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with the Sinaitic covenant—in Ezekiel becomes an everlasting (i.e., unconditional) covenant (Ezek 34:26–30; see 37:26, and the discussion in Greenberg 1985: 291, 303–4).

Another indication that H is fully aware of the Sinaitic covenant is its artful interpretation of the Decalogue in structuring its message. For example, the original core of chap. 19 (Schwartz 1987: 120–23) consists of an inclusio (vv. 3–4, 30–32) based on commandments 1, 2, 4, 5, but nearly in reverse order 5, 4, 1, 2 in vv. 3–4 (parents, sabbath, idolatry, images) and chiastically 4, 2, 5, 1 in vv. 30–32 (sabbath, images [mediums], parents [elders], YHWH only). In the present MT, the appendix vv. 33–36 (Schwartz 1987: 120–23 see INTRODUCTION to chap. 19) ends with a restatement of the Decalogue’s prologue (Exod 20:2), thereby forming an inclusio with v. 2b. Thus the H trident responsible for the appendix was aware that chap. 19, which he had before him, contained an inclusio based on the Decalogue (vv. 3–4, 30–32). He therefore decided to give his expanded chap. 19 (including vv. 33–36) the form of the Decalogue by basing the inclusio on the prologue to the Decalogue. The Decalogue, however, is secondary to the content of chap. 19. That is, the God who freed Israel from Egypt (v. 36b) is also the holy God who can and should be emulated by his people through their fulfillment of the Decalogue as well as the additional duties enjoined upon Israel in this chapter (see further NOTE on 19:2aβ, b).

That the fifth and fourth commandments were chosen to head chap. 19’s list (in that order) may reflect an attempt to show that ethics (respect for parents) and ritual (sabbath observance) are of equal importance, with a nod in favor of ethics. As to why the third commandment (šāw’ vain oath) was omitted from the inclusio, the reason is perhaps due to the author’s decision to place a lying (šēqer) oath into the pericope where he needed it, namely, in his supplement to 5:20–26 (19:11–12; see their NOTES). Alternatively, and preferably, H may have chosen commandments that deal with group (national) rather than individual wrongs (see below).

The comparison of 25:55b–26:2 with Exod 20 and Lev 19 (see also INTRODUCTION to 26:1–2, TABLES) shows that the former is a rephrasing of commandments 1, 2, and 4 of the Decalogue. The author, whom I identify as the exilic H trident and reductor (Hₚ), bypassed the commandments that relate to individual behavior (3, 5, 6–10) in favor of the three commandments that, I maintain, are the determinants of Israel’s existence and, hence, appropriate as a prolepsis of the curses (vv. 26:14–25) that follow.

This trident (Hₚ) did not want the term šabbāt limited to the septennate (26:34–35, 43). He therefore added the weekly sabbath (26:2)—simply by quoting 19:30—so that Israel’s exile would be extended by an additional ninety years (see the calculation and discussion in INTRODUCTION to 26:1–2). The content of 26:1–2—it’s stress on idolatry, rather than H’s specification of sexual violations (18:24–30; 20:22), as the cause of Israel’s exile; the use of maskit, a late term (Num 35:42; Ezek 8:12); and the reference to the septennate (26:34–35, 43, exilic passages)—lead inexorably to the conclusion that 26:1–2 is also of exilic provenance. This conclusion is buttressed by the absence of any mention of idolatry in all of H (except for the Molek), a sign that 26:1–2 stems from a period later than the eighth century—the main provenance of H.

Thus 25:55b–26:2 (Hₚ) sums up in a condensed form the divine laws determinative of Israel’s (return to and) continuous presence on its land by selecting and rephrasing three commandments of the Decalogue: exclusive adherence to YHWH, his aniconic worship, and the sabbath observance. Since Hₚ is interested in only national factors of Israel’s destiny, he cites 19:30 as his support text for the sabbath (rather than 19:3), because it includes another national factor: reverence for the sanctuary (i.e., the cult).

In sum, Hₚ, the reductor, is heir to four covenantal traditions: two patriarchal (Gen 15 [JE]; 17[P]) and two Sinaitic (Exod 19–24 [JE]; Lev 9[P]). Whereas the early priestly tradition (P) contains no verbal revelation (like the Decalogue) and ratification ceremony, but only YHWH’s acceptance of the priestly service by incinerating the inaugural sacrifices (Lev 9:24), the later priestly redaction (Hₚ) incorporates the texts of both covenants of the epic source (Gen 15; Exod 19–24) alongside its own priestly tradition (Gen 17; Lev 9). In effect, we are witnessing the formation of the pentateuchal canon (see II R).

G. HOLINESS

The topic of holiness is discussed at length in the COMMENT to chap. 19, but it is limited to examples taken from that chapter. What follows here are introductory remarks omitted in the COMMENT and some illustrations from other chapters in H.

From a broader perspective, the theme of the entire book of Leviticus is holiness. Chapters 1–10 deal with the sanctuary service; 11–16, with the purification for access to the sanctuary; 17, with blood on the altar; 18–22, with how Israel can attain and priests retain holiness and how sexual violations and ancestor worship defile the sanctuary and the land; 23, with the sanctification of time; 24, with Israel’s upkeep of the sanctuary and the desecration of YHWH’s holy name; 25, with the laws of the “holy” land; 26, with how breaking the covenant causes God’s abandonment of his sanctuaries leading to Israel’s exile; and 27, with the laws of consecrations.

H’s main distinction from P is that P restricts holiness to sanctified persons (priests) and places (sanctuaries), whereas H extends holiness in both its aspects to persons, the entire people of Israel, and to places, the entire promised (YHWH’s) land (see II A). Moreover, his holiness is dynamic: Israel must attain it (19:2; 21:8 LXX; 22:32; see their NOTES), and priests must sustain it (21:15; 22:16; see their NOTES).

Israel is enjoined to be holy because YHWH is holy (19:2). This does not mean that Israel can achieve or even imitate YHWH’s holiness. There is an unbridgeable gap between them. Holiness implies separation, distinction (see COMMENT on chap. 19). In the priestly texts, the Masoretes consistently and metic-
ulously distinguish between divine and human (Israelite, priestly, Nazirite) holiness. When holy refers to God, it is written plene, qedōš (six times); referring to Israel, it is defective, qedōš (ten times). Note the following parade examples:

\[\text{hiyittem qedōšim ki qedōš \ 'anī (11:44, 45)}\]
\[\text{qedōšim tiyū ki qedōš \ 'anī YHWH (19:2)}\]
\[\text{hiyittem li qedōšim ki qedōš \ 'anī YHWH (20:7)}\]
\[\text{qedōš yihyeh-lak ki qedōš \ 'anī YHWH (21:8)}\]

But, when the prescriptions (for holiness) in chap. 19 are examined, though most of them are negative (approximately thirty), many are positive (approximately fourteen). In this latter sense, holiness implies imitatio dei, namely, Israel should emulate God by living a godly life. Observance of the divine commandments leads to God’s attribute of holiness, but not to the same degree—not to God, but to godliness. Just as the priests, who are innately holy, are qualified to enter into God’s presence in the sanctuary, so Israel, by following all YHWH’s commandments (19:37), can attain holiness (19:2) and qualify for admission metaphorically into the providence (i.e., the presence and protection) of God.

Nonetheless, when one examines the holiness contexts outside chap. 19, they are nearly all negative. That is, Israel’s separation from God has to be emulated by Israel’s separation from other peoples. This is explicitly stated in 20:24–25. As YHWH has separated (hībdīl) Israel from the nations, so Israel must separate itself from them by its dietary system (see also the context of 11:43–45). Conversely, observing the dietary laws will ipso facto keep Israel from intermingling with others. The necessity to keep apart from the neighboring peoples is spelled out in chaps. 18 and 20. Incest and other sexual abominations attributed to Egypt and Canaan are defiling to Israel and to the land and lead to kārēt for their indulgers and exile for the people (18:24–30; see the reservations in NOTES on 18:3).

Mary Douglas (1999: 35) defines purity as “adequately segregated.” This can also serve as a definition of holiness. Indeed, both purity and holiness have to be carved out of areas of the impure and the profane, respectively, and they must be safeguarded (segregated) against incursions of the ever virulent impurity. The two priestly traditions, P and H, differ in that H ascribes a dynamic quality to holiness, which counters the aggressive, malevolent force of impurity and empowers it to advance on and reduce the area and control of impurity (see the diagram and its detailed explanation in COMMENT, chap. 19). Thus the notion of segregation (or separation) bridges the two major systems in Leviticus, P’s purity (chaps. 11–16) and H’s holiness (constellated in chaps. 19–22 and passim). To be sure, since all these qualities in H’s monotheistic thought are inert, they possess no intrinsic power. They can be activated only by human deeds. Israel’s sins generate impurity, but it can be transmuted into the pure by purificatory rituals. YHWH has bestowed upon Israel an additional power. It can transmute the pure (and the profane) by observing the divine commandments.

Selected examples of holiness not discussed in the COMMENT to chap. 19 are the following:

1. The only sanctums available to Israel are the meat of the well-being offering (šēlōmim; 7:11–21; 19:5–8; 22:29–30) and the use of YHWH’s name (e.g., in oaths). Desecration is caused by eating sacrificial portions in a state of impurity (7:20–21; cf. 22:3–7), swearing a false oath (19:12), worshiping ancestors (20:1–6; see their NOTES), and faulty sacrificial procedures (see NOTE on 22:32). These rules hold for priests as well as Israelites. The result is the loss of whatever holiness the Israelite has attained or the priest has inherited. Worse of all, in H there is neither remedy nor expiation for this indiscretion.

I have argued that 22:24–25 comprises a single taboo on animals with defective genitals intended for the altar: animals brought to the altar (v. 24a), animals in the land (v. 24b), and imported animals (v. 25). Thus gelded animals and castrated priests are barred from the altar, but not from the land. Moreover, a sanctuary could own gelded beasts of burden, castrated priests could benefit from the sacrifices (21:22), and castrated Israelites could enter the sanctuary to present their sacrifices. Perhaps this implied stance of H influenced the reversal of D’s edict barring castrated Israelites from “entering the congregation of YHWH” (Deut 23:12) in the prophecy of Isaiah of the exile (Isa 56:3–5). Thus H compromises its rigid stance on the “holy land” and allows for the gelding of the flocks and herds so essential for better-quality meat, manageable beasts of burden, and the production of wool (Wapnish and Hesse 1991: 34–35).

2. As Israel sanctifies the sabbath by abstaining from work (Exod 20:8–9; Deut 5:12–14; Jer 17:22, 24), so Israel is commanded to sanctify every fiftieth year (Lev 25:1–12). In both cases, qiddēš (Pi’el) is used, but for the sabbath it means “treat as holy.” The jubilee, in contrast, is sanctified by the positive act of proclamation by the blowing of a shofar—a rite of sanctification.

3. The doctrine of the “holy land,” though not explicitly stated in Scripture, is implied (cf. Exod 15:17; Isa 11:9; 57:13; Jer 31:23; Ps 78:54). But H, which in legislation extends P’s sacred sphere from the sanctuary to the land, never calls the land “holy.” There are two basic theological reasons. The first is the implication that holiness inheres in nature, a notion that monotheistic H implicitly rejects (see NOTE on “do not desecrate the name of your God,” 18:21). As pointed out by Joosten (1996: 176, 169, n. 1), H refrains from using expressions like ‘eres/admatnahalat YHWH, though they are found elsewhere, “lest it be inferred that there was a natural relationship between YHWH and the land.” Secondly, since YHWH is the owner of the land (25:23), the “holiness” of the land is but a reflection of YHWH’s holiness, and it is palpable in the land only when Israel fulfills his commandments (see NOTES on 26:11–12).

4. Inherited land must revert to the owner at the jubilee. If he consecrates (or sells) its usufruct, he, in effect, leases the land until the jubilee. Only if he consecrates the land after selling it (27:20) is he indicating that he does not want the land back, and the land then becomes sanctuary property after the jubilee. The basic postulate is that the sanctuary takes no priority over the landowner. Inherited land always reverts to the owner except if by word (27:28).
or act (27:20–21) he consecrates his land (and not just its usufruct) to the sanctuary.

Perhaps this is the priestly response to the condemnation by the eighth-century prophets of the growing latitudina of the time, both by avaricious creditors (e.g., Isa 5:8–10; Mic 2:1–2) and by covetous priests, who might have looked enviously at the vast land tracts owned by their counterparts in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Thus H devised the jubilee system whereby the status quo ante concerning the land would be restored and indentured Israelites would be released (25:8–43). Also, H made consecrated land subject to the jubilee so that priests could not participate in the land-grabbing practices of their priestly neighbors.

H. Ethics

P's ethics—rather, its alleged absence—have been discussed in vol. I. 21–26 (see also APPENDIX C). H's ethics are touched on in the pericopes on the resident alien (II N), women's rights (II L), democratization (II L), the jubilee (II K), holiness (II G), and the rationales (II B). Here, two topics will be treated: H's postulate (implied) that ethics rank equally with ritual, and H's concern for the underprivileged and helpless. The examples are culled from chap. 19 and 25.

The bonding of ethics and ritual is not unique to Israel. It abounds in Mesopotamia—for example, Surpu, tablet II (Reiner 1958; for the text, see vol. I.21–23), the Bilingual Hymn to Nanurta, II. 3–7 (Lambert 1960: 119), the Nanhsh Hymn, II. 136–71 (Heimpel 1981: 90–93)—and is exemplified in Egypt's sacral sphere by an inscription on a door of the temple of Edfu (Weinfeld 1982a: 233–35; for the text, see APPENDIX C). What, however, is unique to Israel—rather, to H—is the subsumation of ethics in addition to rituals under the rubric of holiness. All the pentateuchal codes raise the issue of holiness. Here, H takes a giant step forward. Other codes restrict holiness to ritual commandments (abstention from sabbath labor, Exod 20:8–11 [JE]; Deut 5:12–15 [D]; eating carcasses, Exod 22:30 [JE]; Deut 14:21 [D]; idolatry and mourning rites, Deut 7:5–6 and 14:1–2 [D]), whereas H lists ethical prescriptions alongside rituals as determinants of holiness. H also differs from the prophets, but in the other direction. The prophets rank ethics as supreme. YHWH's holiness is characterized mainly by ethics: wayyiqrah YHWH šēḇāʾt bammīśpat wēhāʾel haqqāḏos nīqḏos bīṣdqāq YHWH OF HOSTS is exalted by justice and the holy God is shown holy by his righteousness' (Isa 5:16); indeed, for some of the prophets, Israel's national destiny is determined exclusively by its ethical behavior (Kaufmann 1947: 376–79; 1960: 365–67). H, however, insists on the equal and inseparable role of ritual in the prescription for the holy life. Possibly, the fourth and fifth commandments of the Decalogue (sabbath and parents) were chosen to head the list of the prescriptions of holiness (19:3), even ahead of the first and second commandments (19:4), in order to illustrate from the start that ethics (respect for parents) and ritual (sabbath observance) are of equal importance.

Note that 19:9–18 deal exclusively with ethical prescriptions (see also vv. 29, 32, 33–34, 35–36).

H's concern for the underprivileged and helpless is exemplified not only by its numerous citations of them, but also by its formulaic and lexical characteristics. A number of examples should suffice. The closure of nearly every prescription in chap. 19 is 'āni YHWH 'ēloṣēkem 'ı YHWH your God (have spoken'). This formula is explicitly defined at the opening of the chapter by the addition of the word qāḏōs 'holy': qāḏōs 'ǎn YHWH 'ēloṣēkem 'ı YHWH your God am holy' (v. 2). Hence anyone who disobeys YHWH's injunctions concerning the care of the underprivileged and the alien is desecrating YHWH's holiness. Similarly, chap. 25 resorts to this formula to close its major units (vv. 17, 38, 55) and uses exhortative admonitions as an inclusio: lōʾ tōnā 'do not cheat/l oppress' (vv. 14, 17); lōʾ tirdeh bō bēpērek 'do not rule over him with harshness' (vv. 43a, 46bβ). Both chapters also utilize the closing formula wēyārē tā meʾēloṣēkā 'you shall fear your God' (19:14; 32; 25:17, 36, 43). Is it no accident that this formula is attached to those prescriptions where the handicapped are the most vulnerable (the deaf and blind, elders, the indentured servant)? Their case cannot be adjudicated in a human court, but YHWH has witnessed the exploitation and will prosecute.

H also has a penchant for generalizations (in contrast to P, see I D). Thus the injunction "do not curse (tēqallēl) a deaf person, and before a blind person do not place a stumbling block (mīkōl)" (v. 14) cannot be taken literally; rather, "deaf" and "blind" are metonyms for all the helpless, and "curse" and "stumbling block" stand for abuse and harm, respectively. The full importance of this injunction is that though the deaf does not know who insulted him or the blind who hurt him, God knows and he will punish accordingly. In contrast to the codes of the ancient Near East, in which only verifiable injury or loss is adjudicable, Israel's law has moved beyond them to ethical laws under the surveillance of a caring God (D. Stewart).

To be sure, concern for the underprivileged—the poor, the widow, the orphan, and the alien—is consistently reiterated throughout Scripture (Exod 22:20–23; Lev 19:9–10, 13, 33–34; Deut 15:18–19; 24:14; 17; 27:15; Jer 7:6; 22:3; Zech 7:10). The prophets repeatedly rail against their neglect and exploitation (Isa 1:17, 23; 3:14–15; 10:2; Jer 5:8; Ezek 16:49; 18:17; 22:7, 29; Amos 8:4; Mal 3:5; cf. Ps 82:3; 94:6). H differs from them in going beyond outcries and imporations. It legislates concrete measures in order to prevent their impoverishment (see the jubilee laws, II K).

Ostensibly, H has no concern for the needy persons listed above since they are not mentioned in H, except for a single law affirming the indigent's rights to the "leftovers" of the harvest (19:9–10; repeated in 23:22). But it must be borne in mind that H discards empty implorations and focuses on concrete efficacious measures. H, moreover, is mainly the product of the eighth century, when family ties were strong and the patriarchal structure was still in place. The widow and orphan would be the charge of the nearest relative of the deceased (gōʾēl; see Ruth 3:13; 4:4). The alien (gēr) would be the responsibility of the
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owner of the land on which he resided (25:6), and the Levites were in most part employed in the flourishing regional sanctuaries throughout the land (but see II Q).

The eighth century was characterized by national prosperity, which brought in its wake urbanization, latifundia, and other social injustices decreed by the prophets (cited above) and solved (in theory) by the priestly H (see the jubilee laws, II K). In the main, however, every poor Judahite belonged to some household (bêt 'ab) or, if that was wanting, to a kin group (bêt 'abôt, mispâhâ). The situation changed rapidly for the worse when Judah was inundated by hordes of landless, destitute Northern refugees, among whom the widow, orphan, alien, and Levite abounded.

The paucity of references to the poor in H (a single verse and its copy, 19:10; 23:22) should not be misjudged. On the one hand, despite D's plethora of references to the gifts from the produce for the orphan and the widow, namely, of tithes (Deut 14:29; 26:12, 13), of the harvest (Deut 24:19–21), and of the Festivals of Weeks and Booths (Deut 16:11, 14), the poor are excluded from these gifts and, instead, Israel is exhorted to grant them interest-free loans (Deut 15:7–11; 23:20–21; 24:10–13; cf. Exod 22:24–26 [JE]), the assumption being that the poor can work off their debts but the orphan and widow cannot. H, on the other hand, does not discriminate between these groups. As long as they are poor, they are entitled to glean from the crops; they need not depend on the unpredictable beneficence of the rich (but see my reservations, II Q).

The refinement and sensitivity of H's concerns toward the helpless can be illustrated by the following examples:

1. lô 'a'amôd al-dam reêkâ 'You shall not stand aloof by the blood of your fellow' (19:16b). If this rendering is correct, then it is not permitted to remain on the sidelines of one's endangered fellow. The rabbi correctly infer, "If one sees someone drowning, mauled by beasts, or attacked by robbers, one is obligated to save him, but not at the risk of one's life" (b. Sanh. 73a). In H's court, the "silent majority" would be guilty.

Not surprisingly—though I was surprised when I realized it—a similar ethical law derives from P's concept of sin: the inadvertent sinner also pollutes the sanctuary and must "repair" the damage by an appropriate purification (hattâ't offering (vol. 1.254–61). Nonetheless, it should be clear that H has raised the culpability to unparalleled heights. It includes not only unintentionality but also passivity, a nonexistent category, as far as I can tell, in world jurisprudence, both late and modern.

2. The structured sequence in Lev 19:17–18 clearly addresses the needs of the helpless.

19:17

Prohibition: You shall not hate your kinsperson in your heart;
Remedy: Reprove your fellow openly,
Rationale: so that you will not bear punishment because of him.

19:18

Prohibition: Rather you shall not take revenge or nurse a grudge against members of your people.
Remedy: You shall love your fellow as yourself.
Rationale: I YHWH (have spoken).

These two verses form parallel panels (Schwartz 1987: 145), which may aid in discerning the intent of the author. For example, the remedy for taking revenge and nursing a grudge is extending love (for the meaning of love, see below). The ethical emphasis here is on thought, the perils of which were sensitively apprehended by the rabbis who declare that sinâ'at hinâm 'causeless hatred' was responsible for the destruction of the Second Temple (b. Yoma 9b).

3. The verb 'âhâb 'love' (19:18) signifies not only an emotion or attitude, but also deeds. Such is its meaning in suzerainty treaties (Moran 1963) and elsewhere (see note). The medieval exeges comes to the same conclusion by noting that 'âhâb takes the preposition le, which they render as "for," that is, do good as you would do for yourself. Indeed, all four attestations of 'âhâb le (19:18, 34; 1 Kgs 5:15; 2 Chr 19:2) imply doing, not feeling (Malamat 1963).

4. That the injunction to love the alien "as yourself" (19:34) is the exact counterpart of "you shall love your fellow as yourself" (19:18) is shown by the switch to the singular wê 'âhâbâtî within a plural context and by the use of the dative lô, which matches lêrê açâ. This, arguably, is the ethical stratum not only in this chapter, but in all of Scripture.

5. The theological innovation of H's law of redemption is that YHWH is the ultimate redeemer (25:24; see the jubilee laws, II K). If indebtedness causes the sale of any of YHWH's land, the nearest kinsperson is obligated to redeem it and return it to the owner. He may retain it only to cover his costs, but by the unilateral decree of the divine owner, he must return it to the human owner at the jubilee. Here, H has broken with the hoary institution of clan ownership of property (cf. Jer 32). Henceforth, the concern of the law is to guarantee property rights for the individual.

Ethical concerns are also visible in the sale of city houses, which (in distinction to farmhouses) are not subject to the law of the jubilee (for the rationale, see the jubilee laws, II K). Why, then, allow their redemption even for one year (25:29)? Here we touch on the merciful foundations of the jubilee legislation. No differently from the destitute farmer (25:25), the urbanite may have been driven by economic constraints to sell his home. Hence for a short time, no more than a year, an opportunity is granted to him (and his kin group) to regain his holding.

6. Do not charge the Israelite debtor interest as if he were a resident alien (25:35; see NOTES). This constitutes a reversal of antichresis prevalent elsewhere. In this way, whatever the debtor earns amortizes the principal in addition to supporting his family. If his destitution forces him to become an indentured servant, his status is that of a hireling, not a slave. He may not be treated "harshly"
I. LAND

Joosten's (1996: 137–92) discussion of "land" is the centerpiece of his book. Among his many well-argued points is his convincing demonstration that H predicates an Israel in control of its land. For example, it can impose its laws on the gēr (II N), issue prohibitions on food and sex (10–21, 25), prescribe the release of Israelite debt-servants at the jubilee (25:39–43), and impose the death penalty (20:9–16; 24:23). The conclusion is inescapable that H is preexilic (see I J).

Rather than repeating what he says so excellently, I would offer a few corrections and add a few comments of my own.

1. I differ with Joosten on one of his cardinal positions. He (1996: 189, 92) claims that the "land is YHWH's because his sanctuary is located there, and after the expulsion of the Israelites (26:33–34), YHWH will no longer dwell in the land, for his sanctuary will have been destroyed" (26:31). If so, by what right did YHWH have the land expel the Canaanites for polluting the land (18:24–30)—unless the land was already his! Besides, the epic (JE) Song of the Sea expressly states that "you brought them and planted them in the mountain of your inheritance" (Exod 15:17a; cf. Ps 78:54). Again, the land must have been YHWH's even before Israel's arrival. Thus, YHWH chose this land as the future residence of Israel, a grant not abrogated even if Israel would be expelled from it (see 26:40).  

2. That sexual violations (among others) pollute the land is expressly stated by D (Deut 24:1–4; cf. Jer 3:1–10). But only H states that the punishment is inexorably exile (18:24–28; 20:22–23). H's concept of pollution is noncultural, but it is real. Indeed, it is more devastating than P's cultic impurity: it is nonexpiable (see II O). Nonetheless, the polluted land must be cleansed. When the entire earth was polluted in Noah's time, it was cleansed by a flood. Presumably, Israel's polluted land is purified by time. This can be deduced from the explicit statements that the land must be allowed to make up for the sabbaths that Israel has failed to observe (26:34–35; for the nuanced difference, see NOTE on 26:43–44).

3. Israel's possession of the land is called nahālā 'inheritance' in D, ḥuzza 'holding' in H, and both in P. H insists on calling the land YHWH's and Israel its gērīm 'alien residents, tenants' (25:23); hence, H eschews the term nahālā which implies permanent possession.

4. All of H's laws, though given to Israel in the wilderness, are intended to be operative in the land. According to Joosten (1996: 139), four laws are laid down for life in the wilderness camp: blood disposal (chap. 17), the menora oil (24:1–4), the bread of presence (24:5–9), and blasphemy/talion (24:10–23). That all four laws are expected to be in force in the land is indicated by the term hōq/huqqat 'olām in the first three, and since the blasphemy incident gives rise to a series of talion laws (24:15–22), permanence is obviously intended. Joosten, however, overlooks the law of Num 5:1–3 (H), which states that the corpse-contaminated (tāmē' lānepeš), the scale-diseased (sārūμ), and the genitalily diseased (zāḇ) must be sent out of the camp. This omission is important because it undermines his claim that the camp is a paradigm for the land. Those persons might have been expelled from the city (as in the explicit case of the sārūμ, e.g., 2 Kgs 7:3), but certainly not from the land. In fact, Num 5:1–3 indicates that the camp is a paradigm of the city (see also 14:45).

5. Israel and its land belong to YHWH. Of Israel, YHWH declares 'āḇāday hēm 'they are my slaves' (25:42) and of the land YHWH declares kt-lt hā'ares 'for the land is mine' (25:23). Neither can be sold, but only leased. The buyer purchases only the usufruct of the field or the labor of the "slave" calculated as a yearly wage. Even then, the buyer's hold on the purchased land or slave is limited. The land and slave are subject to the laws of redemption and jubilee. The purchase price is calculated according to the years remaining until the jubilee (see the jubilee and redemption laws, chap. 25). The relationship of consecrated land to the jubilee is discussed in II G, and a résumé on the jubilee laws is given in II K, with details in chap. 25, COMMENTS A–B.

J. SABBATH AND SABBATICAL

The sabbath, the sabbatical, and the Day of Purgation are the only times designated by the superlative sāḥḥat sāḥbātōn, literally 'a most restful rest' (Exod 31:15; 35:2; Lev 23:3; 25:4; 16:31; 23:32 [all H]), when the total cessation from kol-mēlā'kā 'all labor' is enjoined.

The sabbath is the only ritual observance commanded in the Decalogue (Exod 20:8–11) and the only commandment grounded in creation (Exod 20:11; cf. 31:17). It is a miqra' qōdēs 'sacred occasion' (Lev 23:3), literally 'a proclamation of holiness'. Normally, the phrase would be followed by yihye lekhem 'it shall be for you' (cf. 23:21, 24 [split], 27, 36). Its inclusion in 23:3, however, would contradict the following attribution, sāḥḥat hī(w) laYHWH 'it is YHWH's Sabbath' (23:3; Exod 31:15; 35:2). In H, YHWH always refers to the sabbath as sabbētōtay 'my sabbaths' (Exod 31:13; Lev 19:3, 30; 26:2). That is, it is not for Israel to proclaim the day. Its septimimal regularity was set at creation (Gen 2:3).
beginning of the closure to chaps. 18 and 19. It is of significance that this statement contrasts with the opening of chap. 18: ‘ānî YHWH ‘ēlōhēkhem kâma ‘âseh ēres-misrayim ‘āser yēšabbem-bâh lô ta ‘âsî ‘I am YHWH your God. As is done in the land of Egypt where you dwelt you shall not do’ (18:2b–3a). In fact, v. 36b can now be seen as the rationale for 18:3a and, indeed, for all of chap. 18: do not follow Egyptian mores because YHWH has freed you from the land of Egypt so that you should serve him (cf. 25:42, 51) by observing his laws (chaps. 18–19). This rationale is followed by v. 37, which, as will be shown below, echoes 18:4–5, thus providing a grand exclamation for chaps. 18 and 19, the opening exhortation to chap. 18 (vv. 2b–5) and the concluding exhortation to chap. 19 (vv. 36b–37). Moreover, this observation would explain why the long coda (v. 36b) does not follow the ending of the chapter (v. 37) where logically, emotionally, and rhetorically it belongs: the closing exhortation was constrained to follow the sequence of verses in 18:2b–5. And conversely, it explains why v. 37 ends with the attested formula—and the short one at that—‘ānî YHWH. For, as stated, vv. 36b–37 enclose 18:2b–5, which also ends with ‘ānî YHWH!

In sum, this closing formula serves a dual purpose: to close the final unit (vv. 35–36a) and to begin the closing exhortation (vv. 36b–37).

v. 37. You shall heed all my statutes and all my rules, and you shall do them. āsēmartem ‘etkol- huqqōtay wē ‘et-kol-mišpātay wa ‘āṣîtem ‘ōtām. This statement should be compared with ‘et-mišpātay ta ‘âsî wē ‘et-huqqōtay tis’mērā . . . āsēmartem ‘et-huqqōtay wē ‘et mišpātay . . . ya ‘âseh ‘ōtām ‘My rules alone you shall observe and my statutes shall you heed . . . you shall heed my statutes and my rules . . . does them’ (18:4–5). The many boldface words of v. 37 speak eloquently of this verse’s conscious imitation of all the cited words of 18:4–5. What is new is the twice-repeated particle kol ‘all’. Thus the close of the inclusion is, in effect, saying: not only should the prohibitions of chap. 18 be observed, but all the injunctions of chap. 19 (Hoffmann 1953).

It also should not be overlooked that the beginning of the concluding exhortation of chap. 20 also uses the same phraseology: āsēmartem ‘et-kol-huqqōtay wē ‘et-kol-mišpātay wa ‘āṣîtem ‘ōtām ‘You shall heed all my statutes and all my rules and do them’ (20:22a). Thus a giant inclusion is effected for chaps. 18–20. Furthermore, since chap. 20 is both a parallel and a complement to chap. 18, this inclusion locks these three chapters into an AXA pattern, whose significance is discussed in the Introduction I A. Moreover, it should be noted that smaller versions of this inclusion are found in 18:26, 30; 19:19a, and 20:8, effectively dividing these three chapters into five large sections, discussed in the Introduction I A. Finally, it may be surmised that it was the H trident responsible for the appendix (vv. 33–37) who is also to be credited with the grand design of chaps. 18–20, supplying it with the inclusions 18:2b–5, 26–30; 19:36b–37; 20:22–26 and the section breaks 19:19a and 20:8, discussed in the Introduction I A, F.

I YHWH (have spoken). ‘ānî YHWH. This deliberate imitation of 18:5b is a further indication that vv. 36b–37 form an inclusion with 18:2b–5, especially with vv. 4–5 (see above).

COMMENT

Holiness

In the Semitic languages, the concept of “holy” is expressed by the root qds. In Akkadian, the D-stem qudušu means both “to purify” and “to consecrate” (persons, buildings, divine images, ritual appurtenances; CAD). Through euphonic metathesis, ds = šd (cf. CAG § 36b), the verb qašādu denotes G-stem (mostly as a stative) “become, be pure”; D-stem (quššudu) “purify, consecrate”; adjective qašu ‘pure, holy’ (AHw 906); and quššušu ‘most holy’ (AHw 930). These derivatives of qds are, almost without exception, found in a religious-cultic context containing a qualified subject of places and persons that have been “purified” and thereby “consecrated”—that is, brought in close relationship to the deity. This would account in the Bible for the ablations required before a theophany (Exod 19:10, 14, 22; Num 11:18; Josh 3:5; 7:13; 1 Sam 16:5 [all Pr’el and Hitpa’el]—that is, purification is a prerequisite for holiness. That the stem qds in BH can denote “purify,” without a cultic association, see 2 Sam 11:4, which is also Hitpa’el, although it can hardly be an accident that ablations are required in all cases of impurity, such as in the case of Bathsheba’s purification following her menses, before access to the sanctuary or sacred food is permitted. Similarly, the “sanctification” required before fasting (Joel 1:14; 2:15) or waging war (Jer 6:4; 51:27–28; Joel 4:9; Mic 3:5) also denotes ablations so that God may be present in the war camp or with the people (cf. 2 Kgs 12:20; Joel 2:16). On the basis of the aforementioned verses, Schwartz (forthcoming) claims that the qds also means “appoint, designate.” However, as indicated, all these verses presume the appearance of God, which requires purification. Furthermore, ‘ispū ‘ām qadd ’sū qahal (Joel 2:16) clearly implies that after the people are gathered, they are “sanctified.” As Wolff (1977: 51) rightly comments, “Sanctify (qds pi’el) means here: to make complete preparations (Josh 3:5 [hitpa’el]) for worship activity, which involves desisting from work, food, and sexual intercourse.” All the above citations, it should be noted, are from non-priestly sources (see below). In West Semitic inscriptions (e.g., Ugaritic), qds as a verb means “consecrate” but not “purify,” as is possible in Akkadian texts. In either case, the consecration of people or objects to the deity implies no moral dimension (on the etymology, see further Kornfeld and Ringgren 1989).

An examination of Semitic polytheism (and, indeed, of any primitive religion) shows that the realm of the gods is never wholly separate from or transcendent to the world of man. Natural objects such as specific trees, rivers, stones, and the like are invested with supernatural force. But this earthbound power is independent of the gods and can be an unpredictable danger to them as well as to man. Holy is thus aptly defined, in any context, as “that which is unapproachable except through divinely imposed restrictions” or “that which is withdrawn from common use.”

In opposition to this widespread animism, we notice its absence from the Bible. Holiness there is not innate. The source of holiness is assigned to God
alone. Holiness is his quintessential nature (see note on 20:3), distinguishing him from all beings (1 Sam 2:2). It acts as the agency of his will. If certain things are termed holy—such as land (Canaan), person (priest), place (sanctuary), or time (festival day)—they are so by virtue of divine dispensation. Moreover, this designation is always subject to recall. Thus the Bible exercises the demaonic from nature; it makes all supernatural force coextensive with God. True, as in the polytheistic religions, the sancta of the Bible can cause death to the unwary and the impure who approach them without regard for the regulations that govern their usage. Indeed, although biblical qōdēs attains new dimensions, it never loses the sense of withdrawal and separation (vol. 1.731; see notes on 20:25), as will be demonstrated below.

The following analysis is limited to the pentateuchal codes (JE, D, P, and H). Diachronically, these four codes can be considered as two: JE leading to D, and P leading to H (see introduction II R).

In P, only the sanctuary, its sancta, and those authorized to serve them (the priests) are holy by virtue of being sanctified with the sacred anointing oil (Lev 8:10–11, 15, 30). A temporary status of holiness is also bestowed on the Nazirite as a consequence of his vow of abstinence (Num 6:2–8), especially the prohibition against shaving or trimming his sanctified hair (cf. Num 6:5, 7, 9, 18). Prior to the selection of Aaron and his descendants, the firstborn served as priests, to judge by the tradition, acknowledged by P, that they were “sanctified” by God (Num 3:13; 8:17). To be sure, P maintains that they were replaced by Levites, not by priests. However, the Levites did not inherit the firstborn’s holiness. In fact, P goes out of its way to deny the term qōdēs ‘holy’ to the Levites and employs, instead, the neutral verb nāṭan ‘assign’ (Num 8:16; 18:6; cf. Milgrom 1990a: 63–64)—an indication of the enduring obsession of the Aaronide priests to deny priestly status to the Levites. The Kohathite Levites, it should be noted, were warned on pain of death not to touch the covered inner sancta, but to carry them by their poles and frames (Num 4:15; cf. 2 Sam 6:6–7). They were forbidden even to look at them while they were being covered (Num 4:20; cf. 1 Sam 6:19). In other words, in regard to the sacred sphere the Levites were laymen.

The term “holy” (rather, miqraq qōdēs ‘a proclamation of holiness’) is also bestowed on the fixed festivals (Num 28–29) because they are characterized by the prohibition against fixed work. This term is, therefore, absent from the injunctions concerning the new moon (Num 28:11–15), which is not a day of rest. It is also missing from P’s prescriptions for the sabbath (Num 28:9–10), despite the fact that it is the day of rest par excellence. In this case, a different consideration prevails: the sabbath is not proclaimed—it automatically falls every seventh day—and, hence, the term miqraq (from qara ‘proclaim’) does not apply (vol. 1.20–21).

In sum, the root qds in all its forms (Pri‘el qiddēs ‘sanctify [by ritual]; Hip‘el hqiddēs ‘consecrate [by transfer from common to sacred status]; adj. qādōs ‘holy’; noun qōdēs ‘sacred place or object’) bears the basic meaning “set apart for God,” and applies in P to only certain space, persons, and time.

Most recently, Kugler (1997: 15, 22) has challenged the consensus that holds that severe impurity pollutes the holy and instead he propounds the reverse: “Contact between the sanctified and impurity never actually damages the holy in Leviticus 1–16. In fact the opposite seems to be true, where the concern to separate the holy from the impure is evident . . . it is probably for the protection of the impure person from the effect of the holy . . . there is no unequivocal expression of deep concern in Leviticus 1–16 about the invasion of the sanctuary of things impure.”

First and foremost, the very P whose theology Kugler (1997) attempts to comprehend postulates that holiness, except for the innermost sanctums, is not contagious to humans (for substantiation, see vol. 1.443–56). I shall cite three examples:

1. Gershonite Levites dismantle, cast away, and reassemble the Tabernacle curtains. The Levites are laymen, and the inner curtains (Num 4:25), according to P, are most sacred (Exod 30:20). Yet the Levites can handle them with impurity! Clearly, their holiness is not contagious to humans.
2. The trespasser upon sanctums must atone for his sacrilege by a fine and sacrifice (Lev 5:14–16), but he is unaffected by his contact with “the most sacred.”
3. A person handling sacred meat, even if it is “most sacred,” is not infected with holiness (Hag 2:12).

Other examples are cited in vol 1.447–450. The upshot of the matter: all the sanctums outside the inner sanctuary possess no contagious holiness, and the formula kol-hannogēa ‘yiqqadēs (Exod 29:37; 30:26–29; Lev 6:11, 20), on which Kugler relies, must be rendered “whatever [not “whoever”] touches . . . shall become holy.” These sanctums are contagious to objects, not persons. P’s great innovation is that it has defused the altar (lying in the outer court, not inside the sanctuary), rendering it uncontagious to persons (Exod 30:28–29) and thus denying it the power to grant asylum to criminals (for the demonstration, see Milgrom 1990: 504–9).

As for Kugler’s (1997: 20) contention that in P the sanctuary and its sanctums are “unaffected by the impurity of the general population,” what is Lev 16 (an entire chapter) all about? Why indeed the urgency and emergency to purge (kippēr) the sanctuary? There is no need to waste time with an investigation. The text is unambiguous and explicit: wēkipēr al- haqqōdēs mittumot bēnē yīṣrā’el ‘Thus he shall purge the adytum of the pollution of the Israelites’ (16:16aa). And this verse ends wēkēn yā ‘ēsh le’ēlḥēl mō ‘ad hāssōkēm ‘ittā bētōk tōm ‘ōtām ‘and he shall do likewise for the Tent of Meeting which abides with them in the midst of their pollution’ (v. 16b). Can there be any doubt that tūm’a ‘impurity’ has invaded the sanctuary building and penetrated into the Holy of Holies? Thus the sanctums, even the most powerful, prove ineffective to repel the incursion of impurity. Kugler (1997: 20), therefore, is fundamentally in error in regard to the relationship between holiness and impurity in P and, as will be shown below, equally erroneous in H.
According to Kugler (1997: 20), H maintains that every Israelite is holy; hence if he contacts impurity, he “stands no chance of survival.” To be sure, H postulates a metaphorical, nonritualistic impurity, such as sexual violations (Lev 18, 20), that is cultically irredeemable (see INTRODUCTION to 18:24–30). However, H does not negate P’s cultic impurity, but supports it. H, for example, appends to Lev 16 its own laws, turning P’s emergency rite (16:2–3) into an annual one that enjoins abstention from work and fasting upon the entire people (16:29–34a). But it also acknowledges the indispensability of purging the sanctuary of Israel’s impurity (v. 33). This means that even the deliberate polluter need not die, but can hope that his penitence on that day will effect absolution. Moreover, 15:31 (H) states that polluting the sanctuary incurs death. But if the people are holy, they should be sentenced to death upon contracting impurity! Again, Num 15:22–31 (H) enjoins the purification offering for all inadvertent sins. But if Israel is intrinsically holy, its sacrifice should be of no avail, since it is automatically doomed! The answer, as expounded in the NOTES on 19:2, is that the laity is not inherently holy, but can become holy by following the commandments. For all Israelites (including priests! see NOTE on 21:15), holiness is not static, endemic, but a goal to be attained (by the laity) or sustained (by the priests).

In H, the root qdš occurs sixty-six times in chaps. 19–23 (Nip’āl [once]; Pi’el [nine times]; Hip’āl [twice]; Hitpa’el [once]; adjective qōdōṣ [ten times], substantive qōdēš [thirty-six times]; miqdaš [seven times]). However, as demonstrated by Zimmerman (1980), God’s holiness is implied by his self-declaration ’amt YHWH (“elóhēkem”) 1 (am) YHWH (your God”), especially when it is followed by his salvific action ’âser hōšē tikā mē’eres misrayim ‘who has freed you from the land of Egypt’. The addition of these two formulas enlarges the compass of H to Lev 18–26. (Concerning the remaining chaps. 17 and 27, see Introduction I E, NOTES on chap. 17, and chap. 27, COMMENT B.) Furthermore, the root qdš referring to God and the two formulas are attested within P contexts, inside and outside Leviticus, in passages also attributable to H (Lev 11:43–45 [see vol. 1]; Exod 6:2–8, 29; 7:5; 12:12; 29:43–46; 31:12–17; Num 3:13, 44–50; 14:26–35; 15:37–41; 35:34; see Introduction II G).

H introduces three radical changes regarding P’s notion of holiness. First, it breaks down the barrier between the priesthood and the laity. The attribute of holiness is accessible to all Israel. This implies, as aptly noted by Greenberg (1990: 370), that just as the priests qualify for service by learning and obeying the rules of their order, so the folk-priesthood of Israel must learn and follow the divine law commanded to them. Second, holiness is not just a matter of adhering to a regimen of prohibitive commandments, taboos; it embraces positive, performative commandments that are ethical in nature. Third, all of Israel, priests included, enhance or diminish their holiness in proportion to their observance of all of God’s commandments (see NOTE on 20:8). The key to these changes is a new understanding of the holiness of God as expounded in Lev 19.

Chap. 19 opens with the imperative: “You shall be holy, for I, YHWH your God, am holy” (v. 2aβ,b). As pointed out in its NOTE, this chapter is thereby radically different from the preceding one, which is headed by the divine self-declaration “I am YHWH your God” (18:2b). This formula opens the Decalogue (Exod 20:2a; Deut 5:6a). In chap. 19, however, H has altered the formula to emphasize YHWH’s holy nature and that Israel should emulate it. The chapter then enumerates some thirty commandments grouped into eighteen units (see INTRODUCTION) by which the goal of holiness can be attained. H accepts the prophetic dictum that righteousness is a quintessential component of holiness (Isa 5:16; with Knohl 1995: 214) and flushes it out in a series of commandments that are a mixture of both rituals and ethics, the latter taking precedence. Thus holiness is no longer just a matter of “divinely imposed restrictions,” but also embraces positive ethical standards that are illustrative of God’s nature: as he relates to his creation, so should Israel relate to one another (details in NOTE on v. 2). Thus all the commandments enumerated in chap. 19 fall under the rubric of holiness. A parade example is the šālāmīm prescription (vv. 5–8). It is a repetition of P (7:16–18), but in its rationale (v. 8) it adds the terms qōdēš and its antonym ḥitlēl. But before entering into a detailed analysis of chap. 19, the concept of holiness in the JE and D codes needs to be discussed.

It comes as a surprise that H never designates God’s land as holy. Perhaps (as suggested in NOTE on 25:23), if the land were a sanctum, it could be polluted by all forms of impurity—deliberate, accidental or unconscious. Thus H’s metaphorical concept of impurity must break the nexus between impurity and its remedy, ritual purification: the pollution of the land is irreversible by ritual means (see INTRODUCTION to 18:24–30). A more fundamental reason, however, is H’s rejection of the notion that holiness inheres in nature. In this regard, it differs sharply with P. Whereas P declares that it was Moses who sanctified the Tabernacle and its priests (with the anointing oil, Lev 8 [P]), H states emphatically “I will sanctify [wēqiddāšti] the Tent of Meeting and the altar, and I will consecrate [‘aqaddēš] Aaron and his sons to serve me as priests” (Exod 29:44 [H]).

Thus H implies that neither the oil is inherently sacred nor its manipulator, Moses, is responsible for the sanctification, but sanctification is generated solely by God’s condescending presence (wēqidaš bikkōdā, Exod 29:43b [H]). In H’s view, God does endow Israel with the power to sanctify—not objects, but time. The festivals are migra’ē qōdēš (lit. “proclamations of holiness”), whose dates on the calendar are fixed by Israel’s decrees (except for the sabbath, which is independent of the calendar and which was preordained by God to be holy, Gen 2:3). The concession is significant: with time, in contrast to the land, there is no fear of inherent holiness, a notion that can imply a source of power independent of that of God. H also differs sharply from earlier JE and its subsequent evolution into D (see Introduction I I).

To be sure, Nicholson (1982: 80–83) followed by Blum (1990: 51–53) claim that Israel at Sinai was actually consecrated as priests and a holy people (in fulfillment of Exod 19:6) by the sacrificial blood dashed on them (Exod 24:8a).

What consecratory power, however, resides per se in blood? The analogy of the priestly consecration (Lev 8:30) actually undermines their case. The sacrificial
blood sprinkled on them and their vestments comes from the altar. That is, the most sacred altar must first transfer its sanctity to the blood (cf. Exod 30:28–29; see vol. 1.443–56, 532–34) before it can sanctify the priestly consecrands. Although the Sinaitic covenant rite is still a mystery, it may be related to the other JE covenant account (Gen 15:17), where God (in Jer 34:18, the people) passes through severed halves of animals as a sign that he has bound himself by the covenant that he struck with Abraham (cf. Weinfeld 1975a: 262–63; 1975b: 77–78). For a similar covenant rite in the ancient Near East, see Sefire I A 39–40 (ANET 660; cf. 532–33). This, indeed, is what the Sinaitic text explicitly states: “This is the blood of the covenant” (Exod 24:8). The blood, then, has not made Israel priests, but confirms that Israel is bound by the covenant (Exod 24: 3–4). The problem with this solution is that blood plays no part in the Abrahamic covenant (or in Jer 34:18). The enigma of the blood rite remains unresolved (cf. Hasel 1981). In any case, it does not sanctify the people. Israel, as the text states explicitly, is an aspirant of holiness (Exod 19:6; cf. 22:30), not its possessor.

Rendtorff (1991: 467) astutely remarks that Israel’s “sancification” is associated with the Exodus (Exod 19:4–6), and that a similar association is recorded in Lev 11:44–45. The latter, however, confirms not that Israel is holy, but that H, like JE before it, enjoins Israel to become holy. Rendtorff also points to the proliferation of the root qāḏ in the Sinaitic account (Exod 19:10, 14, 22), which ostensively affirms Israel’s sanctity. However, as demonstrated in vol. 1.445, 602–3, JE’s Piʾel and Hitpaʿel denote “purify / purify oneself,” not “sanctify / sanctify oneself,” precisely as Israel proceeds to do by laundering its garments.

Gerstenberger (1996: 282) correctly contrasts the ethical holiness prescribed by Lev 19 with its ritual counterpart: “(Ex. 19.10ff., 22; Num. 11:18; Josh. 3:5; 7:13; 2 Chron. 30:15–20) . . . [which] traditionally includes abutions, abstinence rites, and sacrifices (?), and often extends over a specified period of time.” Note, however, that these citations are all from epic sources, whereas in P these cultic preparations are called “purification” (tḥr). Thus, in this matter, H is consistent with its P heritage. Instead, it polemizes with the popular notion of a time-bound “consecration.” Purification (tḥr) eliminates impurity, leading to the state of the common (ḥōl), a condition required for contact with the holy sphere. H pursues this forward movement further, demanding that the common be transformed into the holy (see Figure 3 and discussion, below). H’s ethical stance on holiness is clearly reflected in the priestly challenge to pilgrims at the entrance to the Temple precincts, as recorded by the Psalmist: “Who shall stand in his holy place? He who has clean hands and a pure heart” (Ps 24:3–4; cf. Isa 33:15; 33:14–15, and vol. 1.731).

The epic tradition (JE) has proposed that Israel could become a holy people, but only if it would accept the covenantal obligations of the Decalogue (Exod 19:5–6), the two distinctive elements of which are the rejection of idolatry and the observance of the sabbath (Exod 20:3–11). Implied, therefore, is that nonobservance disqualifies Israel from attaining a holy status (contra Schwartz, forthcoming), a position that anticipates H. In this matter, D differs sharply from its demonstrated reliance on E (Milgrom 1976h). The epic tradition also adds abstention from ṭērēpā ṭorn flesh (by prey) as a holiness requirement (Exod 22:30). This prohibition is contextually tied to the requirement to dedicate the first of the crops and the wnrn of both humans and beasts to YHWH (vv. 28–29), which by implication are also holy (Knohl, personal communication). These three injunctions—abstention from idolatry, sabbath labor, and torn flesh—are therefore JE’s prescription for holiness.

D incorporates them in its holiness prescriptions by its repetition of the Decalogue (Deut 5:7–15), its emphasis on the rejection of idolatry (Deut 7:6; 14:2), and its full dietary code (Deut 14:3–21, esp. v. 21). D may not be original. It may have followed the initiative of eighth-century Isaiah, who referred to the survivors (one-tenth) of God’s purge of Israel as zeraʿ qōdeš ‘a holy seed’ (Isa 6:13; G. D. Cohen, cited by Greenberg 1996: 31). Nonetheless, the translation of this idea into law, incumbent on all Israel and not just for a surviving remnant, is the innovation of D. Moreover, D institutes a change of its own: Israel is a holy people by virtue of its covenant, and perhaps from the days it was founded by the patriarchs (Deut 7:6–8; 10:15; Schwartz, forthcoming).

In any event, D surely follows the view of its forerunner E that Israel was initiated/“consecrated” into the covenant at Sinai (Exod 24:1–8 [E]). The priests (P/H) harbor no such tradition. Only they were consecrated (Exod 29; Lev 8), not the people. The people have to “earn” their consecration by obeying YHWH’s commandments. To be sure, D also acknowledges that Israel’s retention of its holy status is dependent on its adherence to YHWH’s commandments (Deut 26:17–19; 28:9). This condition recalls H’s view of the priesthood: although priests are genetically holy, they diminish, and can even forfeit, their holiness by their violation of the commandments. And conversely, by observing the commandments, they augment their holy status (see notes on “I YHWH sanctify them / him,” 21:8 LXX, 15; 22:9, 16). Thus for H, holiness is a dynamic concept, toward which all of Israel, priests and laity alike, must continually strive: priests to retain it, lay persons to attain it (see below).

Schwartz (forthcoming) claims (contra Milgrom 1976h: 5; Knohl 1995: 183, n. 43) that since Israel’s holiness is transmitted from the forefathers genetically, it is unconditional. In rebuttal, I concede that this view may be implied by the static status of Israel in Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21. However, it is blatantly qualified in the later chapters (by a trident?) so that if Israel adheres to the commandments, only then will God fulfill (yāqīmēkā) his promise of holiness to the forefathers (26:18–19; 28:9). Hence D moves toward convergence with H on the issue of Israel’s holiness.

Nonetheless, this overlap in goal should not mask D’s innovation. Whereas H, in agreement with JE (cf. Exod 19:6), regards holiness only as an ideal toward which Israel should aspire, D establishes Israel’s holiness as inherent in its biological nature. Thus from the diachronic viewpoint, D has extended H’s axioms regarding priestly holiness to all of Israel. Knohl (1995: 183, n. 43) adds a further nuance: in D, holiness is the reason for the prohibitions; in H, the prohibitions are the means for holiness. Both D and H, however, condition priestly holiness (H) and Israel’s holiness (D) on obedience to God’s commandments.
As has been demonstrated (vol. 1.698-704), D's diet laws are modeled on Lev 11, and the attachment of the holiness ideal to Israel's diet is also the contribution of H (see NOTES on 11:43-45). H also bans idolatry and emphasizes the sabbath as part of its holiness prescriptions (20:1-8; 19:3, 30; 26:2a). H, however, goes much further: it adds many other regulations, ritual but mainly ethical, as itemized in chap. 19 (see below), and enjoins the wearing of distinctive tassels as a daily mnemonic that Israel can attain holiness by observing YHWH's commandments (Num 15:37-41; see Milgrom 1990a: 410-14). Moreover, it polemizes against P's dogmatic insistence that priestly holiness is unchanging and permanent by implying that the violation of YHWH's commandments bars not only Israel from attaining holiness but also priests from retaining it (see NOTES on 20:6, 8, 15, 22:9). H's dynamic concept of holiness is best explained by resorting to Figure 3 (also found in vol. 1.722-25, 32).

In P's world view, the tripartite division of human race corresponds to its three covenants with God: humanity (Gen 9:1-11, including the animals), Israel (via the patriarchs, Gen 17:2; cf. Lev 26:42), and the priesthood (Num 25:11-13; cf. Jer 33:17-22). The comparison of these three congruent sets of concentric circles reveals, first, that priests, sacrifices, and sanctuary (the innermost circles) must be unblemished and unpolluted. They are deliberately set apart from the middle circles, implying that the realms of priests, sacrifices, and sanctuary must never be fused or confused with the realms of Israel, edible animals, and holy land, respectively. Humankind is permitted all animals for its diet, with the proviso that their blood is drained (Gen 9:3-4). Israel (the gér) is H's innovation must be in a state of ritual purity to enter the sanctuary or partake of sacred food (Lev 7:20-21, 12:4). Priests are bound to a severe regimen of conduct, especially in regard to mourning and marriage, to warrant their office as sanctuary officiants, and the high priest must live by an even higher standard. These rules are found in H (21:1-15), but it must be presumed to be operative in P (see NOTE on 21:7).

H breaks apart this static, immutable picture. It declares that the innermost circles are neither fixed nor frozen. All three innermost realms are capable of a centrifugal movement, enabling them to incorporate their respective middle circles. According to H, although priests are innately holy, all Israel is enjoined to achieve holiness. Not that Israel is to observe the priestly regimen or attain priestly status in the sanctuary. Rather, by scrupulously observing YHWH's commandments, moral and ritual alike, lay Israel can achieve holiness, and priestly Israel can retain it. Indeed, as detailed in the NOTE on 20:8, Israel's holiness is neither inherent nor automatic (as implied by D), but a reciprocal process. God sanctifies Israel in proportion to Israel's self-sanctification.

Signs of this mobility are reflected in the animal sphere: H insists that the blood of permitted non-sacrificial animals (game) must be buried so that the animal's life force can be returned to its creator (see NOTE on 17:14). Sacrificeable animals, however, must be slaughtered (and sacrificed) at the altar. H has abolished profane (i.e., common) slaughter. Henceforth, all slaughter must be sacred. That is, every animal must be brought to the sanctuary. It is transferred from the domain of the profane to the domain of the sanctuary.

H also harbors an old tradition that the entire camp in the wilderness cannot tolerate severe impurity (Num 5:1-4; cf. 31:19). This tradition is echoed in D, which explicitly stipulates that the camp must be holy (Deut 23:10-15). It is H, however, that extends this view, logically and consistently, to the future residence of Israel—the promised land. Hence impurities produced by Israel by violating YHWH's prohibitions pollute not only the sanctuary, but the entire land. Because God dwells in the land as well as in the sanctuary (e.g., 25:23, 26:11; cf. Josh 22:19; Hos 9:3-4), the land cannot abide pollution (e.g., 18:25-30; cf. Num 35:33-34). It is, therefore, no accident that H enjoins upon both the Israelite and the resident alien (gér)—that is, all who live on the land—to keep the land holy by guarding against impurity and following the prescribed purificatory procedures (e.g., Num 15:27-29, 19:10b-13; the gér is an H addition, as explained in Introduction II I) so that YHWH will continue to reside in it and bless the land and its inhabitants with fertility and security (26:3-12).

The dynamic catalyst that turns H's view of YHWH's covenant from a static picture into one of flux is its concept of holiness. For H, the ideal of holiness not only is embodied in a limited group (priests), animals (sacrifices), and space (sanctuary), but affects all who live on God's land: persons and animals, Israel and the gér.

There is one other obligatory dimension for Israel—time. Figure 4 contains only two concentric circles. The holiest day is the sabbath; it is YHWH's (Exod 16:23, 20:10, 35:2, 23:3). It was sanctified at creation (Gen 2:3), and its observance is theoretically available to all persons, but is obligatory for every Israelite household and every living thing in his charge (Exod 20:8-11). The sabbath's holiness is defined by the stoppage of all labor.

The festivals are not YHWH's. They are miqra' qôdës, literally "proclamations of holiness" (see NOTE on "sacred occasions," 23:3) because they too, require the stoppage of labor (but, with the exception of the Day of Purgation, not to the same degree as the sabbath). Set by the lunar calendar, they do not occur with the regularity of the sabbath. Therefore, it is the responsibility of Israel to fix these days (mô‘ed) and proclaim them (miqra'). In P's calendar, the sabbath is not a miqra' qôdës; it falls automatically on every seventh day and need
not be proclaimed. New moon is not a "sacred occasion" for a different reason: it is a workday (Num 28:11–15).

H declares the sabbath a miqra’ qôdeš (Lev 23:3). Israel was in exile. Being subject to the Babylonian calendar, whose days were ordered by the month—not the week—the exiles might have overlooked the advent of the sabbath; it had to be proclaimed.

In the priestly system, the nations were not required to observe time. Only the prophets, in their eschatological visions, project a period when all peoples will pilgrimage to Jerusalem to worship YHWH on sabbaths and new moons (Isa 66:23) and on the Festival of Booths (Zech 14:16).

Figure 4 contains no arrow and, hence, no movement. In the time dimension, H is not dynamic in relation to P in contrast with the dimensions of person, animals and space (above). H accepts P’s concept of the holy sabbath and festivals and the obligation of Israel to sanctify them by the same differentiated work stoppage. H differs with P only by proclaiming the sabbath (and in some minutiae detailed in NOTES on chap. 23).

Schwartz (forthcoming) visualizes the divine presence touching Israelites, and sanctifying them. This image is misleading. Just as YHWH’s presence in the sanctuary does not continue to sanctify the priests who serve within or the layperson when he enters, neither does his presence in the land sanctify its inhabitants. Indeed, as the blessings of Lev 26:11–13 indicate, YHWH’s walking about (wēhîthallākti, v. 12) is for the purposes of fertility (vv. 1–5a, 9–10), and protection (vv. 5b–8). Israelites and priests alike are sanctified by virtue of their own effort, namely, by their adherence to the divine commandments.

As noted above, the commandments, the observance of which generates holiness, are performative as well as prohibitive, ethical as well as ritual. In contrast with P, which touches on the dangerous, even fatal aspect of the sancta (e.g., 10:1–4; Num 4:15, 17–20), H focuses exclusively on the beneficial aspects of divine holiness. It generates blessing and life; it is the antonym and ultimate conqueror of impurity, the symbol of death (vol. 1.733, 766–68, 1000–1004). This dynamic power of holiness can also be represented diagrammatically:

Persons and objects are subject to four possible states: holy, common, pure, and impure. Two of them can exist simultaneously: pure things may be either holy or common; common things may be either pure or impure. (These relationships are represented in adjoining boxes in the diagram.) However, the holy may not come into contact with the impure. (Their respective boxes do not touch.) These latter two categories are mutually antagonistic. Moreover, they are dynamic; they seek to extend their influence and control over the other two categories: the common and the pure. In contrast to the holy and impure, the common and pure are static. They cannot transfer their state; they are not contagious. Indeed, in effect they are secondary categories. They take their identity from their antonyms. Purity is the absence of impurity; commonness is the absence of holiness (cf. Paschen 1970: 64). Hence the boundaries between the holy and the common and between the pure and the impure are permeable, represented by a broken line. There is no fixed boundary. Israel by its behavior can move the boundaries either way. But it is enjoined by H to move in one direction only: to advance the holy into the realm of the common and to diminish the impure, thereby enlarging the realm of the pure. This accounts for the formulaic expression bēn qôdeš lehōl ēben-tāmē’ lētāhōr ‘between holy and common and between impure and pure’ (Ezek 44:23; cf. Lev 10:10). Besides the fact that it exemplifies the priestly affection for chiasm, ABB’A’ (cf. 11:47; 20:25), it emphasizes that the first member in each clause (AB’) is dynamic and the second, static (BA’).

I submit that the same rationale or, more precisely, its complement obtains here. The bodily impurities enumerated in the impurity table (vol. 1.968–91) focus on four phenomena: death (4, 5, 7, 11), blood (2, 3, 8), semen (3, 10), and scale disease (1). Their common denominator is death. Vaginal blood and semen represent the forces of life; their loss, death (vol. 1.766–68). In the case of scale disease, this symbolism is made explicit: Aaron prays for his stricken sister, “Let her not be like a corpse” (Num 12:14). The wasting of the body, the common characteristic of all biblically impure skin diseases, symbolizes the death process as much as the loss of blood and semen. The antonym of life (qâdōs) and death (tāmē’ ) is graphically underscored by the rationale for not engaging in certain mourning rites for the dead (Deut 14:1–2): ki’ am qâdōs ‘attā ‘for you are a holy people’. (The previous word is lāmē’ ‘for the dead’, making the juxtaposition—rather, the opposition—of holy and death striking.)

Thus tūm’ā and qēdāsā, biblical impurity and holiness, are semantic opposites. And as the quintessence and source of qēdāsā resides with God, it is imperative for Israel to control the occurrence of impurity lest it impinge on the realm of the holy God. The forces pitted against each other in the cosmic struggle are no longer the benevolent and demonic deities who populate the mytholo-
gies of Israel's neighbors, but the forces of life and death set loose by man himself through his obedience to or defiance of God's commandments. Among all the diachronic changes that occur in the development of Israel's impurity laws (vol. 1.986–1000), this clearly is the most significant: the total severance of impurity from the demonic and its reinterpretation as a symbolic system reminding Israel of its imperative to cleave to life and reject death.

Hartley (1992: Lx) writes that "another polarity inherent to the holy is that of whole / defective." This undoubtedly holds within the sanctuary, where priests and sacrifices must be unblemished. But outside the sanctuary, this antimony does not prevail. In fact, Israel's access to the sanctuary or to sacred food is independent of any physical defect (mûm). Note that in the detailed program for achieving holiness (chap. 19), there is no mention of any physical imperfection. One may, however, say that by not following this program, Israel sustains moral imperfection.

Lev 19 provides the prescription to effect this transformation. Under the call to holiness (v. 2), it enumerates sixteen units containing commandments by which holiness can be achieved. The first two units echo the Decalogue. The sabbath (v. 3b) must be sanctified (Exod 20:8–11; Deut 5:12–15), and parents must be honored, revered (v. 3a; Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16); the worship of other gods and images of Israel's God (v. 4) are strictly forbidden (Exod 20:3–6; Deut 5:7–10); and as proposed by the epic tradition—which H has adopted (see Introduction II G)—obedience to the covenantal Decalogue renders Israel a gôy qâdôs 'a holy nation' (Exod 19:6).

Unit 3, the well-being offering (vv. 5–8), expressly mentions the terms qôdes 'sacred' and its violation, hillil 'desecrate' (v. 8). Unit 4, horticultural holiness (vv. 9–10), lacks these terms, but its inclusion under the call to holiness is significant. The emulation of God's holiness, imitatio dei, must include materializing God's concern for the indigent. Also, setting aside part of the harvest might be equivalent to firstfruits and tithes; thereby, symbolically, YHWH has assigned some of his due to the poor. Unit 5, ethical deeds (vv. 11–13), includes oath desecration (hillil, v. 12), implying the concomitant diminution in holiness. The remainder of this ethical series (vv. 14–18) includes unit 6, exploitation of the helpless (v. 14); unit 7, injustice and indifference (vv. 15–16); and unit 8, respect and love (vv. 17–18), all of which emphasize the divine attribute of compassion, essential to his holy nature. As neatly encapsulated by the rabbis: "As he (the Lord) is gracious and compassionate (cf. Exod 34:6) so you should be gracious and compassionate" (Mek. Shira, par. 3; b. Šabb. 133b). "As he clothes the naked (Gen 3:21), you should clothe the naked; as he nurses the sick (Gen 18:1), you should nurse the sick; as he comforts the mourners (Gen 25:11), you should comfort the mourners; as he buries the dead (Deut 34:5), so you should bury the dead" (b. Sot. 14a).

Unit 9, mixtures (v. 19), proscribes the breeding of different animals, sowing mixed seed, or weaving fabrics made from mixed seed because these mixtures are reserved for the sacred sphere: the sanctuary and the priests. Unit 10, the betrothed slave-woman (vv. 20–22), involves a reparation offering prescribed in cases of desecration (5:14–16). Unit 11, horticultural holiness (vv. 23–25), focuses on the fruit of the fourth year, which is declared qôdes 'sacred' and belongs to YHWH (v. 24). Unit 12, eschewing the chief form of impurity, death and the dead (vv. 26–28), is essential in adhering to the God of holiness—life. Unit 13, prostitution (v. 29), is a form of desecration (cf. 22:7, 9). Units 14–16, sabbath and sanctuary (also 26:2), consulting the dead (also 20:1–7), and respecting elders (vv. 30–32), parallel the opening verses (vv. 3–4) and, hence, echo the Decalogue, the basic prescription for holiness. Units 17–18, the gôr and business ethics (vv. 33–37), as explained in the introduction to this chapter, are appendices.

To recapitulate, in Lev 19, H, in effect, writes a new "Decalogue." YHWH's self-declaration becomes a call to holiness, followed by a series of commandments (addressing the most pressing problems in H's time; see below) by which holiness may be achieved.

Schwartz (forthcoming) offers the following reasons for denying that the binding theme of Lev 19 is holiness:

1. Eight units out of eighteen do not have the root qôš (vv. 9–10, 13–14, 15–16, 17–18, 20–22, 32, 33–34, 35–36).
2. The term qôš or its antonym hilll occurs in the rationale, not in the body of the law.
3. Why must the term qôš in some laws be sought elsewhere (e.g., sabbath, Gen 2:2; mixed seed, Deut 22:9, mourning rites, Deut 14:1–2)?
4. The nature of holiness in Lev 19 is not homogeneous; contagious in relation to mixed seeds (v. 19), a notion alien to H; static concerning the sanctuary (v. 30) and the sacrifices (v. 8); and dynamic in regard to YHWH (v. 2).

I shall respond seriatim:

1. Schwartz overlooks the basic fact that the formula āni YHWH ('êlôhêkem), which terminates these units (with the exception of vv. 20–22, which stem from P; see notes), is a declaration of YHWH's otherness or holiness. This identification is made explicit in the chapter's title ki qôš āni YHWH 'êlôhêkem (v. 2b; cf. 11:44, 45, 20:26; 21:8). And since this formula is found throughout chaps. 18–26—that is, in every chapter of the H corpus except the first and last (chaps. 17, 27)—it provides irrefutable justification for referring to those chapters as the Holiness Corpus or Supplement.
2. It is not quite true that the terms qôš and hilll are found only in the rationale (see vv. 29, 30). Besides, that they would be in the rationales is precisely the point. H wants to show that these laws fall under the rubric of holiness.
3. It is of no consequence that the term qôš is found in other passages, since Lev 19, as demonstrated (see introduction) is patently borrowing from these passages. Besides, these units conclude with āni YHWH—the holiness equivalent.
4. H does not deny the protean nature of holiness—for example, contagious, as in P (20:3), dynamic (miqqedde, chaps. 20–22), and static (migdā qa'dēs, the festivals, chap. 23).

As proposed in the notes on 19:2 and Introduction II G, the basic text of Lev 19 (vv. 1–32) and, indeed, the bulk of H reflect the priestly response to the indictment by the prophets of the eighth century (especially by Isaiah of Jerusalem) of Israel’s cultic and socioeconomic sins. Isaiah’s revelation of the thrice-repeated declaration of YHWH’s holy nature (Isa 6:3), to judge by the prophet’s reaction (v. 5), indicates to him that the divine imperative for Israel is to be ethical: “YHWH of hosts shall be exalted by his judgment and the holy God shall be shown holy by his righteousness” (Isa 5:16), a statement that is both a prediction of doom upon unrighteous Israel (vv. 24–30; cf. Milgrom 1964: 167–72) and an indictment of the moral failings of Israel’s corrupt judicial leaders, who blur the distinction between right and wrong (5:20) and pervert justice for the sake of bribes (5:23). Isaiah’s indictment of the leadership includes the prophet and the priest (28:7), but it is especially directed against the civil leaders (3:14) and the rich (5:8), who rob the poor and seize their land. That is to say, for Isaiah the Trisagion implies that YHWH, who governs his world by justice, expects Israel to do the same. In Isaiah’s gloomy forecast, only those who do not participate in these social evils will survive the forthcoming purge, and these few—provided they truly repent—will be called qaddōš ‘holy’ and be admitted into the New Zion (4:3; cf. Milgrom 1964: 167–72).

The text of H testifies that its priestly authors have been stung by their fellow Jerusalemite’s rebuke. Their response is twofold: First, they adopt Isaiah’s revelation that YHWH’s holiness implies that Israel must be ethical, and then they go beyond Isaiah by prescribing specific commandments (Lev 19) by which holiness can be attained and—as will be shown in the notes on chap. 25—by prescribing a revolutionary program that will reverse the extant socioeconomic wrongs (Lev 25). Second, H takes issue with Isaiah’s pessimism concerning Israel’s inability to repent. (Note that after pronouncing Israel’s irrevocable doom in chap. 6, Isaiah never again calls on his people to repent; cf. Milgrom 1964: 167–72.) In chap. 19, H brims with hope that all Israel will heed the divine call to holiness, and hence there is no reason to anticipate a purge of the nation (the door forecast of chap. 26 has not yet dawned; see further Introduction II G).

The rabbis follow up on H’s insight and extend it into new dimensions. To be sure, they accept the Torah’s basic notion that holiness implies separation and withdrawal, and, hence, they interpret the injunction to be holy to mean that Israel must separate itself from the nations of the world and its abominations (20:26; cf. Mek. 63a; Sipra Qedoshim 93b; Lev. Rab. 23 [end]), but they add, in agreement with H: “Be holy, for as long as you fulfill my commandments you are sanctified, but if you neglect them you become profaned” (Num. Rab. 17:6), and “when the Omnipresent enjoins a new precept upon Israel, he adds holiness to them” (Mek. de-Kasp 20); and the rabbis exemplify these statements by specifying that holiness is added to Israel by observing the sabbath (19:3b, 30a; Mek. de-Shabbata 1) and by wearing tassels (Num 15:37–41; Sipre Num. 115).

The rabbis also enjoin a superior kind of holiness termed by Schechter (1898: 7–10), hāsidūt ‘saintliness’: “Sanctify yourselves even in what is permitted” (b. Yeb. 20a), which Ramban elaborates (on 19:2, Schechter’s paraphrase), as follows:

According to my opinion, by the talmudic term pārīsūt ‘separatedness’, is not (just) meant abstaining from illicit sexual unions, but something which gives to those who practice it the name pārīsīm ‘Pharisees’. The matter (is thus): The Torah has forbidden illicit sexual unions as well as certain kinds of food, but allowed intercourse between man and his wife as well as the eating of meat and the drinking of wine. But even within these limits can the man (impure) appetites be drenched in lusts, become a drunkard and a glutton, as well as use impure language, since there is no (distinct) prohibition against these things in the Torah. Therefore the scripture, after giving in detail the things forbidden absolutely, concluded with a general law (of holiness) to show that we must also abstain from things superfluous. As for instance, that even permitted sexual intercourse should be submitted to restrictions (of holiness), preserving it against degenerating into mere animal lust; that the drinking of wine should be reduced to a minimum, the Nazir being called holy because he abstains from drink, and that one should guard one’s mouth and tongue against being defiled by gluttony and vile language. Man should indeed endeavor to reach a similar degree of holiness to R. Chiya who never uttered an idle word in his life . . . the scripture warns us to be clean, pure, and separated from the crowd of men who taint themselves by luxuries and ugliness.

Finally, note this expansion of the Decalogue’s prohibition against adultery: “The eye of the adulterer waits for nightfall” (Job 24:15) teaches us that an unchaste look is also to be considered as adultery; and the verse “so that you do not follow your heart and your eyes in your lustful urge” (Num 15:39) teaches that an unchaste look or even an unchaste thought are also to be regarded as adultery. (Lev. Rab. 23:12; cf. Matt 5:27)

Ramban was unaware of the archaeological evidence—the profusion of stone vessels from the second century B.C.E. through the second century C.E., especially in Jerusalem and its environs but also throughout the land—that ordinary people were observing a form of nonsacred purity, in handling not just sacred food (prescribed by Scripture, Lev 7:19–21), but ordinary, daily food (E. Regev, unpublished paper). Stone is impervious to impurity, and thus the abundance of jars, mugs, pitchers, bowls, and measuring cups for containing the food and drink for daily meals indicates the extent to which the people-at-large, and not just the pharisees, went in order to conduct their lives according to a more stringent form of purity.

Furthermore, the sectaries of Qumran prescribe a nonbiblical, one-day ablation for the corpse-contaminated (11QT 50:13–16; cf. Milgrom 1978: 512–18;
20. PENALTIES FOR MOLEK WORSHIP, NECROMANCY, AND SEXUAL OFFENSES

TRANSLATION

1And YHWH spoke to Moses: 2Say further to the Israelites:

Penalties for Molek Worship

Any man from among the Israelites, or among the aliens residing in Israel, who dedicates any of his offspring to Molek, must be put to death; the people of the land shall pelt him with stones. 3And I myself will set my face against that man and cut him off from among his people, because he dedicated his offspring, thus defiling my sanctuary and desecrating my holy name. 4And if the people of the land indeed shut their eyes to that man when he gives of his offspring to Molek by not putting him to death, 5I myself will set my face against that man and his family, and I will cut off from among their kin both him and all who whored after him in whoring after Molek.

Penalty for Necromancy

6And if any person turns to ghosts and wizard-spirits to whore after them, I will set my face against that person and I will cut him off from among his kin.

Opening Exhortation

7You shall sanctify yourselves and be holy, for I YHWH am your God. 8You shall heed my statutes and do them: (Thereby) I YHWH make you holy.

Penalties for Sexual Violations

9If any man dishonors his father or his mother, he must be put to death; he has dishonored his father or his mother—his bloodguilt is upon him.

10If a man commits adultery with a married woman—committing adultery with his (Israelite) neighbor's wife—the adulterer and the adulteress must be put to death. 11If a man lies with his father's wife, it is the nakedness of his father that he has uncovered; the two of them must be put to death—their bloodguilt is upon them. 12If a man lies with his daughter-in-law, the two of them must be put to death; they have committed a perversion— their bloodguilt is upon them. 13If a man lies with a male as one lies with a woman, the two of them have done an abhorrent thing; they must be put to death—their bloodguilt is upon them. 14If a man marries a woman and her mother, it is a depravity; by fire they shall burn him and them, that there be no depravity among you. 15If a man has sexual relations with a beast, he must be put to death, and you shall kill the beast. 16If a woman approaches any beast to mate with it, you shall kill the woman and the beast; they must be put to death—their bloodguilt is upon them.

17If a man marries his sister, the daughter of either his father or his mother, so that he sees her nakedness and she sees his nakedness, it is a disgrace; they shall be cut off in the sight of their people. He has uncovered the nakedness of his sister; he shall bear his iniquity. 18If a man lies with a woman in her infirmity and uncovers her nakedness, he has laid bare her source and she has exposed the source of her blood; the two of them shall be cut off from among their kin. 19You shall not uncover the nakedness of your mother's sister or your father's sister, for that is laying bare his own flesh; they shall bear their punishment. 20If a man lies with his uncle's wife, it is his uncle's nakedness that he has uncovered. They shall bear their sin: they shall die childless. 21If a man marries the wife of his brother, it is repulsive. It is the nakedness of his brother that he has uncovered; they shall remain childless.

Closing Exhortation

22You shall heed all my statutes and all my regulations and do them, so that the land to which I bring you to settle in will not vomit you out. 23You shall not follow the statutes of the nations that I am driving out before you. It is because they did all these things that I loathed them 24and said to you: You shall possess their land, and I myself will give it to you to possess, a land flowing with milk and honey. I YHWH am your God who has set you apart from other peoples. 25So you shall distinguish between the pure and the impure quadrupeds and between the impure and the pure birds. You shall not defile your throats with a quadruped or bird or anything with which the ground teems, which I have set apart for you to treat as impure. 26You shall be holy to me, for I YHWH am holy; therefore I have set you apart from other peoples to be mine.

Appendix: Penalty for Mediums

27A man or a woman who is a medium for a ghost or wizard-spirit shall be put to death; they shall be pelted with stones—their bloodguilt is upon them.