

10.04.2023

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.

Büchner, Dirk, A Cultic Term (ἀμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the Third Century b.c.e. until the New Testament: BIOSCS 42, 2009, 1–17.

Büchner, Dirk, Writing a Commentary on the Septuagint, in: Peters, Melvin K.H. (Hg.), XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010 (SCS 59), Atlanta 2013, 525–537.

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 Sprachcharakter 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.

Cranz, Isabel, Priests, Pollution and the Demonic: Evaluating Impurity in the Hebrew Bible in Light of Assyro-Babylonian Texts: JANER (Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions) 14, 2014, 68–86.

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.

Eberhart, Christian A., Blut des Bundes. Das Opferverständnis im Buch Levitikus und in der Eucharistie: BiKi 69, 2014, 69–73.

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.

Feder, Yitzhaq, The Semantics of Purity in the Ancient Near East. Lexical Meaning as a Projection of Embodied Experience: JANER (Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions) 14, 2014, 87–113.

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.

Ferch, John G., The Story of Torah: The Role of Narrative in Leviticus' Legal Discourse: Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament 2, 2013, 41–60.

Holmstedt, Robert D., The Nexus between Textual Criticism and Linguistics: A Case Study from Leviticus: JBL 132, 2013, 473–494.

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.

Die „Untersuchungen“ beruhen auf folgender Septuagintausgabe: Brooke, A.E.; McLean, N., The Old Testament in Greek, Vol. I. The Octateuch; part I: Genesis 1906; part II: Exodus and Leviticus, Cambridge 1909. Es handelt sich um sehr detaillierte philologische Analysen des griechischen Levitikustextes. Der Band wird durch ein griechisches und hebräisches Wortregister erschlossen; ein Stellenregister fehlt. Mit Schlussfolgerungen über die Arbeit und Tendenz des Übersetzers hält sich Huber sehr zurück. Manche Ergebnisse müssen gegebenenfalls an neueren textkritischen Ausgaben der Levitikus-Septuaginta (Göttinger Ausgabe, Rahlfs) verifiziert werden.

Hundley, Michael B., Sacred Spaces, Objects, Offerings, and People in the Priestly Texts: A Reappraisal: JBL 132, 2013, 749–767.

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.

Meshel, Naphtali S., The ‚Grammar‘ of Sacrifice. A Generativist Study of the Israelite Sacrificial System in the Priestly Writings With the ‚Grammar‘ of Σ, Oxford 2014.

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]).

Nihan, Christophe, Das Buch Levitikus. Entstehung und sozial-historische Bedeutung: BiKi 69, 2014, 64–68.

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.

Rudnig, Thilo Alexander, Art. Heilig / profan / Heiligkeit: Das wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet: www.wibilex.de (April 2014).

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

Schenker, Adrian, Unreinheit, Sünde und Sündopfer. Kritische Untersuchung zweier verbreiteter Thesen: befleckende Sünden (moral impurity) und Sündopfer *ḥaṭṭā't* als Reinigungsoffer für das Heiligtum: BZ 59, 2015, 1–16.

Meshel, Naphtali S., The Form and Function of a Biblical Blood Ritual, in: *Vetus Testamentum* 63, 2013, 276–289.

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, William K., חַטָּאת as "Sin Offering". A Reconsideration, in: Hodge, Caroline E. Johnson; Olyan, Saul M.; Ullucci, Daniel; Wasserman, Emma (Hg.), "The One Who Sows Bountifully". *Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers* (Brown Judaic Studies 356), Providence 2013, 119–128.

Gilders befasst sich mit dem Entsündigungsoffer und der Schwierigkeit, den hebräischen Opferbegriff חַטָּאת, *ḥaṭṭā't*, angemessen zu übersetzen. Er schlussfolgert: „Thus, for the Priestly tradents, the חַטָּאת, 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.“

Marwil, David J., A Soothing Savor: JBQ 42, 2014, 169-172.

Otto, Eckart, Priesterschrift und Deuteronomium im Buch Levitikus. Zur Integration des Deuteronomiums in den Pentateuch, in: Hartenstein, Friedhelm; Schmid, Konrad (Hg.), *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte*, Leipzig 2015, 161–185.

Dennis, J., The Function of the חַטָּאת Sacrifice in the Priestly Literature. An Evaluation of the View of Jacob Milgrom: *EThL* 78, 2002, 108–123.

Pakala, James C., A Librarian's Comments on Commentaries 36 (Leviticus and Also Some Problems for Commentaries): *Presbyterion* 40, 2014, 47–52.

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 long-standing 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.

Niditch, Susan, Good Blood, Bad Blood: Multivocality, Metonymy, and Mediation in Zechariah 9: VT 61, 2011, 629–645.

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.

Crouch, Carly L., What Makes a Thing Abominable? Observations on the Language of Boundaries and Identity Formation from a Social Scientific Perspective: VT 65, 2015, 516–541.

Published abstract: Previous attempts to synthesise biblical texts’ usage of *tw’bh* 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 *tw’bh* and *t’b* 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 Israelite 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 *gôlâ*,” while at the same time opening possibilities for including the surrounding *gôyîm* 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 *lḥm* (“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 ἰλάσκομαι) 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 Temple 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.]

Nihan, Christophe, Das Sabbatgesetz Exodus 31,12-17, die Priesterschrift und das Heiligkeitsgesetz. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit neueren Interpretationen, in: Achenbach, Reinhard; Ebach, Ruth; Wöhrle, Jakob (Hg.), *Wege der Freiheit. Zur Entstehung und Theologie des Exodusbuches. Beiträge eines Symposiums zum 70. Geburtstag von Rainer Albertz* (AThANT 104), Zürich 2014, 131–149.

Schlussfolgerung (S. 146): „In Ex 31,12–17 liegt eine nachpriesterschriftliche Komposition vor, die vor allem auf dem Hintergrund von Lev 17–26 zu verstehen ist, zugleich aber nicht auf einer Linie mit dem HG [Heiligkeitsgesetz] steht. Die Bedeutung dieser Einheit liegt in der Ergänzung des am Exodus orientierten Korrespondenzverhaltens Israels in Lev 17–26 um ein an der Schöpfung orientiertes Korrespondenzverhalten, bei welchem der Sabbat jetzt als privilegiertes Heiligungsmedium neben dem Tempel hervorgehoben wird, so dass beide Institutionen (Sabbat und Tempel) sich ergänzen und zusammen die beiden «Pole» der Sakralität für die nachexilischen israelitischen Gemeinden definieren. Die Komposition ist weder einer «Pentateuchredaktion» noch einer «Heiligkeitsredaktion» zuzuordnen, sondern geht auf eine spätere, das HG zugleich weiterführende und revidierende Bearbeitung des Pentateuch zurück, die priesterlichen Kreisen der spätachämenidischen Zeit in Judäa und Samaria entstammt.“

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.

Ellens, Deborah L., Fundamental Structure as Methodological Control for Evaluating Introverted Literary Structures in 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, 265–297.

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.

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.

Goldstein, Elizabeth W., Women and the Purification Offering. What Jacob Milgrom Contributed to the Intersection of Women's Studies and Biblical Studies, 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, 47–65.

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.]

Hundley, Michael B., *Tabernacle or Tent of Meeting? The Dual Nature of the Sacred Tent in the Priestly Texts*, 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, 3–18.

Kazen, Thomas, *Purity and Persia*, 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, 435–462.

Kilchör, Benjamin, *Mosetora und Jahwetora. Das Verhältnis von Deuteronomium 12–26 zu Exodus, Levitikus und Numeri* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 21), Wiesbaden 2015.

Kline, Moshe, *Structure Is Theology. The Composition 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, 225–264.

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.”

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

Meshel, Naphtali S., What Is a Zoeme? The Priestly Inventory of Sacrificial Animals, 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, 19–45.

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.

Warner, Megan, The Holiness School in Genesis, 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, 155–174.

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.

Müller, Reinhard, The Sanctifying Divine Voice. The יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ-Formular in the Holiness Code, in: Landy, Francis; Trevaskis, Leigh M.; Bibb, Bryan D. (Hg.), *Text, Time, and Temple. Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 64), Sheffield 2015, 70–84.

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 *'ni 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.]

Nihan, Christophe, The Templization of Israel in Leviticus. Some Remarks on Blood Disposal and Kipper in Leviticus 4, in: Landy, Francis; Trevaskis, Leigh M.; Bibb, Bryan D. (Hg.), *Text, Time, and Temple. Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus* (Hebrew Bible Monographs, 64), Sheffield 2015, 94–130.

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 *h̄t' t* 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 *ḥṭ'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 *ḥṭ'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 *ḥṭ'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 *ḥṭ'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.]

Whitekettle, Richard, *A Study in Scarlet: The Physiology and Treatment of Blood, Breath, and Fish in Ancient Israel*: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 135, 2016, 685-704.

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 traditions hallowed the breath of a land/aerial animal and acknowledged that sovereignty over it belonged exclusively to God.

Goldstein, Elizabeth W., *Impurity and Gender in the Hebrew Bible*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, London: Lexington Books, 2015.

Miller, William T., *A Compact Study of Leviticus*, Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2016.

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.

Kilchör, Benjamin, Did H Influence D on an Early or a Late Stage of the Redaction of D?, in: Old Testament Essays 29, 2016, 502–512.

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.]

Rooke, Deborah W., Leviticus from a Gendered Perspective: Making and Maintaining Priests, in: Spronk, Klaas; Barstad, Hans (Hg.), Torah and Tradition. Papers Read at the Sixteenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap, Edinburgh, 2015 (Oudtestamentische Studiën, 70), Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2017, 201–222.

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.

Tucker, Paavo N., The Holiness Composition in the Book of Exodus (FAT II/98), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

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.

- Hieke, Thomas*, Opfer und Liebe Gottes im Buch Levitikus, in: Oeming, Manfred (Hg.), AHAVA – Die Liebe Gottes im Alten Testament (ABG 55), Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2018, 133–142.
- Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A.* (eds.), Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique (Resources for Biblical Study 85), Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Eberhart, Christian A.*, Introduction: Constituents and Critique of Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity, in: Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A. (eds.), Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique (Resources for Biblical Study 85), Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 1–29.
- Harrington, Hannah K.*, Accessing Holiness via Ritual Ablutions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, in: Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A. (eds.), Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique (Resources for Biblical Study 85), Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 71–95.
- Yoder, Perry B.*, Leviticus (Believers Church Bible Commentary), Harrisonburg: Herald Press, 2017.
- Erbele-Küster, Dorothea*, Menstruation and the Sacred in (Post) Biblical Discourse, in: Berlis, Angela; Biezeveld, Kune; Korte, Anne-Marie (Hg.), Everyday Life and the Sacred. Reconfiguring Gender Studies in Religion (Studies in Theology and Religion 23), Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2017, 101–113.
- 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 4QLXXLev^a 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

(LXX.D), Wuppertal, 24.-27. Juli 2014 (WUNT 361), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 294–308.

Abstract from OTA: Whereas the Old Greek of Leviticus and 4QLXXLev^a 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 4QLXXLev^a, the Old Greek, and the MT for Lev 26:3-15 indicates that, in most cases, 4QLXXLev^a represents the *lectio difficilior*, while the Old Greek is closer to the Hebrew. Thus, 4QLXXLev^a is probably earlier and less literal while the Old Greek represents a revision toward a text like MT.

Olyan, Saul M., Defects, Holiness, and Pollution in Biblical Cultic Texts, in: Baden, Joel S.; Najman, Hindy; Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. (Hg.), *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls. John Collins at Seventy (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 175)*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2017, 1018–1028.

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 and 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.

Rogerson, John W. (ed.), *Leviticus in Practice*, Dorset: Deo Publishing, 2014 (not available in Germany).

Bibb, Bryan D., Blood, Death, and the Holy in the Leviticus Narrative, in: Fewell, Danna Nolan (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Narrative (Oxford Handbooks)*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, 137–146.

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, *Body, Gender and Purity in Leviticus 12 and 15 (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 539)*, New York, Oxford, London, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2017.

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.

Kazen, Thomas, Disgust in Body, Mind, and Language. The Case of Impurity in the Hebrew Bible, in: Spencer, F. Scott (Hg.), *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions. Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature (Resources for Biblical Study, 90)*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2017, 97–115.

Himbaza, Innocent, Quelle est la Septante du Lévitique?, in: *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 49, 2016, 22–33.

Abstract from OTA: H. focuses on two Leviticus manuscripts from Qumran—4QLXXLev^a (late 2nd, early 1st cent. B.C.E.) and 4QpapLXXLev^b (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.

Rhyder, Julia, Holiness Language in II Kings 23? A Note on a Recent Proposal: *ZAW* 127, 2015, 497–501.

Wachowski, Johannes, Lernen am Leviticus, in: *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik und Theologie* 67, 2015, 134–144.

Harrington, Hannah K., *The Purity and Sanctuary of the Body in Second Temple Judaism (JAJ.S 33)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019.

Nihan, Christophe, Supplementing Leviticus in the Second Temple Period. The Case of the Wood Offering in 4Q365 Fragment 23, in: Olyan, Saul M.; Wright, Jacob L. (Hg.), *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible (Brown Judaic Studies 361)*, Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018, 183–204.

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 *terminus 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."

Eberhart, Christian A.; Hieke, Thomas (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019.

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, Thomas, *Writing a Commentary as a Research Achievement*, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 19-24.

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, James W., *Unperformed Rituals in an Unread Book*, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 25-33.

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, William K., Commentary as Ethnography, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 35-47.

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.

Harrington, Hannah K., The Role of Second Temple Texts in a Commentary on Leviticus, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 49-66.

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.

Meshel, Naphtali S., The Form and Function of a Biblical Blood Ritual, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 101-114.

Meshel investigates “The Form and Function of a Biblical Blood Ritual.” He scrutinizes the consensus in current exegetical research that Levitical law never requires blood to be tossed upon the upper surface of the altar. He posits that this

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, Roy E., Purification Offerings and Paradoxical Pollution of the Holy, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 115-125.

Gane answers objections to his proposal regarding a challenging question that any serious commentator on Leviticus must face. How do physical ritual impurities (*tum'ôti*) and sins (*ḥaṭṭā'ôti*) 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).

Meshel, Naphtali S., Some New Questions in the Fundamental Science of P, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 127-138.

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.

Wright, David P., Law and Creation in the Priestly-Holiness Writings of the Pentateuch, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 201-233.

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.

Watts, James W., Drawing Lines. A Suggestion for Addressing the Moral Problem of Reproducing Immoral Biblical Texts in Commentaries and Bibles, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 235-252.

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.

Greer, Jonathan S., The “Priestly Portion” in the Hebrew Bible: Its Ancient Near Eastern Context and Its Implications for the Composition of P, in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138, 2019, 263–284.

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.

Kamionkowski, S. Tamar, *Leviticus (Wisdom Commentary 3)*, Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2018.

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

Perspectives on Early Jewish and Christian Writings, New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2018, 83–96.

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.]

Schorch, Stefan (ed.), *Leviticus (The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior. Volume 3)*, Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2018.

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.

Hieke, Thomas, Tenufa – Emporhebungsgabe statt Schwingopfer, in: Wimmer, Stefan Jakob; Gafus, Georg (Hg.), „*Vom Leben umfassen*“. *Ägypten, das Alte Testament und das Gespräch der Religionen. Gedenkschrift für Manfred Görg* (ÄAT 80), Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2014, 83–89.

MacDonald, Nathan, Scribalism and Ritual Innovation, in: HeBAI 7, 2018, 415–429.

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 *tənûpâ* and *tərûmâ* 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.

Awabdy, Mark A., Immigrants and Innovative Law. Deuteronomy's Theological and Social Vision for the גר (FAT 2. Reihe 67), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Published abstract: Mark A. Awabdy provides a nuanced and extensive understanding of the noun גר (*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.

Awabdy, Mark A., Leviticus. A Commentary on Leueitikon in Codex Vaticanus (Septuagint Commentary Series), Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2019.

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.

Rhyder, Julia, Sabbath and Sanctuary Cult in the Holiness Legislation: A Reassessment, in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138, 2019, 721–740.

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.

Saysell, Csilla, The Blood Manipulation of the Sin Offering and the Logic of Defilement, in: de Jong, John; Saysell, Csilla (eds.), *Holding Forth the Word of Life: Essays in Honor of Tim Meadowcroft*, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2020, 44–57 (also published in: *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research* 13/2, 2018).

van Steenberg, Gerrit J., Sacrifice in Leviticus 1–7 and Pökot Culture: Implications for Bible Translation, in: Kotzé, Gideon; Locatell, Christian S.; Messarra, John A. (eds.), *Ancient Texts and Modern Readers. Studies in Ancient Hebrew Linguistics and Bible Translation (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 71)*, Leiden: Brill, 2019, 300–318.

Krause, Joachim J., Die Bedingungen des Bundes. Studien zur konditionalen Struktur alttestamentlicher Bundeskonzeptionen (FAT 140), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020. Rezension

Rogan, Wil, Purity in Early Judaism. Current Issues and Questions, in: *Currents in Biblical Research* 16, 2018, 309–339.

Published abstract: The study of purity has become a crucial undertaking in the scholarly quest to understand the social and theological dimensions of early Judaism and the texts that early Jews both formed and were formed by. This article surveys scholarly literature on purity in ancient and early Judaism, in order to identify and address four areas of critical inquiry that ought to be taken into consideration when questions about purity arise in the study of early Jewish writings: (1) the conceptualization of purity as a symbolic system; (2) the distinction between kinds of purity (ritual, moral, and genealogical); (3) the relation of purity to the temple and, more broadly, to space; and (4) the function of purity to construct and maintain social identity. Attention to these critical issues premises to give clarity, direction and depth to scholarship on purity in early Judaism.

Adler, Yonatan, The Hellenistic Origins of Jewish Ritual Immersion, in: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 69, 2018, 1–29.

Published abstract: The present study explores the origins of Jewish ritual immersion – inquiring when immersion first appeared as a rite of purification and what the reasons may have been for this development specifically at this time. Textual and archaeological evidence suggest that immersion emerged at some point during or perhaps slightly prior to the first half of the first century BCE. It is suggested here that the practice grew out of contemporary bathing practices involving the Hellenistic hip bath. Through a process of ritualization, full-body immersion emerged as a method of purificatory washing clearly differentiated from profane bathing. By way of a subsequent process of ‘hyper-ritualization’, some ventured further to distinguish purificatory ablutions from profane bathing by restricting use of ‘drawn water’ for purification and by assigning impurity to anyone who bathed in such water. Before us is an enlightening example of one of the many ways wherein Jewish religious practices evolved and adapted in response to Hellenistic cultural innovations.

Ederer, Matthias, Identitätsstiftende Begegnung. Die theologische Deutung des regelmäßigen Kultes Israels in der Tora (FAT 121), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Abstract: In his study of the so-called *tāmîd* texts of the Pentateuch, E. demonstrates that these materials concerning regular communal ritual acts are of particular importance among the ritual and sacrificial texts of the Torah. After a clarification of methods and terms, he turns to a detailed examination of all relevant passages: the *tôrâ* for the sanctuary (Exodus 25-31), the role of the *tāmîd* in the inauguration of the cult (Exodus 40; Leviticus 9; Numbers 8), the new context and halakhic expansion in Leviticus 24 and Numbers 28 and the regular sacrificial procedures in Leviticus 1-7. A final chapter summarizes and systematizes E.’s observations. While the texts seem designed as instructions at the first glance, they do not, in fact, focus on the procedures of the regular cult performances but rather develop theological interpretations of these. All recurrent ritual acts handled in the Pentateuch serve to invoke a regular encounter of Israel with YHWH and of YHWH with Israel as a reminder of what Israel is or should be before YHWH. Thus, these ritual texts preserve Israel’s identity in its theological depth dimension. This identity comes to the fore at the sanctuary, Israel’s center, according to a regular rhythm.-T.H.

Published abstract: Within the Torah’s cultic texts, the instructions to carry out communal ritual acts are of major importance. Matthias Ederer’s minute examination of these ‘Tamid texts’ shows that though they appear to be set out as regulations, they barely address the how and what of performance and instead develop detailed theological interpretations. All that the regular cultic acts dealt with in the Torah have in common is that they outline and commemorate – by initiating a periodical interaction between Israel and YHWH and vice versa – what Israel is, or ought to be, before YHWH. The texts are shaped as a reservoir of a theologically founded identity of Israel, which is presented in a regular rhythm at the center of Israel, the Temple, and thus creates a specific time of Israel.

Nihan, Christophe, Narrative and Exegesis in Leviticus. On Lv 10 and 24,10-23, in: Bühner, Walter (Hg.), *Schriftgelehrte Fortschreibungs- und Auslegungsprozesse. Textarbeit im*

Pentateuch, in *Qumran, Ägypten und Mesopotamien (FAT II/108)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019, 207–242.

Abstract from OTA: In this contribution, N. investigates two passages in the Book of Leviticus that are clearly distinguished by their fully narrative formulation from the rest of the material making up the book. In both instances, a situation is related in which, in response to a ritual misdeed (the incense offering that has not been commanded in Leviticus 10 and the profanation of the divine name in Leviticus 24), already existing laws are creatively transformed. Narrative exegesis and legislative exegesis go hand in hand in these two cases. Lev 24:10-23 utilizes several passages of the Book of the Covenant by means of “lemmatic transformation” in order, ultimately, to reinterpret the qualitative prescriptions regarding talion in Exod 21:22-25 in a quantitative sense wherein the “eye for an eye” principle is to be understood literally. Leviticus 10, for its part, uses the ritual legislation of the Book of Leviticus (as well as Exod 44:10-31) in order, ultimately, to emphasize the primacy of the priestly exegesis of the law vis-à-vis (the silent) Moses. Their specific narrative form of legislative exegesis as well as the texts to which they refer show both passages to be late components in the formation-history of the Book of Leviticus, which, in addition to their clearly scribal reference to existing texts, are clearly motivated by considerations external to the text. “... the narrative exegesis reflected in Leviticus 10 and 24:10-23 appears to be informed by a distinctly priestly outlook. Leviticus 10 establishes the Aaronite priests as the main authorized interpreters of the Law, while Lev 24:10-23 redefines, or reclassifies, lethal and non-lethal injuries as forms of sacrilege, thereby subsuming criminal matters under the authority of the temple and the prerogatives of the priests” (p. 239). [Translated and adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]

Tucker, Paavo N., Why Love Matters for Justice. Political Emotions between Narrative and Law in the Holiness Code, in: Zehnder, Markus; Wick, Peter (Hg.), Biblical Ethics. Tensions between Justice and Mercy, Law and Love (Gorgias Biblical Studies 70), Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2019, 83–104.

Abstract from OTA: The command to the Israelites to love their neighbors and sojourners as themselves in Lev 19:18, 34 has usually been interpreted to signify behaving in loving ways toward these groups of persons, because it is presumed that the emotional commitment of love cannot be commanded. The context of Leviticus 19, however, does not differentiate between internal attitudes and external behaviors, in that the text is concerned with commanding both internal attitudes and emotions flowing from such love, which, in turn, lead to external loving actions. Martha Nussbaum, in her 2013 work *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*, has shown that it is important for communities to secure the emotional commitment of their citizens toward the values of the society, and that this commitment can be developed through narrative strategies that celebrate the shared history and values of the given community. The same argument can be made regarding Leviticus 19, where the authors of the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26) build a case for emotional and behavioral commitments grounded in the shared journey of the people of Israel among the nations of the world that is traced in the P materials of the Pentateuch from Genesis 1 to the moment of Israel’s stay at Sinai in Leviticus. [Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]

- Feldman, Liane M.*, The idea and study of sacrifice in ancient Israel, in: *Religion Compass* 2020;e12380, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec3.12380>.
 Published Abstract: This article offers an introduction to the idea of sacrifice in Israel across the first millennium BCE, and presents data from both the first and second temple periods. In the first part of the article, I discuss three different types of evidence available for the study of sacrifice—archeological, comparative, and literary—the strengths and limitations of each form of evidence, and highlight recent trends in this area of study. In the second part of the article, I turn to a more direct discussion of the what, where, who, why, and how of sacrifice in ancient Israel.
- Achenbach, Reinhard*, Die Torot über die Reinheit in Leviticus 10–15 und die Sakralisierung des Gesetzes, in: Eckhardt, Benedikt; Leonhard, Clemens; Zimmermann, Klaus (Hg.), *Reinheit und Autorität in den Kulturen des antiken Mittelmeerraumes (Religion und Politik, 21)*, Baden-Baden: Ergon, 2020, 55–82.
- Bibb, Bryan D.*, Blood, Death, and the Holy in the Leviticus Narrative, in: Fewell, Danna Nolan (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Narrative*, online May 2015, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199967728.013.10.
 Published Abstract: After briefly discussing the final literary structure of Leviticus, this chapter considers three parts of the book in light of particular themes: blood ritual and mythic drama in chapters 1–7 and 11–15; life, death, and ambiguity in chapters 8–10 and 16; and holiness and God’s people in chapters 17–27. By embedding ritual instructions within a mythical- narrative frame, the authors/editors of Leviticus created a sacred timeless and authoritative world that resists challenge from dissent and doubt. However, narratives interspersed within the ritual texts expose ambiguities within the system and raise questions about the ability of the law to accomplish its purposes. In the second half of Leviticus, the world of “holiness” is expanded and reframed in order to apply to the whole community, a recognition that priestly ritual is a cosmic reality that is broader and more transformative than what happens only in the tabernacle.
- Barmash, Pamela* (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Law*, online November 2019, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199392667.001.0001. See especially the following articles: *Lipka, Hilary*, Women, Children, Slaves, and Foreigners; *Amihay, Aryeh*, Ritual Law: Sacrifice and Holy Days; *Feder, Yitzhaq*, Purity and Sancta Desecration in Ritual Law; *Achenbach, Reinhard*, Priestly Law.
- Klawans, Jonathan*, Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: Collins, John J.; Lim, Timothy H. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, 377–402, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199207237.003.0017.
- Lawrence, Jonathan D.*, Clean/Unclean, Pure/Impure, Holy/Profane, in: Balentine, Samuel E. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ritual and Worship in the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020, 301–311, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190222116.013.18.
- Janzen, David*, Sin and Expiation, in: Balentine, Samuel E. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ritual and Worship in the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020, 289–301, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190222116.013.17
- Hieke, Thomas*, Ritual Experts and Participants in the Ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible, in: Balentine, Samuel E. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ritual and Worship in*

the Hebrew Bible, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020, 179–194, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190222116.013.10

Altmann, Peter; Spiciarich, Abra, Chickens, Partridges, and the /tor/ of Ancient Israel and the Hebrew Bible, in: *Die Welt des Orients* 50, 2020, 2–30.

Published abstract: Traditionally translated as “turtledove,” several scholars have recently argued for alternative renderings for the term /tor/ in the sacrificial ordinances of Gen 15:9; Num 6: 10; and frequently in Leviticus. The importance of the identification of /tor/ lies in its impact on our understanding of biblical sacrificial practices, anthropological understandings of Israelite cult, and their relationship to Israelite meal practices. Specifically, hinging on the nature of the /tor/ is the question of whether all sacrificial animals were domesticated, and to what degree, which has ramifications for the understanding of the connection between the boundaries of Israelite household and Israelite altar. In a first step, this paper will incorporate data concerning the identification of archaeological remains of birds throughout the Southern Levant, allowing material culture to weigh in on the discussion. A second step will bring together the zooarcheological data and biblical reflections on possible identifications for this bird in ancient Israel.

Dietrich, Jan, Listenweisheit im Buch Levitikus. Überlegungen zu den Taxonomien der Priesterschrift, in: Körting, Corinna; Kratz, Reinhard Gregor (Hg.), *Fromme und Frevler. Studien zu Psalmen und Weisheit. Festschrift für Hermann Spieckermann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2020, 371–387.

Laffey, Alice L., Leviticus, in: Gossai, Hemchand (Hg.), *Postcolonial Commentary and the Old Testament*, London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2018, 27–56.

Abstract from OTA: Many scholars consider Leviticus 19 to be the core of the book’s ethical teaching. “Justice and peace come when you love your neighbor.” The description of the Jubilee Year, in Leviticus 25 is also of great significance for postcolonial ethics. The redistribution of the land means that it is God’s land and should not be owned by colonial powers. But texts can be read as both liberating or oppressing. We cannot take for granted that Leviticus is a wholly liberating text, a text that provides a welcoming order. Lev 18:18, for example, is an oppressive text, condemning homosexuality. The birth of a female child differs from that of a male child (Lev 12:1-5), an ideological construct that supports patriarchy. This essay tries to suggest ways people whose ancestors were colonized might read Leviticus through a lens that includes skepticism and resistance, but ultimately is focused on liberation and hope —F.W.G.

Büchner, Dirk, Interpretive Intent and the Legal Material of the Septuagint Pentateuch, in: Cook, Johann; Rösel, Martin (Hg.), *Toward a Theology of the Septuagint. Stellenbosch Congress on the Septuagint, 2018 (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 74)*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2020, 115–139.

Abstract from OTA: A language such as Greek, with a much larger vocabulary and set of syntactical structures than Hebrew, is able to be more precise than the latter, which often appears ambiguous. The question then is whether, like the Targums, the LXX should be regarded as closer to the Hebrew style than to the meaning of the Hebrew texts it translates, to borrow a formulation of David J. Lane. If the former is the case, the task of one seeking for a hermeneutical purpose in the translation is to determine

whether one finds more than simply isolated attempts to create new meanings in the Greek. This paper presents a number of passages drawn from LXX Leviticus where interpretation is clearly operative, but also, as a control sample, other cases in which the material does not appear to display the kind of meaning associated with a liturgical text. If, in a book like Leviticus, containing sacred laws and precepts, we encounter variations with regard to the clarity of the translator(s)' purpose, one is forced to raise the question of what sort of expectations the translation was intended to meet. Such expectations, I argue, exist in the receptor community, rather than in the mind of the translator. Nevertheless, the question is one that can enrich the profile of what one might call a diaspora "theology." [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Wright, David P., Atonement beyond Israel. The Holiness School's Amendment to Priestly Legislation on the Sin Sacrifice (*ḥattā't*), in: Botner, Max; Duff, Justin Harrison; Dürr, Simon (Hg.), Atonement. Jewish and Christian Origins, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020, 40–63.

Abstract from OTA: W.'s essay seeks to trace the Holiness [H] School's expansion of P's regulations on the "sin" or "purification" offering (*ḥattā't*). Via careful textual analysis, W. shows that H amends pre-existing regulations on the *ḥattā't* to include the immigrant (*gēr*) living in the land of Israel. In contrast to the ethical concerns of Deuteronomy and the Covenant Code, however, H is strictly concerned with the *gēr* as the representative of a legal category. If the sins of the *gēr* can pollute the land, as H maintains, then it is vital that the principal source of atonement, the *ḥattā't* sacrifice, be made available for the *gēr* as well. [Adapted from published abstract C.T.B.]

Rooke, Deborah W., Sin, Sacrifice, but No Salvation, in: Botner, Max; Duff, Justin Harrison; Dürr, Simon (Hg.), Atonement. Jewish and Christian Origins, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020, 21–39.

Abstract from OTA: R.'s essay surveys instances in P where atonement becomes impossible, resulting in the offender's being "cutoff" from the community. While there has been much debate about the nature of the so-called *karet* penalty, R. argues that the rhetorical function of the formula itself was equally significant to the tradents of P in order to "inculcate the values of the Priestly legislators into the minds of the community for whom they were writing." Subtle distinctions in the ways in which the *karet* penalty is articulated in P may evince a concern to order hierarchically even the most heinous offenses. [Adapted from published abstract] There is more to understanding the *karet* penalty ... than working out what *karet* represents. The overall point of the penalty is that to benefit from the Priestly system of holiness and sacrifice one must be part of it and abide by its values, and there are certain actions that put perpetrators outside of the system and therefore render them ineligible for its benefits. But in the wording of the penalty there is a sense of the level at which the offense operates—in other words, just how serious an offense it is—and equally significant, an attempt to inculcate the values of the Priestly legislators into the minds of the community for whom they were writing. Indeed, these penalties that indicate what is beyond the bounds of permissibility in the hierarchically structured holy society constructed by P are essential to maintaining its stability. ... [Adapted from author's conclusion, p. 39 – C.T.B.]

Botner, Max; Duff, Justin Harrison; Dürr, Simon (Hg.), *Atonement. Jewish and Christian Origins*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020.

Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020.

Abstract: The book of Leviticus is by far the most quoted in rabbinic literature such as the Mishna or the Talmud, while it has been marginalized in the Christian tradition. Nevertheless, scholars of both traditions have again become highly interested in it for some decades now. As shown by many recent publications, the book is thoroughly studied for textual, literary, historical and reception aspects. It has often been said and written that the text of Leviticus is stable in comparison to many other books of the Hebrew Bible, and that its Greek translation is quite literal. Yet, the text of Leviticus continues to raise questions, not only regarding its content and textual witnesses, but also its interpretation, history and reception. The third international colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg in October 2015, aimed to bring together some specialists of the text of Leviticus in order to advance research on its textual witnesses and the aforementioned topics. – The articles collected in this book reflect the width of current research. They deal with the witnesses to the text of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Masoretic Text, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint. They also study the book's Hebrew editing; its relation to other books such as Joshua, Luke-Acts and Flavius Josephus; and the challenge of its translation, with a case study in French.

Nihan, Christophe; Rhyder, Julia (eds.), *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch. A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021.

Feder, Yitzhaq, *The Textualization of Priestly Ritual in Light of Hittite Sources*, in: Nihan, Christophe; Rhyder, Julia (eds.), *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch. A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021, 121–150.

Schmitt, Rüdiger, *Diversity and Centralization of the Temple Cult in the Archeological Record from the Iron II C to the Persian and Hellenistic Periods in Judah*, in: Nihan, Christophe; Rhyder, Julia (eds.), *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch. A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021, 151–171.

Watts, James W., *Texts Are Not Rituals, and Rituals Are Not Texts, with an Example from Leviticus 12*, in: Nihan, Christophe; Rhyder, Julia (eds.), *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch. A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021, 172–187.

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, *The Ritual Texts of Leviticus and the Creation of Ritualized Bodies*, in: Nihan, Christophe; Rhyder, Julia (eds.), *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch. A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021, 240–254.

Röhrig, Meike J., *Innerbiblische Auslegung und priesterliche Fortschreibung in Lev 8–10 (FAT II/128)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.

Averbeck, Richard E., *Reading the Ritual Law in Leviticus Theologically*, in: Abernethy, Andrew T. (ed.), *Interpreting the Old Testament Theologically. Essays in Honor of Willem A. VanGemeren*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018, 135–149.

Abstract from OTA: The theology we find in Leviticus has important implications for many Christian doctrines, including Christology, soteriology, sanctification, and ecclesiology. A.'s essay focuses on (1) the presence of God in the tabernacle, and (2) the ritual offerings and sacrifices carried out in the tabernacle, especially those having to do with the sin offering. After Moses received the Ten Commandments on Mt. Sinai, the Lord gave him instructions for building the tabernacle. This tent was a "moveable" Mt. Sinai, signifying that God would always be with the Hebrews, walking with them on their journey. According to Exodus 34, God was present with them in a cloud of glory, and he did not depart from them until the fall of Jerusalem and the exile to Babylon (Ezekiel 8, 10, 11). However, God promised to return to his people in a New Temple. This New Temple is described in Ephesians 2 and 3, where it is not in a place, but God's invisible presence among his people. The sacrificial system in Leviticus remains relevant for New Covenant believers and their understanding of salvation. The Day of Atonement (see Leviticus 16), when transgressions are forgiven, finds its true fulfillment in Jesus's cross and resurrection. For further study of the offerings in Leviticus, see Roy Gane, *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy* (2005). - F.W.G.

Ben Dov, Jonathan, The History of Pentecontad Time Units (I), in: Mason, Eric F. (ed.), *A Teacher For All Generations. Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (JSJ.S 153,2), Leiden: Brill, 2012, 93–111.

Abstract from OTA: B.D. seeks for the origins of the fiftieth day and fiftieth year motif in the laws governing the Festival of Weeks and the Jubilee Year in Lev 23:15-16 and Lev 25:8-55 respectively. He first examines the evidence that Hildegard and Julius Lewy presented over seventy years ago to support their thesis that the calculation of time in Leviticus 23 and 25 was based on a calendar of fifty temporal units (a "pentecontad"), which originated in Amorite circles of the second millennium B.C.E. His evaluation of the Old Assyrian and Babylonian material yields no evidence of a pentecontad calendar and thereby eviscerates the possibility of its Amorite origins. B.D., for his part, argues that the highlighting of the fiftieth day and year in the Holiness Code represents a development of earlier Israelite observances. The fifty-day festival of weeks in the Deuteronomic and Priestly traditions represents a shift regarding the agricultural Festival of Weeks with its original undefined duration (Deut 16:9; Lev 23:15; cf. Exod 34:22; Jer 5:24). Priestly writers conceptualized the Jubilee in the fiftieth year as a sevenfold extension of an earlier mandate that prescribed a Sabbath rest for the land every seventh year (Lev 25:8-55; cf. 25:2-7; Exod 23:10-11).-M.W.D.

González, Eusebio, Santidad sacerdotl y santidad de Israel. Dos ideas relacionadas en el libro Levítico, in: *Annales Theologici* 33, 2019, 489–501.

Abstract from OTA: G.'s paper examines the concept of "holiness" in the Bible, with a focus on the relationship between priestly holiness and the holiness of Israel in the Book of Leviticus. In particular, G. seeks to show that the two parts of the book generally distinguished by scholars, i.e. the Priestly Code of chaps. 1-16 and the Holiness Code of chaps. 17-26, can be seen as highlighting two core components of the biblical concept of holiness: the former segment directs attention to God who sanctifies in virtue of his intrinsic, primordial purity and holiness, while the latter

focuses on Israel, which is sanctified according to a process in which a people that is not holy to start with is guided toward their becoming such by the holy God. [Adapted from published abstract – C.T.B.]

Hopf, Matthias, Heiligkeit und Ehre. Die Aufforderung zur *imitatio Dei* im Heiligkeitsgesetz im Verhältnis zu *honor/shame*, in: van Oorschot, Jürgen; Wagner, Andreas (Hg.), Gott und Mensch im Alten Testament. Zum Verhältnis von Gottes- und Menschenbild (VWGTh, 52), Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2018, 139–153.

Luciani, Didier, Des arrangements numériques en Lévitique?, in: EThL 95, 2019, 615–627. Abstract from OTA: Is it possible that certain biblical texts were composed on the basis of techniques involving the counting of words and letters? L.'s note, taking the Book of Leviticus as a test case, seeks to provide a partial answer to this question with regards to the books of the Hebrew Bible. L. also proposes various methodological criteria for evaluating such a gematrical approach. [Adapted from published abstract- C.T.B.]

Metso, Sarianna, Leviticus Outside the Legal Genre, in: Mason, Eric F. (ed.), A Teacher For All Generations. Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam (JSJ.S 153,2), Leiden: Brill, 2012, 379–388.

Abstract from OTA: M. examines three texts to illustrate how the scribes at Qumran quote Leviticus in a manner that transposed legal texts into an apocalyptic horizon that served to enhance the dualistic contrasts between the respective destinies of the righteous and the wicked. (1) In quoting Lev 18:5, the *Damascus Document* accentuates the eschatological thrust of the verse by use of life-and-death language, while also extending the scope of offensive behaviors beyond those pertaining to sexual ethics (CD 3:12-20). (2) The *Damascus Document* also quotes Lev 20:27 in declaring that apostates merit the penalty of death by stoning, which applies only to mediums and necromancers in the biblical text itself (CD 12:2-3). The apostasy in question may have consisted in embracing the Hellenizing initiatives of Jason the high priest (2 Macc 4:13-17). (3) In 11QMelchizedek, quotations of Isa 61:1; Deut 15:2; and Lev 25:9 are related to the proclamation of the Jubilee, which is dramatically refashioned in the Scrolls' texts via its portrayal of Melchizedek, the transcendent high priest, definitively freeing the righteous from the tyranny of Belial on the final Day of Atonement.—M.W.D.

Rhyder, Julia, Centralizing the Cult. The Holiness Legislation in Leviticus 17-26 (FAT 134), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Published abstract: Julia Rhyder untersucht in dieser Arbeit das Heiligkeitsgesetz (Lev 17–26) und die Frage nach der Kultzentralisation in der Perserzeit. Sie zeigt, dass Lev 17–26 die Vorstellung der Kultzentralisation nicht als etablierte Norm voraussetzt, sondern ein eigenständiges Verständnis von einem Zentralheiligtum, standardisierten Ritualen und einem hegemonialen Priestertum entwickelt.

Abstract from OTA: In this work, a revision of her 2018 Lausanne dissertation directed by Christophe Nihan, R. provides new insights into the relationship between the Holiness legislation in Leviticus 17-26 and the processes of cultic centralization in the Persian period. In her work, R. proposes an alternative to the classical theory that Leviticus 17-26 merely presumes, with minor modifications, the conception of cultic centralization articulated in the Book of Deuteronomy. In particular, she makes the

case that Leviticus 17-26 uses ritual legislation to make a new and distinctive case as to why the Israelites must adhere to a central sanctuary, standardized ritual processes, and a hegemonic priesthood. These chapters' centralization discourse reflects the historical challenges that faced priests in Jerusalem during the Persian era, specifically the need to compensate for the loss of a royal sponsor, to pool communal resources in order to meet socioeconomic pressures, and to find new ways of negotiating with the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim and a growing Jewish diaspora. [Adapted from published abstract] -- Following an introduction that lays out key concepts for the study that follows, R.'s chap. 2 examines the current state of research on the Holiness Code (H) ... Chap. 3 goes on to review current scholarly research on the importance of the Persian period in the negotiation of cultic centralization, the relationship between the central sanctuaries at Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim, and the evidence for continued cultic diversity, both within Yehud and Samaria and in the diaspora ... -- Chap. 4 contextualizes R.'s following study of H by considering the question of centralization in P ... The core of her study comprises chaps. 5, 6, 7, each of which considers one aspect of H's discourse of centralization. Chap. 5 offers a close reading of the laws of Leviticus 17 dealing with the proper disposal of blood. ... Chap. 6 discusses the contribution to H's centralization discourse made by its calendar in Leviticus 23 and its laws regarding regular rites at the shrine in Lev 24:1-9. ... Chap. 7 broadens the scope to address the significance of the concept of holiness for H's centralizing discourse. Unlike P, which restricts holiness to the sanctuary, its paraphernalia, and priesthood, H extends holiness to the community as a whole, and even to its activities outside the sanctuary precinct. The chapter argues that this extension reflects H's attempt to align everyday practice with central norms associated with the sanctuary. It thus explores how holiness reinforces a hegemonic discourse of centralization aimed at normalizing the reach of the temple into extra-sanctuary domains through the aid of the law, and soliciting the Israelites' conformity with the law, not just through coercion, but also through consent. This chapter also explores how H's interest in the sabbath and the Israelites' life on the land furthers this attempt to construct all activities—in social, agricultural, and economic domains—as integral to the Israelites' shared obligations to defer to central sanctuary authorities. It concludes by assessing how this program might have bolstered the claims of temple authorities to economic centrality in the Persian period in light of their demands, not only for ongoing material support in the form of offerings and donations, but also for recognition as authoritative in the agricultural and socioeconomic domains. [Adapted from outline of the study, pp. 22-24—C.T.B.]

Feldman, Liane M., *The Story of Sacrifice. Ritual and Narrative in the Priestly Source* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 141), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Abstract from OTA: This is a significantly revised version of F.'s dissertation that was submitted in 2018 to the University of Chicago. Its six chapters look closely at the relationship between the detailed ritual instructions in Leviticus and the broader Priestly narrative in the Pentateuch. F. argues that the two are deeply interdependent and that the P ritual material can and should be read as literature. Chap. 1 offers an introduction and concise history of scholarship on ritual and narrative in the Pentateuch and also provides an orientation to the method used in F.'s study. Chap. 2

focuses on the construction of space in the segment Exodus 40-Leviticus 7, considering the literary function and the structuring of the sacrificial instructions. Chap. 3 discusses the creation of the cult and its public performance in Lev 8:1-10:7. Chap. 4 treats the delineation of boundaries separating the ordinary and the sacred in Israel's cult, with special attention to Lev 10:8-15:33 and Num 7:1-8:4. Chap. 5 studies Leviticus 16-17 regarding the possibility of ritual "decontamination," while chap. 6 is F.'s brief conclusion. The volume contains six charts, a bibliography, and indexes. F.'s literary reading offers an intriguing new conversation with pentateuchal ritual texts without jettisoning the historical value of those texts.—G.A.K.

Choi, Baesick, *Leviticus and Its Reception in the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran*, Eugene, Or.: Pickwick Publications, 2020.

Published abstract: A large amount of Leviticus material has been found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Yet there is surprisingly little secondary scholarly analysis of the role of Leviticus in this corpus. The book of Leviticus survives in several manuscripts; it also features in quotations and allusions, so that it seems to be a foundational source for the ideology behind the composition of some of the nonscriptural texts. Indeed this volume argues that the ideology of the Holiness Code persisted in the communities that collected the manuscripts and placed them in the Qumran Caves. – Abstract from OTA: In this reworking of his University of Manchester dissertation directed by George J. Brooke, C. sets out to show that the Book of Leviticus, chaps. 16-27 in particular, was a major influence on the movement whose adherents resided at Qumran and other nearby sites in the late Second Temple period, both in its earlier ("pre-sectarian") and later ("sectarian") stages. In making his case, C. first notes that the caves at Qumran and its environs have yielded no less than 25 manuscripts of Leviticus in varying formats and states of preservation. From this basis, C. proceeds to examine in some detail 4 DSS texts in which the influence of Leviticus on the given's document's structure, themes, and ideological emphases proves significant. Of these, the first two, i.e., Jubilees and the Temple Scroll, are likely earlier/pre-sectarian in origin, while the remaining two, i.e., the Damascus Document and MMT, are later/"sectarian" productions. Prior to his synthesizing conclusion, C. summarily surveys a number of other DSS, both earlier and later, i.e., the Aramaic Levi Document, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Apocryphon of Jeremiah, as well as 4Q274; 4Q251; and 1QS, all of which evidence the influence of Leviticus on their content and respective ideologies. Overall, C. concludes that the writers of the above texts in their utilization of Leviticus typically did so in ways that, e.g., elaborated on the source text, clarified its meaning, and made its provisions more stringent in accordance with the cultic and educational purposes that inform their compositions.—C.T.B.

Himbaza, Innocent, *Leviticus (Biblia Hebraica Quinta 3)*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2020.

Baumann, Gerlinde, *Das Opfer nach der Sintflut für die Gottheit(en) des Alten Testaments und des Alten Orients: Eine neue Deutung*, in: *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34, 2013, 1–7. Online verfügbar unter <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/>.

Published abstract: The Sacrifice for (the) God(s) after the Flood in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East: A New Interpretation. The experience of a large, devastating flood is part of the cultural heritage of mankind. The famous 'texts of the deluge'

come from Mesopotamia. Here, the flood tradition dates back to the 3rd Millennium. The longest and most traditional of these texts, which – amongst other things – deal with the interpretation of these events, is the Atramḥasis myth. The literary-dependent text is the Gilgamesh epic, and the Old Testament version is the story of the Flood that is found in Genesis 6–9. For a long time the similarities and differences between these three texts have been known. However, so far little attention was given to a passage that all three texts share: the sacrifice of the surviving humans after the Flood. The reaction of the deity(ies) differs in these three texts. In this article I would like to consider the similarities and differences between the texts in order to evaluate the significance of the Old Testament text. This is against the background of recent insights in the field of ancient Israelite sacrifice, related to cultural anthropology. These three passages are first considered in their context and then compared to the relevant aspects of each other before a conclusion is drawn.

Feldman, Liane M., Challenging a Priestly Credit Theology: A New Translation of Niphal חשב, in: *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 84, 2022, 183–201.

Published Abstract: This article argues for a new translation of the *niphal* of חשב in the Priestly Narrative. This verb has typically been translated as “credited” and has been used as the foundation for arguing that the Priestly sacrificial system utilizes a divine ledger that tracks credits and debits of individual Israelites. I demonstrate that the concept of this kind of “credit theology” is foreign to the Priestly Narrative, and that the mistranslation of this verb has enabled a fundamental misunderstanding of the sacrificial system. Instead, I suggest that the use of this verb is limited to a very specific legal scenario related to the inappropriate possession of sacrificial material, is best understood in the context of property law, and should be translated as “to bail.”

Bande García, José Antonio, La protección hacia el extranjero en los principales códigos legales del Pentateuco, in: *Studium Oventense* 47, 2019, 247–260.

Abstract from OTA: The centerpiece of B’s essay is his survey of the three major pentateuchal legal codes, i.e., the Covenant Code of Exodus 21-23; the Deuteronomic Code of Deuteronomy 12-26; and the Holiness Code of Leviticus 17-26 and their respective laws concerning Israel’s dealings with foreigners with whom it comes in contact against the background of the given code’s historical context. This central portion of his study is preceded by remarks on Israel’s own experience of living in a land not its own and of Yhwh’s accompaniment of its ancestors on their way toward the land allotted them by Yhwh as a motivation for all the pentateuchal laws enjoining respect for strangers, as well as a consideration of the Hebrew terms (*zār*, *nokrî*, and *gēr*) which the laws use in reference to various categories of non-Israelites. The essay concludes with a synthesis of the pentateuchal laws’ message concerning the required treatment of the stranger and its ongoing relevance for contemporary Christians living in a highly mobile and globalizing world.-C.T.B.

Boyd, Samuel L., Applied Ritual. The Application of the Blood and Oil on Bodies in the Pentateuchal Sources, in: *Biblical Interpretation* 29, 2021, 120–147.

Abstract from OTA: Source critical analyses of the Pentateuch have focused primarily on literary indicators for detecting distinct literary voices, and in some recent publications, on the historical aspects of the P source in particular. In this article, I

formulate a distinct approach to source criticism that supports this resurgence of documentary analysis, with special attention to the ritual of daubing blood and oil on bodies cited in Exodus 19-24; Leviticus 8 and 14. After summarizing the main point at issue in these texts, i.e., access to the divine, I offer a documentary approach to these texts based on a use of ritual theory. Finally, I highlight the manner in which the ritual study of the texts in question is consistent with both key historical and more recent arguments in the documentary approach to the composition of the Pentateuch.

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

Friedl, Johanna, Ein brüderliches Volk. Das ‚Bruder‘-Konzept im Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomischen Gesetz (Österreichische Biblische Studien 52), Berlin: Peter Lang, 2021.

Abstract from OTA: This is a slightly revised version of F.’s dissertation submitted to the Catholic Theological Faculty at the University of Vienna in 2018. In it, F. discusses the social construct of the term “brother” within the law code of Deuteronomy 12-26 and the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26) with attention to the political and economic aspects of the term in the two corpora. The monograph comprises eight chapters, followed by a concise conclusion, four appendixes, a bibliography, and index of biblical references. Chap. 1 discusses the Hebrew term for “brother,” while chap. 2 focuses on its occurrences within Deuteronomy 12-46 and Leviticus 17-26. Chap. 3 offers a discussion of the use of the term “brother” in other ANE legal corpora (including Hittite, Neo-Assyrian, and Aramaic texts) and also suggests a relative dating for the “brother”-texts within the Deuteronomic law code and the Holiness Code. Chap. 4 looks at the larger context of the social legislation in the Deuteronomic law code, including debt release, laws governing the manumission of slaves, the prohibition of charging, etc. Chap. 5 discusses the collection of laws regulating offices and statuses in Deuteronomy (including priestly laws, prophetic laws, laws about judges, and the institution of the Levirate). Chap. 6 reviews laws invoking “brother” principles in the Holiness Code, while chap. 7 suggests a theological foundation for the Deuteronomic “brother” ethos. Chap. 8 offers a quick review of the political, economic, and social influence of the above laws in later epochs, including antiquity, Scholasticism, Italian humanism, German classicism, and the early twentieth century. F. concludes that a comprehensive understanding of the OT “brother” ethos requires a synthesis of the three perspectives on the “brother” featured in the Pentateuch, i.e., the brother as poor and needy, as a potential leader (or office holder), and as a compatriot.-G.A.K.

Golinets, Viktor, Orthographical, Grammatical and Lexical Peculiarities in the Hebrew Texts of Leviticus. Considerations about Hebrew Bible Editing in the Light of the Linguistic Development of Hebrew, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus*. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292), Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 149–177.

Paximadi, Giorgio, Entre variantes et interprétations. Corruption textuelle ou exégèse dans le texte de la Septante du Lévitique?, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus*. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy

- Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292), Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 133–148.
- Roth-Mouthon, Mary-Gabrielle*, Le Lévitique dans le Pentateuque Samaritain. Étude comparée des manuscrits 6 (C) de Sichem, CBL 751 (Dublin) et BCU L2057 (Fribourg), in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 83–106.
- Tov, Emanuel*, Textual Harmonization in Leviticus, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 13–37.
- Zipor, Moshe A.*, The Nature of the Septuagint Version of the Book of Leviticus, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 121–132.
- Harper, G. Geoffrey*, Endangered or Dangerous? YHWH's Presence and Impurity in Levitical Perspective, in: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 46, 2022, 480–494. DOI: 10.1177/03090892211061175.
- Published abstract: The working assumption in much secondary literature on Leviticus is that unchecked sin and impurity threaten, even endanger, YHWH's earthly presence. Accordingly, purgation within the Israelite cult is primarily viewed as a means of securing and safeguarding divine immanence. Support is drawn from ANE concepts of sanctuary desecration, the exit of YHWH's *kbwd* from the temple in Ezekiel 8–11 and tannaitic formulations. Nevertheless, this article contends that Leviticus nowhere indicates or assumes the departure of YHWH's presence from the sanctuary. On the contrary, Leviticus asserts the permanence of divine presence and the resulting danger posed to impurity and its sources. This dynamic better coheres with the wider texture of the Pentateuch. In fact, importing motifs from ANE, Ezekielian and rabbinic sources arguably distorts the rhetorical force of Leviticus in its literary setting.
- Dietrich, Jan*, Formen der Resilienz im Buch Levitikus, in: Gärtner, Judith; Schmitz, Barbara (Hg.), *Resilienz narrative im Alten Testament (FAT 156)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2022, 69–86.
- Paximadi, Giorgio*, *Levitico. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo Edizioni, 2017.
- Paximadi, Giorgio*, *Levitico. Traduzione e commentario in sinossi del Testo Massoretico e della Septuaginta (ISCAB Serie filologia 1)*, Lugano; Siena: Eupress FTL – Edizioni Cantagalli, 2022.
- Published abstract (translated): The book of Leviticus is the literary and theological center of the Pentateuch. The author presents in this work a new Italian translation from the Hebrew (Massoretic text) and Greek (Septuagint). The Italian translation follows the original Hebrew and Greek text. The text is accompanied by explanatory notes and a commentary by the author.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J.C.*, 4Q26b (4QLeviticus^s) Frag. 2, in: *Textus: A Journal on Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* 29, 2020, 53–56.

- Hopf, Matthias R.*, Is the Holiness Code Law? An Assessment Based on Semantic Observations, Form Critical Observations, and a Criteriology from the Anthropology of Law, in: ZAR 28, 2022, 97–110.
- Noonan, Benjamin J.*, On the Efficacy of the Atoning Sacrifices: A Biblical Theology of Sacrifice from Leviticus, in: BBR 31, 2021, 285–318.
 Published abstract: The topic of the atoning sacrifices’s efficacy has received insufficient treatment in scholarship. Interpreters only sporadically treat this topic, and when they discuss it all, their presentations are far from systematic and largely based on portions of the Bible other than Leviticus. This article remedies this unfortunate gap by examining the efficacy of the atoning sacrifices—the purification (*ḥaṭṭā’t*) and reparation (*’āšām*) offerings—from the perspective of the Pentateuch, focusing especially on the book of Leviticus. It shows that the atoning sacrifices effect atonement and remove sin and cultic impurity for all nondefiant, but not defiant, offenses. It demonstrates, furthermore, that the atoning sacrifices ultimately find their efficacy in God but do not work *ex opere operato* in that the book of Leviticus presumes the offerer’s sincerity and penitence. Thus, the atoning sacrifices can be described sacramentally: they function as external rituals by which God seals a promised efficacy regarding atonement, forgiveness, and cleansing.
- Zuckier, Shlomo*, Nothing to sniff at: Odorless *Reah Nihoach* in early biblical interpretation, in: Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 31, 2022, 184–214.
 Published abstract: Within the Hebrew Bible, the phrase *reah nihoah* (ריח ניחוח), “a pleasing smell,” appears frequently throughout accounts of sacrifice, referring in a most literal sense to the smell of an offering burnt on the altar and offered up “to the Lord.” Throughout multiple Second Temple Jewish texts, both the incidence and meaning of this term shift considerably. Some texts essentially erase the term from sacrificial discourse; others “spiritualize” it, employing *reah nihoah* in contexts other than physical sacrifices; yet others conflate the “pleasing smell” language with other sacrificial technical terms such as “acceptability” and “atonement.” This article examines the manifold shifts in meaning of *reah nihoah* in Ancient Jewish texts, considering various biblical translations, Hellenistic works, materials from Qumran, and New Testament texts. After considering how these texts interpret the biblical *reah nihoah*, it considers possible impetuses for this shift as well as its ramifications.
- Darshan, Guy*, The Casuistic Law in Leviticus, the New Marmarini Inscription, and the Eloulaia and Nisanaia Festivals, in: ZAW 134, 2022, 483–499.
 Published abstract: This paper aims to highlight a series of similarities between Leviticus and an extraordinary Greek inscription that was discovered in Marmarini (Greece) and published during the recent decade (CGRN 225 = SEG 65–376). As this inscription contains instructions and regulations for ritual conduct, as well as reflects many unique Near Eastern features, it serves in this paper as the basis for a new comparative study that has significant ramifications on our understanding of the casuistic law in Leviticus, and the formation of the Priestly material in the Pentateuch.
- Otto, Eckart*, The Priestly Writing and Deuteronomy in the Book of Leviticus: On the Integration of Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, in: Hartenstein, Friedhelm; Schmid, Konrad (eds.), Farewell to the Priestly Writing? The Current State of the Debate (Ancient Israel and Its Literature, 38), Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2022, 165–192.

Review by Reinhard Achenbach (in: Review of Biblical Literature 04/2023): Eckart Otto's "The Priestly Writing and Deuteronomy in the Book of Leviticus: On the Integration of Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch" (165–92) broadens the perspective of scholarly discussion beyond the German horizon, when he refers to works of B. M. Levinson, J. Stackert, J. Baden, F. García López, I. Knohl, and others. In his contribution he investigates the Fortschreibung of the Priestly writing in the book of Leviticus and its receptions in the postexilic Fortschreibung of Deuteronomy. The core of the Priestly Grundschrift (PG), according to his analysis, ends in Exod 24:15b–18; 25:8–9; 26:1–27:19*; 28:1–29:46*. It "narrates the history of the constitution of Israel from the creation of the world to the promise of the establishment of the sanctuary for the indwelling of God among the Israelites and the service of the Aaronides in this sanctuary" (170). It was extended in two blocks in the postexilic era, PS (= P supplements) in Exod 30–31; 35–40*; Lev 8–9*. The introduction of the Holiness Code in Lev 17–26 presupposes PG as well as the postexilic Deuteronomistic Deuteronomy. It is a revision of the Covenant Code as well as of Deuteronomy (cf., e.g., Lev 17 and Deut 12; Lev 19 and Deut 5; Exod 20; Lev 23 and Deut 16; Lev 25 and the social legislation of Deuteronomy; Lev 26 and Deut 28); this stage has a formative function for the redaction of the Pentateuch. The chapters Lev 10*.(11–15).16 and 1–4.(5–7) presuppose the "post-Priestly Holiness Code" and are considered the result of "postpentateuchal redaction" ("theocratic redaction") in the book of Leviticus. In Deut 10:12–11:32 can be found references to the Holiness Code (cf., e.g., Lev 19:33–34 and Deut 10:18–19; Lev 26:3–4 and Deut 11:13–15), "in order to mark the connection to Lev 26 and therefore to identify Moses as a scribal interpreter of the Sinai torah" (182). Moses's speeches are given the character of prophecies (see Deut 4:23–31; 29:21–28; 30:1–10); the texts correspond to scribal discourses in the postexilic prophetic tradition (see Ezek 36:24–28; Jer 31:31–34). Deuteronomy 32 is "a collage of allusions and citations from the books of the Prophets, the Psalms, and Wisdom literature" (191).

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.]

Calabro, David, A Reexamination of the Ancient Israelite Gesture of Hand Placement, in: Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A. (eds.), *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique (Resources for Biblical Study 85)*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 99–124.

Lev 2

Literatur

Grossman, Jonathan, The Significance of Frankincense in Grain Offerings, in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138, 2019, 285–296.

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 $\square\psi\aleph$ Make Reparation to God?: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 91, 2015, 87–110.

Published abstract: Despite the present popularity of the view, the $\square\psi\aleph$ offering is not recompense to God. $\square\psi\aleph$ 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 $\square\psi\aleph$. 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 $\square\psi\aleph$ offerings an alternative development is, however, more likely, a parallel to that which produced the $\square\aleph\aleph$ offering. In relation to this development the choice of $\square\psi\aleph$ 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.

Nolland, John, Sin, Purity and the *תִּטְחַח* Offering, in: *Vetus Testamentum* 65, 2015, 606–620.

Published abstract: The case against *תִּטְחַח* and the piel of *טח* referring to a sin offering does not make purification offering the necessary alternative. When sin is being addressed by the *תִּטְחַח*, 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 *תִּטְחַח* can deal with a deficiency that is neither of impurity nor sin.

Despite the MT exclusive focus of non-cultic uses of *תִּטְחַח* on sin, the wider uses of the *טח* root opens up a place for a cultic use where blame is not necessarily involved.

Watts, James W., The Historical and Literary Context of the Sin and Guilt Offerings, in: Landy, Francis; Trevaskis, Leigh M.; Bibb, Bryan D. (Hg.), *Text, Time, and Temple. Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus (Hebrew Bible Monographs 64)*, Sheffield 2015, 85–93.

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.]

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, The Sacrificial Life and Death of the Servant (Isaiah 52:13-53:12): *VT* 66, 2016, 1-14.

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 gleams 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.

Vis, Joshua M., The Purgation of Persons through the Purification Offering, in: Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A. (eds.), *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique* (Resources for Biblical Study 85), Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 33–57.

Hoskins, Paul M., A Neglected Allusion to Leviticus 4-5 in Jesus's Words Concerning His Blood in Matthew 26:28, in: *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 30, 2020, 231–242.
Abstract from OTA: Previous treatments of the allusions to the OT in Matt 26:28 have overlooked or neglected its allusion to Lev 4:1-5:13, the passage concerning the "sin offering." In fact, however, in comparison with its Marcan and Lucan parallels, Matt 26:28 features the clearest allusion to Lev 4:1-5:13. The allusion is based on both verbal and thematic connections. In terms of verbal connections, Matt 26:28's combination of the terms "blood," "poured out," "for" (περι) the sinner, and the forgiveness of sins is found in only one OT passage, i.e. Lev 4:1-5:13. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Lam, Joseph, On the Etymology of Biblical Hebrew תָּשַׁח. A Contribution to the "Sin Offering" vs. "Purification Offering" Debate, in: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 65, 2020, 325–346.

Ko, Ming Him, Blood Manipulation in Hezekiah's Re-inauguration of the Temple in Chronicles, in: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 46, 2022, 423–442. DOI: 10.1177/03090892221081155.

Published abstract: According to 2 Chronicles 29.20–24, Hezekiah's re-inauguration of the temple involved a purification offering for all Israel in which the blood

manipulation did not include the sevenfold sprinkling of blood in front of the veil (Lev. 4.17) or daubing blood on the horns of the incense altar (Lev. 4.18), as stated in the prescriptive text of P. This article proposes that the apparent inconsistency can be explained by examining the Chronicler's conception of YHWH as cosmic God and global king. The location of the divine presence tends to be in heaven for the Chronicler rather than from within the tabernacle, as illustrated in P. The difference in perspective constitutes a decisive theological reason for the Chronicler's particular depiction of the blood manipulation in Hezekiah's re-inauguration of the temple.

Lev 8–9

Literatur

Anderson, Gary A., *Literary Artistry and Divine Presence*, in: Ganzel, Tova (Hg.), *Contextualizing Jewish Temples* (The Brill Reference Library of Judaism, 64), Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2021, 85–102.

Abstract from OTA: In this essay, I have three aims. First, I intend to show that the chapters dedicated to the appearance of God at the Tabernacle (Exodus 40 and Leviticus 8-9) have been composed in artful fashion: one must attend to what is said as well as how it is expressed in order to understand the content. Second, to demonstrate that the relationship of chronological time (the actual order of events) to narrative time (how those events are ordered in the story) is more complex than a first read-through might imagine. ... Third, and finally, to suggest that the chronological challenge of the narrative has some significant theological ramifications. [p. 85, adapted]—I began this paper with the claim that the two stories of God's appearance at the Tabernacle were composed in an artful fashion. We noted that although the pattern of command and sevenfold completion occurs three different times in the Tabernacle narrative. Exod 40:1-16 distinguishes itself by pointing forward to the close of chap. 40 and Leviticus 8. The author of Exodus 40 was clearly aware of this and put the final completion formula, not at the end of the chapter where we might have expected it, but rather at the end of the command section (v. 16), in order to indicate that the narrative is incomplete as it presently stands. This element of incompleteness was also felt by most early readers of these chapters who attempted to coordinate the two theophanies. Why did our author structure the material in this deliberately awkward fashion? I have suggested that the aim was to embed within the Torah two distinct goals of the divine liturgy: the manufacture of a place for God to dwell and a place for the priests to serve at the altar therein. [p. 102, adapted – C.T.B.]

Himbaza, Innocent, *La Bénédiction d'Aaron en Lévitique 9,22 et le Pentateuque Samaritain*, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015)* (OBO 292), Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 69–81.

Grossman, Jonathan; Hadad, Eliezer, *The Ram of Ordination and Qualifying the Priests to Eat Sacrifices*: JSOT 45, 2021, 476–492. DOI: 10.1177/0309089220963436
Published abstract: The priests qualified for their priestly function in three main ways: being robed in the priestly vestments; being anointed; and undergoing the ceremony of the days of ordination. This article is intended to clarify the contribution of each of the

three components of the procedure, but especially that of the ram of ordination. A semantic and literary analysis demonstrates that donning the vestments qualifies the priests to minister in the tabernacle; anointing them makes them 'holy'; and the ram ceremony qualifies them to eat the sacrifices that are offered on the altar.

Lev 10

Literatur

Anderson, Gary A., "Through Those Who Are Near to Me, I Will Show Myself Holy": Nadab and Abihu and Apophatic Theology: CBQ 77, 2015, 1–19.

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.

Hepner, Gershon, The Naked Truth Concerning the Death of Nadab and Abihu: RB 121, 2014, 108–111.

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.

Wolak, Arthur J., Alcohol and the Fate of Nadab and Abihu: A Biblical Cautionary Tale Against Inebriation: JBQ 41, 2013, 219–226. Online:

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

Kellenberger, Edgar, Der schweigende Mose in Lev 10,16–20: ThZ 71, 2015, 136–143.

Published abstract: Narrative Leerstellen fallen in Lev 10 besonders stark auf und haben im Laufe der Auslegungsgeschichte zu zahlreichen scharfsinnigen und phantasievollen „Auffüllungsversuchen“ geführt, die untereinander kombinierbar sind oder sich gegenseitig ausschliessen. Jedoch muss es einen Grund haben, weswegen Lev 10 nicht eindeutiger formuliert ist. Der vorliegende Beitrag schlägt vor, die Leerstellen als bewusste Darstellung von unauflösbaren Ambivalenzen ernst zu nehmen. Voraussetzungen dazu sind seelsorgerliche Erfahrungen der Priester Israels.

Heyd, Andrew, Honor in the Cult: Leviticus 10 in Socio-Rhetorical Perspective, in: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 46, 2022, 548–562. DOI: 10.1177/03090892221081158.

Published abstract: Walter Houston's article on the death of Nadab and Abihu is one of the few attempts to bring a social science model of honor and shame to bear on the

Pentateuch. This article will argue that he did not go far enough in tracing how honor and shame bring coherence, not just to the Nadab and Abihu incident but also to all of Lev. 10. In particular, honor also explains the speeches of Yhwh and Aaron, the transition from the prohibition of mourning to Aaron's grant of interpretive authority, and the overall narrative tension and resolution of the chapter's narrative. This article will briefly review and critique Houston's article and then argue that Lev. 10 contains a rhetoric of honor that coordinates relationships between Yhwh, priests, and people in a way that brings greater coherence to the chapter as a whole.

MacDonald, Nathan, Whose *Ḥattā't*? Aaron's Enigmatic Response to Moses in Lev 10:19: ZAW 133, 2021, 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zaw-2021-0007>

Published abstract: Aaron's enigmatic response to Moses' accusation of cultic malpractice in the disposal of the remains of the *ḥattāt* (Lev 10:19) has puzzled exegetes since antiquity. Recent interpreters have concluded that it is not possible to understand Aaron's reasoning and that his response emphasizes the priesthood's mystique and its claim to a qualified freedom in interpreting Mosaic law. In contrast, I argue that the *crux interpretum* can be resolved when we pay particular attention to the pronominal suffixes attached to the word תטח.

Lev 11

Literatur

Hawley, Lance, The Agenda of Priestly Taxonomy and the Conceptualization of טמא and שקץ 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 *tāmē'* (טמא, “unclean”) and *šeqeš* (שקץ, “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 *ὄφιομάχης* (Saga ephippigera?) in Lev 11,22LXX und *καμηλοπάραλις* (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.

Meshel, Naphtali S., P1, P2, P3, and H. Purity, Prohibition, and the Puzzling History of Leviticus 11: Hebrew Union College Annual 81, 2010, 1–15.

Staubli, Thomas, Essen: Die tägliche Herausforderung zur Heiligung. Der steinzeitliche Speisezettel, Levitikus 11, Kaschrut und Ökologie: BiKi 69, 2014, 92–95.

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.

Harper, G. Geoffrey, Time for a New Diet? Allusions to Genesis 1-3 as Rhetorical Device in Leviticus 11, in: STR (Southeastern Theological Review) 4, 2013, 179–195.

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.

Meyer, Esias E., Leviticus 11, Deuteronomy 14 and Directionality: *Journal for Semitics* 23, 2014, 71–89.

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.]

Burnside, Jonathan, At Wisdom's Table: How Narrative Shapes the Biblical Food Laws and Their Social Function: *JBL* 135, 2016, 223–245.

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.

Rosenblum, Jordan, *The Jewish Dietary Laws in the Ancient World*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

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.

Krauss, Rolf, Beiträge zum קִלְפִּי (Klippschliefer, rock bager, daman) in der

Wissenschaftsgeschichte vom 17. Jahrhundert bis heute: *Biblische Notizen* 169, 2016, 111–128.

Faust, Avraham, Pigs in Space (and Time). Pork Consumption and Identity Negotiation in the Late Bronze and Iron Ages of Ancient Israel: *Near Eastern Archaeology* 81, 2018, 276–299.

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 zooarcheological 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.

Sapir-Hen, Lidar, Food, Pork Consumption, and Identity in Ancient Israel, in: *Near Eastern Archaeology* 82, 2019, 42–51. Online verfügbar unter <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/703326>.

Angelini, Anna, The Reception and Idealization of the Torah in the Letter of Aristeas: The Case of the Dietary Laws, in: *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 9, 2020, 435–447. Published Abstract: In the *Letter of Aristeas*, the dietary laws are presented as a paradigm for the entire Torah. However, the summary of the dietary laws provided by the author of the *Letter* for the most does not quote literally the biblical texts, but shows a considerable degree of interpretation of these laws. This paper examines the relationship between biblical traditions and Greek cultural referents in the presentation of the dietary and sacrificial laws of the *Letter*, against the background of other texts of Second Temple period which show a reception of these laws (e. g. Philo, Josephus, Qumran texts). It argues that, while the representation of the dietary laws in the Letter attests to a considerable authority of this section of the Torah from a symbolic point of view, they offer still little evidence as for the practice and the contents of a dietary halacha.

Paximadi, Giorgio, La classificazione zoologica in Lv 11. Non solo una questione di purità ma una visione del cosmo, in: *RTL (Revue Théologique de Louvain)* 24, 2020, 509–528.

Abstract from OTA: Leviticus 11 is generally classified as a list of pure and impure animals and is often negatively evaluated as a characteristic example of priestly formalism. Against this background, P. argues, first of all, that the need to inculcate the alimentary norms of the people of Israel within a context in which a purity sensitivity was highly developed was a primary factor that led to the composition of the text. In addition, however, the priestly authors, who are characterized by their systematizing tendencies, also used the text to present a true and proper taxonomic theory of the animal world grounded in the priestly theology of creation and especially in Genesis 1. More particularly, the priestly authors in the above text aimed, above all, to illustrate God's creative work, a work which distinguishes things by ordering them, as well as the place of Israel in the created world. This theological intent manifests itself, not in explicit affirmations, a few sporadic instances excepted, but rather in the text's underlying assumptions which must themselves be identified by means of careful interpretative work. In sum, this contribution attempts to present, in systematic fashion, the zoological classification system present in Leviticus 11 as a key to the better understanding of a text that has been unfairly undervalued. [Adapted from published abstract - C.T.B.]

Cardozo, Cristian M., Reception History of Leviticus 11. Dietary Laws in Early Christianity, in: *Davar Logos* 18, 2019, 39–60.

Abstract from OTA: Early Christianity's attitude to the OT dietary laws is a puzzling issue. On the one hand, the early Church regarded the dietary law in Lev 17:10-14 as binding and restated this as part of the apostolic decree cited in Acts 15. On the other hand, the Church considered the dietary laws of Leviticus 11 as non-binding. Why did the Church reject the dietary laws of Leviticus 11? This article contends that the rejection of these particular food laws reflects a desire to distance Christianity from Judaism rather than a theological rationale that would account for the rejection, as

becomes clear from a study of the reception of the texts commonly used to “prove” the non-validity of the laws of Leviticus 11 as well as from a consideration of the role played by food as an identity marker. When these factors are examined in conjunction with each other, it emerges that the repudiation of the Leviticus 11 food laws had to do with the “Jewishness” of those laws rather than with the theology underlying them. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Angelini, Anna, The Reception and Idealization of the Torah in the *Letter of Aristeas*. The Case of Dietary Laws, in: *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 9, 2020, 435–447. Abstract from OTA: In the *Letter of Aristeas (LA)*, the dietary laws are presented as a paradigm for the entire Torah. However, the summary of the dietary laws given by the author in §§128-171 does not, for the most part, literally quote the biblical texts in question, but rather reflects a considerable degree of interpretation regarding these laws. This paper examines the relationship between biblical traditions and Greek cultural referents in the *Letter’s* presentation of the dietary and sacrificial laws against the background of other Second Temple period texts which feature a reception of these laws, e.g., Philo, Josephus, and the Qumran materials. I argue that while the presentation of the dietary laws in the *Letter* attests to the considerable authority this section of the Torah had for the author from a symbolic point of view, it nonetheless offer little evidence for the practice and content of a dietary halacha. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Angelini, Anna; Nihan, Christophe, Unclean Birds in the Hebrew and Greek Versions of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 39–67.

Péter-Contesse, René, Quelques problèmes de traduction dans le chapitre 11 du Lévitique, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 243–253.

Friedberg, A.; Hoppe, Juni, Deuteronomy 14.3–21: An Early Exemplar of Rewritten Scripture?: *JSOT* 45, 2021, 422–457. DOI: 10.1177/0309089220950341
Published abstract: The almost verbatim parallels of the dietary laws in Lev. 11 and Deut. 14 have baffled scholars for a long time. We reexamine the evidence, offer a novel approach to determining the direction of dependency, and point out the notable similarities the borrowing bears to Second Temple editorial and redactional practices, drawing on recent Qumran scholarship. We conclude that Deut. 14.3–21 may be one of the earliest specimens of Rewritten Scripture.

Lev 12

Literatur

Van der Horst, Pieter Willem, Bitenosh's Orgasm (1QapGen 2:9-15), in: ders., *Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 87)*, Leiden 2014, 6–20.

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

Bar-Asher, Moshe, The Qal Passive Participle of Geminative Verbs in Biblical Hebrew, in: ders., *Studies in Classical Hebrew*, Berlin/Boston 2014, 9–22.

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

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, “She Shall Remain in (Accordance to) Her Blood-of-Purification”: Ritual Dynamics of Defilement and Purification in Leviticus 12, in: Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A. (eds.), *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique (Resources for Biblical Study 85)*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 59–70.

Thiessen, Matthew, The Legislation of Leviticus 12 in Light of Ancient Embryology, in: *Vetus Testamentum* 68, 2018, 297–319.

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.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., Laws Pertaining to Purification after Childbirth in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: Satlow, Michael L. (Hg.), *Strength to Strength. Essays in Honor of Shaye J.D. Cohen (Brown Judaic Studies 363)*, Atlanta: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018, 169–178.

Park, M. Sydney, Inerrancy and Blood. Women and Christology in Leviticus 12, and Mark 5:21-43, in: *Presbyterion* 45, 2019, 83–95.

Abstract from OTA: This essay is limited to texts regarding women in Leviticus 12 and 15 and the hemorrhaging woman in Mark 4. Whereas one does not find a specific rationale for the purity regulations regarding menstruation and childbirth in Leviticus itself, Mark's account of the hemorrhaging woman and the daughter of Jairus, coming as this does at the end of a section of miracle stories (Mark 4:35-5:20: stilling of the storm and exorcism of Legion), supplies a christological rationale for them. To this end, I will first address the issues posed by Leviticus 12 and 15:19-33 and briefly consider feminist interpretations of these passages. Then I will turn to Mark 5:24-34 and address three aspects thereof: textual and conceptual anomalies, interpretative tendencies, and a proposed christological solution regarding the missing rationale for the prescriptions of Leviticus 12 and 15 in light of the broader context of Mark 4:35–

5:20. [pp. 83-84, adapted-C.T.B.] --- *Assessment (English see below)*: Der Artikel ist in mindestens zwei Aspekten sehr problematisch: (1) Die Kapitel Levitikus 12 und 15 sowie das Konzept von Reinheit und Unreinheit werden nicht angemessen verstanden, was zum Teil an unreflektierten Übersetzungen, zum Teil an der Rezeption von Sekundärliteratur liegt, die ihrerseits dem Text nicht gerecht wird. (2) Die christologischen Implikationen im zweiten Teil sind von einer übertrieben misanthropischen Anthropologie, beeinflusst durch Jean Calvin, gekennzeichnet und weisen in der Konsequenz einen supersessionistischen Ansatz auf, der nicht akzeptabel ist. Bei der (christlichen) Auslegung von Levitikus muss man sich immer darum bemühen, dass man die jüdische Leseweise nicht hermeneutisch zurücksetzt, aburteilt oder für obsolet erklärt. Leider setzt dieser Artikel so an, dass die Bestimmungen in Levitikus als großes Problem dargestellt werden, das dann allein durch Christus gelöst wird. - The article is highly problematic in at least two aspects: (1) The chapters of Leviticus 12 and 15 as well as the concept of purity and impurity are not adequately understood, which is partly due to unreflected translations and partly to the reception of secondary literature, which in turn does not do justice to the text. (2) The Christological implications in the second part are characterized by an overly misanthropic anthropology, influenced by Jean Calvin, and consequently exhibit a supersessionist approach that is not acceptable. In the (Christian) interpretation of Leviticus, one must always be careful not to hermeneutically reject, condemn or belittle the Jewish way of reading or declare it obsolete. Unfortunately, this article begins by presenting the prescriptions in Leviticus as a major problem, which is then solved by Christ alone.

Whitear, Sarah, Solving the Gender Problem in Leviticus 12. From Philo to Feminism, in: *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 37, 2020, 299–319.

Abstract from OTA: The Levitical postpartum purity laws have had great religious significance in both Jewish and Christian tradition right up till the present. For more than 2,000 years, people have asked why, in Leviticus 12, a new mother's postpartum impurity is twice as long for a female baby as it is for a male baby. No hypothesis on the matter has achieved scholarly consensus hitherto. The first part of my article examines some of the various ways that the above "gender problem" has been "solved," with attention to physiological and social explanations, as well as feminist approaches. The second part of my article then focuses on the idea, proposed by Martin Noth, that the discrepancy is due to the "cultic inferiority" of women. By examining other gender differences in the P source in Leviticus 15, and in relation to animals, creation, and genealogy, I seek to demonstrate that, for the Priestly author, women have a lesser status in the religious realm and that this is indeed the most likely reason behind the post-parturient gender discrepancy in Leviticus 12. [Adapted from published abstract - C.T.B.]

Literatur

Olanisebe, Samson O., Laws of Tzara'at in Leviticus 13–14 and Medical Leprosy Compared: Jewish Bible Quarterly 42, 2014, 121–127. Online:

http://jbjq.jewishbible.org/assets/Uploads/422/jbjq_422_7_olanisebetzaraat.pdf

Schmitt, Rüdiger, Leviticus 14.33-57 as Intellectual Ritual, in: Landy, Francis; Trevaskis, Leigh M.; Bibb, Bryan D. (Hg.), Text, Time, and Temple. Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus (Hebrew Bible Monographs 64), Sheffield 2015, 196–203. Abstract from OTA: S. employs ritual studies categories to analyze Lev 14:33-57 as a textual phenomenon, an "intellectual ritual" rather than a record of actual ritual practice. He begins with the notion of "ritual reflexivity," the process by which rituals 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.]

Krauss, Rolf, Kritische Bemerkungen zur Erklärung von *šāra 'at* als schuppene Hautkrankheit, insbesondere als Psoriasis: Biblische Notizen 177, 2018, 3-24. Assessment: Der Artikel setzt sich sehr kritisch mit dem Essay von E.V. Hulse, The Nature of Biblical Leprosy: PEQ 107, 1975, 87-105, auseinander. Dem Autor wird vorgeworfen, dermatologisch nicht ausreichend informiert zu sein sowie Wortspielereien und Unterstellungen vorzunehmen. Allerdings helfen die Ausführungen von Krauss nicht wirklich weiter. Krauss' Artikel ist voll mit medizinischem Jargon, so dass er für Bibelwissenschaftler/innen, die sich nicht mit der Thematik intensiv auseinandergesetzt haben, kaum verständlich ist. Während die Argumente von Hulse mit medizinischen Behauptungen demontiert werden, vermisst man jedoch einen eigenen Lösungsvorschlag für die in Lev 13 beschriebenen Phänomene. Da ich mich in meinem Kommentar ausführlich mit dermatologischen Fragestellungen beschäftigt habe und dazu auch einen Dermatologen konsultiert habe, möchte ich mich nicht als „uninformiert“ bezeichnen. Der dermatologische Kollege hat meine Ausführungen zu Lev 13 im HThKAT gegengelesen und als medizinisch vertretbar angesehen.

Bojowald, Stefan, Vögel als Entsorger negativer Kräfte in biblischen, ägyptischen und altorientalischen Texten, in: Biblica 101, 2020, 272–276.

Abstract from OTA: This short paper compares Hebrew and Egyptian texts on the role of birds as removers of negative forces. In the Hebrew Bible, Lev 14:49-53 describes the cleansing of a house from "leprosy" by letting a bird fly away. In an Egyptian

example, P. Ramesseum 3 B33, a swallow symbolically removes a childhood sickness. Comparable motifs also occur in Hittite and Babylonian texts. (Adapted from published abstract)—C.T.B.

Skidmore, Simon, The Evolution of the *ṣāraʿat* Ritual in Leviticus 13:1-46, in: *The Heythrop Journal* 61, 2020, 893–902.

Abstract from OTA: The problematic assumption that biblical purity thematically represents life and death is commonly held in modern biblical studies. Building upon this assumption, many scholars have attempted to explain the treatment of the *ṣāraʿat* patient in Lev 13:1-46 as a symbolic banishment of death. My paper, for its part, seeks to move beyond this reading toward a method of reconstructing the evolution of biblical rituals and practices. Drawing on René Girard’s typology of four scapegoat stereotypes, I identify the scapegoat mechanism operative in the Leviticus text and propose a reconstruction of the evolution of this ritual. In particular, I suggest that the ritual now found in Leviticus 13 may have evolved from an earlier tradition in which *ṣāraʿat* patients were executed to halt a mimetic crisis. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Lev 15

Literatur

Cordoni, Constanza, Die weißen Tage oder warum die Frau immer noch als ‚unrein‘ gilt, nachdem ihre ‚Unreinheit‘ aufgehört hat: *Protokolle zur Bibel* 21, 2012, 3–19.

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.

Hieke, Thomas, Menstruation and Impurity. Regular Abstention from the Cult According to Leviticus 15:19-24 and Some Examples for the Reception of the Biblical Text in Early Judaism, in: Xeravits, Géza G. (ed.), *Religion and Female Body in Ancient Judaism and Its Environments* (DCLS 28), Berlin/Boston 2015, 54-70.

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.

Gehring, René, Is Sexuality Impure? An Alternative Interpretation of Leviticus 15:18, in: *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 24, 2013, 75–115. Online verfügbar unter <http://www.atsjats.org/publication/view/539>.

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.

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, Archaeological and Textual Evidence for Menstruation as Gendered Taboo in the Second Temple Period?, in: Bauks, Michaela; Galor, Katharina; Hartenstein, Judith (eds.), *Gender and Social Norms in Ancient Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity. Texts and Material Culture (Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements (JAJ.S), 28)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 169–184. Abstract from OTA (adapted): E.-K.’s essay focuses on Leviticus 11-15 and its various regulations for women, seeking to bring this biblical text into dialogue with later interpretations found in the DSS as well as with archaeological findings from the Second Temple period. The gaps in the biblical text and its perspective make it unlikely that Leviticus 11-15 was written as a manual for ritual practice. Documents from among the DSS do seem to fill certain of the Leviticus chapters’ gaps and further suggest that the biblical requirements were made more stringent in the DSS material by prolonging the duration of a woman’s impurity. The literary descriptions featured in the Scrolls do not, however, provide unequivocal information regarding the much-debated question of the presence of women in the Qumran community. The large number of contemporary stepped pools found at other sites may suggest that there was an actual ritual for the termination of impurity. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Lev 16

Literatur

Britt, Brian/Creehan, Patrick, Chiasmus in Leviticus 16,29–17,11: *ZAW* 112, 2000, 398–400.
Stöckl Ben Ezra, Daniel, Heiligste Versöhnung. Jom Kippur im antiken Judentum und Christentum: *BiKi* 69, 2014, 102–107.

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.

Adu-Gyamfi, Yaw, The Live Goat Ritual in Leviticus 16: *Scriptura* 112, 2013, 1-10.

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.

Parker, B.J., The Restoration of Shalom: An Intertextual Reading of Leviticus 16 and Psalm 65, in: *The Evangelical Quarterly* 87, 2015, 252-263.

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 כפר, creation theology, and עטרת שנת, 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.

Watts, James W., From Ark of the Covenant to Torah Scroll: Ritualizing Israel's Iconic Texts, in: MacDonald, Nathan (ed.), *Ritual Innovation in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism* (BZAW 468), Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2016, 21–34.

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.

Awabdy, Mark A., Did Nadab and Abihu Draw Near before Yhwh? The Old Greek among the Witnesses of Leviticus 16:1: *CBQ* 79, 2017, 580–592.

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.

Eberhart, Christian A., To Atone or Not to Atone: Remarks on the Day of Atonement Rituals according to Leviticus 16 and the Meaning of Atonement, in: Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A. (eds.), *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique (Resources for Biblical Study 85)*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 197–231.

Williams, Jarvis J., Cultic Action and Cultic Function in Second Temple Jewish Martyrologies: The Jewish Martyrs as Israel's Yom Kippur, in: Wiley, Henrietta L.; Eberhart, Christian A. (eds.), *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity. Constituents and Critique (Resources for Biblical Study 85)*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 233–263.

Ruane, Nicole J., Constructing Contagion on Yom Kippur. The Scapegoat as Ḥaṭṭā't, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes (FRLANT 276)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 139-150.

Ruane considers how the writer of Leviticus 16 understood the two goats of the Yom Kippur rites to act together as a single ḥaṭṭā't offering (16:5). Ruane argues that although this ritual complex with the two goats is quite different from the paradigmatic ḥaṭṭā't rites in Leviticus 4–5, it nonetheless must be understood as a ḥaṭṭā't offering. Moreover, taking this designation of the two goats as a ḥaṭṭā't seriously helps to articulate the fundamental features of all ḥaṭṭā't 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, Thomas, Participation and Abstraction in the Yom Kippur Ritual According to Leviticus 16, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes (FRLANT 276)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 151-158.

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.).

Gilders, William K., Is There an Incense Altar in This Ritual? A Question of Ritual-Textual Interpretive Community, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 159-169.

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!

Gilders, William K., “And They Would Read Before Him the Order for the Day”: The Textuality of Leviticus 16 in Mishnah Yoma, Tosefta Kippurim, and Sifra Aḥare Mot, in: Nihan, Christophe; Rhyder, Julia (eds.), *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch. A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021, 312–325.

Körting, Corinna, Yom Kippur (Lev 16): A Complex Ritual Beyond Space and Time, in: Scheuer, Blaženka; Davage, David Willgren (eds.), *Sin, Suffering, and the Problem of Evil* (FAT II/126), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021, 155–170.

K. examines the detailed ritual instructions for the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16. She asks what the purpose of this text may have been at a time when the central elements of the ritual – the temple and the ark – were absent. K. finds that the fact that the ritual instructions are described in such detail serves to create visual and auditory images of the ritual, which in turn engage the worshipping community in the ritual

even when it can no longer be physically performed (adapted from published abstract). Besides Leviticus 16, K. also includes a study of the related tractate in the Mishnah, Yoma.

Lev 17

Literatur

Joosten, Jan, Réflexions théologiques sur Lévitique 17, in: *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 93, 2013, 145–156.

Teeter, D. Andrew, Textgeschichte, Fortschreibung, und Rechtshermeneutik: Das Problem der ‚profanen‘ Schlachtung in Lev 17: HeBAI (Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel) 2, 2013, 287–314.

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.]

Wright, David P., Profane Versus Sacrificial Slaughter. The Priestly Recasting of the Yahwist Flood Story, 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, 125–154.

Meyer, Esias E., When Synchrony Overtakes Diachrony. Perspectives on the Relationship between the Deuteronomic Code and the Holiness Code, in: *Old Testament Essays* 30, 2017, 749–769.

Published abstract: The review article offers a critique on the recent book by Benjamin Kilchör [Mosetora und Jahwetora. *Das Verhältnis von Deuteronomium 12–26 zu Exodus, Levitikus und Numeri* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 21), Wiesbaden 2015]. I approach his work from the perspective of Leviticus and recent debates on this biblical book. I start by examining Kilchör's introduction and the methodology he selected, and then focus on Lev 19 and 25 and their diachronic relation to texts from Exodus and Deuteronomy. The article finds many of the arguments offered by Kilchör to be wanting.

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.

Fuad, Chelcent, What has Leviticus 17 to do with Deuteronomy 12.20–27? The literary relationship between the Deuteronomic and Holiness Codes on cult centralization and animal slaughter: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 45, 2020, 20–33.

Published abstract: This article examines the literary connection between the laws of cult centralization and animal slaughter in Lev. 17 and Deut. 12.20–27. After establishing a set of criteria for determining the literary connection between two texts, the author compares and analyzes the textual evidence in Lev. 17 and Deut. 12.20–27. This study concludes that the connection between the two passages may not be one of literary dependence of one text upon the other as has been widely assumed by many scholars. Instead, even though both texts attempt to deal with the same socio-religious issues, they may have been literarily independent of each other.

Najman, Hindy, *Imitatio Dei* and the Formation of the Subject in Ancient Judaism, in: *JBL* 140, 2021, 309–323.

Published abstract: This article considers the relationship between *imitatio dei* and selfhood in ancient Jewish traditions. This relationship is considered across a wide range of texts that are engaged in theological reflection and a complex practice of reading, with philosophical implications. Topics such as human essence, divine

creation, and perfectionist aspirations are explored as part of the characterization of selfhood in the Hebrew Bible and beyond. – In part II, the article deals with Gen 9:4-6 and Lev 17:10-14.

Rom-Shiloni, Dalit, Two Prophecies in Ezekiel (14:1–11; 24:6–8) and One Source Text (Leviticus 17): Notes on Intertextuality and Creative Interactions, in: Kim, Hyun Chul Paul; Mayfield, Tyler D.; Park, Hye Kyung (eds.), *Historical Settings, Intertextuality, and Biblical Theology. Essays in Honor of Marvin A. Sweeney (FAT 160)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2022, 195-212.

Abstract from the introduction by the editors: R.-S. argues that Ezekiel 14 and 24 use the text of Leviticus 17 but in differing ways. In Ezekiel 14, the structural framework and legal style of Leviticus 17 are used, but the content is different. In Ezekiel 24, the prophet manipulates the theme of Leviticus 17. These uses of Pentateuchal materials demonstrate Ezekiel's willingness to utilize the same priestly text within different passages for different purposes.

Lev 18; Lev 20

Literatur

Feinstein, Eve Levavi, *Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. (s. online:

<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199395545.001.0001/acprof-9780199395545?rskey=dOvvi4&result=3>;
DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199395545.001.0001)

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.

Mathias, Steffan, Queering the Body. Un-Desiring Sex in Leviticus, in: Taylor, Joan E. (ed.), *The Body in Biblical, Christian and Jewish Texts* (Library of Second Temple Studies 85), London: Bloomsbury, 2014, 17–40.

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.

Miller, James E., Notes on Leviticus 18: ZAW 112, 2000, 401–403.

Ottenheijm, Eric, „Which If a Man Do Them He Shall Live by Them“. Jewish and Christian Discourse on Lev 18:5, in: Koet, Bart J.; Moyise, Steve; Verheyden, Joseph (ed.), *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition. Essays in Honour of Maarten J.J. Menken* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 148), Leiden 2013, 303–316.

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!

Stiebert, Johanna, *Fathers and Daughters in the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford 2013.

Kilchör, Benjamin, Levirate Marriage in Deuteronomy 25:5-10 and Its Precursors in Leviticus and Numbers: A Test Case for the Relationship between P/H and D: CBQ 77, 2015, 429-440.

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.

Pola, Thomas, “Und bei einem Manne sollst du nicht liegen, wie man bei einer Frau liegt: Ein Greuel ist es”. Der literarische und sozialgeschichtliche Zusammenhang von Lev 18,22 und 20,13: *Theologische Beiträge* 46, 2015, 218–230.

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).

Fröhlich, Ida, *Sexual Rhetoric and Historical Interpretation. Leviticus 18 in the Context of Deuteronomistic Historiography and Qumran Historical Interpretation at Qumran*, in: Landy, Francis; Trevaskis, Leigh M.; Bibb, Bryan D. (Hg.), *Text, Time, and Temple. Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus (Hebrew Bible Monographs 64)*, Sheffield 2015, 204–217.

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.]

Trevaskis, Leigh M., *Dangerous Liaisons. Sex and the Woman in Leviticus*, in: Landy, Francis; Trevaskis, Leigh M.; Bibb, Bryan D. (Hg.), *Text, Time, and Temple. Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus (Hebrew Bible Monographs 64)*, Sheffield 2015, 131–152.

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, מוֹת יוֹמָה 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 erhellen. 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 nie derartige Instanzen genannt, man wisse nämlich, wer die entsprechenden Sanktionen wie zu exekutieren habe. Mithin 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 Standardformel *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 Todessanktion, sondern die Verstoßung aus dem Vaterhaus. Wer das ausführt, muss nicht näher genannt werden: die Familie eben, wer sonst? Die Gesamttenenz 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 „Todessanktionen“ 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.

Interessant sind die Paralleltex-te CH §229 und §230, da hier tatsächlich die Instanz nicht genannt ist, die die Tötung des fahrlässigen Baumeisters durchführt, dessen Pusch am Bau zum Tode des Hauseigentümers oder dessen Sohnes geführt hat. Da der Fall aber klar ist, der Schuldige also feststeht, dürfte wie in vielen anderen Fällen von Mord und Totschlag auch die Blutrache greifen, d.h. der nächste Verwandte des Getöteten führt die Exekution durch. Auch wenn das Ergebnis das Gleiche ist, möchte ich aber „Blutrache“ und „Todesstrafe“ begrifflich nicht als synonym ansehen, sondern den Begriff „Todesstrafe“ nur für diejenigen Fälle verwenden, in denen eine – wenn auch noch so rudimentäre – staatliche Instanz das Urteil fällt und die Exekution durchführt. Sucht man nun in den von V. Wagner angeführten Parallelen nach Tötungssanktionen, so findet man nicht viele, denn – und das zeigt die Durchführbarkeit dieses altorientalischen Rechts – meist wird eine detailliert abgestufte Sanktionierung angeführt, die oft auf eine finanzielle Kompensation hinausläuft (s. dazu auch das Fazit von B. Christiansen, „Früher war er einer von Bienen Zerstoehener. Jetzt aber gibt er 6 Schekel Silber“: Sanktionen und Sanktionsprinzipien in der Hethitischen Rechtssammlung, in: ZAR 21, 2015, 31-101, hier: 96). Findet man eine Tötungssanktion (z.B. MAG A § 10.1; MAG A § 50.2; CH §14), so muss dort die Instanz, die die Tötung durchführt, nicht genannt werden: Es ist wiederum klar, dass entweder aufgrund der spezifischen Umstände die Blutrache greift oder dass in anderen Fällen tatsächlich die Umstehenden, die alle die Sachlage klar durchschauen, sofort die Tötung herbeiführen (z.B. MAG A § 13; § 15.1). Auch diesen Fall sehe ich nicht als „Todesstrafe“, sondern als „Lynchjustiz“. Sie war zweifellos weit verbreitet und ist auch im Alten Testament bezeugt (Dtn 13,2–19). – Bei Fällen des illegitimen Geschlechtsverkehrs ist meist der „gehörnte“ Ehemann derjenige, der das Recht hat, seine Frau und/oder den Ehebrecher zu töten (sehr

differenziert z.B. in HG §197.1.2.3, je nach Ort des Geschehens). Er kann aber auch auf dieses Recht verzichten (im folgenden Paragraphen HG § 198; von V. Wagner nicht erwähnt). – Bei HG § 188 und § 199 ist mir nicht klar, ob tatsächlich unterschieden wird „ohne/unter Einschaltung des Königs“. Falls doch, so handelt es sich bei der Sache „ohne“ Einschaltung des Königs wieder um Lynchjustiz. Ich sehe also in den angeführten „Parallelen“ mehr Unterschiede als Gemeinsamkeiten zu Lev 20; während man sich gut vorstellen kann, dass die altorientalischen Rechtsvorschriften so in etwa auch praktiziert wurden, ist dies bei den biblischen Texten weniger nachvollziehbar. Die priesterlichen Autoren der Levitikus-Texte verfolgten den Schutz des Kultes und der Kultgemeinschaft als oberstes Prinzip und wiesen weniger ein Interesse daran auf, ein differenziertes Strafrecht auszuarbeiten, dessen Ausführbarkeit in sozialgeschichtlicher Hinsicht unter persischer Oberherrschaft ohnehin noch einmal zu überprüfen wäre.

Nun möchte ich auf die von V. Wagner ab S. 249 angeführten Gegenargumente eingehen. Ad 1.: Die von V. Wagner angeführte hohe Zahl an Rechtsvorschriften, die keine Gerichtsinstanz nennt, ist dahingehend zu relativieren, dass in den Rechtstexten häufig aus dem Kontext oder dem Sachverhalt selbst heraus sehr klar ist, wer die Strafe ausführt. Insofern hat V. Wagner mit seinen Anmerkungen auf S. 250, letzter Absatz, völlig recht. Die schlichte Übertragung auf die so genannten „Rechtskorpora“ des Alten Testaments ist mir jedoch zu einfach: Bei der *mōt yūmāt*-Sanktion fehlen mir immer noch Gerichtsinstanzen und Scharfrichter, die aus meiner Sicht nötig wären, um von einer institutionellen „Todesstrafe“ zu sprechen. Der in den altorientalischen Rechtstexten vielfach herangezogene König fällt in den alttestamentlichen Rechtstexten als Bezugsgröße und damit als staatliche Instanz, die eine Todesstrafe verhängen und exekutieren kann, bekanntlich aus. Wenn aber keine solche Instanz greifbar ist, schlage ich vor, nicht von Todesstrafe zu sprechen, sondern von Blutrache bzw. Lynchjustiz. Ad 2.: Tatsächlich bleibt auch V. Wagner nichts Anderes übrig, als in den Verfahren, bei denen nicht die Blutrache greift, die Lynchjustiz anzunehmen: Die Umstehenden („An ein Privatleben in unserem Sinne war da wohl gar nicht zu denken“ – richtig!) sehen alles und schreiten sofort zur „Hinrichtung“. Dass ich das für unrealistisch halte, sage ich als Anwalt der antiken Judäer, die wohl bald gemerkt haben, dass bei einem solchen Verfahren dem Missbrauch Tür und Tor geöffnet sind. Die Geschichte von Nabots Weinberg in 1 Kön 21 zeigt die Sensibilität dafür, obwohl selbst dort noch der Schein eines „gerechten Verfahrens“ gewahrt wird. Auch würde so ein undifferenziertes Vorgehen nicht zu der detaillierten Ausarbeitung passen, die das Numeribuch zur Anwendung der Blutrache anführt (Num 35,9–34). Die Darlegungen zur Verwendung der Asylstädte als Eindämmung einer voreiligen Blutrache versuchen doch, das schon als problematisch erkannte Rechtsinstitut der Blutrache in geordnete Bahnen zu lenken und ihr wenigstens eine Untersuchung voranzuschalten (s. auch Dtn 19,1–13). Dies lässt sich mit einem Verständnis der *mōt yūmāt*-Sanktion als sofort von den umstehenden Zeugen zu exekutierende „Todesstrafe“, also genauer einer „Lynchjustiz“, aus meiner Sicht nicht vereinbaren. Dabei hilft es auch nicht, die *mōt yūmāt*-Sanktion einer (viel) früheren Zeitstufe („Eisenzeit I und IIa“, so V. Wagner) zuzuweisen. Selbst wenn die Texte da entstanden sein sollten (was ich nicht glaube), werden die Sätze doch in

nachexilischer Zeit verwendet, und auf dieser Ebene muss ich sie im Endtext zu verstehen versuchen. – Ad 3.: Das Fehlen von Hinweisen auf Exekutionen von Todesstrafen in der erzählenden (oder auch der kultischen oder prophetischen) Literatur erklärt V. Wagner mit einem *argumentum e silentio*. Es sei eben viel zu wenig überliefert, als dass sich solche Hinweise erhalten haben könnten. Dagegen lässt sich schlecht etwas sagen, aber vielleicht muss man dann die Frage stellen, ob damit nicht die „Todesstrafe“ zu etwas Alltäglich-Banalem wird, über das weder die Geschichtsdarsteller noch die Priester noch die Propheten irgendeinen Satz verlieren wollen? Ist das realistisch?

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 werden, geradezu todernst. In ihrer Abscheu gegenüber den genannten Verhaltensweisen wussten sie sich keinen anderen Rat, als immer die „Höchststrafe“ zur Sprache zu bringen – jede Person, die dieses tut, wird „für tot erklärt“, und zwar auf einer höheren, um nicht zu sagen „ernsteren“, Ebene als auf der juristischen: Während auf der menschlich-juristischen Ebene Fehler passieren und manche Übeltäter sich dem menschlichen Strafzugriff entziehen können, sind die Sanktionen in Lev 20 insofern „wasserdicht“, als Gott als ausführende Instanz hinter allem steht. Gott wird den angedrohten physischen Tod, den sozialen Tod (*karet*-Sanktion) oder den Tod der Zukunft (Kinderlosigkeit) mit Sicherheit herbeiführen – so ist das Kapitel in seiner Endgestalt zu verstehen. Leider geht V. Wagner auf diese Argumente meinerseits auf S. 779 im Herder-Kommentar nicht mehr ein und klärt damit auch nicht die Frage, die sich bei seinem Verständnis der *mōt yūmāt*-Sanktion als „Todesstrafe“ ergibt: Wie verhält sie sich zur *karet*-Sanktion und zur Androhung der Kinderlosigkeit? Während man bei der *karet*-Sanktion noch diskutieren kann, so ist doch die angedrohte Kinderlosigkeit kaum anders denn als Gottesstrafe zu verstehen. Warum aber sollten Gottesstrafen und von Menschen zu exekutierende Strafen in dem Kapitel undifferenziert „gemischt“ werden (s. die Liste im Kommentar auf S. 776)? – Ich danke abschließend V. Wagner für die hervorragenden Denkanstöße, die mich dazu gebracht haben, meine Position zu überdenken. Ich halte sie aber nach wie vor für vertretbar. – Inzwischen ist die sehr hilfreiche Arbeit von J. Vroom zum Grad des Verpflichtungscharakters des „Gesetzes des Mose“ im Frühjudentum erschienen. Ich denke, dass Vrooms nachvollziehbare Beobachtungen und Interpretationen meine Position stützen. Literaturangabe: Vroom, Jonathan, *The Authority of Law in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism. Tracing the Origins of Legal Obligation from Ezra to Qumran* (JSJ.S 187), Leiden: Brill, 2018.

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 ’hry 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.

Stiebert, Johanna, First-Degree Incest and the Hebrew Bible. Sex in the Family (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 596), London, UK, New York, NY: Bloomsbury; T&T Clark, 2016.

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.

Wells, Bruce, Punishments in the Torah and Their Rationale, in: Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 22, 2016, 245–267.

Abstract: Der Artikel untersucht das Grundprinzip hinter den Strafbestimmungen von Bundesbuch (B), deuteronomischem Gesetz (D) und Heiligkeitgesetz (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.

Römer, Thomas, Homosexuality in the Hebrew Bible? Some Thoughts on Lev 17 and 20; Gen 19 and the David-Jonathan Narrative, in: Oeming, Manfred (Hg.), AHAVA – Die Liebe Gottes im Alten Testament (ABG 55), Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2018, 213–231.

Dershowitz, Idan, Revealing Nakedness and Concealing Homosexual Intercourse. Legal and Lexical Evolution in Leviticus 18, in: Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel 6, 2017, 510–526.

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.

Assessment: Dershowitz macht einen sehr interessanten Vorschlag zur Genese der Bestimmungen in Lev 18. Ursprünglich habe z.B. Lev 18,14 nur gelautet: „Mit dem Bruder deines Vaters sollst du keinen Geschlechtsverkehr haben“. Der Satz habe sich darauf bezogen, dass gleichgeschlechtlicher Sexualverkehr unter Männern (nur) dann verboten war, wenn die Geschlechtspartner verwandt (hier: Onkel und Nefte) waren.

Gleichgeschlechtlicher Sexualverkehr unter Männern, die nicht blutsverwandt waren, sei damit implizit erlaubt gewesen. Ein späterer Bearbeiter im Zuge der Redaktion des Heiligkeitsgesetzes habe dann den Sinn dieser Bestimmung durch den Zusatz „du sollst dich seiner Frau nicht nähern, denn sie ist deine Tante“ vollständig geändert und den verbotenen Geschlechtsverkehr auf die Tante verlagert. Zugleich habe damit die Wendung „die Scham aufdecken“ auch eine metaphorische Bedeutung erhalten. Insgesamt ist dadurch der verbotene Geschlechtsverkehr zwischen verwandten Männern aus dem Blick geraten, so dass die Bestimmung in Lev 18,22 hinzugefügt werden konnte, die gleichgeschlechtlichen Analverkehr unter Männern *generell* verboten und damit im Alten Orient etwas Neues kreiert hat. Möglicherweise stand der Fortschreiber unter dem Einfluss persisch-zoroastrischer Literatur (die Sammlung *Videvdad*). Nur in dieser altiranischen Sphäre sei gleichgeschlechtlicher Verkehr unter Männern in vorbiblischer Zeit geächtet gewesen. – Die Ausführungen sind durchaus bedenkenswert und sorgfältig erarbeitet. Allerdings leiden sie unter dem Problem, dass die Annahme einer späteren Fortschreibung z.B. in Lev 18,14 (s.o.) letztlich eine literarkritische Vermutung ist, die aus dem Text allein heraus nicht hinreichend begründet werden kann. Damit steht und fällt allerdings das Argument. Sobald ich die literar- und redaktionskritische Analyse nicht teile, ist auch die erklärende Schlussfolgerung hinfällig. Darüber hinaus ist festzuhalten: Die Annahme, das Verbot gleichgeschlechtlichen Sexualverkehrs unter Männern betreffe (zunächst) nur blutsverwandte Männer, ist in ähnlicher Weise schon bei Milgrom als vorsichtige Vermutung zu finden. Dafür gibt es allerdings keinen schlüssigen Beweis. Dershowitz's entstehungsgeschichtliche Spekulation löst ferner nicht das hermeneutische Problem, das die Endgestalt des biblisch gewordenen Texts aufgibt. Zudem geht Dershowitz nicht auf die sehr früh einsetzende Rezeptionsgeschichte des Textes ein, die Lev 18,22 stets im Sinne eines Verbots gleichgeschlechtlicher sexueller Handlungen unter Männern verstanden hat. – Mein Kommentar versucht, den Text in seinem soziokulturellen und zeitgeschichtlichen Horizont zu verstehen und zugleich eine hermeneutische Brücke zu bauen (s. ferner T. Hieke, *Homosexualität* [2015]).

Hieke, Thomas, Kennt und verurteilt das Alte Testament Homosexualität?, in: Goertz, Stephan (Hg.), „Wer bin ich, ihn zu verurteilen?“ Homosexualität und katholische Kirche (Katholizismus im Umbruch 3), Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 2015, 19-52.

Grisanti, Michael A., Homosexuality – An Abomination or Purely Irrelevant? Evaluating LGBT Claims in Light of the Old Testament, in: *The Master's Seminary Journal* 28, 2017, 115–134.

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.

Sklar, Jay, The Prohibitions against Homosexual Sex in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13: Are They Relevant Today?, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 28, 2018, 165–198.

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 *petitio principii*.

Hieke, Thomas, The Prohibition of Transferring an Offspring to “the Molech”: No Child Sacrifice in Leviticus 18 and 20, in: Christian A. Eberhart/Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics–Methodology–Themes* (FRLANT 276), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, 171-200.

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* (לִמֹּלֵךְ, 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 ἀρχοντι 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.

Trauner, Cordula, Homosexualität im Alten Testament, in: Schmidt, Jochen (Hg.), Religion und Sexualität, Würzburg: Ergon, 2016, 10–32.

Johnson, Merwyn S., The Idiom of Scripture, Leviticus 18:5, and Theology - at a Time of Paradigm Shift, in: BTB 47, 2017, 155–170.

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.]

Balzaretti, Claudio, Il sacrificio dei bambini. Aspetti metodologici, in: Rivista Biblica 66, 2018, 175–206.

Israel, Felice, Materiali su Moloch II. Il viaggio di Moloch nel mediterraneo, come quando e perché, in: Rivista di Studi Fenici 44, 2016, 115–127.

Published Abstract: The Author tries to find when and why in the biblical exegesis the connection between the biblical Molek 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 exegetes, 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.

Leuenberger, Martin, *Geschlechterrollen und Homosexualität im Alten Testament*, in: *Evangelische Theologie* 80, 2020, 206-229.

Published abstract: After a few hermeneutical preliminaries reflecting on how to perceive 'homosexuality' appropriately in ancient contexts within the framework of gender roles, the exegetic contribution first casts an iconographic glance at two Ancient Near Eastern images. This background then helps to sharpen the contours of prominent OT texts: On the one hand, the narrative creation texts in Gen 1-3 elaborate two distinct models of human gender roles, both of which should be understood as fundamental anthropological and theological constructions and conceptualizations. On the other hand, it becomes clear that the only explicit statement on sexual intercourse between two men in Lev 18:22/20:13 represents a prescriptive parenthesis seeking to ensure the transgenerational survival of the threatened Yahweh-community in the Persian province of Yehud. In both instances, the contexts and pragmatics of the texts are essential when asking about possible implications for understanding 'homosexuality.'

Gilders, William K., *Prohibited Bodies in Leviticus 18*, in: *Satlow, Michael L. (ed.), Strength to Strength. Essays in Appreciation of Shaye J.D. Cohen (Brown Judaic Studies 363)*, Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018, 27–43.

Abstract from OTA: Drawing on Michel de Certeau's *Practice of Everyday Life*, G. points out that cultures differ in their understanding of nakedness. The Israelite view of nakedness can be discerned from several biblical passages (viz., Genesis 2-3 and 9; 2 Samuel 10; Isaiah 20; and Ezekiel 16). These passages demonstrate that the term 'erwâ refers to genitals and that the prohibition against "seeing" nakedness applies to both sexual contact and observation.-F.E.G.

Jennings, Theodore W. Jr., *Same-Sex Relations in the Biblical World*, in: *Thatcher, Adrian (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Theology, Sexuality, and Gender*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018, 206–221.

Wells, Bruce, *On the Beds of a Woman: The Leviticus Texts on Same-Sex Relations Reconsidered*, in: *Lipka, Hilary; Wells, Bruce (Hg.), Sexuality and Law in the Torah (LHB/OTS 675)*, London: T & T Clark, 2020, 125–160.

Hollenback, George M., *Translating Leviticus 20:13*, in: *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 52, 2019, 103-105.

Töyräänvuori, Joanna, *Homosexuality, the Holiness Code, and Ritual Pollution: A Case of Mistaken Identity*, in: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 45, 2020, 235–267.
Published abstract: The Holiness Code in Leviticus contains a well-known list of illicit sexual practices. Two infamous Levitical verses (18.22 and 20.13) have been widely interpreted as forbidding and calling for punishment for carnal relations between two adult males and have even influenced modern legislation regarding homosexuality and marriage equality in many countries. It is the suggestion of the author that the verses do not in fact refer to homosexual acts at all, but instead should be interpreted as

forbidding and calling for punishment of the act of two males sharing simultaneously the bed of a single woman, which in the context of the Holiness Code and its other statutes aims at prohibiting the creation of offspring whose patronage is unclear and form is abominable, which in turn would lead to the ritual pollution of the Promised Land.

Graf, Philipp, Ménage à trois? Ein neuer Blick auf Lev 18,22 und 20,13: y-nachten.de, 7. Juni 2021.

Published abstract: In der Debatte um Homosexualität und Kirche scheinen die theologischen Argumente längst ausgetauscht. Doch gibt es Neues zu entdecken. Philipp Graf diskutiert Forschungsergebnisse der finnischen Exegetin Joanna Töyräänvuori, die minutiös den hebräischen Text in Lev 18,22 und 20,13 analysiert und darin nicht homosexuelles Verhalten verurteilt sieht, sondern Geschlechtsverkehr zweier Männer mit einer Frau – eine „ménage à trois“.

Goeman, Peter J., Recent Scholarship and the Quest to Understand Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, in: *The Master's Seminary Journal* 31 (2020) 243–274.

Published abstract: This article analyzes Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13. One of the most debated parts of these prohibitions is the phrase “as one lies with a female” (מִשְׁכָּבֵי אִשָּׁה). Although many modern scholars have attempted to explain this phrase as a technical phrase referring to incest or specific homosexual behavior, this phrase should be understood as a general reference to sexual activity. Thus, Leviticus 18:22 and 20:73 should be read as general prohibitions against sex between homosexual partners. Assessment:

Dieser Artikel verfolgt die übliche Argumentationsweise derer, die Lev 18:22 mit einer homophoben Agenda lesen. Es steht von vorneherein fest, dass dieser Vers (zusammen mit Lev 20:13) „Homosexualität“ verbietet, und zwar auch unter Frauen. Sämtliche Einwände, die dieser These widersprechen, werden mit verklausulierten Formulierungen angezweifelt, da eben nicht sein kann, was nicht sein darf. Dass der Antike das moderne Konzept von „Homosexualität“ als sexuelle Orientierung, die nicht wählbar ist und als Partnerschaftlichkeit gleichgeschlechtlicher Personen auf Augenhöhe gar nicht bewusst war, kommt nicht in den Blick. Hier wird also Apologetik, aber keine Wissenschaft betrieben.

This article follows the usual line of reasoning of those who read Lev 18:22 with a homophobic agenda. It is clear from the outset that this verse (along with Lev 20:13) prohibits “homosexuality,” even among women. All objections that contradict this thesis are challenged with cloistered formulations, since precisely what cannot be cannot be. The fact that the ancient world was not even aware of the modern concept of “homosexuality” as a sexual orientation that cannot be chosen and as a partnership of persons of the same sex at eye level does not come into view. So here apologetics, but no science is practiced.

Hollenback, George M., Was There Ever an Implicit Acceptance of Male Homosexual Intercourse in Leviticus 18?, in *ZAW* 131, 2019, 464–466.

Published Abstract: A controversial article by Idan Dershowitz asserts there is evidence that a supposedly earlier version of Leviticus 18 reflected a general acceptance of male homosexual intercourse; this note challenges that view.

- Dershowitz, Idan*, Response to: “Was There Ever an Implicit Acceptance of Male Homosexual Intercourse in Leviticus 18?” by George M. Hollenback in *ZAW* 131/3 (2019), 464-66, in: *ZAW* 131, 2019, 625–628.
Published Abstract: I comment on George Hollenback’s response in *ZAW* 131/3 (2019) to my article »Revealing Nakedness and Concealing Homosexual Intercourse: Legal and Lexical Evolution in Leviticus 18,« *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* (HeBAI) 6/4 (2017): 510–526.
- Römer, Thomas*, Homosexualität und die Bibel. Anmerkungen zu einem anachronistischen Diskurs, in: *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 33, 2018, 47–66.
Published abstract (adapted): No text of the Hebrew Bible (and also no text of the New Testament) speaks about homosexuality as a social phenomenon to describe loving and sexual same sex relations. As a result, one has to seriously question the use of different biblical texts in contemporary and ecclesial debates. Texts like Leviticus 18 and 20 reflect the understanding of gender in the Ancient Near East, as well as a view of sexuality that is exclusively concerned with procreation. Genesis 19 and Judges 19 denounce sexual violence and do not offer a theory of homosexual fornication. In the story of David and Jonathan we find an erotically tinted loving relationship between men. This story has to be related to the Epic of Gilgamesh, and here, too, one has to avoid anachronistic interpretations. When we explore biblical concepts of Eros and sexuality, the narrative of 1 Samuel 18–2 Samuel 1 should not be ignored (adapted from published abstract).
- Stewart, David Tabb*, Categories of Sexuality Indigenous to Biblical Legal Materials, in: Lipka, Hilary; Wells, Bruce (eds.), *Sexuality and Law in the Torah* (LHB/OTS 675), London: T&T Clark, 2020, 20–47.
Abstract from OTA: S. begins with a brief reflection on M. Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality*. With Foucault serving as background, he then provides a table of five ways the OT regulates sexual practices: “Figure 1. Spectrum of Sexual Relations,” with as main headings Forbid, Reprehend, Allow, Command, Celebrate. A comparative analysis of Hittite and biblical laws regulating sexuality, with a focus on the Holiness Collection, leads S. to say that biblical law reflects a hierarchical system of divine, human, and bestial sexualities, along with a manifest concern about blurring the boundaries among these categories and with potential transgressions of sub-boundaries within the human category. Leviticus 18-20 forms a sort of ancient triptych. The two side panels (chaps. 18 and 20) focus on sexual behaviors, Chap. 18 organizes the laws by means of two inset pieces: vv. 7-16 present ten commandments concerning incest, headed by a general rule in v. 6 and framed by a bridging section in vv. 17-18. The bridging section adds two rules that extend the incest prohibition to any mother—daughter or sister pairing. The second inset panel, vv. 19-23, contains a poem featuring seven commands. The poem arranges the seven laws as follows: no menstrual sex, no adultery, no Molek sex, no profaning the divine name, no male—male incest, no male-initiated bestiality, and no female-initiated bestiality.—F. W.G.
- Gunda, Masiiwa Ragies*, The Bible and Homosexuality in Zimbabwe. A Socio-historical analysis of the political, cultural and Christian arguments in the homosexual public debate with special reference to the use of the Bible (*Bible in Africa Studies* 3),

Bamberg, University of Bamberg Press, 2010 (online: <https://fis.uni-bamberg.de/handle/uniba/248>).

Welch, John W., Structural Comparisons of Hittite Laws 187–200, Leviticus 18:6–23, and Leviticus 20:1–21, in: ZAR 28, 2022, 19–45.

Lev 19

Literatur

Gaß, Erasmus, „Heilige sollt ihr werden. Denn heilig bin ich, Jahwe, euer Gott“. Zur Begründungsstruktur in Lev 19: Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift 64,3, 2013, 214–231.

Auf S. 227–229 befasst sich E. Gaß v.a. mit der Bedeutung von Lev 19 im Christentum. Auch verweist E. Gaß auf weitere Literatur zu Lev 19.

Hieke, Thomas, Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe als Angebot. Lev 19 als Ausdruck und Summe der Theologie des Levitikusbuches: BiKi 69, 2014, 74–79.

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.

Huehnergard, John; Liebowitz, Harold, The Biblical Prohibition Against Tattooing: VT 63,1, 2013, 59–77.

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.

Jacobs, Sandra, The Body Inscribed: A Priestly Initiative?, in: Taylor, Joan E. (Hg.), The Body in Biblical, Christian and Jewish Texts (Library of Second Temple Studies, 85), London: Bloomsbury, 2014, 1–16.

Friedman, Richard Elliott, Love Your Neighbor: Only Israelites or Everyone?: Biblical Archaeology Review 40/5, 2014, 48–52.

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.

Schüle, Andreas, „Wer ist mein Nächster?“ Die Bedeutung der Exodustradition für das Verständnis sozialer Nähe und Ferne in den exilisch/nachexilischen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments: JBTh 29, 2014, 43–61 (erschienen im November 2015). Abstract aus dem Vorwort: A. Schüle fragt im Kontext exilisch-nachexilischer Erfahrung, wer denn dieser Nächste sei, den es zu lieben gelte: der Mit-Israelit oder ebenso der Fremde? Insofern ringt dieses Gebot um Identifikation und um den Umgang mit dem Anderen angesichts von Exodus und Exilerfahrung, woraus schließlich der radikal formulierte Solidaritätsgedanke wächst, der Goldenen Regel vergleichbar. Der berühmte Vers aus der Mitte der Tora bietet sich demzufolge als Herzstück eines biblischen Humanismus an – ein Verständnis, das auch der Babylonische Talmud vertritt, wenn Hillel zu einem Proselyten sagt (bShab 31a): „Was dir nicht lieb ist, das tue auch deinem Nächsten nicht. Das ist die ganze Tora, und alles andere ist nur ihre Auslegung. Geh, und lerne sie!“ Im vorliegenden Aufsatz umrahmt A. Schüle das Liebesgebot mit dem Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk 10,25-37). Er sieht die implizite Frage nach der Identität des zu liebenden Nächsten als den Nukleus des entstehenden Frühjudentums. Dazu widmet er sich Fragen der Identitätsbildung im frühnachexilischen Judentum und behandelt dazu das Motiv der Heimkehr der Kinder Zions in Deuterocesaja, sodann entsprechende Aspekte in Tritojesaja und im Heiligkeitsgesetz. Zu Lev 19,18 zieht er 19,34 hinzu: Auch der Fremde ist „wie du“ (und insofern zu lieben). „Und wiederum ist es die Exodustradition, die den erkenntnisleitenden Schlüssel bietet: Exil, Diaspora und Fremdheit sind prägende Elemente der kulturellen Erinnerung Israels, die nun auch eine authentische, weil erfahrungsgesättigte Wahrnehmung der Situation des Fremden erlauben. Die eigene kulturelle Erinnerung an den Exodus wird zum Medium von Empathie und Solidarität mit dem Fremden. Und eben dieser Einsicht in das elementar Verbindende dient das Gebot als Grundlage der allgemeinen Nächstenliebe“ (S. 59).

Noonan, Benjamin J., Unraveling Hebrew אֶצְטָשׁ: JBL 135, 2016, 95–101.

Published abstract (adapted): Hebrew אֶצְטָשׁ, 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, אֶצְטָשׁ is a lexical blend. Its two source words are אֶצְטָשׁ* and אֶצְטָשׁ*, the early Hebrew forms of the Semitic words for “ewe” (**ta*’at) and “goat” (**anz*/**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 אֶצְטָשׁ means in Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:11.

Stewart, David Tabb, Leviticus 19 as Mini-Torah, 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, 299–323.

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.

Student, Gil, The Meaning of BIKKORET in Leviticus 19:20: *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 44, 2016, 3–6.

Rabbi Student gibt einen Überblick über die verschiedenen Deutungsvorschläge des Lexems *biqqoræet* in Lev 19,20 und zeigt schließlich, dass der Vorschlag von J. Milgrom („investigation“) der Interpretation entspricht, die bereits Raschi vorgelegt hat.

Hieke, Thomas, Die Heiligkeit Gottes als Beweggrund für ethisches Verhalten. Das ethische Konzept des Heiligkeitsgesetzes nach Levitikus 19, in: Frevel, Christian (Hg.), *Mehr als Zehn Worte? Zur Bedeutung des Alten Testaments in ethischen Fragen (QD 273)*, Freiburg i.Br. 2015, 187-206

Meyer, Esias E., The Reinterpretation of the Decalogue in Leviticus 19 and the Centrality of the Cult: *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 30, 2016, 198–214.

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.

Goldstone, Matthew, Rebuke, Lending, and Love: An Early Exegetical Tradition on Leviticus 19:17–18: *JBL* 136, 2017, 307–321.

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.

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, Zur Anthropologie der Ethik der (Liebes)Gebote, in: Wagner, Andreas; van Oorschot, Jürgen (eds.), Individualität und Selbstreflexion in den Literaturen des Alten Testaments (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 48) Leipzig 2017, 341–354.

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).

Hopf, Matthias, Zwischen Sollen und Sein. Einige rechtsanthropologische Überlegungen zum Menschenbild in Lev 19, in: Wagner, Andreas; van Oorschot, Jürgen (eds.), Individualität und Selbstreflexion in den Literaturen des Alten Testaments (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 48) Leipzig 2017, 355–372.

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.

Büchner, Dirk, A Commentary on Septuagint Leviticus 19:11-15, in: Gauthier, Randall X.; Kotzé, Gideon R.; Steyn, Gert J. (Hg.), Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture. Studies in Honour of Johann Cook (Vetus Testamentum Supplements, 172), Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2016.

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.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar, Love of Neighbor as Great Commandment in the Time of Jesus: Grasping at Straws in the Hebrew Scriptures, in: *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 60, 2017, 265–281.

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.

Kim, Sun-Jong, La 'nourriture de Dieu' (לחם אלהים) dans le Code de Sainteté, in: *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 123, 2011, 424–430.

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.

Meyer, Esias E., The Foreskinned Fruit in Leviticus 19, in: *Semita* 58, 2016, 93–114.

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.

Rogerson, John W., Leviticus 19 and the meaning of Holiness, in: Rogerson, John W. (ed.), *Leviticus in Practice*, Dorset: Deo Publishing, 2014, 48-53 (not available in Germany).

Jagersma, Henk, *Leviticus 19: identiteit, bevrijding, gemeenschap*, Assen: van Gorcum, 1972.

Stemberger, Günter, Support for the Poor. Leviticus 19 in Qumran and in Early Rabbinic Interpretation, in: Dobos, Károly Dániel; Kőszeghy, Miklós (Hg.), *With Wisdom as a*

Robe. *Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 21), Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009, 451–469.

Wagner, Volker, Lev 19 - Warnung vor irreparabler Unreinheit durch das Zusammenbringen unvereinbarer Dinge und Handlungen, in: *Biblische Notizen* 126, 2005, 5–18.

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 imperable impurity and is to be punished by excommunication, death or banishment.

Akiyama, Kengo, *The Love of Neighbour in Ancient Judaism. The Reception of Leviticus 19:18 in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, the Book of Jubilees, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the New Testament* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 105), Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018.

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.

Bosman, Hendrik L., *Loving the Neighbour and the Resident Alien in Leviticus 19 as Ethical Redefinition of Holiness: Old Testament Essays* 31, 2018, 571–590.

“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.

Cranz, Isabel, *The Rhetoric of Prohibitions. Divination and Magic in Deuteronomy and Leviticus*, in: *Semitica* 60, 2018, 139–158.

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.]

Chavalas, Mark W., *Unholy Ink. What Does the Bible Say about Tattoos?*, in: *Biblical Archaeology Review* 42, 2016, 22, 68.

Akiyama, Kengo, *How Can Love Be Commanded? On Not Reading Lev 19,17-18 as Law*, in: *Biblica* 98, 2017, 1–9.

Published abstract: This article argues that the command to love the neighbor in Lev 19,18 is best read as a wisdom-law. The article problematizes the common forensic reading of Lev 19,17-18, identifying some interpretative issues in viewing the love command as a legal mandate. It then suggests an alternative interpretative framework, drawing on the insights of narratological and genre studies.

Arcadi, James M., *“You Shall Be Holy”. A Speech Act Theoretic Theological Interpretation*, in: *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 12, 2018, 183–199.

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.]

Goldstone, Matthew S., *The Dangerous Duty of Rebuke. Leviticus 19:17 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 185)*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2018.

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.

Braulik, Georg, *Der blinde Fleck – das Gebot, den Fremden zu lieben. Zur soziaethischen Forderung von Deuteronomium 10,19*, in: Klissenbauer, Irene; Gassner, Franz; Steinmair-Pösel, Petra; Kirchschräger, Peter G. (Hg.), *Menschenrechte und Gerechtigkeit als bleibende Aufgaben. Beiträge aus Religion, Theologie, Ethik, Recht*

und Wirtschaft. Festschrift für Ingeborg G. Gabriel, Göttingen: V&R unipress; Vienna University Press, 2020, 41–63.

Adam, Klaus-Peter, Bloodshed and Hate. The Judgment Oracle in Ezek 22:6-12 and the Legal Discourse in Lev 19:11-18, in: Grohmann, Marianne; Kim, Hyun Chul Paul (eds.), *Second Wave Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible (Resources for Biblical Study 93)*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019, 91–111.

Published abstract: “Bloodshed and Hate: The Judgment Oracle in Ezek 22:6–12 and the Legal Discourse in Lev 19:11–18,” by Klaus-Peter Adam, offers a further exploration of the connections between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code. While the passages under consideration participate in different genres, Adam finds an “ethos of mutual benevolence” connecting them (93). Adam concludes that the “terminological and ideological overlap between both texts is apparent” (110), even though they address different audiences and historical situations.

Abstract from OTA: A.’s article focuses on the lexicographic and thematic overlaps between the Holiness Code in Leviticus 19 and the Priestly undercurrents in Ezekiel 22, highlighting both similarities and differences between the two chapters. In addition to its compositional analyses of two passages, A.’s intertextual reading yields the additional thematic insight that whereas Ezekiel 22 underscores the urban setting of the ruling elites, Leviticus reflects rather the rural context of the lay kinship community. [Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]

Otto, Eckart, “You shall Not Wear Clothes Made of Wool and Linen Woven Together” (Deut. 22:11). Clothing in Biblical Law, in: Berner, Christoph; Schäfer, Manuel; Schott, Martin; Schulz, Sarah; Weingärtner, Martina (Hg.), *Clothing and Nudity in the Hebrew Bible. A Handbook*, London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Publishing; T&T Clark, 2019, 323–330.

Lockett, Darian, The Use of Leviticus 19 in James and 1 Peter: A Neglected Parallel, in: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 82, 2020, 456–472.

Published Abstract: Numerous linguistic and thematic connections between James and 1 Peter have been well documented, yet the common use of Leviticus 19 has not been noted as one of those significant connections. In this article, I argue that Jas 2:1-13 and 1 Pet 1:15-22 are both influenced by the larger literary context of Lev 19:2-18. Both texts cite Leviticus 19 directly (19:18b in Jas 2:8; 19:2 in 1 Pet 1:16) and both show evidence of secondary allusions to Leviticus 19 in the immediate context (19:15 in both Jas 2:1, 9 and 1 Pet 1:17). There is a further allusion to the command to love one’s neighbor (Lev 19:18b) in 1 Pet 1:22, which leads to the conclusion that both texts offer extended commentary on Leviticus 19, contextualizing the love command in the particular rhetoric of each letter. Finally, I argue that this neglected parallel between James and 1 Peter must be considered in the reassessment of the larger question of the literary relationship between the two letters.

Adam, Klaus-Peter, Purity and Holiness in P. Leviticus 19:11-18 and the Decalogues, in: Krause, Joachim J.; Oswald, Wolfgang; Weingart, Kristin; Blum, Erhard (Hg.), *Eigensinn und Entstehung der Hebräischen Bibel. Erhard Blum zum siebzigsten Geburtstag (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 136)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 147–162.

Abstract from OTA: The correlation between H (the Holiness Code, Leviticus 17-26) and P is an often studied theme that may serve as a test case for the pervasive power of the conceptualization of a priestly work as a composition rather than a typical source. For this compositional understanding of a multi-layered P, the use of sources is critical. Specifically, the notion of a P-layer created with the use of external source documents, but not following the theme or vocabulary of those documents offers room for voices within the P material. An example of the inclusion of source material in the composition of H is the series of 12 prohibitives featured in Lev 19:11-18. Presumably based on sources, this passage in H does not cover specifically cultic or priestly themes but speaks instead of areas of daily life with the intention of establishing acceptable ways of interaction. Thus, e.g., the series of prohibitives addresses fundamental aspects of communal life, comparable to the way in which Leviticus 18 and 20 lay out the limits for sexual relations between clan members. Among other things, H's Lev 19:11-18 includes typical rules for everyday conflicts in any kin-based community. The series is one of the longest sequences of prohibitives in the Hebrew Bible, one of whose central intentions is to promote de-escalation in typical conflict constellations. Via a comparison of the passage with parallel material, this study seeks to clarify the form and function of Lev 19:11-18 in H and the "Priestly Composition," with particular attention to which specific genre of legal texts the question of Lev 19:11-18 might belong [p. 147, adapted]. – The examples of parallels between Lev 19:11-18 and the rules of ancient Egyptian religious associations discussed above mirror in many ways the authoritative character of the groups for whom such rules were drafted. Leviticus 19 expresses the firm and personal character of such social spaces, also through its references to community members with the typical second person singular pronoun: your brother, your companion, sons of your people, your compatriot. The content parallels between Lev 19:11-18 and the rules of ancient Egyptian religious associations also shed light on the former passage as a compendium of laws regulating relationships within the group. – It is worthy of note that H in Leviticus 19 frames the rules for an insider ethos with prohibitives that enjoin strict cultural distinction vis-a-vis the surrounding world. This separatist ethos illustrates the striking ways in which the relationship of religious groups to their wider world may differ substantially from their insider ethos. With regard to ancient Egyptian religious associations in the period from the 6th cent. B.C.E., we have little information about their interaction with the surrounding world. Yet, it is telling that one of the few records of an Egyptian religious association from the time of the 26th Dynasty, i.e. approximately the same time in which H may have been drafted, i.e. the Demotic Papyrus Rylands 9, provides a noteworthy example of aggressive and harmful behavior by the members of the association against an (outsider) opponent. [pp. 162-63, adapted—C.T.B.]

- Collins, John J.*, The Neighbor and the Alien in Leviticus 19, in: Lemos, T.M.; Rosenblum, Jordan; Stern, Karen B.; Ballentine, Debra Scoggins (eds.), *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal. Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 42), Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2021, 185–198.
- Büchner, Dirk*, A Commentary on Greek Leviticus 19:1–10, in: Perrin, Andrew B.; Baek, Kyung S.; Falk, Daniel K. (eds.), *Reading the Bible in Ancient Traditions and Modern*

Editions. Studies in Memory of Peter W. Flint (Early Judaism and Its Literature 47), Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 331–354.

Lipka, Hilary, The Offense, Its Consequences, and the Meaning of רָחַץ in Leviticus 19:29, in: Lipka, Hilary; Wells, Bruce (eds.), *Sexuality and Law in the Torah* (LHB/OTS 675), London: T&T Clark, 2020, 159-179.

Abstract from OTA: Leviticus 19 opens with a call to Israel to be holy. The rest of the chapter provides guidance on how this goal can be achieved, speaking in turn of matters related to proper worship and sacrificial practice, ethical conduct in business and in the courts, and how one should behave toward those in need. By contrast, the two chapters framing Leviticus 19, Leviticus 18 and 20, both largely concern themselves with various kinds of prohibited sexual unions. In Lev 19:29, there is a warning to fathers not to let their daughters engage in “depravity.” L. considers several questions raised by the verse, including how the Hebrew word “depravity” should be translated in this context, the nature of the daughter’s desecration and who is blamed for it, the impact of such behavior on the land, how this admonition fits into the larger context of Leviticus 19, and what it has to do with achieving and maintaining holiness. She concludes that this verse warns fathers to keep control over their unmarried daughters’ sexuality and not let them engage in promiscuous behavior. Not only will this cause the daughters to profane themselves and thus lose holiness, but such behavior also poses a threat to the entire community. The authors view such behavior as contagious, i.e., likely to foster similar misbehavior in others, which in turn can lead to the land being filled with depravity and then becoming defiled. The ultimate result would be exile from the land. See also Adele Berlin, “Sex and the Single Girl in Deuteronomy 22,” in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay* (2009) 95-112; and Eve Levavi Feinstein, *Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible* (2014). [Adapted from published abstract—F.W.G.]

Hügel, Karin, Queere Auslegungen der Liebesgebote aus Levitikus, in: *Journal of the European Society of Women in Theological Research* 28, 2020, 201–236. doi: 10.2143/ESWTR.28.0.3288489

Abstract from OTA: In this essay, I propose “queer” interpretations of the “love commandments” of Lev 19:18 (love of neighbor) and 19:34 (love of the stranger) in connection with three traditional ways of interpreting the former text. First, the commandment to love one’s neighbor could be translated “You shall love your neighbor as you *love* (or *shall love*) yourself.” In this understanding, the neighbor is to be loved to the same extent that one loves oneself. So understood, the commandment presupposes self-love and enjoins such self-love. Against this background, to accuse queer persons of lacking self-love might be regarded as a cynical denial on the part of the one making the accusation that a self-determined sexual life is impossible in the case of the persons in question. Conversely, self-love by those persons would be made easier for them by creation of an environment that supports their ways of life and love. A loving attitude by queer persons toward themselves, in turn, would have a positive impact on their interactions with other human beings.—Second, Lev 19:18 might be understood to say: “you shall love your neighbor because he is *a human being* like you.” In the period of the Jewish Enlightenment, the Jewish poet, philologist, and exegete Naphtali

Herz Wessely created a new Jewish tradition of interpreting the above commands as a theological underpinning for the equality for all human beings that is itself rooted in creation. From a present-day feminist and queer perspective, it is necessary to adopt an inclusive interpretation of the biblical commandments to love neighbors and strangers in such a way that the love commandment in Leviticus is understood as a call for respectful treatment also of women and diverse minorities such as queer people.— Third, and finally, the commandment of Lev 19:18 can be interpreted in light of the negative “Golden Rule” as follows: “You shall love your neighbor in such a way that *what is hateful to you, you shall not do to him.*” Already at the time of composition of the Aramaic translation of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, the love commandments were seen to be in need in further explanation and so the wording of the golden rule was woven into its rendering of Lev 19:18, 34. The golden rule is attributed not only to major ancient rabbis like Hillel or Akiba but also to Jesus of Nazareth. Today, that rule, in contrast to its understanding in antiquity, needs to be interpreted in an inclusive way and applied, not only in the case of men, but also women and queer people as a component of an ethic that aims at the optimal coexistence of all human beings in the world. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Wischmeyer, Oda, Leviticus 19,18. The Text and Some Stations in the History of Its Reception, in: *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 41, 2020, 553–369.

Abstract from OTA: Lev 19:18 is a component of the cultic-social-ethical commandments making up Israel’s Torah. The history of the reception of Lev 19:18, in the strict sense of a quotation, began with Paul. He was the first to cite the love commandment explicitly and to discuss its range and place within the Torah. In so doing, Paul gave the commandment the comprehensive and unique ethical and legal status that it had not had previously. Martin Luther intensified the existential-emotional aspect of the love spoken in the text via his famous translation of the Hebrew *ahab* as *Nächstenliebe*. More recently the papal encyclical *Deus caritas est* (2005) and the statements of the German Protestant bishop Heinrich Bedford-Strohm have sought to safeguard the ethical value and dynamics of Lev 19:18 in conditions that are completely different from the historical, social, and religious context in which Lev 19:18 originated. [Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]

Steyn, Gert J., Loving your neighbour (Lev 19:18) as a ‘royal law according to scripture ...’ (Jas 2:8),” in: Dafni, Evangelia G. (ed.), *Law and Justice in Jerusalem, Babylon and Hellas. Studies on the Theology of the Septuagint Volume III* (WUNT 475), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021, 205–218.

Published abstract (adapted): Lev 19:18 displays a broad early Christian trajectory, covering the Pauline and Gospel traditions. It is no surprise that the New Testament writers frequently quote the so-called “golden rule,” or “rule of reciprocity” from Lev 19:18. They probably traced the origins of the “golden rule” back to a Logion in the Jesus tradition which contained Jesus’ own summary of the law. The love command from Lev 19:18 lies behind Jesus’ interpretation and is quoted in its positive form by the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 12:31, 33; Matt 5:43; 19:19; 22:39; Luke 10:27), as well as by Paul as the fulfillment of the “whole law” (Gal 5:14) and as the summing up of “the commandments” (Rom 13:9). It is also quoted by James as “the royal law according to scripture” (Jas 2:8). S. intends to investigate the different text forms of

Lev 19:18 with Lev 19:34 in their Hebrew and Greek versions and to compare these with their occurrences and reception in early Christianity.

Meyer, Esias E., Leviticus 19:2 and Joshua 24:19. An Example of Literary Allusion?, in: Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 179-203.

Bar, Shaul, Inquiring of the Dead: JBQ 49, 2021, 171–179.

Campbell, Nicholas J., A Comparative Interpretation of the Old Testament Prohibited Mixtures: Mixed Breeding in Leviticus 19:19, in: CBQ 85, 2023, 199–218.
Published abstract: Leviticus 19:19 is often paired with the nearly parallel passage Deut 22:9–11 as the laws of prohibited mixtures. The three standard interpretations are that mixtures are sacred, mixture disrupts the order of creation, and mixture is a metaphor for intermarrying with non-Israelites. Each of the laws, however, is necessary for the proper functioning of the cult and society. I argue that the prohibition against mixed breeding in Lev 19:19 is intended to maintain the distinct breeds needed for cultic and agricultural purposes.

Lev 21

Literatur

Schipper, Jeremy; Stackert, Jeffrey, Blemishes, Camouflage, and Sanctuary Service: The Priestly Deity and His Attendants: HeBAI 2, 2013, 458–478.

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.

Olyan, Saul M., Defects, Holiness, and Pollution in Biblical Cultic Texts, in: Baden, Joel S.; Najman, Hindy; Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. (eds.), *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls. John Collins at Seventy (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 175)*, Leiden, Boston 2017, 1018–1028.

- Neikrug, Shimshon*, Toward a Humanist Understanding of Mum in the Hebrew Bible, in: *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 45, 2017, 126–132.
- Kellenberger, Edgar*, Muss ein Priester perfekt sein? Anforderungen an Körper, Moral und Geist der Priester in der Antike, in: *TZ (Theologische Zeitschrift)* 75, 2019, 129–143. Abstract from OTA: The question of what human prerequisites were considered necessary for a person's assuming the priestly role in the ancient world leads to the further question of how a priest's subsequent loss of these required qualities was to be dealt with. In his article, K. surveys cross-cultural evidence from the ANE (including ancient Israel) through the period of Late Antiquity regarding these two questions. The result of this survey is that there are both noteworthy similarities and equally noteworthy differences among the various cultural spheres in their respective responses to the above questions. K. concludes with some tentative remarks concerning contemporary issues suggested by his survey. (Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.)
- Belser, Julia Watts*, Priestly Aesthetics: Disability and Bodily Difference in Leviticus 21, in: *Interpretation* 73, 2019, 355–366. Published abstract: Leviticus 21:16–23 forbids priests with a wide range of disabilities from offering sacrifice at the altar, a ritual act that Leviticus considers the most sacred responsibility of the priesthood. This essay raises critical questions about the biblical writer's assumption that God desires the service of those with "perfect" bodies. The essay probes traditional Jewish interpretation of Leviticus 21 and argues that rabbinic texts teach the prohibition of much practical force. Despite offering a path toward more inclusive practice, conventional readings of these texts have left in place power dynamics that presume the inferiority of the disabled body. Yet they also contain the seeds for a conceptual shift that could transform the way contemporary communities engage with disability.
- Adam, Klaus-Peter*, Defect or Blemish? Cultural-Historical Readings and Lexicography of *mûm* in Leviticus 21:17–24; 22:17–23, in: Lemos, T.M.; Rosenblum, Jordan; Stern, Karen B.; Ballentine, Debra Scoggins (eds.), *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal. Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 42)*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2021, 149–166.
- Hentrich, Thomas*, Masculinity and Disability in the Hebrew Bible, in: Graybill, Rhiannon; Huber, Lynn R. (eds.), *The Bible, Gender, and Sexuality. Critical Readings (Critical Readings in Biblical Studies)*, London: T&T Clark, 2021, 71–85.
- Shectman, Sarah*, Priestly Marriage Restrictions, in: Lipka, Hilary; Wells, Bruce (eds.), *Sexuality and Law in the Torah (LHB/OTS 675)*, London: T&T Clark, 2020, 180–193. Abstract from OTA: S.'s essay considers the priestly marriage restrictions in Lev 21:7–8 and 13–15, which limit a priest's choice of wife to a virgin or a widow and the requirement that the high priest's marriage be to a virgin of his own kin. S. also gives attention to Ezek 44:22, which extends the latter restriction to all priests, with the exception that a priest may marry the widow of another priest. She provides an innovative thesis to explain the possible reasons for these regulations, in particular why a priest may marry a widow but not a divorced woman, focusing on what it is about the nature of marriage and its dissolution that renders divorced women, and at times widows, problematic as priestly spouses. She suggests that marriage creates a

bond that goes beyond sexual relations such that the above law cannot simply be about sexual purity or stigma. That bond may be conceptualized in quasi-physical terms; it is not fully dissolved by divorce, and according to some biblical authors, it may not be fully dissolved by the death of the husband either. [Adapted from published abstract—F.W.G.]

Watts Belser, Julia, Priestly Aesthetics and Bodily Difference in Leviticus 21, in: *Interpretation* 73, 2019, 355–366.

Abstract from OTA: Leviticus 21:16–23 forbids priests with a wide range of disabilities from offering sacrifice at the altar, a ritual act that Leviticus considers the most sacred responsibility of the priesthood. B.’s essay raises critical questions about the biblical writer’s assumption that God desires the service of those with “perfect” bodies. It likewise probes traditional Jewish interpretation of Leviticus 21 and argues that rabbinic texts deprive Leviticus’s prohibition of much of their practical force. Despite offering a path toward more inclusive practice, conventional readings of these texts have left in place power dynamics that presume the inferiority of the disabled body. Yet they also contain the seeds for a conceptual shift that could transform the way contemporary communities engage with disability. [Adapted from published abstract-J.M.H.]

Fuad, Chelcent, Priestly Disability and Centralization of the Cult in the Holiness Code, in: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 46, 2022, 291–305.

Published abstract: This article analyzes how the notion of priestly disability in Lev 21:16–23 is used in the Holiness Code (H) to construct social identity, shape culture, and organize the society of ancient Israel based on the cultural model of disability. The present study finds that the laws concerning the disabled priests were used in H as a strategy for reconstructing and narrating a new social order, namely, the centralized cult. Although the disabled priests, in contrast to able-bodied priests, were marginalized insofar as they were banned from the most elite rites, they maintained a higher status in the cult compared to other groups in both the priestly and non-priestly communities. Thus, their unique priesthood status was affirmed regardless of their disability. Furthermore, by reinforcing the idea of the officiating priests as the normate image, H’s discourse on priestly disability centralized the authority in the cult of ancient Israel and granted power to the priests.

Lev 22

Literatur

Goodfriend, Elaine Adler, Leviticus 22:24. A Prohibition of Gelding for the Land of Israel?, 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, 67–92.

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.]

Berkowitz, Beth A., Interpretation in the Anthropocene: Reading the Animal Family Laws of the Pentateuch,” in: Mark W. Elliott; Raleigh C. Heth; Angela Zautcke (eds.), *Studies in the History of Exegesis (History of Biblical Exegesis 2, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2022)*, 39-51.

Abstract: B. focuses on the animal family laws in the Pentateuch (Exod 23:19; 34:26; Deut 14:21; Exod 22:29; Lev 22:27–28) and wants to find a somewhat more satisfying way to talk about these laws than the humanitarian rationale offers. B. begins with exegetical observations about Lev 22:27-28. Then she turns to ancient Jewish readings from Qumran (the Temple Scroll, 11QT col. 52); she demonstrates the Temple Scroll's permutations and related issues in 4QMMT (B 30-33). Further technical questions are raised by the rabbis in *Sifra*, the legal midrash on Leviticus. Next, B. examines the reception and interpretation of the biblical passage in the Mishnah and beyond (*m. Hullin* 5:1-3; *m. Bekhorot* 7:7; Philo, *On the virtues*; Josephus, *Antiquities* 3:236-237). She concludes that the ancient texts discuss the sort of discursive formation the family is within these animal family laws. These laws of the Bible suggest to consider animal family bonds as belonging to the genealogy of the family and the politics and traumas associated with it.

Lev 23

Literatur

Babcock, Bryan C., Sacred Time in West Semitic Festival Calendars and the Dating of

Leviticus 23: *Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament* 2, 2013, 1–23.

Babcock, Bryan C., Sacred Ritual. A Study of the West Semitic Ritual Calendars in Leviticus 23 and the Akkadian Text Emar 446 (*Bulletin for Biblical Research: Supplements* 9), Winona Lake, IN 2014.

Kilchör, Benjamin, Passah und Mazzot – Ein Überblick über die Forschung seit dem 19. Jahrhundert: *Biblica* 94, 2013, 340–367.

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.

Körting, Corinna, „Seid fröhlich vor dem Herrn, eurem Gott“. Ein Beitrag zu Geschichte und Bedeutung des Festkalenders in Lev 23: BiKi 69, 2014, 96–101.

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.

Pakkala, Juha, God's Word Omitted. Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 251), Göttingen 2013.

Auf S. 134–154 befasst sich J. Pakkala mit dem literarischen Abhängigkeitsverhältnis des Heiligkeitsgesetzes vom Deuteronomium und argumentiert hauptsächlich auf der Basis von Beobachtungen am Festkalender Lev 23 dafür, dass H das dtn Gesetz ersetzen wollte. Besonders behandelt werden das Wochenfest und das Laubhüttenfest. Für die Entwicklung des Pessachfestes macht J. Pakkala einen eindrucksvollen Vorschlag. Die älteste Fassung sei Ex 23,15–18, die von Dtn 16,1–8 rezipiert wird, während Lev 23,5–8 die jüngste Fassung der drei Versionen darstelle und ein eigenständiger, neuer Entwurf auf der Basis der älteren Texte sei. Die späteste Entwicklungsstufe sei Num 28,16–25, die eng mit der Levitikus-Fassung zusammenhänge. Eine weitere außerbiblische Entwicklungsstufe finde sich in der Tempelrolle (11QT 17,6–16). Auf S. 153 bringt J. Pakkala folgendes Stemma:



Langgut, D.; Gadot, Y.; Lipschits, Oded, “Fruit of Goodly Trees.” *The Beginning of Citron Cultivation in Israel and its Penetration into Jewish Tradition and Culture: Beit Mikra* 59, 2014, 38–55.

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 *’arba’ minîm* (four species), which are defined as the *lûlāv* (palm branch), *’etrôg* (citron fruit), *hādassîm* (myrtle branches), and *’arāvôt* (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 *pēri’ ēš 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 *'etrōg* (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 שבת 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 *šbt* 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 *seba' šabbātōt* ("seven Sabbaths") in Lev 23:15, which in the weekly Sabbath-based theories appears simply superfluous. [Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]

Tammuz, Oded, The Sabbath as the Seventh Day of the Week and a Day of Rest. Since When?, in: ZAW 131, 2019, 287–294.

Published abstract: The objective of this note is to reevaluate the terminus post quem for the concept of Sabbath as the last day of the week and the day of rest. Until now scholars based their evaluation of the problem on biblical material exclusively. In this note I use extrabiblical material that was not used previously and that allows for a new evaluation of the problem.

Moster, David Z., Etrog. How a Chinese Fruit Became a Jewish Symbol, Cham, CH 2018.

Published abstract: Every year before the holiday of Sukkot, Jews all around the world purchase an etrog—a lemon-like fruit—to participate in the holiday ritual. In this book, David Z. Moster tracks the etrog from its evolutionary home in Yunnan, China, to the lands of India, Iran, and finally Israel, where it became integral to the Jewish celebration of Sukkot during the Second Temple period. Moster explains what Sukkot was like before and after the arrival of the etrog, and why the etrog's identification as the “choice tree fruit” of Leviticus 23:40 was by no means predetermined. He also demonstrates that once the fruit became associated with the holiday of Sukkot, it began to appear everywhere in Jewish art during the Roman and Byzantine periods,

and eventually became a symbol for all the fruits of the land, and perhaps even the Jewish people as a whole.

Hollenback, George M., Sabbath and Sanctuary in the Holiness Legislation. A Reassessment, in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138, 2019, 721–740.

Levitikus 24

Literatur

Lee, Bernon, Unity in Diversity. The Literary Function of the Formula of Retaliation in Leviticus 24.15-22: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, 2014, 297–313.
Published abstract: This article offers two novel explanations for the staggered expression of the formula of retaliation ('X for X') in Lev. 24.15-22. First, 'life for life' in Lev. 24.18, in standing apart from other members of the formula in Lev. 24.20, points to Exod. 21.33-36 with reference to the conception of restitution as a bilateral exchange. This feature of Lev. 24.18 joins others in Lev. 24.15-22 in alluding to the laws of Exodus 21. Secondly, the removal of 'life for life' from the rest of the formula creates an aesthetic quality in the passage that promotes the perception of the principle of equitable restitution as foundational to the laws of Lev. 24.15-22. In a word, the design of the passage sustains connections within Lev. 24.15-22 and beyond to Exodus 21. Judicial equity emerges as the common ethos.

Nihan, Christophe, Révisions sribales et transformations du droit dans l'Israël ancien: le cas du talion (*jus talionis*), in: Artus, Olivier (ed.), *Loi et Justice dans la Littérature du Proche-Orient ancien (BZAR 20)*, Wiesbaden 2013, 123–158.

Rooke, Deborah W., The Blasphemer (Leviticus 24). Gender, Identity and Boundary Construction, in: Landy, Francis; Trevaskis, Leigh M.; Bibb, Bryan D. (Hg.), *Text, Time, and Temple. Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus (Hebrew Bible Monographs 64)*, Sheffield 2015, 153–169.

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.]

Wright, David P., Source Dependence and the Development of the Pentateuch – The Case of Leviticus 24, in: Gertz, Jan C. et al. (eds.), *The Formation of the Pentateuch (FAT 111)*, Tübingen 2016, 651–682.

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.]

González Holguín, Julián Andrés, Leviticus 24:10-23: An Outsider Perspective: *Hebrew Studies* 56, 2015, 89–102.

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 worshipping 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.

Vroom, Jonathan, Recasting *Mišpāṭim*: Legal Innovation in Leviticus 24:10–23: *JBL* 131, 2012, 27–44.

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).

Fuad, Chelcent, The Curious Case of the Blasphemer: Ambiguity as Literary Device in Leviticus 24:10-23, in: *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 41, 2019, 51-70.

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.

Olyan, Saul M., *Violent Rituals of the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Published abstract: Although seldom studied by biblical scholars as a discrete phenomenon, ritual violence is mentioned frequently in biblical texts, and includes ritual actions such as disfigurement of corpses, destruction or scattering of bones removed from a tomb, stoning and other forms of public execution, cursing, forced depilation, the legally-sanctioned imposition of physical defects on living persons, coerced potion-drinking, sacrificial burning of animals and humans, forced stripping and exposure of the genitalia, and mass eradication of populations. This book, the first to focus on ritual violence in the Hebrew Bible, investigates these and other violent rites, the ritual settings in which they occur, their various literary contexts, and the identity and aims of their agents in order to speak in an informed way about the contours and social aspects of ritual violence as it is represented in the Hebrew Bible.

Johnson, Dylan R., *Sovereign Authority and the Elaboration of Law in the Bible and the Ancient Near East (FAT II/122)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Published abstract: Five Pentateuchal texts (Lev 24:10-23; Num 9:6-14; Num 15:32-36; Num 27:1-11; Num 36:1-12) offer unique visions of the elaboration of law in Israel's formative past. In response to individual legal cases, Yahweh enacts impersonal and general statutes reminiscent of biblical and ancient Near Eastern law collections. From the perspective of comparative law, Dylan R. Johnson proposes a new understanding of these texts as biblical rescripts: a legislative technique that enabled sovereigns to enact general laws on the basis of particular legal cases.

Typological parallels drawn from cuneiform and Roman law illustrate the complex ideology informing the content and the form of these five cases. The author explores how latent conceptions of law, justice, and legislative sovereignty shaped these texts, and how the Priestly vision of law interacted with and transformed earlier legal traditions.

Bar, Shaul, Death by Stoning in the Hebrew Bible and in Post-Biblical Traditions, in: *Old Testament Essays* 34, 2021, 789–805.

Published abstract: Different modes of death appear in the Hebrew Bible, among which we find stoning as a form of execution. Since the person is dead, why does the Bible go to such lengths to describe this manner of death? In order to proffer an answer, we shall examine the cases which describe death by stoning. The intention behind stoning seems to have been to remove the criminal from the camp and the city. This was not merely a physical removal; it also bore significance for the dead man's spirit. The punishment of stoning prevented the burial of the corpse. Non-burial was worse than death because the spirit of the dead would not find rest and would therefore never reach the underworld. In a later period, the procedure for stoning was modified. Forms of judicial execution mentioned in the Bible, compared with those in the Talmud, indicate the latter made an effort to preserve the body of an executed man. This difference stems from the fact that in the Talmudic period the idea of resurrection was well developed.

Levitikus 25

Literatur

Kessler, Rainer, Utopie und Grenzen. Schabbatjahr und Jubeljahr in Lev 25: *BiKi* 69, 2014, 86–91.

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.

Mayshar, Joram, Who Was the *Toshav*?: *JBL* 133, 2014, 225–246.

Published abstract: The term תושב (*tōšāb*; *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.

Meyer, Esias E., Returning to an Empty Land: Revisiting my Old Argument about the Jubilee: OTE 27, 2014, 502–519.

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.

Meyer, Esias E., People and Land in the Holiness Code. Who is Yhwh's Favourite?: OTE 28, 2015, 433–450.

Adapted from published abstract: M.'s article focuses on how the land (*'eres*) is personified in the Holiness Code. It starts by describing the various “countries” portrayed in the Code and then discusses all its 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.

Mtshiselwa, Ndikho, Mind the Working-Class People! An African Reading of Leviticus 25:8-55 with Latino/a Critical Tools: OTE 29, 2016, 133–150.

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, *sākīr* (“hired labourer”) and the qal verb, *'bd* (“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 workingclass 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. *Artus, Olivier*, Sabbath Year and Jubilee in Lev 25, in: *Indian Theological Studies* 50, 2013, 233–252.

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 Neo-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 Utopia? 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.

Olanisebe, Samson O., Sabbatical and Jubilee Regulations as a Means of Economic Recovery, in: *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 46/3, 2018, 196–202.

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.

Achenbach, Reinhard, The 'amānāh of Nehemiah 10 between Deuteronomy and Holiness Code, in: Lackowski, Mark; Bantzer, Richard J. (Hg.), *On Dating Biblical Texts to the Persian Period. Discerning Criteria and Establishing Epochs (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe, 101)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019, 79–91.

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.]

Kaplan, Jonathan, The Credibility of Liberty. The Plausibility of the Jubilee Legislation of Leviticus 25 in Ancient Israel and Judah, in: *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 81, 2019, 183–203.

Abstract from OTA: Although we may not have positive evidence for the observance of the Levitical jubilee in ancient Israel, we do have indications that it was an institution that would have been theoretically conceivable in ancient Israelite and Judean society. This assessment is supported by descriptions of analogous though distinct practices in the ANE as well as by the agrarian society that the jubilee presumes and in which it could have functioned as a plausible institution. Despite the difficulties in locating the jubilee in any given period in the history of early Israel and Judah, it might have served as a plausible legal framework in any number of periods in Israel's history. The perception of the jubilee legislation in Leviticus 25 as plausible is ultimately what contributed to its emergence and endurance as a force in shaping ancient Jewish thought. A wide range of biblical and postbiblical texts assume the plausibility of the jubilee legislation decreed in Leviticus 25 as a utopian ideal. Indeed, the credibility of the practice led later Jews and Christians to appropriate the jubilee as a powerful inspiration for their utopian visions of a restored Israel and of a just society in the world. [Adapted from published conclusion-W.J.U.]

Ridenour, Randy, Abandoning Jubilee. The Structural Causes of Poverty, in: *Review & Expositor* 116, 2019, 6–15.

Abstract from OTA: The jubilee law of Leviticus 25 is a radical economic plan that requires a leveling of real assets every fifty years, thus providing an economic structure that regularly dissolves large economic inequalities. Following the letter of the jubilee law in a modern, non-agrarian economy is not possible, but this fact should not free us from the responsibility of adhering to the spirit of the law. A survey of social structures in the contemporary United States reveals an economy that is contrary to the spirit of jubilee—one that not only makes inequalities possible but also makes escaping from poverty nearly impossible. [Adapted from published abstract-C.T.B.]

Kaplan, Jonathan, יזבל, A New Proposal, in: *Biblica* 99, 2018, 109–116.

Abstract from OTA: The legislation for the Israelite practice of the jubilee in Leviticus 25 employs the Hebrew term of K. 's title to designate that practice. In this contribution, K. argues that the term in question functions as a polyseme that evokes the meaning of the root *ybl* ('to bring, conduct') as well as other derived forms of that root such *ybw* ('agricultural product') and *ywbl* ('ram's horn'). In Leviticus 25 the term takes on the technical meaning of 'a period of agricultural release inaugurated by the blast of a ram's horn.' [Adapted from published abstract- C.T.B.]

Watts, James W., The Historical Role of Leviticus 25 in Naturalizing Anti-Black Racism, in: *Religions* 12, 2021, 570, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12080570>.

Published abstract: Leviticus 25:39–46 describes a two-tier model of slavery that distinguishes Israelites from foreign slaves. It requires that Israelites be indentured only temporarily while foreigners can be enslaved as chattel (permanent property). This model resembles the distinction between White indentured slaves and Black chattel slaves in the American colonies. However, the biblical influence on these early modern practices has been obscured by the rarity of citations of Lev. 25:39–46 in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources about slavery. This article reviews the history of slavery from ancient Middle Eastern antiquity through the seventeenth century to show the unique degree to which early modern institutions resembled the biblical model. It then exposes widespread knowledge of Leviticus 25 in early modern political and economic debates. Demonstrating this awareness shows with high probability that colonial cultures presupposed the two-tier model of slavery in Leviticus 25:39–46 to naturalize and justify their different treatment of White indentured slaves and Black chattel slaves.

Bergland, Kenneth, Jeremiah 34 Originally Composed as a Legal Blend of Leviticus 25 and Deuteronomy 15, in: *Armgaradt, Matthias; Kilchör, Benjamin; Zehnder, Markus* (eds.), *Paradigm Change in Pentateuchal Research (BZAR 22)*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2019, 189–205.

Abstract from OTA: The above evidence leads to the conclusion that the reuse of both Leviticus 25 and Deuteronomy 15 was part of the original composition of Jer 34:8-22 and cannot be removed without collapsing the latter passage itself. ... Thus the thrust of Jeremiah 34 is better explained as an original reuse of Leviticus 25 on the part of the author of the former passage, *pace* S. Chavel (1997). As argued above, the differences between the justifications for the manumission of the Hebrew slaves in Jer 34:9b and 14 are best understood as evidencing different strategies of reuse by the same author. While 34:8-11 shows an alternating and much tighter-knit reuse of Leviticus 25 and Deuteronomy 15, 34:12-22 largely deploys Deuteronomy 15 in connection with the release prescription in Jer 34:13-14, with 34:15-22 reusing Leviticus 25 more in connection with the divine indictment against the peoples taking back their recently freed slaves. Given the above discussion, it therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the reuse of both Leviticus 25 and Deuteronomy 15 is original in Jer 34:8-22. As a conflation of both Pentateuchal texts, Jer 34:8-22 would be the youngest of the three passages. [Adapted from author's summary, p. 203]—C.T.B.

Bergsma, John Sietze, Biblical Manumission Laws. Has the Literary Dependence of H on D Been Demonstrated?, in: Mason, Eric F. (ed.), *A Teacher For All Generations. Essays in honor of James C. VanderKam* (JSJ.S 153,1), Leiden: Brill, 2012, 65–91.

Abstract from OTA: The crux of this study is B.'s detailed comparison of the syntax and vocabulary in the laws governing the manumission of slaves in Deut 15:1-18 and Leviticus 25. He begins by noting his interest in detecting the existence and direction of any literary—as distinct from conceptual—dependence between D and H. Evidence for literary dependence would consist in a shared repertoire of words or phrases that are rarely used elsewhere in the MT. He identifies cases of such occurrences, which, e.g., confirm the dependence of the Chronicler on the Deuteronomistic History, Ezekiel on the Holiness Code, the Holiness Code on the Covenant Code, and the Deuteronomic Code on the Covenant Code as well. By contrast, B.'s careful analysis yields no such evidence of rarely used syntax or lexemes that would confirm a literary dependence in either direction between Deut 15:1-18 and Leviticus 25. These conclusions have implications for discussions about putative relationships between the Holiness and Deuteronomic Codes and about possible connections among Deut 15:1-18; Jer 34:8-22; and Leviticus 25. An appendix lists vocabulary common to Deut 15:1-12 and Lev 25:1-55.—M.W.D.

Houston, Walter J., What's Just about the Jubilee? Ideological and Ethical Reflections on Leviticus 25, in: Houston, Walter J., *Justice for the Poor? Social Justice in the Old Testament in Concept and Practice*, Eugene: Cascade Books, 2020, 58–72.

Abstract from OTA: Who benefits from the Jubilee described in Leviticus 25? The group that would cleans benefit from the implementation of the measure, if it were ever to be implemented, would be the peasantry, the landholding families of Israelite villages. It would not benefit those without any recognized title to land: those identified in the text as “the aliens residing with you” (v. 45). We have no means of knowing what proportion of the population these were, but it was clearly not negligible, in view of the frequency with which the *gēr* is mentioned in biblical literature. It would also not benefit, but positively disadvantage, the ruling groups or merely more wealthy farmers mentioned so frequently as exploiting the peasants and seeking to gain control of their land and their persons. This is the straightforward interpretation of the text's implications. The attraction of the biblical Jubilee campaign is its promise of a new start unencumbered by debts, in full possession of one's land and person, just as severely indebted countries today dream of a new start free of debt. The most crying need is for the humble acknowledgment that human beings have no right to absolute possession of the earth or any part of it to do with as they wish: it is intended for a higher purpose —F.W.G.

Joseph, Simon J., “The Land is Mine” (Leviticus 25:23). Reimagining the Jubilee in the Context of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, in: *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 50, 2020, 180–190.

Abstract from OTA: The Jubilee tradition commemorates the release of slaves, the remission of debt, and the repatriation of property, a “day” of physical and spiritual restoration. The Jubilee tradition, which originated in a constitutional vision of ancient Israel periodically restoring its ancestral sovereignty as custodian of the land, became a master symbol of biblical theology, a powerful ideological resource as well as a

promise of a divinely realized future during the Second Temple period, when the Qumran community envisioned an eschatological Jubilee and the early Jesus tradition remembered Jesus's non-violence in Jubilee terms. Jubilee themes can be identified in ideals inscribed in the founding of America, the abolitionist movement, the women's liberation movement, the civil rights movement, and liberation theology. This study seeks to extend the exploration of Jubilee themes by adopting a comparative methodological approach, re-examining Jubilee themes in the context of the contemporary Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Where the dream of peace in the Middle East continues to play out in predominantly politicized contexts. [Adapted from published abstract–C.T.B.]

Dykesteen Nilsen, Tina, Ecology and Economy of SHMITTA (Exod 23,10-11; Leviticus 25,1-7; Deuteronomy 15,1-6). Biblical Texts and Contemporary Judaism, in: Zehnder, Markus; Hagelia, Hallvard (Hg.), The Bible and Money. Economy and Socioeconomic Ethics in the Bible (The Bible in the Modern World 76), Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2020, 314–336.

Abstract from OTA: The UN's sustainable development goals acknowledge the connections between ecology and social justice. However, such realizations are not new. My article focuses on the relationship between, on the one hand, ecological issues pertaining to agriculture and, on the other hand, economic issues of social justice. My article traces the understanding of such a relationship from biblical times until our own day in the laws of the *šēmittâ* (also known as the year of release, the seventh year, or the sabbatical year). The article's first part focuses on the relevant biblical texts, using literary analysis in particular to discern the nuanced stances taken regarding the *šēmittâ* in Exod 23:10-11; Lev 25:1-7; and Deut 15:1-6. The second part of the article shows how early and mediaeval Jewish writings received these biblical texts, particularly in terms of agricultural and economic legislation, separating ecology from the economy in so doing. The final part of the article discusses the reception of the biblical texts in question in Jewish green movements of our own time, analyzing how some of the main actors in these movements have revived *šēmittâ* and by doing so have revived the interconnections between ecology and the economy as well.

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

Démare-Lafont, Sophie, Unjust Law. Royal Rhetoric or Social Reality?, in: Graef, Katrien de; Goddeeris, Anne (Hg.), Law and (Dis)Order in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 59th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Held at Ghent, Belgium, 14-19 July 2013, University Park, Pennsylvania: Eisenbrauns, 2021, 48–60.

Abstract: Remaining in the late third and early second millennia, S. Démare-Lafont's treatment of "unjust laws" (ch. 5) within legal codes raises some important questions regarding economic imbalances caused by periodic *mīšarum* and *andurārum* edicts to cancel debts, usually thought to reflect progressive tools for achieving social equality. The harm caused to debtors and what measures were taken to counteract it is well documented in the article, but it also raises questions regarding how biblical Sabbatical and Jubilee Year debt forgiveness could have functioned in practice, if it ever did.

Watts, James W., Leviticus 25's History of Inspiring Freedom as a Moral Challenge to Literary-Historical Interpretation, in: Biblical Interpretation 30, 2022, 1-27.

Published abstract: Though Leviticus 25's description of the Jubilee sounds unrealistically utopian to many biblical scholars, the Jubilee ideal has stimulated many movements for freedom and economic reform in the last 500 years. It most famously motivated enslaved people to resist and abolitionists to challenge the institution of slavery. Today it continues to inspire reform movements for land redistribution and fair housing, for sovereign debt relief, and for developing environmentally sustainable economies. The contrast between scholarly assessments of the chapter's meaning in its literary and ancient historical contexts and its proven power to inspire movements for freedom that were unimaginable to its writers poses a moral challenge to the conventional methods of biblical scholarship. This article describes the Jubilee's ideological context in four historical settings: in Israel's ancient Middle Eastern political economy, in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century movement to abolish slavery, in contemporary movements for economic reform, and in modern biblical studies to explore how biblical scholars can credibly account for the chapter's historical and contemporary power to inspire mass freedom movements in their descriptions of the meaning of Leviticus 25.

Achenbach, Reinhard, „Von den Völkern rings um euch her sollt ihr einen Sklaven oder eine Sklavin nehmen!“ (Lev 25,44). Zur rechtlichen Stellung von Sklavinnen und Sklaven in Israel und seiner Umwelt, in: Fischer, Irmtraud; Feichtinger, Daniela (Hg.), *Sexualität und Sklaverei* (AOAT 456), Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2018, 141–171.

Nicolaides, Angelo; Onumah, Joseph Mensah, Restitution and Land Issues in South Africa: Biblical and Ethical considerations based on the Jubilee year in Leviticus 25, in: *Pharos Journal of Theology* 104, 2023, 1–17 (<https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.1042>).

Published abstract: The question of land is indeed a vexing one in contemporary South Africa. White control of land and the unequal distribution thereof was one of the pillars of the apartheid system. During colonial rule and under apartheid, numerous communities were simply expelled from their land. The Land Act of 1913 had a diabolical effect in dislocating communities and separated people from their traditional inheritance and from each other. Dispossession of land by its original inhabitants in waves of incessant forced removals proved to be highly distressing and ultimately led to enduring poverty for the masses. It is important in our predominantly Christian society to atone for past ills and to redress some of the ills relating to land which were in fact human rights abuses, by considering inter alia, Leviticus 25 as a starting point. Thus, a Christian stance is considered to be important from both a biblical and ethical perspective as land dispossession due to inhuman laws is addressed. We are stressing the fact that only in a liberating relationship with God can we consider and apply human rights and that in African thought social issues are viewed from a communitarian perspective in which the common good takes precedence.

Levitikus 26

Literatur

Hieke, Thomas, The Covenant in Leviticus 26: A Concept of Admonition and Redemption, in: Bautch, Richard J.; Knoppers, Gary N. (ed.), *Covenant in the Persian Period. From Genesis to Chronicles*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015, 75-89.

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: *Jian Dao* 44, 2015, 1–24.

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 Theologie 40), Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015, 186–218.

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 altorientalistischer 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.

Nihan, Christophe, Leviticus 26:39-46 and the Post-Priestly Composition of Leviticus. Some Remarks in Light of the Recent Discussion, in: Giuntoli, Federico; Schmid, Konrad (eds.), The Post-Priestly Pentateuch. New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 101), Tübingen 2015, 305–329.

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.

Kessler, John, Patterns of Descriptive Curse Formulae in the Hebrew Bible, with Special Attention to Leviticus 26 and Amos 4:6–12, in: Gertz, Jan C. et al. (eds.), The Formation of the Pentateuch (FAT 111), Tübingen 2016, 943–984.

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.]

Nihan, Christophe L., Ezekiel and the Holiness Legislation – A Plea for Nonlinear Models, in: Gertz, Jan C. et al. (eds.), The Formation of the Pentateuch (FAT 111), Tübingen 2016, 1015–1039.

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.]

Kopilovitz, Ariel, What Kind of Priestly Writings Did Ezekiel Know?, in: Gertz, Jan C. et al. (eds.), *The Formation of the Pentateuch (FAT 111)*, Tübingen 2016, 1041–1054.

Lyons, Michael A., How Have We Changed? – Older and Newer Arguments about the Relationship between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code, in: Gertz, Jan C. et al. (eds.), *The Formation of the Pentateuch (FAT 111)*, Tübingen 2016, 1055–1074.

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.]

Ganzel, Tova; Levitt Kohn, Risa, Ezekiel's Prophetic Message in Light of Leviticus 26, in: Gertz, Jan C. et al. (eds.), *The Formation of the Pentateuch (FAT 111)*, Tübingen 2016, 1075–1084.

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.]

Gunjević, Lidija, Jubilee in the Bible. Using the Theology of Jürgen Moltmann to Find a New Hermeneutic (Biblical Interpretation Series 156), Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Lyons, Michael A., Extension and Allusion: The Composition of Ezekiel 34, in: Tooman, William A.; Barter, Penelope (Hg.), Ezekiel. Current Debates and Future Directions (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 112), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 138–152. Abstract: M.A. Lyons argumentiert für eine literarische Abhängigkeitsrichtung von Lev 26 nach Ez 34, wobei er insbesondere die interpretierende Erweiterung als Argument für die Abhängigkeitsrichtung anführt. Er nimmt eine vierstufige Entstehung von Ez 34 an, wobei in jeder Stufe Lev 26 nach den gleichen hermeneutischen Prinzipien rezipiert worden ist. (s. Benjamin Kilchör, in: https://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/12238_13639.pdf)

Kilchör, Benjamin, Überlegungen zum Verhältnis zwischen Levitikus 26 und Ezechiel und die tempeltheologische Relevanz der Abhängigkeitsrichtung, ZAR 24, 2018, 295–306. Abstract: Der Artikel reflektiert einige jüngere Studien zum Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zwischen Lev 26 und Ezechiel. K. fokussiert dabei auch auf die Methodik und optiert schließlich für eine Abhängigkeitsrichtung von Lev 26 zu Ez 37.

Zehnder, Markus, Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. Some Observations on Their Relationship, in: Armgardt, Matthias; Kilchör, Benjamin; Zehnder, Markus (Hg.), Paradigm Change in Pentateuchal Research (BZAW 22), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2019, 115–175.

Abstract from OTA: The main results of this study can be summarized in the following way:

(1) The most salient finding generated by the lexical and structural analysis of Leviticus 26 concerns the passage's adversative use of the noun *qry*, which likely points to the early date of the places in which it is used. With respect to Deuteronomy 28, the complexity of its overall structure is remarkable and clearly distinguishes this text from Leviticus 26. The same goes for Deuteronomy's much more detailed references to developments following the activation of the curses (see Deuteronomy 29-31). In both cases, the observations made tend to suggest a chronological later dating of Deuteronomy 28(-31) vis-à-vis Leviticus 26.

(2) The investigation of the lexical and phraseological/syntactical connections between the two texts in question shows that there is considerable thematic overlap between them, while at the same time close lexical or phraseological connections are rare. My detailed observations in this regard do not allow us to draw any clear and specific conclusions in terms of a possible literary dependence between the two texts or their relative chronological sequence.

(3) The investigation of the lexical or phraseological/syntactical connections between Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 on the one hand and other biblical texts on the other shows that there are a large number of passages in the prophetic books that can, with a high degree of probability, be regarded as literarily dependent on either Leviticus 26 or Deuteronomy 28. The fact that many of these passages can also be dated with considerable confidence to the pre-exilic or early exilic period provides positive evidence that the corresponding passages in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 must be

still older. Regardless of the question of the direction of dependence between either Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 on the one hand and the other biblical texts on the other, the fact that the latter's intertextual links are to both of the former passages shows that neither of these was understood as replacing the other.

(4) As far as connections, both linguistic and topical, between the above two passages and extrabiblical materials are concerned, it turns out that several passages in both texts pertain to a chronological milieu that predates the Neo-Assyrian period. On the other hand, the direction of dependence between the biblical and extrabiblical materials cannot generally be established with certainty.

For many of the questions concerning the relationship between Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28(-31), only tentative answers can be given, often with a considerable degree of uncertainty. Broadly speaking, it is, however, likely that both texts are largely independent of each other. Direct lexical/idiomatic overlap between them is rare, and can best be explained in terms of their shared dependence on a wider curse tradition. However, there are signs that the author(s) of Deuteronomy 28 might have been familiar with Leviticus 26 or an earlier version of this text. On the basis of my study of the inner-biblical evidence and the extrabiblical comparative material, both passages, likely in their entirety, can be dated well before exile. [Adapted from the author's conclusion, pp. 171-72-C.T.B]

Weingart, Kristin, Die Verdopplung von רצה im Zusammenspiel von Auslegungsgeschichte und Lexikographie, in: *Biblische Notizen* 179, 2018, 59–68.

Published abstract: Many and also the most recent dictionaries like e.g. Gesenius¹⁸ list רצה I and רצה II and propose the translation “to pay / redeem” for רצה II. The latter is said to be attested in Lev 26:34, 41, 43; Isa 40:2; Job 20:10, and 2 Chr 36:21. The paper argues that the assumption of a root רצה II is not necessary. It does not result from lexicographic evidence but was rather prompted by a specific understanding of Lev 26 rooted in theological presuppositions.

Assessment: Die Argumentation von K. Weingart ist für Lev 26,34.41.43 weniger überzeugend, da sie keinen konkreten Übersetzungsvorschlag macht. Die Ausführungen zu Lev 26,34.41.43 sind im Wesentlichen nachvollziehbar. Allerdings stellt sich die Frage, ob das „Annehmen“ der „Schuld“ im Sinne des Akzeptierens des Reinigungsgerichts JHWHs nicht doch auch eine Aktion des „Bezahlens“ (EÜ: Genugtuung leisten) impliziert: Mit der bloßen „Annahme“ ist es ja doch nicht getan bzw. findet die Annahme der Schuld ihren Ausdruck im Ableisten derselben. Damit wird aber die Grundbedeutung von רצה (I) so stark erweitert, dass es nicht abwegig erscheint, lexikographisch eine „zweite Wurzel“ anzunehmen. Man müsste dann die lexikographische Kriterien diskutieren: Wo liegt die Schwelle zur Annahme einer zweiten Wurzel?

Groß, Walter, Bundestheologie im Wandel, in: Könemann, Judith; Seewald, Michael (Hg.), *Wandel als Thema religiöser Selbstdeutung. Perspektiven aus Judentum, Christentum und Islam* (QD 310), Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 2021, 39–63.

Zehnder, Markus, The Promise Section in Leviticus 26:3-13: Structural Observations and Consequences for the Interpretation, in: *Biblische Notizen* 188, 2021, 51–62.

Allgood, Andrea, A Sinful People, an Angry Deity, and a Nauseated Land: A Triadic Relationship in the Hebrew Bible through the Lens of Land Defilement, in: Lemos, T.M.; Rosenblum, Jordan; Stern, Karen B.; Ballentine, Debra Scoggins (eds.), *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal. Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 42), Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2021, 221–234.

Himbaza, Innocent, Leviticus 26:6 in the Mur/HevLev Manuscript, in: *Revue de Qumran* 31, 2019, 145–152.

Abstract from OTA: MS4611 from the Schøyen Collection (designated since its first publication by É. Puech in 2003 as XLev^c, 4QLevⁱ, 4Q26c), has recently been republished by T. Elgvin, who notes that it contains Lev 26:3-9, 33-37 in 2 columns, with three variants as compared to the MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the LXX, including, in Col. I, 5, a hitherto unknown textual variant in Lev 26:6: *whš^o dt^o* reflecting *whšmdty* where LXX = ἀπολω̄; 4QLXXLev^a [α]πολω̄; and MT and SP = *whšbty*. H. corroborates Elgvin's reading of *whš^o dt^o* as *whšmdty* ("I will exterminate") and asks whether the reading reflects the *Vorlage* of LXX's ἀπολω̄. On the basis of literary considerations, H. concludes that the Greek translator read the MT's *whšbty* and that the LXX reading *whšmdty* derives from an assimilation to the same verb in Lev 26:30.—G.Y.G.

Müller-Kessler, Christa, Unparalleled Variant Readings for Leviticus 26:26b-44 and Numbers 4:15b–5:6a in an Early Christian Palestinian Aramaic Palimpsest from St. Catherine's Monastery (Greek NF M 167), in: *Revue Biblique* 128, 2021, 354–370.

Abstract from OTA: One palimpsest bifolio deriving from shelf number Greek NF M 167 was published in a poorly readable black and white photo in 1980 and again in 1981, together with other manuscript samples of the so-called "New Finds" discovered in a secluded storage room in the St. George Tower at St. Catherine's Monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai. Hitherto, it is not been possible to identify the underlying Christian Palestinian Aramaic text of the palimpsest, written in uncial letters and dating to the 6th century, which was overwritten by a Greek Menaion of the 11th century. In this article, I propose that the former text features unparalleled textual readings for Lev 26:26b-44 and Num 4:15b–5:6a that stem from a lost Greek witness. [Adapted from published abstract—C.T.B.]

Nihan, Christophe, The Holiness Legislation and the Pentateuch: Tradition- and Composition-Historical Aspects of Leviticus 26, in: Hartenstein, Friedhelm; Schmid, Konrad (eds.), *Farewell to the Priestly Writing? The Current State of the Debate* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature, 38), Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2022, 193–233.

Review by Reinhard Achenbach (in: *Review of Biblical Literature* 04/2023): In "The Holiness Legislation and the Pentateuch: Tradition- and Composition-Historical Aspects of Leviticus 26" (193–233), Christophe Nihan presents a detailed analysis of text of promise and threat at the end of the Holiness Code. It is part of a speech of YHWH on Mount Sinai (Lev 25:126:46) as an "oracle to Moses that interprets the history of Israel from the perspective of the alternative between torah observance or non-observance" (202). In Lev 26:1–2 a combined reception of the Decalogue (Exod 20:4a) and Lev 19:4, 30 can be observed. Leviticus 26:4–13 contains references to the covenant theology of P (cf. Gen 17:19b and Lev 26:9) and the prophetic

announcement of a covenant of peace (Ezek 34:25–29; 37:25–29). The threats in Lev 26:14–46 take up wordings and motifs from Deut 28 and also from Ezekiel (cf., e.g., Lev 26:27–33 and Ezek 5:2, 12, 14; 6:3bβ–5a). The concept that the land can be restored only after the exile, after it enjoys its Sabbaths (Lev 26:34–36), refers to the law of the Sabbath Year (Lev 25:2–7). Leviticus 26:39–40 takes up the wording of Ezek 4:17 and 33:10, but, pointing out that the Israelites will “rot” because of their own guilt as well as of the guilt of the fathers, the text “implies a correction of Ezek 18” (217). Leviticus 26:42–45 integrates elements of Priestly covenant theology and the non-Priestly theology of a Sinai covenant and already presupposes the redactional integration of both. The reception of prophetic texts “acknowledges the authority of these prophets but at the same time attempts to subordinate them under the authority of Moses as the first prophet” (229). This seems to coincide with the end of the Pentateuch (Deut 34:10–12), but Nihan, however, tends to see Lev 26 as part of a “Leviticus redaction” in a post-Priestly Pentateuch.

Levitikus 27

Literatur

Younger, K. Lawson, Some Recent Discussion on the Hērem, in: Burns, Duncan; Rogerson, John W. (ed.), *Far From Minimal. Celebrating the Work and Influence of Philip R. Davies* (T & T Clark Library of Biblical Studies 484), London 2012, 505–522.

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

Gordon, Benjamin D., The Misunderstood Redemption Fee in the Holiness Legislation on Dedications: ZAW 126, 2014, 180–192.

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 renegeing 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.

Taggar-Cohen, Ada, Between Herem, Ownership, and Ritual. Biblical and Hittite Perspectives, 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, 419–434.

Hattingh, A. J. K.; Meyer, Esias E., “Devoted to Destruction”. A Case of Human Sacrifice in Leviticus 27?, in: *Journal for Semitics* 25, 2016, 630–657.

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.

Hofreiter, Christian, *Making Sense of Old Testament Genocide. Christian Interpretations of Herem Passages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Rezeptionsgeschichte

Judentum

Krochmalnik, Daniel, *Schriftauslegung. Die Bücher Levitikus, Numeri, Deuteronomium im Judentum (NSK-AT 33/5)*, Stuttgart 2003.

Krochmalnik, Daniel, *Kadosch. Das Heilige im Buch Levitikus und in der jüdischen Tradition: BiKi 69*, 2014, 80–85.

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.

Avioz, Michael, *The Book of Leviticus in Josephus' Writings*, in: *Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 227–242.

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.

Steyn, Gert J., *The Text Form of the Leviticus Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles*, in: *Himbaza, Innocent (ed.), The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015) (OBO 292)*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020, 205–225.

Origenes, *Die Homilien zum Buch Levitikus. Eingeleitet und übersetzt von Agnethe Siquans (Origenes Werke mit deutscher Übersetzung 3)*, Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 2021. Published abstract: Das Buch Levitikus mit seinen zahlreichen Vorschriften für Opfer und Kult war und ist für christliche Leser/-innen oft schwer zugänglich. In seinen Homilien zu Levitikus legt Origenes dieses Buch aus einer christlichen Perspektive

aus. Er sucht einen Zugang zu den vielfach als veraltet angesehenen kultischen Geboten auf spiritueller Ebene und erschließt so die Texte für seine Hörerschaft und ihr religiöses Leben. – With its numerous rules for sacrifice and worship, the Book of Leviticus was and is still difficult for many Christian readers to understand. In his homilies on Leviticus, Origen interprets this book from a Christian point of view. He searches for a way to understand the ritual commands, frequently viewed as obsolete, on a spiritual level, opening up the texts to his listeners and their religious lives.