Zur Einleitung

Brenner, Athalya; Lee, Archie Chi Chung (ed.), Leviticus and Numbers (Texts@Contexts), Minneapolis 2013.
Published abstract: Leviticus and Numbers focus attention on practices and ideals of behavior in community, from mourning and diet to marriages licit and transgressive. The contributions to this collection of essays examine all of these from a variety of global perspectives and postcolonial and feminist methods. The authors ask, “How do we deal with the apparent cultural distances between ourselves and these ancient writings; what can we learn from their visions of human dwelling on the earth?” The essays come with an identification of the contributors, a preface by A. Brenner introducing the articles, a common bibliography (pp. 227-251), an author index, and a scripture index.


Published abstract: This paper highlights some issues encountered in commenting on Leuitikon 5–7. In these chapters in NETS some tricky moves were made to accommodate the translator’s response to Hebrew idiom. I intend to present a procedure for how one deals with syntactical and lexical difficulties in the body of a commentary such as the SBLCS. Tribute will be paid to Karl Huber’s Untersuchungen über den Sprachkarakter des griechischen Leviticus, published in 1916. In addition, these chapters begin giving attention to the matter of impurity, and some remarks will be made about this topic, with reference to Theodor Wächter’s Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult, published in 1910.

Published abstract: The Priestly Source makes no explicit reference to the demonic when describing pollution which supposedly sets it apart from non-biblical conceptualizations of impurity. Most scholars explain the Priestly disregard for demons by referring to the advance of monotheism and the subsequent eradication of supernatural forces other than God. Depending on whether monotheism is viewed as gradual process or as the foundation of Israelite religion, commentators either detect a weakened demonic quality in Priestly pollution or claim that the Priestly Source has always been of a non-demonic nature. However, in recent years the idea that monotheism pervades most books of the Hebrew Bible has been increasingly called into question. At the same time, the extensive publication of Assyro-Babylonian ritual texts allows for better understanding of Assyro-Babylonian conceptualizations of
impurity. These developments necessitate the reevaluation of the current views on Priestly pollution by examining Assyro-Babylonian texts pertaining to impurity and the demonic. Special attention is given to context and dating of the cuneiform sources used to exemplify the non-demonic nature of Priestly impurity. This renewed comparison of Priestly and Assyro-Babylonian impurity highlights how the Priestly writer frames the concepts of pollution within the context of the sanctuary and its maintenance. The Assyro-Babylonian texts dealing with impurity and demons, by contrast, focus on the individual and his/her relationship to the personal god rather than temple maintenance. Likewise, cuneiform texts that deal with pollution and temple maintenance do not concern themselves with demonic affliction. Consequently, it can be argued that the non-demonic nature of impurity in the Priestly Source is the result of the Priestly focus on the sanctuary and does not give witness to an underlying theological ideal.

Abstract: The Eucharist is the fundamental form of worship for all Christian denominations and confessions. The article examines the roots of Christ’s word about the cup and his blood. These roots lie at the heart of the prescriptions of the Book of Leviticus about sacrifices and atonement. The sacrifices in Leviticus invite to a joyful communication with the deity; the blood rituals clean humans and items used for the cult (the altars, the sanctuary) and thus achieve atonement. These traditional Jewish ideas form the basis for Christian soteriological concepts in the New Testament, especially for the Eucharist. To drink the wine as “blood of the covenant” is a process of consecration transmitting God’s peace and grace to human beings.

Published abstract: This article analyzes the primary terms for purity in Biblical Hebrew, Ugaritic, Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite. Building from insights from cognitive linguistics and embodiment theory, this study develops the premise that semantic structure—even of seemingly abstract concepts—is grounded in real-world bodily experience. An examination of purity terms reveals that all of them can be related to a concrete sense pertaining to radiance (brilliance, brightness, shininess). The article then traces the semantic development of purity terms in distinct experiential context and shows how semantic analysis can elucidate the inner logic of fundamental religious concepts.


Published abstract: Forty-five years after James Barr’s Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament appeared, it is time to reiterate his call for a balanced approach to philology and textual criticism. Though the essential issues are the same as when Barr wrote, the amount of textual data from the Dead Sea Scrolls as well as methodological challenges to the standard view of the linguistic history of ancient
Hebrew have produced a significantly more complex situation. As scholars move forward in both subdisciplines of Hebrew studies—textual criticism and historical linguistics—it is more critical than ever to keep in mind that the history of the text and the history of the language are inextricably bound to each other. Using two variants in Leviticus, I will illustrate what a reasonably balanced approach looks like from the perspective of a Hebrew linguist, with the hope that textual critics and Hebrew linguists will see the need to work more closely with each other.

Huber, Karl, Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus, Gießen 1916.


Published abstract: In the Priestly texts, holiness is understood both as an absolute and as a relative term to demarcate the hierarchy within the holy sphere. Rather than primarily redefining the term “holy,” the present work aims to determine the term’s function in describing spaces, objects, offerings, and people in the Priestly account. While there are several different levels of holiness for people, places, objects, and offerings, the Priestly writers have only two terms at their disposal, “holy” and “most holy,” which they use in a dizzying combination to situate elements hierarchically. Nonetheless, once the Priestly language is clarified, elements in the holy sphere fit into a fairly consistent hierarchy. Within this taxonomic system, people have access to spaces and objects of one level of holiness higher than they themselves possess. While accessing one degree higher is acceptable, two degrees proves fatal. The Priestly labels “holy” and “most holy” mediate access, express the privilege and unnaturalness of access, and indicate the consequences of improper contact, thereby safeguarding the divine abode from improper encroachment and humanity from the corresponding punishment.


Nihan, Christophe, The Priestly Laws of Numbers, the Holiness Legislation, and the Pentateuch, in: Frevel, Christian; Pola, Thomas; Schart, Aaron (Hg.), Torah and the Book of Numbers (FAT 2.62), Tübingen 2013, 109–137 (see OTA 37, 2014, 581–582 [no. 1936]).


Abstract: N. sketches a proposal for the history of origin of the Book of Leviticus. The central position of Leviticus within the Torah can be explained by its history of composition. Leviticus 1-16 marks the culmination of Priestly Narrative insofar as the
presence of God within the cult is restituted. This concept corresponds to Israel’s new self-understanding as a community of the temple that replaces the king as patron of the cult. In the course of the emerging Pentateuch, Leviticus 17-26 continues the temple-oriented cosmic restitution of God’s presence within Israel: The cultic category of “holiness” becomes the basic concept of Israel’s entire existence.

http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/wibilex/das-bibellexikon/lexikon/sachwort/anzeigen/details/heilig-profan-heiligkeit-at/ch/94b9277f2f1daf13102173f033487e0a/


Published abstract: There is a consensus in current research that Levitical law never requires blood to be tossed upon the upper surface of the altar. This conception has reinforced—and has been reinforced by—an understanding that YHWH is never to be offered blood. However, it appears that according to several priestly texts, the blood of many sacrifices, including wellbeing, whole-burnt and reparation offerings, is to be tossed upon the upper surface of the altar.


Gilders befasst sich mit dem Entsündigungsopfer und der Schwierigkeit, den hebräischen Opferbegriff Ìwān, ḥaṭṭāʾ t, angemessen zu übersetzen. Er schlussfolgert: „Thus, for the Priestly tradents, the Ìwān, a specific ritual complex with clearly defined technical elements, was a ‘purification offering’ that dealt with ‘sin,’ as well as a ‘sin offering’ that dealt with impurity. We may assume that this reality made sense to the Priestly tradents.“


Published abstract: P. briefly surveys and evaluates six, English-language commentaries on the Book of Leviticus of the last 35+ years. In each instance, he devotes particular attention to how the given commentator deals with two longstanding problems posed by the book, i.e., the rationale for the requirement that the
purification process for the mother of a female infant be twice as long as that for a male (see Lev 12:5) and the meaning of the term “Azazel” in Leviticus 16.

Published abstract: A number of scholars have pointed to the ways in which Zechariah 9 convincingly functions as a literary and conceptual whole. Approaching Zechariah 9 as a unity, however, raises important questions concerning a recurring motif in the chapter that has especially deep cultural connotations: blood. Blood is forbidden as food and unclean-rendering in Zech 9:7, blood is intimately involved in the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel in 9:11 and it is part of the Israelites’ post-victory feast in several important Septuagintal traditions in 9:15. A study of the blood motif in Zechariah 9 through the lenses of a variety of anthropological and literary approaches reveals the ways in which blood operates as a symbolically rich, multivalent motif not only in this chapter but in the larger Israelite tradition.

Published abstract: Previous attempts to synthesise biblical texts’ usage of twʿbh have associated the language with cultic concerns in Deuteronomy and Ezekiel or with ethical concerns in Proverbs. The reconciliation of these interests, especially in conjunction with a number of additional outlier texts, has proved problematic. This investigation suggests that the texts which use twʿbh and tʿb exhibit a persistent focus on issues of identity, on the transgression of boundaries and on perceptions of the compatibility and incompatibility of fundamental social, theological and ideological categories. This understanding goes some way towards providing an explanation of the diverse appearances of these terms across the biblical texts.

Chavel, Simeon, Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah (FAT II, 71), Tübingen 2014.
Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 800, #2621: This volume began as C.’s dissertation at Hebrew University under Israel Knohl. In it, C. argues that four texts from the Priestly strand of the Torah—Lev 24:10-23, Num 9:1-14, 15:32-36; and 27:1-11—are best considered together as exemplars of the same genre, which he terms “oracular novella.” The four texts each have the same incidental character, essential plot, and structure; employ a specialized diction; portray in an unusually specific manner Moses’ precise role in the legislative and judicial process; straddle the fence between law and narrative; demonstrate a distinct method for generating law and establishing it thereafter; and give distinctive expression to certain elements that stand at the base of communal identity” (p. 1). Even so, the four texts are to be differentiated into two subtypes—an “action” type (Lev 24:10-23; Num 15:32-36) and a “situation” type (Num 9:1-14; 27:1-11). In addition to genre considerations, C. draws on sociological insights on how texts can be used by a community “to refresh itself” (p. 15). After his introduction, C. offers lengthy chapters on each of the four texts. In each case, the text is examined with regard to “(1) its internal coherence and poetics ... compositional history ... and tradition history; (2) its specific location within the Priestly history; and (3) its relationship with other texts in the Priestly history and elsewhere in the Hebrew
Bible and lore outside them” (p. 257). A summary and conclusion round out the study. A combined bibliography and list of abbreviations and indexes of sources and subjects are also included.—B.A.S.

**Brett, Mark G.,** Natives and Immigrants in the Social Imagination of the Holiness School, in: Ben Zvi, Ehud; Edelman, Diana Vikander (Hg.), Imagining the Other and Constructing Israeliite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 456), London 2013, 89–104. Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 671, #2216: B. surmises that the policy on the “native” in the Holiness Code (H), which introduces a new vocabulary on the topic, must stem from a need to articulate a new understanding of the relationship between land and identity that was not present in earlier, Deuteronomistic theology, in view of a new set of problems about the legitimacy of land possession. The phrase “people of the land” must already have taken on negative connotations that prevented it from expressing a sense of equity between native and immigrant. The H editors of the Persian period were imagining new ways to express religious and economic integration via permeable boundaries that would allow a reconciliation of the peoples of the land who never went into exile with the “children of the gölâ,” while at the same time opening possibilities for including the surrounding göyîm as both land-owners and participants in the Jewish cult. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

**Büchner, Dirk,** Brief Remarks on the Occurrence and Value of Blood in Greek Sources from Epic to Early Christianity, in: Kraus, Wolfgang; Kreuzer, Siegfried; Meiser, Martin; Sigismund, Marcus (Hg.), Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2012 (WUNT 325), Tübingen 2014, 255–271. Abstract: B. presents brief observations about the scant significance that blood appears to have in Greek ritual and poses the question whether blood can be viewed as playing a purificatory role in Greek ritual. B. discusses several occurrences in Greek ritual descriptions and concludes that Greeks did not regard blood as a significant substance in θυσία, and that it was not considered a widespread cathartic medium outside of murder pollution. After that he presents the rather contrastive prominence given to blood in the Septuagint, Jewish-Hellenistic writings, the New Testament and Early Christianity.

**Eberhart, Christian,** Beobachtungen zu Opfer, Kult und Sühne in der Septuaginta, in: Kraus, Wolfgang; Kreuzer, Siegfried; Meiser, Martin; Sigismund, Marcus (Hg.), Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2012 (WUNT 325), Tübingen 2014, 297–314. Abstract: E. examines a selection of texts that are essential and revealing for the topics of sacrifice, cult, and atonement in the Septuagint. He first focuses on the narrative of the Sinai covenant in Exod 24:1-11. Here, the LXX follows the Hebrew text faithfully, with one exception: The LXX avoids the notion that the elders of the Israelites “saw” God directly and rather reads “and they appeared in the place of God.” This has to do with the general tendency of the LXX to avoid anthropomorphisms. Another example would be the fact that the LXX in the Torah translates ḫm (“bread”) when it is used
for sacrifices never verbatim, but rather as τὰ δῶρα, “the offerings.” E. also discusses the longer text of the LXX in Lev 17:4a: This plus stresses the necessity to bring the animals as offerings to the sanctuary. Finally, E. demonstrates that the LXX equivalents for Hebrew kipper (ἐξιλάσκομαι and ἱλάσκομαι) confirm the wide semantic spectrum of this concept that ranges between purification and consecration. Hence, the LXX in major areas appears as a faithful interpretation of the cultic concepts of the Hebrew text.

Feder, Yizhaq, The Wilderness Camp Paradigm in the Holiness Source and the Tempel Scroll. From Purity Laws to Cult Politics: Journal of Ancient Judaism 5, 2014, 290–310. Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 670, #2215: F.’s paper explores the socio-historical implications of the levitical purity laws as these are understood in the Holiness Code (H) and the Temple Scroll (TS). Though the rhetoric of these sources is similar, closer examination reveals fundamental differences between them. In particular, F. focuses on the manner in which these sources understand the wilderness camp model, which serves as the primary framework for their respective applications of the biblical purity laws. In H, we find a repeated emphasis on the danger of polluting the Tabernacle (see, e.g., Lev 15:31; Num 5:4, 19:13, 20). From a strictly philological analysis of these H verses, it becomes clear that they have as their focus the purity of the centralized sanctuary. Interestingly, this stance finds echoes in the rabbinic view, which restricted the application of the purity laws almost exclusively to Jerusalem. In contrast, the interpretation of these same verses in TS construes them as requiring purity on other cities throughout the land as well. The comparison of the above source and the relationship between purity and the cultic establishment implied by them can serve as a basis for contextualizing H and TS historically. Such analysis can also enable us to trace the development of attitudes towards purity in Israel in the periods before and after cult centralization. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Vogels, Walter, Célébration et sainteté. Le Lévitique (Lectio divina, 207), Paris 2015. Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 800, #2620: For many readers, both scholarly and non-scholarly, Leviticus is an off-putting and thus understandably neglected book. In this volume directed to non-specialist, but potentially interested readers, V. begins with an introduction which comments on Leviticus’ centrality within the Pentateuch and salvation history overall, as well as diachronic and synchronic approaches to the book. He then proceeds to survey the book’s four main sections (chaps. 1-7, 8-10, 11-16, and 17-27) and their component sub-sections in turn. In each instance, V. devotes particular attention to the internal organization of the given unit, the principles underlying its often arcane laws, and the enduring values those laws seek to promote, e.g., solidarity, mutual respect, and personal responsibility, and the interweaving of religious and social concerns (whence V.’s title “celebration and holiness” for his study of the book). The volume concludes with a brief list of recent French and English-language commentaries on Leviticus.—C.T.B.


Gane, Roy E., Didactic Logic and the Authorship of Leviticus, in: Gane, Roy E.; Taggar-Cohen, Ada (ed.), Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature. The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond (Resources for Biblical Study 82), Atlanta 2015, 197–221. Abstract from OTA: G.’s starting point in this discussion of the Book of Leviticus is the question formulated by James Watts concerning Leviticus 1-16: who is trying to persuade whom of what by writing these texts? (Watts’s answer is that Leviticus 1-16 is the work of priests—whether preexilic, exilic, or postexilic—whose purpose was to persuade the Israelite community to accept the cultic monopoly of the Aaronide priesthood). In engaging with Watts’s claim, G. focuses on the book’s (his study extends to the whole of Leviticus 1-27) various didactic strategies (e.g., organizing items of information in recognizable progressions; providing perspective through logical hierarchy; reinforcing by repetition, simplifying by abbreviating) as well as its backgrounding or foregrounding concepts and practices and what this suggests about what its hearers/readers are presumed to know already (e.g., the basic notion of physical impurity) or, conversely, to require more detailed instruction about (e.g., the holy Yhwh’s ethical requirements for his holy people). On the basis of his findings regarding the above matters, G. concludes, contra Watts, that the book’s prevailing concern is to promote a communal ideal of ritual and ethical holiness to which all Israelites—both priests and lay—are subject. Moreover, the book’s invocation of the authority of the non-priest Moses (behind whom stands Yhwh himself) could suggest that its authors were not priests themselves (so Watts), but (possibly) prophetic figures.—C.T.B.


Goldstein, Elizabeth W., Women and the Purification Offering. What Jacob Milgrom Contributed to the Intersection of Women's Studies and Biblical Studies, in: Gane,
Abstract from OTA: Truly, the glass is either half full or half empty with regard to P and women. G.'s essay shows that Jacob Milgrom espoused the former view. He demonstrated the parturient's utter lack of sin, re-read Lev 15:32 in favor of gender parity, and asserted that both men and women washed in their purification process. On the parturient (Lev 12:7-8), Milgrom pointed out: “This distinction makes it crystal clear that the parturient and all others who suffer physical impurity have committed no moral wrong that requires divine forgiveness.” This insight, among many others relevant to women's studies, is one of Milgrom's lasting legacies. G. herself finds that the Priestly writer of Leviticus 15 portrays male and female bodily impurities in basically parallel fashion, even though the differences between them are significant. Why does the writer do this? Perhaps the answer lies in the difference between those who led, operated, and performed the rituals and the one who wrote down their instructions. Officiating priests were always men, although not all men served as officiating priests. Despite the references to female functionaries at the sanctuary or temple, equal roles for women of priestly descent did not exist as they did for men. Nevertheless, it appears that the one who transcribed the rituals, the Priestly writer, intended to indicate the parallel and equally inferior status of potentially impure male and female bodies in relationship to the deity. [Adapted from author's conclusion—C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: The Torah is composed of non-linear, two-dimensional units that can be viewed as tabular, or woven. The identification of these building blocks makes it possible to discern the compositional structure of Leviticus. In this essay, K. presents examples of the Units, a detailed reading of Leviticus according to its three-concentric-ring structure, and a comparison between this structure and that of Genesis. Thematically, K. suggests that the structure of Leviticus leads to an experiential reading that involves a two-step process of individualization and socialization, pivoting on a core experience of imitatio Dei. The structural context of Leviticus, within two concentric rings created by Exodus and Numbers, indicates that the three
central books of the Torah were constructed as five concentric rings, these reflecting the structure of the Israelite encampment in the desert. The historical narrative in the first half of Exodus, which is resumed in Num 10:11, parallels the Israelite camp; the second half of Exodus and Num 1:1-10:10 represent the Levitical camp; and the three concentric rings of Leviticus represent the court, the sanctuary, and the inner sanctum. This structure is reinforced by the structure of the Book of Numbers, which is itself formatted to reflect the structure of the camp … The present essay, with its detailed examination of Leviticus (and of Genesis and Numbers to some extent) gives credence to the view that the Torah was composed by “one major author.” The essay also resoundingly affirms Jacob Milgrom's affirmation that “structure is theology.”


Schellenberg, Annette, More Than Spirit. On the Physical Dimension in the Priestly Understanding of Holiness: ZAW 126, 2014, 163–179. Published abstract: Again and again, the Priestly text emphasizes bodily issues – in addition to the reference to male and female in Gen 1,27 and the emphasis on circumcision as the sign of the covenant in Gen 17, this is demonstrated most clearly in regulations for impurity, sin, sacrifices, and rituals and in the special requirements for priests. This article maintains that this focus on bodily issues is a reflection of an understanding of holiness that comprises a physical dimension – even when it comes to God.


Samuel, Michael Leo, Torah from Alexandria. Philo as a Biblical Commentator: Volume 3: Leviticus, New York 2015. Editor’s abstract: The third volume of Torah from Alexandria sets on display how Philo interpreted the role of the Temple, offerings, festivals, dietary practices, marital laws, and laws of purity. While Philo always remains firmly committed to the importance of the actual religious act, he consistently derives ethical lessons from these ritual practices, thus putting him alongside the great Jewish philosophers of history. Reading Philo alongside Rabbinic wisdom, Greek philosophy, Patristic writers, as well as Medieval and modern authors, breathes new life into the complexities of Leviticus and reinstates Philo’s importance as a biblical exegete. Reclaiming Philo as a Jewish exegete puts him in company with the great luminaries of Jewish history—a position that Philo richly deserves. Philo remains as one of Jewish history’s most articulate spokespersons for ethical monotheism. Rabbi Michael Leo Samuel has meticulously culled from all of Philo’s exegetical comments, and arranged them according to the biblical verses. He provides extensive parallels from rabbinic literature, Greek philosophy, and Christian theology, to present Philo’s writing in the context of his time, while also demonstrating Philo’s unique method of interpretation.
Schellenberg, Annette, „Ein beschwichtigender Geruch für JHWH“. Zur Rolle der Sinne im Kult (nach den priesterlichen Texten), in: van Oorschot, Jürgen; Wagner, Andreas (Hg.), Anthropologie(n) des Alten Testaments (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 42), Leipzig 2015, 132–158.


Abstract from OTA: M.’s essay explores the question of how Yhwh “speaks” to the people in the Holiness Code (H). He begins with the problem that Yhwh's voice is not physically audible. So how do the people in fact hear that voice? Through an interior dialogue? A mediator? In either of these ways, the validity of divine communication would be fragile. As it is, however, the voice of Yhwh is mediated through the scriptural text and given voice in communal reading. M. argues that, in H, the repetition of the ʾni yhwh formula serves the rhetorical function of sanctifying the people through the voice of the priests who read the text. In making his case, M. examines variations on the phrase and their distribution throughout H, and draws on ANE parallels in suggesting that the voicing of the formula makes Yhwh present in the midst of the people through—although distinct from—the voice of the priest. In fact, the repetition of the formula is a constant reminder that the speaker has no importance relative to the divine voice, an affirmation one finds in prophetic texts as well. M. goes on to suggest that this rhetorical purpose presumes a liturgical setting for oral delivery for H, a setting that would have been particularly important in local settings far from the divine presence residing in the central sanctuary. By addressing the people directly through the priests, Yhwh communicates the commandments by means of which the people are to sanctify themselves, and by which Yhwh will himself be sanctified in reciprocal fashion. The special place of the priests in this communicative process explains the requirement for their own sanctification in the midst of the community.

[Adapted from published abstract— C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: N. offers a detailed study of the connection between blood disposal and the functioning of the kipper ritual for inadvertent sin in Leviticus 4. He evaluates the major theories that have attempted to explain the purpose of the blood ritual, concluding that these are based on inferences prompted by gaps in the text and are dependent on unprovable parallels with other texts and ancient practices. Thus, e.g., N. discusses J. Milgrom's theory that Leviticus 4 and 16 are companion rituals for the cleansing of sancta from impurity by inadvertent sins (chap. 4) and other offenses (chap. 16). However, for N., there is no evidence that the blood ritual must be consistent across P texts, such that Milgrom's theory requires him to make several questionable harmonizing moves. N. further rejects Milgrom's proposal that the function of the ḫt’i in Leviticus 4 is to purify the sanctuary rather than the offerer. He then considers several additional proposals inspired by Milgrom's work, in particular
the idea that the ḫṭʾ t in Leviticus 4 has two functions, i.e., the purification of the altar as well as the worshiper. In the end, N. argues that what is needed is an interpretation of the blood rite in the kipper ritual that does not require a coherent, uniform meaning for the blood or its use. His own proposal is that the blood ritual of the ḫṭʾ t functions to "index" the "templization" of the group identified as "Israel" in the text. An "index," as distinct from a "symbol," is based not on social convention but rather on an existential connection with the object to which it refers. The manner in which the blood is handled is what sets the ḫṭʾ t apart from other sacrifices, and the application of the blood to the sancta creates a de facto connection between the offerer and the inaccessible deity, and thus "indexes" the role played by the sanctuary in the community. In addition, the blood ritual demarcates the basic ritual, social, political and legal-ethical hierarchies within "Israel." Thereby, the ḫṭʾ t ritual becomes the site in which Israel establishes a relationship with its deity and also creates a coherent whole out of its component parts. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]


Published abstract: Leviticus 7:26 and 17:10–14 state that the blood of land animals and aerial animals must not be consumed. These verses say nothing, however, about the blood of fish, implying that the consumption of fish blood is permitted. This difference in the treatment of land/aerial animal blood and fish blood is based on a belief that the blood of land/aerial animals is a breath/blood amalgam, while the blood of fish is simply blood. Thus, what Lev 7:26 and 17:10–14 prohibited was the consumption of a land/aerial animal’s breath/blood amalgam. And, since it was breath that set this amalgam apart from the blood of a fish, it was really the consumption of a land/aerial animal’s breath that was being prohibited. It was believed that the breath of a land/aerial animal was the essence of its life and that God had complete sovereignty over a land/aerial animal’s breath. Consequently, by prohibiting its consumption, the Levitical/Priestly tradents hallowed the breath of a land/aerial animal and acknowledged that sovereignty over it belonged exclusively to God.


Abstract from OTA: Leviticus is probably not the first book that comes to mind for purposes of adult Bible study. M.'s handbook provides a guide for those who, nonetheless, might venture to investigate the book in systematic fashion in company with other interested persons. His volume begins with a general introduction to Leviticus (in which M. notes that his own primary scholarly resource throughout is the three-volume AB commentary of Jacob Milgrom) and instructions for study groups. Thereafter, M. proceeds to divide Leviticus up into 22 sections, for each of which he provides an outline, summary verse-by-verse comments, study questions designed to elicit understanding of and reflection on the various features of Leviticus' often obscure provisions and a summary conclusion concerning the segment. The volume concludes with a final overview, in which M. seeks to synthesize Leviticus' message about God, his people, and their relationship; an answer key to the preceding
questions; and a brief bibliography. This volume complements M.’s previous similar treatments of Genesis (2006); Exodus (2009); and Numbers (2013).—C.T.B.

Varenhorst, Martin, Levitikon / Levitikus / Das dritte Buch Mose, in: Kreuzer, Siegfried (Hg.), Einleitung in die Septuaginta (Handbuch zur Septuaginta LXX.H 1), Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016, 137–145.


Abstract from OTA: Although D (the Deuteronomic Code) is generally regarded as older than H (the Holiness Code), it has often been observed that H also seems to have influenced D. While this influence of H on D has usually been viewed as having occurred in connection with a late redaction of D, K. argues, on the basis of various examples drawn from his 2015 dissertation (see OTA 39 [2016] #2190), that the influence in question took place at an early stage in the redaction of D. K.’s short paper, which was presented as the 2016 IOSOT conference in Stellenbosch, concludes with a postscript in which he responds to some of the points raised in the discussion following his presentation. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA 40, 2017, #1649: R. makes the opening observation that in both the making and maintaining of cult and priesthood in the Book of Leviticus, there is a clear masculine gender bias. In the book’s overwhelmingly androcentric conception, women provide some of the raw materials for the cultic apparatus and are required for purposes of reproducing the priestly line. But they are excluded from the sphere of the holy and any holiness that they may appear to have as a result of either birth from or marriage to a priest disappears when their connection or proximity to the priest either ends or is superseded. Indeed far being holy, women can threaten priestly holiness, specifically by virtue of their sexuality, as is evidenced by the book’s restrictions on priests’ marriage partners, the severe punishment of a priest’s daughter who becomes a prostitute, and the ban on priests’ mourning—alone among their close relatives—their wives and married sisters. Priests who fail to observe these restrictions risk profaning themselves and/or their offspring, thereby losing their priestly status. At the same time, the cult as envisaged in Exodus and Leviticus could not exist without women. R. accordingly concludes that the nature of cultic holiness in the material studied by her is clear—it is constructed, performative, and provisional, as are the notions of gender that underlie it.


Published abstract: In this study, Paavo N. Tucker considers the different models of formation for the Priestly literature of the Pentateuch through an analysis of the Priestly texts in Exodus and how they relate to the Holiness Code in Lev 17–26. The texts in Exodus that are traditionally assigned to the Priestly Grundschrift are not
concerned with the priestly matters of Exod 25-Lev 16, but are better understood as relating to the language, theology, and concerns of Lev 17–26, and should be assigned to the same strata of H with Lev 17–26. The same applies to the Priestly narratives beginning in Gen 1. The Priestly literature in Gen 1-Lev 26 form a composition that develops the themes of creation, Sabbath, sanctuary, and covenant to their climactic expression and culmination in the legal promulgation and ethical paraenesis of H in Lev 17–26. The author shows that, rather than being a “Priestly composition” as Erhard Blum argues, it is more fitting to see this literature as an “H composition,” which weaves narrative and law together in order to motivate obedience to the laws of Lev 17–26.


Yoder, Perry B., Leviticus (Believers Church Bible Commentary), Harrisonburg: Herald Press, 2017.


Abstract from OTA: E.-K.’s essay explores the concept of the female body during menstruation as this is presented in the so-called purity laws of Leviticus 11-15. These texts, she points out, connect the human body, both male and female, to the divine sanctuary and hence to the sacred. The segment in question has strongly influenced the perception and experience, especially, of the female body within Western Judeo-Christian culture and has had an ambiguous reception history. In a re-reading of these texts that sees living bodies as a model of the space of the temple inhabited by God, one can, in fact, find a “democratization” of the sacred that extends to both women and men and connects their bodies directly to the sphere of the sacred.

Himbaza, Innocent, What Are the Consequences if 4QLXXLevª Contains the Earliest Formulation of the Septuagint?, in: Kreuzer, Siegfried; Meiser, Martin; Sigismund, Marcus; Karrer, Martin; Kraus, Wolfgang (Hg.), Die Septuaginta - Orte und Intentionen. 5. internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch
Abstract from OTA: Whereas the Old Greek of Leviticus and 4QLXXLeva are connected within the textual history of the Greek version of Leviticus, scholars disagree as to which version is the earlier and which is secondary. H.’s comparison of 4QLXXLeva, the Old Greek, and the MT for Lev 26:3-15 indicates that, in most cases, 4QLXXLeva represents the lectio difficilior, while the Old Greek is closer to the Hebrew. Thus, 4QLXXLeva is probably earlier and less literal while the Old Greek represents a revision toward a text like MT.


Abstract from OTA: Defects have a complex relationship to profanation of holiness and pollution, a relationship that varies by source, and one should thus avoid easy generalization of the relationship of defects to the cult as represented in biblical texts. Thus, while Malachi 1 amd the Temple Scroll construct defects as polluting, the Holiness Code, Deuteronomy, and Isaiah 56 do not. The priest, e.g., with a defect may continue to stay in the sanctuary and eat holy and most holy foods (Lev 21:22); the defective sacrificial animal with limbs of uneven length may be sacrificed as a free-will offering (Lev 22:23); the defective firstling is classed with clean game animals rather than unclean animals and may be eaten in a manner similar to game (Deut 15:22-23); the eunuch of Isa 56:3-5 is welcome in Yhwh’s temple. Conversely, a defective animal is called an “abomination of Yhwh” in Deut 17:1, suggesting that it was unacceptable under all circumstances, not unlike the unclean animal, which is an “abomination” and not to be eaten according to Deut 14:3.


Published Abstract: The so-called purity laws in Leviticus 11-15 reflect a cultic and social view on the male and female body. These texts do not give detailed physiological descriptions. Instead, they prescribe what to do in the cases of skin disease, delivery and wo/man’s genital discharges, but the particular way of dealing with the body and the language used in Leviticus 12 and 15 ask for clarification: How do these texts construct the male and female body? Which roles does gender play within this language? By means of themes like menstruation and circumcision, the author unfolds the language used for the body in Leviticus and its interpretation history. The study provides material for a contemporary anthropology of bodies, which relates the human sexed body to God’s holiness.

Abstract from OTA: H. focuses on two Leviticus manuscripts from Qumran—4QLXXLeva (late 2nd, early 1st cent. B.C.E.) and 4QpapLXXLevb (1st cent. B.C.E.), the latter in particular. The two manuscripts are similar in style and display a freer translation technique than the major codices that lie behind the standard LXX editions of A. Rahlfs and J.W. Wevers. It is likely that the Qumran manuscripts also represent a more ancient version of LXX than what one finds in the standard editions, which need to be revised accordingly. Moreover, H. contends that the usage of the two manuscripts reflects broader developments in translation techniques related to the LXX; in other words, the earliest translators did not feel tied to a literal (word for word) translation.


Abstract (excerpts from pp. 202-204): “In short, attempts to identify a reference to the law of 4Q365 23 in Neh 10 or, alternatively, to derive 4Q365 23 from Neh 10, are problematic and unconvincing. While both texts refer to a Mosaic law concerning the offering of wood to the temple, they do not appear to be directly related. This point is consistent, in particular, with the absence of any significant connection between these texts. If this reconstruction of the evidence is correct, Neh 10:35 arguably represents the earliest known witness to an expansionist version of the Pentateuch that included provisions for the wood offering. 4Q365 23, for its part, appears to represent a separate version of this same legal tradition, which was not (yet) known to the author of Neh 10:31-40. Furthermore, the connections noted above between the wood offering in 4Q365 and in the Temple Scroll suggest that the version of the law of the wood offering known to the author of Temple Scroll was similar to (albeit not identical with) the one preserved in 4Q365. It is difficult to be more precise about the origins of the legal tradition underlying the wood offering in the Second Temple period, not the least because we cannot know with certainty when Neh 10:35 was composed. As various scholars have argued, the unit comprising Neh 10:31-40 is unlikely to have been part of Nehemiah's memoir; more likely, it represents a later supplement to the Nehemiah tradition, possibly from the late Persian or early Hellenistic period (fourth or third century BCE).60 This date, according to the
reconstruction proposed here, would then represent the tenninus ad quem for the
creation of an expansionist Version of Leviticus in which the ritual legislation of this
book was supplemented with an instruction for the offering of wood. As for 4Q365,
the manuscript itself can be dated to the mid-first century BC E.61 However, the
parallels between 4Q365 23 and the Temple Scroll suggest that this version of the law
of the wood offering may actually go back to the second century BCE, if not
somewhat earlier. … Contrary to other supplements in the Reworked Pentateuch
manuscripts, the law of the wood offering in 4Q365 23 cannot be explained merely as
an inner-scriptural development. More likely, this supplement reflects the growing
importance of the wood offering during the Second Temple period, which is
independently documented by other contemporaneous sources. It is clear from the
law’s content that it does not purport to describe or prescribe an actual practice; this is
suggested, in particular, by the reference in lines 9-11 of the fragment to the Israelite
tribes bringing their offering of wood to the temple. Rather, the instruction for the
wood offering in 4Q365 is a legal fiction, seeking to provide a scriptural basis for an
offering that was deemed important enough by some scribes to be appended to the
festal legislation of Leviticus. … Nevertheless, … this scribal development is
intriguing, as it challenges some of our current assumptions regarding the
textual stability achieved by this book during the Second Temple period. In
effect, 4Q365 23 points to the existence of an expansionist version of Leviticus
that included provisions for the wood offering—and presumably for other festivals
as well, especially the festival of new oil, and was circulated alongside the main
copies of the book until the first century BCE (the date of the manuscript of
4Q365). The parallels between the wood offering in 4Q365 and in the Temple
Scroll suggest that this supplement was part of a broader legal tradition that
gradually developed during the Second Temple period and may be reflected for
the first time in a late addition to the book of Nehemiah (Neh 10:35). At any rate,
4Q365 23 documents the fact that even relatively stable scriptures such as
Leviticus were susceptible of being revised and amplified during most of the
Second Temple period in order to reflect new legal and ritual traditions such as the
wood offering. … Second, the case of the wood offering in 4Q365 is significant
also for the way in which it sheds light on the scribal techniques used in the
composition of a legal supplement such as this. While the wood offering in 4Q365
23 is a new topic, the language used in this fragment to describe this offering is
not. Specifically, the examination of this material shows that the law of the wood
offering draws on several scriptural traditions, arguably more so than has been
previously acknowledged. The introduction to the law (lines 4-5) takes up Lev
24:1-2a and combines it with various passages from Lev 23-25 (23:10 and 25:2,
18-19) as well as with Deut 26:1. The references to Lev 23-25 suggest a concern
to highlight the continuity between the law of the wood offering and its scriptural
context (the festal legislation of Leviticus), whereas the conflation of Lev 23:10
and 25:2 with Deut 26:1 arguably reflects a broader scribal trend in the pre-
Samaritan versions of the Pentateuch to align Leviticus and Numbers with
Deuteronomy wherever possible. The description of the law itself, from line 5
onward, also presents some substantial parallels with other passages of the
Pentateuch, such as Exod 35-40 and Num 7. For ancient readers, the presence of such scriptural parallels would have significantly facilitated the recognition of the wood offering as a Mosaic law. In addition, as we have seen, the selection of scriptural materials in the composition of 4Q365 23 simultaneously points to significant associations between the wood offering and other key offerings in the Torah, especially the firstfruits (Lev 23:10 and Deut 26:1), the community’s contribution to the building of the tabernacle (Exod 35-40), and the offerings for the dedication of the tabernacle (Num 7). These remarks suggest that the scriptural phraseology used in the composition of this legal supplement serves a twofold function: it authorizes the introduction of a new offering in the Torah, while simultaneously positioning this material within the Mosaic traditions about the Israelite cult.”


Writing a commentary on a biblical book is not limited to the scholar’s study and desk. Hence, several experts in the field of Hebrew Bible currently writing a larger commentary on the book of Leviticus followed the invitation of Christian A. Eberhart (University of Houston) and Thomas Hieke (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) to meet between 2014 and 2016 at annual conferences of the Society of Biblical Literature. They shared their experiences, discussed a variety of hermeneutical and methodological approaches, probed critical questions, and presented their ideas about particular themes and issues in the third book of the Torah. The results of the three consultative panels had a significant impact on the production of the commentaries.


Hieke demonstrates that writing a commentary on a biblical book is a research achievement. Society usually associates “research” with other activities (expensive experiments in laboratories etc.). In search for an official definition of “research,” Hieke points to the *Frascati Manual* of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). In his essay, he demonstrates that writing a commentary on a biblical book increases the stock of knowledge, devises new applications of available knowledge, and is novel, creative, uncertain, systematic, transferable and/or reproducible. Hence, the scholarly endeavor of commenting on a biblical book meets the OECD definition of “research.”


Watts highlights the unusual challenge posed to commentators by the fact that many of Leviticus’s ritual instructions have not been performed for almost 2,000 years and that Christians, at least, tend not to read it at all. Since commentary is supposed to explain the meaning of the text, he asks: What is the significance of an unperformed ritual? What is the meaning of an unread text? His reflections, excerpted and expanded from
the Introduction to his commentary, explore the nature of textual rhetoric, of ritual rhetoric, of theological symbolism, and of priestly interpretive authority. He concludes that Leviticus’s status as scripture pushes commentators to consider the whole range of the text’s uses, not just as an authoritative text but also as a performative text and as religious icon.


Gilders focuses on the role played in his forthcoming commentary on Leviticus by anthropology and ritual theory, which Gilders believes to be the most important element in that work. In drawing on the work of anthropologists, he takes the risk of characterizing the commentary as a work of ethnography in which he acts as a “professional stranger” (the anthropologist M.H. Agar’s designation for the ethnographer). This approach is exemplified through discussion of Leviticus 2, the basic legislation for the קרבן מנחה (“tribute offering”), in order to highlight the desire to disengage treatment of the offerings in Leviticus from the idea that “sacrifice” necessarily involves the killing of animal victims. Gilders explains how his commentary will constitute an ethnography of the ways in which Aaronide priests represent and interpret Israelite cultural practices through the medium of the texts they composed and edited. Gilders intends for the commentary to do justice to what his ancient Israelite informants tell him and to provide a cultural translation for its presumed audience of twenty-first century readers. He sets out a multi-layered interpretation of the cultural data on the basis of the theoretical models he finds most compelling and productive. Specifically, while he largely avoids offering symbolic-communicative explanations of ritual performances, Gilders explicates the indexical force of such practices in terms of Peircian semiotics. His goal is to strike a balance between providing sufficient interpretation and providing too much.


In her contribution “The Role of Second Temple Texts in a Commentary on Leviticus,” Harrington takes a Second Temple perspective to Leviticus. She asks how the book was read by Second Temple priests and sages. She finds special value among these sources for: 1) determining the state of the text of Leviticus; 2) clarifying ambiguity in Leviticus; and 3) fixing the chronological development of specific Levitical traditions while bringing into relief Second Temple issues. Her contribution focuses on Ezra-Nehemiah and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Ezra-Nehemiah may have been redacted around the same time as the textus receptus of Leviticus and thus the data and issues of both texts are relevant to each other. The earliest witnesses to the actual text of Leviticus, the Dead Sea Scrolls, also supply important textual variants. They also disclose issues in interpretation. Harrington demonstrates how the Scrolls bring into relief ambiguity in the text of Leviticus and provide clarity for complex laws (e.g. purity regulations). Harrington urges commentators to grapple with the development
of various Levitical traditions throughout the Second Temple period. With four examples, she illustrates the necessity of examining single traditions in light of Second Temple literature: a) tithing; b) holy days; c) the resident alien; and d) intermarriage.

Hieke, Thomas, Writing on Leviticus for the HThKAT Series: Some Key Issues on Sacrificial Rituals, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 67-76. The title “Writing on Leviticus for the HThKAT Series: Some Key Issues on Sacrificial Rituals” conveys that Thomas Hieke reflects on central problems that emerged during his work on the Leviticus commentary for the series “Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament” (HThKAT). (1) Especially the first chapters of Leviticus use a very stereotypical or standardized language. The sacrifices and the various components of the respective rituals are tagged with a certain technical language and terminology. Hence, he elaborated a glossary explaining this general vocabulary and placed it after the introduction and before the commentary proper. (2) The introductory formulas (e.g., Lev 1:1–2; 4:1; 6:1; 8:1 etc.) are theologically crucial for the way the text wants to be understood: The rituals are – according to the biblical text – not invented by humans but revealed by God. (3) The meaning of the hand-leaning rite (e.g., Lev 1:4) is still a disputed issue. The contribution and the commentary present a new solution for interpreting this necessary part of the ritual. (4) Finally, the essay discusses problems of the nomenclature of the sacrifices, especially the so-called “sin offering”.

Eberhart, Christian A., Sacrifice? Holy Smokes! Reflections on Cult Terminology for Understanding Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 77-99. In his contribution “Sacrifice? Holy Smokes! Reflections on Cult Terminology for Understanding Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible,” Christian A. Eberhart explores interpretive aspects of sacrificial rituals that are manifest in both Hebrew and Greek technical terms for sacrifices and selected ritual aspects or components. The individual profile and common implications of this terminology offer insights into perceptions of early communities, tradents, and translators of the texts, who understood sacrifices as dynamic processes of approaching God and as tokens of reverence and reconciliation. Eberhart concludes that this terminology conveys the importance of the burning rite as a ritual component; this methodological approach allows the incorporation of both animal sacrifices and sacrifices from vegetal substances into modern scholarly theorizing. This understanding is corroborated by a brief investigation of rituals that do not count as sacrifices in the Hebrew Bible.

conception has reinforced – and has been reinforced by – an understanding that YHWH is never to be offered blood. He argues that, according to several priestly texts, the blood of many sacrifices, including wellbeing, whole-burnt and reparation offerings, is to be tossed upon the upper surface of the altar. Based on these observations, the claim that the ritual indicates that YHWH, like the Israelites, refrains from the consumption of blood, is being reassessed.


Gane answers objections to his proposal regarding a challenging question that any serious commentator on Leviticus must face. How do physical ritual impurities (ṭumʾōt) and sins (ḥaṭṭāʾōt) pollute the sanctuary so that they must be purged from there on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:16, 19)? In his book Cult and Character (2005), Gane concluded that these evils affect the sanctuary through purification offerings during the course of the year, as indicated by Leviticus 6:20–21. Here blood of a most holy purification offering that spatters on a garment must be washed off in a holy place because it paradoxically carries some pollution, and a vessel in which purification offering flesh is boiled must be broken or scoured and rinsed in water for the same reason. The pollution comes from the offerer when the sacrifice removes the evil from that person. So when a priest applies some of the blood to part of the sanctuary, the sanctuary receives the pollution.—Christophe Nihan has countered Gane’s interpretation in part of his essay titled “The Templization of Israel in Leviticus: Some Remarks on Blood Disposal and Kipper in Leviticus.” Nihan finds the idea that purification offerings transfer pollution from offerers to the sanctuary to be problematic because ancient Near Eastern people were afraid of defiling sacred places, and he rejects the inference from Leviticus 6:20–21 that most holy purification offerings carry pollution, preferring the view that verse 20 requires the washing of priestly vestments to remove contagious holiness.—In the present essay, Gane responds to these and other objections through exegetical analysis of the relevant biblical passages, reference to ancient Near Eastern texts, and clarification of his interpretation. It is especially significant that the rules in Leviticus 6:20–21 apply only to the purification offering, which removes sins (Lev 4:1–5:13) and physical impurities (e.g., 12:6–8).


Scholarship on the Priestly system of pollution and purification tends to view the diverse sources of ritual pollution as if they were located on a one-dimensional scale, from most severe to least severe – to some extent under the influence of rabbinic literature. With the title “Some New Questions in the Fundamental Science of P,” Meshel’s contribution offers an alternative model in which each impurity comprises several factors – including duration (how long the impurity lasts), tenacity (how difficult it is to eliminate the impurity), and contagion (how easily it is transmitted.
from one object to another). There is not always a direct correlation between the various factors, as one type of pollution may last a long time without being highly contagious, and another may be highly contagious but of relatively short duration. This alternative, multidimensional model leads to several new questions, for example: If one becomes defiled by one type of impurity, then later by another, are the waiting periods counted as overlapping periods of time or successive periods of time (does “time served” count)? Does it matter if the impurities are of the same type (e.g., contact with two different corpses) or of different types (e.g., menstruation and contact with a corpse)? While P does not explicitly address these questions, several post-Biblical sources discuss them explicitly, suggesting that a full understanding of the Priestly ritual system entails careful consideration of these scenarios – some of which are outlandish, but others quite commonplace.


In his essay “Law and Creation in the Priestly-Holiness Writings of the Pentateuch,” Wright argues that a chief goal of the Priestly-Holiness (PH) corpus of the Pentateuch is to explain Yahweh’s election of Israel and associated obligations of cultic practice. Wright looks specifically at PH’s portrayal of the development of various cultic practices and phenomena (sacrifice, use of the divine name, the calendar, purity and holiness practices, the divine glory [kavod]), as well as PH’s portrayal of the genealogical evolution of Israel and its use of creation language in narrative. The PH corpus tells a story in which the culmination of creation, as described in Gen 1:1–2:4, is the establishment of the nation Israel with accompanying obligations of cultic service. This set the stage for then describing how the nation acquired its land.


Some texts in Leviticus and in many other biblical books explicitly support genocide, indiscriminate capital punishment, patriarchy, and slavery. In “Drawing Lines: A Suggestion for Addressing the Moral Problem of Reproducing Immoral Biblical Texts in Commentaries and Bibles,” James W. Watts observes that these verses pose a moral challenge for commentators and Bible publishers because they conflict with the legal and ethical teachings of Jewish and Christian traditions, and also with the laws of modern nations. By publishing Bibles and commentaries that reproduce these texts, translators and commentators continue to promulgate a document that claims divine endorsement for immoral and illegal behavior. Though long-standing traditions of halakhah, preaching, canon law and commentary have restrained the social force of these texts, the iconic status of biblical texts has often overridden interpretive traditions. These restraints have become easier to ignore as revolutions in printing and, now, digitization have made biblical texts ever more accessible. Anyone can cite a verse of Leviticus with the accurate preamble, “the Bible says,” and can do so to
justify harming other people. Interpretations of biblical texts, their social contexts, and their reception history remain essential to countering malevolent uses of the Bible, but they are not enough. Watts suggests that commentaries and mass-market Bible translations should strike through immoral normative texts to indicate typographically that Jewish and Christian traditions have long-standing objections to reading them as representing the divine will.

Albertz, Rainer, Die Abschlüsse der ersten und zweiten priesterlichen Kompositionen in Lev 16 und 26, in: Albertz, Rainer; Wöhrle, Jakob; Neumann, Friederike (Hg.), Pentateuchstudien (FAT 117), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018, 297–326.


Published Abstract: The Hebrew Bible contains a variety of traditions concerning which meat cuts from animal sacrifices comprised the “priestly portion.” The variant textual traditions invite questions related to the historical situations that gave rise to these traditions and fostered their incorporation in the present form of the Pentateuch. This article identifies these traditions and explores questions of priority and provenance, first, from text-critical and source-critical perspectives, and, second, by considering the traditions in light of textual, iconographic, and zooarchaeological data from the broader ancient Near Eastern world. Text-critical and source-critical approaches highlight the complexity of the issue and affirm two dominant systems: one assigning the hindlimb to the priests and another the forelimb, presumably from the right side of the animal in both cases. Ancient Near Eastern texts, iconography, and archaeology suggest that the origins of both traditions stretch deep into the Late Bronze and Iron Ages, the forelimb tradition perhaps the earlier of the two and rooted in southern regions, and the hindlimb tradition rooted in northern regions. A point of coalescence is identified geographically in the southern Levant and chronologically in the Iron Age II, concomitant with the rise of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. In this light, any assumption that Priestly cultic literature is a unified, postexilic, Jerusalem-centered corpus may need to be reexamined.


Abstract from OTA: In this contribution to a new commentary series applying feminist interpretation to each book in the Bible, K. focuses on four goals in evaluating the value and compelling messages communicated in the Book of Leviticus. Of these, the first is to pay attention to ignored, overlooked aspects of the text and ask unasked questions of the text. The second is to name the problematic and oppressive aspects of the text, while the third is to uncover the ideologies and practices that undermine assumptions about what one might expect to find in a patriarchal system. K.’s final goal is to fill in the gaps and silences and exercise “informed imagination” without reliance on patriarchal assumptions, an endeavor that includes trying to understand what messages are conveyed by the book’s description of ritual practice, not just the actions the text is prescribing.-V.H.M.

Rhyder, Julia, Space and Memory in the Book of Leviticus, in: Keady, Jessica M.; Klutz, Todd E.; Strine, Casey A. (Hg.), Scripture as Social Discourse. Social-Scientific
Abstract from OTA: The initial supposition of R.'s essay is the increasingly accepted distinction in scholarship on the Book of Leviticus between ritual text and ritual praxis. Recent scholarship based on that distinction is, however, evaluated by R. as evidencing inadequate awareness of important differences between "actual" or empirical spaces on the one hand, and cultic spaces located in a mythic and thus distant past such as that described in Leviticus on the other. Even the best of recent scholarly treatments of social and ritual space in Leviticus, R. argues, presuppose that the conceptualization of space in the text of Leviticus directly mirrors either existing or desired cultic space. Against this background, R. suggests that in order to provide a better account of the role of Leviticus in constructing a socially relevant memory of Israel's cultic past, a methodology is required that integrates a blend of social-scientific studies of memory and interdisciplinary research on ritual space; for that purpose, recent anthropological and other appropriations of philosopher Henri Lefebvre's model of space as the product of an interaction among physical, mental, and symbolic fields is used by R. to analyze space in Leviticus as not merely a matter of spaces as places, i.e., as relatively stable or even static phenomena, but more subtly as dynamic environments in, around, and through which participants in ritual events move with a rich variety of meanings. Of the various noteworthy results produced by R.'s application of her methodological synthesis, the three most illuminating might be (1) her reading of Leviticus 16, the Yom Kippur text, as designed to help nonpriestly Israelites to imagine the processes of movement in all the spaces required for the ritual; (2) her proposal that the many differences between the wilderness referential context in Leviticus and a Jerusalemite context of its early textual reception would have required any practice of ritual imitation to be imaginative and contextually adapted; (3) and finally, her interpretation of the absence of reference to either a king or royal patronage for the cult in Leviticus is indicative of an authorial interest in constructing a paradigmatic memory for a people living under foreign rule in which all that is needed for their meaningful participation in the cult are priests, the law, and the people themselves. [Adapted from published abstract - C.T. B.]


Published abstract: A critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch is one of the most urgent desiderata of Hebrew Bible research. The present volume on Leviticus is the first out of a series of five meant to fill this gap. It provides a diplomatic edition of the five books of the Samaritan Torah, based on the oldest preserved Samaritan manuscripts. Throughout the entire work, the Samaritan Hebrew text as gathered from 30 different manuscripts is compared with further Samaritan witnesses (esp. the Samaritan Targum, the Samaritan Arabic translation, and the oral Samaritan reading tradition) as well as with non-Samaritan witnesses of the Pentateuch, especially the Masoretic text, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Septuagint, creating an indispensable resource and tool not only for those working with the Samaritan Pentateuch, but for any scholar interested in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible in general, and particularly the Pentateuch. For more information see the excerpt on academia.edu.

Published abstract: The ritual texts of the Pentateuch do not always reflect actual cultic procedures of the Second Temple. Two examples are examined where this is probably the case: first, the confusion of tǝnûpâ and tǝrûmâ and, second, the blood manipulation of Exodus 24. A careful examination of these two examples can lead to a better appreciation of the historical cult of Israel and the effects of textualization of rituals.

Published abstract: Mark A. Awabdy provides a nuanced and extensive understanding of the noun גֵּר (gēr, engl. immigrant) in the book of Deuteronomy (D). He argues that a precise reconstruction of the historical referents of D’s gēr is impossible and has led scholars to misread or overlook literary, theological, and sociological determinants. By analyzing D’s gēr texts and contexts, evidence emerges for: the non-Israelite and non-Judahite origins of D’s gēr; the distinction between the gēr in D’s prologue-epilogue and legal core; and the different meanings and origins of D’s “gēr-in-Egypt” and “ebed-in-Egypt” formulae. Awabdy further contends that D’s revision of Exodus’ Decalogue and Covenant Code and independence from H reveal D’s tendencies to accommodate the gēr and interface the gēr with YHWH’s redemption of Israel. He concludes by defining how D integrates the gēr into the community of YHWH’s people.

Published abstract: In Leviticus Awabdy offers the first commentary on the Greek version of Leviticus according to Codex Vaticanus (4th century CE), which binds the Old and New Testaments into a single volume as Christian scripture. Distinct from other LXX Leviticus commentaries that employ a critical edition and focus on translation technique, Greco-Roman context and reception, this study interprets a single Greek manuscript on its own terms in solidarity with its early Byzantine users unversed in Hebrew. With a formal-equivalence English translation of a new, uncorrected edition, Awabdy illuminates Leueitikon in B as an aesthetic composition that not only exhibits inherited Hebraic syntax and Koine lexical forms, but its own structure and theology, paragraph (outdented) divisions, syntax and pragmatics, intertextuality, solecisms and textual variants.

Published abstract: This article examines the innovative focus on Sabbath observance that characterizes the Holiness legislation (H). By comparing H’s conception of the Sabbath with what is known about this sacred time from other biblical and extrabiblical sources, I demonstrate that H creatively blends two aspects of the Sabbath that were not always connected: (1) the idea, already present in the Decalogue and Gen 2:2–3, that the Sabbath is a time of cessation held every seventh day; and (2)
the more traditional associations of the Sabbath with sacrificial rites at the shrine. I conclude by assessing the implications of H’s dual requirements of Sabbath observance—that is, both the cessation of labor and the accompanying sanctuary rituals—for contextualizing the H materials in the history of ancient Israel. I suggest that the prominence of the Sabbath in Lev 17–26 may not reflect H’s origins in the “templeless” situation of the Babylonian exile, as is often argued. H’s distinctive concept of the Sabbath may rather reflect a Persian-period context, when collective obligations to the cult were renegotiated to ensure the success of the Second Temple.

Harrington, Hannah K., The Use of Leviticus in Ezra-Nehemiah, in: Journal of Hebrew Scriptures 13, 2013, Article 3, 1–20. Published abstract: The significant dependence of Ezra-Nehemiah on Deuteronomic traditions is indisputable, but the relationship between Ezra-Nehemiah and Leviticus is less clear. Recently, scholarship has focused attention on social-political contexts recorded in Ezra-Nehemiah which may have given rise to the writing of Leviticus, or parts of it. However, with the current wide disparity of views along this line of inquiry, it seems appropriate to revisit particular traditions found in these books in order to gain a sense of logical progression of thought. The analysis below examines significant cultic traditions from Leviticus along with their counterparts in Ezra-Nehemiah and asks which version of the law is primary. … In conclusion, it appears most logical that many cultic traditions from various parts of Leviticus preceded the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah.


Zu den einzelnen Kapiteln

Lev 1

Literatur

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, Reading as an Act of Offering. Reconsidering the Genre of Leviticus 1, in: Houtman, Alberdina; Poorthuis, Marcel; Schwartz, Joshua J.; Turner, Joseph (Hg.), The Actuality of Sacrifice. Past and Present (Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 28), Leiden 2014, 34–46. Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 699, #2211: Exegesis of the sacrificial system in Leviticus 1-7, the book’s offering tōrôt, has long been focused on issues of source-redaction- and form-criticism. However, reading these texts simply as ritual handbooks does not reveal how they function on a canonical level. Furthermore, such readings ignore the question of why these texts have been read in situations far beyond cultic sacrifice. This is the point of departure for E.-K.’s rhetorical interpretation of these texts. Along with other scholars, she seeks to explain the ways in which Leviticus 1 can be read as a fictional text, without denying its possible actual ritual use. Accordingly, rather than focusing on the historical practice of offerings in ancient Israel, she concentrates rather on the literary features of the chapter and their rhetorical
function. Her main questions are thus: Why are texts re-read beyond cultic situations? What is fictional about the reading process? How does the text understand sacrifice as expressed in its literary and rhetorical form? [Adapted from author's introduction — C.T.B.]


Lev 2

Literatur


Published abstract: According to Lev 2, frankincense is offered along with grain offerings, although this is mentioned in relation to the fine flour offering and not in relation to prepared grain offerings. This article proposes that the function of the addition of frankincense is to create a “sweet savor” for nonanimal offerings, which, in contrast to animal offerings, do not produce a good smell when they are burned. There is therefore no need to burn frankincense along with prepared grain offerings because baking or frying of the grain also produces a good smell that symbolizes the “sweet savor” associated with voluntary offerings.

Lev 4–5

Literatur

Nolland, John, Does the Cultic אָשֶׁם Make Reparation to God?: Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 91, 2015, 87–110.

Published abstract: Despite the present popularity of the view, the אָשֶׁם offering is not recompense to God. אָשֶׁם became the name of a cultic offering as a “recompense offering” in the special sense of a cultic offering associated with recompense to a wronged person (Lev 5,2–26; cf. Num 5,5–8). The range then expanded in stages to cover offences that had some kind of similarity to the offences already associated with an אָשֶׁם. At some point the specific reason for the name may have been lost sight of, and further expansion unconstrained by the original connection became possible. For many of the אָשֶׁם offerings an alternative development is, however, more likely, a parallel to that which produced the חטאת offering. In relation to this development the choice of אָשֶׁם for the name of the offering simply marks a fit between offence and offering, but with no suggestion that this fit takes the form of offence and compensation. This is simply God’s provision for making retrieval possible.


Published abstract: The case against חטאת and the piel of חטא referring to a sin offering does not make purification offering the necessary alternative. When sin is
being addressed by the חטּאת, it connects with moral impurity only in the exceptional case of the Day of Atonement. Not impurity but defect/deficiency provides the right level of generality for making sense of the whole range of texts. Unless the view in Ezek 43:26 is an unstated assumption of all the Pentateuchal cultic texts, it seems likely that the חטּאת can deal with a deficiency that is neither of impurity nor sin. Despite the MT exclusive focus of non-cultic uses of חטּאת on sin, the wider uses of the חטא root opens up a place for a cultic use where blame is not necessarily involved.


Abstract from OTA: In this reprint of a section of his 2013 HCOT commentary on Leviticus 1-10, W. turns to the laws on "sin" and "guilt" offerings in Leviticus 4-5, analyzing the historical and literary context of these rituals in order to explain the significance and meaning of their names. From a historical point of view, W. argues that sin and guilt offerings were priestly innovations during the 8th to 6th cents. B.C.E. that were developed in response to changing political and economic realities. These offerings increased the prominence and wealth of the priestly class even as the political fortunes of Judah's royalty declined. However, foreign invasions and the ultimate destruction of Israel and Judah called into question the effectiveness of Temple worship, a concern perhaps addressed by Leviticus 4 in its emphasis on unintentional sins. The priests could not reasonably claim to effect atonement for intentional sins, given the catastrophic punishment their nations underwent. By emphasizing unintentional sins instead, the priests could still play an indispensable role in a skeptical community. Furthermore, these offerings created a role for confession and restitution, which anticipates the hope for the survival of the covenant in Lev 26:42-45. From a literary point of view, W. argues that internal references in Leviticus 4-5 to the words of Moses connect the above offerings to the larger rhetorical context of the Torah. When the Torah was assembled in the Second Temple period, these traditions addressed the people's ritual need for atonement, not only ritually but also textually. They invite readers to identify themselves as the "Israelites" in the narrative and take seriously the reality of human sin. Thus the terms "sin" and "guilt" have resonated with the ritual and emotional needs of worshipers for thousands of years—even after the cessation of Temple worship. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]


Published abstract: The argument presented in this article is that the term ‘asham’ in Isa 53:10 refers to the sacrificial ritual of the guilt offering, that this reference is supported by indications throughout Isaiah 53, and that therefore the suffering and death of this Servant of the LORD is to be understood as sacrificial by analogy with the ritual of the guilt or reparation offering in the book of Leviticus. This conclusion,
much contested in contemporary scholarship, is supported by a survey of the reception of this text in the period prior to early Christianity.

Assessment: Although many of B.’s observations are helpful and plausible, the overall thesis suffers from the problem that the final condition of the Servant makes him not acceptable as an offering: The Servant bears infirmities and diseases, is full of bruises (Isa 53:3-5), and an animal in such a condition is not eligible for an offering or sacrifice (see Lev 22:17-25). Hence it is necessary to underscore the metaphorical language of the Fourth Servant Song: It gleans some aspects from cultic language and sacrificial concepts, including the ‘asham’ offering from Lev 5:14-19 and 7:1-6, but it does not entirely take over the ‘asham’ as a priestly concept for cultic atonement. The Fourth Servant Song rather mixes bits and pieces from various sources in order to create a new idea of atonement by human suffering (of a group, i.e., Israel, rather than an individual). Here one finds a close relationship with the Prayer of Azariah (Dan 3), as B. also points out. But the Prayer of Azariah rather draws heavily upon Leviticus and the sacrificial logic than on the Fourth Servant Song. See Hieke, Thomas, Atonement in the Prayer of Azariah (Dan 3:40), in: Xeravits, Géza G.; Zsengellér, József (eds.), Deuterocanonical Additions to the Old Testament Books. Selected Studies (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 5), Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2010, 43–59.


Lev 10

Literatur


Published Abstract: The story of Nadab and Abihu has been called “a model of undecidability.” For many readers it looks like “a punishment in search of a crime” (Edward Greenstein). Though scholars have posed numerous suggestions as to why Nadab and Abihu are incinerated beside the altar, none has compelled assent. Edward Greenstein suggested that this aporia in the text is not accidental but was intended by the author. I concur with this conclusion but not with the Derridean explanation he offers. Apophatic theology offers an account that is more in keeping with the lineaments of a Priestly theology of divine presence.


Abstract: H.’s analysis of the premature deaths of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10:1–6) supports Philo’s interpretation of this narrative when he states that the two sons of Aaron entered the Tabernacle naked. However, whereas Philo regarded their conduct favorably, H.’s analysis suggests that the author implies that they were violating biblical laws, especially Exod 28:42–43. The Nadab and Abihu narrative may
therefore be regarded in part as an implicit polemic against worship of YHWH in a manner other ancient Near Eastern nations worshipped their gods – naked.

http://jbq.jewishbible.org/assets/Uploads/414/JBQ_414_2_wolakalcohol.pdf


Lev 11

Literatur

Hawley, Lance, The Agenda of Priestly Taxonomy and the Conceptualization of ṭāmēʾ (טָמֵא) and šeqeṣ (שֶׁקֶץ) in Leviticus 11: CBQ 77, 2015, 231–249. Published abstract: Anthropologists and biblical scholars have long sought to understand the rationale for the categorization of animals in Leviticus 11. The text itself provides no overt answer; rather, it presents the reader with a systematic taxonomy. In this article, I seek to demonstrate how the priestly authors conceptualize ṭāmēʾ (טָמֵא, “unclean”) and šeqeṣ (שֶׁקֶץ, “detestable thing”) as identifications for different sets of animals in Leviticus 11. The system of differentiation and classification itself, as it is expressed in the compositional layers of Leviticus 11, provides the best way forward for determining the Priestly justification for distinguishing between permissible and impermissible animals for eating. After tracing the compositional history of Leviticus 11, I argue that the taxonomy has a clear focus on land quadrupeds, which may hint at the agenda of the Priestly authors, namely, to undergird theologically Israel’s sacrificial practices. Additionally, the taxonomy directly corresponds to the systematic ordering of the world in Genesis 1, reflecting the Priestly ideal that temple life is woven into the fabric of the created cosmos.

Hobson, Tom, Kosher in the Greek: The Giraffe and the Snake-Fighter?: ZAR 19, 2013, 307-312. Die griechischen Begriffe δφιομάχης (Saga ephippigera?) in Lev 11,22LXX und καμηλοπάρδαλις (Giraffe?) in Dtn 14,5LXX sind vermutlich keine Phantasienamen, sondern authentische Wiedergaben der hebräischen Begriffe, auch wenn nicht mehr bestimmt werden kann, was genau die LXX damit meinte.


Abstract: The Book of Leviticus understands dietary rules as a means for the people to become holy. Leviticus 11 became the basis for Kashrut, the Jewish dietary laws. The rules of Leviticus 11 are the result of a very old culture of food in the Eastern Mediterranean region (especially the Southern Levant). The chapter forms the starting point of a specific Jewish dietary culture: this religious culture combines obedience toward the Torah and affirmation of identity by establishing a certain diet marked by the exclusion of several sorts of food. The dietary rules from the Old and the New Testament shall make readers of the Bible sensitive to ecological questions relating to human nutrition. However, they cannot be received at face value, but need to be developed further according to contemporary conditions of living.


Ruane, Nicole J., Pigs, Purity, and Patrilineality: The Multiparity of Swine and Its Problems for Biblical Ritual and Gender Construction: JBL 134/3, 2015, 489–504. Published abstract: The biblical characterization of pigs as impure has been interpreted in a variety of ways. Most have focused on the anomalies of the pig compared with other domesticated animals, especially with regard to their alimentary processes. All interpretations, however, have neglected a primary feature of pigs that makes them radically different from all other clean land animals, namely, that they are multiparous, giving birth in litters. This article argues that the multiparity of pigs makes them incompatible with other ritually clean land animals in four ways: (1) All clean land animals are uniparous. (2) As multiparous animals, pigs do not bear a true firstborn male, which would make them different from all clean domesticated animals. This feature is most important because the sanctity of the domesticated firstling is recognized by all pentateuchal sources, and, furthermore, the ideology of the firstborn male is integrally related to the human practices of inheritance, lineage, and wealth management. (3) The multiparity of pigs highlights abundant female fertility in comparison with the more controlled and managed fertility seen in the biblical purity systems. (4) Multiparous animals are capable of bearing the offspring of multiple sires simultaneously, a phenomenon that conflicts with the biblical focus on paternity.

Aitken, James K., Why is the Giraffe Kosher? Exorcism in Dietary Laws of the Second Temple Period: Biblische Notizen 164, 2015, 21–34. Published abstract: One of the more surprising animals considered lawful to eat is the giraffe. While the meaning of the Hebrew term in the list of clean ruminates (Deut 14:5) remains uncertain, the Septuagint is the first to identify it as a giraffe. The reason seems to be the cultural prominence that the giraffe gained in Egypt of the third century BCE, leading the translator to make the text both Egyptian and exotic. This is indicative of other animals in the list of permissible foods, chosen more for the exoticism they lend to the passage than as animals that were actually eaten. From this it may be suggested that the application of the kosher laws to animals would have been applied only minimally, since few animals would have been available for eating. The translator resorts to exoticism in translating the list of animals, possibly reflecting a wider interest in antiquity in fine and peculiar dining.
Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 670, #2213: M.'s article engages with the old debate about the diachronic relationship between Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14. It starts with outlining certain criteria which might help to determine directionality in the relationship between the two texts. It then provides a synchronic overview of the chapters, focusing on their commonalities and differences before proceeding to address the diachronic debate, in connection with which M. contrasts and critiques the views of Christophe Nihan and Reinhard Achenbach. On this basis, M. then attempts to draw some conclusions regarding the debate. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Published Abstract: The food laws of Lev 11:3–23 and Deut 14:3–20 are among the great enigmas of biblical law. This paper views the food laws as a series of “narrative paradigms” aimed at a high-context society in which information is shared and internalized. This shared social knowledge raises the question of how the common environment of ancient Israel would make the categories intuitively clear. The narrative paradigms make sense because they reflect day-to-day engagement with the environment. The paradigm cases identify certain characteristics of a taxonomic group, which are then negated. The effect is to convey a complex body of knowledge about what can and cannot be eaten in an economical, unambiguous, and practical manner. The laws build on one another, enabling the audience to accumulate knowledge as they progress through the different categories. In this way, the very construction of the categories clean and unclean—and hence the structure and presentation of the laws themselves—is shaped by practical wisdom. This is consistent with self-executing narrative rules elsewhere in biblical law. This reanalysis helps us to understand both the compositional strategy of the food laws and their social function.

Abstract from OTA: In The Jewish Dietary Laws in the Ancient World Jordan D. Rosenblum explores how cultures critique and defend their religious food practices. In particular he focuses on how ancient Jews defended the kosher laws, or kashrut, and how ancient Greeks, Romans, and early Christians critiqued these practices. As the kosher laws are first encountered in the Hebrew Bible, this study is rooted in ancient biblical interpretation. It explores how commentators in antiquity understood, applied, altered, innovated upon, and contemporized biblical dietary regulations. He shows that these differing interpretations do not exist within a vacuum; rather, they are informed by a variety of motives, including theological, moral, political, social, and financial considerations. In analyzing these ancient conversations about culture and cuisine, he dissects three rhetorical strategies deployed when justifying various interpretations of ancient Jewish dietary regulations: reason, revelation, and allegory. Finally, Rosenblum reflects upon wider, contemporary debates about food ethics.


Author’s conclusion (pp. 293–294): Thus, when examined against the wider social background of the Iron Age, once pork became associated with the Philistines, it became an important cultural and ethnic marker. Its gradual association with the Philistines influenced its consumption both within Philistine communities (where its consumption initially even grew with time) and without them (where it was usually avoided, at least among neighboring communities, and was never very popular). When this association waned, and the Philistines decreased their consumption of this meat, some communities slightly increased its consumption (whereas others continued to maintain the taboo). Moreover, the distribution of pigs in space and time correlates nicely with other sensitive traits of material culture, and is indicative of the overall strategies of boundary maintenance used by the different groups residing in the region. Finally, more nuanced studies might reveal more subtleties in the pig politics of the different eras, and probably some subgroupings within the major, broad identity groups discussed in this article, thus refining the conclusions presented above. Still, the overall patterns identified above, which show that pork consumption was related to ethnic negotiation, is not likely to change.

Altmann, Peter, Banned Birds. The Birds of Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 (Archaeology and Bible 1), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Published abstract: Peter Altmann beantwortet in dieser Studie die schwierige Frage, warum die hebräische Bibel den Verzehr bestimmter Vögel verbietet, indem er diese Vögel in den Kontext ihres allgemeinen Auftretens in der Archäologie, den Texten und der Ikonographie im Vorderen Orient der Antike und innerhalb der Bibel selber setzt. / The dietary prohibitions in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 represent one of the most detailed textual overlaps in the Pentateuch between the Priestly material and Deuteronomy, yet study of them is often stymied by the rare terminology. This is especially the case for the birds: their identities are shrouded in mystery and the reasons for their prohibition debated. Peter Altmann attempts to break this impasse by setting these flyers within the broader context of birds and flying creatures in the Ancient Near East. His investigation considers the zooarchaeological data on birds in the ancient Levant, iconographic and textual material on mundane and mythic flyers from Egypt and Mesopotamia, as well as studying the symbolic functions of birds within the texts of the Hebrew Bible itself. Within this context, he undertakes thorough terminological studies of the expressions for the types of birds, concluding with possible reasons for their exclusion from the prescribed diet and the proposed composition-critical location for the texts in their contexts.
Lev 12

**Literatur**


Der Artikel bietet u.a. einen Überblick über spätantike und rabbínische Vermutungen über die Entwicklung des ungeborenen Kindes (s. zu Lev 12,2).


Der Artikel befasst sich mit der Etymologie und Semantik des Begriffs niddā.


Published Abstract: Interpreters have provided numerous unsatisfactory reasons for why priestly literature stipulates that women endure a longer impurity after the birth of a girl than they endure after the birth of a boy. This article situates Leviticus 12 within a wide range of medical discourses, found in Hittite, Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Christian literature, in order to illuminate the priestly rationale behind this legislation. It demonstrates that these differing periods of ritual impurity relate to ancient medical beliefs that females developed more slowly than did males. These different articulation rates were believed to result in different lengths of postpartum lochial discharge, which meant that the new mother suffered different lengths of ritual impurity based on the sex of the newborn child.


Lev 13–14

**Literatur**


are themselves ritualized, protected from critical analysis and transformed into rhetorical communication. S. argues that the elimination ritual for the diseased house in the above text has turned into didactic literature that teaches about the clean/unclean and about the nature of ritual authority. Examining the structure and content of the text, he concludes that the absence of performative detail makes the text unsuitable as a manual for priestly practice. Since the text cannot be performed "as is," we should accordingly read it as a rhetorical claim, an assertion that impurity is a concrete-materialistic force rather than a miasmatic or dynamistic spiritual force. Thus, the priests who diagnose the problem and repair its breach of purity are indispensable specialists whose authority in such matters is absolute; they are purveyors of a ritualistic monopoly with its concomitant spiritual and social control. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]


Lev 15

Literatur


Published abstract: This article compares three versions of a rabbinic story dealing with the so called impurity of women during the menstruation and its biblical roots. Since rabbinic stories do not stand on their own but are always used to illustrate an argument made in the context in which they are transmitted, be it Talmudic or midrashic, special attention is paid to the specific function the story has in each of the studied contexts.

Published abstract: The biblical instructions in Leviticus 15:19–24 about women’s regular shedding of the uterine lining and their religious activity mostly refer to male conceptualizations of the female body in Antiquity: The male concepts consider women during their menses as unable to participate in the cult. The woman’s status during this period is called “impure.” The paper presents the overall structure of Leviticus 15, a short note about the origin of the text, and an exegesis of Leviticus 15:19–24: What exactly do the biblical prescriptions regulate and what was the impact for everyday life? Finally some examples demonstrate the reception of this biblical passage in Early Judaism.


Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 670, #2214: The law in Lev 15:18 seems most puzzling, running counter to the tenor of biblical morality. G. begins by referring to Philo and Josephus, who recognize two types of possible defilement: nocturnal emission (Lev 15:16-17) and legal conjugal intercourse (Lev 15:18). Josephus refers to a moral problem in this connection citing the pleasure of the act and the resulting debasement of the soul. He accordingly labels sexual intercourse as “fornication” unless it is for the purpose of begetting children. The Mishnah seder Toharot also offers a discussion of the subject. The treatments of Philo and Josephus are dominated by a strong dualism between body and soul. This explains the Jewish custom of bathing after conjugal intercourse. G.’s conclusion is that Leviticus 15 is about unintended impurities caused by uncontrollable bodily discharges and communicated by contact. Thus, Lev 15:18 “does not speak about sexual intercourse and does not attach any impurity to legal sexuality.”—M.K.

Lev 16

Literatur


Abstract: The Yom Kippur is the central feast and fast of Judaism until today. The ritual as described in Leviticus plays a basic role in post-biblical Judaism and Christianity. S. B. E. describes its reception in the New Testament (e.g., Acts 27:9-10) and Early Christianity (Epistle of Barnabas, John Chrysostom, Adversus Judaeos). He presents a detailed comparison of Mark 15:6-15 and its synoptic parallel in Matt 27:15-26. The changes that Matthew introduces in the Markan text as his source demonstrate that Matthew wants to allude to the Day of Atonement blood ritual in the temple.


Published Abstract: The live goat ritual in Leviticus 16 has, for many decades, attracted debate in biblical scholarship. However, the main focus has often been on the identity of Azazel. This article examines some aspects of the live goat ritual in
Leviticus 16: (1) the use of two hands rather than the usual one hand laid over the head of the goat; (2) the content of the confession over the goat; (3) the purpose of the rite; (4) whether the ritual is a sacrifice or something else; and (5) the significance of the ritual. I contend that the two hands used are representational, that the ritual is a unique sacrifice, and that the ritual symbolized a complete eradication of sin from the community.

Adapted from published abstract: In this paper P. seeks to explore the intertextual relationship between The Day of Purification (or Day of Atonement) in Leviticus 16 and Psalm 65. P. adopts Ziva Ben-Porat’s approach to reading intertextually as the approach allows the exegete to attempt to balance concerns of both the reader and historical development. P. argues that markers in the text of Psalm 65 such as בファー, creation theology, and עשתה שגא, activate both the entire text of Leviticus 16 and the theological world it connotes. The outcome is a psalm that draws on a rich theological tradition that became especially important in the post-exilic period.

Abstract: The builders of Jerusalem’s Second Temple made a remarkable ritual innovation. They left the holy of holies empty. They apparently rebuilt the other furniture of the temple, but did not remake the ark of the covenant that, according to tradition, had occupied the inner sanctum of Israel’s desert tabernacle and of Solomon’s Temple. The fact that the ark of the covenant went missing has excited speculation ever since. Watts considers how biblical literature dealt with this ritual innovation. Why did the Pentateuch, a Second-Temple-era work at least in its final form, describe in elaborate detail the manufacture and use of a ritual object (Exod 25:10 –22; 37:1–9; 40:20 –21; Lev 16:12–16) that did not exist in its own time? How did this Torah support and validate Second Temple rituals that deviated from its prescriptions in such a central way? Watts’ thesis is that the Pentateuch was shaped to lay the basis for Torah scrolls to replace the ark of the covenant as the iconic focus of Israel’s worship.

Published abstract: Leviticus scholars debate the reasons for the differences between the Old Greek (OG) and Hebrew witnesses. Leviticus 16:1 offers an intriguing example that raises the literary question, Did Nadab and Abihu draw near before Yhwh (MT, SP) or only offer strange fire before Yhwh (OG, Tgs., Syr., Vg. and possibly 11Q1)? In this article, I explore the internal evidence of the OG, assess the targums, and give particular attention to reevaluating the fragmentary evidence from Qumran. My conclusions illuminate another dimension of the mystery of the biblical traditions of Aaron’s oldest sons.


Ruane considers how the writer of Leviticus 16 understood the two goats of the Yom Kippur rites to act together as a single ḥaṭṭāʾ offering (16:5). Ruane argues that although this ritual complex with the two goats is quite different from the paradigmatic ḥaṭṭāʾ rites in Leviticus 4–5, it nonetheless must be understood as a ḥaṭṭāʾ offering. Moreover, taking this designation of the two goats as a ḥaṭṭāʾ seriously helps to articulate the fundamental features of all ḥaṭṭāʾ rites, namely, the separation of the offering into two distinct parts, one of which becomes portrayed as harmful or unclean, and the elimination of that negative part.


Hieke reflects on “Participation and Abstraction in the Yom Kippur Ritual according to Leviticus 16.” Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, is widely observed as a Holy Day among Jewish people all over the world. Although it goes back to the description of the ritual in Leviticus 16, the actual celebration of the day differs widely from the biblical text. A long and intensive process of abstraction took place over centuries. The issue of abstraction lies at the roots of the ritual itself; abstraction already occurred at the time when the ritual was actually carried out at the Second Temple in Jerusalem (before 70 C.E.). Yet the inner logic and concern of Yom Kippur was central for the composers of the book of Leviticus and the Torah: They placed the description within the center of the Torah. Hieke demonstrates that the central position of Leviticus 16 (the prescription for the Day of Atonement) is also justified and corroborated by content-related aspects. In Leviticus 16, all groups within the people of Israel participate (the High Priest, the priests, the Israelites), all sorts of sins and impurities are eliminated, and the ritual itself shows the highest degree of abstraction (a minimal amount of blood in an empty room suffices for the efficacy of the ritual). Methodologically, an exegetical commentary has to explore the inner logics of the text and to detect its semantic concepts. In this sense, Leviticus 16 represents a comprehensive reset of cultic and social relationships; the concept includes purification as well as reconciliation (or atonement), in a collective and individual way as well. By means of abstraction, the ritual itself turns into a metaphor, even at the time when it actually still took place in Jerusalem. Jews all over the diaspora abstained
from food consumption and thus participated spiritually in the ritual of the Holy Day. These concepts constitute the basis and starting point for multiple transformations and further abstractions as well as metaphorical charging in Judaism (the liturgy in the synagogue, fasting, rest from working) and Christianity (the christological application in Rom 3:25: Christ as *hilasterion* – expiation or place of atonement, etc.).


Taking a theoretical start from the work of Stanley Fish on the authority of interpretive communities (presented in his influential 1980 book, *Is There a Text in This Class*?), Gilders explores how interpreters determine that the ritual complex for the “Day of Atonement” set out in Leviticus 16 includes, or does not include, the application of blood to a golden incense altar inside the tent-shrine. The importance of interpretive assumptions about the incense altar and the blood rituals it receives are the focus of his paper. He investigates the activity of two significant ritual-textual interpretive communities that engage with Leviticus 16 and the ritual complex it presents: those who adopt a largely holistic and synthesizing approach to the text and those who attend to what David Carr calls the “fractures” in the textual corpus. Gilders highlights the crucial role played by Exodus 30:10 for interpretive decisions to see an incense altar and blood rites directed at that altar in Leviticus 16. His paper concludes that the answer to its titular question is: It depends on whom you ask!

Lev 17

*Literatur*


Published abstract: This article argues for the importance of considering extant textual variation in connection with inner-literary processes of development (redaction, *Fortschreibung*, inner-biblical exegesis), as well as in light of the broader history of interpretation. The textual plus at Leviticus 17:4, preserved in several ancient witnesses, represents a classic case that has received very mixed evaluation, both with regard to its textual status (whether primary or secondary), and with regard to its potential legal/exegetical function. After surveying a variety of textual and interpretive assessments, the case is argued that this plus represents a deliberate exegetical expansion serving to clarify ambiguities and to specify that it is specifically slaughter for the purpose of sacrifice that is at issue in Lev 17:3–7. This variant represents an early but complex analogical effort to interpret the legal requirements of Leviticus 17 in light of Deuteronomy 12. In this way, text history takes up and extends trajectories inherent within the internal literary development of the scriptural text.
Meyer, Esias E., Leviticus 17, Where P, H, and D Meet. Priorities and Presuppositions of Jacob Milgrom and Eckart Otto, in: Gane, Roy E.; Taggar-Cohen, Ada (ed.), Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature. The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond (Resources for Biblical Study 82), Atlanta 2015, 349–367. Abstract from OTA: The difference between Otto and Milgrom regarding Leviticus 17 ultimately lies with their “prior commitments to a particular theory of composition” to use the formulation of Michael A. Lyons. Milgrom's reading of Leviticus 17 is so interwoven with his broader understanding of the development of P and H as preexilic documents that to adopt his reading of the chapter would basically mean accepting the theory of Y. Kaufmann concerning P—something that very few European scholars would be willing to do. On the other hand, to side with Otto's reading of the chapter, one must first broadly accept J. Wellhausen's understanding of P as a product of the exilic/postexilic period. One would also have to agree that P came after Deuteronomy—whether or not H is all that different from the rest of P. The bottom line is that deciding on a specific chronological order of texts from D, P, and H is not only based on the details of these texts. Rather, this decision is also influenced by scholarly presuppositions regarding the broader development of the Pentateuch. [Adapted from author's conclusion—C.T.B.]


Gaines, Jason M.H., Parallelism and Other Poetic Constructions in the Holiness Legislation: Revue Biblique 125, 2018, 481–503. Abstract from OTA: This paper examines the compositional style of the Holiness Legislation (HL, Leviticus 17-26), and concludes that a significant number of the complex's verses are best understood as featuring literary, grammatical, lexical, and phonological parallelisms. Redefining the component sentences of the HL as parallelistic rather than linear has significant exegetical ramifications, providing as it does evidence that a given verse of the segment consists of a single law that is reformulated and intensified by way of multiple clauses rather than multiple laws. Prolix repetition is, G. suggests, often necessary to convey the kernel content of a particular law, while the non-essential elements of its formulation enable the author to
display his literary artistry. Parallelism thus governs the lines of the HL by determining their shape and form.

Lev 18; Lev 20

Literatur


Published abstract: The concepts of purity and pollution are fundamental to the worldview reflected in the Hebrew Bible yet the ways that biblical texts apply these concepts to sexual relationships remain largely overlooked. Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible argues that the concept of pollution is rooted in disgust and that pollution language applied to sexual relations expresses a sense of bodily contamination resulting from revulsion. Most texts in the Hebrew Bible that use pollution language in sexual contexts reflect a conception of women as sexual property susceptible to being “ruined” for particular men through contamination by others. In contrast, the Holiness legislation of the Pentateuch applies pollution language to men who engage in transgressive sexual relations, conveying the idea that male bodily purity is a prerequisite for individual and communal holiness. Sexual transgressions contaminate the male body and ultimately result in exile when the land vomits out its inhabitants. The Holiness legislation's conception of sexual pollution, which is found in Leviticus 18, had a profound impact on later texts. In the book of Ezekiel, it contributes to a broader conception of pollution resulting from Israel's sins, which led to the Babylonian exile. In the book of Ezra, it figures in a view of the Israelite community as a body of males contaminated by foreign women. Yet the idea of female pollution rooted in a view of women as sexual property persisted alongside the idea of male pollution as an impediment to holiness. Eva Feinstein illuminates why the idea of pollution adheres to particular domains of experience, including sex, death, and certain types of infirmity. Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible allows for a more thorough understanding of sexual pollution, its particular characteristics, and the role that it plays in biblical literature.


Der eher philosophisch angelegte Artikel sieht die entsprechenden Verse in Levitikus 18,22 und 20,13 als „texts of terror“, die auch nicht durch hermeneutische Strategien entschärft werden können. S. Mathias zeigt aber, dass diese Verse gar nicht von dem sprechen, was man heute unter „Homosexualität“ im positiven Sinne (Zuneigung, Liebe, Verantwortlichkeit) versteht. Insofern muss man ihnen die Relevanz für die heutige Debatte um Homosexualität absprechen; keinesfalls kann damit christlich-kirchliche Homophobie gerechtfertigt werden.


Der Artikel untersucht die Rezeptionsgeschichte von Lev 18,5 im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament unter der Frage, ob und wenn ja wie es möglich ist, das „Gesetz“ (die Tora) zu halten. Die Antworten der Quellen sind durchaus unterschiedlich!


Published abstract: In this article, I argue that Deut 25:5-10 has precursors in Leviticus and Numbers. The subject of levirate marriage picks up the topic of daughter’s right to an inheritance (Num 27:1-11) and the related problem that when a daughter marries, the inheritance of her father might transfer to another family (Num 36:6-12). Furthermore, within the Decalogue orientation of the Deuteronomic law, Deut 25:5-10 is related to Deut 5:21a and picks up the prohibition of Lev 20:21. While it is generally forbidden to take the wife of a brother because this would dishonor him, in the special case of Deut 25:5 it is even commanded to marry the wife of the brother to preserve his name.

Assessment: While the article contains various important observations, the overall conclusions are not convincing in the end. The mixing of synchronic and diachronic argumentation does not support the basic proposal. The main interest of K. lies clearly on the suggestion of a diachronic history of origin of the treated texts. The overarching hermeneutics of “Torah” (the Rechtshermeneutik of the Pentateuch) which only works in a synchronic approach is not taken into account. Hence, K. offers no solution for a complementary reading of the statutes in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. On a diachronic level, the relationship between P, H, and D is very complicated and needs an evaluation of every single correspondence. It is not possible to develop a “master key” from one Test Case alone.


Adapted from published abstract: The prohibition of anal intercourse (not homosexual desire in general) between males in Lev 18:22 and 20:13 should be seen within the context of the theological intention of the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26). In the Code, the holiness of Yhwh is no longer restricted to the priests—it becomes relevant for the ethics of the Israelite laity as well. Moreover, the intention of the Code’s laws is to enable and advance the cycle of life. Given that intention, it follows that a kind of sexuality which interrupts the chain of offspring pertains to the sphere of death and so calls for the death penalty. In any case, however, in the daily life of ancient Israel, long-term homosexual relationships were not an option. In addition, the death penalty prescribed in Lev 20:13 does not envisage the execution of homosexuals; rather, it serves to highlight the wrongfulness of anal intercourse between men. According to
Deut 23:19, male homosexuals (and bisexuals) did exist in Judean society. Eschatological prophecy as well as Psalm 51 calls them to hope for Yhwh’s forgiveness and for Yhwh’s creation of the “new man” (cf. 2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15).


Abstract from OTA: F. reads the Holiness Code legislation in light of Deuteronomistic narratives and interpretative texts from Qumran. Just as certain sins in H defile the land and lead to the _krt_ penalty, similar offenses appear in the Dtr as pretexts for the disinheritance of heirs. F. identifies three specific sins that defile the land in H: inappropriate cultic practices, bloodshed/homicide, and sexual sin. While all three are also attested in Dtr, she focuses on the third category. In Dtr, three of David's sons commit sexual transgressions, and these sins lead to the disinheritance of all three: Amnon’s rape of his (half-)sister Tamar, Absalom's public appropriation of David's harem, and Adonijah’s request for David's concubine Abishag. David himself, of course, commits a sexual transgression with Bathsheba. Finally, F. turns to a series of parabiblical texts from Qumran that retell and reinterpret biblical narratives about sexual transgression. She argues that these texts demonstrate the capacity of sexual sin to exclude someone from a rightful inheritance. Thus, she shows that in the Bible, sexual sins result in impurity and banishment, not only in ritual texts but also in historical narratives as well as later texts that interpret those historical narratives. 

[Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: T. examines three verses in Leviticus that prohibit sexual intercourse with a menstruating woman: 15:24(P) and 18:19/20:18 (H). He explores in detail two questions that emerge from a close comparison of these verses: why does H include a narrowly ritual prohibition in the midst of moral instructions? and why is there a different punishment for the offense in P (seven-day impurity) and H (_krt_)? T. proposes that the answer to both of these questions lies in H's symbolic connection between sex with a menstruant and the foreign "abominable customs" cited in chap. 18. First, he suggests that the _krt_ penalty for this violation of cyclical impurity functions within the moral legislation of H as a reminder for Israel to avoid foreign practices that would cause expulsion from the land. Since sexual activity with a menstruant cannot result in pregnancy, it is consistent with the other four prohibited behaviors in Lev 18:19-23. Moreover, the nonproductive element of these sexual liaisons resonates with the _krt_ penalty's elimination of one's family from the land. On the second of the above questions, T. argues that the seriousness of the _krt_ penalty implies that H considers it to be an intentional act with moral implications, whereas the seven-day impurity cited in P assumes that it is merely an inadvertent moral
transgression. Even if H does consider sex with a menstruant a serious moral
transgression, the krt penalty prescribed for this is difficult for modern readers to
understand. However, such personal concerns were of little importance to the Priestly
writers vis-à-vis the balance and logic of their conceptual system. [Adapted from
published abstract—C.T.B.]

Wagner, Volker, מות יומת in Lev 20 – Strafandrohung oder Mahnrede?, ZAR 21, 2015, 233–
251.

Assessment: V. Wagner führt auf den Seiten 234 bis 249 dankenswerterweise eine
Fülle an altorientalischen Rechtstexten an, um den rechtshistorischen Hintergrund der
in Lev 20 angedrohten Strafen, insbesondere der mōt yūmāt-Sanktion zu erhellten. Er
arbeitet heraus, dass in sehr vielen Fällen die urteilende und bestrafende Instanz nicht
genannt sei, ähnlich wie im Alten Testament. Damit sei das Argument hinfällig, dass
die mōt yūmāt-Sanktion kein ausführbarer Rechtssatz sei, weil die Instanzen einer
Strafgerichtsbarkeit fehlen würden. Schließlich seien auch im Alten Orient selten bis
die derartige Instanzen genannt, man wisse nämlich, wer die entsprechenden
Sanktionen wie zu exekutieren habe. Mitin sei die mōt yūmāt-Sanktion sehr wohl als
„Todesstrafe“ zu verstehen und als solche auch ausgeführt worden. – Diese
Schlussfolgerung ist nicht unproblematisch. Das Fehlen einer explizit genannten
Exekutivinstanz ist nur eines von mehreren Argumenten, die dagegensprechen, die
mōt yūmāt-Sanktion als „Todesstrafe“ aufzufassen. Mit den weiteren von mir
genannten Argumenten im Herder-Kommentar und in meinem Artikel „Das AT und
die Todesstrafe“ (Biblica 85, 2004, 349–374) setzt sich V. Wagner vorerst nicht
auseinander. Schaut man sich die von ihm genannten Rechtstexte genauer an, so fragt
man sich in vielen Fällen, worin genau die Parallele zum biblischen Text besteht.
Meist sind die Tatbestände im altorientalischen Recht viel detaillierter geregelt und
benennen Dinge, die in den alttestamentlichen Texten so genau gar nicht genannt sind.
Auch bei den Sanktionen sind die Ausführungen oft viel differenzierter als die im
Alten Testament so häufige Standardsformel mōt yūmāt, „er wird gewiss getötet
werden“. Von daher ist die Vergleichbarkeit aus meiner Sicht stark eingeschränkt bzw.
sind die Unterschiede größer als die Gemeinsamkeiten. Ein Beispiel dazu wäre CH
§158 als „Parallele“ zu Lev 20,11 (von mir im Kommentar auf S. 778 und von V.
Wagner in seinem Text auf S. 246 genannt): Anders als Lev 20,11 steht im CH keine
Todes sanktion, sondern die Verstoßung aus dem Vaterhaus. Wer das ausführt, muss
nicht näher genannt werden: die Familie eben, wer sonst? Die Gesamttendenz der
altorientalischen „Parallelen“ ist klar: Auf differenzierte Tatbestände werden
differenzierte Sanktionen gesetzt. In Lev 20 dagegen werden fast alle Tatbestände mit
der „Standardsanktion“ mōt yūmāt versehen; Alternativen sind noch die karet-
Sanktion (von mir als „sozialer Tod“* gedeutet), die Formulierung „die Sündenlast
tragen“ und die Kinderlosigkeit. Die beiden letzteren Sanktionen sind aus meiner Sicht
eindeutig als von Gott auszuführende Strafen zu deuten. Für ein Rechtssystem wäre es
aber sehr merkwürdig, dass menschliche Instanzen („Todesstrafe“) und Gott als
strafende Instanz undifferenziert nebeneinanderstehen, noch dazu bei durchaus
ähnlichen Tatbeständen. Ich glaube daher nicht, dass es in Lev 20 bei den
„Todes sanktionen“ um von Menschen zu exekutierende Todesstrafen geht. Auch ist
das gesamte Korpus in seiner vorliegenden Endgestalt meiner Meinung nach kein ausführbares Recht, da sowohl die Tatbestände als auch die Sanktionen zu undifferenziert erscheinen und das genaue Vorgehen zur Schuldfeststellung und zur Bestrafung unklar bleibt. V. Wagner nimmt zu diesem Argument nicht Stellung, auch nicht zu der Frage, warum Tatbestände von ganz unterschiedlicher Schwere immer mit der gleichen Todessanktion belegt werden.


Völlig unverstanden fühle ich mich im letzten Abschnitt: Nirgends habe ich gesagt, dass die Strafandrohungen „nicht ernst gemeint sein“ sollen. Eher habe ich den Eindruck, dass V. Wagner das Wort „Paränese“ nicht ernst nehmen will. Den Priestern, die diese Texte verfasst haben, waren die Tatbestände, die aufgelistet

Dewrell, Heath D., „Whoring after the mōlek“ in Leviticus 20:5. A Text-Critical Examination: ZAW 127, 2015, 628–635. Published abstract: In scholarly discussion of the nature of the so-called lmwlk offerings, one especially contentious issue has been the meaning of the lmwlk phrase itself. Scholars have traditionally translated the phrase, “to (the god) Molek.” Otto Eissfeldt, however, famously proposed that the phrase should receive the translation “as a molek (-sacrifice).” Many scholars have argued that the phrase “to whore after the molek” (lznwt ʾhry hmlk) in Lev 20:5 is incompatible with Eissfeldt’s proposal. Text-critical examination of the verse, however, reveals that the phrase in question is most likely the result of a textual corruption. In its original form, the phrase may actually serve to establish Eissfeldt’s thesis.


Hollenback, George M., Who Is Doing What to Whom Revisited: Another Look at Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13: JBL 136, 2017, 529–537. Published abstract: According to the overwhelming majority of modern English Bible translations, the proscriptions of male-on-male sexual intercourse in Lev 18:22 and 20:13 appear to be directed to the activity of the insertive party, the few remaining versions simply proscribing male-on-male sex in such a general way that there is no
indication one way or the other as to whose activity is being addressed. Jerome T. Walsh has challenged the status quo, however, persuasively arguing that, when correctly interpreted, the Hebrew text indicates that it is instead the activity of the receptive party that is being addressed (“Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13: Who Is Doing What to Whom?,” JBL 120 [2001]: 201–9). Building on the foundation laid by Walsh, the present work analyzes the two verses in their immediate Hebrew context and applies the same analysis to the earliest translations, the result being a validation of Walsh’s contention that the proscriptions were indeed directed to the activity of the receptive rather than the insertive party.

Abstract: Der Artikel untersucht das Grundprinzip hinter den Strafbestimmungen von Bundesbuch (B), deuteronomischem Gesetz (D) und Heiligkeitsgesetz (H). Während es B vornehmlich um Schadensersatz gehe, plädiere D auf Vergeltung und Beschwichtigung der Gottheit, und H stelle hinsichtlich der Strafbegründungen eine Kombination aus Vergeltung und Abschreckung dar.


Published abstract: The list of forbidden unions in Leviticus 18 reflects comprehensive revision that obscures its original character. The motive for reworking this passage was to reverse the original text’s implicit toleration of male same-sex intercourse. This conclusion finds support in additional biblical and ancient Near Eastern texts.


Abstract from OTA: G.’s article considers God’s revelation concerning homosexuality in three key OT passages, Gen 19:1-11; Lev 18:22 and 20:13. These three passages convey a consistent message: Homosexuality is a violation of God’s created order and stands opposed to God’s intention that his people throughout the ages live in such a way to manifest his surpassing greatness.


Published abstract: This article explores whether the prohibitions against homosexual sex in Lev 18:22 and 20:13 have ongoing relevance today. It begins by noting that the use of the term abomination in these verses does not settle the question and then turns to consider three different types of responses to the question: (1) the prohibitions do not apply today because Leviticus does not apply today; (2) the prohibitions do not apply today because the reason this activity was prohibited in Leviticus no longer applies today; and (3) the prohibitions do apply today because the reason the activity was prohibited in Leviticus still applies today. The conclusion notes that multiple moral rationales may be at work behind a single command and considers why this is significant when discussing whether these particular verses have ongoing relevance. Assessment: The very well written article discusses various hermeneutical questions regarding the current relevance and normativity of the regulations on same-sex sexual intercourse in the book of Leviticus. Several hermeneutical points of view, which occur in the discussion about the biblical passages today, are put to the test or even questioned. The only point that ultimately remains is that the book of Leviticus refers strongly to the gender roles of the Creation Report (Genesis 1) and therefore retains its
relevance from this biblical text. However, there are two critical points to be objected to: First, the reference of Leviticus 18 and 20 to Genesis 1 on a literary level is not very pronounced (or does not exist). Second, it is by no means proven that the statements of Genesis 1 about the manifestation of humankind in two sexes (or: genders?) allow sexual relations exclusively between a man and a woman. This is thus a petio principii.


Commenting on a biblical book sometimes requires the suggestion of new solutions to much disputed problems. During his work on Leviticus 18 and 20, Thomas Hieke identified “the Molech” as a crux interpretum and proposed a new understanding of the term la-molech (看一看, 18:21 and 20:1–5). He presented the results in an article in the journal Die Welt des Orients and in his HThKAT commentary, all of which were written in German. Hence the essay “The Prohibition of Transferring an Offspring to ‘the Molech’: No Child Sacrifice in Leviticus 18 and 20” presents the results for the first time in English and is an updated version of these publications. After a brief overview of the pertinent terminology, the article summarizes usual interpretations: la-molech as a term for a Canaanite deity; a term for a sacrifice; a dedication rite for children. The context of Leviticus 18 and 20, however, does not fit these interpretations. Hieke therefore argues that the phrase “you shall not give any of your offspring to pass them over to Molech” may be read as a cipher or code. He understands the consonants l-m-l-k as a reference to pre-exilic stamp seals in Judaea containing the words “for the king;” the Septuagint translation ἄρχοντι of Leviticus 18:21 points in the same direction. The reality behind the phrase is the priestly prohibition for the Jewish community to hand over any of their children to serve in the Persian army or the households of the Persian authorities. The children given as servants to foreigners were lost for the Jewish cult community. However, the priests could not express their opposition to this kind of collaboration with the Persian authorities directly without raising suspicion; hence, they used the well-known sequence of consonants lmlk. This interpretation fits both the context of Leviticus 18 and 20, which features family laws, and the socio-historical reality of Jewish life under Persian domination.


Abstract from OTA: Lev 18:5 (“the one doing them shall live in them”) offers a prism through which to view the idiom of Scripture – the distinctive dynamic and theology of the Bible. The verse pinpoints the interplay between God’s doing-and-living and our own. At issue here is whether the commandments reflect a “command-and-do” structure of life with God, which maximizes a quid pro quo dynamic between God and us; or rather delineate a “covenant place where” we abide with God and God with us,
as a gift of shared doing pure and simple. J.’s article traces the trajectory of Lev 18:5 through both the OT and the NT, showing how pervasive the verse is in both Testaments. The main post-World War II English translation, J. argues, misrender the verse at every turn, contrary to the 16th-century Reformation Church, which understood the verse and the issue it raises under the Law and Gospel rubric. [Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]


_Published Abstract_: The Author tries to find when and why in the biblical exegesis the connection between the biblical MoIek and the Carthaginian rite of the so-called children sacrifice was made. In order to solve this question, it is necessary to have in mind two facts: the first one is to be found in the history of exegesis, the second in the historical studies on the Phoenician and Carthaginian/Punic religion. As it concerns the biblical exegesis firstly the biblical commentator of the Middle Age, Rashi, quoting the midrash, asserted that Molek was a statue. In the same age he was followed by Nicholas of Lyre, and in the Reformation age by Martin Luther and Jean Calvin. After the publication of the Greek text of Diodorus Siculus in the Renaissance the historian of Semitic religions John Selden (1617) remarked the coincidence between the Greek tale of Diodorus and the midrash quoted by Rashi. In the 17th century the two exeges, the catholic Cornelius a Lapide (1621) and the Calvinist Hugo Grotius (1648), also made the same comparison quoting a lot of classical writers—see here our _excursus_—on the matter of human sacrifice in Phoenician and Punic world. This formal coincidence between two different historical traditions—the Hebrew and Phoenician ones—around the same time is the reason why the children sacrifice became almost until now a firm tradition both in Biblical and Phoenician scholarship.

_Joosten, Jan_, A New Interpretation of Leviticus 18:22 (Par. 20:13) and Its Ethical Implications, in: Journal of Theological Studies 71, 2020, 1–10.

Published abstract: The laws in Lev. 18:22 and 20:13 are general considered to prohibit homosexual intercourse between men. A renewed investigation of the vocabulary used in the prohibition, taking an important cue from Gen. 49:4, points the way to a different understanding. As Reuben lay on his father’s bed, having intercourse with his father’s concubine, so the man addressed in Lev. 18:22 and par. is prohibited to lie on the bed of a woman, having sex with her man. The laws prohibit homosexual intercourse involving a married man.
Lev 19

Literatur


Abstract: Leviticus 19 exemplifies the basic and central chapter of the Torah’s ethics. It shows many relations to the Decalogue and other texts of the Torah. The human beings are summoned to keep these commandments in order to represent God’s holiness on earth in a way that is possible and adequate for humans (Lev 19:2). By observing the commandments, the human beings will gain a successful and happy life (Lev 18:5). One can see the core of the chapter in the demand to love one’s neighbor (Lev 19:18). The formulation of this commandment is an invitation and instruction to find true humanity.

Published abstract: Lev 19:28 prohibits tattooing, but no reason for the prohibition is given. Since it appears in a context of pagan mourning practices (Lev 19:27,28) it is assumed that the reason for the prohibition lay in its association with such mourning practices. In this paper we explore the broader context of the law in biblical times, and how it was understood in subsequent rabbinic times. We propose that in the biblical period the prohibition was associated with the marking of slaves, and that in the subsequent rabbinic period it was associated with paganism.


Published abstract: Against those who maintain that the love your neighbor injunction in Lev 19:18 refers only to fellow Israelites, F. argues for an inclusive interpretation that refers to all humankind. In support of his view, F. points to the widespread concern for the welfare of aliens in the “Levite sources” (E, P, and D) of the Pentateuch and the use of the term “neighbor” to refer to non-Israelites as well as Israelites in several contexts.


Published abstract (adapted): Hebrew שַׁﬠַטְנֵז, which refers to a mixed fabric, occurs only in Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:11 in prohibitions of various mixtures. Its meaning is clear, but its etymology has hitherto eluded a convincing explanation. Noonan proposes that, as a word denoting a hybrid of materials, שַׁﬠַטְנֵז is a lexical blend. Its two source words are חאנ* and עַנ*, the early Hebrew forms of the Semitic words for “ewe” (*taʾat) and “goat” (*ʿanz/*inz), respectively. The resulting blend originally referred to a mixture of sheep and goat wool but was subsequently generalized to designate any mixed fabric, which is precisely what שַׁﬠַטְנֵז means in Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:11.


Abstract from OTA: Scholars have identified numerous connections between the legal compendium Leviticus 19 and other pentateuchal laws, but have disagreed as to the significance of this phenomenon for the overall assessment of the Leviticus chapter. Drawing on previous observations and proposals, S. here attempts to synthesize the relevant data, identifying and differentiating among the multiple ways in which Leviticus 19 alludes to—while also modifying for its own purposes—numerous laws found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, these including verbal quotation of a given text, fusion of multiple texts, metalepsis, and what S. designates as "drawing from the middle" of reference texts. The result of the use of all these techniques by Leviticus 19's author is to make of the chapter a "mini-torah" which invites readers/hearers to think together in dialectical tension a whole range of pentateuchal laws.—C.T.B.
Rabbi Student gibt einen Überblick über die verschiedenen Deutungsvorschläge des Lexems biqqoret in Lev 19,20 und zeigt schließlich, dass der Vorschlag von J. Milgrom („investigation“) der Interpretation entspricht, die bereits Raschi vorgelegt hat.


Published abstract: The article builds on the emerging consensus that Leviticus 17-26 was a later addition to Leviticus 1-16. It shows how the two halves of Leviticus differ and then argues that the addition of Leviticus 17-26 to 1-16 was an attempt to integrate ethical concerns into the larger priestly worldview in which the cult is central. The article shows how Leviticus 19,3-4 reinterpreted parts of the Decalogue by means of a process of inner-biblical exegesis. This process of inner-biblical exegesis led to some tension between Leviticus 19 and the Decalogue and to a lesser extent with texts from Leviticus 1-16.

Published abstract: In this article I posit the presence of an early Jewish exegesis of Lev 19:17–18 preserved in the Tannaitic midrash known as Sifra, which is inverted and amplified in Did. 1:3–5, Q 6:27–35, Luke 6:27–35, and Matt 5:38–44. Identifying shared terminology and a sequence of themes in these passages, I argue that these commonalities testify to the existence of a shared exegetical tradition. By analyzing the later rabbinic material I delineate the contours of this Second Temple period interpretation and augment our understanding of the construction of these early Christian pericopae. In commenting on Lev 19:17, Sifra articulates three permissible modes of rebuke: cursing, hitting, and slapping. In its gloss on the subsequent verse, Sifra exemplifies the biblical injunction against vengeance and bearing a grudge through the case of lending and borrowing from one’s neighbor. The Didache, Matthew, and Luke invert the first interpretation by presenting Jesus as recommending a passive response to being cursed or slapped, and they amplify the second interpretation by commanding one to give and lend freely to all who ask. The similar juxtaposition of these two ideas and the shared terminology between Sifra and these New Testament period texts suggest a common source. By reading these early Christian sources in light of this later rabbinic work I advance our understanding of the formation of these well-known passages and illustrate the advantages of cautiously employing rabbinic material for reading earlier Christian works.

Abstract: E.-K. discusses the question of self-reflection and individuality/self in the Old Testament by referring to the love commandments in Deuteronomy and Leviticus. These commandments refer to the self or imply self-reflection. E.-K. hereby focuses especially on the bodily and emotional components of “love” in its various dimensions. She first turns to an interpretation of Deuteronomy 6 and Deuteronomy 10: The command to love God implies the constitution of the self as center of one’s intentions, power of life, and physical power. Then, E.-K. demonstrates how the love commandment in Leviticus 19 triggers self-reflection in the love of the other/one’s neighbor/the alien resident. Finally, E.-K. examines cultural-anthropological concepts of love (the genre of the love commandments, the bodily aspect of love, the heart as organ of ethical reflection, character ethics).


Abstract: H. starts with considerations about the interdependence of anthropology and ethics in general. On that basis, he sets out to analyze the juridical anthropology behind the commandments in Leviticus 19 (1). The first main part (2) of the essay deals intensively with the basic proposition of the chapter, Lev 19:2. H. focuses (a) on the address in the second person plural, (b) on the idea of imitatio Dei (which, according to H., is rather an analogous formulation, i.e., the human beings/the Israelites shall imitate not God himself, but “only” his holiness), and (c) on the concept of holiness. Next, H. correlates some further aspects from the remaining chapter with these thoughts (3). In sum, the anthropology of Leviticus 19 emerges to be very ambivalent; the human being is not holy, but rather has to become holy time and again. This corresponds to the anthropological ambivalence in the Priestly Code (P). Furthermore, the community dominates over the individual. While Leviticus 19 reveals a rather realistic idea of the human being and acknowledges social and ethnic boundaries, it offers utopian theological ways to overcome such powerful anthropological differences.


Abstract from OTA 40, 2017, #1651: After a short introduction to recent developments in translation theory, B. presents an excerpt from the future volume on Leviticus in the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint series, in which for each verse in Lev 19:11-15 a lemmatized commentary on the Greek syntax and vocabulary is provided in comparison with the MT. The implied audience of LXX Leviticus was educated, perhaps bilingual, and able to appreciate the Hebrew source. The translator generally attempts to replicate translation choices from the Septuagint of Genesis and Exodus for the sake of consistency, but also makes some innovative and clever word choices.

Abstract from OTA 40, 2017, #1653: One’s “neighbor,” generously interpreted to include everyone in the world, even personal and impersonal enemies, looms large in the NT, especially in the form of the second great commandment, and its various expressions in the Golden Rule. The NT also contains explicit claims that neighbors have a similar importance in the OT. The main basis commentators find for these claims is the half-verse in Lev 19:18b, “you shall love your neighbor as yourself,” supported by other isolated OT verses, such as Exod 23:4-5 on rescuing the donkey of one’s enemy. Relying on these verses might appear as a grasping at straws in order to provide an OT grounding for Jesus’ words. It does, on the other hand, seem clear that by the time of Jesus the above words had been stretched out and elevated to a new significance. John Meier has recently argued that it was Jesus himself who gave the “neighbor” of Lev 19:18b his high standing. Given, however, that the Gospels present that significance of the neighbor as something already known, K. argues that the matter had already achieved a consensus by Jesus’ time.


Abstract from OTA 40, 2017, #1650: The expression “food of God” is an anthropomorphic metaphor expressive of the nature of God. This expression does not refer simply to the sacrifices offered to God, but rather underlines the importance of food in real life. The act of eating serves to consolidate the solidarity between God and his creatures and among human beings themselves. The Holiness Code imparts a quality of holiness to the food shared by God and his creatures.


Abstract from OTA 40, 2017, #1654: M.’s article explores the problem posed by Lev 19:23 and its mention of “uncircumcised fruit.” What is the reason for this image? What does it mean? Is the fruit referred to in the verse thought to be cut down or left hanging? After a brief survey of the contemporary debate concerning circumcision in the Hebrew Bible, as well as that regarding the structure of Leviticus 19, M. focuses on the metaphorical usage of the term “uncircumcised” and concludes that the above text has in view a practice whereby the fruit was left hanging on the tree. The term “uncircumcised” is used in order to arouse disgust and so discourage the hearers of the text from eating that fruit.


Published abstract: With the exception of two cases only, the commandments and prohibitions compiled in Lev 19 can be understood as cautioning against the combination of incompatible things and acts. In accordance with 19,8b and numerous parallels to other collections of rules in the Old Testament, such combination leads to imparable impurity and is to be punished by excommunication, death or banishment.


Published abstract: In The Love of Neighbour in Ancient Judaism, Kengo Akiyama traces the development of the mainstay of early Jewish and Christian ethics: “Love your neighbour.” Akiyama examines several Second Temple Jewish texts in great detail and demonstrates a diverse range of uses and applications that opposes a simplistic and evolutionary trajectory often associated with the development of the “greatest commandment” tradition. The monograph presents surprisingly complex interpretative developments in Second Temple Judaism uncovering just how early interpreters grappled with the questions of what it means to love and who should be considered as their neighbour.


“Loving the neighbour” is generally accepted as fundamental to Judeo-Christian theological ethics. However, few reflect on the implications of extending “loving the neighbour” (Lev 19:18) to “loving the resident alien/foreigner” (Lev 19:33-34) within the context of the Holiness Code (Lev 17-26). This contribution argues that “holiness” is redefined in Leviticus 19 by combining the instructions related to cultic rituals (aimed at the priests) in Leviticus 1-16 with the theological-ethical issues (aimed at all Israelites) in Leviticus 17-26; thereby moving from “ascribed holiness” (granted by divine decree to cultic officials) to “achieved holiness” (available to all Israel through obedience) in the post-exilic period.


Abstract from OTA: Biblical scholars recurrently raise the question of how the Pentateuch’s prohibitions of magic and divination are to be squared with the popularity of these practices in ancient Israel as attested elsewhere in the OT. C.’s article addresses this problem by analyzing the relevant biblical legislation from a literary and rhetorical perspective. Her analysis highlights the way in which Deut 18:10-11 utilizes prohibitions of magic and divination in presenting the role of the prophet and situates its legislation within a historiographical context. Similarly, Leviticus 18-20 employs these prohibitions in order to articulate a norm of purity and renewed holiness. These findings show that neither the Deuteronomistic nor the Priestly redactors had any direct interest in formulating normative laws against the body of practices deriving from the spheres of magic and divination. Rather, their prohibitions subserved different rhetorical goals that varied according to their respective biblical literary contexts. [Translated and adapted from published abstract - C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: In Lev 19:2 God says, “You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy.“ Using speech-act theory and an account of holiness recently proposed by Alan Mittleman, I argue that one’s antecedent commitments to a particular conception of holiness have dramatic implications for one’s categorization of the kind of speech act one takes God to be performing with the above utterance. If, on the one hand, one takes holiness to refer to an ethical category, then one will see the utterance in question as a command - God directing the people toward some ethical end. On the other hand, if one adopts a metaphysical understanding of holiness, one will read the utterance as the exact opposite of a command. Instead of placing obligations on the people, God in this utterance is placing obligations on Godself. I conclude by adopting Mittleman’s synthesis of the ethical and metaphysical conceptions of holiness as undergirding a synthesis of the twin speech acts performed by God with the above utterance. [Adapted from published abstract C.T.B.]


Published abstract: In The Dangerous Duty of Rebuke Matthew Goldstone explores the ways in which religious leaders within early Jewish and Christian communities conceived of the obligation to rebuke their fellows based upon the biblical verse: “Rebuke your fellow but do not incur sin” (Leviticus 19:17). Analyzing texts from the Bible through the Talmud and late Midrashim as well as early Christian monastic writings, he exposes a shift from asking how to rebuke in the Second Temple and early Christian period, to whether one can rebuke in early rabbinic texts, to whether one should rebuke in later rabbinic and monastic sources. Mapping these observations onto shifting sociological concerns, this work offers a new perspective on the nature of interpersonal responsibility in antiquity.

Lev 21

Literatur


Published abstract: Leviticus 21:16-24 enumerate twelve blemishes that disqualify a priest from altar service. We argue that the Holiness Legislation’s laws against physically blemished priests serving in the sanctuary are fundamentally related to the Priestly myth’s larger characterization of the Israelite god as a superhuman king, its corresponding understanding of the cult, and, in particular, its views of divine perception. Yhwh, whose great powers can effect both good and ill, must be attended by servants whose ministrations are as unobtrusive as possible. It is the inconspicuous quality of priestly officiation that protects these servants as they venture into close
proximity with the deity. In the case of the priest without a blemish, the cultic vestments that are required during altar service successfully mitigate the deity’s gaze, functioning as a sort of camouflage for him. Yet these vestments do not sufficiently camouflage a priest with a blemish, and this priest’s physical defect attracts excessive and potentially dangerous divine attention. H’s prohibition against sanctuary service by blemished priests, like the requirement that the priest wear the prescribed, sacred vestments, is thus both concerned to maintain the deity’s royal expectations and preferences – what we will term here his “divine repose” – and to protect the priests who serve the divine sovereign.


Lev 22

Literatur


Abstract from OTA: The goal of G.’s work is to reevaluate the traditional interpretation of Lev 22:24b according to which the clause prohibits the gelding of domesticated animals in the Land of Israel. Most modern commentaries and translations view the words “and in your land you shall not do” in the clause as a reiteration of v. 24a, such that gelding is only prohibited for animals intended for the altar. This limitation allows for the use of oxen for plowing and traction, a remarkably utilitarian benefit for the ancient Israelite farmer, and indeed all premodern farmers. However, the weight of the evidence adduced by G. supports the traditional understanding of the verse, an understanding which would place the Israelite farmer at a disadvantage, given that on this understanding far fewer suitable animals would have been available for his use. Various strategies may have been utilized to deal with the problem posed by the prohibition as so understood, including a large-scale use of cows for traction, but also the importation of oxen. The restriction of Lev 22:24b would, for its part, have been motivated by the life-affirming ethos of Israel's laws, an aspect of Scripture amply illuminated by the work of Jacob Milgrom. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Lev 23

Literatur


Published abstract: With the beginning of the historical-critical study of the Old Testament, the biblical picture of the origin and development of Passover and Mazzot was not taken for granted anymore. Since there are a lot of texts concerning this topic, however, the options to explain the history of Passover and Mazzot are legion. Starting with George and Wellhausen, this article attempts to outline the history of research on Passover and Mazzot up to now. Some thoughts on the current state of research complete the paper.


Published abstract: Leviticus 23 is the basis for most of the Jewish holidays celebrated today. The chapter is the longest holiday calendar of the Old Testament. The names and dates for the feasts are basically used until today. On p. 97, C. Körting presents an illustration of the cycle of the Jewish year with months and festival days. She explains all the festivals of Leviticus 23 separately. Purim and Chanukah are mentioned briefly by referring to other biblical passages. Körting concludes that participating in the celebration of the holydays includes the congregation into the life-giving order of creation: The festivals are designed as the affirmation of the community between humans (Israel) and God.


Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 671, #2217: The authors point out that even though the Etrog (citron) is traditionally used on the holiday of Sukkot as one of the four prescribed species, it is not explicitly mentioned in this connection in the Bible. Rather, the intended species is referred to, indistinctly, as the “fruit of goodly trees” (Lev 23:40). The authors argue that the Etrog is not mentioned because it reached the region in the 5th-4th centuries under the Persians.—D.E.G.

Moskovitz, Gabriel, The Genesis of the etrog (Citron) as Part of the Four Species: Jewish Bible Quarterly 43, 2015, 109–115.

Abstract from OTA 38, 2015, 671, #2218: Jews the world over celebrate the festival of Sukkot, in September or early October. One of the unique rituals of this holiday is taking the ʾarbaʿ mînîm (four species), which are defined as the lûlāv (palm branch), ʾetrôg (citron fruit), hâdassîm (myrtle branches), and ʿarāvôt (willow branches), reciting a blessing over them, and then waving them in six directions. However, Lev 23:40 does not specifically identify the citron fruit (Citrus Medica), as one of the four species used in the ritual. The Bible calls instead for pĕrî ʾêṣ hādār (“the fruit of goodly trees”). When referring to the Feast of Tabernacles, the Bible enjoins: “Ye shall take you on the first day the fruit of goodly trees, branches of palm-trees, and boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook, and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days” (Lev 23:40). Nehemiah 8 uses similar wording to describe a ritual event that occurred during the Second Temple period. Sometime during the
period beginning with Ezra, Israel made a transition from the Prophet/Temple Priest arbiter of Jewish law to a proto-rabbinic exegetical model. This new era had a formative role in creating the vast body of rabbinical definition, exposition, and innovation vis-à-vis Torah. It gave birth inter alia to the novel idea and tradition of identifying the newly discovered ἑτρῶγ (citron from India), with its unique aroma and beauty, as one of the “goodly fruit/trees” referred to in Leviticus 23.—F.W.G. Maris, Bradford, A Proposed Solution to "The Most Long-Lasting Schism in the History of the Jewish People". A Fresh Look at השבת in Leviticus 23:11, in: Andrews University Seminary Studies 56, 2018, 47–62. Abstract from OTA: The term "S/sabbath" in Lev 23:11 provides the temporal orientation within vv. 9-22 for both the sheaf elevation ritual of vv. 10-14 on the following day, and the new grain offering ritual (the Festival of Weeks), seven weeks thereafter. However, the identity of the S/sabbath spoken of in the above verse is contextually indeterminable in chap. 23 itself, and has been disputed throughout the centuries. The various theories, all of which are based on the notion of a cessation of human labor, argue for either a weekly Sabbath linked to the Festival of Weeks, or rather for one of the two festival days on which occupational work is prohibited, or a "Sabbath week." Yet, none of these approaches is able to establish its claim regarding the specified S/sabbath over against the other theories. The only antecedent with requisite specificity for the term S/sabbath in 23:11 is to be found in Exod 12:15, where the hiphil of the verb šbṭ is used to mandate the "cessation of leaven," specifically on the first day of the festival beginning on the 15th of the month Abib. This proposal, vis-a-vis either the weekly Sabbath theory or the Sabbath-week theory, is corroborated by the essential use of the adjective tēmīmot ("complete"), which modifies the expression sebaʿ šabbātōt ("seven Sabbaths") in Lev 23:15, which in the weekly Sabbath-based theories appears simply superfluous. [Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]

Levitikus 24

Literatur


Abstract from OTA: R. contributes a literary analysis of the narrative of the blasphemer in Leviticus 24 in which she argues that the narrative employs gendered language to make moral judgments about the blasphemer and to draw a boundary between Israel and the other nations. She begins by showing how laws in the Holiness Code (H) are not practical or casuistic but rather idealistic and centered around larger questions of identity. The identity thus constructed by H is: (1) masculine, in that the laws are for men and include the governance of women; (2) ethnic, in that they distinguish the men of Israel from other groups; and (3) holy, in that the people and God engage in reciprocal sanctification through the performance of these laws. Since the community as a whole is defined by this identity, these laws apply equally to foreigners residing permanently in their midst, who thereby surrender some of their own identity. In the context of Leviticus 24, the narrative of the blasphemer shifts to an outside setting with outsider characters on the edges of the community. Describing the man as "the son of an Israelite woman" indicates something marginal about him from the start. Compared to the masculine "Israelite man," he is feminized and othered. By blaspheming (literally "piercing," and thus feminizing) the masculine holiness, the man has dishonored the deity and must be stoned by "the sons of Israel." Holiness, a masculine concept, is feminized by blasphemy and must be protected and restored by masculine violence against the feminized other. Finally, R. argues that the Egyptian identity of the man's father recalls Israelite slavery in Egypt and trades in a racial stereotype of Egyptians as people who dishonor God. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: This essay explores the details of how hermeneutical transformation plays a role in the composition of the legal novella about blasphemy and talion from the Holiness School (H) in Lev 24:10-23, which is part of the larger Priestly-Holiness (PH) framework. Several recent studies, especially those of C. Nihan, have shown that this pericope used and transformed legislation from the Covenant Code (CC). This essay highlights additional significant dimensions of this creative compositional engagement with CC and also shows that D was a considerable catalyst in this process. This investigation casts light on the compositional procedure by which the passage came to be, on the passage’s inherent ideology, on its significance for the history of ideas about law and ritual, and on the development of the Pentateuch. [Adapted from author’s introduction, pp. 652-653 – C.T.B.]

Adapted from published abstract: This paper explores Lev 24:10-23 from the perspective of the outsider. By looking at the story of the so-called blasphemer, I bring up the issues of community boundaries that affect the way he is portrayed. How the narrative describes this person introduces tensions between him and the community. First, I explore the exegetical problems that surround the fight between this man and an Israelite, showing that there is more here than just a wayward or malicious person cursing the deity of the community. Second, I look at the divine speech because one possible interpretation is that the deity, Yhwh, allows for the possibility of the community worshiping other gods. This issue complicates the mainstream interpretation that depicts the *mestizo* as a „blasphemer.“ [The term *mestizo* is used in Latin America to denote a person of mixed racial origin, with one parent of European descent and another coming from the local native community.] Since Yhwh accepts worship of other gods, the boundaries between insiders and outsiders are not well defined; in this context, issues of justice are part of the story and the man’s gruesome fate. After considering the biblical text, I will explore a recent case where an outsider pays for the consequences of misspeaking and ends up deported to his homeland. I establish an initial dialogue between the biblical story and that of a Bangladeshi native to see how these stories complement each other. The connection critiques the traditional readings of the Leviticus narrative that do not pay attention to the portrayal of the *mestizo* in it.


Abstract from OTA 36, 2013, no. 271, adapted: V. investigates the narrative of the trial of a man with an Egyptian father and Hebrew mother who committed blasphemy in the course of a brawl as described in Lev 24:10-12. V. says the issue here is whether the perpetrator’s mixed parentage mitigated his culpability or was he rather subject to the same laws (and punishments) as a “native Israelite.” V. focuses on vv. 17-21 in the above text, which appear to be out of place in the overall passage. V. argues that “the manner in which this legal material was incorporated into the narrative calls for an innovation to one of Israel’s native legal traditions (found in Exod 21:1-22:16) from an ethic-based jurisdiction to a territorial-based jurisdiction. This innovation was required by the Holiness Code’s … theological perception of the promised land, which sought to ensure that no inhabitant, native or alien, would pollute the land through the violation of the legal ideals of an older venerated tradition” (p. 28).


Published abstract: This article argues that, instead of the nature of the crime or its punishment, the underlying problem that needs oracular law in the account of the blasphemer in Lev 24:10-23 is the ambiguity of the criminal’s identity. This ambiguity is employed in the narrative as a literary device by which the redactor of the narrative introduces the universal applicability of the blasphemy law that includes both natives and foreigners. By so doing, the redactor of Lev 24 serves the Holiness Code’s theological agenda, namely, the extension of holiness to all inhabitants of the land since pollution of the land by any of its inhabitants may eventually cause the expulsion
of the whole people from the land. To this end, the redactor rewrites the Covenant Code and frames it with the narrative of the mixed-pedigree blasphemer.

Levitikus 25

Literatur

Abstract: K. reads Leviticus 25 as a visionary concept to overcome debt overload and impoverishment. The basic rhythm is marked by the sequence of six years plus one. The sabbatical year (every seventh year) is a “Sabbath for Yahweh,” i.e., rest for the land (a fallow year) and rest for God. While the sabbatical year was practiced at certain times in the history of Israel and Judah, the Jubilee year (the year after seven times seven years) is a literary construct providing liberation for people fallen in debt slavery and for property sold to pay debts off. After 49 years all property (real estate) which was sold shall return to its original owner. People who had to sell their workforce and fell into debt slavery shall be released and return to their own family. While the Jubilee was never set into practice, its theological idea was influential even for Christianity.

Published abstract: The term יושב (tôšāb; toshav) appears in the Bible fourteen times, mostly in passages associated with the Holiness Code (H). It is typically interpreted as referring to an alien who resides in a foreign country on a long-term basis. I propose, instead, that it had an economic meaning, referring to “a rent-paying (farming) tenant,” that is, someone who cultivates land that he does not own and pays rent to the landlord. In the course of supporting this interpretation, I offer a framework for understanding the social structure envisioned by H and for appreciating H’s innovative social aspirations.

Published abstract: In this article, M. engages with his 2003 monograph on the biblical Jubilee, with a focus on Leviticus 25 and 26. In 2003, M. argued that Leviticus is a text concerning the Judean elite who are about to return from exile and who wanted their land back, an argument in support of which he adduced the “myth of the empty land” as featured in Leviticus 26, where the land is represented as lying empty during exile and waiting for the exiles to repopulate it. On historical-critical grounds, M. now rejects the first part of his earlier claim about Leviticus 25. At the same time, he adduces additional support for the “myth of the empty land” part of his earlier argument by reference to current historical-critical debates about the portrayal of the land in the P materials and the Holiness Code.

Adapted from published abstract: M.’s article focuses on how the land (ʾereš) is personified in the Holiness Code. It starts by describing the various “countries” portrayed in the Code and then discusses all It instances in the Code where land
functions as the subject of a verb (Lev 18:25, 27, 28; 19:29; 20:22; 25:2, 19; 26:4, 20, 34, 38, 40). The land at times seems close to being a human character in its “becoming defiled,” “vomiting,” “acting like a prostitute,” “observing the Sabbath,” “giving,” and “enjoying”—all verbs which are usually associated with human actions. In light of these texts, M. then attempts to describe the relationship among the land, Yhwh, and the Code's addressees. In his analysis, it becomes clear that in the Code there is a closer relationship between Yhwh and the land than there is between Yhwh and the addressees. Finally, M. seeks to engage with N. Habel’s ecojustice principles, showing that the authors of the Code may have been familiar with certain of these.


Adapted from published abstract: It is generally accepted by Latino/a biblical scholars, namely, Fernando F. Segovia and Alejandro F. Botta, among others, that both the historical-critical methods and the contextual approaches are equally important in the reading of the HB. First, this paper argues that Lev 25:8-55 contains verses (cf. Lev 25:10, 39-40 and 54-55) which are ascribed to the Deuteronomistic writers (D) but which were re-used by the authors of the Holiness Code (H). Second, because the absolute noun, šākîr (“hired labourer”) and the qal verb, ʿbd (“to work”) in Lev 25:40 refer to the working-class people, the context(s) from which the text of Lev 25:8-55 emerged will be investigated in relation to the working-class people. Third, the paper probes the relevance of Lev 25:8-55 to Ernesto “Che” Guevara’s discourse of the experiences of the working-class people and Segovia’s reading of the HB in the light of such experiences. It is argued in this paper that H’s concern for social justice for the working-class people can throw light on the reading of the ancient texts, particularly from the perspective of the Latino/a biblical criticism, and more importantly, that such a reading could also have implications for the working-class people of South Africa.


Abstract from OTA 40, 2017, #1655: A.’s article features a wide-ranging overview of the many questions posed by Leviticus 25. Topics addressed by him include: the diachronic relationship of the “Holiness Code” (Leviticus 17-26, HC) to the other major compositional complexes in the Pentateuch (D and P in particular); the placement of Leviticus 25 within the HC; the structure of Leviticus 25; the laws of Leviticus 25 vis-a-vis those of Exod 21:2-11 and Deut 15:12-18 as well as Old Babylonian and Nee-Babylonian royal edicts concerning release of slaves and remission of debts; and the conception of the jubilee in Leviticus 25. This last topic is discussed by A. under the general heading “jubilee and logic of the gift,” that is itself further specified with the subheadings: “Vocabulary of gift in Lev 25: Can we talk of Social Ethics in Lev 25?” and “The Jubilee: A Utopía? Norm and Metanorm.” Here, A. points out that while it remains unclear whether the jubilee legislation of Leviticus 25, with its insistence that no Israelite is to be the “slave” of another Israelite and that Yahweh’s gift of the land to his people calls them to respond by “redeeming” the land at the jubilee, was ever put into effect during the Second Temple period, the text’s
vision did get picked up in subsequent messianic and eschatological discourse (see Isa 61:1-2 and Luke 4:18-19).

Mtshiselwa, Ndikho, Poor and Landless Women. An African Reading of Leviticus 25 and Ruth 4 with Latino/a Critical Tools, in: Brenner-Idan, Athalya; Yee, Gale A.; Lee, Archie C.C. (Hg.), The Five Scrolls (Texts@Contexts, 6), London [etc.]: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2018, 71–85.


Abstract from OTA: Leviticus 25 describes a Sabbath year, one in every seven (Lev 25:1-7), and a Jubilee year, one in every fifty (Lev 25:8-17). In the Sabbath year, the fields lie fallow, lest the ground be exhausted. In the year of Jubilee, leased or mortgaged lands were to be returned to their original owners, and all slaves and laborers were to go free (Lev 25:10). The Jubilee was thus a way for poor people to be released from crushing debt and to make it possible for them to participate in shaping the common good. - F.W.G.


Abstract from OTA: A.’s essay focuses on the literary core of Nehemiah 10, which comprises a series of legal measures involving endogamy, merchandise sold on the Sabbath and holy days, seven-year rules (fallow ground and cancellation of debts), obligatory contributions to the maintenance of the temple cult, i.e., the wood offering, and those of the firstfruits, and the firstborn, the tithe for the Levites, along with a general commitment never to neglect the temple of God. Because each of these topics appears also in the pentateuchal traditions, A. compares the laws of the Bible’s first five books with what is found in Nehemiah 10. In each A. differentiates the legal approach in Nehemiah 10 from that evidenced in the pentateuchal sources, be these those of the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic writers (e.g., on the issue of endogamy), the Covenant Code (e.g., on the question of seven-year rules), the Priestly writer (on matters of temple sacrifice and the preeminence of the Aaronides vis-a-vis the Zadokites), or the writers of the Holiness Code (e.g., on Sabbath regulations and the seven-year rules). Via this comparison, A. shows that the legal precepts of Nehemiah 10 consistently stand apart from and often predate the corresponding pentateuchal regulations, especially those of the Holiness Code. On this basis, he concludes that H was not established sacral law at the time of Nehemiah, such that H should not be dated earlier than the 2nd half of the 5th cent. B.C.E., the date of the original core of the Book of Nehemiah according to A. A. further underscores the value of Nehemiah 10 for dating texts within the Persian period: in the middle of the 5th cent., Judean legal discourse was much more fluid than we might imagine. For A., Nehemiah 10 thus provides a valuable Achaemenid window on the development of the Torah and the formation of the Pentateuch. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]
Levitikus 26

Literatur


Abstract: With the exception of Lev 2:13 and 24:8 the term bryt, “covenant,” occurs in the book of Leviticus only in chapter 26. Here, however, the eight occurrences form a significant concept in three stages that correspond to the three main parts of the chapter. In the part called “blessings” or better “promises” (Lev 26:3-13), God enumerates the blessings and benefits that will be granted to Israel if the people follow God’s laws, keep God’s commandments and observe them. Israel will gain agricultural and military success, and God will uphold his covenant with Israel (26:9). However, if Israel does not obey God and his commandments, thus breaking the covenant (26:15), God has to punish the people severely and a sword will execute vengeance for the covenant (26:25). The (longer) part called “curses” or better “commination” (Lev 26:14-39) lists a wide variety of consequences of Israel’s disloyalty to the covenant and God’s commandments. God will take back all the promises mentioned in the first part – with one exception: the promise to uphold his covenant is not mentioned and therefore not withdrawn in the second part.—Israel experienced the evil consequences in destruction and exile in the sixth century B.C.E. But as the people survived the catastrophe, these two parts of admonition need to be supplemented by a third part of redemption (Lev 26:40-45). God grants mercifully a new beginning after the (necessary) punishment. The text uses the metaphor that God “remembered his covenant” – it is the covenant with the Patriarchs (Jacob, Isaac, Abraham – in this sequence in 26:42) and the (same) covenant with the ancients freed from the land of Egypt (26:45). This concept of redemption that results from the experiences of the Exile and the new beginning in the Persian period is integrated into the revelation at Mount Sinai in order to anchor the paradigm of failure, punishment, forgiveness and new beginning at the roots of Israel’s religion. While the concept of admonition by promises and commination is borrowed from the treaties in the Ancient Near Eastern literature, the concept of redemption is unique in Israel’s environment.—The text suggests the following theological and anthropological conclusions: The concept of covenant in Leviticus 26 presents God as a reliable covenant partner and as a merciful and forgiving deity. As Israel is freed from the land of Egypt in the sight of all nations (26:45), hence the people stand for an anthropological paradigm: All human beings are summoned to a life according to God’s ethical demands in order to gain a life in prosperity and peace. While human beings experience their failure in following God’s commandments and suffer the severe consequences, God will answer confessing and repentance by granting a new beginning (“remembering the covenant”). Thus God’s mercy does not suspend the ethical responsibility of the human beings; their actions do not become irrelevant. However, punishment will not be God’s last word; it is the covenant that lets God’s love prevail against his vengeance.
Ho, Shirley S., Leviticus 26 in Psalm 79. The Defilement of the Sacred, Nations and Lament: 

Nihan, Christophe, Heiligkeitsgesetz und Pentateuch. Traditions- und 
kompositionsgeschichtliche Aspekte von Levitikus 26, in: Hartenstein, Friedhelm; 
Schmid, Konrad (Hg.), Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der 
Pentateuchdebatte (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für 
Abstract from OTA: In recent scholarship, there has been much discussion concerning 
the literary history and status of the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26), its concluding 
chapter, Leviticus 26, in particular. N.’s article highlights the chapter’s multiple 
conceptual and terminological links with and dependence on passages in P, the non-P 
material in the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy and Ezekiel. On this basis he concludes that 
the chapter (and Leviticus 17-26 as a whole) stems from a “Leviticus redaction” the 
purpose of which was to integrate the complex of Leviticus 1-26 into the developing 
Pentateuch (in which the P and non-P materials had already been combined) and to 
“correct” P’s conception of an unconditional divine covenant.

Fischer, Georg, A Need for Hope? A Comparison Between the Dynamics in Leviticus 26 and 
Deuteronomy 28-30, in: Gane, Roy E.; Taggar-Cohen, Ada (ed.), Current Issues in 
Priestly and Related Literature. The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond (Resources 
for Biblical Study 82), Atlanta 2015, 369–385.
Abstract from OTA: Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 evidence an overall parallel 
movement as well as many specific terms and motifs in common. On the other hand, 
the former chapter ends in vv. 39-45 (which F. regards as an integral and original part 
of the unit) with a word of hope, which is conspicuously absent in the latter. When, 
however, one extends one's reading of Deuteronomy to the following chapters 29-30, 
30:1-10 in particular, one does find a message of hope for the exiles comparable to 
that in Lev 26:39-45. At the same time, Deut 30:6 takes the hopeful message of Lev 
26:39ff. with its announcement that God will circumcise the people's heart a step 
further in that it resolves the problem, merely alluded to in Lev 26:41, of the Israelites' 
"uncircumcised heart" as the root of all their failures in their relationship with Yhwh. 
In their extant form, both Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28-30 do articulate a hopeful 
vision for Israel’s future beyond exile, a vision which presupposes Israel’s turning to 
Yhwh, even as it remains a matter of a gratuitous divine initiative. Hope then is indeed 
a human “need,” but never a “necessary” outcome from God’s side.—C.T.B.

Zehnder, Markus, Structural Complexity, Semantic Ambiguity, and the Question of Literary 
Integrity: A New Reading of Leviticus 26,14–45, in: Jenni, Hanna; Saur, Markus 
(Hg.), Nächstenliebe und Gottesfurcht. Beiträge aus alttestamentlicher, semitistischer 
und altorientalischer Wissenschaft für Hans-Peter Mathys zum 65. Geburtstag 
(AOAT 439), Münster 2016, 503–530.
Assessment: Z. presents a lot of interesting and helpful explanations regarding the 
macro and micro structure of Leviticus 26. Regrettably, he uses these synchronic 
observations as a proof for the literary unity of the chapter. This way of concluding 
from synchronic phenomena back to diachronic hypotheses about the text’s origin is 
methodologically unconvincing. Likewise, Z.’s attempt to opt for a pre-exilic date of
the entire chapter is highly problematic. The parallels to extra-biblical texts from the 9th and 8th century B.C.E. are too scarce to bear the burden of proof, and the overall theological picture a reader gets from Leviticus 26 in its context does not match the religion-historical situation of the pre-exilic era. In addition, it is methodologically questionable whether it is possible or reasonable to isolate a chapter from its context and presume a certain date for it without considering the structural embedding within a larger literary framework.


Abstract from OTA: Basing himself on the view—increasingly accepted among contemporary scholars—that “H” (Holiness Code; Holiness Legislation) is both later than P and never existed as an independent document, N. focuses on the concluding segment of Leviticus 26, i.e., vv. 39-46. In these verses (which, N. maintains, constitute a literary unity), the H author, e.g., seeks to align P and non-P (Deuteronomistic) conceptions of Yhwh’s covenant, this resulting in his developing a notion of the covenant that encompasses both the covenant with the patriarchs (stressed by P) and the Sinai covenant (emphasized by the Deuteronomists). Along the same lines, the notice of 26:46, with its multiple law terms, has in view the whole body of laws elsewhere in the Pentateuch—not just those of H itself. At the same time, N. holds that the author of H should not be regarded as a/the pentateuchal redactor, but rather as one whose work was intended to give Leviticus a distinct, well-delimited status as a “book” within the pentateuchal complex.—C.T.B.


Abstract from OTA: Several implications emerge from the preceding analysis. First, if my arguments are sound, this study has demonstrated the variety of ways in which Israelite texts have creatively reconfigured the traditional stock of ANE curse vocabulary for use within various theological streams and traditions. This finding then underlines the need to ascertain the orientation and purpose of a given text before advancing broad hypotheses regarding the significance and function of any curse formula used within it. Form-critical judgments alone are not sufficient when dealing with such curse materials. Second, as we have seen, there are several broader patterns into which descriptive curse formulations may fall. Thus, Amos 4; Leviticus 26; and Isa 5:20-25; 9:7[8]-10:4 historicize the more static pattern of sin—consequence or interdiction—deterrent found elsewhere. In doing so, they integrate the conceptions of benediction and malediction with the idea of Israel’s lived experience, stretched out over time, and the nation’s sufferings as Yhwh’s discipline and instruction. Moreover, this integration of blessing and cursing with lived experience enables the writers of these texts to view Yhwh’s maledictions as challenges that put the nation to the test: Will it choose submission and blessing or rebellion and curse? Third, significant differences of perspective may appear even between texts belonging to the same
general curse pattern. For example, a careful analysis of the differences between Leviticus 26 and Amos 4 reveals fundamentally different understandings at numerous key points, especially regarding the role of suffering in producing change, the way in which such change will be evidenced, and the basis of Israel’s ultimate restoration. Thus, when considering the significance of curse language in any given context, one must move beyond commonalities of form and be attentive also to differences in fond. Texts displaying similar formal elements may intentionally deepen, revise, or correct those on which they have been patterned. Fourth, and finally, the fact that one or more prophetic texts (Amos 4; Isa 5:25-29; 9:7[8]-10:4) use a descriptive curse pattern strikingly similar to the one found in Leviticus 26 suggests that consideration of the literary growth of the Pentateuch cannot be undertaken in isolation from the prophetic corpus. The prophetic materials, which so frequently display strong intertextual relationships with numerous pentateuchal texts, must play a significant role in pentateuchal analysis. Since the inception of modern biblical criticism, the prophetic materials have been seen as a foundational element in addressing issues of the literary development of the Pentateuch. The vitality of the scholarly literature addressing the relationship between these two corpora testifies to the continuing importance of this discussion. Failure to address ongoing developments in the study of the prophetic materials can only impoverish pentateuchal study, whereas attention to the interaction between the two corpora can only enrich it. [Adapted from author’s conclusion, pp. 983-984—C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: Some general conclusions derive from my analysis with regard to the relationship between the Holiness Legislation and Ezekiel, which can be briefly summarized by way of a conclusion. First, in line with some recent studies, I have argued that the parallels between the two collections are part of a complex formative process, which impacted both the composition and the transmission of Ezekiel in the Second Temple period and which is documented by the comparison between the textual forms of this book preserved in the OG and in the MT. Second, while the presence of scribal expansions characterized by a concern to coordinate the prophecy of Ezekiel more closely with the Holiness Legislation is documented in both the OG and the MT, the textual evidence clearly suggests that the textual form preserved in the MT should be situated toward the end of this scribal process of coordinating Ezekiel with H. This conclusion, in turn, implies that any approach to the relationship between these two corpora that is exclusively (or even predominantly) based on the MT of Ezekiel is inherently flawed. Third, the evidence provided by the comparison between Ezek 34:23-31 and 37:24-28 in relation to H (Leviticus 26) indicates that the relationship to H may differ according to the compositional stage reflected in these shared materials; though the later text of Ezek 34:23-31 arguably reflects the influence of H, this does not appear to be the case for the earlier text of 37:24-28. This conclusion, for its part, suggests that the reception of H may, in fact, be more characteristic of the later stages in the composition of Ezekiel than of the earlier forms of the book. Overall, the findings presented here point to the need to elaborate
complex, nonlinear models in order to adequately describe the relationship between H and Ezekiel. [Adapted from author’s conclusion, p. 1039—C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: It is widely recognized that there are a remarkable number of locutions common to Leviticus 17-26 (the Holiness Code, H) and the Book of Ezekiel. The quality, frequency, and distribution of these locutions are such that most agree that they can only be explained by a model of literary dependence—either by one text borrowing from the other or by their mutual dependence during the process of their respective textual formation. There is, however, no consensus on the direction of literary dependence. This does not (for me, at least) constitute a crisis; readers will naturally construe these texts in different ways due to the complex nature of cognition and the complexities of the texts themselves. Yet, the lack of consensus does suggest that we look closely at, and think critically about, the criteria we have traditionally used to determine textual relationships. In this essay, I will review early arguments about the direction of literary dependence between H (in particular Leviticus 26) and Ezekiel. I will then examine the extent to which we have (or have not) moved beyond the criteria used to support these arguments. Finally, I will conclude with reflections about how we have changed. It is my hope that this will inspire greater methodological awareness on the part of those analyzing relationships between texts and that it will encourage greater dialogue between specialists in pentateuchal and in prophetic literature. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]


Abstract from OTA: An examination of Ezekiel’s use and interpretation of biblical law illustrates the way in which authoritative biblical texts are reinterpreted in the face of new historical circumstances, “when,” in the words of M. Fishbane, “divine words have apparently gone unfulfilled as originally proclaimed (as in various promises and prophecies); or when new moral spiritual meanings were applied to texts which had lost their vitality.” As Moshe Greenberg further notes, in Ezekiel “there is almost always a divergence large enough to raise the question, whether the prophet has purposely skewed the traditional material, or merely represents a version of it different from extant records." … it was Y. Kaufmann who first observed that the Law (i.e., the Torah) seldom refers to the prophets. This observation is the key to the way in which we understand and approach the plethora of terms and expressions found in P, H, and the Deuteronomistic History. In addition, there is a continuously growing body of scholarly work that illustrates quite conclusively the way in which Ezekiel creatively reformulates Torah precepts in order to fit the context and needs of his contemporary audience living out their lives in the Babylonian diaspora. That said, the discussion of the relationship between H/P and Ezekiel must now, in our opinion, turn to a closer examination of the individual context in each source before addressing issues of
textual mutuality, borrowing, or direction of influence. [Adapted from authors’ introduction (p. 1077) and conclusion (p. 1084) - C.T.B.]


Levitikus 27

Literatur


Ein Literaturbericht über neuere Vorschläge zur Deutung des Wortes ḥēræm ohne eigene Stellungnahme.


Adapted from published abstract: The Holiness legislation on “dedications” (Leviticus 27) stipulates that owners wishing to redeem dedicated property must pay a 20% redemption fee on top of the item's valuation. This fee has been understood either as a penalty imposed on the owners for reneging on the dedication or a surtax levied to take advantage of the owners’ special attachment to their property. G. argues, however, that the fee is related to the use of the holy shekel in these transactions. Archaeological remains, including Judean limestone weights, demonstrate that the common shekel on the eve of the Babylonian exile comprised 24 gerāh. The holy shekel, on the other hand, contained only 20 gerāh (Lev 27:25; Ezek 45:12), a 20% lower value. The redemption fee can thus be understood as bringing a fixed valuation into line with the actual market value of the dedication. It was thus not meant to punish or take advantage of individuals redeeming dedicated property.

Abstract from OTA: This article reflects on Lev 27:28-29 and its possible relationship to the practice of human sacrifice in ancient Israel. It provides an overview of the current state of the discussion about human and child sacrifices, before focusing on Leviticus 27 for itself. H. and M. argue that while the chapter is a later addition, it does constitute a suitable conclusion to the Book of Leviticus. After their consideration of the chapter as a whole, the authors direct their attention to vv. 28-29 in particular. They conclude that these verses are very vague about what is taking place and that this vagueness was likely deliberate on the part of the one(s) who formulated them.


Rezeptionsgeschichte

Judentum
Abstract: K. introduces the Jewish interpretation of the Torah section Qedoshim. In the center of this Parasha stands the exhortation to be holy and to love one’s neighbor. The other instructions of Leviticus 19 are arranged in concentric circles around Lev 19:18 (illustrated by a chart on p. 84). The message of the commandment to love one’s neighbor and the whole chapter 19 are the key to understand the whole Holiness Code Leviticus 17-26. Humans are referred to their relationship toward God and summoned to respect the dignity of other humans.

Christentum
Marbach, Carolus, Scripturarum scilicet ex sacro scripturae fonte in libros liturgicos derivata, 1907.
Auf den Seiten 24 und 25 finden sich Hinweise, aus welchen Versen des Buches Levitikus sich in der römischen Liturgie (Stand: 1907!) verwendete Antiphonen und andere Versikel speisen. Betroffen sind die Verse Lev 21,6.8.10; Lev 23,1.2.4.5.6.41.43; Lev 26,9. PDF auf Anfrage.