors by demanding to know their credentials. Bailey argues that the demand of the men of Sodom to "know" the strangers in Lot's house meant nothing more than their desire to "get acquainted with" them. The problem, argues Bailey, was nothing more than inhospitality. Others, including Blair, have expanded on this argument.

The Biblical story demonstrates the seriousness with which these early Eastern people took the important customs of Oriental hospitality. It appears that, if necessary, they would even allow their own daughters to undergo abuse in order to protect guests. The sexual aspect of the story is simply the vehicle in which the subject of demanded hospitality is conveyed. It is clearly interpreted in Ezekiel 16:49: "Behold, this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had pride, surfeit of food, and prosperous ease, but did not aid the poor and needy."

The Hebrew word for "know" (יַדָּעַ, yada'‫ת‬), Bailey points out, can be translated "to get acquainted with" or "to have knowledge of" or
"to have intercourse with." The word $\text{yādā}$ appears over 943 times in the Old Testament and only 12 times does it mean "to have intercourse with." He also states that intercourse, as a means to personal knowledge, depends on more than copulation. Therefore, he argues, the circumstances in Sodom could not fit the sexual connotation of the word "know." He concludes by reasoning from the fact that Lot was a $\text{rūg}$, a resident foreigner. As such, Lot had exceeded his rights by receiving two foreigners whose credentials had not been examined.\(^5\)

The first problem with this argument is the fact that the meaning of a word in a given passage is not determined solely on the basis of the number of times it is translated that way in the Bible. The context determines how it is to be translated. Of the 12 times the word $\text{yādā}$ occurs in Genesis, 10 times it means "to have intercourse with." Kidner offers the following rebuttal to Bailey's arguments.

To this we may reply: (a) Statistics are no substitute for contextual evidence (otherwise the rarer sense of the word would never seem probable), and in both these passages the demand to "know" is used in its sexual sense (Gn. 19:8; Jdg. 19:25). Even apart from this verbal conjunction it would be grotesquely inconsequent that Lot should reply to a demand for credentials by an offer of daughters. (b) Psychology can suggest how "to know" acquired its secondary sense; but in fact the use of the word is completely flexible. No one suggests that in Judges 19:25 the men of Gibeah were gaining "knowledge" of their victim in the sense of personal relationship, yet "know" is the word used of them. (c) Conjecture here has the marks of special pleading for it substitutes a trivial reason ("commotion . . . inhospitality") for a serious one for the angels' decision. Apart from this, it is silenced by Jude 7, a pronouncement which Dr. Bailey has to discount as belonging to a late stage of interpretation.\(^6\)

The whole scene in Genesis 19 takes on near-comic proportions if Lot, on hearing the demand of the crowd that they wished to "get acquainted with" the men in his house, said, "Please, my brothers, do not act wickedly. Now behold, I have two daughters who have not known a man; please let me bring them out to you and do to them as is good in your sight, only do nothing to these men. . ." (author's translation). In verse 8 the same verb, $\text{yādā}$, with the negative particle is used to describe Lot's daughters as having "not known" a man. The verb here obviously means "have intercourse with." It could hardly mean simply "be acquainted with." In narrative literature of this sort it would be very unlikely to use one verb with two different meanings so close together
unless the author made the difference quite obvious. In both verses 5 and 8 *yóú* should be translated "to have sexual intercourse with." The context does not lend itself to any other credible interpretation.

Jude 7 gives a commentary on this passage. It clearly states that the sin of Sodom involved gross immorality and going after strange or different flesh (*σαρκάς ἐπεραζ*). It is no accident that Jude describes their actions by using *ἐκπορνευόμενοι*. The verb *πορνεύω* definitely refers to sexual immorality and the preposition *ἐκ* explains that it means that "they gave themselves up fully, without reserve, thoroughly, out and out, utterly." The term "strange flesh" could imply unnatural acts between men or even of human beings with animals. The inhabitants of Canaan were guilty of both of these sins (Lev. 18:23-29). This definitely includes the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. History and archaeology confirm these same conditions. Josephus, who wrote around A.D. 99-100, said that the Sodomites "hated strangers and abused themselves with sodomitical practices."

Boswell says that Lot was following local customs in offering his daughters to appease the angry mob. "No doubt the surrender of his daughters was simply the most tempting bribe Lot could offer on the spur of the moment to appease the hostile crowd. . . . This action, almost unthinkable in modern Western society, was consonant with the very low status of female children at the time. . . ." But what Lot did was not right. Just because Lot offered his daughters to them in accordance with local customs does not mean that his action was morally acceptable in God's sight. It is much more probable that Lot's offer was motivated by the thought that however wrong rape is, homosexual rape was even worse. Lot's offer was simply what he thought to be the lesser of two evils.

**Homosexuality and the Mosaic Law**

**THE INJUNCTIONS IN THE LAW**

God's command concerning homosexuality is clear: "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination (Lev. 18:22). This is expanded in Leviticus 20:13. "If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act. . . ." These passages are set in the context of God's judgment on sexual crimes and are an expansion of the seventh commandment.
Moses was not trying to establish an exhaustive code on the subject of sexuality; rather he was dealing with certain gross offenses of the seventh commandment that were common in the nations surrounding Israel at the time.

Prohomosexual advocates usually dismiss these passages by relegating them to simple religious prohibitions rather than taking them as moral prohibitions. Blair exhibits this line of reasoning.

That the very pronounced Old Testament judgment against a man's having sexual relations with another man is included in the priestly Holiness Code of Leviticus (18:22 and 20:13) is significant because the concern of the priests was one of ritual purity. It was not the moral preaching of the prophets. From this priestly point of view, it is clear that above all else, Israel was to be uncontaminated by her pagan neighbors. In all things, she was to remain a separate "pure vessel unto the Lord." At this time, male prostitutes in the temples of the Canaanites, Babylonians, and other neighboring peoples, were common features of the pagan rites. There, it is understandable that this "homosexuality" connected with the worship of false gods would certainly color Israel's perspective on any and all homosexual activity.10

Blair, and those who follow his line of thinking, assume that ritual purity and moral preaching are always distinct. Therefore the passages in Leviticus, they argue, are not really speaking against homosexuality as such, but only against identifying with the practice of alien religions. The issue was religious identity, not the righteousness of God.

But this type of reasoning begs the question on several counts. The first major fault is in assuming that ritual purity and moral purity are always distinct. Those who make this dichotomy argue that Leviticus 18 and 20 cannot be of an ethical or moral nature. Blair states this when he divides the priests with their ritual purity and the prophets with their moral teaching into two groups that were not to transgress each other's territory. But the prophets preached to the needs of their day. Anything not included in their teaching is more logically explained by that particular sin's absence among the sins of that generation, rather than by a rigid distinction between ceremonial and moral purity. To hold to such a distinction one would have to conclude that adultery was not morally wrong (18:20), child sacrifice had no moral implications (18:21), and that nothing is inherently evil with bestiality (18:23). The point is that ceremonial purity and moral purity often coincide.
These passages, again, are consistent with God's purpose for human sexuality, as presented in Genesis 1-3. When these passages are studied, it becomes obvious that God's purpose is to preserve the sanctity of marriage and the home.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE LAW

Prohomosexual advocates spend much effort and time trying to show the irrelevance of the Law to Christians today. Scanzoni and Mollenkott are an example of this. “Consistency and fairness would seem to dictate that if the Israelite Holiness Code is to be invoked against twentieth-century homosexuals, it should likewise be invoked against such common practices as eating rare steak, wearing mixed fabrics, and having marital intercourse during the menstrual period.”11 Blair follows Scanzoni and Mollenkott in arguing that the Old Testament Law must be thrown out when seeking a guide to the issue of homosexuality.

It is interesting how lightly evangelicals have taken other proscriptions found in the same Old Testament Code, e.g.: rules against the eating of rabbit (Lev. 11:26), oysters, clams, shrimp, and lobster (Lev. 11:10ff), and rare steaks (Lev. 17:10). Evangelicals do not picket or try to close down seafood restaurants nor do we keep kosher kitchens. We do not always order steaks "well-done." We eat pork and ham. The wearing of clothes made from interwoven linen and wool (Deut. 22:11) does not seem to bother us at all. Evangelicals do not say, in accordance with these same laws of cultic purification (Lev. 20:13), that those who practice homosexual activity should be executed as prescribed. Evangelicals do not demand the death penalty for the Jeane Dixons of this world (Lev. 20:27) nor do we "cut off" from among the people, as is demanded by this same Code, those who have intercourse with women during menstruation (Lev. 20:18) and those who marry women who have been divorced (Lev. 21:14). Evangelicals do not keep out of the pulpit those who are visually handicapped or lame or those "with a limb too long" (Lev. 21:18ff).12

These statements expose a great ignorance of how the Law fits into the total scheme of the Scriptures. When taken to their logical conclusion these assertions make it possible to say that having sex with animals or engaging in incest is okay for today simply because homosexuality is sandwiched between these two prohibitions. These writers pay a great price in trying to justify their position. It would have been easier for them to say that Christ brought an end to the entire Law (Rom. 10:4). The Ten Commandments are also included in this termination (2 Cor. 3:7-11). Christ is now the Christian's High Priest, which shows
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that a radical change in the Law has come about (Heb. 7:11). The Law has been superseded (Heb. 7:11).

When the statement is made that the Law had ended, this does not mean that God no longer has any laws or codes for His people. This does not mean that there are no moral precepts to be followed. The New Testament speaks of the "law of the Spirit" (Rom. 8:2), the "law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2), and the "royal law" (James 2:8). This "law" includes numerous commands, both positive and negative, which form a distinct code of ethics for today. It is here that the prohomosexual exegetes have made their mistake. As a unit the New Testament code is new, but not all the commands in the New Testament are new. There is overlap, deletion, and addition. Some of the commands in the Mosaic code have been reincorporated into the New Testament code.

But if the Law was done away, how can parts of it be repeated in the New Testament? The answer lies in the distinction between the Old Testament code and the commandments which were contained in that code.

The Mosaic law has been done away in its entirety as a code. God is no longer guiding the life of man by this particular code. In its place He has introduced the law of Christ. Many of the individual commands within that law are new, but some are not. Some of the ones which are old were also found in the Mosaic law and they are now incorporated completely and forever done away. As part of the law of Christ they are binding on the believer today.

This throws much light on the statements made by those who would justify homosexuality from a biblical standpoint. It serves to bring their emotional rhetoric into proper focus. The laws concerning diet, punishment by stoning, or wearing mixed fabrics have been abrogated. However, the proscriptions against homosexual behavior have been repeated in the New Testament code (Rom. 1:26-27; 1 Cor. 6:9-11; 1 Tim. 1:9-10). This should be a major concern of prohomosexual advocates simply because it totally destroys the point they attempt to make with regard to the Old Testament law. It is false to say that something which was sin under the Law is no longer sin under grace.

What this all means is that the commands dealing with homosexuality in Leviticus 18:23 and 20:13 are still highly relevant because they have been reincorporated into the New Testament code. A moral unity exists between the Old and New Testaments. It has always been wrong to murder, rape, steal, to have sexual relations with animals, and to have sexual relations with
persons of the same sex. God has dealt with people in different ways at different times, but His standard for righteousness has never changed. If morality has changed then the character of God has changed, because the basis of morality is in the character of God who is immutable (Mal. 3:6).

Notes

4 Ibid., p. 4.
5 Ibid., pp. 3-5.
8 Josephus, quoted in Wolff, ibid., pp. 76-77.
12 Blair. *An Evangelical Look at Homosexuality*, p. 3.
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The Significance of the Sabbath

Merrill F. Unger

THE Sabbath is not Sunday, nor does the latter represent a mere change from the seventh day to the first day of the week. Sunday, the first day of the week, is a wholly new day instituted to commemorate the beginning of the new creation with the resurrected Christ as its Head.

The only similarity of Sunday to the Sabbath is that it perpetuates under grace the principle that, although all redeemed man's time is God's, one seventh is to be especially sacred and ought to be set aside in voluntary gratitude for the purpose of worship and for ministry for God in behalf of men's spiritual needs, and for rest and recuperation for the body, soul, and spirit.

In all other respects Sunday is in contrast to the Sabbath. Even in the matter of preserving the principle that one seventh of redeemed man's time is especially sacred to God, there is a radical difference between the two days. One is observed on the basis of gratitude and spontaneous love. The other on the basis of strict legal obligation, infringement punishable by death. One calls to devotion in worship and consecrated work, rest being a secondary benefit. The other entotal rest from all work.

THE SABBATH AND CREATION

The Biblical Sabbath commemorates God's rest or cessation from His creative work of refashioning the earth (Gen. 1:1-31) for the habitation of His masterpiece--unfallen men (Gen. 2:2-3). The reason God could "rest" was because He saw that everything He had made, including man, "was very good" (Gen. 1:31). Sin had not yet entered the abode God refashioned for man nor into man's heart. Therefore, God
could and did "rest."

It was to memorialize His finished work of refashioning a chaotic and judgment-ridden earth (Gen. 1:2) that God established and sanctified the seventh day. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which God created and made. And God blessed the seventh day." He made and declared it especially sacred, attaching to it the memorial that He was satisfied with all that He had done in making it a suitable abode for man and that He was pleased with man whom He had created to occupy it.

God is also said to have "sanctified" the seventh day by setting it apart as a day of rest from the other six days of work, thus distinguishing it as a reminder to unfallen man that God had created him innocent and free of sin. The Creator's rest was possible because the creature He had made rested in perfect and unbroken fellowship with the Creator, undisturbed by sin. God therefore revealed and imposed the sanctity of the Sabbath upon *unfallen* man.

Soon, however, the fall occurred (Gen. 3:1-24). Man sinned and his rest in fellowship with the Creator was broken as well as God's rest in a creation unsullied by sin, which He could no longer pronounce "very good" (Gen. 1:31).

Man's fall consequently made it impossible for God to impose the seventh day upon fallen man because the very thing memorialized, namely, the divine rest in a "very good" creation, had been destroyed by the entrance of sin into the human race. No longer was God's creation "very good." No longer could God rest in the old creation. He must begin to work in redemption toward a New Creation.

Hence the Sabbath revealed and imposed at the beginning upon an unfallen race vanishes from the pages of revealed truth in the long era from Adam to Moses, appearing with startling suddenness in connection with the revelation of the law from Sinai. There Sabbath observance was not only made a part of the Mosaic code (Ex. 20:8-11), but constituted its unique and dominant feature as a significant sign between the Lord and His newly chosen and *redeemed* nation Israel (Ex. 31:12-18).

Through this elect redeemed nation God had a special pur-
pose in restoring His Sabbath rest disturbed by sin. Therefore, the Sabbath was revealed anew and imposed upon a redeemed elect nation, through which the earth and man eventually would be restored to the rest the day commemorated. As the Sabbath was originally imposed upon unfallen man, now it is imposed upon a nation of redeemed men, destined to fulfill "God's purposes of restoration for the earth and the nations.

Despite the fact that God never enjoined the Sabbath upon fallen mankind, but only upon the race before it fell into sin and broke His Sabbath rest, it is apparent that fallen man from Adam to Moses attempted to observe the seventh day without divine sanction.

The seven-day week and the Sabbath are a very ancient Semitic institution, prominent in Assyrian-Babylonian civilization, antedating the time of Moses by many centuries. The so-called Pinches tablet lays restrictions upon the king on the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th days of the month (the 19th marking the Sabbath of weeks). However, apparently no restrictions were placed upon ordinary men, but only upon the king as divine, and the Sabbath being for replenishment.¹

The oldest calendar of the Semitic peoples, in use long before the Mosaic era, was also based upon a seven-day week, with a secondary time unit of fifty days. It consisted of seven weeks, plus one additional day, celebrated as a festival of conclusion or termination of the fifty-day period. Agricultural in nature, this reckoning of time was made up of seven pentecontads (fifties) plus two festival periods of seven days (one week) with a concluding day of supremely sacred character, 365 days in all.²

Among pagan Semites this farm calendar was of course interwoven with idolatry. From it the ancient Babylonian Sabbath (shabattu) was derived. When the Lord redeemed Israel out of Egypt, and gave them the Mosaic laws, He employed existing time reckonings and customs, purifying and adapting them when possible to the special revelation of His redemptive truth to His chosen people Israel. This fact appears in the historical and archaeological backgrounds underlying Israel's festal calendar (Lev. 23).

² Morgenstern, "Sabbath," The Interpreter's Bible, IV, 135-36.
THE SABBATH AND SINAI

The fourth commandment given from Sinai enjoining the holy observance of the seventh day is unique in the Decalogue (Ex. 20:8). Although this law, like all the moral laws expressed in the Ten Commandments, had been revealed and was operative upon the human race from its creation, this commandment alone had been enjoined only upon unfallen man (Gen. 2:2-3). All the other nine commandments had been operative upon unfallen man and remained unchangeably operative upon fallen man as well, since God's holy requirements of His creatures are as unchangeable as His holy character.

But the Sabbath day was different. Its original significance as a day commemorating God's rest and satisfaction in a perfect creation was nullified by the fall and man's sin. No longer was the old creation, notably man the crown and goal of that creation, "very good" (Gen. 1:31). Instead it was very bad, and God immediately began working in redemption (Gen. 3:15, 21; John 5:17) to restore the divine rest disturbed by man's sin.

As a result God could not impose the Sabbath rest upon His fallen creatures when the very thing commemorated by it had been obliterated by sin. He now began working in redemption, no longer resting in a perfect creation. Only as He could choose and redeem a people through whom He could restore the earth and man from the curse of sin that had broken His rest, could He impose Sabbath observance that would be consonant with the true meaning of the day.

The fourth commandment from Sinai enjoining Sabbath observance is not only unique in the Decalogue. This commandment, it must also be emphasized, was never imposed upon any nation or people except Israel. All the other commandments express eternal and omnitemporal moral principles obligatory upon all of God's creatures from the creation of man--before the fall as well as after the fall.

These abiding laws of God were not altered because man changed when he fell. God never changed, nor did His holy requirements of all His creatures. Nor are these eternally abiding principles to be abrogated or set aside in any age or dispensation. They are simply adapted and applied to the char-
acter of that particular age or dispensation.

All the moral principles thundered as stern law from Sinai find expression under grace in the New Testament epistles with the sole exception of one. Nowhere is Sabbath keeping ever imposed upon a Christian in this age of grace. Indeed, the very opposite is true.

Keeping new moons and sabbaths, the unique and dominant feature of the Mosaic covenant of legalism—a pedagogue conduct to Christ—is declared to be completely at variance with the gospel of grace (Col. 2:16-17; Gal. 4:9-10; Heb. 4:4) now that Christ has come and given us His wonderful salvation.

Although the Sabbath was never divinely imposed upon fallen man, the custom from Adam to Moses of setting apart the seventh day, like divinely ordained as well as nondivinely ordained customs in general, degenerated as the fallen race strayed from God and became engulfed in idolatry.

Instead of a day of rest reminiscent of the Creator's satisfaction in His fashioning of the earth for His unfallen creature, man, under the deterioration of creature worship the seventh day came to be looked upon as a day of ill-omen controlled by evil spirits in which labor would not only not succeed but stir up evil powers to work mischief on such activity.

In giving the Fourth Commandment to Israel, the Lord accordingly took a well-known day, which paganism looked upon with ill-omen and popular superstition, thereby desecrating it, and He sanctified it by restoring it to its original significance of commemorating the Creator's rest in a perfect creation, enjoining it upon His people recently redeemed out of Egypt (Ex. 20:1-2). Moreover, the Lord invested the day with suitable meaning as a sign that Israel was the Lord's blood-bought people, His own elect nation separated by redemption from the surrounding pagan nations and joined to the Lord, their Redeemer (I Cor. 10:2). Through this chosen delivered nation He would restore the earth and mankind, so that His divine rest, broken by man's fall, would be restored by redemption.

What the Lord never enjoined upon fallen man, nor upon the nations, at Sinai He imposed upon His one nation. He did
this because this nation was chosen to be an example of His redemptive power to all other nations sunk in idolatry, and its Sabbath was to be a badge that God's rest would eventually be restored through this people.

As circumcision had been given as a token or badge of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 17:9-13), so Sabbath observance was instituted as a sign and symbol of the Mosaic covenant to Israel (Ex. 31:13). This covenant marked Israel as a separated people through whom Messiah would come and God's rest would be restored through salvation brought to the nations and the earth.

Even in the latest period of the Jewish nation before its destruction in A.D. 70, Sabbath keeping was still regarded as the peculiar stamp of the Jew. Juvenal (c. A.D. 55-135), a Roman poet, notes this particularly in his famous Satires and the fact was well known and recognized in the ancient world.3

Moreover, since Sabbath observance was more than merely keeping a day, but actually a sign between the Lord and His chosen nation that He has established with them a perpetual covenant, profanation of the day was accordingly tantamount to violating the covenant.

For this reason Sabbath keeping was rigidly enforced. Infraction of it meant death (Ex. 31:14-15; Num. 15:32-35). Breaking the sign of the covenant, the offender broke the covenant itself. By this act he in essence denied that God's people Israel were different from the pagan nations. He thus violated the principle of separation. The penalty was his separation from God's people.

THE SABBATH AND PROPHETIC CONSUMMATION

The Sabbath was not only enjoined solely upon the nation Israel, never upon any other people since the fall, either the nations or the church or God. It was also enjoined as a reminder that God's creation rest would be restored through that nation. Israel's Sabbath had accordingly a double role, retrospective and prospective.

Retrospectively the Sabbath looked back and memorialized God's creation rest undisturbed by sin, when He finished the

3 VI, 159; XXII, 18-20.
earth for the habitation of unfallen man (Gen. 2:2-3). Prospectively it pointed ahead to Israel's future as a Messianic nation through which God's creation rest would be restored as a result of Christ's redeeming work received by that nation and mediated by it to all the nations of the earth in the future kingdom age (Isa. 11:10-16; 60:1-22; Acts 1:6; Rom. 11:26-36).

The Sabbath is now in abeyance because of Israel's unbelief and violation of it, occasioning her world-wide dispersion and long centuries of chastisement (Hos. 2:11). Upon the completion of God's ad interim purpose in the church, the Sabbath will be reinstituted in the tribulation (Matt. 24:20) and in the kingdom over Israel set up at Christ's return in glory (Rev. 19:11-20:8). Not until Israel's spiritual restoration will the nation realize the true meaning of its Sabbath (Isa. 66:23; Ezek. 46:1; cp. Deut. 30:8).

As a sign of a "perpetual covenant" between the Lord and the Israelite nation, the Sabbath points to the great consummation of God's purpose for the earth. This plan centers in restored Israel in ministry to the nations of the earth. Israel will be in the midst of the nations, and Christ will be in the midst of Israel, ruling "till he hath put all enemies under his feet" and delivers up "the kingdom to God, even the Father . . . that God may be all in all" (I Cor. 15:24-28).

At that grand finale God's creation rest will be restored through redemption. This redemption brought to mankind and the earth, so long cursed by sin, will be realized through His elect redeemed nation and the Redeemer it produced. Meanwhile the Sabbath imposed upon that nation is a sign and symbol to all the people of the earth that that nation was set apart from all others for this high and holy calling.
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