STUDIES IN JUDAISM
IN LATE ANTIQUITY

EDITED BY

JACOB NEUSNER

VOLUME FIVE

IN THE PRESENCE OF
THE LORD

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1974

IN THE PRESENCE OF
THE LORD

A STUDY OF CULT AND SOME CULTIC TERMS
IN ANCIENT ISRAEL

BY

BARUCH A. LEVINE

Professor of Hebrew, New York University

To my wife Corinne

Ḥayyāh -Lēʾāh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE

THE *ŠELĀMÎM* SACRIFICE

PART TWO

SACRIFICES OF EXPIATION

FOREWORD

This study was begun in 1967-68 during my Sabbatical year, spent in Jerusalem. I am indebted to the National Endowment for the Humanities (National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities) for having awarded me a Senior Fellowship. This made it possible for me to devote the entire year to uninterrupted research. The original title of the proposal was: "The Technical Terminology of the Biblical Cult."

In the intervening years my original plan has undergone some contraction in scope, but it lives up to its primary definition as an examination of some of the biblical cultic terminology. One whose ultimate goal it is to reconstruct biblical civilization will have to transcend philology, in the last analysis, but he cannot bypass it as the proper, first step in solving problems of biblical interpretation.

The opportunity for consultation with colleagues and masters in the field is an important factor in the research process. It has been my good fortune to be able to do so, and I mention herewith those with whom aspects of this study were discussed, and who were gracious enough to share their expertise with me: My colleague at New York University, Stephen Lieberman, was of assistance with the Mesopotamian materials. The late Jacob Liver offered important criticism of my first effort in the direction of the present study, a Hebrew article entitled: *"Kippûrîm,"* (*Eretz-Israel* 9, 1969). Yochanan Muffs gave freely of his fund of knowledge in Bible and Semitics. Jacob Neusner's interest in purity as an aspect of ancient Judaism has clarified my own way in this area of inquiry. Anson Rainey has helped me to absorb the important recent developments in Ugaritic studies, and Hayim Tadmor has shed light on some historical as well as textual problems. Finally, I acknowledge my enduring debt to H. Louis Ginsberg, once and always my teacher,

Aspects of this study have been discussed in papers before the American Oriental Society, the Seminar on the Hebrew Bible, Columbia University, and the graduate seminar in ancient Near Eastern history at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, under the leadership of Abraham Malamat and Benjamin Mazar. My ongoing research on the biblical cult has served as material for several graduate seminars at Brandeis and New York Universities. All of these encounters have produced valuable criticism and learned reaction.

The American Council of Learned Societies and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, New York University, have been most gracious in supporting my research endeavors with travel assistance from 1969 until the present time, so that my close contacts with the community of scholars in Israel could be preserved. I also wish to thank the staffs of the National Library, Jerusalem, of the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, and of the *Ecole Biblique*, Jerusalem, for their helpfulness to me at various times.

In dedicating my first book to my wife, Corinne, I wish to acknowledge her devotion to my scholarly endeavors, and her appreciation of my goals as a student of Torah.

Menaḥḥēm-ʾĀb, 5733   BARUCH A. LEVINE
August, 1973

ABBREVIATIONS

AAA	*Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology.*
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung.*
AHW	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Wiesbaden, 2 vols., 1959-72.
An. Or.	*Analecta Orientalia.*
AOS	*American Oriental Series.*
AP	A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C,,* Oxford, 1923.
Assyrian Studies 16	*Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger,* (*Assyrian Studies* 16), U. of Chicago, 1965.
BASOR	*Bulletin, American Schools of Oriental Research. (Suppl. St. = Supplementary Studies).*
BH	Biblical Hebrew.
Blome, *Opfermaterie*	Fr. Blome, *Die Opfermaterie in Babylonien und Israel,* Rome, 1934.
BMAP	E. G. Kraeling, *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri,* Yale U., 1953.
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary*, U. of Chicago. (Vols. lettered: *CADA, CADB*, etc.).
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly.*
CIS	*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.*
D	Deuteronomy.
Daniel, *Vocabulaire*	S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante,* Paris, 1966.
Dussaud, *Origines*	R. Dussaud, *Les Origines Canaanéenes du Sacrifice Israélite,* Paris, 1941.
EA	El-Amarna.
EB	*Encyclopaedia Biblica* (Hebrew), vols. I-VI, Jerusalem, 1950- .
EI	*Eretz-Israel*, Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem.
EJ	*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, New York, 1970, vols. 1-16.
Elliger, *Leviticus*	K. Elliger, *Leviticus,* (*Handbuch zum alten Testament* 4), Tübingen, 1966.
GAG	W. von Soden, *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik* (*An. Or.* 33), Rome, 1969.
Gray, *Sacrifice*	G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* with a Prolegomenon by Baruch A. Levine, (The Library of Biblical Studies), New York, 1971.
Grelot, *Documents*	P. Grelot, *Documents Araméens D'Égypte*, Paris, 1972.
H	Holiness Code.
Hoffmann, *Leviticus*	D. Hoffmann, *Das Buch Leviticus*, vols. I-II, Berlin, 1905-6.
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review.*
HSS	*Harvard Semitic Series.*
HuAL	W. Baumgarten, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch* I, Leiden, 1967.
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual.*
ICC, Kings	J. A. Montgomery, H. S. Gehman, *The Books of Kings, International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh, 1960.

IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal.*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society.*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature.*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies.*
Jean- Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire*	C. F. Jean-J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest*, Leiden, 1965.
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies.*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies.*
KAI	H. Donner, W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäisches Inschriften*, vols. I-III, Wiesbaden, 1966.
Kaufmann, *Tôledôt,*	Y. Kaufmann, *Tôledôt Hā'emûn Hayyiśre'ēlit*, 2nd ed., (Hebrew), vols. I-IV, Jerusalem, 1952.
LA	Late Aramaic.
Landsberger, *Date Palm*	B. Landsberger, *The Date Palm and Its Byproducts According to the Cuneiform Sources (Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft* 17), 1967.
Levine, *Prolegomenon*	See: Gray, *Sacrifice.*
Levy, *Wörterbuch*	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, vols. I-IV, Darmstadt, 1963.
Lex Syr²	K. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, Hildesheim, 1966.
LH	Late Hebrew.
LVT	L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden, 1958.
LXX	Septuagint.
M	Mishnah
McCarthy, *Survey*	*Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions*, Oxford, 1972.
de Moor, *Schrift*	J. C. de Moor, "The Peace-Offering in Ugarit and Israel, "*Schrift en Uitleg, Studies... W. H. Gispen*, Kampen, 1970, 113-17.
MVAG	*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft.*
NEB	*The New English Bible*, Oxford U., 1970.
NJV	*New Jewish Version*, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1963.
NSI	G. A. Cooke, *A Textbook of North Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1903.
P	The priestly source.
R Acc	F. Thureau-Dangin, *Rituels Accadiens*, Paris, 1921.
Rainey, *Ug V,*	A. F. Rainey, "The Ugaritic Texts in Ugaritica V," (to appear).
RB	*Revue Biblique.*
RSO	*Rivista degli Studii Orientali.*
Schmid, *Bundesopfer*	R. Schmid, *Das Bundesopfer in Israel; Wesen, Ursprung, und Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Schelamim*, München, 1964.
TB	Talmud, Babylonian, standard editions Wilno.
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen*, vols. I-III.
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, Rome 1965. (Note: Texts are listed *UT* 1, etc. *UT* 01-614 are the Ugaritic texts first published in *Ugaritica* V, 1968, and assigned these numbers by Gordon, *UT*, supplement, 549)*.

de Vaux, *Sacrifice*	R. de Vaux, *Le Sacrifice dans l'Ancien Testament, (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique* I), Paris, 1964.
Vincent, *Religion*	A. Vincent, *La Religion des Judeo-Araméens à Elephantine,* Paris, 1937.
VT	*Vetus Testamentum, (Suppl. = Supplement).*
Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*	M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School,* Oxford, 1972.
Whittaker, *Concordance*	R. Whittaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature,* Harvard U., 1972.
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

---

* To find the corresponding number of a text in A. Herdner, *Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabetiques (CTA),* 1964, see: M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Konkordanz der Ugaritischen Textzählungen,* Neukirchen, 1972, or consult Whittaker's concordance on particular words.

PART ONE
THE *ŠELĀMÎM* SACRIFICE

INTRODUCTION

Some students of biblical religion consider the *zebaḥ* "slain offering" to have been the basic form of Israelite sacrifice. It was a rite utilized for a wide variety of cultic occasions and several types of *zebaḥ* are recorded. The type which became most prominent was *zebaḥ haššelā-mîm*, most often listed merely as *šelāmîm*, or *haššelāmîm*.[1]

The precise sense of the term *šelāmîm* has eluded even the most recent scholars, and ascertaining the character and function of the rite so designated has constituted a crux in the study of biblical religion since late antiquity. This is evidenced, *inter alia*, by the several divergent renderings of the term in the Septuagint translations to various biblical books, and is similarly suggested by the preservation of multiple interpretations of the term in early Midrashim.[2]

The study of the *šelāmîm* sacrifice has been complicated by the

---

[1] The Bible attests, in addition to *zebaḥ haššelāmîm* the following: *zebaḥ (ḥag ḥap) pesaḥ* "the Pascal slain offering" (Ex 12:27, 34:25); *zebaḥ hayyāmîm* "the annual slain offering" (See Appendix IV): *zebaḥ/zibḥê tôdāh* "-of thanksgiving" (Lev 7:12-13, 22:29, Ps 107:22); *zibḥê ṣedeq* "slain offerings rightfully due the deity "(See Appendix IV); *zibḥê terûʿāh* "—accompanied by the blast" (Ps 27:6, and cf. Nu 10:10); *zebaḥ mišpāḥāh* "family slain offering" (I Sam 20:29, and cf. v. 6); *zibḥê mētîm* "—to the dead" (Ps 106:28). The term *šelāmîm* is not, therefore, synonymous with *zebaḥ, per se*. Only subsequent to the enactments promulgated in *H* and *P*, making the *šelāmîm* the *zebaḥ*, par excellence, did the two terms become partially, though not consistently interchangeable. See Part I, n. 124. On the *zebaḥ*, generally, and notions about its role in Israelite worship, see R. J. Thompson, *Penitence and Prayer in Early Israel*, 1963, 2 f., 36 f., and index, s.v. *zebaḥ*. G. Ryckmans, *HUCA* 23, 1950-51, Part I, 431-8, discusses the evidence for the sacrifice called *ḏbḥ* in the Safaitic inscriptions, and cf. on the same subject, Gray, *Sacrifice*, Appendix II, 406. Certain lexicographic problems relevant to the term *zebaḥ* are discussed in our Appendix I.

[2] See Daniel, *Vocabulaire*, 273-97 on the translations of the term *šelāmîm* in *LXX*, and the brief discussion in Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xi-xii, and ns. 7-8. The three renderings of *šelāmîm* in *LXX* are: a) *to sōtērion*, and related forms: "that which saves, preserves." b) *teleiōsis*, and related forms: "complete, perfect." c) *eirenikos*, and related forms: "that which concerns peace." We are most interested in the first of the three, which Daniel sees as conveying the original understanding of the term by the Judeo-Hellenistic Bible translators. Particularly relevant is Daniel's discussion of the term *to sōtērion* in Hellenistic historical and inscriptional sources (*ibid*. 278-81). Her findings *re* these non-Jewish sources tie in well with our overall interpretation of the *šelāmîm* and its roles in ancient Israel, including the following considerations: a) The public character of the *sōtērion* sacrifice as an offering appropriate for city-wide and/or royal celebrations, often connected with the honoring of eminent personages. b) The *sōtērion* as an

wide range of connotations attendant on the common Semitic root
š-l-m, which is charged with religious, ethical, and even socio-political
and economic associations. Theological notions have intruded upon
philological investigations to the point that the varying suggestions
on the meaning of šelāmîm tend to correspond to notions lying within
distinct theological contexts, most notably the interrelated complex
of communion, covenant, and fellowship.[3]

Sufficient evidence is now available for ascertaining the precise
character of the šelāmîm sacrifice and for defining its roles in the reli-
gious life of ancient Israel, but we must first unravel the confusion of

---

offering expressive of thanksgiving over rescue from disease and ill fortune.
c) The utilization of the *sōtērion* on fixed dates.

We cannot be certain whether the translation *to sōtērion* represents a traditio of
Jewish exegesis, or merely the selection of a current Greek term deemed appro-
priate.

On the various Midrashic interpretations, see *Midrash Haggadol, Leviticus*, ed.
N. Rabinowitz, 1932, 55. Implied are the following meanings for the term *šelāmîm*:
a) *šehakkōl šelāmîm bô* "that all come out with something from it." As the Midrash
explains, the priests receive their portions, and the altar its fatty sections, and the
rest of the flesh and the hides go to the donor(s). Cf. the modern rendering:
"shared offering" in *NEB*, s.v. Lev 3:1, *et passim*. b) Only one who is *šālēm*
"whole" may offer the *šelāmîm*, to the exclusion of the *'ônēn*, one who has yet to
bury his dead. Also see *Midrash Haggadol, Leviticus*, 140-43, for a paean to *šālôm*,
thematically associated with the *šelāmîm* sacrifice, and cf. the summary of tradi-
tional interpretations presented by Hoffmann, *Leviticus*, I, 131-3, on the *šelāmîm*.
Although it is normal for the Midrash to present several interpretations to any
word or passage, one senses, in this case, a certain puzzlement.

[3] Major discussions of the šelamin sacrifice in recent years include the following:
(1) Schmid, *Bundesopfer*, a monograph which stresses the notion of covenant with
respect to the *šelāmîm*, after Dussaud and earlier scholars. (See Part I, n. 24 for
Schmid's theory on the origins of the *šelāmîm*). (2) De Vaux, *Sacrifice*, 22-48, a
concise summary of accepted notions on the *šelāmîm* as "communion sacrifice,"
with a review of the comparative evidence, and exegetical problems. (3) R. Rend-
torff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel*, 1967, 119-62. (See Part I, n. 48
on Rendtorff's understanding of the term *šelāmîm*, itself, and note his related
study, *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift*, 1963, 23-38). (4) A. Charbel. *Il Sacrificio
Pacifico*, 1967, a monograph whose title betrays the author's understanding of the
biblical *šelāmîm*. (Also note Charbel's questionable attempt to attest the *šelāmîm*
at Elephantine in *Bibbia e Oriente* 12, 1970, 91-94). (5) W. Eisenbeis, *Die Wurzel
š-l-m im alten Testament (Beihefte, ZAW* 113) 1969, 71-73, 222-96. Eisenbeis shows
insight in connecting the *šelāmîm* and the royal establishment in ancient Israel,
but, in our opinion, fails to see the import of his evidence, and reverts to the
sense of "*Ganzheit; Verbundenheit*," for the term *šelāmîm*, following accepted
renderings. See 285-96 for a review of his conclusions.

Further discussions of importance include: Dussaud, *Origines*, 96-116, 327. (See
Part I, ns. 89-90 for the influence of Dussaud's views). Blome, *Opfermaterie*, 77,
104. N. Snaith, *VT* 7, 1957, 308 f. Elliger, *Leviticus*, 99-103. De Moor, *Schrift*,
112-17, and *idem, UF* I, 1969, 182, n. 111.

exegesis, etymology, history and theology in an effort to isolate the term *šelāmîm* from other terms used in biblical literature to designate sacrificial offerings.

As a term, *šelāmîm* has a history of its own, and the tracing of that history should be the first step in discussing the *šelāmîm* sacrifice. Evidence on the term *šelāmîm* yields the following general outline: The term is attested in Ugaritic documents, dating from the last half of the second millennium BCE. It also occurs in the singular, *šlm*, in the Punic tariffs, usually dated to the fourth or third centuries, BCE. The biblical evidence stands between the Ugaritic and Punic as a large "middle", more difficult to interpret, and yet potentially more enlightening.

We can anticipate at the outset that purely etymological considerations will be of only secondary importance in establishing the sense of the term *šelāmîm*. An argument could be advanced for almost all of the classic suggestions. The determination as to which set of meanings for the root *š-l-m* applies to the technical term in question must be arrived at on other than etymological grounds. Nevertheless, care must be exercised to demonstrate that a newly proposed meaning can be legitimately derived from the root *š-l-m*. In so doing, we can use the fact that, as a term for sacrifice, *šelāmîm* has a pre-biblical history in the Ugaritic texts. We need not, therefore, be bound to normative Hebrew idiom, and may be justified in giving precedence to cognate usage.

In addition to historical and linguistic considerations, a proper understanding of the *šelāmîm* sacrifice requires a precise overall classification of the biblical terms for sacrifice. Technical terms reflect a discrete orientation. In a selective manner they disclose to us only certain aspects of that which they designate. Biblical terms for sacrifice usually designate rites which, in their realized forms and functions encompass more than the term, itself, necessarily connotes. Our task is to ascertain what, in fact, each term tells us about the rite it designates and what it does not purport to tell us.[4] As a rule, a term cannot be interpreted to mean something that runs counter to its orientation, but quite often its functional definition retains very little connection

---

[4] G. B. Gray came close to formulating the notion of orientational categories in his discussion of terminology and etymology (Gray, *Sacrifice*, 1-20). His goal was to identify precisely what was conveyed by the etymology of a particular term for an understanding of its role and function. Also see *ibid.* 56-7, for Gray's sage comment on the nature and limits of terminology, and *ibid.* 47 f. on the terminology of the propitiatory sacrifices.

with that orientation. Thus, a functional definition of the term *ʿolāh*
might be "burnt offering" or "holocaust", because of the prescribed
manner of its disposition, but the orientation of the term relates to
some "ascent", either of the sacrifice on the altar, of the smoke
heavenward; or to the officiant's ascent on to some tower, wall, or
raised platform.[5] In studying the history of the *ʿolāh*, as an example,
it would be important to know how that sacrifice got its name, all
the while bearing in mind that, in functional terms, it did not remain
bound to the limited orientation reflected in its name.

Biblical terms for the various sacrifical offerings exhibit three
principal orientations:

(1) Terms indicating the *manner* of performing the rite. Related to
this is the question of the substance, or *matter* to be utilized. As
might be expected, there is an overlapping of manner and matter,
since the substances used may determine the disposition of the
sacrifice.[6]

(2) Terms indicating the position of a sacrifice within the order,
sequence or structure of the cult, or in the calendar of sacred events.[7]

---

[5] See de Vaux, *Sacrifice*, 28, n. 2; Gray, *Sacrifice*, 7. The suggestion of a tower
sacrifice comes from a comparison with practices known at Ugarit. See H. L.
Ginsberg, *BASOR, Suppl.* 2-3, 1946, 37, s.v. Keret A, line 70 f.

[6] Following is a list of biblical terms for sacrifice which reflect the orientation
of manner and/or matter: (1) *ʾiššeh* "fired offering" (Lev 23:8, *passim*.). (2) *billûlim*
"rites of jubilation" (Lev 19:24, Jud 9:27). (3) *zebaḥ* "slain offering" (See Appen-
dix I). (4) *kawwān* "cake offering" (Jer 7:18, 44:19, cf. Akkadian *kamānu* in *CADK*,
110, s.v.). (5) *leḥem (ʾelōhîm)* "food offering (for God)". (6) *maśʾēt* (Punic *mśʾt*)
"levied offering" (See Part I, n. 40, and Appendix II for the Punic evidence.
(7) *miśrāpāh** perhaps: "burnt offering," attested only in the pl. const. *miśrepôt*
(Jer 34:5). Cf. Ugaritic *šrp*. (8) *nesek* "libation" (See *LVT* 620, s.v. *nesek* I). (9)
ʿolāh "offering of ascent," or: "ascending offering." (See Part I, n. 5). (10) *qetôret*
"incense offering" (See M. Haran, *VT* 10, 1960, 113-28). (11) *qorbān* "presentation"
(See Part II, n. 121). (12) *tenûpāh* "raised offering." (See J. Milgrom, *IEJ* 22, 1972,
33-8). (13) *terûmāh* "contribution." (See Part I, n. 40).

Possibly to be assigned to this category are the following: (1) *bikkûrîm* "first
fruits," assuming the term reflects the substance of the offering. (See B. A. Levine,
EJ 6, 1312-14). (2) *millûʾim* "rites of investiture" (Ex 29:22, *passim*, Lev 7:37,
8:22, *passim*). (3) *nîḥôaḥ* "pleasurable aroma" (Lev 26:31, and see *LVT* 614).
(4) *rēʾšit* "first/best fruits/grains" (Lev 23:10, Nu 15:20, Dt 18:4, 26:10, Jer 2:3
(as a metaphor), Ezek 20:40, etc.)

[7] Following are terms which reflect the order or position of the sacrifice in the
structure of the cult, or the liturgical calendar: (1) *pesaḥ* "sacrifice of the *Pesaḥ*
festival". See Part I, n. 1 on the *zebaḥ*, in general, and *LVT* 769, s.v. *pesaḥ*). In
later biblical usage the pl. *pesāḥim* occurs (II Chron 30:17, 35:7, *passim*., con-
tinuing into *LH*. It is to be assumed that when the verb *ʿāśāh* takes *pesaḥ* as its
object the sacrifice is intended, and not the festival, as a whole (Ex 12:48, Nu 9:10,

(3) Terms indicating the *religious attitude* or human-divine relationship which called forth the sacrifice; the *motivation, purpose,* or *special preconditions* that underlie it. In this category we find the sacrifices of expiation, thanksgiving, etc.[8]

The above classification must be qualified in two respects:

(1) The same term may operate within more than one orientational category, depending on its particular application. Thus, the term *minḥāh* belongs in category 3 when it means "tribute; gift to a deity," but in category 2 when it means "evening offering," and in category 1 when it means "grain offering."

(2) Many terms require "further specification." Again using the term *minḥāh* as an example, we have such composite terms as *minḥat qenā'ôt* "a grain offering [brought in consequence] of passionate suspicions" (Numbers 5:15, 18, 25). In a similar way, the various substances used in concocting the *minḥāh* may account for further specifications.[9] The observable fluctuations in technical sense serve to complicate the precise definition of the biblical terms for sacrifice.

Operating within a classification of orientational categories is indispensable, and we shall note that, in effect, the various suggestions as to the meaning of the term *šelāmîm* imply assigning the term to one

---

etc.). (2) *tāmîd, ḥattāmîd* "daily offering." See B. A. Levine, *Lešonēnû* (Hebrew), 30, 1965-66, 3 f., and the brief comment by H. L. Ginsberg, *EJ* 5, 1162, s.v. "The Regular Public Offerings"). (3) *piggûl* "delayed offering." See B. A. Levine, *EB* VI (Hebrew), 1971, 435-6, s.v. *piggûl*). (4) *šabbātôn* "Sabbath feast" (Ex 16:23, and possibly Lev 23:24, 29). It is not certain that the feast is designated by this term, and it may refer to the overall occasion, in a broader sense.

[8] Following are terms which reflect religious motivation or purpose: (1) '*azkārāh* "token." (Thus *NJV*. Also see G. R. Driver, *JSS* I, 1956, 99-100). (2) '*āšām* "expiatory penalty" (See Part II, ch. V, and Appendix IV). (3) *ḥanukkāh* "dedication offering." Cf. verbal form in I Kings 8:63. (4) *ḥaṭṭā't* "offering for expiating an offense" (See discussion, Part II, chs. VI-VIII). (5) *kippûrîm* "rites of expiation" (See Part II, chs. I-IV). (6) *nedābāh* "voluntary offering" (See Part I, n. 111). (7) *neder* "votive offering." (See Part I, n. 108). (8) '*abôdāh* "cultic service/worship." (Ex 12:25-6, 13:5, 29:35, II Chron 35:10, 16, See J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology* I, 1970, 60-87, especially 82, n. 301, and 87, n. 322). Cf. Aramaic *polḥān* (Ezra 7:19). (9) *qodāšîm* (*qôdeš haqqodāšîm*) "sacred offering(s)." (See *LVT* 827-8, s.v. *qôdeš*). (10) *tô'ēbāh* "abominable offering." (For sources see J. L'Hour, *RB* 71, 1964, 481-503, and *LVT* 1022, s.v. *tô'ēbāh*, and literature cited.

[9] On *minḥāh* see B. A. Levine, W. W. Hallo, *HUCA* 38, 1967, 46, n. 21, and Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xli, n. 56, and literature cited. In I Sam 2:17 the term *minḥāh* connotes animal sacrifices, as well. Gray's discussion on the etymology of the term *minḥāh* is inconclusive (Gray, *Sacrifice*, 14-17). Until a clear etymology is found, this term cannot be assigned to an orientational category with certainty. It would seem to reflect manner.

or another category. It is our view, anticipating our subsequent discussion of the *šelāmîm* sacrifice, that it belongs in the third category, that reflecting religious attitude.

Now that our basic method has been introduced, we may proceed to treat the evidence bearing on the term *šelāmîm* in detail, beginning with the Ugaritic texts.

I. THE UGARITIC EVIDENCE

The term *šlmm*, as the designation of a type of sacrifice, occurs in a number of descriptive ritual texts, recording various sacrifices offered to different deities of the Ugaritic pantheon on specific occasions. Some of these texts were treated in an earlier study, where our particular concern did not center around the *šlmm* offering, as such, but where it was our purpose to analyze the formularies wherein consonantal *šlmm* represented a term for sacrifice, and not a divine name, or a noun simply meaning: "peace, wellbeing."[10] Since that study was completed, new descriptive rituals have been uncovered, in some respects even more enlightening than what was formerly available, and it is time to review our assessment of the Ugaritic evidence bearing on the *šlmm* sacrifice and its role.[11] Aspects of this new material, published in *Ugaritica V*, have been treated by Loren Fisher and J. C. de Moor.[12] Anson Rainey has prepared a most helpful analysis and review of the new texts, adding new insights into the philological and exegetical problems which they present, and other scholars have also treated particular problems relevant to our present discussion.[13]

New occurrences of the pair *šrp- (w)šlmm* "-a burnt offering (and) a *šlmm* offering" have come to light, attesting the parallelism of the two terms, as well as their occurrence in sequence.[14] As has been noted, the pair *šrp- (w)šlmm* is functionally equivalent to the biblical

[10] See *JCS* 17, 1963, 108-8. The term *šlmm* occurs in *UT* 1:4, 3:29 (173:31), 5:7, 9:7, 15, and possibly in 5:21.

[11] The term *šlmm* occurs in the following new texts: *UT* 609, obv. 10, 611:9, 612:9, 613:10. These texts were first published by Ch. Virolleaud in *Ugaritica V*, 1968, 545 f., with plates and glossary.

[12] See L. Fisher, *Ugaritica* VI, 1969, 197-205, and J. C. de Moor, *UF* I, 1969, 167-188, *UF* II, 1970, 303-27. Also see J. Blau, J. C. Greenfield, *BASOR* 200, 1970, 15, and see further, in ns. 13-22 for literature.

[13] See the study of Anson F. Rainey, "The Ugaritic Texts in Ugaritica V," to appear shortly. I am grateful to Prof. Rainey for making the manuscript of his study available to me before publication.

[14] The pair *šrp-šlmm* occurs in *UT* 612:9-10, 613:15-16, and cf. 611:9-10, and *wšlmm* in 609:9-10.

pair *'ôlāh/'ôlôt (û)šelāmîm* "holocaust(s) (and) *šelāmîm* offering(s)", thus further strengthening the identification of the Ugaritic and Hebrew terms, by indicating that the *šlmm* at Ugarit, like its biblical counterpart, served as part of composite rites of the same order.[15]

The term *šlmm* also occurs by itself in a few elaborate descriptive rituals which reveal something of its significance.[16] Ugaritic *šlmm* is masc. pl. of the Segollate type, *šalamûma*. As yet, the singular has not been definitely attested in Ugaritic.[17]

One of the most important new texts for an understanding of the *šlmm* offering at Ugarit is *UT* 611. The entire content is relevant to our present discussion, and we here present the transcribed text and our translation of it:[18]

----

[15] De Moor, *Schrift*, 112-14, makes a good point on the phrasing of *šrp-wšlmm* in the Ugaritic descriptive rituals, and we are prepared to revise the phrasing we had adopted in our earlier study on this genre of texts (*JCS* 17, 1963, 107). To summarize the problem: In *UT* 609 it is clear that lines 1-9 constitute a section of the text, and that consequently *wšlmm* in line 10 introduces a new section. The same is true in *UT* 1:4. There, we have a sequence in lines 3-4, terminating in the term *šrp*, and a new section beginning with the term *wšlmm*. (Cf. *UT* 613:15-16, and probably 9:7, 173:15, where the texts are broken). In *UT* 3:16 it is difficult to ascertain whether or not *šlmm* (here without a *Waw*) begins a new section.

The above, a slight modification of de Moor's findings, suggests the formulation customary in the cultic codes of the Pentateuch, where conjunctive *Waw* often introduces a new series or type of regulations. Thus, in Nu 7:14-16, *et passim.*, we have: "1 bull... *le'ôlāh*, and 1 kid-goat *leḥaṭṭā't*; *ûlezebaḥ haššelāmîm*: 2 bulls," etc. Similarly, in Lev 23:18: *ûminḥātām*, which introduces the rule concerning a new class of offerings. Also cf. Nu, chs. 28-9, where conjunctive *Waw* has the same force.

This new, more accurate phrasing of the Ugaritic descriptive rituals further clarifies the nature of the rites involved, but does not contradict what we are saying about the connection between the *šrp* and *šlmm*. The *šlmm* often followed upon the *šrp*, which accounts for the appropriateness of *šlmm* as a parallel word for *šrp* in *UT* 612:9-10. The same could be said of *'ôlāh-šelāmîm* in biblical poetry. cf. Amos 5:22, Ps 51:18. In the light of the above, the discussion by A. Schoors, *Ras Shamra Parallels* I, 1972, (*An. Or.* 49), 4-5, s.v. entry 1, requires some modification.

[16] *UT* 609 is a good example of the descriptive ritual. See Rainey, *Ug V*, s.v. 609:10, and cf. J. C. de Moor, *UF* II, 1970, 306 f. for a treatment of the entire text. As de Moor notes, *dbḥ ṣpn* "the (slain) offering of/to *ṣpn*" is elsewhere associated with *dbḥ mlk* "the (slain) offering of the king" in *UT* 2004:3, a text which in certain other respects resembles *UT* 609. Note the passage: *k t'rb 'ṭtrt šd bt mlk* "When *'ṭtrt* of the fields(?) enters the temple/palace" (*UT* 2004:10//609:18). *UT* 609 records a series of offerings to the pantheon as a whole (*pḫr ilm*, in line 9), and to each of the listed gods, individually. The text is divided into five parts, of which the first two concern us primarily: 1) lines 1-9—the *dbḥ* to the list of deities, and 2) lines 10-12, the *šlmm* sacrifice which accompanied it. See above, ns. 14-15.

[17] See Part I, n. 44.

[18] See L. Fisher, *op. cit.*, 197-205, and cf. Part I, n. 22. Also see J. C. de Moor, *UF* II, 1970, 316-17, and Rainey *Ug V*, s.v. *UT* 611, and literature cited.

1. *id ydbḥ mlk*
2. *l uš[ḥr ḥl]mṭ*
3. *l bbt ilbt*
4. *š l ḥlmṭ*
5. *w tr l qlḥ*
6. *w š ḥll ydm*
7. *b qdš ilbt*
8. *w tlḥm aṭṭ*

9. *š l ilbt šlmm*
10. *kll ylḥm bh*
11. *w l bbt šqym*
12. *š l u⟨š⟩ḥr ḥlmṭ*

13. *w tr l qlḥ*
14. *ym aḥd*

Translation:

1. When the king offers slain offerings.
2. to *Ušḥr*, the serpent,
3. in the inner sanctum of the god of the temple (?)--[19]
4. A male head of small cattle for the serpent,
5. and a dove for *Qlḥ*.
6. A male head of small cattle for the *ḥll ydm* rite[20]
7. in the sanctuary of the god of the temple (?).
8. The woman (= the queen) partakes.
9. A male head of small cattle for the god of the temple(?) as the *šlmm* offered in connection with
10. the *kalil*. He (= the king) partakes of it.[21]

---

[19] After Rainey, *Ug V*, s.v. *UT* 611, who notes that there is no evidence for a deity, *bbt*. Rainey contrasts line 3 with line 7, suggesting that in line 3 a ritual takes place in the inner sanctum, whereas in line 7 a rite is performed in the main, or outer temple *(bqdš)*. Rainey also compares Ugaritio *lbbt* to Hebrew *ûlemibbêt lappārôket* "inward of the *pārôket*-curtain" (Nu 18:7).

[20] Both J. C. de Moor (*UF* 1, 1970, 317) and J. Blau, and J. C. Greenfield (*BASOR* 200, 1970, 15) relate *ḥll* to Akkadian *ellu, elēlu*, thus to some purification rite. We cannot presently explain this term. Virolleaud (*Ugaritica* V, 1968, 588) suggests that it is the name of a region whence came the sacrificial animals.

[21] Our translation agrees in general with Blau-Greenfield (*BASOR* 200, 1970, 15). Also see our Appendix II on the Punic evidence for the term *šlm kll*. We cannot agree however, that *ylḥm* is a passive form (Cf. Rainey, *Ug* V, s.v. *UT* 611, who also doubts this interpretation). If we assume that *ylḥm* has as its antecedent the king (line 1), we then have both the queen (line 8) and the king partaking of the sacrifice. The suggestion of L. Fisher, (*op. cit.*, 198, and n. 11) that *kll* means "all," i.e. everyone (cf. Virolleaud, *op. cit.*, 586) seems to go counter to the usage

11. And in the inner sanctum, a libation.[22]
12. A male head of small cattle for *Ushr*, the serpent,

---

13. and a dove for *Qlh*.
14. Day: One.[23]

The record of this rite emphasizes the consumption of parts of the sacrifice, if not most of it, by the officiants and/or donors. This corresponds to what we know of the *zebah* type of sacrifice in biblical praxis, and to the disposition of the *šelāmîm* as representative of that type.

As we shall note in our discussion of the biblical evidence, the fact that the king and queen participate in a rite which included a *šlmm* offering corresponds to our tracing of the role of the *šelāmîm* in ancient Israel.[24]

Since the beginning of Ugaritic studies, scholars have sought to find occurrences of the term *šlmm* in the epic texts. One suggested

---

of *kll* in Ugaritic, where it is an adverbial adj. (Cf. *UT*, glossary, 1240, s.v. *kll*, and *ibid.* text 1015:14). Rainey's view (*Ug V*, s.v. 611) that *kll ylhm bh* means: "He will eat everything from it" is possible, if by "everything" is meant those portions of the *šlmm* which were eaten by priests and/or officiants, since not all of the *šlmm* was eaten.

[22] L. Fisher, *op. cit.*, 198, and Rainey, *Ug V* s.v. *UT* 611:11, and literature cited. De Moor's suggestion that *šqym* is to be divided *šq ym*, and that *qym* means "regular fixed," cannot be accepted (*UF* II, 1970, 316-17). Aramaic and *LH qayyām/qayyāmā* means: "enduring," not: "regular," and *qeyām* in Aramaic and Syriac means "treaty, covenant." De Moor has probably confused the two. (Cf. Levy, *Wörterbuch*, IV, 294-5, s.v. *qîm, qām; qayyām, qayyāmā*'; and *qeyām, qeyāmā*').

We must also dispute Th. Gaster's contention (*JRAS*, 1944, 51, n. 70) that the *šlmm* at Ugarit was a drink offering. Here we see that a libation was part of the rites of which the *šlmm* was also a part.

[23] We find it difficult to accept L. Fisher's conclusion (*op. cit.*, 199 f.) that Genesis, chapter 1, reflects a liturgical background, a conclusion based, as far as we can see, on the fact that it and *UT* 611 (line 14) contain a calendrical formula, *ym ahd/yôm 'ehhad* (Gen 1:5b). We agree with Fisher, however, that *ym ahd* means "the first day," as in Genesis, and not "a single day" (thus Virolleaud, *op. cit.*, 586) or: "each day" (thus Blau-Greenfield, *op. cit.*, 15).

[24] *A propos* of the evidence provided by *UT* 611 on the *šelāmîm* as a type of *dbh*, we are led to comment on a review of Schmid, *Bundesopfer*, by D. Gill, *Biblica* 47, 1966, 255-62. Gill evaluates Schmid's theory that the burnt offerings of the Ugaritians, Canaanites, and Israelites represented a mode of sacrifice borrowed from the Aegean peoples. This is a major problem to which we hope to devote a separate study. Gill seems to be on solid ground when dealing with Aegean and Greek sources, but his acquaintance with Northwest Semitic sources is secondary. As an example, Gill accepted Schmid's judgment that the *šlmm* at Ugarit was not identical to the *šelāmîm* in biblical Israel, while, on the other hand,

occurrence is in III Anat, lines 13-14. The passage in question presents difficulties independent of its possible relevance to the technical term *šlmm*. It is composed of two couplets:

1. *qryy barṣ mlḥmt*
   št bʿpr(t/ḥm) ! ddym
2. *sk šlm bqrb arṣ*
   arbdd lkbd šdm

In his translation of the Ugaritic texts, Cyrus Gordon followed the earlier trend, which had identified the term for a sacrifice in consonantal *šlm*, rendering the entire passage as follows:

Put bread into the earth
Set *mandrakes* in the dust
Pour a *peace offering* in the midst of the earth
A *libation* in the midst of the fields![25]

Albrecht Goetze presented a new translation which, in our opinion, comes closer to the actual meaning of this passage. He rendered the two couplets as follows:

Remove war from the earth!
Do away with passion
Pour out peace over the earth,
Loving-kindness over the fields![26]

The former couplet stands in contrast to the latter. The former speaks of the elimination of negative factors, and the latter of the production of positive, desirable factors. Clearly, *mlḥmt* is more likely to mean "war; wars," than "bread," and although certainty as to the

---

also accepting his judgment that the *šrp* at Ugarit was identical to the *ʿōlāh* and *kālîl* of the biblical cult:

We can hardly accept de Moor's view (*Schrift*, 115-6) that only the heart of the sacrificial animal was cast into the fire in the execution of the Ugaritic *dbḥ*. This conclusion is based on a problematic word, *wḥurm* (*UT*, glossary, no. 800) in which de Moor finds *ur* "fire," and on a restoration which produces *lb* "heart"!

[25] C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, 1949, 19, s.v. III Anat: 11-14. De Moor also indicates his acceptance of this rendering (*Schrift*, 116, n. 32) Gordon apparently changed his mind, for in *UT*, glossary, no. 1367 *mlḥmt* is rendered "war". On the other hand, *ddym* (*ibid*, no. 648) and *arbdd* (*ibid*, no. 330) are left untranslated. We don't understand how Gordon's rendering of *qryy* as "contentious" fits into the overall translation, although in itself, this translation, which Gordon bases on Syriac *qeroyoyoʾ* (*Lex. Syr².*, 691, s.v), the Peshitta's rendering of Hebrew *qerî* (Lev 26:21), is possible.

[26] A. Goetze, *BASOR* 93, 1944, 17-20. Goetze's views were presented as part of his discussion of the Gospel formula in Luke 2:14: "And on earth, peace; Goodwill toward men."

sense of *ddym* and *arbdd* is not yet possible, a relationship to a root meaning "love, passion" is definitely reasonable.[27] The verb *qryy* is problematic in both interpretations, but there is no problem in taking the preposition *Beth* as "from," in line with Goetze's translation.[28]

Although a clear rendering of the passage eludes us, there is enough to recommend the view that *šlm* means "peace," or the like, and we therefore conclude that the term for sacrifice is not present in this epic passage, which, in turn, eliminates all sorts of artificial problems allegedly occasioned by the occurrence of a term for sacrifice in this context.

J. C. de Moor has suggested that in II Anat: 31-32 and in the more recently published *UT* 603: rev. 4 the singular *šlm* occurs as the term for sacrifice. The passage as restored, reads:

yṣq šmn šlm bṣ'

This, de Moor renders:

"Oil of a *šlm*- offering is poured from a bowl."[29]

If correct, this interpretation would add the singular of the term for sacrifice to the Ugaritic lexicon and would constitute yet another attestation of the term for sacrifice in an epic text. The context is, indeed, sacral, especially in the fuller version of II Anat, where the goddess is preparing herself for a ritual, and, in addition to ablutions, rouges her hands and arms. There is, however, no real basis for seeing the term for sacrifice here, and it is more likely that the use of oil was for the purpose of annointing the goddess, as a form of purification or as a means of investing her in a cultic office. It is, therefore, preferable to preserve the accepted rendering, i.e. "oil of peace/wellbeing is poured from a bowl."[30]

Of possible comparative relevance is the biblical phrase: *šemen śāśôn* "oil of delight" applied in one instance to the unction of the

---

[27] That a word having the positive connotation of "love" can also connote a negative emotion is also evidenced by Hebrew *q-n-'*. Contrast *qin'āh*, with the usual sense of "envy" (Eccl 4:4), as a parallel to *'ahabāh* "love" in Cant 8:6.

[28] On *qryy* see Goetze, *op. cit.*, 18, and n. 12; 19, and n. 14. Goetze takes it as a *Pi''ēl* inf. abs. in the sense of "remove." His interpretation of II Aqhat VI:43 is suggestive. Instead of: "I encounter you on the path of sin, "etc. Goetze suggests: "I remove you from the path of sin."

[29] Contra de Moor, *Schrift*, 116, n. 32, and with Virolleaud, *op. cit.*, 559.

[30] Cf. *UT*, glossary, no. 2424, and L. Fisher, F. Knutzon, *JNES* 28, 1969, 160. Also see U. Cassuto, *The Goddess Anath*, trans. from the Hebrew by I. Abrahams, 1971, 120.

divinely elected king, (Psalm 45:8), and in another context used as
one of several images to dramatize the contrast between mourning
and rejoicing (Isaiah 63:1).

Consonantal *šlmm* occurs in yet another epic passage, a refrain that
appears in the Keret epic. Keret has lain seige to the city of Udum.
The king of that city, *Pbl-mlk*, sent forth a legation to Keret, en-
treating him to withdraw the siege and promising him, in the nature
of tribute, any number of valuable commodities. The official message
reads as follows:

> *thm.pbl.mlk*
> *qh.ksp.wyrq.hrs*
> *yd.mqmh.w'bd.'lm*
> *tlt.sswm.mrkbt*
> *btrbs.bn.amt*
> *qh.krt.šlmm*
> *šlmm.wng.mlk*
> *lbty.rhq.krt*
> *lhzry.al.tsr*
> *udm.rbt.wudm trrt*
> *udm.ytnt.il wušn*
> *ab.adm*

Translation:

Message of *Pblmlk*:
Take silver and yellow-glittering gold;
yd mqmh and perpetual slaves;
a groom, horses, chariots
from the stable, and the son of a handmaiden.
Take, Keret, *šlmm*
šlmm! And flee, oh king,
from my palace! Be distant, Keret,
from my court! Do not besiege
Udum, the greater or the smaller!
For Udum is the gift of El;
the present of the father of man.[31]

Before H. L. Ginsberg's innovative study on the Keret epic, most
scholars had sought the term for sacrifice in this passage, and had
ventured all sorts of vague speculations as to what type of "sacrifice"
it was that was offered to Keret. Ginsberg, also sensing the inappro-

---

[31] H. L. Ginsberg, *BASOR* Suppl. 2-3, 1946, 17, s.v. Keret lines 126-36, *et
passim* and 39, in his comments on the text.

priateness of a term for sacrifice in this context, took *šlmm* as *šlm-m* (the enclitic) and rendered it: "Make peace:" or perhaps: "Be at peace!"[32]

This interpretation is possible, but we find it problematic. It would make more sense if the one besieged were to sue for peace, rather than the besieger. One is reminded of the laws of war stipulated in Deuteronomy (20:10-14). In the dynamics of a siege, the besieger, hoping to avoid the protracted effort and expense involved, customarily offers terms of peace to the city under attack, and only if this fails, undertakes the siege.

Fully understanding Ginsberg's attempt to take *šlmm* as something other than a term for sacrifice, we feel impelled, nevertheless, to re-examine the possibilities of *šlmm*, as a substantive. If we were to take *šlmm* in this Keret passage as the same term used elsewhere in Ugaritic to designate a type of sacrifice, but employed here in a different technical connotation, the inappropriateness of a cultic term in the context of sieges would be eliminated and, at the same time, a new perspective would be created in our understanding of the history of the term *šlmm*.

We propose that *šlmm* in the Keret passage means something like "tribute", and that the clause in question is to be rendered:

"Take, Keret, tribute, and more tribute!"[33]

In support of this suggestion, we will now proceed to demonstrate just how such a meaning can be adduced for Ugaritic *šlmm*, and thus for biblical *šelāmîm*, as well. It is generally recognized that, in ancient Near Eastern languages, many terms for sacrifice have as their underlying meaning the sense of "gift, tribute, present," and the like. This is only to be expected, since however we interpret the motivations and experiences relevant to ritual activity, the fact is that something desired by the deity is conveyed to him by his worshippers through the act of sacrifice. A gift of sorts is offered to the deity; presented to him by persons subservient to him.[34]

Semantically, we note that terms for "gift, tribute," etc. are regularly

---

[32] The rendering: "Be at peace:" was communicated to the author verbally.

[33] Repetition occasionally indicates accumulation or increment. Cf. in Hebrew: *ḥomārîm, ḥomārîm* "heaps and heaps" (Ex 8:10, Nu 11:32) and see de Moor, *Schrift*, 117, n. 37.

[34] It was Gray, *Sacrifice*, 1-20 f. who argued the case for the gift theory of Israelite sacrifice. (Cf. Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxviii-xxx). Also see the rather interesting, albeit sketchy discussion by Th. van Baaren, "Theoretical Speculations

applied to cultic offerings. In Akkadian, the term *šulmānu* has the sense of "present" when employed in non-cultic contexts as a term of political, economic, juridical, or social relevance. In the framework of temple ritual the term *šulmānu* connotes a present offered to a deity, or to a sacral king or priest. Such gifts could consist of rare objects as well as sacrificial animals.[35] What is true of *šulmānu* is also true of its synonyms in Akkadian, *igiśû* and *kadrû*.[36] As we shall observe further on, the term *šulmānu* has considerable importance for our overall treatment of the *šelāmîm* sacrifice.

Hebrew analogues to the semantic process noted with respect to the Akkadian terms abound. The term *minḥāh* has the basic sense of "tribute, gift," in political or social contexts, but connotes a gift to the deity in cultic terminology, developing specialized connotations

on Sacrifice," *Numen* 11, 1964, 1-12. Van Baaren differentiates four notions of sacrifice in world religions: (1) Sacrifice as a gift. (2) Sacrifice as parting with something of one's own in a moment of renunciation. (3) Sacrifice as the repetition of a primordial event, such as creation. (4) Sacrifice as a form of symbolic sanctification of the world, i.e. as sacrament.

With regard to the biblical evidence, we find no indication of the sacramental dimension at all. The notion of renunciation for the benefit of the deity would apply only in the sense that Yahweh desired or took pleasure in sacrifices. It is our view that it is a misconception to attribute to this dimension more importance than it actually had. When the Israelite parted with something of value in presenting an offering he did so out of a certain practicality, assuming that a gift would produce a favorable disposition on the part of the deity. As for sacrifice as the repetition of a primordial event, we doubt that this existed in the biblical religious mentality. We have already presented our critique of Mowinckel and his school on this point. See Part I, ns. 98-9.

[35] On the term *šulmānu* see J. J. Finkelstein, *JAOS* 72, 1952, 77-80, and literature cited. Mainly, Finkelstein discusses the *šulmānu* as a payment to judges, in Middle Assyrian records, contending that it was not a bribe, *per se*, but a payment whose purpose was to bring one's case to speedy adjudication. On this basis, Finkelstein maintains the *hapax*, *šalmōnîm* in Isa 1:23 should not be understood as a bribe, either. Also see P. Artzi, *EI* 9, 1969, (Hebrew), 22-8, and literature cited, including J. C. Greenfield, *Proceedings of the Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 1967, 119. Artzi demonstrates how the *šulmānu* was associated with international trade and diplomacy in the Amarna period, based primarily on his analysis of Amarna letter no. 15. Most interesting, from our immediate point of view, is Artzi's conclusion that *šulmānu*-gifts were presented by envoys either immediately upon their arrival or before their arrival (*ibid*. 25, and n. 14). Furthermore, the purpose of the *šulmānu* in diplomatic and commercial contexts seems to have been the evoking of good will; more precisely, to ascertain the disposition of the ruler and his decision on the matter pending (*ibid*. 25, n. 25). (Also see *CAD A*/II, 23, s.v. *amāru šulmu*, a). Z. Kallai, and H. Tadmor, *EI* 9, 1969, (Hebrew), 139, ns. 12-14, 141, and ns. 25-7, and literature cited. There the cult of the deity *Šulmānu* is discussed, and well as the utilization of the element *šulmānu* in personal and divine names, generally.

[36] See *CAD I*, 41-3, s.v. *igiśû*, and *CAD K*, 32-3, s.v. *kadrû*.

as well.[37] Hebrew *minḥāh* is anticipated by Ugaritic *mnḥ(t)*.[38] Another example is Hebrew *berākāh* which bears the sense of "grant, estate," and also "tribute," but as a religious or cultic term connotes a gift, usually granted by the deity.[39]

Another Hebrew term reflecting the same semantic process is *maś'ēt* "levy; offering", a term also attested in the Punic tariffs. In a sense, the term *terûmāh* fits this category because it can connote either a "tax", as was imposed on the Israelites in connection with the construction of the tabernacle, or a specific type of obligatory cultic contribution to be conveyed to the priests. The former usage would seem to suggest a non-cultic matrix for the term *terûmāh*, particularly when we note technical usage of the verb *hērîm* in connection with aspects of taxation.[40]

Our major hypothesis concerning the sacrifice designated by the term *šlmm/šelāmîm* rests, therefore, on the well attested semantic process by which terms meaning "tribute, present," etc. are appropriated as cultic terms for sacrifices, conceived as gifts.

The lexicon of the cult thus appears to be largely derivative, taking its terminology from other spheres in the life of a society, and attributing specialized meanings to terms and concepts of broader application.[41] In the Keret passage, we have a singular instance in Ugaritic

---

[37] See Part I, n. 9, and P. Artzi, *op. cit.*, 25, n. 13. Artzi mentions for comparison Jacob's *minḥāh* to Esau (Gen 30:21) in discussing the *šulmānu* in the Amarna letters.

[38] On Ugaritic *mnḥ* see *UT*, glossary, no. 1500, and M. Dahood, *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets*, ed. L. Fisher, 1971, 31-2, and cf. correct rendering "tribute, offering," by A. Rainey, "Gleanings from Ugaritic," *Israel Oriental Series*, 1973, s.v. RS 1957.701, line 6.

[39] *Berākāh* has the sense of "estate, grant," in Gen 27:36, Jos 15:19, Jud 1:15, and in I Sam 30:26, connotes the spoils of war dispensed by the military leader, as a kind of tribute to those whose continuing friendship he sought. The sense of "tribute" for Hebrew *berākāh* is clearly conveyed in Gen 33:11 (synonymous with *minḥāh*), I Sam 25:27, II Kings 5:15, 18:31// Isa 36:16. In cultic contexts the *berākāh* is granted by God (Mal 3:10, Ps 24:5), and cf. Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxix, and n. 56.

[40] The Hebrew term *maś'ēt* (cf. Punic *mś't*, and see Appendix II), can designate a "tax, levy," or "tribute" (Amos 5:11, Esther 2:18) or "ration, allotment" (Gen 43:34, Jer 40:5, and probably II Sam 11:8). This term reflects the graphics of both the politico-economic and cultic situations, whereby a gift is presented by lifting it up, or whereby a tax is "carried away" from persons *(Hip'il of nāśā')*, as in II Sam 17:13, Ezek 17:9. We find cultic applications in Ezek 20:40, Ps 141:2, and II Chron 24:6. On *hērîm* in the sense of "raise a fund; collect a tax," see Nu 31:28, Ezra 8:25, II Cron 30:24, 35:7 f.

[41] See Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxix, and n. 55, and *idem. Lešōnēnû* (Hebrew), 30, 1965-66, 3-11.

of what was the basic sense of the term *šlmm*, whereas in the descriptive ritual texts we have the specialized cultic appropriation of that term, used to designate a type of sacrificial rite. As a socio-political term, *šlmm* is most appropriate to the context of Keret's siege of the city of Udum. The king of the besieged city offers his attacker a list of valuable items as a kind of tribute, hoping to persuade him not to press for the real object of military effort, the woman he is after. After enumerating these items, the besieged king summarizes his entreaty: "Take, Keret, tribute and more tribute! And flee—"

In this regard, we acknowledge the independent insight of J. C. de Moor who sensed the connection between the word *šlmm* in the Keret passage and the term for sacrifice in the ritual texts. Although his exegesis of the Keret passage is correct, de Moor's interpretation of the term *šlmm* is purely contextual. He renders it: "gifts that are offered in order to obtain peace." As for the cultic term *šlmm*, he suggests that it was a sacrifice offered so as "to prevent the deity from raging against his worshippers, and to guarantee the people a peaceful existence."[42]

As will become evident from our discussion to follow, this definition for the cultic term does not fit the role of the *šlmm/šelāmîm* in the ancient cults, and ignores lexicographic evidence relevant to the term, itself. In our opinion, de Moor errs by his adherence to the traditional notion of "peace/welfare offering" for the term *šlmm/šelāmîm*. Wherever the root *š-l-m* is involved, "peace, wellbeing," and the like, must also be involved in some way. As we shall note presently, these notions affect the term *šlmm/šelāmîm* in a roundabout way.

Establishing the sense of "present" for the term *šlmm* in the Keret passage, and in a larger sense, identifying its usage in this passage as the basis for our understanding of the cultic history of the *šlmm/šelāmîm* sacrifice requires us to demonstrate that Ugaritic *šlmm* can, indeed, bear the connotation of "tribute," etc., on grounds other than immediate context. In our opinion, this can be established by the comparative investigation of the common Semitic root *š-l-m*, and its derivatives.

The Akkadian term *šulmānu* "present", and in cultic contexts "offering of greeting, presentation", may provide us with an analogue to the relationship we are positing between the *word* of greeting and the *gift* of greeting, in suggesting our interpretation of *šlmm/šelāmîm*.

---

[42] De Moor, *Schrift*, 117, and ns. 37-8.

Akkadian *šulmānu* is compounded from the *quṭl* formation *šulmu* "peace, wellbeing," the word of greeting, plus *-ānu*, an afformative yielding *šulmu- ānu⟩ šulmānu.* The afformative *-ānu* has the effect of characterizing the noun to which it is affixed, yielding in this case, the overall sense: "That which pertains to *šulmu*; which bears or conveys the greeting of *šulmu.*" The best translation would be "present," with all that is latent in that word. This use of the afformative *-ānu* is paralleled in the term *qutrēnu(m)* "incense offering," from *qutru* "incense" plus *-ēnu(m)*, a variant of *-ānu.*[43] The term *šulmānu* thus assumes the connotation of "present" in a roundabout way. The essential meaning relates to the greeting itself, and the sense of "present" comes by association.

The situation in Ugaritic and in Hebrew is slightly different. Consonantal *š-l-m*, as a substantive, reflects in our context, two differentiated forms: a) a noun meaning "peace, wellbeing," and b) a term for sacrifice. In Hebrew, this differentiation is indicated by the vocalization of the former as *šālôm*, and of the latter as a Segollate, *šelem*, pl. *šelāmîm*. It is reasonable to posit a similar differentiated vocalization in Ugaritic, whereby "peace, wellbeing" is to be read *šalāmu* (nominative), and the term for tribute, offering, etc. would be taken as a *qaṭl* formation, sing. *šalmu, pl. *šalamûma.*[44] Certain possible interactions between the word for "peace" and for "gift of greeting" require further investigation.[45]

Except for the unique instance of *šelem* in Amos 5:22, and the occurrence of the singular in the Punic tariffs, *šlmm/šelāmîm* is probably restricted to the plural.[46] We do not consider the plural form problematic, since it is appropriate, after all, for characterizing gifts

---

[43] See W. von Soden, *GAG* 70, s.v. 56 r, 39, and *ibid.* 73, s.v. 58 b, and *ibid.* 77, s.v. 61 j, and *ibid.* 111, s.v. 85 d. As noted by Z. Kallai, H. Tadmor, *op. cit.*, 141, and n. 27, the *-ānu* afformative is to be differentiated from the pl. *-ānu* (variant: *-āni*, a later form), often attested in greetings as the pl. of *šulmu.* See A. F. Rainey, *Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, III:4, 1968, 136, for usage of *šulmu* as a word of greeting in Akkadian documents from Ugarit, and translations of epistolary greetings into Ugaritic. On *šulmu* as a word of greeting in the Amarna letters see P. Artzi, *op. cit.*, 27, and ns., and also *CADB* 55, s.v. *balāṭu* 2b (v), and *ibid.* 68, s.v. *balṭu* 2b', (adj.)

[44] See *UT*, grammar, 54, s.v. 8:7, on the masc. pl. of Segollate nouns.

[45] Personal names in Hebrew may hold some information. Thus, *Šelemyāh(û)* could mean: "gift for/of YHWH," in contrast to *Šelummi'ēl* (cf. *Šallûm*): "El is my ally/friend." (*Mešelemyāh(û)*) is probably analogized from *Mešullāmyāhû*). When the notion is "peace," etc. the pointing is: *Šelômô, Šelômît*, etc. (See *LVT*, 981).

[46] The sing. *šelem* may occur in a Hebrew ostracon from Arad. See B. A. Levine, *IEJ* 19, 1969, 49-50, and literature cited.

and offerings. Usually, more than one gift or offering was presented, which accounts for the frequency of plurals. One example is Ugaritic *tlḥm*, Hebrew *šillūḥîm* "parting gifts, dowry."[47]

The preceding discussion of the Ugaritic evidence leads us quite directly to the biblical sources. We are treating a pre-biblical term, with close Akkadian affinities, and with a pre-established context in Ugaritic which at least classifies the *šlmm* in the *dbḥ/zebaḥ* category, and already relates it to a burnt offering as a conventional pair of cultic rites. What is perhaps most important is that Ugaritic enables us to trace the original provenience of the term *šlmm/šelāmîm* to a non-cultic context, thus establishing a semantic development parallel to Akkadian *šulmānu*, a term so close to it in meaning and function.

II. THE BIBLICAL EVIDENCE

1. *Order and Meaning in the Israelite Cult*

We begin our discussion of the biblical evidence relevant to the term *šelāmîm* with a consideration of the order of that sacrifice in the structure of the Israelite cult. The *šelāmîm* invariably follows the *ʿōlāh*, and there is no instance in the *description* of composite rites where the *šelāmîm* precedes the *ʿōlāh*. Often, other types of offerings, such as grain offerings and libations intervene between the *ʿōlāh* and the *šelāmîm*, and there are even a few cases on record where the *šelāmîm*, in and of itself, constituted the complete ritual. The fact is, however, that in a prescribed series of sacrifices, the *šelāmîm* consistently comes at the conclusion of the series. This pattern is so clearly evident that some students of the biblical cult, like Rolf Rendtorff, have actually translated the term *šelāmîm* as "concluding offering," or the like.[48]

---

[47] On *tlḥm* UT 77, line 47, and cf. I Kings 9:16. On *qodāšîm* "sacred offerings," see II Kings 12:5, 19, and cf. Lev 22:6-7, Nu 18:19. On *šalmônîm* see Part I, n. 43, above. Also note *bikkūrîm* "first fruits" (Lev 23:17, etc.), and *mattānôt*, meaning "gifts" (Ps 68:19, Prov 15:27, Esther 9:22).

De Vaux, *Sacrifice*, 47, and n. 3, considers the pl. form of Ugaritic *šlmm*, Hebrew *šelāmîm* as a pseudo -plural, originally a primitive sing., with mimmation. He cites for comparison terms such as *ʾurrîm*, *tummîm*, *terāpîm*, etc. We doubt this, certainly as regards *šlmm/šelāmîm*. On the construction *zebaḥîm šelāmîm* (Ex 24:5, I Sam 11:15) wherein de Vaux takes *šelāmîm* as an explanatory adj., see our alternative interpretation in Part I, n. 69.

[48] Rendtorff, *op. cit.* (Part I, n. 3), 132-3, renders *šelāmîm* "*Schlussopfer, Abschlussopfer*," a meaning attributed to L. Koehler in *LVT*, 980, s.v. *šelem*. Rendtorff also cites in support of this translation *LXX teleios* which, however, does not

This rendering could be substantiated etymologically, but to do so would be to confuse function with etymology. As we shall show, there are functional considerations which determined the order of the *šelāmîm* sacrifice, but they do not account for how the sacrifice got its name, or for its essential character.

An objection to our proposed explanation of how the sacrifice called *šelāmîm* got its name immediately becomes apparent. If *šlmm/ šelāmîm* connotes a gift of greeting, a presentation, why does it not come first in the order of sacrifices? The logic is that first one greets the deity, welcomes him, so to speak, and then proceeds to attend to other cultic activity. To answer this question properly requires that we examine in detail all considerations of order and position pertaining to the *šelāmîm*, for only in this way can its consistent position, after the *ʿōlāh*, help to clarify the role of the *šelāmîm*. The first point to be made is that a descriptive analysis of the frequent pairs *ʿōlāh-zebaḥ* and *ʿōlāh-šelāmîm* can tell us relatively little about the *šelāmîm*, in particular, because most occurrences are *clichés*, or merisms. Take, for example, the statement in Exodus 10:25:

> Moses said to Pharaoh: Even you, yourself will provide us with slain offerings and burnt offerings to Yahweh, our God!

Nothing specific can be learned from such a passage about the explicit function of the *zebaḥ* or *ʿōlāh* except that they were traditional components of Israelite ritual. The same reservation may be applied to most attestations of the pair *ʿōlāh-zebaḥ* in biblical sources, some of which actually refer to non-monotheistic rites.[49] Even in codified passages, where one would expect a more technical usage to obtain, the pair *ʿōlāh-zebaḥ* seems to retain a merismic quality. Thus, Leviticus 17:18:

> Unto them say: Anyone of the house of Israel who offers up a burnt offering or slain offering, ...[50]

It is clear that even in several descriptions of ritual events, such as I Samuel, chapter 6 (see verse 15), or in the royal edict preserved in II Kings, chapter 16 (see verse 15), usage of the pair *ʿōlāh-zebaḥ* was

---

mean "concluding," as he maintains, but: "complete, perfect." Cf. Daniel, *Vocabulaire*, 287-8.

[49] Cf. Ex 18:12, Jos 22:28, I Sam 15:22, II Kings 5:17, 10:24, Isa 56:7, Jer 7:20-22, Ps 50:18, 51:8.

[50] Cf. Nu 15:3, 5, 8, Dt 26:6, 11, 27.

largely proverbial.[51] The situation with respect to the pair 'ôlāh-šelāmîm is somewhat different, although there, too, the element of cliché is noticeable. What we have, however, is precise technical usage in a number of passages. An example is Exodus 24:5:

> He sent forth the young warriors of Israel, and they offered up burnt offerings and they butchered slain offerings of the šelāmîm [type], consisting of bulls.

Here one notes a slightly greater emphasis on detail, but even that tells us little of what we seek to know about the šelāmîm sacrifice.[52] There are also a few contexts which indicate that the šelāmîm sacrifice, along with the 'ôlāh, was appropriate for the initial dedication of an altar or cult site.[53] Beyond these few gleanings, we remain unenlightened, and must use a different approach in attempting to clarify the particular character of the šelāmîm.

2. The 'Ôlāh as Attraction and Invocation

To understand why it is that the zebah, as a general type of sacrifice, and the šelāmîm as a more particular variety, follow upon the 'ôlāh, a fact illustrated by the sequences 'ôlāh-zebah and 'ôlāh-šelāmîm but not explained thereby, will require us to isolate the 'ôlāh, concentrating on those instances in the biblical record where the 'ôlāh constituted a complete rite. There is reason to assume that in such situations something of the essential or original character of the 'ôlāh would be revealed which would have carried over to the role of the 'ôlāh as a component of composite rites.

The essential role of the 'ôlāh seems to have been that of *attraction*. The 'ôlāh was offered up with the objective of evoking an initial response from the deity prior to bringing the primary concerns of his worshippers to his attention.

We have discussed the matter of attraction elsewhere, in a different connection, but some of our earlier observations may be pertinent

---

[51] Contrast, in I Sam 6, v. 14, where we have an exact report of the disposition of the cows and of the wagon, itself. In II Kings 16:15, our reference is to the latter part of the verse: "—but all blood from other holocausts and all blood from other slain offerings shall you sprinkle upon it." The former part of the verse clarifies our point, since there we have specific statements on precise offerings.

[52] Cf. Ex 32:6, Nu 10:10, Jud 20:26, 21:4, I Sam 10:8, 13:9, II Sam 7:17, 24:25, I Kings 3:15, 9:25.

[53] Cf. Jud 20:26, 28, 21:4, II Sam 6:17-18, 24:25.

here.[54] The '*ōlāh* functions as a complete rite in the ritual activities of Balaam connected with his attempt to pronounce effective execrations over the Israelites. Balaam sought a communication from Yahweh which would give him leave to curse the Israelites, since he realized that without Yahweh's consent he was powerless. In order to attract the God of the Israelites to a propitious site, Balaam erected seven altars, upon which he offered up '*ōlōt*. There is no mention of any other sacrificial rite in this connection, although magical means were also employed by the non-Israelite prophet, as would be expected. It is quite clear from this account that the '*ōlōt* provide the basic attraction, for after offering them up Balaam does, indeed, encounter Yahweh, who speaks to the pagan seer, not far from the altars. The key verb in the passage is *qrb*, which in the *Nip'al* stem has the sense of establishing contact, often by chance.[55]

To clarify the objective of attraction we may turn to another episode which also involves non-monotheistic prophets. We refer to the encounter between Elijah and the priests of Baal somewhere in the Carmel range (I Kings, chapter 18).[56] Elijah instructs the Baal cult prophets to section a bull and prepare it as a burnt offering. Although the sacrifice prepared by them is not specifically termed an '*ōlāh*, the parallel offering prepared by Elijah, himself, in the same manner is so called. Whereas the Baal priests fail to evoke a response from their deity, Elijah, of course, succeeds in doing so. In Elijah's case the means of attraction included, in addition to the '*ōlāh*, the water which he had poured over the altar so that it ran down into a ditch previously dug around the altar. It was a time of drought, and the request for water was paramount. At Elijah's call, fire descends from heaven, laps up the water and consumes the '*ōlāh* on the altar. The precise function of the '*ōlāh* in this episode becomes clear when we recall the terms of the contest:

> The deity who responds in the form of fire, he is the [true] God!

---

[54] B. A. Levine, "On the Presence of God in Biblical Religion," *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, 1968, 71-87.

[55] *Ibid.* 79-80. On the verb *qrb* in the *Nip'al* stem, see Nu 23:3-4, 16, and cf. Ex 3:18, Nu 11:23.

[56] The exact location of this encounter has been the subject of dispute. For an accurate statement of the problem see Z. Kallai, *EB* (Hebrew), 4, 1962, 328-9, and literature cited, 329. Also see R. de Vaux, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 1971, 238-51. We agree with de Vaux that the site of the encounter was most likely the area of the *Muḥraqa*, on the South-East side of the mountain ridge (*ibid.* 238, and n. 4).

Also of interest in this connection is Elijah's taunt to the Baal priests:

> Call in a loud voice, for he is a deity, and has business to look after! ...
> Perhaps he is asleep and will awaken![57]

The scene of the confrontation epitomizes the basic function of the *'ôlāh* as a sort of signal directed at the deity, residing in heaven, in an effort to get him to respond and to approach his worshippers, or to do their bidding from the distance of his heavenly abode. The folkloristic *naiveté* of the account makes it a valuable source for understanding the operative motivations characteristic of sacrifice in ancient Israel.

Several other biblical accounts illustrate the same role as regards the *'ôlāh*, and they all come from relatively early sources. Judges, chapter 6 recounts an incident from the career of Gideon. He was instructed to destroy the Baal altar used by his own father, and to cut down the *'ašērāh* statue near it. He was then to erect a proper Yahwistic altar on the site, symbolically utilizing the wood of the pagan statue, as well as some animals probably associated with the Baal cult, in preparing the offering of an *'ôlāh* to Yahweh, thus initiating the legitimate cult of Yahweh. The *'ôlāh* was intended to demonstrate that Yahweh was present at the site. Even though Gideon had experienced a theophany, his anxieties persisted over Yahweh's possible withdrawal, and he insists upon a number of reassuring signs. The *'ôlāh*, along with the signs, served as evidence of Yahweh's presence.[58]

Another case in point is the account of the birth of Samson (Judges, chapter 13). Manoah and his barren wife are visited by a messenger of Yahweh who announced the birth of a son to them. When Manoah and his wife set before the messenger an hospitable meal, the latter, as yet unidentified as a divine being, refused to partake of it, saying:

> Though you detain me, I shall not partake of your food. If, however, it is an *'ôlāh* that you intend preparing, offer it up to Yahweh![59]

---

[57] On *šiaḥ wāśig* see S. Mowinckel, *Studia Theologica* 15, 1962, 1-10, especially 7; and also *ICC, Kings*, additional note to chapter 18 (307-09, 311). The pair is a hendiadys, connoting some preoccupation or other. Also see R. de Vaux, *op. cit.*, 243-51, and note de Vaux's instructive comparison of the "awakening" of Yahweh with similar practices known from the Phoenician cult of Melcart.

[58] On general aspects of the account see A. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, 1968, 173-4, and B. A. Levine, *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, 1968, 76-77, and *idem, Prolegomenon*, xxxiv. Also see M. Haran, *'Iyyûnîm Besēper Šôpeṭîm* (Hebrew), 1966, 235-41, on some problems in the account.

[59] Jud 13:16, and cf. Y. Kaufmann, *The Book of Judges* (Hebrew), 1962, 247-9, s.v. Jud 13:15. This passage seems to etymologize the term *'ôlāh*. (See Part I, n. 5).

Manoah accepts the suggestion of a sacrifice, and places the food-stuffs on a rock. Thereupon, a flame ignites the sacrificial flesh, and the messenger ascends heavenward in a tongue of fire. Manoah is terrified by the sudden awareness that the two of them have been so dangerously close to a divine being, but he is reassured by his wife, who says to him:

> If Yahweh had wanted us to die he would not have accepted an *'olah* and a *minḥah*, and would not have allowed us to witness all of these happenings or to hear such tidings at this time.[60]

The acceptance of the sacrifices indicated Yahweh's approval of those who offered them, and his willingness to grant them blessings. No sacrifice of the *zebaḥ* type was included in these rites, and the accompanying *minḥah* was also a holocaust. Here, again, the *'ôlāh* serves as an indication that Yahweh responds to a sort of signal, and an Israelite woman understands this. Moreover, it is not a coincidence that this interpretation is given to a burnt offering, because it is the sacrifice so executed which reaches heaven, through the fire and smoke, and evokes the divine response.[61]

One last instance is further illustrative of the function of the *'ôlāh*. The king of Moab offered up his first-born son on the wall of his city as an *'ôlāh* when the battle with the Israelites was going against him. One may posit the following situation, in cultic terms: *Kemôš* had not responded to earlier entreaties but could hardly refuse to respond when confronted with so extreme an act, with the result that the wrath of the Moabite god was unleashed against the Israelites. Here, too, the *'ôlāh* is utilized when the objective is a response from a deity presumed to be distant at the moment.[62]

An analysis of those instances in biblical accounts where the *'ôlāh*, in particular, is characterized, or its immediate motivations and objectives clarified has justified our viewing the *'ôlāh* as a signal, aimed at ascertaining the disposition of the deity; at evoking an indication of a favorable attitude, or of a willingness to manifest himself and respond to the entreaties of his worshippers.

Corollary to this analysis of the *'ôlāh* as a distinct sacrifice is the

---

[60] Jud 13:23. These folkish words are perhaps the best expression on record in the Bible for what may be termed "cultic faith," i.e. the notion that nearness to divine power is not intrinsically dangerous, and is not be avoided, *per se*.

[61] See Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxxiv, and n. 74, and cf. Gen 8:21, I Sam 26:19, Amos 5:21, and also probably Lev 26:31, Dt 4:28, Ps 115:6.

[62] II Kings 3:26-7. The term *qeṣep* "wrath" is almost always associated with divine wrath, usually Yahweh's wrath against Israel. See Part II, n. 39.

consistent order of composite rites whereby the *zebaḥ* type of offering followed upon the *'ôlāh*. If this pattern reveals anything significant about the structure and meaning of the *šelāmîm* as a prominent type of *zebaḥ* it is that one normally invited the deity to a common, shared sacrificial meal (like the one described in I Samuel, chapter 9) after he had been invoked by means of an *'ôlāh*. There are instances, albeit infrequent in biblical literature, where the *šelāmîm*, or the *zebaḥ* generally, constituted the sufficient rite.[63] The fact that in so many cases a sequence of composite rites is projected, and not a single sacrifice, indicates just what we are saying, i.e. that the *'ôlāh* was normally utilized for the purpose of invoking the deity preparatory to joining with him in a fellowship of sacrifice, which was the context for petitition and thanksgiving, and for the expression of other religious attitudes of this character.

On this basis, it is eminently clear why the *šelāmîm* sacrifice, understood as a gift of greeting, a present to the deity, would follow the *'ôlāh* and not precede it. Until the deity indicated his readiness to "come" to his worshippers, it would have been less appropriate to offer such a gift to him.

In a recent study on the order of biblical sacrifices, Anson Rainey has demonstrated that no sacrifice of an expiatory nature (*'āšām* or *ḥaṭṭā't*) intervened between the *'ôlāh* and the *zebaḥ* in the usual procedures of the cult.[64] The *minḥāh* and libation which often followed the *'ôlāh* in listing the sacrifices were actually accompaniments to the *'ôlāh*, forming with it a unified complex. In our section on the expiatory sacrifices we will attempt to show that the type of *ḥaṭṭā't* which became part of public ritual and which appeared to precede the *'ôlāh* and *zebaḥ* in certain cases, was actually a preliminary rite, which did not affect the *'ôlāh*-*zebaḥ* or *'ôlāh*-*šelāmîm* dynamic as we have explained it. The actual approach to the deity began with the *'ôlāh*, whereas the *ḥaṭṭā't*, in such cases, was a prerequisite to invoking the deity. This becomes all the more evident when we realize that there

---

[63] See our discussion of I Sam 11:14-15 and of I Kings, ch. 8, which follows.

[64] A. F. Rainey, "The Order of Sacrifices in Old Testament Rituals," *Biblica* 51, 1970, 485-98. Rainey distinguishes between the administrative order, according to which materials for sacrifices are often listed in biblical ritual texts, and the procedural order by which they were actually offered. We fully accept this distinction, as well as the consequent modification of our findings in *JAOS* 85, 1965, 312-13, which Rainey cites. Once Rainey's distinction is realized, it becomes clear that the expiatory sacrifices, the *ḥaṭṭā't*, in particular, sometimes listed between the *'ôlāh* and the *zebaḥ* or *šelāmîm* (as in Nu, ch. 7, for example), were actually offered before the *'ôlāh* (Rainey, *ibid.* 495-6).

were actually two fairly distinct types of *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, one a riddance rite, patently introductory and preliminary to the celebration, proper, and the other, a *ḥaṭṭāʾt* of the people offered so as to render individual Israelites and their leaders free of offense, thus ritually fit to engage in sacrificial activity, public and private.[65]

Interpreting the term *šelāmîm* as a gift evokes the obvious question of the disposition of the *šelāmîm*. It would be more reasonable, so the argument goes, that a gift be conveyed in its entirety or in large part to the deity, whereas we see that the *šelāmîm* as a type of *zebaḥ* was mostly allotted for human consumption.[66] The logic of this argument is superficial. The importance of a gift to Yahweh, and apparently to other deities, was not primarily quantitative. It was a matter of giving the deity what he most desired. From biblical sources, even of a non-cultic provenience, we learn of the special importance attached to the fatty portions of sacrificial animals as food for the deity.[67] When we recognize that in the disposition of the *zebaḥ* type of sacrifice, the choicest parts were reserved for the deity, quantity has less importance. There is also the fact that the deity desires the company of his worshippers, that he desires to be invoked and invited, so to speak. This is to be deduced from the relatively great importance of the *zebaḥ* type of sacrifice, as a form of celebration.[68]

3. The Distinctive Role of the Šelāmîm

Thus far in our treatment of the biblical evidence we have attempted to establish a proper context for a consideration of the *šelāmîm*

---

[65] We agree with Rainey (*op. cit.*, 498) that: "first of all, sin had to be dealt with." We cannot agree, however, that: "This (i.e. the expiatory sacrifice) was closely linked with a burnt offering that followed immediately, and thus completed the self committal required for full atonement." In Part II, chs. VI-VII we will provide a full discussion of our views on the two types of *ḥaṭṭāʾt* sacrifices, and their respective relationships to the offerings which followed them in the order of the ritual.

[66] Gray, *Sacrifice*, 3, 22, 30 was concerned about the matter of relative quantities, although he also recognized the principle we are here proposing, i.e. that quality meant more than quantity. (Cf. *ibid.*, 32).

[67] See Dt 32:38, and also Gen 4:4, I Sam 15:22, Isa 1:11, 43:24, and see our previous discussions in *EJ* 5, 1158-9, 1166, and Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxxii-iii, and ns. 66-71. Also see N. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers*, (*The Century Bible*), 1967, 31, 38-40, 44, 60.

[68] See Part I, n. 1 on the *zebaḥ* in general. On the possibly diminishing role of the *zebaḥ* in late biblical times, see Part I, n. 132. It seems that the *zebaḥ* originated in private and family worship, including the somewhat private activities of kings.

sacrifice by clarifying its relationship to the *'ôlāh* in terms of position and corresponding function, and by relating it to the *zebaḥ* type of sacrifice, generally. It is now proper to pursue with respect to the *šelāmîm* the same methodology utilized in investigating the *'ôlāh*, i.e. to isolate those instances where the *šelāmîm* seems to have constituted the complete rite. This step should precede any attempt to go further than we have gone in delineating the function and meaning of the *šelāmîm* in composite rites. It will also prove helpful historically, because isolating the *šelāmîm* will enable us to trace its development more precisely as it assumed new roles in the Israelite cult.

As far as we can discover, the earliest reference to the *šelāmîm* as a sufficient rite is to be found in I Samuel 11:14-15, the brief record of a convocation at Gilgal during the early reign of Saul, presided over by the cult prophet, Samuel. The text reads:

> Samuel said to the people: Come, let us go to Gilgal and there renew (Hebrew, *ḥiddēš*) the kingship. The entire people went to Gilgal, and there, at Gilgal, proclaimed Saul king. There they offered up slain offerings, consisting of *šelāmîm*, in the presence of Yahweh. Then Saul and all the yeomanry of Israel rejoiced exceedingly.[69]

Because of literary problems pertinent to the text of I Samuel it is difficult to determine the exact force of the convocation at Gilgal, especially since the verb *ḥiddēš* could mean "renew", in which case one would presume a previous enactment of Saul's designation as king. One version (I Samuel 9:1-10:16) relates that Saul annointed Saul secretly at Ramah, and the other (*ibid.* 10:17-27) describes the casting of lots at Miṣpah which resulted in the designation of Saul as king, in the presence of the tribes or their representatives, assembled.[70] Intriguing is the fact that in the episode at Ramah, Samuel instructs Saul to await him at Gilgal. This could be a reference to the convocation recorded in 11:14-15, although the dynamics of the story would seem to indicate that the dissatisfaction of some elements of the

---

[69] The usage of Hebrew *ḥiddēš* here is distinctive. Usually, it means: "to restore"—by repairing (II Chron 24:4, 12), to restore the conditions of an earlier, better period (Threni 5:21). On the construction *zebāḥîm šelāmîm* (cf. Ex 24:5) see *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd English ed., 1960, 423-27, especially 424, d., where it is explained that this is a kind of apposition, relevant to the content of a thing.

[70] The casting of lots is a patently cultic mode of indicating divine selection, whether for honor or guilt and punishment. Cf. Jos 7:14-18 f., Jonah 1:7 f. It was used in apportioning the land to the tribes (Jos, ch. 15 f.). This indicates that the account of Saul's selection by lot is from another source, probably the same priestly source from which the accounts of the *ḥērem* violations, etc. were taken.

people (10:27), and the war against the Ammonites, in which Saul
proved his prowess through victory (11:1-13) were the actual rationale
for the convocation at Gilgal. To dispel further grumblings, Samuel
exploited the impact of Saul's victory at Jabesh Gilead to celebrate his
election by means of sacrifices, as though to declare Yahweh's will
final in the matter.[71] The verb *ḥiddēš* might here convey the nuance
of firmly establishing or prolonging the rule of Saul, a sense the
Akkadian cognate *uddušu* occasionally has in royal salutations. This
cultic celebration would not have served as the real instrumentality
for bestowing kingship, that having been accomplished by unction,
but would have served to lend sanction to the pre-established fact.[72]

Thus, we have a cultic celebration utilized as a means of solidifying
Saul's precarious rule over Israel. In this brief record no sacrifices
except the *šelāmîm* are mentioned. What, if anything, can we deduce
from this fact? The obvious would be to conclude that the *šelāmîm*
was particularly appropriate for the initiation of kings and for the
celebration of victory. The two are closely related, as the full account
in I Samuel clearly shows.

In our pursuit of more light on the precise relationship between
the *šelāmîm* and the celebration of kingship we are led to comparative
evidence which is highly suggestive. It pertains to the *šulmānu*, and to
its uses in the Middle-Assyrian cult as part of the annual investiture
of the sacral king. We have already discussed the etymological and
semantic relationship between the two terms, *šelāmîm* and *šulmānu*.
With all due reservations, we present here additional evidence on
possible points of connection between the actual rites designated by
those two related terms.

The role of the *šulmānu* in Mesopotamian cults might be best intro-
duced by reference to the fourth tablet of *Enuma eliš* where we read
of the convocation on high after Marduk's victory over Tiamat. The

---

[71] There is some biblical evidence for the use of sacrificial rites in connection
with the proclamation of kingship. An instance is the abortive proclamation of
Adonijah as king (I Kings 1:18-26). On that occasion, a priest was present as
well as a general, together with the "princes" *(benê hammelek)*. A *zebaḥ* was em-
ployed, with the usual *qerū'îm* "invitees" (v. 41). The same situation obtained
with respect to Absalom's attempt to have himself proclaimed king (II Sam
15:11-12 f.). These two dissidents were undoubtedly following traditional
practices.

[72] On Akkadian *uddušu* see *CADE* 32, s.v. *uddušu*, b), 2', and 3, *uteddušu*. On
the matter of unction as the instrumentality for establishing the fact of kingship
see E. Kutsch, *Salbung als Rechtsart im alten Testament*, 1963, *(ZAW, Beihefte,* 87),
especially 36-69.

older gods, rejoicing in the triumph of their young hero, presented gifts to him:

igi.sá-*e šulmānī ušābilū šunu ana šâšu*

"They brought gifts and presents; they to him."[73]

The gift to the hero god in myth becomes, in another context, the ordained ritual offering to the ruling god of the city, presented to him by the king of the city who rules in his name. Thus it is that the *šulmānu* has a promiment role in the Middle-Assyrian ceremony of the periodic investiture of the Assyrian sacral king, so called. We are fortunate in having a version of the *Königsritual* of the Middle Assyrian kings, pieced together by Karl Müller from texts discovered in the Assur archives. He dates the ritual to the period 1220-1150 BCE, the end of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, or after.[74] The *Königsritual* includes a detailed listing of the gods of the city Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, built by Tukulti-Ninurta I across the river from the city of Assur. The *tākultu* texts studied principally by R. Frankena contain a similar listing and it is this fact which points to the similarity in function of both groups of rites. Both rituals were aimed, at least in part, at securing the abiding support of the city pantheon for the continued rule of the king. Through the *Königsritual*, the king was re-invested annually, under the aegis of divine authority, in a temple ritual and banquet attended by the gods of the city.[75]

In the *Königsritual*, the high priest officiates alongside the king, representing a parallel channel of authority. The king is first divested of his emblems of office, and subsequently the same is done to his subordinate officials. The king then appears before the god *Aššur* as

---

[73] *Enuma eliš*, col. IV, line 35, *apud CADI* 42, s.v. *igisû*, 2, b.

[74] Karl Fr. Müller, *Texte zum Königsritual* (*MVAG* 41/3), 1937. Müller's dating was based on linguistic considerations, and historical data, as well. It is accepted by G. van Driel, *The Cult of Aššur*, 1969, 52. On Assyrian chronology, see J. A. Brinkman, in A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 1964, 346. Also see n. 75, which follows.

[75] On *Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta* see A. L. Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, 119, 138. On the *tākultu* see *ibid.* 378, n. 33, and cf. *ibid.* 308, n. 26. The major study is R. Frankena, *Tākultu, De Sacrale Maaltijd in het Assyrische Ritueel*, 1954, 57, 60-66, and in the English summary, 129, 132-3, especially 133c, which notes that the list of divinities in Müller's text is closely related to that of the *tākultu*. Frankena supports the Middle-Assyrian dating of Müller (*ibid.*, 62), and also stresses the relatedness of Müller's text to the *akitu*. The list of gods appears in Müller, *op. cit.*, 15-16 (s.v. col. III, lines 15-41). A sacral feast was part of the *Königsritual* (Müller, *ibid.* 59 f., and comment, 67). In I Sam. 11:15 there is the implication of a feast, and the *šelāmîm* was, of course, a sacred meal.

a humble suppliant. At that point we are inside the sanctuary, and we hear the proclamation of *Aššur's* sovereignty: *aš-šur* lugal *aš-šur* xx *(šar)* "*Aššur* rules, *Aššur* rules!"[76]

The king then presents to the god lavish gifts of silver and gold and other precious objects. These are, for the most part, assigned to the high priest and his fellows as their *malqētu* "take, portion."[77] Subsequently, the king is re-invested with his royal emblems, and is crowned and extolled with wishes for a long reign, etc. After the coronation, the high officials of the realm pay obeisance to the king. These ceremonies involve some moving about in various parts of the temple-palace complex. Finally, the king enters his throne room and occupies his throne. The various officials show their subservience to the king, kiss his feet, and present him with gifts termed *šulmānu*. The text fails to specify what the *šulmānu* consisted of. The text then reads as follows:

šul-ma-na pa-ni-a ša a-na xx *(šarri)* *[ú]-qar-ri-bu-ni a-na ē (bīt) aš-šur ub-bu-lu a-na* igi *(pān) aš-šur i-ša-ku-nu [ma]-al-qe-tu ša* lú sanga.gal.

The first *gift of greeting* which they presented to the king they convey to the temple of *Aššur*, and place it before *Aššur*. It is the portion of the high priest.[78]

Other gifts follow, and the king by virtue of his renewed authority, re-invests the other officials, each in turn. Ritual offerings then follow to all the gods of the pantheon. The text concludes: "The gods of Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta reside in the city of Assur."[79]

There is, of course, much more to this text than is directly relevant to the role of the *šulmānu*. In terms of our subject, the most interesting point is the disposition of the *šulmānu*. It was in the first instance, a gift presented to the king by his subordinates. The king, in turn, devoted the gifts he had received to the god Aššur, and placed the

---

[76] Müller, *op. cit.*, 8-9, s.v. col. I, line 29. The Assyrian text reads: *aš-šur* lugal *aš-šur* xx (= *šar*). It is not certain whether or not lugal was read *šar*.

[77] Müller, *op. cit.*, 8-9, s.v. col. I, line 37, and comment, *ibid.* 22. On the term *malqētu* see *AHw*, 643.

[78] Müller, *op. cit.*, 14, s.v. col. III, lines 5-7. The cultic terminology is distinctive here. (See Müller, *ibid.* 30, s.v. *abālu*, and *CAD A*/I 14, s.v. *abālu* A, 2a, and 15, s.v. 2b. On the *šulmānu* see Müller, *ibid.* 41, s.v. col. III, line 4, and 45, s.v. coll III, line 36.

[79] The original reads: dingir. meš *(ilāni)*ᵘ *ša*ᵘʳᵘ kar. tukul. maš *i-na*ᵘʳᵘ šà. uru *uš-bu* (Müller, *op. cit.*, 16, s.v. col. III, lines 40-41, and note the Assyrian form *ušbu* for *uššabu* (ibid. 45).

šulmānu gifts before *Aššur*. As was a customary mode in Mesopotamia,
the god viewed the offerings, and they were then removed from his
presence and assigned to the high priest. In this ritual we observe the
step-by-step process by which a present to the king becomes an
offering to the god, and is then appropriated by the priesthood.

Although we certainly could not prove it, it is our impression that
what transpired with respect to the *šulmānu* in the Assyrian *Königs-
ritual* is also what happened to the *šelāmîm* used in the convocation of
Gilgal, when Saul was proclaimed king in the context of a cultic
celebration. Is it not possible that the *šelāmîm* were, in the first instance,
gifts presented to Saul on the occasion of his victory and investiture
as king over Israel, and that he, in turn, offered these very gifts as
sacrifices to the God in whose name he ruled?

We are not in a position to demonstrate Middle Assyrian influences
on the early Israelite monarchy, and yet, the *Königsritual* may suggest
new avenues of investigation into the character of the Israelite mo-
narchy prior to the neo-Assyrian period. We are not suggesting any-
thing like the proposed *Šulmānu* cults in or around Jerusalem, and
quite agree with Z. Kallai and H. Tadmor that there is no evidence
at the present time to link Jerusalem with the Mesopotamian deity
Šulmānu.[80] What we are suggesting is something quite different, i.e.
that notions of monarchy, and the nexus of monarchy and cult in
ancient Israel may have reflected a broader pattern, wherein the
šulmānu, for one thing, had an important role.

If our interpretation of I Samuel 11:14-15 is valid, the *šelāmîm*
would have entered the Israelite cult at a relatively early period, as a
distinctive type of sacrificial offering. We are aware that there is some
question about the provenance of chapter 11 in I Samuel, but there is
justification for classifying it as part of the pre-Deuteronomic material,
i.e. material available in some form to the compiler of Samuel, and
not material introduced by him.[81] If so, the source in I Samuel,
chapter 11, would indicate that the *šelāmîm* was, in the first instance,
a sacrifice associated with kings. This hypothesis gains further support
from I Kings, chapter 8, a chronistic account of the dedication of the
Solomonic temple, wherein the *šelāmîm* served as the sacrifice, *par
excellence*.

I Kings, chapter 8 is composed of several clearly definable literary
strata, and a proper understanding of the cultic rites incorporated in

---

[80] See Part I, n. 35.
[81] See the analysis of N. Gottwald in *EJ* 14, 791-4, s.v. "Samuel, Books of—".

the dedication requires a preliminary discussion of these strata, which are: 1) A quotation from a poetic source (verses 12-13), 2) A chronistic account of the dedication of the temple (verses 1-6, 62-66), 3) Prayers and blessings (verses 14-61), and glosses (most notably, verses 7-11).[82] When divested of its accompanying texts, the chronistic account achieves a rather smooth continuity. Verses 1-6 describe the occasion in general terms, recording primary aspects of the dedication: the convocation of the Israelites in Jerusalem, the installation of the ark in the new temple, and the offering of numerous *zebāhīm* (verse 5). This aspect of the celebration is resumed in verse 62. Verse 63 states that the *zebāhīm* offered by the king and all Israel consisted of *šelāmīm*. Thus, verses 62-66 (with the exception of 64b, which is probably a gloss) take up the account where verse 6 left off, and refer directly to the sacrifices mentioned in verse 5. There then follows a summary of the event, enumerating the large quantities of sacrifices, and including a laudatory salute to the king who sponsored the dedication. Thus we read in verses 62-63:

> The king and all Israel with him were offering slain offerings in the presence of Yahweh. Solomon offered the slain offering of the *šelāmīm*, which he had offered to Yahweh: large cattle—22,000, and small cattle—120,000. They dedicated the temple, the king and all Israel.[83]

The *šelāmīm* here emerges as the central sacrifice in the dedication of the Jerusalem temple, the dedicatory sacrifice, proper. The *'ōlāh* and *minhāh* are mentioned in verse 64b, a probable gloss. Even if original, however, verse 64b is only a passing remark, referring not to the dedication, itself, but to the offering of various sacrifices in the courtyard "which Solomon had dedicated."[84]

From the post-exilic literature of II Chronicles we find at least traditional corroboration for the important role of the *šelāmīm* in royal,

---

[82] For the exegesis of I Kings, ch. 8, see *ICC, Kings*, 37, 185-203. Our proposed division of the chapter does not agree in every detail with Montgomery-Gehman, but the recognition that vs. 1-6 (at least up to 6a) are continued by 62 f., and that vs. 12-13 are a quotation from an epic source, is accepted. Vs. 7-11 are generally agreed to be secondary (*ibid.* 188-9), and, of course, vs. 14-61 represent a different source. We agree that v. 6b is probably a gloss. Also see J. A. Montgomery, *JBL* 29, 1910, 29-40.

[83] Cf. II Sam 6:13, on the occasion of bringing the ark to Jerusalem during David's reign. J. Gray, *I and II Kings, A Commentary (The Old Testament Library)*, rev. ed., 1970, 203 f. notes the continuity between v. 5b and v. 62. Also see *ibid.*, 231-3.

[84] Montgomery (*ICC, Kings*, 200-201) does not mention the possibility that v. 64b is a gloss, and considers vs. 62-66 as late.

dedicatory rites. According to the account of the Passover celebration ordained by Hezekiah (II Chronicles, chapter 30) šelāmîm sacrifices were offered by the people assembled at the temple in Jerusalem (verse 22). The occasion is described as having been exceedingly joyous (verses 23, 25-26). In effect it was a rededication of the temple, after it had been cleansed, and the impure altars removed from it. The priesthood also submitted to ritual purification.[85]

Prominence was also assigned to the šelāmîm in the account of Menasseh's restoration to his throne (II Chronicles, chapter 33). After accomplishing repairs in the temple, the repentant king removed the idolatrous altars:

> He set up the altar of Yahweh, and offered upon it slain offerings of šelāmîm and thanksgiving. He commanded the Judeans to serve the God of Israel.[86]

There are, of course, serious questions about the historicity of each of the above two accounts, especially the latter, which is transparently a fanciful tale about a wicked king. The point is, however, that the events projected are described in a traditional manner, in accordance with what later writers considered to be the proper way of dedicating a temple, or celebrating a national festival. It is the šelāmîm which is singled out for prominence in such rites. The Chronicler undoubtedly took his cue from I Kings, chapter 8, which means, in turn, that the role of the šelāmîm in royal celebrations of a dedicatory nature was traditional at the time Chronicles was written.[87]

In summary, we see the šelāmîm as originally a sacrifice related to royal and/or national celebrations of a distinctive character, and which only subsequently became incorporated into the regular cult.

In so proposing a theory as to the original character of the šelāmîm we have been compelled to consider prevailing interpretations of the šelāmîm sacrifice which see it as something quite different in function and meaning. Perhaps this is the point in our discussion where it is proper to assess these theories before continuing our analysis of the

---

[85] II Chron 30:15-19. Aside from hiṭṭahhēr (v. 18) the verb which conveys the notion of ritual purification is hitqaddēš (Cf. Ex 19:22, I Sam 16:5, II Sam 11:4, and . Isa 66:17). It included ablutions and the cleansing of garments, at the very last.

[86] On the relatedness of the šelāmîm and the tôdāh, see Part I, ns. 111-13.

[87] See our discussion further in Part I, II, 6, "The Changing Character of the šelāmîm in Israelite Religion," and ns. 133-4, on the reuse of older motifs by the priestly writers.

šelāmîm, particularly since it is I Kings, chapter 8, which figures prominently in the exposition of the prevailing notions about the *šelāmîm*.

4. *Sacrifices and the Covenant*

Ever since René Dussaud's pioneer work of the early 1920's it has been widely accepted by most serious scholars of the biblical cult that the term *šelāmîm* in some way reflects the etymology of "harmony, wellbeing, peace," etc. endemic to the root *š-l-m*, and that, as a type of sacrifice, the *šelāmîm* pertained to the experience of communion between worshipper and deity, to the harmonious covenant relationship or the dynamics of ritual fellowship, all suggested by this same connotation of the verbal root.[88] This complex of notions—communion, covenant, fellowship—goes back to W. Roberton Smith's work on biblical religion, though later scholars have modified his original interpretations to a considerable extent.[89] Although such interpretations place the term *šelāmîm* in the correct orientational category of religious attitudes and motivations, we must reject them, for what we consider cogent reasons. In view of the importance of such interpretations in the development of biblical research on the cult, they deserve an in-depth analysis and critique by anyone who would presume to upset the neat structure which currently dominates the scene.

After Dussaud, most scholars endorsing the communion-covenant-fellowship complex have taken their cue from a passage in Solomon's prayer (I Kings 8:61) which reads:

> May your heart be completely given over (*šālēm ʿim*) to Yahweh, our God; walking in the way of his statutes, and keeping his commandments, as of this day.

In the very next verses (8:62-63) the text proceeds to record that Solomon and all Israel offered the *šelāmîm* sacrifice. On the surface of it, it would appear that we have a built-in definition of the term *šelāmîm*, linking it with the stative adjective, *šālēm* "complete", and substantiating the interpretation of the term *šelāmîm* as expressing the proper relationship between worshipper and deity. From such a derivation of the term *šelāmîm* emerges a complex theory as to the

---

[88] See Dussaud, *Origines*, 99-101, and Part I, n. 3.

[89] See R. J. Thompson, *op. cit.*, 5 f., and W. Robertson-Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, with a Prolegomenon by J. Muilenberg, 1969, 269-388 for the basic exposition of the notion of sacrifice as communion.

function of the šelāmîm, and of the Israelite cult, in general. To be in a state of harmony with the deity is characteristic of the covenant relationship as well as of the ritual experience of communion. The forms šōlēm and šālôm/šālûm mean "ally, one bound by treaty or covenant." It is only a logical extension of this interpretation to relate the šelāmîm to fellowship on the primarily human level. Fellowship seems to stress the values, in collective terms, which emerge from the celebration, especially from the shared, sacred meal; whereas the notion of communion gives expression primarily to the numinous aspects of the sacrifice, particularly the binding power of blood.[90]

Actually, the cliché: šālēm 'im YHWH represents a standard of loyalty ordained for the Davidic kings. It refers specifically to the prohibition of all forms of idolatry. Thus, we read in I Kings 11:4:

> It came to pass that, as Solomon reached old age, his wives influenced him to pursue the worship of other gods, and his heart was no longer completely given over to Yahweh (šālēm 'im YHWH), his God, as had been the heart of David, his father.

Complete devotion of the heart is a precondition of the Davidic covenant. We are here dealing with a commonplace used to epitomize the example of David, whose devotion to strict Yahwism was proverbially extolled by the author of Kings.[91] The use of this cliché at the dedication of the Jerusalem temple, a royal project assigned to Solomon under the terms of the dynastic covenant, can only mean that the Israelites are being adjured on that occasion to adhere to the exclusive worship of Yahweh in the temple associated with his name. To apply this cliché specifically to the šelāmîm sacrifice, thereby implying that it was this sacrifice, particularly, which related to those whose hearts were "given over" to Yahweh is not only to misconstrue the provenience of the phrase, itself, but to impose on the šelāmîm sacrifice an exclusive role it never has. There is also the question of the literary composition of I Kings, chapter 8, which was discussed

---

[90] See Schmid, Bundesopfer, 103-26. On šālôm as a covenantal word see M. Noth, The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, 1966, 113. On the term šōlēm "ally" (Ps 7:5) see J. Tigay, JBL 89, 1970, 182-4. On šālûm (attested on in the pl. const.—šelûmê) see II Sam 20:19. Also note šālôm (attested in suffixed form, šelômāu (Ps 55:21, and perhaps Jer 38:22). Also cf. Akkadian šalāmu(m) "ally" as noted by Tigay (ibid. 182-3, and n. 26). On šālēm "friend, ally," see Gen 34:21.

[91] Cf. the same cliché in II Kings 20:3, 23:3 (Hezekiah), and as a general norm in I Chron 12:18, 39, 29:17, 19. Also cf. I Kings 2:4, 3:6, 8:58, 9:4, 15:11, and II Chron 19:9, 25:3. Note the Akkadian idiom libbu gummuru in CADG 31, s.v. gummuru, h.

above. There is no real continuity between verse 61, the conclusion of the prayer, and verse 62, the continuation of the interrupted chronistic account.

The generally accepted identification of the *šelāmim* as "communion/ covenant/fellowship offering" raises basic questions as to the overall relationship between covenant and cult in ancient Israel. As we have noted, theories of communion through sacrifice, as applied to biblical religion primarily by the comparativists, have been predicated on the covenantal triad of a) the individual and/or his family, b) the larger tribe or nation, and c) the deity or deities, related both to the group and to the individual. We discussed this nexus in our *Prolegomenon* to George Buchanan Gray's classic work on biblical sacrifice, where we offered a critique of W. Roberton-Smith's theory of sacrifice as communion.[92] Here it suffices to emphasize that no particular type of sacrifice, in and of itself, served as the special means for dramatizing the covenant (or covenants) operative between Yahweh and Israel. In a certain sense, the entire cult presupposed the existence of the covenant relationship, but the same can be said concerning duties and activities of a non-cultic character prescribed in the codes of the Pentateuch, and in other biblical sources. As far as the enactment of covenants is concerned, the use of sacrifice, where attested, represented only one of several means available for the celebration or sanctioning of a covenant.[93] A clear example is Genesis 31:54, where

---

[92] The main point of the critique we presented in Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxv-vi was the artificiality or formality of the covenant idea in ancient Israel, and in the Near East, generally. Now see M. Weinfeld *EJ* 5 1011-22, s.v. "Covenant," for a recent statement, and *idem, JAOS* 93, 1973, 190-99.

[93] In descriptions of covenants in the Bible where some amount of detail is provided, it is most often the case that no sacrificial activity is recorded. This allows for the conclusion that sacrifice was not essential to the process of covenant enactment, itself. Cf. the following records: a) Gen 21:27-32, the covenant between Abraham ahd Abimelech, where only the *'ēdāh* "proof" and the *šebû'āh* "oath" are mentioned. b) I Sam 18:3-5, the covenant between David and Jonathan, where personal garments and weapons belonging to Jonathan were given to David to symbolize the finalizing of the covenant. c) I Sam 20:16-17, a further covenant between Jonathan and the house of David, where only an oath is mentioned. d) II Kings 11:4, the covenant between Jehojadah and officials in the temple on the matter of the legitimate heir, where only an oath is mentioned. e) Jos 9:15, the covenant with the Gibeonites, under Joshua's leadership, where only an oath is mentioned. f) Jos 24:25-7, the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, negotiated by Joshua, where a commemorative stela, oath, and written record are mentioned, but no sacrifice. g) II Kings, ch. 23, the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, enacted "in the presence of Yahweh", where an oath is implied, and a written document mentioned, but no sacrifice. h) Dt, ch. 29, the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, under Moses' leadership,

a *zebaḥ* was offered to Yahweh in the course of enacting a covenant,
but only subsequent to the treaty oath (verse 53), and to the erection
of a stela commemorating the occasion (verses 44-52).[94] The sacrifice
was an accompaniment to the enactment of the covenant. This is also
how we interpret Psalm 50:5:

> Gather unto me my devoted ones, who enact my covenant *to the
> accompaniment of* slain offerings."[95]

In such instances, the specific function of the sacrifice was to avail
the participants to the covenant of the presence of Yahweh actualized in
the altar fire and in the shared, sacred meal.[96]

The first point to be made regarding the *šelāmîm* in particular is that
it was in no way singled out as a covenant sacrifice. Other sacrifices
such as the *'ōlāh* were also employed on occasion.[97] There is the

where a written document is mentioned (v. 19) and oaths (vs. 18, 26), but no
sacrifice. In Gen ch. 15, the covenant between Yahweh and the family of Abraham.
What was executed on that occasion bore definite connections to sacrifice, but
not in the accepted manner of Israelite sacrifice. See E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, (The
Anchor Bible), 1964, 110-15.

In the version of the Sinaitic covenant recorded in Ex, ch. 24, sacrifices were,
of course employed in connection with the enactment. Both the *'ōlāh* and the
šelāmîm were offered. See D. J. McCarthy, *VT, Suppl.* 23, 1972, 68-75, who makes
this point.

[94] See D. J. McCarthy, *CBQ* 26, 1964, 179-89, and *idem, Survey*, 30-31. Cf. II
Sam, ch. 3, the covenant between Abner and David, where we find the covenant
oath followed by a feast (v. 20), but no sacrifice, proper.

[95] The prep. *'al* can mean: "in conjunction with, accompanied by-". One
example is Isa 18:4: "As white heat *intermixed with* light; as vaporized dew in
the heat of harvest time" (Hebrew: *keḥōm ṣaḥ 'alê 'ôr*). In the Psalms, the super-
scriptions often use *'al/'alê* in this sense. Thus: *'al haššemînît* "to the accompani-
ment of the *šemînît*," and cf. Ps 8:1, 92:4, etc. Now see *The Book of Psalms*, Jewish
Publication Society of America, 1972, s.v. Ps 50:5, which renders *'alê zebaḥ* "*over
sacrifice*."

[96] See B. A. Levine, *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, 1968, 71-87, already
cited. Actually, the objective of securing the presence of the deity at the *zebaḥ*
emerges clearly from Ps 50, itself, which is a critique of contemporary notions as
to what the deity desires from his worshippers. Yahweh approaches, and calls
his people to judgment (v. 4). He "appears, shines forth" from Zion, and his
approach is tumultuous and fiery (vs. 2-3). See B. A. Levine, *ibid.* 75, n. 2, for
the significance of the verbs *hôpî'a* and *bā'*. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 102-4, considers
that the purpose of sacrifice as an accompaniment to covenant enactment, at least
as far as Deuteronomy is concerned, was to impress on the parties, in a dramatic
fashion, the consequences of violating the treaty. This end would have been more
properly served by the oath, the written record, the commemorative stela, etc.
As we have explained, the sectioning of the victims in Gen, ch. 15, was not a
typical sacrifice.

[97] We cannot agree with McCarthy, *Survey*, 30-31, that the *šelāmîm* was a
sacrifice "which produces a union between God and his people." See Part I, n. 121.

further consideration that sacrifices were not the essential instrumentality by which covenants were put into force. They were not even a constant component in the formalities of covenant enactment.

We need not be pedantic, however, in discussing the relationship of the *šelāmîm* to covenants in ancient Israel. It is fairly obvious that those who view the *šelāmîm* as a rite whose function it was to establish, ratify, dramatize, or reaffirm the essential covenants in force between Yahweh and Israel are proceeding from a specific set of theories on the overall relationship of covenant and cult in biblical Israel. It was Sigmund Mowinckel, in his major studies on the biblical Psalms, who argued most incisively for the cultic origin and provenience of the Psalter, maintaining that the Israelite cult assigned prominence in its scheduled rites to covenant renewals. He fashioned a complex exegetical structure according to which an annual enthronement festival, at the Feast of Tabernacles in the autumn of the year, provided the context for the renewal of the early covenants between Yahweh and Israel, as part of Yahweh's periodic enthronement.[98]

In effect, this theory reduced the events consciously commemorated in the major festivals to non-events. The Exodus and the convocation at Sinai, traditionally associated with the seasonal festivals, were no more "historical" as far as the cult was concerned than was the creation of the world, traditionally an historical event, but actually a primordial, mythic "event". It was the cult which was primary, and early Israelite history, as recorded in biblical narrative, was really *Heilsgeschichte*, a background projected by the cultic establishment so as to provide a basis, or setting for periodic rites.[99]

Recent studies into the dynamics of biblical covenants have pretty well upset this school of thought by demonstrating the actual, historical role of covenants in the lives of ancient Near Eastern peoples.

---

[98] See S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 1962, I, 155-60, and *idem*, *Psalmenstudien*, 1966, 150-51, on the concept of *šālôm* as a covenantal term. Also see McCarthy, *Survey*, 6-7 on Mowinckel's thesis. Actually, Mowinckel's outlook was anticipated in some essential respects by R. Kraetzchmer, *Die Bundesverstellung in alten Testament in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 1896, 40-41.

[99] A. Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 1966, 130, n. 121, agreed with Mowinckel on the matter of the *Bundesfest*. He states:

> Their use (i.e. the covenant words) in this setting gives the stories of the first covenant the character of aetiological tales for the rite of the later act of renewal at the covenant, and suggests that these stories took their form from that rite.

Also cf. M. Noth, *op. cit.*, 37 f., 46, who generally follows this view and attempts to show how the Sinaitic covenant became a model, or point of reference.

"Covenant" is not merely a religious idea or the idiom of a liturgy. It was an institution serving social, political, and economic ends, and even the religious dimension, highly significant in ancient Israel, is not to be viewed in static terms, but as an expression of historic experience and collective aspiration.[100] Recent research, heralded by the work of George Mendenhall, liberated our understanding of biblical covenants by exploring their effects on all aspects of Israelite life, especially, in the case of Mendenhall, on the development of law.[101]

Methodologically speaking, it is not only form-critical analysis of covenant formularies that is required, important as such analysis may be, but the investigation of the functional roles fulfilled by covenants. Real history then becomes basic, a point succinctly expressed by Delbert Hillers in a recent work on the idea of covenant in biblical Israel.[102] In this respect, Kurt Baltzer is one of the last exponents of a school on its way out. He continues to maintain that only in the framework of the cult and its liturgies could the fixed covenant formularies have been preserved over long periods or time. Baltzer admits, however, that even he cannot substantiate this hypothesis, and that it is a jump from assuming that the covenant formularies were liturgical to assuming that there were actual covenant renewal rites.[103]

There is really no evidence in biblical literature for regularly scheduled covenant renewals, as part of the ongoing cult. Those occasions of covenant renewal, or of the reaffirmation of earlier covenants through entering into a new one, relate to particular moments of transition, crisis, or radical change in Israelite history, and are always portrayed as one-time events necessitated or warranted by particular circumstances.[104] There is never a hint in the narrative records of the Bible that such occasions were intended to take the form of regular or periodic components of the festival celebrations, or to become part of the ongoing Israelite cult.

It is important to realize that Mowinckel had based his interpreta-

---

[100] Se D. J. McCarthy, *CBQ* 27, 1965, 217-40, especially 230-31, n. 27. We cannot agree that the Sinaitic sacrifice is the paradigm for the role of sacrifice in ancient Israel. Also see *idem*, *Survey*, 34-8.

[101] See G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, 1955, The study consists of two parts, I: "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," and II: "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition."

[102] See D. R. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*, 1969, 166-7.

[103] See K. Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary*, 1971, particularly 39, 84 f., and 89.

[104] For a review of biblical covenant renewals see K. Baltzer, *ibid.*, 39-84.

tion of covenant renewals in large part on the Psalms. It has now been shown that although the Psalms bore a definite relationship to the temple cult they are not to be construed across the board as fixed liturgies, even if some Psalms appear to have a liturgical character. There is, after all, a difference between saying that the motif of Yahweh's enthronement is present in the Psalter and maintaining that there was an enthronement festival at which particular Psalms, expressive of that motif, were recited liturgically. Generally speaking, the act of sacrifice, proper, was distinct from any liturgical recitation or prayer that existed in ancient Israel. Even if it were possible to argue convincingly for a liturgy of covenant renewal it would remain extremely doubtful if a sacrifice would have been so motivated.[105]

The heart of the matter relates to our understanding of the sacrificial cult and its essential role in Israelite society. Like other ancient Near Eastern cults, that of the Jerusalem temple and of other centers represented a complex of dynamic acts aimed at securing certain responses from the deity relevant to vital concerns of current urgency. The covenant (or covenants) merely served as the charter, or commission under the terms of which the cult, as well as the other establishments within Israelite society operated. The inner dynamic of the sacrificial cult bore its own intrinsic efficacy and did not exist for the principal purpose of sanctifying the covenant.[106] The penchant among scholars for etymologizing the term *šelāmîm* in a manner that binds that sacrifice to the notion of covenant should, therefore, be recognized as artificial, and as a prime example of the pitfalls of etymology for historical research. This does not imply, however, that notions of covenant and of sacral fellowship did not play a part in the religious expression of ancient Israel. The matter of communion, as that term is used by students of comparative religion, after W. Robertson-Smith, is another question. We doubt very much that communion *through sacrificial blood rites* was part of the motivation and purpose of Israelite sacrifice.[107]

---

[105] Cf. the discussion of Mowinckel's views and the critique by N. Sarna, *Prolegomenon* to M. Buttenweiser, *The Psalms, (The Library of Biblical Classics)*, 1969, xxii-xxxi, and *idem, EJ* 13, 1315-17, s.v. "Psalms and the Cult," and bibl. 1333.

[106] We have stressed elsewhere that the cult was the stuff of ancient religions, not because it expressed lofty notions of an abstract character, but because it worked to secure the blessings of life for the people, individually and collectively.

[107] See our discussion in Levine, *Prolegomenon* (cited in Part I, 92), and D. J. McCarthy, *VT, Suppl.* 23, 1972, 84.

5. Votive Offerings and the Šelāmîm

Thus far we have been speaking of public ritual, tracing the biblical references to the šelāmîm in an attempt to show that where it served as the primary, or sole rite in a celebration, it was somehow related to royal and/or national sponsorship—to the coronation of kings, the dedication of altars and temples, etc. At this point it would be well to explore another line of evidence, i.e. the role of the šelāmîm in private ritual. We refer to the connection between the šelāmîm sacrifice and the neder, a term which applies both to the original pronouncement of a "vow", as well as to its subsequent fulfillment or payment.[108]

Public and private ritual were closely interrelated. Alongside the festival celebrations and pilgrimages to the larger, central shrines, and the regular temple cults, votive activity served as a parallel channel of approach to the deity, bringing large numbers of individual Israelites and their families to cult sites, large and small, throughout the land. The interrelationship of public and private ritual is epitomized in the account of Hannah and her husband, Elkanah at Shiloh (I Samuel, chapter 1). There we read of much diverse cultic activity. The couple undertook annual pilgrimages to Shiloh in order to offer up zebaḥ hayyāmîm "the annual slain offering", at the same time pronouncing vows and making good on those already pledged. Such occasions also afforded the embittered, barren woman the opportunity to pour out her feelings, entreating Yahweh for a son.[109]

The simplest, most naïve glimpse into the connection between the šelāmîm and the neder is provided by a passage from the book of Proverbs, chapter 7, which portrays the "hateful woman," the harlot who lures young men into license. She lurks in the streets, accosting her potential client with the following inducement:

"I owe slain offerings of šelāmîm, for today I paid my vows."

(verse 14)

The passage is admittedly somewhat cryptic. The harlot in question was either employing a customary pretext or was actually planning a feast in her quarters on that occasion. As she states the matter, she is offering her client sections of the šelāmîm sacrifice as a repast on the

---

[108] The term neder as connoting the original pronouncement is attested in many narrative passages (Gen 28:20, 31:13, Nu 21:2, 30:3-4, Dt 23:22, Jud 11:30, Eccl 5:3. In the sense of the fulfillment or payment of the votive, cf. Lev 7:2, 16, 22:21-3, Nu 15:3, 8, Jud 11:39, I Sam 1:21.

[109] On zebaḥ hayyāmîm, see Appendix IV.

evening of the day when she offered it. That sacrifice may have re-presented the actual payment of the vow or an accompaniment to the fulfillment of the vow, offered in celebration.[110]

Brief as it is, this passage from Proverbs attests to the use of the šelāmîm in connection with votive activity, a connection spelled out in the tôrāh of Leviticus 7:11-38, and posited by the ordinance of Leviticus 22:21, following. In the code of Leviticus 7:11-21, par-ticularly, the payment of vows represents one of three associated uses of the šelāmîm sacrifice, the other two being the tôdāh "thanksgiving offering", and the nedābah "voluntary/generous offering." All three sacrifices were motivated by the same general circumstances. The tôdāh was particularly appropriate for expressing gratitude over one's deliverance from danger or misfortune.[111]

Internal analysis of the various priestly texts dealing with the šelāmîm and its use for votive offerings indicates that the tôdāh was, at an earlier stage than Leviticus, chapter 7, unrelated to the šelāmîm, and less closely connected to the offerings termed neder and nedābāh. Thus, Leviticus 22:21, following, speaks of the šelāmîm only in con-nection with the neder and nedābāh, whereas the tôdāh is treated under a separate heading (verse 29 f.). There are also differences in the pres-cribed disposition of the tôdāh. Leviticus 7:15 ordains that in the case of the šelāmîm offered up as tôdāh, the flesh of the sacrifice must be consumed the same day, whereas in the case of neder and nedābāh it may be eaten until the second day (verses 16-17).[112] The same specific difference, as applied to the tôdāh, appears in Leviticus 22:29-30. It would appear, therefore, that Leviticus, chapter 7, subsumed the tôdāh under the category of cultic activity served by the šelāmîm, but in so doing did not alter its distinctive character entirely. The compound term zebah tôdat šelāmâu (Leviticus 7:13, 15) epitomizes the incorpora-tion of the tôdāh into the class of offerings covered by the šelāmîm.[113] That Leviticus, chapter 7, is subsequent to chapter 22 is evident from the relative dating of the Holiness Code (henceforth H), which en-compasses Leviticus, chapters 17-26, vis à vis the other priestly

[110] There is no restriction on where the flesh of zebāhîm may be eaten, but only on partaking of sacrifices in the class of qodšê qodāšîm "most sacred offerings" (Lev 6:19, 7:6, and cf. 7:19).

[111] Cf. Ps 50:14-15, 23, 56:13, 107:21-2, 116:17-18, Jonah 2:10, and for the nedābāh Ps 54:8.

[112] See B. A. Levine, EB (Hebrew), 6, 196, 435-6, s.v. piggûl, and see Part I, n. 7.

[113] See Hoffmann, Leviticus I, 247-9, s,v. Lev 7:247-9.

writings of the Pentateuch (henceforth P), according to which H antedates P.[114]

It seems reasonable that in time what was a more limited type of offering was extended to include religious concerns thematically associated with the *neder*, i.e. thanksgiving and the generosity of the one blessed by God. Just exactly where Numbers 15:1-16 fits into this scheme remains uncertain. The thrust of that section centers around the offerings required as accompaniments to the *'ôlāh* and the *zebaḥ*, in general, i.e. the grain offering *(minḥāh)* and the libation *(nesek)*. The idiomatic phraseology of verses 3 and 8, respectively, have little to do with the particular role of the *šelāmîm*, and it would be unwarranted to conclude that the *šelāmîm* was regarded in this passage as distinct from the *neder* merely because verse 8 states: "to fulfill a *neder* or a *šelāmîm* offering."[115]

Numbers 6:1-21, the code of the *nāzîr* mentions the *šelāmîm* only as part of the sacrifices required at the conclusion of the period covered by the vow, and there seems to be no connection in particular between the votive aspects of the *nāzîr*'s situation and the *šelāmîm* as a special type of *zebaḥ*. Numbers 6:1-21 merely refers to the *šelāmîm* as the ordinary *zebaḥ*.

In summary, we have in the priestly traditions of the Pentateuch a clear connection between the *šelāmîm* and votive activity, despite a certain amount of vagueness here and there. Furthermore we have been able to trace more than one stage in the development of that connection, to embrace the *tôdāh*.

Pushing our inquiry one step further back, we can shed some light on the origin of the nexus of *šelāmîm* and *neder* by noting that in Deuteronomy the *neder* is represented as a distinct offering, and is never associated with the *šelāmîm*. This means that the connection between the *šelāmîm* and votive activity came about after Deuteronomy. We will have more to say about problems of dating further on.[116]

The overall character of votive activity lies beyond the scope of this study. What concerns us here is the appropriateness of the

---

[114] See M. Haran, *EJ* 8, 820-25, s.v. "Holiness Code."

[115] See N. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers, (The Century Bible)*, 1967, 249-50, s.v. Nu 15:1-16. Snaith makes the point that the term *'iššeh* includes that part of the sacrifice which was burned on the altar.

[116] There are two Deuteronomic passages about the *neder*: a) Dt 12: 6, 11, 17, 26, where the *neder* is listed in the ordinances requiring that all offerings be brought to the one, central temple. That requirement applies to the *neder*. b) Dt 23:19, 22-4, where the Israelites are adjured to make good on votive pledges.

šelāmîm, as we have interpreted it, for use in fulfillment of votive
pledges. The person offering the *šelāmîm* either as actual payment of
his *neder* or possibly as a celebrative act associated with the fulfillment
of his vows, is approaching the deity who had granted him his en-
treaty. He is coming into Yahweh's presence. The theme of presenta-
tion conveyed by the term *šelāmîm* would be most suitable for such
occasions. Such a person was also acting under the contractual terms
of the *dô- ut dēs* relationship, and the paying of a vow is certainly to be
considered a gift to the deity, whether obligatory or as a sign of
generosity. The attested association of *neder* (and of *nedābāh* and *tôdāh*)
seems to support the rendering of the term *šelāmîm* as "present,
gift of greeting."[117]

6. *The Changing Character of the Šelāmîm in Israelite Religion*

Thus far in our discussion of the biblical evidence we have been
concerned with the basic character of the *šelāmîm* sacrifice. Our
tracing of its roles in ancient Israel has only been loosely chronological.
We have introduced material which clarified the essential functions
of the *šelāmîm*, like those sources bearing on the nexus of *šelāmîm* and
neder, for example, without regard for problems of precise dating. A
review of the biblical evidence adduced up to this point with an eye
toward the more historical questions would now be appropriate:

(1) The *šelāmîm* is an ancient sacrifice, probably introduced into the
Israelite cult before the beginnings of the monarchy. It is attested in
relatively early biblical sources, such as Exodus 20:24, 24:5, and in
Amos 5:22. There are references to its use in the days of Saul and
Samuel (I Samuel 10:8, 11:14-15), by David (II Samuel 6:17-18,
24:25), by Solomon (I Kings 8:63-64, 9:25), and by Ahaz (II Kings
16:13).[118] In these sources, with the possible exception of Amos

---

[117] There is some evidence to suggest that just as it was customary to pro-
nounce vows in sacred locales—at temples, near altars and *bāmôt*—it was tradi-
tional, if not at times obligatory, to return to the place where the vow had been
pronounced initially when the time came to fulfill it. The fact that those leaving the
land of the God of Israel stopped at sacred locales to make vows, and later
returned to the same spots to present their votives in payment of them, after they
had been restored safely to their homeland accentuates the graphics of presentation
associated with the payment of votives. Cf. Gen 28:1-22, especially v. 22, and
35:1 f. Also cf. II Sam 15:17-19, which relates that Absalom used the pretext of
having to go to Hebron to pay a vow undertaken there.

[118] Jos 8:31 echoes Ex 24:5, and is therefore probably late.

5:22, the *šelāmîm* appears as a rite largely reserved for royal and/or confederative-national celebrations of a dedicatory or commemorative character, and not as a rite which figured in the regular, public cult.

On the basis of Amos 5:22 one could speculate that the *šelāmîm* was in wider use in the Northern kingdom, at Bethel of Amos' time, since the prophet lists it in a standard series of offerings. Otherwise, the *šelāmîm* is recorded for convocations at Gilgal and Jerusalem and its environs before the temple was built, when, for example, David brought the ark to Jerusalem.[119] Solomon not only used the *šelāmîm* in the dedication of his new temple, but apparently used to offer the *šelāmîm* three times a year as an act of individual worship. Likewise, Ahaz offered the *šelāmîm* as part of the dedication of his new altar.[120]

(2) The *šelāmîm* is absent from the cultic codes of Deuteronomy, in chapters 12, 16-18, and 23 (verses 19, 22-24). It is mentioned only once in Deuteronomy 27:7, a passage which speaks of the erection of an altar atop Mount Ebal for a commemorative occasion.[121]

(3) The *šelāmîm* is not mentioned by any literary prophet, except Amos, until Ezekiel, chapters 40-48. Isaiah and Jeremiah never mention it, although they refer quite regularly to other types of sacrifices—*'ōlāh*, *zebah*, incense offerings, etc. Note especially that Jeremiah repeatedly refers to the *tôdāh*, but never mentions the *šelāmîm*.[122]

It would seem that the writers of the historical books, the literary prophets, for the most part, and the author of Deuteronomy knew of the *šelāmîm* only as an exceptional sacrifice, and mention it only when they had a specific record of its use on special occasions, as an ancient and honorable rite. They did not know of it as a regular ingredient either in private or public ritual.

---

[119] Cf. I Sam 11:14-15, II Sam 6:13, 18.

[120] The fact that there is no mention of the *šelāmîm* in the account of Josiah's celebration in Jerusalem or in his cultic activity is probably not significant, because that account speaks of no cultic aspects of the celebration, with the exception of the *Pasah* festival (II Kings 22:1-23:30).

[121] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 164-6, does not consider ch. 27 to be original but an insertion from the Elohist's Schechem tradition. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy, A commentary (The Old Testament Library)*, 1966, 164-9 also considers ch. 27 not to be integral in content or style. See Part I, n. 135 for problems of dating Deuteronomy, which will, in turn, clarify our conclusion that ch. 27 is, indeed, original.

[122] Cf. Jer 17:26, 30:19, 33:11 for references to the *tôdāh*, and for references to other sacrifices, cf. Jer 6:20, 7:21-2, 17:26.

When the above evidence is compared with *H* and *P*, and with Ezekiel, chapters 40-48, we note a definite change in the utilization of the *šelāmîm*. Certain features of the older tradition continue, but new roles and functions are attributed to the ancient rite. There is first of all, the connection between the *neder* and the *šelāmîm*, already discussed. This is first attested in *H* (Leviticus 22:21, following). *H* also provides information about the general extension of the role of the *šelāmîm*. Leviticus 17:1-9 is part of a broad, opening statement on the cult, prescribing what was undoubtedly intended as a far-reaching innovation. Henceforth, all sacrifices of whatever sort, *'ôlāh* or *zebaḥ*, were to be presented at the opening of the Tent of Meeting and not upon the open field.[123] Verse 5b states that *zebāḥîm* were henceforth to be offered as *šelāmîm*. This could be interpreted to mean that, as part of a broad alteration in ritual praxis, the *šelāmîm* was to serve as the exclusive *zebaḥ*. Whether or not such an extreme conclusion is warranted it is clear that the legislation of Leviticus 17:1-9, along with its more general import, had the effect of lending greater prominence to the *šelāmîm*. There is also the general statement in Leviticus 19:5-8 which more or less establishes the *šelāmîm* as the *zebaḥ*, par excellence. At this point, the term *šelāmîm* becomes available as a synonym for *zebaḥ* although the two terms never became consistently interchangeable.[124]

The principal question to be asked about the legislation of Leviticus 17:1-9 and 19:5-8 is whether it was intended to assign a role to the *šelāmîm* in regular, public ritual or only in individual votaries or other types of sacrificial acts undertaken out of gratitude or generosity (*tôdāh*, *nedābāh*, etc.).[125] In other words: Do we have explicit evidence

---

[123] Our historical assessment that *H* and *P* are subsequent to *D* includes our conclusion that the provision of Lev, ch. 17 on the place of sacrifice is tantamount to cult centralization, projected, of course, into a wilderness environment, with a portable sanctuary. This will be the subject of a future study. Now see M. Haran, "Studies in the Bible: The Idea of Centralization of the Cult in the Priestly Apprehension," (Hebrew), *Beer-Sheva* 1, 1973, 114-21 for similar views.

[124] Daniel, *Vocaulaire*, 28-31, and ns. 25-28, also observes that the *šelāmîm* was not necessarily synonymous with *zebaḥ*. In Jos 22:27 *LXX* renders the words: *ûbizebāḥênû ûbišelāmênû* as though they were written *ûbezibḥê šelāmênû*, undoubtedly so as to synchronize this unique construction with normal usage.

[125] There is ample evidence for the ongoing role of the *šelāmîm* in private worship. The formulation: *'îš 'îš* "anyone" in Lev 17:3 might be taken to indicate the acts of individuals, or acts on their behalf, not of priests in public ritual. Nu 29:39 groups the *šelāmîm* together with other private offerings, the *neder* and the *nedābāh*. The same is true of Lev 7:11-28, of course.

that the *šelāmîm* ever became a regular ingredient in the daily cult, or in the rites of the Sabbath and other sacred days of the year?

The picture emerging from *H* and *P* is somewhat unclear. We have the evidence of Leviticus 23:15-22, especially verse 19, which prescribes a *šelāmîm* offering for the Pentecost, as part of an elaborate ritual including as well a plentiful *'ôlāh* and a *ḥaṭṭā't*. Now Leviticus, chapter 23, is a liturgical calendar generally devoid of specific prescriptions pertaining to animal sacrifices, except for verses 12-13 relevant to the offerings accompanying the *'ômer* "the sheaf of new grain" and verses 18-20, of which we are speaking. Otherwise, there is only the general stipulation that an *'iššeh* "fired offering" is to be brought on each of the seven days of *Pesaḥ* (verse 8), on the first day of the seventh month (verse 25), on *Yom Hakkippûrîm* (verse 27), and on the seven days of *Sukkôt* and the assembly of the eighth day (verse 36).[126] The text does not specify what the *'iššeh* consisted of. There is a concluding statement in verses 37-38 which might be taken to mean that the *'iššeh* referred to in the calendar included both an *'ôlāh* and a *zebaḥ* with their related libations and grain offerings, but this is far from certain, since the referent of *debar yôm beyômô* "each matter in its day" in verse 37 could be simply what was ordained in the calendar, and nothing more.[127]

It is clear that the received text of Leviticus, chapter 23 is composite. Verses 12-13, 18-20, and the postscript in 37b-38 are certainly not original to the liturgical calendar of *H*, and were inserted so as to bring this earlier record into line with *P*'s overall regimen of sacrificial requirements.[128] In any event, the prescription of a *šelāmîm* offering

---

[126] The term *'iššeh* requires further investigation, and the rendering "fired offering" is tentative. See Part I, n. 115.

[127] See the discussion in Hoffmann, *Leviticus*, II, 281-2, s.v. Lev 23:37 who notes the implication that the *'iššeh* prescribed for all of the holy days included both an *'ôlāh* and a *zebaḥ*. Also cf. in the *Sifra'* ed. L. Finkelstein, 1967 (Hebrew year, 5717), 566, s.v. Lev 23:37, the comment that a *zebaḥ* was intended for all occasions when a *nesek* "libation" was ordained.

[128] The original text of H in ch. 23, aside from not specifying what the *'iššeh* consisted of, would have left two occasions without altar sacrifices: The occasion when the *'ômer* was originally reaped and presented to the priest (v. 11), and the occasion when the *minḥāh* of new grain was "raised" before Yahweh (v. 17) would have been celebrated only according to the old mode of presenting offerings in view of the deity, or showing them to him. (Cf. Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxxiii-iv, and *idem*, *EJ* 5, 1161). It is possible, therefore, that *P* superimposed the more normative altar rites on two occasions which did not originally have such provisions. The only rite entirely of the old mode preserved by *H* or *P* is the bread of display (Lev 24:5-9), which was entirely eaten by the priests, and only placed before the deity for a period of time. But, even in that case, some sort of *'iššeh*

for the Pentecost, most probably an innovation of *P*, is definitely attested, subsequent to the promulgation of *P*. This is corroborated by the tradition of the Mishnah, which terms this sacrifice *kibśê 'aṣṣeret* "sheep of the sacred assembly", since two yearling sheep were ordained.[129]

There is no conclusive evidence that the *śelāmîm* or any other *zebaḥ* ever became part of the regular cult. The two exceptions were the Pascal *zebaḥ*, an ancient rite, and the *śelāmîm* prescribed for the Pentecost, a later innovation. Ezekiel 46:2 mentions a *śelāmîm* sacrifice to be offered by the *nāśî'* on Sabbaths and New Moons. The reference was probably to an individual act of devotion, by the leader of the people.[130]

In Numbers, chapters 28-29 we have a code of sacrificial rites for the entire year, including the daily offerings. The code is problematic. There is no mention of any *zebaḥ*, even the Pascal *zebaḥ*. Only the *'ōlāh*, the *minḥāh*, the *nesek* and the *ḥaṭṭā't* are enumerated. It seems clear, therefore, that the omission of *zebāḥîm* was intentional. Whereas one could maintain that the *śelāmîm* of the Pentecost represents a later development, the same cannot be said for the Pascal *zebaḥ*. This code systematically excludes *qodāśîm qallîm* "offerings of lesser sanctity."

The postscript (Numbers 29:39) is also problematic. Most probably it is to be taken as follows:

> These shall you offer to Yahweh on your appointed days; apart from your votive and voluntary offerings presented as your holocausts, grain offerings, libations and *śelāmîm* offerings.

That is to say: The code prescribes the obligatory sacrifices of the *qodśê qodāśîm* "most sacred offerings", which are apart, or in addition to other sacrifices, i.e. votives and voluntary offerings presented in the form of holocausts, etc. This classifies the *śelāmîm* as a private offering brought voluntarily. Dispite certain problems which persist in the interpretation of this postscript, that much seems certain.[131]

The upshot of our analysis of both Leviticus, chapter 23 and Num-

---

was probably deemed necessary, so as to replace the usual *'azkārāh*, pinched from the *minḥāh* cakes (Lev 2:2), and so 23:7 interpolates the requirement of a spice offering to be placed on the altar.

[129] See M. *Menāḥôt* II:2, III:6, V:6, VII:3. This offering was also known in Talmudic sources as *(zibbê) śalmê ṣibbûr* "public (slain) *śelāmîm* offerings (Cf M. *Pesāḥîm* VII:4, *Zebāḥîm* V:5, *Menāḥôt* V:7, *Me'ilāh* II:5).

[130] Cf. Ezek 46:12 for an oblique reference to the same practice, and note our discussion, following, on Ezek 46:2, 12, as an echo of I Kings 9:25.

[131] It should be noted that, although the *zebaḥ* was the most prominent type of sacrifice in private and individual rites, the *'ōlāh*, *minḥāh*, and *nesek*, also had a role in this sphere, quite apart from their functions in regular, public ritual. This is indicated by the fact that priestly codes of the Pentateuch specify the *'ōlāh* and

bers, chapters 28-29 is that the *šelāmîm* was ordained only for the Pentecost, and otherwise remained in the sphere of voluntary activity, connected with votives, etc. The appropriateness of the *šelāmîm* for the Pentecost seems to have been related to an aspect of dedication intrinsic to that festival. This is suggested by the prescription of a three-tiered rite consisting of *ʿôlāh-ḥaṭṭāʾt-šelāmîm* and their accompanying grain offerings and libations, similar in structure to the rites performed at the dedication of the tabernacle altar (Numbers, chapter 7), although the quantities of each sacrifice differed somewhat.[132] This would also be suggested by the unusual rites surrounding the offering of the *ʿômer*, including the *minḥāh* of first fruits *(bikkûrîm)* ordained especially for this occasion. These rites, ordained by *P*, dovetail with celebrations ordained in Deuteronomy (26:1-11). The overall impression is that the Pentecost was celebrated in an elaborate fashion and marked the conclusion of a spring harvest complex, which began on Pesaḥ. In such a context, *P* ordained the *šelāmîm*, perhaps to create a symmetry between the *Pesaḥ* with its *zebaḥ*, embellishing the Pentecost with its own festive *zebaḥ*.

P also preserves the older, traditional role of the *šelāmîm* as a dedicatory sacrifice. This is confirmed in two texts pertaining to the initiation of the Tabernacle cult, Leviticus, chapter 9, and Numbers, chapter 7. We have elsewhere discussed these texts in depth, indicating that they exemplify the tradition of descriptive rituals in the Pentateuch, and represent an early part of *P*.

---

minḥāh for certain purificatory rites for individuals (Lev 12:6, 8, 14:10, 21, etc.) and also suggest, at the very least, that individuals offered the *ʿôlāh* and *minḥāh* (Nu 15:8-10, and cf. Lev chs. 1-2, 17:8, etc.). Perhaps more telling are indications of extensive utilization of the *nesek* by individuals and families in Jer 7:18, (and cf. 19:3), 17:26, 41:5, 44:17-25, Ezek 20:28, Ps 40:7, and possibly Gen 35:14. On the *minḥāh* and *ʿôlāh* see further, Gen 4:3, Jud 13:23, I Sam 26:19, Isa 57:6-8. Kings offered *ʿôlôt* along with *zebāḥîm* as private acts of devotion (I Kings 9:25, II Kings 16:13-15). Also note the recurrent *cliché: meqaṭṭerîm ûmezabbeḥîm*, and variations on that theme (I Kings 22:44, II Kings 12:4, 14:4, etc.) which probably refer to the offering of the *minḥāh* (See M. Haran, *VT* 10, 1960, 116-18).

[132] See B. A. Levine, *JAOS* 85, 1965, 314-18 for a discussion of Nu, ch. 7. In Lev 23:18-20, the *ʿôlāh* is the main event, consisting of one head of large cattle and a total of nine heads of small cattle. Nu ch. 7, representing the older tradition of the *šelāmîm* as a dedicatory sacrifice (see ns. 133-4, following) features a *šelāmîm* consisting of two heads of large cattle and a total of ten small cattle. There may be something to de Vaux's claim (*Sacrifice*, 35-6) that the importance of the *zebaḥ* diminished as time went on, whereas the *ʿôlāh*, especially as utilized in the *tāmîd*, grew in importance. Nu 10:10 might mean that the *šelāmîm* was offered on all festivals, but the terminology is imprecise, and the context too general to allow for this conclusion.

Leviticus, chapter 9 (see verse 4) is an account of the initiation of sacrificial rites on the Tabernacle altar by Aaron and his sons after their investiture in the priestly office (*ibid.* chapter 8). Numbers, chapter 7, is a record of the dedication of the Tabernacle altar with the contributions of the chiefs of the twelve tribes of Israel, the *nesî'îm*. In both rites, the *šelāmîm* was offered together with a *ḥaṭṭā't* and an *'ôlāh*.[133]

There is a thematic connection between the earlier use of the *šelāmîm* in the proclamation of Saul's kingship and in the dedication of Solomon's temple, and its utilization in the invesiture of Aaron and his sons and in the dedication of the Tabernacle altar. This connection illustrates how the priestly tradition of the Pentateuch preserved something of the older role of the *šelāmîm*.

The evidence of Ezekiel, chapters 40-48 and of I and II Chronicles provides only limited enlightenment on the developing role of the *šelāmîm*. In Ezekiel 43:27 we have a probable echo of Leviticus 9:4, associating the *šelāmîm* with the initiation of the temple cult. The projection of the *šelāmîm* as a rite performed by the *nāsî'* as an individual act (Ezekiel 46:2) probably reflects I Kings 9:25, where Solomon is said to have so utilized the *šelāmîm* three times a year.

References to the *šelāmîm* in I and II Chronicles represent either the retelling of accounts about David and Solomon wherein the *šelāmîm* had a prominent role (I Chronicles 16:1-2, 21:26, II Chronicles 7:7) or relate to traditions of dubious historicity about Hezekiah and Menasseh (II Chronicles 29:35, 30:22, 31:2, and 33:16).[134]

The above analysis of the priestly traditions relevant to the *šelāmîm* allows us to conclude that its change from a limited sacrifice reserved for certain special occasions to one of wider, general use, resulted from the legislation of *H* further reinforced by *P*. To put it more historically, perhaps, the legislation of *H*, followed by *P*, codifies a change in praxis whereby the utilization of the *šelāmîm* was extended.

It is our view that *H* is subsequent to Deuteronomy, although it may contain some very ancient material. Now, there is growing evidence for the Northern origin of Deuteronomy, and for dating its composition to the last half of the eighth century BCE.[135] It has

---

[133] See B. A. Levine, *op. cit.*, 314-18.

[134] See S. Japhet, *EJ* 5, 526-7, s.v. "Chronicles, Book of—", on the reworking of earlier sources regarding the kings of Judah, after Solomon.

[135] In several recent scholarly lectures, H. L. Ginsberg has argued quite convincingly, and with new evidence, for the Northern origin of Deuteronomy, and

already been noted that Deuteronomy knows of the *šelāmîm* only in its older, traditional role, and not in its expanded role. This is an innovation of *H*. If we assume that generally speaking, *H* antedates Ezekiel, chapters 40-48 which draw on *H* (and on parts of *P*, as well) we can fix the *terminus ad quem* of *H* (and of parts of *P*) in the near-exilic period.

The extension of the *šelāmîm* sacrifice was accomplished by the Jerusalem priesthood, from whose circles *H* and *P* emanated. The cultic establishment of Jerusalem transformed an ancient sacrifice associated with kings and with great moments of cultic importance into the *zebaḥ* par excellence, rivalled only by the Pascal *zebaḥ*.

Perhaps therein lies the key to this development: The priesthood of Jerusalem sought to avail itself of a sacrifice identified with great cultic moments in Israelite history—the initiation of the monarchy under Saul, sanctioned by a cultic convocation; the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, marking the rise of that city to cultic preeminence, and the dedication of Solomon's temple. There was also the tradition of the *šelāmîm* offered at Sinai (Exodus 24:25), and its association by the Deuteronomist with the initiation of Yahwistic worship in Canaan (Deuteronomy 27:7). The *šelāmîm* epitomized significant beginnings, and we know that the cultic establishment frequently attempted to routinize the momentous, thus rendering it part and parcel of the ongoing religious experience of the individual Israelite and of the people, collectively.

Underlying the entire history of the *šelāmîm*, with its developments in Israel, is the notion of sacrifice as an efficacious gift of greeting, offered "in the presence of the Lord."

---

for dating it to the late eighth century, BCE. Not all of the received text is original to Deuteronomy, of course, but what is original shows striking Hoseanic influences, on the one hand, and no influence whatsoever from Isaiah, hardly conceivable if the book were of Judean origin and a product of the late seventh century. *Inter alia*, this strengthens the case for taking ch. 27 as original to *D*, which originally projected a Northern central temple, undoubtedly in Schechem. One would not have to reach for Elohist traditions (see Part I, n. 121). In part, see H. L. Ginsberg, *EJ* 8, 1010-24, s.v. "Hosea, Book of—."

A. Rofé, *VT, Suppl.* 22, 1971, 221-7, is searching for Northern elements in the doctrine of the unification of the cult, but he proceeds from certain *a priori* assumptions about the seventh century date of *D*, all of which tends to confuse his analysis.

PART TWO
SACRIFICES OF EXPIATION

INTRODUCTION

The general subject of ritual expiation involves basic issues in our understanding of the religious mentality of ancient Israel throughout most of the biblical period. It is also an area of study requiring the resolution of complex questions of biblical philology and textual interpretation.

Consistent with our basic methodology we begin our discussion with a consideration of the terminology relevant to expiatory activity in the context of the Israelite cult. The Hebrew verb which conveys the process of expiation is *kippēr*. In an earlier study, intended as a commentary on Leviticus, chapter 16 and written in Hebrew, we argued for a new understanding of this verb and its derivatives.[1] We have been able, since then, to deepen our findings on the process of expiation, availing ourselves of the recently published *K* volume of *The Assyrian Dictionary*, University of Chicago, which clarifies considerably the Akkadian evidence basic to a proper understanding of the biblical terminology.[2]

The two principal expiatory sacrifices in ancient Israel were the *ḥaṭṭā't* and the *'āšām*. The precise difference in motivation and purpose between these closely related sacrifices has constituted yet another crux in the interpretation of the Israelite rites of expiation. Building on earlier, brief treatments by G. B. Gray and E. A. Speiser, we will here propose a possible resolution of this problem.[3]

In discussing the process of ritual expiation, we will be dealing with aspects of cultic activity which show signs of magic. The question of just how magical, if at all magical, the Israelite cult was, has been a matter of dispute for some time. In recent years, partly as a reaction to earlier exaggerations, there has been a tendency to minimize the extent of active magical components in the public cult of Israel as portrayed in the priestly sources of the Bible, primarily. To us it is clear that the distinctive objectives of magical activity and those of the

---

[1] B. A. Levine, *Kippûrîm* (Hebrew), *EI* 9, 1969, 88-95.

[2] See Appendix III for a detailed presentation of the cognate data relevant to the root *k-p-r*.

[3] Gray, Sacrifice, 57-66, and E. A. Speiser, "Leviticus and the Critics, "*Yeḥezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume*, ed. M. Haran, 1960, 3033, and *idem*, "Nuzi Marginalia," *Orientalia N.S.* 25, 1956, 9-15.

cult, proper, converged in pursuit of the common end of eliminating destructive or demonic forces identified as the sources of impurity, and viewed as the matrix of sinfulness and offense to the deity.

We will endeavour to show just how apotropaic and prophylactic magic figured in the enterprise of cleansing, or purifying cultic persons, objects, buildings and sites, and sacrificial materials so as to protect their state of purity, once attained, from contamination. It is the general area of purity, as a ritual and religious complex, which must be understood properly if the full import of expiation is to be realized.[4]

I. THE VERB *KIPPĒR* AND ITS DERIVATIVES

In studying the verb *kippēr* the importance of etymology and comparative lexicography cannot be overemphasized. Specifically, the problem is to establish the precise sense of this critical verb, which cannot be ascertained primarily on the basis of context. In this instance, context can only suggest the outlines of connotation.

Conventionally, scholars have taken the verb *kippēr* to mean: "to cover (up/over)," a meaning which relates to the notion, elsewhere attested in biblical literature, that expiation consists of the covering of sins. The forgiven is the one whose offenses are covered from God's view, which is a way of indicating that the deity does not take notice of them, nor show concern with exacting punishment for them.[5]

An alternative interpretation of the verb *kippēr* is supplied by the cognate evidence of Akkadian, where the D-stem of *kapāru*, *kuppuru*, has the sense: "to wipe off," hence "to purify." G. B. Gray, writing before 1922, summarized the evidence for both interpretations, and favored the latter. In 1934, G. R. Driver wrote a brief study of the

---

[4] Definitions of magic differ, of course, but we know of no definition which excludes exorcism, or apotropaic and prophylactic magic. See our discussion further on in Part II, ch. IV. We are grateful to Prof. Jacob Neusner for the opportunity of reading the manuscript of his forthcoming study, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*, 1973, which includes a section on the biblical background to post-biblical and Talmudic notions about purity as a major theme in Judaism. Prof. Neusner was kind enough to include discussion of our views on the biblical materials (*ibid.* ch. I).

[5] See P. D. Schötz, *Schuld- und Sündopfer im alten Testament*, 1930, 102-44, and J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im alten Testament*, 1940, 59-66, who favors this explanation of *kippēr*. The notion of covering sins is, of course, well attested in biblical religious literature. Cf. Ps 32:1, 85:3, Prov 10:12, 17:9, 28:13, and cf. Isa 33:24, Micah 7:18, Job 7:21.

problem, providing additional Akkadian and comparative evidence, albeit somewhat imprecise, and deciding on the idea of "wiping off, cleansing" as basic to the expiatory process.[6]

More recently, Benno Landsberger wrote a work on the terminology relevant to the date palm in Mesopotamia, in which he treats the verb *kapāru* "to trim, cut", which we know to be a homonym. Nevertheless, Landsberger's study clarifies many problems, and includes an excursus on the other *kapāru*, "to wipe off" in the Semitic languages.[7] We have since received the somewhat differing assessments of the two lexica, *AHw* and *CADK*. Despite some persisting ambiguities in the classification of the Akkadian data, it should be possible to demonstrate quite convincingly that biblical Hebrew *kippēr* and related forms do not reflect the motif of covering or concealing sins, but rather the sense of cleansing, and the elimination which results from it. As we shall note presently, the sense of "covering", if at all related to the same root, is actually a later connotation, one which could not have had any role in determining the usage of *kippēr* and related forms, or of the noun *kōper* "ransom, expiation gift," in biblical sources.

Let us first examine the classical argument for alleged *kippēr* "to cover (up/over)." This meaning is suggested, first of all, by the frequent occurrence of the construction: *kippēr* + *'al*, which would seem to indicate that the action conveyed by the verb is accomplished "upon" or "over" something. Presumably, this is corroborated by a comparison of Jeremiah 18:23 with the paraphrase in Nehemiah 3:27. In terms of the usual argument, we translate the Jeremiah passage as follows:

> For you, Yahweh, know all of their deadly scheme against me. Do not cover up their transgression *('al tekappēr 'al 'awōnām)* nor erase their offense from your presence.
> The parallel in Nehemiah has:
> Do not cover up their transgression *('al tekas 'al 'awōnām)* nor allow their offense to be erased from your presense.

The replacement of *kippēr* + *'al* by *kissāh* + *'al* is taken to indicate that *kissāh* and *kippēr* are precise synonyms.[8] This conclusion is open to question on several grounds. First of all, there is the fact that the

---

[6] Gray, *Sacrifice*, 67-73, G. R. Driver, *JTS* 34, 1933, 34-38, and see Part II, n. 20.

[7] B. Landsberger, *The Date Palm and Its Byproducts According to the Cuneiform Sources (AfO, Beiheft* 17), 1967, 30 f.

[8] Gray, *Sacrifice*, 68, *LVT*, 451-2, s.v. *k-p-r*, and J. Stamm, *op. cit.*, 62 f.

parallelism of *kippēr*//*māḥāḥ* in Jeremiah 18:23 would be precise if *kippēr* indeed meant "to wipe off," which is one of the meanings of *māḥāḥ*.[9] Furthermore, the suggestiveness of *kippēr* + *'al* is misleading, for there are other constructions used with respect to the verb *kippēr* which do not convey the graphics of accomplishing an act "over" or "upon" something. Thus, we have *kippēr* + *be'ad* "—on behalf of," *kippēr* + *l* "—to, for," as well as *kippēr* + direct object, and *kippēr* + 0 (= no object).[10]

It is more likely, therefore, that *kissāh* was substituted for *kippēr* in Nehemiah 3:37 because it conveyed in a general way the notion of forgiveness, and not because it was taken as a precise synonym for *kippēr*.

There are, however, other considerations, more basic to a critique of the accepted interpretation: "to cover (up/over." They are of an etymological and conceptual character.

(1) Predicating for Hebrew *kippēr* and related forms the root meaning "to cover" requires deriving all biblical usage of these forms from the *hapax kāpar* in Genesis 6:14, a denominative from *kōper* "pitch," hence "to smear"-with pitch.[11] It further involves assigning to the term *kōper* "ransom, expiatory payment," a root meaning of "covering, concealing, "—a debt, offense, crime, etc. In fact, etymologians have generally tended to reduce varying manifestations of the consonantal *k-p-r* to the root meaning "to cover." Thus, even *kepîr* "young lion" is tentatively explained as a lion covered by a growing mane, and *kōper* "henna" is that which is smeared.[12] In a situation of

---

[9] On usage of *māḥāḥ* in the context of wiping out, erasing sins see J. Stamm, *op. cit.*, 73-5, and cf. Isa 43:25, Jer 18:23, Ps 51:3, 11, 109:14, Nwh 3:37, and possibly in the same vein Prov 5:32: "He shall overtake plague and shame, and his disgrace shall not be erased." *À propos* of the parallelism of *kippēr*//*māḥāḥ* it might be appropriate to question the conclusion of Landsberger, *Date Palm*, 31, n. 95, that Hebrew *kippēr* never means "to wipe out." We might also note Isa 28:18 where *kuppar* (*Pu"al*) means" to be erased, wiped out," therefore: "nullified."

[10] a) *kippēr* + *be'ad*: Ex 32:30, Lev 9:7, 16:6, 11, 17, 24, Ezek 45:17, II Chron 30:18-19, and see J. Milgrom, *Lešōnēnû* (Hebrew), 35, 1970-71, 16-17. b) *kippēr* + *l*: Nu 35:33, Dt 21:8, Isa 22:14, Ezek 16:63. c) *kippēr* + 0 (+ *b* "in"): Lev 16:17, 27; *kippēr* + 0 (+ *b* "by means of—"): Lev 7:7, Ex 29:33, Isa 27:9, Prov 16:6, Gray, *Sacrifice*, 72, raises the interesting question, in the name of S. Langdon, that *LXX* never translates *kippēr* by a word that means "to cover."

[11] For a similar *Qal* denominative, see Lev 2:13: *bammelaḥ* "you shall season with salt," and cf. Ezra 4:14.

[12] This is the view of J. Stamm, *op. cit.*, on the term *kōper*, which he renders: "*Deckung, Deckungsmittel.*" Also cf. *LVT* 453, s.v. *kōper* III, for this interpretation of "henna", and *ibid.* 450, concerning *kepîr*.

homonyms, it is better to search for independent meanings, rather than attempting forced semantic combinations.[13]

(2) J. Stamm, a principal exponent of the meaning "to cover" for Hebrew *kippēr* cites considerable Arabic evidence in support of his view, pointing to Arabic *kafara*, II-form *kaffara*, and related forms, which clearly attest, among their varied meanings, the sense "to cover". This meaning is usually traced back to Hebrew and Aramaic, although here, too, we encounter ambiguity.[14]

(3) The Akkadian data, in our opinion more essential to an understanding of Hebrew usage than connotations attested for later periods, also requires some sorting out. For the convenience of the reader, we will present the cognate evidence in Appendix III: "Observations on *k-p-r* in Certain Semitic Languages." Our overall conclusion is that the connotation "to cover" is clearly attested only in Arabic. It is likely that this Arabic meaning was read back into earlier biblical and even post-biblical usage before the full weight of the Akkadian evidence was realized. Once this was done, the accepted meaning stayed, and has resisted dislodgment. Even post-biblical Hebrew and Late-Aramaic do not clearly attest the meaning "to cover", although it is from there that the meaning "to deny, disavow," prominent in Arabic, originates. Just how all of these concepts became attached to consonantal *k-p-r* in later vocabularies will be discussed in Appendix III.

For purposes of our discussion, the entry *kapāru* A in *CADK* is of immediate relevance. D-stem *kuppuru* means both a) "to wipe off, clean objects; to rub," and b) "to purify,"-magically. The difference between cleaning and purifying emerges from the nature of the physical actions involved, as well as from immediate context. Cleaning, wiping, etc. involve direct physical contact between the cleansing agents and the objects to be cleansed, in a manner suitable to accomplishing the necessary results, even if the agents are not the usual ones used for such purposes. Thus, wiping off a foot with dough is cleansing it, not purifying it.

When the actions conveyed by *kuppuru* and the context in which they are executed reflect a magical and/or ritual concept, and when the result being sought is significant not primarily because of its physical dynamics, but because of the concept fulfilled through it, *kuppuru* means "to purify." In some such cases, the text will not even

---

[13] See Appendix III, where it shown that in all languages under consideration, Hebrew, *LH*, *LA*, and Arabic the essential situation is the same in this respect.

[14] J. Stamm, *op. cit.*, 63-6, and see Appendix III.

specify which materials were employed, or which specific actions were involved, because that is not of primary importance.[15]

There is also the noun *takpirtu* "purification", sometimes the cognate accusative of *kuppuru* in the syntax of ritual and magical passages, which reflects the same conceptual framework.

All of this will prove to be relevant to our analysis of the biblical usage of *kippēr* both in cultic and non-cultic contexts. It is our contention that biblical usage of *kippēr* almost exactly parallels the evidence available for Akkadian *kuppuru*, even to the point that biblical expiation, conveyed by *kippēr*, involved acts of a magical character, specifically the magical utilization of sacrificial blood.[16]

In the Hebrew Bible, the verb *kippēr* was never used to convey either the graphics of "covering" sins, or that particular notion of atonement or forgiveness. An examination of the biblical evidence, beginning with the older, non-cultic vocabulary, will verify this conclusion.

Driver has already discussed the sense of *kippēr* in Genesis 32:21, although he failed to perceive the precise meaning of the passage.[17] In part, it reads:

> That I may wipe off (the wrath) from his countenance *('akapperāh pānāu)* by means of the tribute which precedes me.

The force of *kippēr* here is clarified by Proverbs 16:14, not recognized by Driver:

> The wrath of a king is like messengers of death, but a skillful man may wipe it off *(yekapperennāh)*.

Esau was enraged at Jacob, who sent him vast tribute so as to assuage his anger.[18]

It should be noted that Akkadian also attests the idiom *kuppuru pānē* "to rub, wipe off the face." This idiom occurs in omen texts. It

---

[15] The significance of this distinction will be brought out in our discussion of the Hebrew syntax in Part II, ch. II.

[16] See Part II, ch. III.

[17] G. R. Driver, *op. cit.*, 35, n. 1.

[18] In Gen 32:21 *'akapperāh pānāu*, without the referent *ḥēmāh* "wrath" constitutes, in effect, an abbreviated idiom. In other words, it was proverbial to wipe the wrath off of one's face. Another such abbreviated idiom is: *hib'īš* "to cause the odor to be foul" (Gen 34:30), with the word for "odor" *(rēaḥ)* understood. This is demonstrated by the full idiom in Ex 5:21: *'ašer hib'aštem 'et rēḥēnū* "For you have caused our odor to be foul." Also cf. I Sam 27:12. Also cf. Isa 30:5, pace Driver, *op. cit.*, 38, and n. 2. J. Stamm, *op. cit.*, 62 compares the idiom *'akapperāh pānāu* with *kesūt 'ēnaim* "a cover up" (Gen 20:16), and takes *kippēr* to mean "to cover the face."

was considered ominous if a new-born infant rubbed his hand over one or the other side of his face, as babies are wont to do.[19]

This leaves little doubt that biblical Hebrew usage, precisely in non-cultic contexts, closely parallels Akkadian usage. The sense of "washing off, wiping off" is also attested in later Aramaic dialects, where one uses this verb in speaking of washing parts of the body.[20]

Driver refers to yet another passage of interest, Isaiah 28:18, which reads: "Your covenant with death shall be erased/wiped off *(wekuppar berîtkem 'et māwet)*, and your treaty with Sheol shall not stand."

The verb *wekuppar* has customarily been emended to read *wetupar* "will be annulled", a verb frequently employed in connection with treaties. As Driver suggests, the emendation is unnecessary, because *kippēr* actually means: "to erase," and it is elsewhere a synonym of *māḥāḥ*.[21]

The Akkadian evidence thus dovetails with Hebrew usage, once we liberate ourselves from the tendentious interpretation which explains *kippēr* as "cover up", or the like.

A survey of the other related forms, based on the root *k-p-r*, will bear out our proposed interpretation.

The term *kôper* "ransom, expiation, gift" is a case in point. Contrary to usual explanations, this term does not reflect the notion of "covering over" the guilt or offense. It is not a sort of bribe given so as to induce either a deity or another person to overlook or disregard an offense, but is rather a payment made for the purpose of erasing or "wiping away" guilt incurred by the offense. Presumably, the amount of the *kôper* was computed according to a scale, or standard, commensurate with the culpability or responsibility involved, and was conceived as a kind of compensation or consideration, in the economic sense.

Such a conclusion emerges from an examination of the biblical sources relevant to this term. As a concession, one may in certain situations of limited responsibility redeem his life (Hebrew: *pādāh*) by

---

[19] See *CADK* 179, s.v. *kuppuru*, c) "to rub."

[20] See G. R. Driver, *op. cit.*, 37, and ns. 4-10, 38, and ns. 1-2, and cf. Levy, *Wörterbuch* II, 386, s.v. *kepar* 2, and *kappēr* 2. Driver notes the fact that the Targum translates *ûmāḥatāh pîhāh* "She wipes her mouth" (Prov 30:20) by: *mekapperāh pummāh*.

[21] J. Stamm, *op. cit.*, 62, seems to favor the emendation, whereas G. R. Driver, *op. cit.*, 34, considers the original reading acceptable, although Driver forces his argument somewhat.

paying a *kôper* (Exodus 21:30), where, according to the theory of
Israelite law, actual forfeiture of one's life would have been required.
In other situations, where, for example, premeditated murder was
involved, no *kôper* may be substituted for the death penalty (Numbers
35:31-32). Similarly, when one's time to die has come, no *kôper* is
possible, (Psalm 49:8). The *kôper* is thus a substitute for a life (Exodus
30:12, Isaiah 43:3), one's own or another's (Proverbs 21:18). A man
may have to forfeit all of his wealth just to stay alive, handing over
his riches as *kôper* (Proverbs 13:18). A man may be fortunate enough
to have at least one intercessor who will entreat God to spare him:
"Redeem him from descending into the pit. I have found ransom."
(Job 33:24).

As is often the case with terms connoting a payment or gift, *kôper*
appropriates less respectable applications. It may be synonymous
with "bribe" or with unjust gain (I Samuel 12:3, Amos 5:12, Job
36:18, Proverbs 6:35). This semantic development occurs simply
because any system of justice is subject to abuse. Such extended con-
notations should not be confused with the essential meaning of the
term involved. In the case of *kôper*, it should not be assumed that
because *kôper* can appropriate the sense of "bribe" etc., it derives
from a root that means "to cover up, conceal."[22]

Turning to matters cultic, we find the term *kôper* designating an
expiatory payment to be remitted by all counted in the census (Exodus
30:12). There, the term *kôper* is synonymous with *kesep hakkippûrîm*
"silver of expiation" (verse 16). Various interpretations have been
advanced to explain the particular need for such a payment in con-
nection with census taking.[23]

The religio-legal implications of interpreting *k-p-r* as: "to cover"

[22] In *EI* 9, 1969, 90, n. 15, we accepted A. Goetze's translation of a passage in
an Old Babylonian letter (*Sumer* 14, 1958, no. 7:15) wherein he rendered the
word *kiprum* "expiation gift." The context was cultic, or at least related to the
temple and to a festival. This would have constituted a cognate to Hebrew *kôper*,
although a unique instance of the same. *CAD* uncovered another instance of the
word *kipru* which rather suggests that it is a substance, similar to alum and black
dye, possibly sulphur (cf. *kibrîtu* in *CADK*, 333-4), used in magical rites and in
fumigation. The passage treated by Goetze reads: *inûma ki-ip-ri-ka teleqqûma
tanadinu* "When you have received and delivered your *kipru*—have the god brought
in for the *nabrû*-festival." (See *CADK*, 400, s.v. *kipru* (or *kibru*). *AHw* 383, s.v.
kiprum had accepted Goetze's translation. We cannot, therefore, attest an Akka-
dian cognate to Hebrew *kôper* without additional evidence.)

[23] See E. A. Speiser, *BASOR* 149, 1958, 17-25, and J. Liver, *Yehezkel Kauf-
mann Jubilee Volume*, (Hebrew), ed. M. Haran, 1960, 54 f.

for biblical concepts of atonement are that all expiatory activity constitutes an attempt to cover up or conceal offenses from God's view or notice. This is certainly not the notion underlying purification, an important dimension of the expiatory process. Purification is more properly understood as an attempt to alienate impurity, for persons to divest themselves of it. Impurity is viewed as an external force which adheres to a person or object.

Some have pointed to the term *kappôret* as evidence for taking *kippēr* as meaning: "to cover," since the *kappôret* was, in fact, a sculptured lid for the ark. Actually, the *kappôret* was so called because of its function as that artifact related to the granting of expiation, and not because of its structure. This is indicated by the Septuagint rendering *hilastērion*.[24]

It seems, therefore, that there is no real evidence for relating any of the terms based on the root *k-p-r* in the cultic vocabulary to the notion of covering.[25]

As suggestive as the comparison of Akkadian and Hebrew usage is for establishing the basic sense of the verb *kippēr* and related terms, differences in idiom and syntax between Hebrew and Akkadian are equally revealing.

II. THE SYNTAX OF *KIPPĒR* AND BIBLICAL NOTIONS OF EXPIATION

In Akkadian, *kapāru/kuppuru* tends to take the direct object, whereas in biblical Hebrew more often than not, *kippēr* is constructed with an indirect object, introduced by the independent prepositions *'al* and *be'ad*, and with the prefixed proposition *l*. It also occurs in the construction *kippēr* + 0, without any object at all.[26]

Anticipating our conclusions, we can state that the cultic lexicon

---

[24] *LXX*, translation to Ex 25:18, 37:6, *et passim*, related to *hilaskesthai*, a verb used in classical and epic literature to connote the appeasement of the gods or reconciliation with them. It is the *LXX* rendering of *kippēr* in Ps 78:38. See E. Hatch, H. A. Redbath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* I, 1954, 684, s.v. *hilaskesthai*, and related forms.

[25] See Appendix III for the full argument. It is not impossible, of course, that one or another of the units of meaning reflected by consonantal *k-p-r* connotes covering, but not those units of meaning having to do with expiation.

[26] See above, Part II, n. 10, for references to *kippēr* + *be'ad*, and + *l*, and further, Part II, ns. 30-31 for references to *kippēr* + *'al*.

of the Bible appropriated the verb *k-p-r* from the general vocabulary, where this verb took the direct object, and adapted its usage to the particular conceptions of expiation and purification basic to the Israelite cultic outlook. Standing between the general usage and the cultic terminology are what may be termed the religious and politico-legal contexts. In such contexts, *kippēr* usually takes the direct object in speaking of the "wiping away" of sins and transgressions, and in connection with the nullification, or the violation of treaties.[27] Even there, however, the indirect object will occasionally occur.[28]

Our question is: Does the syntactic difference between cultic and non-cultic exposition, whereby the cultic texts evidence adaptations involving indirect object constructions not as frequently attested in the purely non-cultic texts, reflect a difference in conception? Some observations on Hebrew usage will show that the change in syntax is, indeed, the result of a change in view.

Nowhere in biblical cultic texts is the human body or any of its parts, or a collective of humans, such as the congregation, the people, etc., the direct object of the verb *kippēr*, although buildings and appurtenances, as objects of purification, may occur in that syntactic position (Leviticus 16:20, Ezekiel 43:20, 26, 45:20). In fact even sacrificial animals are not the direct objects of *kippēr* in the cultic usage. In non-cultic texts, Hebrew syntax follows Akkadian more closely, and, as we have seen, parts of the body, such as the face, may occur as the direct object of *kippēr* (Genesis 32:21).[29]

The cultic texts understood the verb *kippēr* primarily in a functional, or technical sense: "to perform rites of expiation," rather than: "to cleanse." Thus, *kippēr + al* can connote two processes: (1) the rela-

---

[27] In referring to direct object constructions we include *Puʿʿal* and *Hitpaʿʿēl* formations, which are predicated on the syntax of the direct object, although the voice may be passive or reflexive. See I Sam 3:14, several times in Isa (6:7, 22:14, 27:9, 28:18, 47:11), and Ps 65:4, 78:38.

[28] See Dt 21:8 (2 occurrences), Jer 18:23, Ezek 16:63, Ps 79:9, and probably Dan 9:24.

[29] This fact of Hebrew syntax was independently noted by J. Milgrom, *Lešōnēnū* (Hebrew) 35, 1970-71, 16-17 and *idem, Tarbiz* (Hebrew) 40, 1970-71, 1-8, but he derives different conclusions from it, and pursues the evidence along different lines, altogether. Milgrom concludes that the indirect object construction signifies that the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* does not result in the purification of the person who committed the inadvertent offense which occasioned it, but only in the purification of the object upon which the blood was placed, i.e. the sanctuary and/or its appurtenances. As will become clear in our discussion of the types of *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and the kinds of situations which occasioned them, we cannot agree with Milgrom's conclusions. See Part II, chs. VI-VIII.

tional process, i.e. "to perform rites of expiation with respect to-" persons, places, etc. Thus, *lekappēr ʿal benê yisrāʾēl* means: "to perform rites of expiation with respect to the Israelites," i.e. in relation to them. It does not mean that such acts were necessarily accomplished over the Israelites, or that any physical contact was involved. It means merely that the effects of these acts accrued to the Israelites. This is shown by the occurrence of two differing constructions in the same verse, Leviticus 16:33:

> He shall purify the sanctuary and the tent of meeting and the altar (*kippēr* + direct object), and shall perform expiatory rites with respect to the entire people of the congregation *(kippēr + ʿal)*.

Here the difference is perfectly clear: The sanctuary, tent and altar received physical action. Blood was dashed upon them, etc., and as a result, they became pure *(ibid.* 18-20); whereas no acts were performed, in this instance, directly upon the Israelites. They were simply the beneficiaries of the expiatory rites which had been performed.[30] (2) The spatial process, i.e. "to perform rites of expiation in proximity to, upon-" sacrificial animals, persons, places, etc. When *kippēr* + *ʿal* has this force physical contact, or at least proximity is definitely implied.[31]

What does it mean to say that the priest performed rites of purification *upon* or *over* the altar (Leviticus 16:18-19)? It means that the acts performed resulted in purification, but did not automatically constitute cleansing or purification. This distinction is more important than it appears at first glance. Note that in the biblical priestly writings we have the sequence *kippēr* + *ʿal-weṭāhēr* or *kippēr* + *ʿal-wenislaḥ lô*, meaning, respectively: "He shall perform expiatory rites over—with the result that he (i.e. the recipient of expiation) becomes purified," or: "with the result that he is granted forgiveness."[32]

Once certain acts are performed, purity resulted, just as in other instances forgiveness resulted. That is to say: As a result of the performance of certain rites, God grants expiation or atonement. In such instances, expiation, forgiveness, etc. are not the direct *physical effects* of the rites performed. Such acts are prerequisite, but not

---

[30] References for the spatial process include: Lev 16:16, 18, Ex 29:36-7, 30:10, Lev 1:4, and frequently in Lev chs. 4-6, 8:15, 12:7-8, chs. 14-15, 19:22, Nu 6:11, ch. 8 (ecept v. 19).

[31] References for the relational process include: Lev 8:34-5, 10:17, 23:28, Nu 15:25, 28:22, 30. Also cf. Ezek 45:15, Neh 10:34, I Chron 6:34, II Chron 29:24.

[32] Lev 4:31, 12:7, 14:53, Nu 15:28, etc.

causational. It is God who grants the desired result! This emerges even more clearly from the force of the construction: *kippēr-l*—which means: "grant expiation to"—or: "for" (Ezekiel 16:63; Deuteronomy 21:8, etc.), This is something which only the deity can accomplish.[33]

The same conception of expiation must be assumed for the construction *kippēr + be'ad* which means: "to secure/accomplish expiation on behalf of"—one's self, another, the people of Israel, etc. (Leviticus 16:6, 11, etc.).

In summary, the biblical cultic writers, building on general Hebrew usage, and aware of the non-cultic and religious idiom, amplified the use of *kippēr* and its derivatives in a way that changed their force from physical causation to prerequisite activity, to the dynamic of action and consequence instead of cause and effect. Such a development may have been latent even in Akkadian and earlier Hebrew, but it was the cultic writers who gave it full expression.[34] In fact, in the cultic texts even the older construction, i.e. *kippēr +* direct object seems to have the same functional force as *kippēr +* indirect object, when it conveys the spatial process. Thus, *mikkappēr 'et haqqôdeš* "from purifying the sanctuary", in Leviticus 16:20 (compare verse 33) refers to the same ritual acts to which *wekipper 'al haqqôdeš* in verse 16 refers. The graphics of the direct object construction are admittedly more binding physically, but as far as the relationship between action and consequence is concerned, there is no difference. Purification was not automatic in either case.

One can only speculate that *kippēr +* direct object was not employed by the cultic writers in connection with humans or the substance of the sacrifices precisely because it was desired to avoid the associations of the older usage, wherein *kippēr* meant simply "to wipe off, cleanse," implying automatic effects. Instead, the cultic texts, when they refer to the human body, use the verb *ṭihhēr* "to render pure," which conveys different, less graphic associations, or they find other ways of conveying the notion of ritual purification.[35]

[33] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 211 points out this is basic to the Deuteronimistic conception of God.

[34] Against the argument that once manipulation by automatic effects is eliminated, the process is no longer magical, we call attention to an interesting discussion by Islwyn Blythin, "Magic and Methodology," *Numen* 17, 1970, 45 f. Blythin makes the point that magic was related to man's collective concerns and personal objectives, moral and religious. Unfortunately, Blythin knew of biblical and Canaanite religions only from secondary information, and relied almost entirely on John Gray's studies.

[35] For *ṭihhēr*, when the direct object of the verb is the body of a person, or an

In the light of the above observations it becomes possible to study the functional force of *kippēr* and its derivatives in the biblical cultic texts with a proper understanding of the process of expiation which was aimed at securing certain responses from the deity, and probably from other potent forces, as well!

III. *KIPPĒR* AND THE ISRAELITE BLOOD RITES

Kippēr in biblical cultic texts reflects two distinct verbal forms: (1) *kippēr* I, the primary *Pi"ēl*, and (2) *kippēr* II, a secondary denominative, from the noun *kōper* "ransom, expiation gift." For reasons which will become apparent, we prefer to discuss *kippēr* II, the denominative, first. This form is mainly attested in a technical idiom: *kippēr 'al nepeš* "to serve as *kōper* 'ransom' for a life." In the priestly writings of the Pentateuch, this idiom occurs three times. In two instances, there is no reference to the use of sacrificial blood, but the notion of expiation by substitution is present. In Exodus 30:15-16 the context relates to the payment of a *kōper* in connection with a census. Interpretations have differed on the reason for this payment, but is clear that the taking of a census was an enterprise replete with dangers, from the magical and cultic points of view. The same context, that of a census, characterizes Numbers 31:50.[36]

It is the occurrence of this idiom in Leviticus 17:11 which is most

---

ailment on his body, see :Lev 13:6, *passim*, 14:7, *passim*, Nu 8:7, 21, and frequently in religious literature, referring to persons as the direct object, as in Ps 51:4, 9, etc. The root meaning of *ṭ-h-r* relates to "whiteness, brightness," as would be said of the sky (Ex 24:10) or of the purity of metals (Ex 25:11, etc.). In its range of connotations, Hebrew *ṭ-h-r* resembles Akkadian *ellu* (*CADE* 80-3, s.v. *elēlu* (v). *D*-stem *ullulu*, and *ibid.* 102-6, s.v. *ellu* (adj.), and *ellu* A (n), cf. *la ellu*). On the use of *ḥiṭṭē'* when the direct object is the body of a person see Nu 8:21, 19:19, Ps 51:9. Also cf. Lev 6:19, 9:15, where the direct object of *ḥiṭṭē'* is the sacrificial victim.

[36] See Part II, n. 23, and cf. II Sam, ch. 24. In Nu 15:28 we do not have the technical idiom: *kippēr 'al nepeš*. The clause: *wekipper hakkōhēn 'al hannepeš haššōgeget* "The priest shall make expiation on behalf of the person who erred," is merely a reflex of the casuistic style of the preceding v. 27: "In case it is an individual who has erred *(nepeš 'aḥḥat)*, for which cf. Lev 4:27, etc. In other words, *nepeš* here does not mean "life", as it does in Lev 17:11, Ex 30:15-16.

The fact that *kippēr* in Ex 30:15-16 is a denominative is suggested by the occurrence of the word *kōper* in v. 12. The implication of the denominative usage may be present in II Sam 21:3, where David inquires of the offended Gibeonites: "What shall I do for you, and with what shall I pay ransom?" The answer is then given that the Gibeonites don't wish gold or silver as payment.

germane to our present discussion. We have translated the passage as
follows:

> For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have assigned it to you
> to serve as expiation *(kôper)* for your lives *(lekappēr ʿal napšōtêkem)* on
> the altar; for the blood may expiate according to the value of life.

This passage is speaking of the blood libation, that sacrificial blood
which is dashed against the sacrificial altar *(mizbaḥ hāʿōlāh)* and runs
down into the earth. This libation is prescribed for virtually all of the
altar sacrifices, whether directly connected to expiation, or not. Un-
doubtedly, this libation, aimed at the God of Israel in the biblical
cult, had its origin in the worship of chtonic deities, and is related to
an entire complex of biblical rites and motifs concerned with the
restoring of blood to the earth. In the biblical cult, Yahweh accepts
the blood as an apotropaic agent, and contains his wrath, which on
occasion has been known to strike out at the Israelites standing in his
immediate presence.

The underlying conception here is the role of blood as the life force.
As such, blood can serve as a substitute for life, *pars pro toto*. The
second part of Leviticus 17:11, if properly understood, expresses this
notion clearly:

> "For the blood may expiate according to the value of life."

The *Beth* in the word *bannepeš* is *Beth pretii* "of price." The sense is
that blood can custitute for life to the extent required to ransom it,
redeem it. Deities, like demons, accept blood in lieu of life, and do
the bidding of those who present it to them.[37]

---

[37] See D. J. McCarthy, *JBL* 92, 1973, 205-10 on some facets of the symbolism
of blood, viewed comparatively, especially 208-8 on blood as the symbol of life.
It is McCarthy's view that whereas the Greeks at various times saw in blood the
symbol of death, the Israelites saw it only as the symbol of life.
   On *bannepeš* in Lev 17:11 see our prior discussions in *EI* 9, 1969, 90-1, and
ns. 14-17, and Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxvii-viii. *Beth pretii* is often used in connec-
tion with *kippēr* and related concepts. See *EI* 9, 1969, 90, n. 15 for references.
A. Metzinger, *Biblica* 21, 1940, 159-87, 247-72, 353-77 disputes the entire theory
of substitution and insists that in Lev 17:11 we have *Beth instrumentii*. As he
understands the passage it is as though it were written: *kî haddām hû bannepeš
<ʾašer bô> yekappēr* "For blood expiates by means of the life (which is in it). "This
view was accepted by de Vaux, *Sacrifice*, 88-91, who refers to Metzinger's studies.
Actually, the difference between *Beth pretii* and *instrumentii* is quite clear. Thus, in
Dt 19:23 *nepeš benepeš* "a life for a life" replaces *nepeš taḥat nepeš* "a life in place of
a life", in the original formulation of Ex 21:23. *Beth pretii* does not indicate the
means in a causational sense, but rather designates that which amounts to the
equivalent of the other, and which can, therefore, substitute for it if required.

Originally, in chtonic and other cults, the objective of enhancing the potency of the gods was involved in the use of blood, which, by virtue of its potent properties, was considered especially efficacious in approaching the deities, since they desired blood. Some of that atmosphere still remains in the biblical mentality, although the priestly version of the cult had certainly gone beyond these notions.[38]

Kipper II in the priestly writings is thus related to the blood libation, to the substitution of sacrificial blood by worshippers whose mere presence in sacred precincts was dangerous for them. In this context, Yahweh is portrayed much like demons were portrayed. He dwells in the inwardness of his sanctuary and requires that his worshippers defend themselves from his wrath. This may appear to some as a strange notion, so it becomes necessary to demonstrate to what extent the priestly tradition, not to speak of other, less doctrinaire traditions in biblical literature, were infused with the sense of Yahweh's wrath.[39] Only when the full impact of the idea that the use of blood in Israelite sacrifices had a primarily apotropaic objective is realized can the process of expiation be fully understood.

There is a priestly "mythology", just as there is a mythological sub-

---

Metzinger's entire, lengthy analysis hangs on the syntax of Lev 17:11, and we fear that in this regard his conclusions were tendentious.

The act of sacrifice represents a process of several stages. The substitution of a victim and the transfer to it of the impurity and sins of the worshippers creates the apparent paradox of an impure victim serving as atonement, as the instrumentality for purification. On the other hand, the victim had to be pure and without blemish to qualify, in the first instance. And yet, this apparent paradox is built into the entire system of Israelite purificatory rituals. See B. A. Levine, *EJ* 6, 1312-14 s.v. "Cult, Israelite," and *ibid.* 10, 870-1, s.v. Kedushah. Also see *idem, Judaism*, 16, 1967, 248-50.

[38] Dt 21:19 prescribes a rite for restoring the unrequited blood of one slain to the earth, in the form of a blood rite (Cf. Nu 35:33-4, and Gen 4:10 f.). In Lev 17:13 we have the rule requiring one offering sacrifice of animal or fowl killed in the hunt to pour out the blood upon the earth and cover it over, and in Dt 12:23-4 we read the general requirement of pouring out the blood of slain animals on the ground as part of the innovation of *D* in allowing non-sacrificial slaughter. Even though it had become allowable to partake of flesh without recourse to an altar sacrifice, it was still necessary to assure the return of the blood to the earth. All of the above references indicate the enduring motif of the earth as the recipient of the blood of humans and animals, which of course, harks back to the belief in chtonic deities.

[39] See, *à propos* the term *qeṣep* "wrath" J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology* I, 1970, 21, and n. 75, and 30, n. 109. The epic term is *ḥēmāh*, although *qeṣep* is a notion also attested in epic. Cf. Isa 34:2, 54:8, 60:10, and in Jer, sometimes combined with *ḥēmāh* (Cf. Dt 29:27). The etymology is "foam, froth," from the imagery of the sea (Hos 10:7).

stratum in other biblical traditions. We refer to cultic narratives, all of which make the point, in etiological fashion that Yahweh's wrath will be unleashed against all who fail to take proper precautions when entering into his immediate presence, or against all who were not permitted to stand in sacred precincts, to start with.

Perhaps the best known of these priestly narratives tells about Nadab and Abihu, two of Aaron's sons, who were destroyed by Yahweh's fire after offering incense that was "hateful" (Hebrew: *zārāb*) to the deity (Leviticus 10:1-3).[40] A further reference to this "event" is Leviticus 16:1-2, where it is stated that the purificatory rites prescribed in chapter 16 were made necessary by the catastrophe of the two sons of Aaron. In the same way, the prescriptions of Leviticus 10:6-11 were said to have been specifically occasioned by that same event. In both instances, the brief narratives serve as a backdrop for the ordaining of already accepted rites.[41]

Another priestly narrative is to be found in Numbers, chapters 16-18, the account of the rebellion of Qorah and his bloc against the authority of Moses and Aaron and their immediate Levitical clan. At Yahweh's command, Qorah and his followers, together with Moses, Aaron, and the elders, were convened before the Tent of Meeting for a test of divine preference. All those present held in their hands incense offerings in copper pans. Presumably, those who were the elect of Yahweh would have their offerings accepted by him. At this point Yahweh's *kābôd* appeared to the entire assemblage. Privately, it was communicated to Moses that the entire people was threatened

---

[40] For a discussion of priestly narrative see G. von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, 1934, 84 (s.v. Lev. ch. 10), and 85 (s.v. Lev. ch. 16). M. Haran *VT* 10, 1960, 115 translates *'ēš zārāb* "strange fire", i.e. incense taken "from somewhere outside the altar area." Our translation is based on the primary sense of *zār/zārāb* as "hateful" (Cf. Dt 32:16, Prov 2:16, 5:3, 7:5, 20, 22:14, 23:33. Cf. the parallelism: *zār//nokrî* in Isa 28:21, Hos 8:12.

[41] This is a corollary to our analysis of "prescriptive introductions" in the priestly records (B. A. Levine, *JAOS* 85, 1965, 310, and n. 15, and *idem. EI* 9, 1969, 89, s.v. Lev 16:1-2). In Lev ch. 10, vs. 6-11 come abruptly after the narrative account, and emphasize the motif of death basic to the narrative (see vs. 7, 9). There is, of course, no intrinsic connection between the narrative and the rules, except the presence of death. From other sources it is clear that these ordinances were not occasioned by one incident. Thus, the prohibition of egress is mentioned respective of the High Priest in Lev 21:12 in much the same terms as here, i.e. that those annointed should remain in the sacred area. The prohibition against drinking is repeated in Ezek 44:21, but relates to a larger complex of prohibitions. Thus, Isa 28:7 refers dissapprovingly to priests and prophets who drink intoxicants, and cf. possibly Hos 4:9 f., and Isa 24:2 f.

with extinction (Numbers 16:19-22). The catastrophe was temporarily averted by the entreaties of Moses and Aaron.

The proper sequence of the narrative is 16:6-22, 35, 17:1, following. Another version intruded after 16:22, whereby Qorah and his group were swallowed up by an aperture in the earth suddenly created for the occasion (16:23-34). This contradicts 16:35, which states that Qorah and his group were destroyed by Yahweh's fire.[42]

After the annihilation of the rebellious group, Moses is instructed to cast away the incense but retrieve the copper pans held by Qorah and his group. These pans were to be fashioned into sheets as plating for the altar. Once having been designated and used for offerings to Yahweh these firepans had become sacred, even though Yahweh, for his part, had subsequently rejected the offerings associated with their use.[43]

Again, Yawheh's *kābôd* appeared, announcing the intention of the deity to wipe out the entire people. A plague commences, and Aaron barely saves the people from extinction by the apotropaic utilization of incense. Here incense was being used against the demonic wrath of Yahweh, himself, or, at the very least, against a demonic plague unleashed by Yahweh, which then became uncontrollable.[44] After all that had happened, Moses and Aaron engaged in a kind of divination aimed at producing a sign clearly indicating that Yahweh had declared his will, and would refrain from further wrath.[45]

Accounts such as the above were preserved so as to imbue the reader with a sense of the reality of divine wrath as a feature of religious life. Elsewhere we have noted that the cultic enterprise was predicated on a faith in Yahweh's overriding goodness. The Israelites were willing to risk the dangers of God's nearness to them for the blessings they believed would be forthcoming from him.[46] This faith is epitomized in a Talmudic dictum: "The attribute of [God's]

---

[42] Apart from contradictions, the phraseology of 16:23-34 appears like an artificial imitation of epic style, with a *mélange* of stereotypic vocabulary, such as *ni"ēs* (v. 30), *tiblā'ēmô 'āreṣ* (v. 34), etc.

[43] See M. Haran, *VT* 10, 1960, 115-6, and *idem, HUCA* 36, 1965, 217, 223, and n. 73, 226, and n. 78, with literature cited.

[44] Nu 17:11-15, and M. Haran, *op. cit.*, 116.

[45] Nu 17:16-24 (and cf. Dt 29:17). Also see Th. Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament*, 1969, 301, s.v. no. 95, "The Blossoming Rod", and n. 397. Gaster cites parallels in classical literature and in early Christianity where the blossoming of a rod indicated selection for cultic or clerical office.

[46] See Part I, n. 60.

goodness is abundant, whereas the attribute of retribution is limited."[47]

Alongside biblical notions of justice and mercy, whereby the punishment should fit the crime in compensatory terms, and whereby God is conceived of as merciful and slow to anger, divine wrath was also a characteristic of Yahweh's relation to Israel, and to all men. It is the cultic tradition, drawing on old epic motifs, which gave a new and distinctively cultic form to divine wrath, as a consuming fire emanating from inside the sanctuary, itself.[48]

The death of the offender by God's hand, as threatened in cultic regulations, is not like a capital sentence imposed by a court on the basis of evidence, but is conceived as direct, immediate judgment executed by the divine judge. This is the force of the frequent formula: *welō' yāmût* "Lest he meet death."[49]

The severity of Yahweh's responses to cultic offenses would indicate that he was extremely concerned about his purity as a resident deity. This is also indicated by the severity of the regulations against viewing, touching, or approaching the sacred precincts and the appurtenances contained in them. From another point of view, the prohibition of egress imposed on priests who served in sacred areas was also a reflex of the concern for Yahweh's wrath.[50]

The above discussion should render the pervasive blood libation more comprehensible. It was required to insure the safety of the priests and worshippers. In the same manner, the High Priest used incense when, on rare occasions, he penetrated the innermost area of the sanctuary (Leviticus 16:12-13). The cloud of incense which covered the *kappōret*, thus reproducing the conditions of Yahweh's heavenly abode (I Kings 8:12, II Samuel 22:12 // Psalm 18:10, 97:2, Job 38:9), also served to protect the priest. The apotropaic properties

---

[47] See *Mekîltā'*, ed. Friedman, 1870, *Bô'*, 7b, par 7, s.v. *mē'ādām we'ad behēmāh*, and 8a, s.v. *'ant YHWH*. The context relates to the ten plagues brought by God on the Egyptians.

[48] See above, Part II, n. 39, and note the destroying fire coming from the sanctuary in Lev 10:2, Nu 16:35, 26:10. In Nu 11:1-3 it is not clear just where the fire came from.

[49] See J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology* I, 1970, 7, table B, for occurrences of the formula, and Milgrom's overall discussion, especially 21, and ns. 64-5, 30, and n. 109, where he alludes to the point we are clarifying here. His main concern was the *Hop'al* form: *yûmāt* "He shall be put to death," indicating the right of the Levitical guards to kill encroachers (*ibid.*, Part II, 5-59).

[50] For a systematic discussion, see M. Haran, *HUCA* 36, 1965, 216, 226: "The Graduated Taboo." Also see Lev 10:7, 21:12.

of the blood, and of the incense, were aimed at the deity, himself, who was viewed as the source of danger.

This orientation was true only with respect to that use of blood intended by the technical idiom: *kippēr ʿal nepeš*. It does not underly the primary *Pi*ʿ*ēl* as it is used in the priestly writings of the Pentateuch. As we have seen, *kippēr* means: "to perform rites of expiation." Its usage in the priestly sources is almost always associated with the expiatory sacrifices, the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and the *ʾāšām*.[51] It follows that the use of blood in such activities must be understood as expiatory or purificatory in purpose. Most often, *kippēr* relates to the placing of blood from the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* or the *ʾāšām* on various cultic objects—the horns of the incense altar, or of the altar of burnt offering; on the *pārōket* curtain, etc., or on other objects or persons, in an effort to eliminate impurity already contracted, or to prevent contamination, in the first place. This is best exemplified in the purificatory rites prescribed in Leviticus, chapter 16.[51]

In executing these rites the High Priest entered into the most area of the sanctuary, inside the *pārōket* curtain, and sprinkled blood taken from the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* sacrifice upon the area above and facing the *kappōret*, the sculptured lid of the ark (16:14). Moving outward, the priest then placed some of the same blood on the horns of the altar of incense, which stood immediately outside the *pārōket* (16:18-19).

What was the specific purpose of such utilization of blood, conveyed by the verb *kippēr*? For his own protection, the High Priest had employed incense. For the protection of the worshippers, outside

[51] In Lev 14:53 the purification of an infected house is conveyed by the verb *kippēr*, but there the terminology is clearly borrowed from the first part of the chapter (vs. 1-32), where actual sacrifices are stipulated. Lev 1:4b—*wenirṣāh lô lekappēr ʿalāu* "That it may be acceptable in his behalf in expiation for him," cannot refer to all *ʿōlôt*, but is appropriate, since the *ʿōlāh* is the general category to which the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and the *ʾāšām* belong, i.e. the category of *qōdeš haqqodāšîm*, although their disposition, except for one type of *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, was not as a holocaust (Cf. Lev 6:17-7:8). The point of Lev 1:4b is that the laying on of the hands is prerequisite if the offering, in any of its forms, was to be efficacious for expiation. Since late antiquity, this passage has been recognized as difficult. (See Hoffmann, *Leviticus*, I, 119-23, s.v. Lev 1:4. In Nu 17:11-12, the verb *kippēr* conveys the apotropaic use of incense in stemming a plague. This usage is borrowed, since the incense was sprinkled or spread over the people in the manner of blood, hence the verb *nātan* (v. 12), elsewhere used in connection with placing sacrificial blood on the altar (Lev 4:25, 30, 34, etc.), In Nu 25:13 the verb *kippēr* characterizes the result of Aaron's action in stabbing the sinful *nāśîʾ*, thus again resembling the use of blood. We observe, therefore, that even in several cases where *kippēr* does not refer directly to the use of blood from the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and *ʾāšām*, it relates to apotropaic activity similar to it.

the tent, the blood libation had been offered. It seems to us an ines-
capable conclusion that the blood was placed on those areas and
objects so as to protect the deity and his immediate surroundings
from the incursion of impurity which would penetrate the sanctuary
through a route leading from the courtyard, outside the tent, through
the entrance of the tent, past the altar of incense, and through the
pārōket, opened to let the priest in, and into the very spot where the
deity sat, astride the cherubim. These were figures made as part of the
sculptured kapporet-lid of the ark.[52]

What we observe here is the protection of a route or channel from
contamination. This route was rendered particularly vulnerable by the
entry of a human being, the High Priest, into the most sacred section
of the sanctuary. This interpretation is suggested not only by the
graphics of the purification rites prescribed in Leviticus, chapter 16.
From other sources we learn that the placing of blood from expiatory
sacrifices on a particular person or object may have as its clear purpose
the protection of that person or object from contamination, or the
elmination of contamination already existing.

According to Leviticus 14:14, the priest is instructed to dab blood
from the 'āšām sacrifice on the person who had been afflicted with a
skin ailment known as ṣāra'at. In connection with this rite, a bird was
to be dispatched into the open field, to carry with it the feared
disease. It is clear, in this case, that the sacrificial blood was used to
immunize the afflicted person in a magical way, against the recurrence
of the ailment.[53] The same objective is observable in the dabbing of
blood on the persons and vestments of Aaron and his sons during
the rites of their installation as priests. Before assuming cultic duties
which would necessitate their entry into sacred areas, they had to
take precautions against contamination which would have resulted in
the introduction of their own impurities into the sanctuary.[54]

The same magical objective of "washing off" impurity was opera-

---

[52] Cf. Nu 7:89, I Sam 4:4, II Sam 6:2, II Kings 19:15 // Isa 37:16, Ps 80:2,
99:1, I Chron 13:6, and cf. II Sam 22:11 // Ps 18:11, and numerous references in
the book of Ezekiel. Also see R. de Vaux, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 1971,
136 f., on the *kapporet*.

[53] Cf. Lev 14:4 f. The dispatch of the bird into the open field or up to the sky
as a means of riddance in apotropaic rites is attested in Mesopotamian exorcistic
literature. See *CAD I* 211, s.v. *iṣṣuru* 3': *arni* mušen *ana šamê lišeli* "May a bird take
up my sin to the sky." Also see E. Reiner, *Assyrian Studies* 16, 247 f.

[54] Lev 8:23-4. A mixture of the "oil of unction" and sacrificial blood was also
sprinkled on the persons and vestments of Aaron and his sons (v. 30). See
B. A. Levine, *JAOS* 85, 1965, 311.

tive in the placing of blood on the doorposts and lintels of the Israelite houses in Egypt (Exodus 12:7, 13, 23). In the account, as we have it, the identities of Yahweh and the *mašḥīt*, a destructive force, are somewhat muddled, but it is clear, nevertheless, that the *mašḥīt* was conceived as a distinct force which, once unleashed, was not controllable, even by Yahweh, himself![55]

Other prescriptions relevant to the placing of blood from expiatory sacrifices on various objects are also instructive. Thus, in Numbers 19:13 it is explicitly stated that one who had become impure as a result of contact with a dead, human body and had not subsequently purified himself in the proper manner had actually caused the contamination of the sanctuary, itself.[56] The purification rites undertaken on behalf of one so contaminated included the sprinkling of blood from the red heifer on the surface of the Tent of Meeting, itself, preliminary to the preparation of a mixture of ashes and water to be used in subsequent rites (*ibid.* 19:4). The purificatory rites of those impure as a result of contact with a dead, human body had a two-fold purpose: to purify the persons directly contaminated, and at the same time to protect the abode of the resident deity from contamination.[57] This latter aspect must be clarified further:

One becoming impure as the result of an offense against the deity introduced a kind of demonic contagion into the community. The more horrendous the offense, the greater the threat to the purity of the sanctuary and the surrounding community by the presence of the offender, who was a carrier of impurity. This person required purification if the community was to be restored to its ritual state, which, in turn, was a precondition set down by the resident deity for his continued presence among the people. The deity had made a vital concession to the Israelites by consenting to dwell amidst the impurities endemic to the human situation (Leviticus 16:16). If his continued residence was to be realized, Yahweh required an extreme degree of purity (Exodus 25:8). In his heavenly abode, Yahweh was well guarded from impurity, and this condition was to be reproduced as nearly as possible in his earthly residence. In effect, this is the force

---

[55] Cf. the dictum of the sages: "Once leave has been granted to the "destructive force" (*mašḥīt*), he no longer discriminates between the righteous and the wicked." *Mekīltā*, ed. Friedman, 1870, 11b, s.v. *Bō*, par. 11, s.v. *weʾattem lōʾ tēṣeʾū*. See Part II, n. 84.

[56] Hebrew: *ʾet miqdaš YHWH ṭimmēʾ* "He has rendered the sanctuary of Yahweh impure."

[57] See further, Part II, ch. VI, on the priestly *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, and Part II, ns. 148-51.

of the epic passage quoted in I Kings 8:12-13, to which we have
already referred relevant to the use of incense in the sanctuary, and
this is also the concept underlying the design of the Solomonic
temple, with its concealed adytum.[58]

It is unnecessary here to justify the desire for the nearness of the
resident deity, a subject we have discussed in an earlier study.[59] Here
it is our purpose to clarify the lengths to which the Israelites were
instructed to go in the effort to retain the presence of Yahweh in
their midst. Most cultic activity was motivated, directly or indirectly,
by this objective, especially the process of ritual expiation which we
are now discussing, most particularly the blood rites designated by
the verb *kippēr*, and associated with the expiatory sacrifices, the
ḥaṭṭāʾt and the *ʾāšām*, to be discussed in due course. Implicit in all
expiatory rites is the assumption that ritual offenses endanger the
deity in some way, since they threaten to diminish the purity of his
earthly dwelling. This is the nexus of expiation, as a ritual process,
and the protection of the deity as a primary objective of the cult.

It is quite clear, in this regard, that the rites prescribed in Leviticus,
chapter 16 had as their objective the purification of the sanctuary, and
not the purification of the people. The latter objective is mentioned
only in a postscript (verses 29-34), whereas in the main body of the
text (verses 3-28) there is no mention of the people as direct objects
of purification.

The point to be emphasized is that the offenses of the people, indi-
vidual and collective, and of the leaders of the people, diminish the
purity of the sanctuary. This is the sense of Leviticus 16:16:

> *wekipper ʿal haqqôdeš miṭṭumeʾôt benê yisrāʾēl umippišʿêhem lekôl
> haṭṭôtām*

> Thus, he shall purge the sanctuary of the impurities of the Israelites,
> and of their transgressions, whatever their offenses.

The *Waw* introducing the word *ûmippišʿêhem* is explanatory, as if to
say: "What are impurities? Transgressions and offenses." The word
ʿāwôn in Leviticus 16:21, referring to verse 16, has a meaning similar
to that in Numbers 18:1, 23, where we have the phrase: *ʿāwôn hammiq-
dāš* "the transgression of the sanctuary," i.e. infractions against the
purity of the sanctuary. In that context, the priests were charged with

---

[58] See B. A. Levine, *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, 1968, 81, and n. 1.
[59] B. A. Levine, *ibid.*, 71-87.

assuring the purity of the sanctuary, and would bear its ʿāwôn, i.e. the responsibility for any violations of its purity.[60]

Impurity was viewed as an external force which entered the person or attached itself to him. The primary purpose of expiation was, therefore, to rid one's self of this foreign force. The verbs employed in biblical literature to connote the elimination of sins, such as māḥah "to wipe away, erase," heʿebîr "to cause to pass away," and, of course, kippēr "to wipe off, cleanse" convey this notion clearly. Thus, we read in an ancient prayer:

> "Acts of transgression have overwhelmed me. It is you (= God) who must wipe them away" (Psalm 65:3).[61]

IV. MAGIC, PURITY, AND BIBLICAL MONOTHEISM

All that has been discussed this far could lead us quite directly into a treatment of the expiatory sacrifices, the ḥaṭṭāʾt and the ʾāšām, but we feel obliged to confront certain objections to our theory of expiation as a process involving a complex of rites bearing an essentially magical character.

The prevailing view understands expiation differently from the way we have explained it here. According to that view, expiatory activity was necessitated by the fact that, by their offenses against the deity, individuals and groups had threatened the covenant relationship in force between the deity and the Israelites. Such offenders either had to be banished from the community permanently, or were to be reinstated after their sins had been expiated in the proper way, by means of a sacrifice which appeased the deity and mollified his wrath. The use of sacrificial blood in the purification of the offender signified his rebinding to the covenant. This was, after all, the function of sacrificial blood, generally.[62]

In our view, expiation addressed itself to the presence of impurity,

---

[60] N. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers, (The Century Bible)*, 1967, 108-18, and Elliger, *Leviticus*, who correctly translates ʿawôn in Lev. 16:16 "*Unreinheit.*" Also cf. Ex 28:38, and the phrase ʿawôn bāʿēdāh "the transgression of the congregation" (i.e. their impurity) in Lev 10:17.

[61] For usage of kippēr and māḥah see Part II, ns. 8-9, 21, 27-8. On heʿebîr see II Sam 12:13, 24:10, Zech 3:4, Job 7:21, I Chron 21:8, and cf. J. Stamm, *op. cit.*, 7075.

[62] See Part I, ch. IV, for a detailed discussion of the relationship of covenant and cult, and Part I, ns. 88-107 for relevant literature.

the actualized form of evil forces operative in the human environment. This was the function of expiation as a phenomenon. It was not so much that Yahweh had to be appeased for the offenses committed. To the extent that this was the case, such mollification took the form of the sacrifice, itself. The accompanying expiation through blood, as distinct from the sacrificial gift, itself, became necessary because Yahweh demanded that the forces of impurity, unleashed by the offenses committed, be kept away from his immediate environment. There is a reason for Yahweh's wrath. It was not mere displeasure at being disobeyed. His wrath was a reaction based on a vital concern, as it were, for his own protection. The sacrificial blood is offered to the demonic forces who accept it in lieu of God's "life", so to speak, and depart, just as they accept it in lieu of human life in other cultic contexts.

In the accepted view, all utilization of sacrificial blood had essentially the same function: to bind the worshipper and the deity in a communion of blood, in a covenantal bond. In such terms, the nexus of covenant and cult is epitomized in the account of the Sinaitic covenant (Exodus, chapter 24). Half of the sacrificial blood was dashed against the altar, and the other half upon the people assembled, thus binding the two "parties" to the covenant. The altar represented the deity. Exponents of the covenantal interpretation take this version of the enactment of the covenant at Sinai as paradigmatic for the function of blood in general cultic praxis. It was a binding agent. In the case of ritual expiation the offender or one afflicted had to be rebound, and this explains why blood rites were part of this process.[63]

There is no doubt that blood was used in ancient Israel as a binding agent in the context of covenant making. It is our contention, however, that such covenantal use of blood differed from its use in sacrificial rites, generally, and particularly in rites of expiation. Those being bound by blood in the covenant of Sinai did not have the status of worshippers in the enactment procedures, proper, but were parties to the enactment of a treaty. Some evidence of a similar status as parties to a covenant may be seen in the investiture rites of Aaron and his sons (Leviticus, chapter 8) where blood from "the ram of investiture" was sprinkled on the persons of the priests. A covenant was in force between Yahweh and the Aronide house (Numbers 25:12-13). Even there, however, the apotropaic dabbing of sacrificial blood on

---

[63] See Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxv-vii for a discussion of the Sinaitic covenant enactment.

the priests also figured in the rites, as we have already noted.[64] We must object, therefore, to the confusion of various functions attributed to sacrificial blood and insist that the given situation of the enactment of the Sinaitic covenant is a peculiar one, not applicable to cultic praxis generally.

An obvious objection to our formulation of the problem of ritual expiation would be that in the biblical conception, sin was not the embodiment of active, evil forces, demonic or destructive, as it was normally conceived in the non-monotheistic religions of the ancient Near East. Especially in the priestly literature of the Torah, promulgated by strict monotheists, it would have been blatantly contradictory, so the argument goes, to allow for the independent, active operation of demonic forces in a world governed by one, supreme God, who held all power, and who could hardly have been vitally concerned with his own protection against what were actually nonentities, after all.[65]

This point of view was carefully expounded by Yehezkel Kaufmann in his monumental work on Israelite religion. Kaufmann's major thesis is that in biblical religion the "domain of impurity" is a state of being or a situation, and not "an active force." No "action" emanates from the domain of impurity, and impurity is not demonic, and therefore does not endanger men or deities, as is true in the conceptions of the non-monotheistic religions. Despite the formal similarities between some of the rites of expiation prescribed in the priestly codes and those known from non-monotheistic religions, there is no substantive identity between these systems.[66]

A case in point is the procedure for dispatching the scapegoat prescribed in Leviticus, chapter 16. We quote from Kaufmann's interpretation of this rite:

---

[64] Levine, *ibid.* xxv-vii, and n. 51, and also above, Part II, n. 54.

[65] We have yet to find in the Hebrew Bible an explicit statement of Yahweh's omnipotence, in the sense that there is no other power of any sort except his. There are, of course, statements to the effect that he is the only real deity; that he is creator of the universe and all that is in heaven and earth; that he was victorious over other gods, such as the gods of Egypt; that he is master of the universe and of nature, worker of great wonders and acts of deliverance, including healing, and that he knows the thoughts and plans of men. Biblical literature gives evidence of great areas of development in each of the above aspects, but nowhere do we find the notion clearly expressed that Yahweh's rule is entirely free from opposition or conflict.

[66] See especially, Kaufmann, *Tôledôt*, I, 525-33, 539-45 f. Actually, all of Book II, in Volume I, is pertinent to our discussion.

Among these we find, as well, rites of unloading "sin" on the "scape-goat." But "sin" among ancient peoples meant an impure contamination which causes misfortune by means of its demonic power. In any event, to the extent that rites are aimed at the elimination of impurity and at the expulsion of demons they are always conceived as instrumentalities of battle against the evil which derives from pernicious demons. Gods are summoned to the assistance of humans in this battle against their common enemy. Not so in the case of the scapegoat.

It is clear, first of all, that the goat is not conceived as a sacrifice to 'Azazel, notwithstanding the parallelism "to Yahweh // to 'Azazel," for the priest also places the scapegoat "in the presence of Yahweh" (verse 10). It is combined with the other goat, offered to Yahweh, as part of one *ḥaṭṭā't* sacrifice.[67]

o Kaufmann, the fact that the scapegoat was part of the expiatory cedures undertaken "in the presence of Yahweh" indicates that t was done with the goat bore no relation to any other power, ne or demonic. Kaufmann would not share our interpretation of expiatory rites, themselves, and would hardly agree that the use acrificial blood connoted by the verb *kippēr* had as its purpose the ection of Yahweh and the purity of his surroundings from demonic es.

aufmann's exegesis of Leviticus, chapter 16, is problematic independently of such considerations. Verse 10, crucial to Kaufmann's ument, does not mean that acts of expiation were performed on" or "over" the scapegoat. The passage reads:

While the goat designated by lot for 'Azazel shall be stationed, alive, in the presence of Yahweh, to perform rites of expiation beside it, and to send it off to Azazel, to the wilderness.

s we have already noted, *kippēr* + *'al* can mean: "to perform rites xpiation in proximity to—" a person, object, etc. The rites presed in verse 10 do not pertain directly to the scapegoat. They have heir referent the bull and the other goat, slaughtered as *ḥaṭṭā't* ifices. The scapegoat was merely stationed near the altar while the st took some of the sacrificial blood for use in the expiatory rites. a matter of fact, most exegetes have considered the words: *ppēr 'ālāu* in verse 10 as an interpolation, since no ritual expiation executed on the scapegoat; no blood was placed on it.[68] Our unstanding of the force of *kippēr* + *'al* renders this deletion unssary.

Kaufmann, *ibid.* 571-2.
See Part II, n. 30, on *kippēr* + *'al* in the spatial process. Also see M. Noth, *us, (The Old Testament Library)*, 1962, 121, on the problem of Lev 16:10.

The precise force of *wehe'emîd* "he stationed" in Leviticus 16:7, and of its reflex in verse 10, may be clarified by a comparison with usage of the same verb in Leviticus 14:11, and in Numbers 5:16, 18, 30. In each of these instances a person was "stationed" in the presence of Yahweh preparatory to the offering of a sacrifice and to the performance of corollary purification rites on the person of the one "stationed." It is hardly possible to maintain, in those instances, that the persons who were stationed before the deity were combined with the expiatory sacrifice involved, and were part of that sacrifice, as Kaufmann maintains was the case with the scapegoat. The humans who were "stationed" before the deity in proximity to the altar were merely brought into Yahweh's presence, probably so as to ascertain that they were acceptable in his eyes, but not as sacrifices to him.

Returning to Leviticus, chapter 16, we note that later on in the procedure, when the priest was about to pronounce the confessional over the scapegoat, he similarly brought it near to the altar of sacrifice (verse 20). The scapegoat was not the object of expiation, nor was it utilized for that purpose, in the usual sense. Its disposition represented a parallel procedure to the *hattā't*, a different method for eliminating sins from the Israelite sanctuary and community.[69]

Kaufmann was correct, nonetheless, in sensing that the scapegoat was not a sacrifice to 'Azazel, but he was, in our opinion, wrong in concluding that 'Azazel was a virtual non-entity, a passive recipient of the sins of the Israelites. The elimination of sins by permanently returning them to their place of origin has analogues in extra-biblical procedures, magical and ritual.[70] In the Israelite ritual, the scapegoat

---

[69] For a survey of literature on the scapegoat, see *EI* 9, 1969, 88, n. 2.

[70] See O. R. Gurney, *AAA* 22, 1935, 77 f. "The Ritual for Healing a Sick Man," of the series *utukkê limnūti* "evil demons." In the course of exorcizing the affliction, the *āšipu* "magical expert" (Part II, n. 79) placed a slaughtered goat next to the sick person. The disease is transferred from the sick man to the animal, after which the carcass is cast out into the street, so that the evil may return to the earth (*ibid.* 86-7, lines 136-7). The goat is called *mašhultuppu* (*CADH* 231, s.v. *hultuppu*, and *AHw* 626, s.v. *mašhultuppu*). In the New Year's ritual of Late Babylonian times we have a description of the casting of a carcass into the river (*RAcc.* 141, lines 357-61). E. Ebeling, *Tod und Leben*, 1931, 74 f., no. 19, is a Neo-Assyrian ritual for healing a man seized by a demon so that he cannot eat or drink. A goat is tied to the head of his bead, and the affliction is transferred to the animal from the sick man. The next morning, the goat, together with several magical utensils, are brought to the desert *(a-na mu-da-bé-ri)*. The head of the goat is cut off, and then placed along with honey and oil into a hole in the ground dug for this purpose. The meat of the animal is boiled prior to its burial. (Cf. *CADH* 242, s.v. *huptu* B, and *CADB* 136, s.v. *subšulu*, A).

is pictured as falling into the hands of 'Azazel, ruler of the wilderness. The scapegoat was forced on 'Azazel, who most certainly would not have admitted it into his wilderness domain willingly. Under the circumstances projected in the biblical ritual, all that 'Azazel can do is to destroy the scapegoat, but he cannot prevent its entry into the wilderness.

An emissary of the High Priest accompanied the scapegoat into the wilderness, making certain that it would not return to the Israelite habitations. The Talmudic description of the dispatching of the scapegoat might reflect ancient practice, whereby it was pushed off of a high bluff.[71] In terms of the cultic conception, however, 'Azazel destroyed it!

The Israelite High Priest exercized potent powers in compelling 'Azazel to admit the goat into his domain. It is likely that the High Priest was invested with a numinous power for this purpose, and that such happened to him while he was standing in the immediate presence of Yahweh, inward of the *pārôket* curtain. The timing of the procedures here is significant: The priest lays his hands on the scapegoat after leaving the presence of Yahweh in the inwardness of the sanctuary. This was the occasion for his deepest penetration into the sanctuary. Might we not suggest that one of the reasons for this deep penetration was to arm the priest with the power required for the battle against 'Azazel? The priest infused the goat with potency by laying his hands on it, transferring that potency which he had received to the scapegoat. If accurate, our interpretation implies that Yahweh indirectly combatted 'Azazel, through the instrumentality of his priest, to whom he gave the power to propel the goat into the wilderness. This means that 'Azazel was conceived as an active force; one to be countered by potent means.[72]

The pronouncing of the confessional also gives some evidence of conflict with evil forces, actualized in the sins of the Israelites. The purpose of the confessional was to trap the sins by exposing them, by calling them by name, thus preventing their escape or concealment. In biblical Hebrew, *hitwaddāh* connotes the revealing of sins.[73] Once exposed and trapped, the sins could be loaded onto the scapegoat and dispatched.

---

[71] See *M. Yômā* VI:3-6, 8, and *TB Yômā* 67b.

[72] The laying on of hands has customarily been taken solely as the transfer of the sins onto the goat.

[73] Cf. Ps 32:5, Prov 28:13.

There is thus a magical objective to the confessional as well as to the laying on of hands, in this instance. The confessional traps the sins, and the laying on of hands propels the scapegoat, who carries them away.

Kaufmann devotes considerable space to a discussion of the rites prescribed for the treatment of afflicted persons in the *tôrôt* of Leviticus and Numbers. He argues against the magical interpretation of such rites, emphasizing that they had nothing really to do with healing, since they were performed only after the disease or affliction was past. He correctly notes that treatment of disease is a major concern in the non-monotheistic religions of the ancient Near East.[74]

Kaufmann takes as an example the dispatching of two birds into the open field after one apparently afflicted with a skin disease known as *ṣāraʿat* was pronounced healed, or on the way to good health (Leviticus 14:1-8). Kaufmann attempts to draw a distinction between means employed to avert actual danger—plague, disease, etc.—and means utilized only to avoid *ṭumeʾāh* "impurity", which Kaufmann did not consider to have been the actual cause of any danger or misfortune. By a certain logic, the dispatch of the two birds should have been executed as part of an attempt to cure the disease involved, at an earlier point, and not after the disease had been declared non-contagious. If the means were conceived as magical, so the argument goes, why wait until after the real danger was over?[75]

The matter is not quite that simple! The rites by which afflicted persons were to be treated, according to Leviticus and Numbers, applied only in cases where an ailment proved not to be actual *ṣāraʿat*, called *ṣāraʿat mamʾeret* "infectious *ṣāraʿat*" (Leviticus 13:51-52, 14:44), but merely appeared, at first examination, as a possibly infectious disease. The afflicted person could be pronounced "pure" only after a sufficient time had elapsed to allow for a proper diagnosis. During that time quarantine was imposed as a precaution. There were undoubtedly several prevailing ailments with similar symptoms, some benign and others malignant, as we would say. When malignancy became evident, by ancient norms of medical experience, the afflicted person was permanently banished from the community (Leviticus 13:46). The only cure, in such cases, was a miraculous act of God, in response to entreaty.[76] The incurable *meṣôrāʿ* was perma-

---

[74] See Kaufmann, *Tôledôt* I, 548-51.

[75] Kaufmann, *ibid.* 548-9.

[76] See Nu: 12:13, II Kings 5:11, 14, etc.

nently *ṭāmē'* "impure," i.e. infectious. Disease is classified as *ṭûme'āh*
"impurity." Disease is a real source of danger. Ergo: *ṭûme'āh* can be a
real source of danger! This also becomes apparent in the case of in-
fected houses and buildings, and certain objects, which were to be
destroyed because they were "impure."[77]

The ancient Israelites clearly possessed no method for effectively
treating whatever ailment it was that was called *ṣāra'at*. Prophylactic
magic could be employed only to prevent the recurrence of those
afflictions which bore ominous symptoms, but which proved to be
other than fatal, and magic could not be undertaken until the remis-
sion of such afflictions. Had the Levitical codes contained prescrip-
tions for more normal ailments, magical efforts would have been
prescribed, most likely, at an earlier point in the treatment. The
tôrôt in no respect account for a representative range of medical
contingencies. The unusual emphasis on skin ailments of the *ṣāra'at*
variety is probably due to an ancient religious belief among the Israe-
lites that such ailments were a punishment from God more particularly
than others known to them. The message of the *tôrôt* is, precisely,
that incurable illnesses of an infectious character constitute *ṭûme'āh*,
and that their carriers must be permanently removed from the Israelite
community, just as infected buildings must be destroyed.

Actually, there is very little information in the Bible as a whole
about the treatment of curable diseases. There are references to in-
juries and wounds, but by and large it is probably accurate to state
that illnesses had to take their own course. Either they remitted, or the
afflicted person died. Balms and medicines were employed to heal
wounds, which were bound, etc., but the terminology of illness in
biblical Hebrew makes it clear that the usual alternatives were life and
death, with little in between.[78]

Kaufmann's view that the Israelite purification priest was not a
healer requires qualification. Kaufmann attempts to distinguish the
Israelite priest from the Mesopotamian *āšipu* "magical practitioner."
We now have detailed studies on the respective roles of the *āšipu* and

---

[77] We agree, of course, that the classification is not limited to dangerous situa-
tions. On the destruction of buildings that are "impure" cf. Lev 14:39-47, 55,
15:12. The stones, boards, etc. and the earth must be removed from the camp.
Cf. Lev 11:33, 35.

[78] For the attitude of life or death alternatives, even for those not aged and
considered to be in a terminal state, see I Kings 14:1 f., 17:17 f., II Kings 8:7 f.,
and ch. 20 // Isa chs. 38-9, especially 38:9.

the *asû*, who was the real physician in ancient Mesopotamian societies. The *asû*, and not the *āšipu* was the professional whose activities more notably involved medical treatment carried out on the person of the one afflicted. Like the Israelite purification priest, *hakkôhēn hammeṭah-hēr* (Leviticus 14:11), the *āšipu* emphasized environmental factors, viewing disease in the context of extant religious beliefs. The fact that a cultic functionary treats disease in a largely non-medical way in no sense diminishes his concern for healing. It merely means that he approached his task in a certain, traditional way.[79]

Kaufmann failed to note the variety of treatments and procedures extant within Mesopotamian societies, with which he contrasted Israelite practices, and he consequently misunderstood the interplay of magical, ritual, and medical factors in treating disease according to the Levitical codes.[80] The only distinctly medical procedures undertaken by the Israelite priest are the washing of the diseased person, the shaving of his hair, the use of oil as an unguent, the imposition of quarantine, and what we now call clinical observation. The fact that the priest does not employ bandages and balms in treating the skin ailments discussed in the *tôrôt* is probably explained by the particular character of those ailments, which were not treated like wounds and other injuries. In any event, the de-emphasis of treatment which is distinctly medical is not evidence of a lack of concern for healing.[81]

Ironically, a rather clear case of the treatment of a curable affliction by magical means is discounted by Kaufmann. We refer to the utilization of a copper serpent in the healing of snake bites (Numbers 21:6). In his wrath, Yahweh sends forth snakes to bite the people, and many die. Yahweh recants somewhat from his earlier rage, and instructs Moses on how to counter the plague of snake bites. A homeopathetic principle is to be employed. A force of similar character, in the form of a copper serpent, was erected on high, and all who gazed upon it were healed of the bites. We have here a situation wherein Yahweh unleashes a plague of sorts against the Israelites which

---

[79] See E. Ritter, "Magical Expert *(āšipu)* and Physician *(asû)*", in *Assyrian Studies* 16, 299 f.

[80] See *ibid.*, 301-302 on the differing postulates of the *āšipu* and the *asû*, and note especially the notion of "critical days and crisis", "recurrence," etc. that figure in the work of the *āšipu*.

[81] Nowhere in the Bible is any treatment prescribed for *ṣāra'at* except bathing in the water of the Jordan, in the case of Na'amān (II Kings 5:10, 14).

gets out of control, so that when Yahweh is subsequently moved to
compassion by Moses' plea, he can no longer undo what he had
initiated. That objective must be reached by magical means, since
demonic forces, once unleashed, no longer respond to divine com-
mand, and merely continue to do what it is in their nature to do, so
to speak. From the book of II Kings (18:4) we gather that after
having been introduced as a remedy for snakes bites, the copper
serpent, there named *nehuštān*, came to be revered as a potent artifact.[82]

What does Kaufmann have to say about this patently magical
method for counteracting the real danger of snake bites? He contends
that since Yahweh, himself, instructed Moses to fashion the copper
serpent and to employ it, it could not have been conceived as a
magical instrument.[83] This logic is curious. The Talmudic sages could
understand how it was that the God of Israel occasionally employed
demons to do his work, even though it meant unleashing unmana-
geable powers, but a modern scholar, trained in phenomenology,
considers the same notion a contradiction of biblical monotheism!
We refer to the Talmudic dictum: "Once leave has been granted to
the "destructive force" *(mašḥit)* to do injury, it no longer discriminates
between the righteous and the wicked."[84] The context of this dictum
is the plague which killed the firstborn of Egypt, where the Israelites
were instructed to dab the doorposts of their homes with blood to
protect them from the plague sent forth by Yahweh (Exodus 12:7,
22-23). Another instance, also discussed earlier, is the use of incense
against a plague sent forth by Yahweh after the rebellion of Qorah
and his followers (Numbers 17:10-15). There it is Moses who in-
structs Aaron to use such magical means against the plague, but the
dynamics are the same.[84]

A further problem with Kaufmann's interpretation of the copper
serpent is called to mind by the interrelationship of the divine and
the magical in the Neo-Assyrian magical texts. A recurrent motif in
that literature is the so-called Ea-Marduk myth. Marduk is entreated
by his worshippers for assistance against demons. He appears before
Ea, his father, and asks that he reveal to him the magical means
effective against demons. After evading his son's request, Ea finally

---

[82] On *nehuštān* see M. Haran, *EB* (Hebrew) 5, 1968, 826-7, and literature cited.
[83] Kaufmann, *Tôledôt*, I, 475, notes that Yahweh commanded Moses to fashion
the copper serpent (Nu 21:8), and that it was not the product of fixed magical
means, such as incantations, etc., but rather a revelation of God's will.
[84] See Part II, n. 55.

gives in and discloses to Marduk the special *gnosis*, one might say, for fighting demons.[85]

What we have in the Ea-Marduk myth is an instance of a deity giving instruction on effective combat against demons. That Yahweh should instruct Moses in the same manner should present no problem. It merely demonstrates that he is a deity concerned for the welfare of his worshippers, and who regrets his outbursts of wrath against them. From the fact that on one occasion Moses instructed Aaron on the apotropaic use of incense as a magical weapon one may deduce that Moses possessed a good deal of magical know-how. After all, Yahweh had instructed him at an earlier point in his career on magical methods preparatory to his confrontation with the Egyptian magicians.[86]

It may seem logical to maintain that a divine being, because he was so much more powerful than demons, would dispose of them without involving humans or other divine beings in magical activities against them. And yet, that is not typical of the ancient Near East, generally, or of the biblical view, specifically. In a sense, all that is told in the Bible about Yahweh's wondrous acts could be questioned in the same way that Kaufmann questions the necessity for Yahweh to combat demons. If Yahweh is supreme, can the waters of the Reed Sea challenge him? Can the lifelessness of the Sinai wilderness resist him? And yet, Yahweh tells Moses to strike the rock, to cast his staff over the sea waters, and to throw a tree into a stream so as to sweeten its waters.[87]

In attempting to contrast Israelite and non-Israelite attitudes toward magic, Kaufmann raises another point, more fundamental to the overall argument than what we have been discussing up to this point, i.e. the absence of incantations pronounced by the priest against evil forces. This is in sharp contrast to the activities of the Mesopotamian *āšipu*, for whom the incantation, termed *šiptu*, was a prominent feature of his work.[88] The closest we come to an incantation in the

---

[85] The Ea-Marduk motif pervades much of Mesopotamian magical literature. See A. Falkenstein, *Die Haupttypen der sumerischer Beschwörung*, 1931, 55 f. It is prominent in the magical series *utukkê limnūti*. See O. R. Gurney, *op. cit.*, 76-7, line 25 f., and in general, R. C. Thompson, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, II, 1904, 31-39, H. Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion*, 1901, 91-3, 123-37, and H. W. Saggs, *The Greatness that was Babylon*, 1962, 305, 314-16. It also occurs in the so-called *Lipšur* Litanies (E. Reiner, *JNES* 15, 1956, 129 f.). See Part II, n. 79, above.

[86] See discussion and sources in Kaufmann, *Tôledôt*, I, 475.

[87] Cf. Ex 14:15-26 f., 15:22-5, 17:4-7.

[88] See Kaufmann, *Tôledôt* I, 403-08, 551 f., and see O. R. Gurney, *op. cit.*, 54 f., 60 f. for examples of the *šiptu*.

priestly codes of the Torah is the confessional pronounced by the High Priest preparatory to dispatching the scapegoat (Leviticus 16:21), and we do not even have a record of the text of that confessional. One can surmise that it contained an enumeration of the sins and an entreaty to Yahweh to wipe them away. This is the principal content of the Mesopotamian *šiptu*, wherein there is reference to the specific dangers and afflictions to be expelled, and an entreaty to a divine being, often a statuary representation, to remove the danger and to protect the persons involved from its recurrence. In biblical cultic codes the confessional was also prescribed for those offering the *ḥaṭṭā't* and the *'āšām*.[89]

A later version of the expiatory confessional is preserved in the Mishnah, and there are religious confessionals in the later books of the Bible.[90] One can only assume that confessional texts were also extant in earlier biblical times. That the content of the confessional called for in the Levitical expiatory rites is not presented reflects the general character of of the priestly source of the Pentateuch, which contains almost no texts of prayers or ritual recitations. The only exceptions are the priestly benediction (Numbers 6:22-26), the brief prayer of Moses on behalf of Miriam asking Yahweh to heal her (*ibid.* 12:13), and the *'ālāh* "execration" pronounced by the priest over the wife suspected of adultery (*ibid.* 5:19-22). Of these, the priestly benediction is out of place, since one would expect it following Leviticus 9:22a.[91]

The prayer on behalf of Miriam can hardly be called a liturgy (Numbers 12:13). Only the execration of Numbers 5:19-22 bears the semblance of a fixed text, preserved as part of the rites performed in association with its recitation.

Are we to conclude from the absence of texts in the priestly sources that no blessings, prayers, oaths, ritual recitations etc. were a part of ancient Israelite ritual? We have several such texts in Deuteronomy.[92] The fact is that the priestly source shows almost no concern for such material. Even Kaufmann did not consider the absence of incantation texts from priestly sources sufficient proof that such literature was not extant in ancient Israel, since he devotes considerable space to a

---

[89] Lev 5:5, 7.

[90] For later confessionals see Dan 9:20, *M. Yômā'* VI:2.

[91] Lev 9:22a reads: "Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people, and he blessed them."

[92] Dt 20:3-4, 21:7-9, 26:5-10a, 13-16.

discussion of the allegedly magical provenience of some biblical Psalms, offering a critique of Mowinckel's theory of their incantational character. In this critique he was, in our opinion, essentially correct.[93] One must also agree with Chanan Brichto's critique of Hempel, that references to magical pronouncements in biblical literature represent more of a substratum than a reflection of actual texts in use for magical purposes.[94]

We must conclude, therefore, that there was a remarkable difference in content and tone between biblical literature and non-Israelite magical literature in this respect. Does this mean that magic was incompatible with monotheism?

There can be little doubt that the Israelite ethos was, from our earliest knowledge of it, opposed to certain varieties of magic, more precisely divination and scorcery. It must be remembered, however, that ancient Near Eastern societies in general sought to outlaw scorcery and forms of magic directed against members of the society.[95] Such legislation was not limited to any particular religious outlook, but was practical in motivation, and reflected the great fear ancient man had of magical forces. The essential difference between the biblical and other outlooks becomes clear in the case of divination—omens, necromancy, etc. This underlies biblical opposition to *laḥaš* "incantation", where such opposition is present. The Pentateuch contains four explicit, legal statements against magical praxis (Exodus 22:7, Leviticus 19:26-28, 20:6, and Deuteronomy 18:9-11). Common to all of them is the absence of apotropaic and prophylactic magic in the listing of prohibited activities.

The Israelite attitude on the matter of omens and divination is epitomized in words attributed to Balaam:

> Lo, there is no augury in Jacob; no divination in Israel. Jacob is told at once what Yahweh has planned (Numbers 23:23-24).[96]

Israel has no need for omens, since it has the benefit of prophecy, by which avenue it is informed of the course of action which will lead to

---

[93] Kaufmann, *Tôledôt* I, 551-8.

[94] H. Ch. Brichto, *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible, JBL Monograph Series* 13, 1963, 205 f.

[95] For a summary, see P. Artzi, *EB* (Hebrew), 4, 1962, 348-65, and extensive literature cited, s.v. *kešāpîm*.

[96] See W. F. Albright, *JBL* 63, 1944, 215, who interprets this passage to mean that augury will not be effective against Israel, taking prepositional *Beth (be-ya-'aqôb, be-yisrā'ēl)* as "against." Cf. Nu 22:7, 24:1.

salutary consequences. Jeremiah assured Israel that it had nought to
fear from astral omens (Jeremiah 10:2), and Isaiah of the exile taunts
the people for their reliance on divination (Isaiah 47:9, 12-15). As
regards necromancy, we read of the attempts by pious kings to outlaw
its practice, and of others, less loyal to strict Yahwism who at least
tolerate, if not sponsor its practitioners. We also have the tragic
account of Saul's anxious recourse to necromancy after he, himself,
had outlawed its practice (I Samuel 28:7, following).

Nowhere do we see any animus against the type of magical activity
involved in healing or relieving affliction, or in preventing death,
danger and disease. Therapeutic magic is never prohibited. On the
contrary: It was employed by priests and men of God in contexts
quite apart from what we are here proposing with respect to cultic
expiation.[97] Pinhas Artzi has carefully summarized the biblical evi-
dence on the problem of magic, against the background of ancient
Near Eastern civilizations. He states in part:

> Alongside the negation of the power of scorcery, monotheism at
> times resorts to means which, although borrowed from magical praxis,
> have been subserviated to the new religion, and were not considered
> as acts of scorcery. Blatant examples of this are healing by means of
> the copper serpent, and the examination of the *sôṭāh*.[98]

This is a traditional formulation, of course, one which tends to
obviate the theological problem in allowing for the practice of any
type of magic by the official Yahwistic priesthood. Nevertheless,
Artzi does not disregard the magical character of certain practices
recorded with approval by the biblical writers.

We have covered a wide range of problems in attempting to validate
our interpretation of the process of expiation in the Israelite cult,
including a discussion of the notion of expiation, and the role of
magic in eliminating evil forces, actualized as sins and impurity. We
are proposing, in summary, that expiation as a ritual complex con-
tained a magical component, related primarily to the particular
utilization of sacrificial blood. We have argued that such magic was
not in contradiction to the biblical conception of God, and we have
cited other examples in biblical Israel of the use of magic in an

---

[97] For a summary of such activities see Kaufmann, *Tôledôt*, I, 468 f., 477.
Kaufmann maintains that such activities differed from pagan practices in that
Yahweh, himself, was never conceived as performing magic, as do the gods of
other nations, but only as exercizing his will.

[98] See P. Artzi, *op. cit.*, 363.

approved manner. In effect we have argued that in the ancient Israelite mentality, the reality of anti-God forces was present, and was inculcated by means of stringent ritual codes, administered by the priesthood, but affecting the Israelite community at large. Our interpretation of the expiatory sacrifices, the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't*, which now follows, will further demonstrate the interplay of magical, ritual, legal and administrative factors operative in the cultic institutions of ancient Israel.

V. THE *'ĀŠĀM* SACRIFICE

There has long been a question about the precise difference between the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't* since, aside from certain variances in praxis, the borderline between these two offerings appears to be indistinct. Both are purificatory in effect, for the offenses which occasion them usually render the offender impure, and his reinstatement expressed itself in the resumption of purity. Furthermore, inadvertence is common to both sacrifices, as a governing circumstance. It is to be assumed that the intentional commission of the same offenses would warrant specific punishments, including the death of the offender, at least in theory, and would not be corrigible by ritual means at all.[99]

A careful study of the Levitical texts indicates that there were adaptations of the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't* for specific needs, and it becomes more difficult to ascertain the original character of the two sacrifices. Continuing our consistent method of isolating phenomena as completely as possible, we must first discuss the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't* proper, the essential rites designated by those names, and only subsequently take up the interaction of the two sacrifices, and their respective adaptations. For reasons that will become apparent, we will discuss the term *'āšām* first.

In contrast to the verbal root *ḥ-ṭ'* and its derivatives, verbal forms of the root *'-š-m* are virtually unattested outside of Hebrew, and even nominal forms are pretty well limited to Hebrew, and to Arabic.[100] Ugaritic *aṯm/iṯm*, if the same root, may be related to Hebrew *'āšām*,

---

[99] The usual penalties for transgressing against a negative command, involving an act (and not merely omission) were *kārēt* "banishment," or death, either by the people after trial, or by God's hand. Ritual expiation never availed the wilful offender.

[100] See discussion in Gray, *Sacrifice*, 57-8, and our Appendix IV for a full discussion of the etymological problem.

but as yet the evidence is too sparse to allow for any degree of certainty.[101] A significant body of evidence comes from the Northwest-Semitic onomasticon where we have divine names and theophoric personal names with *'šm*.[102]

Here our concern is with the functional aspects of the term *'āšām* as a term for sacrifice. Herein is a problem, because *'āšām* can also mean "penalty," in a more general sense, not referring to any prescribed expiatory offering.[103]

The key to ascertaining the precise difference in function between the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't* has little to do with etymology or even with lexicography and semantics. The essential difference between the two rites is to be found in the distinctive character of the *'āšām* offering, which reflects a particular system of cultic administration in ancient Israel, as well as a specific mode of cultic presentation. As interesting as the religious notions underlying the *'āšām* may be, administrative considerations prove to be more enlightening, in this case, than concepts imbedded in the term *'āšām*.[104]

Before discussing the Levitical codes relevant to the *'āšām* it would be instructive to examine a narrative account of the *'āšām* in a different context. We refer to the *'āšām* of the Philistines (I Samuel 5:1–7:1). The ark had been captured by the Philistines in battle, and the captors were experiencing gruesome consequences of their exploit; worst of all, the affliction of tumors and hemorrhoids. On the assumption that one or another particular locale was offensive to the God of Israel, the Philistines transferred the ark from city to city, but to no avail. They surmised that the continued presence of the captured cult object

---

[101] The exact meaning of Ugaritic *aṭm* eludes us, and it is probable that more than one meaning is in evidence. See Whittaker, *Concordance*, 42, s.v. *aṭm*, and 69, s.v. *iṭm*. Whittaker does not list the occurrence of *aṭm* in *UT* 27: 7-9, and restorations, noted by A. Rainey, *Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* III/4, 1968, 140, and n. 82, who accepts the identification with Hebrew *'āšām*. Cf. *UT*, glossary, no. 422, J. C. de Moor, *UF* I, 1968, 178, and ns. 88-9, (s.v. *UT* 602, obv. 14), doubts this identification, and suggests that *aṭm/iṭm* characterizes cattle: "firm fleshed (cattle)." The text in which the verbal forms occur (*UT* 2104) is too fragmentary to allow for precise interpretation. The nominal occurrences do, indeed, occur in the context of cattle *(šgr wiṭm)*. Without further attestations, there can be no certainty about the identification with Hebrew *'āšām*.

[102] In Appendix IV we note the wide range of connotations attendant upon the verbal forms of *'-š-m* and nominal forms as well, including "destruction, misfortune," and the notion of devotion and taboo.

[103] See further *à propos* the precise sense of *'āšām* in Lev 5:6, 15, and in Nu 5:7.

[104] In Appendix IV we venture to speculate on the basis for calling a sacrifice *'āšām*, s.v.

was the cause of their misfortunes, and decided on a test plan to verify their interpretation of the events. If the wagon bearing the ark proceeded without guidance directly to the Israelite settlement, the Philistines could be assured that by restoring the ark to the Israelites they were acting in accordance with the will of the Israelite deity, and would be spared further suffering. Having tasted the severity of Yahweh's wrath, the Philistines saw fit to send an expiatory gift, termed *'āšām*, along with the ark. This *'āšām* consisted of gold figurines in the form of tumors and rats, the carriers of plague. The magical character of the *'āšām* is expressed by the homeopathetic forms of the figurines, and by their number, which corresponded precisely to the number of the Philistine principalities.[105]

The plan was efficacious, and the afflictions ended. This remarkable account has important implications for our study of the *'āšām*, as a sacrifice. In anticipation of conclusions to be arrived at further on, we here note several of these implications, emerging from a close analysis of the account in I Samuel:

(1) The context of the Philistine *'āšām* is the misappropriation of sacred property, devoted to specific cultic use. As such, the *'āšām* is a gift to the offended deity, remitted in addition to restitution of the object which had been improperly taken. The Hebrew legal term for such misappropriation is *ma'al*, and it is this circumstance which necessitates the offering of the *'āšām*, as a payment additional to the "principal" of the misappropriation, according to the Levitical codes.[106]

(2) The *'āšām* here assumed the form of objects of value to be presented to the God of Israel, presumably to be placed before him. It did not assume the form of an altar sacrifice, in the usual sense. In form and substance, the Philistine *'āšām* resembled a votive presentation.[107]

(3) The Philistines were led to present the *'āšām* by the reality of

---

[105] I Sam 6:4-5. V. 5 is particularly instructive, because it provides the reasoning behind the form of the gifts, i.e. that the rats and tumors are "destroying" (Hebrew: *mašḥttîm*) the land." See M. Segal, *The Books of Samuel*, (Hebrew), 1956, 50, s.v. I Sam 6:5.

[106] On the term *ma'al* see *LVT* 5 7-8, s.v. *m-'-l* I, (v) and *ma'al* I, (subst.). The etymology is not certain, but perhaps it represents a secondary formation from *'ll* "to do a deed" (*LVT*, 708-89, s.v. *'ll* I). It would resemble *māsāk* from *s-k-k*, and *māgēn* from *g-n-n*. (See *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd English ed., 1960, 236, g.

[107] See discussion further on the origin of the *'āšām* sacrifice, and Part II, ns. 118-19.

misfortune, seeking the cause for their misfortune in an offense to a deity. Although the capture of the ark cannot properly be termed an inadvertent act, since it was undertaken with calculation, one could say that the offenders, in this case, were unaware of the extent of their offense and of its consequent penalties, else they would not have retained the ark in their cities once the battle was won. They knew of its potency, to be sure, but they did not know what would happen if they kept it, as captors often did with respect to cult objects of their defeated enemies. The 'āšām thus emerges as a response to misfortune, when the causes of misfortune are not fully identified, and an element of uncertainty exists.[108]

Bearing these observations in mind, we now proceed to examine the code of Leviticus 5:14-26, the regulations relevant to the 'āšām. proper. This section enumerates the basic circumstances which obligated one to offer an 'āšām sacrifice. Note that we are now speaking of a sacrificial animal disposed of as an altar sacrifice in a manner resembling the ḥaṭṭā't, for the most part. We will sooner or later have to account for this change of form from precious objects to sacrificial animals. Taking the Levitical code on its own terms, the 'āšām was required as follows:

(1) One guilty of the inadvertent misappropriation (ma'al) of sacred property must, in addition to making full restitution, and in addition to paying a fine of 20%, offer a ram without blemish as an 'āšām to Yahweh (Leviticus 5:14-16, and compare 22:14-16).

(2) One who is guilty of unknowingly committing an act prohibited by Yahweh's command, thus becoming liable to punishment, must offer as an 'āšām a ram without blemish (5:17-19).

(3) One who is guilty of misappropriating the property of others by means of: a) a false oath, b) the failure to return lost property or to be accountable for property entrusted to his keeping, or c) oppressive business dealings must, in addition to making full restitution and to paying the fine of 20%, offer a ram without blemish as an 'āšām to Yahweh (5:20-26, and compare Numbers 5:5-8). This is the 'ašam gezêlôt "the 'āšām of robbery" in Talmudic legislation. It reflects the principle that improper dealings "between man and man",

---

[108] This is the force of: le'ašmat hā'ām "to the misfortune of the people". (Lev 4:1. The same can be said of the ḥaṭṭā't, in this respect. For an interesting discussion of the function of the ark as conceived by the Israelites, see G. Henton Davies, *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 5, 1967, 30-47.

especially those involving false oaths, constitute, at one and the same time, an offense against the deity.[109]

The second of the above three passages in Leviticus, chapter 5 (i.e. verses 17-19) may well serve to illustrate the central methodological problem in defining the 'āšām. It is problematic in its formulation. It fails to stipulate the fine of 20%, common to the first and third regulations and to Numbers 5:5-8, as well, and does not mention the offense of ma'al "misappropriation." Furthermore, it appears almost identical to Leviticus 4:27, following, which ordains a ḥaṭṭā't in similar circumstances. All in all, verses 17-19 appear to disrupt the essential frame of reference of the 'āšām, i.e. the presence of ma'al as a governing circumstance. What are we to make of this passage?

This passage contains one technical term absent from any codes pertaining to the ḥaṭṭā't, the term 'erkekā (5:18, and compare verses 15, 25). It is this term which can lead us to a proper understanding of the entire development of the 'āšām in ancient Israel. Taking the most problematic passage within the code of Leviticus 5:14-26 as our point of departure, we proceed to a treatment of the key term, 'erkekā.

The late E. A. Speiser discussed this crucial term in a comparative framework. In addition to clarifying the unusual construction of the term, he connected the two contexts in which it occurs: 1) The commutation of vows (Leviticus, chapter 27), and 2) the 'āšām sacrifice.[110] Proceeding from comparative considerations, Speiser rendered the technical phrase: be'erkekā kesep šeqālîm in Leviticus 5:15 as: "convertible into silver shekels." This translation was adopted in the *New Jewish Version*. The term 'erkekā, itself, is rendered as "equivalent." Speiser interpreted the regulations of Leviticus 5:14-26 relevant to the 'āšām to mean that the 'āšām could be remitted in the form of an animal or its equivalent in silver, by the sanctuary weight. This would parallel the commutation of vows, where that which was devoted—animals, houses, fields, and live humans—was convertible into silver shekels according to a scale of established "equivalents" (Hebrew: 'erkekā).[111]

---

[109] On the 'ašam gezēlôt see 'Enṣiqlôpēdiāh Talmûdît (Hebrew), II, 1952, 265-66. It is contrasted with 'ašam me 'ilôt, the misappropriation of property (*ibid.* 266-67).

[110] See Part II, n. 3. Also see Gray, *Sacrifice*, 33-40, 58-65, N. Snaith, *VT* 15, 1965, 73-80, and R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 1961, 421. Snaith is correct in sensing that the 'āšām was required when a presumable loss was incurred, but he was, in our opinion, incorrect in stating that inadvertence was not the underlying precondition of both the ḥaṭṭā't and the 'āšām.

[111] E. A. Speiser, *Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume*, ed. M. Haran, 1960, 33.

Speiser found parallels to his proposed interpretation in Nuzi and Mari documents where he noted the occasional practice of what he termed "ceremonial payment," i.e. the separate listing of certain obligatory fines and payments in terms of fairly standard numbers and classes of animals. These documents made a point of recording that the required payments, in these instances, represented the equivalent of a certain number of specific types of animals, even though it was clearly the practical intent to obligate payment in silver or tin, as the standard of value may have been variously imputed. Thus, in one instance, X. gave his sister *ana kallūti* "into brideship" to Y., who agreed, for his part, to remit to X. "36 minas of tin, *equal to* (Akkadian: *kima*) one ox, 24 minas of tin *equal to* one ass and ten sheep," etc.[112]

The obvious question is: Why the necessity of stipulating the equivalence of the tin minas to a specified number of animals? Speiser suggests that it was necessary to maintain this separate listing because of the "solemn" character of the obligations (and their corresponding violations) involved in adoption and marriage arrangements. He also found evidence of the same, separate listing in cases where a defendant accused of criminal assault refused to undergo an oath, and was consequently fined. Here, again, there was a "solemn" aspect to the legalities of the case, contends Speiser, associated with the administering of oaths and with criminal acts.[113] Speiser thus surmised that both in these documents and in the biblical codes regulating the commutation of vows (Leviticus, chapter 27, and compare Numbers 18:16) a traditional or "ceremonial" requirement obliged the listing of animals as units of value when what was actually involved was a payment in currency.

Although we are not certain that Speiser has explained the need for a separate listing, his suggested parallel seems to be accurate thus far. In the commutation system of Leviticus, chapter 27, the object was to secure silver for the cultic establishment to be expended on various needs. The objects actually devoted were not being actively sought. There was provision, of course, for supplying the ritual need for sacrificial animals, but where commutation was provided for, temple servitors, real estate and livestock were not the object. It is therefore proper to translate *'erkekā* as: "the equivalent," since this term refers to the imputation of value according to another standard or unit. It was apparently traditional in biblical society that one intending to

---

[112] E. A. Speiser, *Orientalia*, *N.S.* 25, 1956, 11, referring to *HSS* V, no. 79.

[113] Speiser, *ibid.* 12, 14-15.

make a contribution to the temple and cult would state that he was devoting his possesions, or himself, to the service of Yahweh, and not merely a specified amount of silver. In part, this custom may hark back to a time when wealth and property were conceived in terms of ancestral land or items suitable for barter. The devotion of one's own value or "equivalent" to the temple obviously reflects ancient practices, whereby persons devoted their own labors for definite periods of time, or devoted the lifelong services of their children.

The point is that Leviticus, chapter 27, projects a system of commutation wherein votive pronouncements are archaistically formulated, and whereby sources of temple revenue were couched in traditional terms. When the term *ʿerkekā* is employed the actual intent behind the traditional formulation is revealed. Thus, 27:2 has the phrase: *beʿerkekā nepāšôt* "in the equivalent of human lives." It is the particular referent of the term *ʿerkekā* which, in differing contexts, determines the fiscal process involved.[114]

Our problem with Speiser's interpretation relates to his understanding of the *'āšām* as prescribed in Leviticus 5:14-26. Our question is: Does the situation with regard to the *'āšām* precisely parallel that of the system of commutation of vows? In practical terms, what is the force of the phrase: *beʿerkekā kesep šeqālîm* (5:15) and its abbreviation, *beʿerkekā* (5:18, 25)?

It must be remembered that there were two stages in the presentation of a sacrifice: 1) The form of remittances to the temple and/or priesthood to be allotted for sacrifices, and 2) The form ultimately assumed by the sacrifice, in the ritual. The form of remittances tended to be flexible, for obvious reasons. In certain, limited cases the form of remittance was specifically prescribed, but more often than not, it mattered little whether the particular sacrificial animal, etc., or its silver equivalent was contributed. Firstlings and some tithes were to be presented as they were, but even in the case of tithes we note a trend toward substituting currency when such was more expedient.[115]

An insight into these procedures can be gained from a careful study of II Kings, chapter 12, an account of certain activities undertaken by King Joash with respect to the Jerusalem temple. Joash at first decreed that all cultic funds contributed to the temple as votives,

---

[114] Cf. II Kings 12:5.

[115] Thus, the provisions of Dt 14:22, 26:12, etc. which legislate the conversion of the tithe of the third year into equivalents, to be brought in their stead to Jerusalem. See M. Weinfeld, *EJ* 16, 1157-62, especially 1160-61; "The Tithe in the Deuteronomic Code."

etc., be administered by the priests, who were to undertake necessary repairs of the temple (12:5-7). After a time, the king realized that such repairs had not been accomplished by the priests, and he removed that enterprise from their jurisdiction and assigned it to the royal scribe working under direct orders from the king. Henceforth, funds collected in the temple were to be handled by the royal scribe, who was to allocate them to the artisans and craftsmen assigned to the actual projects (12:7-13). The fashioning of ritual vessels was to be suspended until adequate repairs had been completed (12:14-16).

Exempted from this overall shift in procedures were funds remitted to the temple expressly for the expiatory sacrifices, the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't*. Such funds were not to go into the general collection, but directly to the priests for securing sacrificial animals and other *Opfermaterie*. One may postulate that this exemption was necessitated by the ongoing need for expiatory offerings prerequisite to the ritual purity of the temple, of the priesthood, and of individual Israelites, a purity which restored religious acceptability, as well. Of particular interest to our discussion is the fact that in Joash's time Israelites often remitted the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't* in the form of silver according to the *'erek* "equivalent, value" assessed by the cultic establishment.[116]

Now, if the Levitical prescriptions relevant to the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't* were, indeed, a reflection of the operative praxis of the Solomonic temple, at least at certain periods, it would appear that these two sacrifices had differentiated roles. The *'āšām* never served as part of the public temple cult, nor was it ever prescribed for rectifying the offenses of the entire people or of its priesthood, as was true of some varieties of *ḥaṭṭā't*. As we will demonstrate, there was a *ḥaṭṭā't* which served private needs, and another which became a major component of the temple cult in the celebration of the festivals, as well as in the periodic purifications of the temple and its officiating priesthood. The *'āšām*, on the other hand, bore no relationship to the purity of the altar or temple. So, one must assume that *kesep 'āšām* (12:17) was remitted by individual Israelites in pursuit of their own private needs, whereas *kesep ḥaṭṭā'ôt* (note the plural) was at least in part contributed in support of the public cult.[117] The terms *kesep 'āšām*

---

[116] See *ICC, Kings*, 426 f., especially the introductory comments, 427-8.

[117] At the risk of reading too much into the pl. *ḥaṭṭā'ôt* written *Plene* in v. 17, we might venture to suggest that it indicates an awareness of the two types of *ḥaṭṭā't* sacrifice.

and *kesep ḥaṭṭā'ôt* emphasize the payment or contribution in the form of silver, although it is likely that both ultimately assumed the form of sacrificial animals, and the accompanying *Opfermaterie*—grain offerings, libations, etc. This is the process of which we are speaking.

Returning to our earlier questions about the puzzling and defective formulation of Leviticus 5:17-19 we may now attempt to clarify the general history of the *'āšām*. It is probable that the *'āšām* was not originally an altar sacrifice, and originally no part of it was placed on the altar or consumed by the fire. It was originally a cultic offering presented to the deity in the form of silver or other objects of value in expiation for certain offenses. What is significant, if we are correct, is that the *'āšām* in earlier periods retained its original form up to and including its final disposition in the temple. In this respect it would have resembled votive or other voluntary contributions not earmarked for specific rituals, but devoted for use in the manufacture of cultic vessels, for repair of the temple buildings or for deposit in the treasury. This would be suggested by the form of the Philistine *'āšām*. It would also be suggested by the terminology of Numbers, chapter 7, where contributions of vessels made of silver and gold by the tribal chiefs for the dedication of the tabernacle altar are termed *qorbān*, a designation usually applied to altar offerings.[118]

Thus viewed, the original *'āšām* should be classified as a *qorbān* not destined for the altar fire, but for presentation to the deity through another mode of sacrifice. The Bible gives evidence of two modes of sacrifice in ancient Israel: 1) Altar sacrifices, of which at least some part was consumed by the altar fire, or was burnt as incense, and 2) Offerings placed before the deity and subsequently removed from his view and otherwise disposed of. We need not repeat here in detail what we have said elsewhere about the interplay of these two modes in ancient Israel.[119] We wish only to suggest that the *'āšām* originally belonged to the second type, the presentational offering. It was only subsequently that its form and mode of presentation were altered and accommodated to the prevailing propensity for burnt offerings.

The amount of the obligatory *'āšām* was fixed. Whereas the fine of 20% varied according to the amount of the misappropriation, the expiatory penalty offering would not. The *kôper* "expiation gift" was

---

[118] Cf. Nu 31:50, where the term *qorbān* designates the spoils or war against the Midianites, devoted to the Tabernacle in the form of precious articles. Also see Gray, *Sacrifice*, 13.

[119] See Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxxiii-vi.

also fixed at a half shekel (Exodus 30:11-16). In the same way, the
'erek for humans was fixed, according to age and sex. In extenuating
circumstances, reductions were allowable, which was also a feature
of the commutation system (Leviticus 27:8).

In summary, the technical phrase: *be'erkekā kesep šeqālîm* means:
"imputed according to the equivalent in silver shekels." The *'āšām*
could be variously remitted, of course, but according to Leviticus
5:14-26 it had to assume the form of a sacrificial ram for its disposition
in the ritual. What renders the codes relevant to the *'āšām* distinctive
is the reference to its original character as a fixed penalty. It is as if to
say: The *'āšām* being offered in the form of a sacrificial ram repre-
sents a fixed payment in silver, and is being offered in substitution for
that payment.

Now, this constitutes the inverse of what we observed in the case
of votive commutation. According to Leviticus, chapter 27, the
separate listing of animals, fields, etc. was traditional or "ceremonial",
to use Speiser's term, whereas it was the silver which was actually
desired by the cultic establishment. In the case of the *'āšām* the "cere-
monial" dimension of the formulation is the reference to the silver
equivalent of the *'āšām*, whereas it is clear that according to the
Levitical code, the penalty was to assume the form of an altar sacrifice,
to be partially burned on the altar, and partially consumed by the
priests.

Whatever the imprecisions in the formulation of Leviticus 5:17-19,
one thing is clear: Wherever the term *'erkekā* is present we are dealing
with the *'āšām*, proper. This term does not occur in 5:1-13, a part of
the same code, which suggests that the sacrifices referred to as *'āšām*
in that section are adaptations, a fact we will attempt to verify further
on in our discussion.

Apart from Leviticus, chapter 5, there are several legal passages in
the Pentateuch which relate to the *'āšām*, and to its principal under-
lying circumstance, the presence of *ma'al* "misappropriation." Leviti-
cus 19:20-22 is a brief statement, requiring an *'āšām* as the penalty for
carnal relations with a slave woman who, though pledged to another
man as his intended wife, had not yet been freed from her master.
Had she been freed at the time, she would have been considered a
me'ōrāšāh, and the one having relations with her would have been liable
to the death penalty as an adulterer.[120] Since at the time of the inci-

---

[120] Dt. 22:23-4, f.

dent the woman still bore the legal status of property, only the mis-
appropriation of another's property was involved. It is not clear
exactly what the liability of the offender consisted of, but, as Speiser
has shown, the term *biqqôret* (verse 20) means "damage claim/obliga-
tion". This clearly indicates that the offender was liable to a payment
in addition to the sacrificial *ʾāšām*.[121] What we have in this instance is
tantamount, therefore, to *maʿal*, although a penalty over and above
the loss with respect to the slave is not definitely indicated.

The *ʾāšām* of the *nāzîr* who has been contaminated during the
period covered by his vows (Numbers 6:8-12) actually constitutes
another type of *maʿal*, which explains why the *ʾāšām* was obligatory in
such circumstances. The *nāzîr* was consecrated to Yahweh for the
specified period of his vow (verse 8), which makes of him a form of
sacred property. In the event that the *nāzîr* was rendered unfit for
that status, the period of his devotion would represent a loss to the
temple, thus to Yahweh. That loss must be restored by having the
nāzîr reconsecrate himself, thus beginning the period of devotion all
over again. The *nāzîr* is thus penalized by the cancellation of the
period before his contamination, and must begin to reckon the period
anew. This is actually similar, in principle, to a fine, like the 20%
imposed in cases of *maʿal*. Furthermore, the *nāzîr* was liable for an
ʾāšām consisting of a sheep (verse 12).[122]

VI. THE *ḤAṬṬĀʾT* SACRIFICE

Against the background of our discussion of the *āšām*, the basic
differences between it and the *ḥṭṭaʾt* will become increasingly clear.
Massoretic *ḥaṭṭāʾt* with the augmentation of the second radical by a
dāgēš, actually reflects two different nominal forms: (1) A *Piʿʿēl* forma-
tion, the real term for the sacrifice. In Hebrew, the *Piʿʿēl* of the root
ḥ-ṭ-ʾ has the force of connoting the undoing of the action conveyed
by the *Qal*, *ḥāṭāʾ*. Verbal *ḥiṭṭēʾ* consistently means: "to remove the
ḥēṭ, the impurity; to purify." This verb is frequently employed in

---

[121] E. A. Speiser, Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume, ed. M. Haran, 1960,
33-36. For a survey of traditional commentaries on this passage, see Hoffmann,
Leviticus, II, 38-41, and *ʾEnṣiqlôpēdiāh Talmûdit* (Hebrew), II, 1952, 273-4, s.v.
ʾašam ʾiššāh ḥarûpāh.

[122] The requirement that the *nāzîr* also offer an *ʿôlāh* and a *ḥaṭṭāʾt* on the day he
reconsecrates himself merely represents a purificatory ritual designed to rectify
his defilement. (Cf. Lev 5:7-10).

biblical literature to connote the ritual purification of sacred edifices, altars and other objects, persons, and sacrificial animals, and is sometimes synonymous with *kippēr*.[123] It is clear, therefore, that the sacrificial term *ḥaṭṭāʾt* must be a *Piʿʿēl* formation, since the *Qal* of *ḥ-ṭ-ʾ* has other meanings. (2) A *Qal* formation, *ḥaṭāʾt*, a variant of *ḥaṭāʾāh*, the feminine of *ḥēṭʾ* "an offense, sin."[124] The Massoretes apparently pointed consonantal *ḥṭʾt* with a *dāgēš* in all instances, even when the word in question did not refer to the sacrifice. It would be difficult to see in the term for "sin, offense" a primary *Piʿʿēl* since biblical Hebrew *ḥiṭṭēʾ* never means: "to commit an offense." *Piʿʿēl ḥaṭṭāʾîm* "offenders" is the *nomen opificium* in the typical *qaṭṭāl* formation, and does not imply that finite *ḥiṭṭēʾ* means: "to commit an offense."[125] We must conclude, therefore, that *Piʿʿēl ḥaṭṭāʾt* and *Qal ḥaṭāʾt* have become confused in the punctuation.

The root *ḥ-ṭ-ʾ* in Hebrew is cognate to Akkadian *ḥaṭû* and related forms, and the nominal forms *ḥēṭʾ*, *ḥaṭāʾāh*, and *ḥaṭāʾt* are cognate to Akkadian *ḥiṭu* and *ḥiṭītu*. *Piʿʿēl ḥaṭṭāʾt* in Hebrew, seems to be distinctive.[126] The term *ḥaṭṭāʾt* reflects an extensive history, as we learn primarily from the Akkadian evidence. It derives from the vocabulary of treaties and legal documents, as well as from cultic terminology.

___

[123] See most recently, J. Milgrom, *Tarbiz* (Hebrew), 40, 1970-71, 1 f. and *idem*, *VT* 21, 1971, 237-8. As will become evident in our discussion to follow, we do not endorse Milgrom's conclusions relevant to the *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, generally. On *ḥiṭṭēʾ* see Lev 14:52, and cf. Ezek 43:20, 45:18—the purification of a building: Nu 19:19, Ps 51:9—of a person; Ex 29:36, Lev 8:15, and cf. Ezek 43:22—of the altar; and Lev 6:19, 9:15—of a sacrificial animal. Also see Ezek 43:23, II Chron 29:24. In Gen 31:39 *ʾaḥaṭṭennāh* "I shall make restitution for it," *ḥiṭṭēʾ* is synonymous with *kippēr*, the denominative.

[124] See for *ḥaṭāʾāh* "offense, sin" (without a *Dāgēš*): Gen 20:9, Ex 32:21, 30-1, II Kings 17:21, Ps 32:1, and cf. *ḥaṭṭāʾt* (written consistently with a *Dāgēš*) in the same meaning: Gen 4:7 (?), Nu 12:11, Dt 19:15, I Sam 2:17, 14:38, 15:23, I King 8:34, 36, Isa 30:1, Jer 17:1, 3, Micah 1:13, 6:7, Zech 14:19 (the penalty, or punishment of sin), Ps 59:13, 109:14, Dan 9:20, and frequently in the book of Proverbs. Also note some further peculiarities: a) *ḥaṭṭāʾāh* "sin' offense" (with a *Dāgēš*) in Ex 34:7, Isa 34:7. b) *ḥaṭāʾāh*, the term for sacrifice (without a *Dāgēš*) in Ps 40:7, 109:7.

[125] For *ḥaṭṭāʾāh* "sinful" (adj. fem.) see Amos 9:8. On the formation *ḥaṭṭāʾ* "sinful person," see Gesenius, 84ᵇ b, and *GAG* 66, no. 55, 0, 23, a.

[126] Akkadian abounds in instructive forms. See *CADḤ*, s.v. the following forms, on pages noted: 153: *ḥaṭītu* "wickedness, evil," *ḥaṭītu* "adulteress", *ḥaṭṭiʾu* "sinner" (Hebrew: *ḥōṭēʾ*, in Dt 22:26). 156:8: *ḥaṭû* "to commit an offense," etc. (Hebrew: *ḥaṭāʾ*). 158: *ḥaṭû* adj. "wrong, portending evil; faulty." 159: *ḥaṭû (EA)* "sinner". 208-10: *ḥiṭītu* (variant *ḥiṭātu*) "misdemeanor, sin, cultic mistake," (Hebrew: *ḥaṭāʾt*, *ḥaṭāʾāh*. 210: *ḥiṭu* "sin, offense," (Hebrew: *ḥēṭʾ*). 212: *bēl ḥiṭi* "malefactor, conspirator," etc.

It represents one of a complex of terms appropriated by cultic establishments from other contexts. It is one of a group of Hebrew cultic terms which expresses the servant—master relationship obtaining between the Israelite and his God, revealed in the act of sacrifice. It's matrix is the notion of incumbent religious duties binding on the worshipper. The covenant, and the only-to-be-expected violations of it represent the larger framework within which the ḥaṭṭā't sacrifice functioned.

The various cultic codes of the Torah actually project two types of ḥaṭṭā't; (1) A purification rite intended to safeguard the sanctuary and its ministering priesthood from contamination. (2) A rite intended to expiate certain of the offenses of "the people", of Israelites, individually, and even of their nesí'ím, the tribal chiefs. In the case of such offenses the threat to the purity of the sanctuary was less direct, although present.

This differentiation of two types of ḥaṭṭā't is reflected in the prescribed praxis. In Leviticus 6:23 it is stated that the ḥaṭṭā't whose function it was "to secure expiation in the sanctuary" was to be performed in a particular manner. Some of the blood from the sacrificial animal was to be brought inside the sanctuary to be sprinkled or dabbed on the altar of incense and on other appurtenances located within the sanctuary. The priests were not to partake of any part of this ḥaṭṭā't, for the parts of the sacrificial animals not actually placed on the altar fire were to be removed from the Israelite "camp" and burned to ashes, so as to rid the settlement of the impurity that had been actualized in the sacrificial victim. This, then, is one type of ḥaṭṭā't. The distinction between this type and the other is epitomized in a cultic narrative, one of those brief accounts preserved in the priestly source for the express purpose of explaining how and why certain rites were performed.

In the rites accomplished by Aaron and his sons after their investiture (Leviticus, chapter 9), both types of ḥaṭṭā't were included. A bull calf was offered as the ḥaṭṭā't of Aaron, and a goat as the ḥaṭṭā't "of the people" (verses 2-3). Aaron proceeded to execute his ḥaṭṭā't in the manner of a purificatory rite, removing those parts of the bull calf not offered on the altar from the camp to be burned. Then Aaron offered "the sacrifice of the people" (qorban hā'ām), their ḥaṭṭā't (verse 15). We are then told, when the account resumes (Leviticus 10: 16-20) that Moses was concerned about the goat offered as ḥaṭṭā't, and he inquired angrily of Aaron and his sons:

> Why did you not eat the *ḥaṭṭā't* in the sacred area? For it is most holy,
> and He has given it to you, so as to remove the guilt of the community
> and to make expiation for them before Yahweh. Since its blood was
> not brought inside the sanctuary, you ought certainly to have eaten it
> in the sanctuary, as I commanded (verses 17-19).

The account spells out the ideology of this type of *ḥaṭṭā't*, whose
role was not directly to preserve the purity of the sanctuary, but "to
remove the guilt of the community," i.e. to rectify the offenses
committed by Israelites,

Thus, we have the two types of *ḥaṭṭā't* clearly differentiated. The
ḥaṭṭā't of the people, sponsored and donated by them, was essentially
a gift to the priesthood for their services on behalf of Israelites. The
purificatory *ḥaṭṭā't*, usually provided by the priests, was an expression
of the duty of the priesthood to protect the purity of the sanctuary, and
to rid it of contamination accumulated primarily as a result of offenses
committed by the ministering priesthood, itself. This is the force of
Numbers 18:1;

> Yahweh said to Aaron: You with your sons and the ancestral house
> under your charge shall bear any guilt connected with the sanctuary.
> Only you and your sons shall bear any guilt connected with your
> priesthood.

As part of this duty, *ḥaṭṭā't* sacrifices were to be offered so as to
preserve the purity of the sanctuary and the priesthood, since in the
most direct way that state depended on the condition of the priests,
and the Levites, as well (Numbers 18:2).

Let us now examine the priestly *ḥaṭṭā't* in depth and contrast it
with the second type, the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the people. Leviticus, chapter 4,
prescribes both types of *ḥaṭṭā't* and distinguishes them from one
another. Verses 1-21 prescribes the priestly, purificatory *ḥaṭṭā't* to be
offered in cases where the chief priest or the community collectively
have inadvertently committed an act prohibited by Yahweh's com-
mandment, thus bringing misfortune on the entire people. (This is the
force of the phrase: *le'almat hā'ām* in verse 3, expressing the conno-
tation of misfortune associated with the noun *'ašmāh*).[127] A male
head of large cattle is to be sacrificed, of which no part was to be
eaten by the priests. Those parts of the animal not placed on the
altar fire were to be burned outside the camp (verses 11-12, 20-21).
Part of the blood of the victim was to be sprinkled on the *pārōket*
curtain and dabbed on the horns of the incense altar which stood

---

[127] See Appendix IV, and Part II, n. 103.

inside the sanctuary (verses 5-6, 16-18), We have already stated that this type of *ḥaṭṭā't* represented one instance of the expiation process conveyed by the verb *kippēr*, as is stated in 4:20.

These, then, are the general preconditions of the priestly, purificatory *ḥaṭṭā't*. The burning of the remaining parts of the sacrifice and their removal from the settlement follow established procedures of riddance.

Leviticus 4:22-35 speaks of the other type of *ḥaṭṭā't* obligatory in the event a chief of one of the tribes or an individual Israelite commits an act forbidden by Yahweh's command, and one immediately notes the differences in praxis. There is no mention of bringing sacrificial blood inside the sanctuary or of burning parts of the victim outside the camp. Blood is dabbed only on the horns of the altar of burnt offerings, which stood in the courtyard outside the sanctuary, proper (verses 25, 30, 34). Another difference between the two sections of Leviticus, chapter 4 concerns the class of animal required for each variety of *ḥaṭṭā't*. The priestly *ḥaṭṭā't* required a head of large cattle (compare Leviticus 9:1), and the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the *nāśī'* or of the people, a small head of cattle, a sheep or goat (4:23, 28, 32). The same distinctions appear in Numbers 15:22-31 in a less detailed cultic code.[128]

We also note that in prescriptions concerning the priestly *ḥaṭṭā't* there is usually some reference to the fact that the sacrificial victim was provided by the priests, and did not come from the people, directly. As examples we cite the following:

(1) According to Leviticus, chapter 16, the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the priests, consisting of a male head of large cattle, was provided by Aaron (verses 3, 11), whereas the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the people, consisting of two male heads of small cattle, was provided by the people (verse 5).

(2) According to Leviticus 8:1, 14 a large head of cattle was required for the *ḥaṭṭā't* offered in conjunction with the investiture of Aaron and his sons. In Exodus 29:1-28, a later version of the same rite, the same class of animal is prescribed (29:1, 10-14), as is the same manner of execution. In both versions it is implicit that the victims

---

[128] It is likely that Nu 15:22-31 is based on Lev, ch. 4, but it adds a note of severity by contrasting the inadvertent offender with the wilfull offender (vs. 30-2). The form *beḥeṭ'āh* in v. 28 is probably an inf. const. with fem, pronominal suffix, a conflate form from *beḥoṭ'āh*, with *Mappîq* omitted, contra *HuAl* 203, s.v. *ḥeṭ'āh*, which takes it as a nominal form, compared to Akkadian *ḥiṭṭu*. The *ḥaṭṭā't* offered by Hezekiah and the princes (II Chron 29:20 f.) is merely a loosely stated composite, for the purification of both temple and "kingdom," and utilizing both large and small cattle.

and the accompanying materials were not provided by the people directly, but by the priesthood. This deduction emerges from our observation that whenever "the Israelites" provided the victims, this fact is stated explicitly, as in Leviticus 4:28 and 16:5. Similarly, in Leviticus 9:15 we have the specification of a sacrifice as *qorban hā'ām* "the offering of the people."

(3) The *ḥaṭṭā't* offered in connection with the investiture of the Levites (Numbers 8:5-22) also required a large head of cattle, provided by the Levites, themselves (verse 8).

(4) The purificatory rites associated with removing the contamination of dead, human bodies also provide instructive insights into the pattern under discussion (Numbers, chapter 19). A *ḥaṭṭā't* consisting of a red heifer was offered as sacrifice. In this case, the animal was provided by the Israelites, and not by the priesthood, and was donated to the priesthood (verses 1-3). The logic is clear: The prescribed purificatory rites were not necessitated exclusively, or even largely, by the priests, who were cautious about contact with dead, human bodies, but by the contamination of Israelites, usually resulting from inadvertent carelessness. The contamination through contact with dead bodies falls into the category projected in Leviticus 4:13, following, i.e. offenses committed by the entire community, offenses whose seriousness affected the entire community. In such cases, the victims were to be supplied by the people, as a whole, which is conveyed by the plural verb, *wehiqrîbû* "they shall offer," in 4:14.

The contamination from contact with dead bodies was a kind of exception, since it directly endangered the purity of the sanctuary, like the offenses of the priesthood. This is stated, in so many words, in Numbers 19:13:

> Anyone who is in contact with a dead body of a human being who has died, and does not undergo purification, *has defiled the sanctuary of Yahweh*...[129]

This form of contamination was apparently widespread, and an elaborate rite was ordained, involving the concoction of a mixture of the ashes from the remaining parts of the red heifer which had been burned outside the camp, and water, to be used in meeting the ongoing need for prophylaxis. An example would be its use in purifying the Levites as part of their investiture (Numbers 8:7).

In contrast to the above rituals for which large heads of cattle were

---

[129] See Part II, n. 56.

required, small cattle were used fairly consistently where the offenses were associated with individual Israelites, and did not relate directly to the priesthood or the sanctuary. No specific purification of the sanctuary was involved in such cases and the victims were most often supplied by the offenders. In addition to sources already noted, we may cite the following examples of this type of *ḥaṭṭāᵓt*: (1) Leviticus 14:10-32—the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* of the *meṣōrāʿ*, one afflicted with a skin ailment. (2) Numbers 6:13, following—the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* of the Nazirite. (3) *Ibid.* 7:16, *passim*—the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* offered by the chief of each of the twelve tribes at the dedication of the tabernacle altar. Although it might appear, at first glance, that the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* sacrifices offered by the tribal chiefs related directly to the purification of the altar, it is clear that these were actually offerings intended to ascertain that the chiefs, themselves, were free of offenses.

The *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* of the people is mentioned in a fairly early source, Hosea 4:8, as part of a prophetic denunciation of the Northern priesthood:

> They consume the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* sacrifice(s) of my people, and yet desire their transgression.

The consecrated priests, whose partaking of the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* of the people was part of the expiatory process were, themselves, guilty of the very offenses which the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* was intended to rectify. This reference to the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* indicates that at a fairly early period it was already customary for the priests to partake of it.[130] According to the priestly code of Numbers 18:9-10, the male priests were to eat sections of the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt*, of the type we are now discussing, in a sacred precinct of the sanctuary. The pertinent passage reads:

> This shall be yours from the most holy sacrifices, from the fire; every such offering that they remit (Hebrew: *hēšîb*) unto me as most holy sacrifices, namely, every grain offering, *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* and *ᵓāšām of theirs* shall belong to you and your sons... (verse 9).

The particular force of the third masculine plurals (*lekôl minḥātām*, etc.) makes it clear that this passage is speaking of sacrifices offered by Israelites, and not about the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* of the priesthood.

A partial parallel to the different disposition of the two types of *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* is observable in the case of the *minḥāh*, as well. Thus, the *minḥāh* of a priest, offered on his own behalf for some infraction of his own,

---

[130] The verse is admittedly difficult, but the term for the sacrifice cannot be read out of it! Probably read: *yiśᵉᵓû napšām*. Also see H. L. Ginsberg, *EJ* 8, 1018·

was disposed of as a holocaust, as was the *minḥāh* offered as part of the rite of unction (Leviticus 6:12-16). Other *minḥāh* offerings presented on behalf of Israelites were for the consumption of the priests, once the *'azkārāh* had been cast into the altar fire as the portion of the deity (Leviticus 2:3, 10).

There was, therefore, a pattern in the varied disposition of certain expiatory sacrifices whereby two somewhat distinct roles were differentiated. In the case of the *ḥaṭṭā't* this differentiation is so basic as to suggest that the *ḥaṭṭā't* actually represents the coalescence of two originally distinct rites; the one a rite of riddance and the other a gift of expiation. In Numbers 18:9 the phrase *min hā'ēš* "from the fire" is problematic. Its context is the allotment of sections of the most holy sacrifices, including the *ḥaṭṭā't*. M. Haran has suggested that originally the *ḥaṭṭā't*, *'āšām*, and *minḥāh* were all holocausts, but that subsequently sections of these offerings were "rescued" from the altar fire and assigned to the priests. Although this process possibly functioned in ancient Israel, with respect to the *ḥaṭṭā't*, itself, Haran's interpretation runs counter to the probability that the *ḥaṭṭā't* of which Numbers 18:9 speaks was, since early times, a sacrifice to be consumed partially by the priests, as evidenced by the statement to that effect in Hosea 4:8. It is more likely, therefore, that there were two originally distinct expiatory rites. The differences between the two types of *ḥaṭṭā't* would then be more adequately accounted for by assuming an original difference in function.[131]

VII. ADAPTATIONS OF THE *ḤAṬṬĀ'T*

Now that we have outlined the *'āšām* and the *ḥaṭṭā't*, proper, it is possible to deal with those Levitical prescriptions which have always been a source of confusion and difficulty to students of the Israelite cult, i.e. the adaptations of the *ḥaṭṭā't* involving a graduated scale of sacrificial requirements, determined by the ability of the offender to pay. We have already noted that this graduation was a feature of the system of votive commutation. Thus, we read in Leviticus 27:8:

> But if one cannot afford the equivalent, he shall be presented before the priest, and the priest shall assess him according to what the vower can afford.

---

[131] See M. Haran, *EB* (Hebrew), 4, 1962, 40, s.v. *qodšê qodāšim*.

In situations where the denial of ritual expiation would render vowers and offenders seriously disabled, and adversely affect their standing as members of the Israelite community, accommodations became necessary. This was not allowable where actual misappropriation had occurred, or where a sin of commission was involved, but it was allowable for sins of omission and for the failure to fulfill duties under the votive system.

This is the situation projected in Leviticus 5:1-13. Thus, 5:1-4 speaks of withholding testimony, of the failure to fulfill what was enunciated in an oath or pledge as well as the failure to purify one's self properly after contamination by certain types of impurity termed *ṭûme'at 'ādām* "human uncleanness" (verse 3).[132] Common to all of the provisions of 5:1-13 is the aspect of omission, whereas in chapter 4, where the *ḥaṭṭā't* sacrifices are ordained, there is repeated emphasis on commission, conveyed by the verb *'āśāh* (verses 2, 13, 22, 27).

So much for the graduated penalties allowed in 5:1-13. The question is: What type of sacrifice is it that 5:1-13 is prescribing? The so-called *'āśām*, what in Talmudic terminology was known as *'āśām tālûi* "the graduated *'āśām*" is really a form of *ḥaṭṭā't*. This is conveyed by 5:6:

> He shall bring as his penalty (Hebrew: *'aśāmô*) to Yahweh, for the sin of which he is guilty, a female from the flock, a sheep or goat, as *ḥaṭṭā't* sacrifice...

The word *'aśāmô* in verse 6 has the same general sense as it does in Numbers 5:7, i.e. "culpability," and is not here a term for a type of sacrifice. If one contrasts 5:6 with 5:25 he will get the point, and note a salient difference in terminology. In 5:25 one offers "his *'āśām* (*'et 'aśāmô*) .... as an *'āśām* sacrifice *(le'āśām)*", whereas in verse 6, which is not speaking of the *'āśām* proper, one brings his *'āśām* (*'et 'aśāmô*) "his penalty" as a *ḥaṭṭā't* (*leḥaṭṭā't*). It is clear, therefore, that "the graduated *'āśām*" is a form of *ḥaṭṭā't* incorporating a feature of the votive system, i.e. the allowability of a scaled-down penalty in extenuating circumstances, and applicable when the offense does not involve actual misappropriation, in which case the *'āśām* applies; or sins of commission, in which case the essential types of *ḥaṭṭā't* apply. Theoretically speaking, when Yahweh requires that a rite be performed in a particular manner, so as to expiate for certain

---

[132] The term *ṭûme'at 'ādām* (cf. Lev 7:21) is not to be confused with the contamination resulting from contact with a dead human body. The immediate contexts of Lev 5:3 and 7:21 make this fact clear.

offenses, alterations of the prescribed rite would hardly be allowable. If, however, we are dealing with the requirement of a payment or equivalent and not with an originally ritual activity, there would be room for leniency. This would apply most obviously where the offender has only been remiss in his duties, or where he was subjected to circumstances otherwise not reprehensible which have rendered him impure. The system of the fixed *ʿerek* would not apply in the situations projected in 5:1-13, since the assessment of just how much the offender must expend on the sacrifice was not based on fixed amounts or quantities, as was the case with votives and the misappropriation of property or wealth. It was only the principle of graduation due to inability to pay that was extended, but not the actual table of fixed equivalents.

There were, therefore, several options available to the offender liable to a *ḥaṭṭāʾt* under the provisions of 5:1-13: 1) A *ḥaṭṭāʾt* consisting of a female from the flock, the very same sacrifice as is required for the essential *ḥaṭṭāʾt* in cases of commission (Leviticus 4:27-35). If the offender can afford it, he should remit the regular *ḥaṭṭāʾt* required for sins of commission, although his was only a sin of omission. 2) Two turtle doves or two pigeons, one as *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and the other as *ʿōlāh*. Exactly why one of the birds was designated as a holocaust is not clear. Possibly, the diminution of the *Opfermaterie* was regarded as depriving the deity of part of his share, and consequently all of the second bird was to be consumed by the altar fire, instead of giving sections of it to the priests, which would be standard procedure for this type of *ḥaṭṭāʾt*. 3) A *minḥāh* consisting of 1/10 *ʾēpāh* of fine flour as *ḥaṭṭāʾt*. The *ʾazkārāh* would go to the deity and the rest to the priests, as was normal procedure for the *minḥāh* offered on behalf of Israelites.[133]

In addition to Leviticus 5:1-13 there are other examples of the attenuated *ḥaṭṭāʾt*:

(1) Leviticus 14:1-32 prescribes an *ʾāšām* for the *meṣōrāʿ*, one afflicted with a skin ailment which proved to be benign and did not necessitate his permanent banishment from the settlement. After ablutions and magical rites of riddance were performed, and following upon quasi-medical measures undertaken, the *meṣōrāʿ* offered sacrifices on the eighth day after the remission of his ailment (verse 3). He was to provide three heads of sheep, two male and one female, plus

---

[133] See above, 107-8.

materials for the *minḥāh* (verse 10). One male was to serve as an *ᵓāšām*, and the other as an *ᶜōlāh*, and the female as a *ḥaṭṭāᵓt*. The utilization of blood from the *ᵓāšām* on the body of the one being purified, as prescribed in verses 14-19 is similar to the procedure ordained for the priestly investiture (Leviticus 8:23-24).

In trying to make sense out of this puzzling complex of ritual requirements incumbent on the *mesōrāᶜ* we should note, first of all, that this *ᵓāšām*, in and of itself, is not reduced. Only the accompanying *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* is reduced if the *mesōrāᶜ* cannot afford even small cattle. Our problem is: On what basis was an *ᵓāšām* required for the *mesōrāᶜ*, over and above the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt*, *ᶜōlāh*, and *minḥāh*? The particular use of the blood in this case may hold the key. Judging from the parallel of Leviticus, chapter 8, we have in 14:1-32 a prophylactic purification rite in which blood and oil are used to immunize a person against the forces of impurity, in one form or another. In the investiture of the priests this same concern was clearly present, and there, too, the blood for prophylaxis did not come from the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* sacrifice but from another sacrifice, the ram of investiture, offered in addition to the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt*. As a matter of fact, blood from a *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* is never applied to the body of a human being, although it can be dabbed or dashed upon buildings and objects. In some way, this restriction on the use of *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* blood may be related to the fact that the verb *kippēr* in cultic usage never took as its direct object the human body or any of its parts.[134]

It may well be that an *ᵓāšām* was prescribed for the purification of the *mesōrāᶜ*, in addition to a *ḥaṭṭāᵓt* and other sacrifices, because sacrificial blood was needed, and could not be supplied from the *ḥaṭṭāᵓt*, nor from the *ᶜōlāh* which was entirely burned, nor from the non-animal *minḥāh*. An *ᵓāšām* was prescribed just as a ram of investiture was ordained for the prophylaxis of the invested priests.[135] This is the closest we can come to an explanation of the *ᵓāšam mesōrāᶜ*. The additional requirement of an *ᶜōlāh* and a *minḥāh* in this case is somewhat easier to explain. It was undoubtedly part of the reinstatement of one who had been temporarily impure and unfit. To indicate that the purified *mesōrāᶜ* was restored to full status in the Israelite com-

---

[134] See Part II, n. 29.

[135] Cf. Lev 8:22-4. Tradition explains that the *mesōrāᶜ* is being punished for the sin of slander, based on the Miriam episode (Nu 12:4-13). Apparently it was widespread belief that such afflictions were a punishment. See Th. Gaster, *op. cit.* (Part II, n. 45), 300.

munity, he performed ritual acts reserved for those of full status, i.e. he made offering to the God of Israel. The element of gratitude was also present, of course.

(2) Leviticus 12:6-8 ordains the sacrifice to be offered by a woman after childbirth. It consisted of a yearling sheep as *ʿōlāh* and a pigeon or turtle dove as *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, with the provision that if the woman could not afford a sheep, she could substitute two pigeons or turtle doves. Although the allowable reduction actually applies to the *ʿōlāh* and not to the *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, it seems fairly obvious that we have in this instance merely another application of the system we observed in the case of the *mesōrāʿ*, and elsewhere. The preoccupations governing purification from flux (Leviticus, chapter 15) resemble the provisions for the new mother and represent, along with all that is prescribed in Leviticus, chapters 12-15, applications of the general category *ṭūmeʾat ʾādām* "human uncleanness" (Leviticus 5:3).[136]

VIII. THE *ḤAṬṬĀʾT* OF THE PEOPLE IN THE REGULAR CULT

We have already dealt with the priestly *ḥaṭṭāʾt* in special rites where purification of the sanctuary and its vessels or of the priesthood was specifically required, or where it was necessary to deal with the continuing problem of contamination through contact with dead bodies, which occasioned a *ḥaṭṭāʾt* of that variety. Thus far, however, we have discussed the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* of the people almost exclusively in terms of the private needs of Israelites. We mentioned the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* sacrifices offered by the chiefs of the tribes at the dedication of the tabernacle altar which, although it was a public celebration, was not part of the regular cult, but a one time affair.

Numbers, chapters 28-29 constitute a code of sacrifices for the various sacred occasions of the year. There it is stipulated that a *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, consisting of a goat (*śāʿīr*) was to be offered on every occasion except the Sabbaths and the daily *tāmīd*. An earlier priestly source, the liturgical calendar of Leviticus, chapter 23 (verse 19) ordains a *ḥaṭṭāʾt*, consisting of a *śāʿīr*, for the Pentecost. That prescription is probably not original to the calendar, but represents an interpolation from P.[137] We can conclude, on this basis, that the incorporation of the *ḥaṭṭāʾt*

---

[136] See Part II, n. 132, above.
[137] See Part I, ns. 126-31.

of the people into the observance of the festivals is an innovation of P. Ezekiel 45:21-25 also speaks of the *ḥaṭṭā't* as part of the festival ritual, and this is similarly indicated in Nehemiah 10:34.

This is actually all that we know about the utilization of this type of *ḥaṭṭā't* in regular, public ritual. II Kings 12:17 may allow us to conclude that in the reign of Joash (835-798 BCE) the *ḥaṭṭā't* was incorporated in festival ritual, but we cannot be certain of this merely from a brief statement on temple funds.

We should attempt to clarify on what basis the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the people was incorporated into the celebration of sacred occasions, and likewise, why the chiefs of the tribes offered such a sacrifice at the dedication of the tabernacle altar (Numbers, chapter 7). We are here speaking of a goat, and of a *ḥaṭṭā't* not intended to purify the sanctuary or the priesthood. We should note, at this point, that the *ḥaṭṭā't* consisting of a goat in the *kippûrîm* rites prescribed in Leviticus, chapter 16, represents an exceptional case. There, one of the goats provided by the people is offered as a *ḥaṭṭā't*, and the other became the scapegoat (verse 9). The disposition of the *goat-ḥaṭṭā't* is distinctive, in that part of its blood is brought inside the sanctuary in the same manner as the blood of the *bull-ḥaṭṭā't* provided by the priests (verse 15). What we have, in effect, is a singular instance of popular participation in the periodic purification of the sanctuary. The closest we come to this is in the purification from contamination by dead bodies (Numbers, chapter 19), where a large head of cattle, provided by the people, is disposed of in a similar manner. So it is that once a year a thorough purification of the sanctuary is undertaken, wherein both the priesthood, in its usual role, and the people at large provide animals for two purification rites, instead of one.

The answer to our query about the utilization of the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the people in public ritual has already been indicated in our earlier discussion of the two types of *ḥaṭṭā't*, and we need here only carry our conclusions a step or two further. We made particular reference to Leviticus, chapter 9, and to 10:16-20. This latter section spells out the ideology, so to speak, of the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the people as a gift to the priesthood in return for its services in securing expiation for the people (10:17). It speaks of the initiation of the tabernacle cult by the Aaronide priests subsequent to their investiture. The burden of 10:16-20 is to stress that the *ḥaṭṭā't* of the people was not to be burned to ashes and was not a riddance rite like the priestly *ḥaṭṭā't*. From this to the incorporation of this type of *ḥaṭṭā't* into regular,

public ritual is only a small step. What was appropriate at the dedication of the tabernacle altar and at the first officiation of the priests became appropriate for all special, sacred days. When the celebration of a sacred occasion was about to commence, it was incumbent on the people, at large, to provide a goat as *ḥaṭṭā't* to the priests, to be offered as a preliminary to the celebration, proper, so as to insure that inadvertent offenses which might detract from the efficacy of the celebration would be properly expiated. Such expiation was not required for Sabbaths or for daily worship. Only on less frequent, special occasions was it necessary.

THE TERM *ZEBAH* AND RELATED FORMS

We have consistently translated the term *zebaḥ* as "slain offering", although, in our opinion, some uncertainty exists as to the precise definition of this West Semitic term and its related verbal forms.

CADZ, 105-106 s.v. *zību* A relates the West Semitic verbal root *d/zbḥ* to Akkadian *zību* "food offering." If this relationship is correct, so states *CAD*, the West Semitic verbal and nominal forms would represent a specialization of the more general Akkadian connotation, since it appears that West Semitic *d/zbḥ* refers only to the slaughter of animals. *CAD* further notes that Akkadian *zību* is a synonym of *naptānu* "meal for the gods" in the lexical lists, and is attested from Old Babylonian on. The verb *qâdu* "to burn" is used in conjunction with *zību*, and this, together with the fact we have the composite term *zībī taklīme* suggests that it was probably a meat offering, cooked and then shown to the gods. *CADZ*, 84 further relates the verb *zebû* "to slaughter, sacrifice" to *zību* A, noting that it is a late Assyrianism appearing in a few Standard Babylonian texts. All of the above is differentiated from *zību* D (*CADZ*, 107) which means "incense", and is synonymous with *qutrinnu* "incense ofering" in a separate section of the lexical list, and is therefore unrelated to *zību* A.

We are not in a position to judge the conclusions of *CAD* on the relationship of *zību* A to West Semitic *d/zbḥ* and related forms, or on the differentiation of *zību* A from *zību* D. The verb *zebû* seems to us a clear case of West Semitic borrowing into Assyrian. Akkadian *naptānu*, the synonym of *zību* A was originally an accounting term, designating an allotment or ration of foodstuffs, either for cultic purposes or for agencies of the temple.[1]

From the West Semitic viewpoint we are in a better position to discuss *d/zbḥ* as a possible cognate of Akkadian *zību* A, and our observations to follow may serve to strengthen the proposed identification.

It would be accurate to state that biblical usage attests no instance where the verb *zābaḥ* or the noun *zebaḥ* refer explicitly to any manner

---

[1] On *naptānu* see B. A. Levine, W. W. Hallo, *HUCA* 38, 1967, 46, and n. 21, 55, s.v. kin. sig.

of sacrificing which did not involve or include the act of slaughter
performed on animals or fowl, or, in some extended contexts, on
humans. The same overall conclusion emerges from a survey of
Ugaritic literature, where predominant usage of *dbḥ*, the verb and
the noun, envisions the slaughter of animals and fowl, at times as
part of rites which also included libations, etc. There is, however, one
instance in Ugaritic literature of a divergent usage which may prove
significant. In *UT* 3, and its duplicate *UT* 173, one of the listed
offerings is:

dbḥ šmn mr šmn rqḥ

"An offering of oil of myrrh; of oil of mixed spices."[2]

This specification of the term *dbḥ* makes it clear that at Ugarit the
term *dbḥ* could be applied to offerings other than those directly in-
volving the slaughter of animals, fowl, etc. This single instance
becomes more enlightening for an accurate definition of West Semitic
usage when we note that the term *zbḥ šmn* occurs in the Punic tariffs
of a later date. Thus, in *CIS* i, 167, lines 9-10, we read:

qdmt] *qdšt w'l zbḥ ṣd w'l zbḥ šmn* [   ] [*'l bll w*]*'l ḥlb w'l*
zbḥ bmnḥt w'l [*kl zbḥ* . . .

—sacred first] fruits(?), and concerning an offering of *ṣd* or an offering
of oil [   ], [or one mixed with oil,] or of milk, and concerning
any of the grain offerings and concerning any offering...

Whereas in the parallel of the above passage appearing in *CIS* i,
165, line 12, the sense of *zbḥ šmn* might appear to be complicated by
the heading '*]l ṣpr*, in our version there is no reason to dispute the
translation "offering of oil." This is further supported by the more
general designation *zbḥ bmnḥt* which indicates that *zbḥ* was applicable
to grain offerings, as well. The term *bll*, which can only refer to a cake
or bisquit made with oil, also suggests that *šmn* means "oil" and not
animal fat.[3]

It is probable, therefore, that we have in Punic a usage of the

------

[2] See Whittaker, *Concordance* 179, s.v. *dbḥ* and UT 3:20, 173:22, and *ibid.*
glossary, no. 2532, and no. 3429. Gordon renders *šmn rqḥ* "perfumer's oil,"
(= *raqqābi*). We prefer our translation, for which cf. Eccl 10:1, and less explicitly,
Ex 30:25, 35.

[3] On *ṣd* possibly: "the hunt", see comment on Ugaritic *ṣd, mṣd*, by Ch. Virol-
leuad, *Ugaritica V*, 1968, 549, s.v. *UT* 601:1-2, and J. C. de Moor, *UF* I, 1969, 169,
s.v. obv. 1. On *bll* see B. A. Levine, *Lešōnēnû* (Hebrew), 30, 1965-66, 3-5. Punic
bll = Hebrew *bālál.*

term *zbḥ* which parallels that attested in Ugaritic, i.e. "food offering", a more generalized connotation than is evident in biblical Hebrew, and one more in line with Akkadian *zību* A. If we only had the Punic evidence, one could maintain that later usage in West Semitic simply became generalized all over again, and that this had little if any bearing on the early cognate identification of West Semitic *d/zbḥ* with Akkadian *zību*. The clear attestation of the term *dbḥ šmn* in Ugaritic indicates two things: (1) In early West Semitic usage *dbḥ* (subst.) was not limited to the act of slaughter, and (2) Punic usage of *zbḥ* (subst., verb) probably reflects a survival of early West Semitic usage. These considerations strengthen the case for taking Akkadian *zību* A as cognate to West Semitic *d/zbḥ*, but, if accepted, would require some modification of the statements in *CAD* on the usage of West Semitic in this connection.

APPENDIX II

PUNIC EVIDENCE FOR THE TERM *ŠLM*

The term *šlm kll* occurs several times in one of the Punic tariffs, *CIS* i, 165, discovered at Marseille, and usually dated to the fourth or third century, BCE.[1] The occurrence of this term in a distinctively ritual context, makes the Punic tariffs immediately relevant to our study of the biblical *šelāmîm*. The general content, terminology, and formulaic composition of the tariffs relates them fundamentally to the study of the biblical cult, especially the priestly codes of the Pentateuch.

It was only to be expected, therefore, that students of Israelite religion would tend to see in the Punic texts evidence on the origins of the Israelite cultic praxis. Although considerations of chronology would make the reverse appear to be more accurate, i.e. that Israelite praxis predated the Phoenician-Punic cult of a later age, it is to be assumed that the Punic tariffs incorporated earlier practices.

Like so much of the material in Leviticus and Numbers, the Punic tariffs are prescriptive texts which set forth the administrative procedures for presenting sacrificial animals and other *Opfermaterie* at the Carthiginian temple, including the payment of a tax to the priests, and the conveyance of other materials of value to them, in addition.

CIS i, 165, is the most elaborate of these texts. Its composition is important for an understanding of its distinctive and elusive terminology. The following excerpt, lines 3-4, is an example:

b'lp—kll, 'm ṣw't, 'm šlm kll:
lkhnm ksp 'šrt 10 b'ḥd.
wbkll ykn lm 'lt pn hmṣ't ẓ
š'r mšql šlš m't 300.
wbṣw't qṣrt wyṣlt.
wkn b'rt wbšlbm whp'nm,
w'bry hš'r lb'l ḥẓbḥ.[2]

---

[1] See *KAI*/I, 15-16, no. 69, and II, 83-7, for literature and commentary. Also see A. van den Branden, "Lévitique et le Tarif de Marseille, *CIS* i, 165," *RSO* 40, 1965, 107-30, for a recent treatment of the text. Also cf. *CIS* i, 166 (*KAI*/I, 16, no. 75), and *CIS* i, 167 (*KAI*/I, 16, no. 74), and Guzzo-Amadasi, M-6., *Studii Semitichi* 28, 1967, 129 f.

[2] We have inserted certain punctuation marks for greater clarity.

Translation:
In the case of a head of large cattle, whether offered as *kll*, *ṣw't*, or *šlm kll*: To the priests shall be paid silver in the amount of ten, 10, shekels for each one. In the case of the *kll*, they (= the priests) shall have, in addition to this tariff, meat in the weight of three hundred, 300, shekels. In the case of the *ṣw't*, the lower foreleg and the shoulder. The hides, the ribs, and the feet, and the rest of the meat shall be for the donor of the slain offering.[3]

This same formulation, introduced by the preposition *Beth*, is repeated throughout the code, each time a new class of animals, or a different kind of sacrificial object is discussed. The force of the introductory *Beth* has eluded scholars, because they searched for comparable usage in biblical Hebrew, and failed to find it, precisely. Actually, it is in Mishnaic Hebrew that we find the prefixed preposition *Beth* with a force most clearly applicable in these tariffs. The *Beth* is to be rendered: "In the case of; in the matter of ,"as we have translated it above. It then becomes obvious that the text is delineating a series of different cultic circumstances.[4]

---

[3] The terms *yṣlt*, *qṣrt*, and *šlbm* require comment. That *yṣlt* is a phonetic variant of ʾ*aṣlāh*/ʾ*aṣllôt* (Jer 38:12, Ezek 41:8), ʾ*aṣllê* (pl. const. Ezek 13:18), has been assumed for some time (*KAI*/II, 85, s.v. line 4). Similarly, it has been assumed that *šlbm* (variant: ʾ*šlbm*) means "ribs," *(ibid.)* The term *qṣrt* has been explained with less certainty, either as a variant of Akkadian *qurṣinnu*, Hebrew *qarṣôl* "ankle," or as cognate to Arabic *qaṣarat* "bottom of the neck," loosely rendered as "breast." (Dussaud, *Origines*, 148-9, *KAI*/II, *ibid*). As "ankle" *qṣrt* would represent essentially the same section of the animals as *p'nm*/*p'mm* "feet."

In this text we see clear evidence of the transposition of anatomical terminology and the vocabulary of the crafts. Thus, ʾ*aṣllôt*/ʾ*aṣllê*- (Jer 38:12, Ezek 13:18) are anatomical terms, with *yād* "hand," whereas ʾ*aṣllāh* in Ezek 41:8 is an architectural term, meaning "angle," or the like. Conversely, the term *šlbm* is an originally artisan term, meaning either "tier, ledge," (I Kings 7:28) or "rung, horizontal bar," as in *LH* (Tosefta, ed. Zuckermandel, *Kēlīm, Bābāʾ Meṣiʿāʾ* III:13, 581-2) where *šelābīn*/*šelūbīn* is in contrast to *'ômdīn* "uprights" in the description of an ornamental ladder for camels, and cf. Ex 26:17, 36:22 for denominative, *mešullāb*).

Now, *šlbm* has become an anatomical term in the Punic text, whereas anatomical *yṣlt* serves as an architectural term in Ezek 41:8, where, by the way, the anatomical term *ṣēlāʿ* "rib" has also become an architectural term! On this basis, we suggest seeking a meaning for *qṣrt* in the artisan vocabulary. In M. *Kēlīm* XVIII:5 we find three terms designating parts of a bed: a) *keraʿaim* "legs," an anatomical term (Ex 12:9, Lev 11:21). b) ʾ*arūkāh* "long slat," and c) *qiṣrāh* "short slat," the slat that goes the width of the bed. Therefore, we propose that *qṣrt* in the Punic text means: "the short legs," i.e. the hind legs, which are shorter on quadropeds. Precisely, *qṣrt* would designate that part of the hind legs above the hock (the part of the hind leg below the knee, which is very short). So, we now have *qṣrt wyṣlt* "the shank and the shoulder", as the portions assigned to the priests from the *ṣw't* sacrifice.

[4] See *NSI* 117, who calls this prep. *Beth* of reference, and *KAI*/II, 83, where it is translated: "beim." Actually, it is from *LH* that the precise sense comes. Cf.

The formula: *kll ʾm šwʿt ʾm šlm kll* has the force: "Whether A, or B, or C." The term *šwʿt* still defies a proper etymology. The term *kll* (Hebrew *kālîl*) connotes an offering "entirely" consumed by the fire, and it is unlikely that it meant something different in Punic.[5] It is clear that the quantities of flesh assigned to the priests in the case of the *kll* did not come from the sacrificial animals, themselves, which were burned completely. Whenever actual sections of sacrificial animals were assigned to the priests or to the donors they were specified as such, i.e. ribs, forelegs, etc., as in the case of the *šwʿt*, and were not listed by units of weight, as in the case of the *kll*.

It is the third term in the series, *šlm kll*, which concerns us here, particularly. We take it as a construct formation: "The *šlm* of the *kll*," i.e. the *šlm* which accompanied the *kll*. This interpretation was actually proposed long ago by W. Robertson-Smith, but subsequently disputed by G. A. Cooke on the grounds that if the *šlm* were a third type of sacrifice, the code would have stipulated with respect to it additional consignments to the priests, just as it did with respect to the *kll* and the *šwʿt*.[6]

The problem raised by Cooke can be met by a more exact application of the various clauses in the tariff. The key is the recurrent statement: *wkn bʿrt wbšlbm whpʿnm wʾḥry hšʾr lbʿl hzbḥ* "The hides, and the ribs, and the feet, and the rest of the meat shall be for the donor of the slain offering."

The question is: To which sacrifice or sacrifices does this statement apply? It is likely that it refers to all three types, the *kll*, *šwʿt*, and *šlm kll*, and not to the *šwʿt*, alone, as might appear to be the case. Let us consider the disposition of the *kll*: The hides of *kll* animals were not consumed by the sacrificial fire in the Punic rites. This is evidenced by *CIS* i, 167, lines 2-5, where it is stipulated that whether the sacrifice was a *kll* or a *šwʿt* offering, the hides went to the priests. Despite the contradiction in this matter between *CIS* i, 167 and text 165, which assigns the hides to the donors in every case, there is agreement on the fact that the hides were not burned as part of the *kll* sacrifice.

the frequent idiom: *bammeh debārîm ʾamûrîm* "In which circumstance do these statements apply? Answer: *Be*—"In the case of X." Also see M. *Bābā Batrāʾ* III:1 for a full series of items, all introduced by *Beth*, and cf. M. *Ḥullîn* I:6, III:1, *Temûrāh* II:i, 3, VII:1, *Kēlîm* V:1.

[5] On the possible relationship of *kālîl/kll* to Egyptian *grr*, Coptic *glil* see Dussaud, *Origines*, 159-62, and Schmid, *Bundesopfer*, 50.

[6] W. Robertson-Smith, *op. cit.*, 237, n. 1, and *NSI*, 118.

On a comparative basis, it is noteworthy that in the disposition of the biblical *ʿōlāh* the hide was stripped off of the animal before the animal was sectioned and placed on the altar fire (Leviticus 1:7). According to one prescription, the hide of the *ʿōlāh* went to the officiating priest (*ibid.* 7:8), which corresponds to *CIS* i, 167, as against text 165, which assigns the hides to the donor.[7]

In effect, this means that the statement: *wkn hʿrt*, etc. could apply to the *kll* and to the *šlm kll*, and not to the *ṣwʿt*, alone, on the following basis: In the case of the *kll*, only the hides went to the donors, because there was no remaining meat at all. In the case of the *ṣwʿt*, certain remaining sections of the animal went to the donor, in addition to the hides. In the case of the *šlm kll* the designation *wʾhry hšʾr* "the rest of the meat" would apply to all sections of the animals not consumed by the fire, none of which went to the priests. In effect, the donor would receive all of the edible sections of the flesh, as well as the hides. This was also the rule in the case of a bird offering (line 11), where only a payment in silver was to be conveyed to the priests, and no more.

We concede that the formulation of the Punic tariffs is somewhat loose, but our proposed interpretation would seem to be supported by *CIS* i, 165, line 11:

> *bṣpr ʾgnn ʾm ṣṣ: šlm kl [l] ʾm šṣp ʾm ḥẓt lkhnm ...*

In the case of a bird, whether in the bowl (?), or *ṣṣ*: Whether *šlm kll,* or *ṣṣp,* or display offering (?), to the priests, etc.

Here the *šlm kll* appears as the first in a series, and is clearly a separate sacrifice. It is likely, therefore, that the statement: *wkn hʿrt,* etc. is a summary clause, variously applicable to all three types of sacrifices, as we have explained above. If so, the *šlm kll* was not without its own specifications as to the assignment of its parts, and Cooke's objection would be answered.

It is possible, of course, that the composite term *šlm kll* represents not a construct formation, but rather an instance of attribution: "a whole *šlm*," or the like. The problem is that, based on usage known from Ugaritic and Hebrew, *kll,* as an adjective, does not bear a quantitative sense, such as "whole, complete, not partial," etc., but a qualitative sense: "perfect, without fault," similar to Hebrew *tāmîm*

---

[7] Only in the case of certain types of *ḥaṭṭāʾt* was the hide of the sacrificial animal to be burned, and then outside the camp, and not as part of an altar rite, proper (Lev 4:11-12, 21, 16:27, Nu 19:35). See Part II, ch. VI.

"without blemish." If we were to render *šlm kll* "the perfect *šlm*" we would be advancing two different meanings and syntactic positions for the same word, *kll*, in the same clause, which is unlikely. We prefer, therefore, to take *šlm kll* as a construct formation. The Punic *šlm* was so termed because it usually, although not always accompanied the *kll*.

In our discussion of the Ugaritic evidence relevant to the history of the term *šelāmîm* we noted the possibility that Punic *šlm* had an Ugaritic precursor, *šlmm kll* in *UT* 611, lines 9-10.[8] In any event, it is quite clear that Punic *šlm*, the singular, is equivalent to biblical *šelem* in Amos 5:22.

---

[8] See Part I, n. 24.

OBSERVATIONS ON *K-P-R* IN SOME SEMITIC LANGUAGES

(1) We adhere to the breakdown of the Akkadian evidence which we first proposed in *EI* 9, 1968, 91, n. 20, with certain refinements and additions. *AHw* (442-3, s.v. *kapāru* I) is incorrect in combining *kapāru* "to trim, cut," with *kapāru* "to wipe off," etc. The separation of these two roots was demonstrated by Landsberger (*Date Palm*, 30 f.) and followed by *CADK* 178-80, s.v. *kapāru* A, as distinguished from *kapāru* B. The lexical evidence certainly supports this differentiation.

Now, whereas *CADK* is correct in this analysis, there remains some uncertainty about *AHw*'s postulation of an independent root, its *kapāru* II, a denominative of *kupru* "bitumen". Some observations lead us to question *CADK* in this regard, in favor of *AHw*, *CADK*'s meaning 2, under *kapāru* A is: "to smear on (a paint or liquid)." Forms attested under this meaning are functions of the *G*-stem (*ka-pé-ir*, *ka-ap-ru*, *ta-kap-par*, and *N*-stem *ik-kap-par*). There is no *D*-stem meaning predicated on *G*-stem: "to smear on-." There is also the fact that, except for a single citation, occurrences of this meaning are limited to the application of *kupru*, or to more complex activities involving the use of bituminous substances along with other similar materials. The only exception refers to the applying of medications on teeth. It seems reasonable, therefore, that meaning 2 could be just as well be taken as a denominative of *kupru*. If so, we would also have to assign the derivative *kāpiru* "caulker" (*CADK* 183-4) to the denominative *kapāru* rather than to *kapāru* A, *contra CADK*, 178.

Whether or not we are correct on this point, it is clear that Akkadian *kapāru* A, *D*-stem *kuppuru* does not mean "to cover", for which Akkadian has *katāmu* (*CADK* 298 f.). [Perhaps we should note the curious circumstance, which may or may not be significant, that certain forms of *katāmu* (such as the present future, written *i-ka-tam*) could have been misread *i-ka-par*, since the *UD* sign has both values.] If, indeed, a denominative *kapāru* does exist, its meaning would be limited to smearing on bitumen, and related actions, and would not mean "to cover."

(2) Just as Akkadian fails to attest the sense: "to cover" for *kapāru*, so, too, does biblical Hebrew for *kippēr*. This evidence is discussed in

Part II, chapter I. What is more, the sense: "to cover" is not clearly attested in Late Hebrew or Aramaic, to our knowledge. In passing, we note that Jean-Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire* 126, s.v. *k-p-r* I, lists the occurrence of a probable verbal form in *AP* 37:14: *kpr PN* "He pardoned *PN*," i.e. a particular obligation was waived .(Cf. in *LH*, *māḥal* in this sense, and see Levy, *Wörterbuch* III, 75-6, and *ibid.* 76, s.v. *meḥīlāh*). Also listed is a Palmyrene passage (*CIS* ii, 3913) where a probable *Paʿʿēl*, 3rd perf. pl. occurs: *ʾp ʿln kprw dy mks lʾ gbn* "Even for them they granted exemption; that they do not collect impost."

Thus far, we see no real change from earlier usage. The forms *kpr*, *kprw* in Aramaic merely convey the notion that *kôper* was allowed, so to speak. In fact, these Aramaic forms are probably denominatives from a noun, the Aramaic form of *kôper*. On the other hand, *LH* and Jewish-Aramaic introduce both new meanings and new forms associated with the root *k-p-r*. Sources of a later date in these languages also continue to attest earlier meanings already noted for Akkadian and Hebrew. First of all we have in *LA* the sense! "to wipe off", both in the *Peʿal* and the *Paʿʿēl* stems (Cf. Levy, *Wörterbuch* II, 386, s.v. *kepar* (v), meaning 2, and *kappēr* (v), meaning 2). Also see, in our Part II, n. 20. It is of interest to note *LA kûprāʾ* "palmbranch" (*ibid.* II, 389), which harks back to Akkadian *kapāru* B.

As for *LH* and *LA kippēr/kappēr*, and *LH hitkappēr/nitkappēr* in connotations which pertain to "expiation, atonement, substitution," etc., they must mean whatever we decide *kippēr* and related forms mean in *BH*. Since lexicographers assume that *kippēr* meant "to cover(up/over)," they carry over this meaning to *LH* and *LA*, including Aramaic *kûprāʾ* (= Hebrew *kôper*" ransom, expiation gift"), Aramaic *kippûrāʾ*, and Aramaistic *kappārāh* "expiation", etc. If, as we maintain, the notion of expiation conveyed by the root *k-p-r* is unrelated to "covering", these later forms do not really attest such meanings, at all, but rather continue with the notion of "wiping off" the sins, thus purifying and cleansing them.

In *LH* and *LA* we first encounter the connotation: "to deny, disavow," etc. in the *Qal/Peʿal* stem (and in the *Hipʿîl* "to cause one to deny; to make an unbeliever out of one"), but never in the *Piʿʿēl/Paʿʿēl*, and related stems. We also have nominal forms, such as *kepîrāh* "denial, disbelief" (cf. *kaprānût*), and *kaprān, kaprānît* liar, denial", all of which are based on the simple stem. (Cf. Levy, *Wörterbuch* II, 386, 389-90).

The context of such connotations is essentially legal, and pertains

to the disavowal of debts or other material obligations. *Kāpar* functions as an antonym of *hôdāh* "to admit, acknowledge, confess." The syntax is significant: *kāpar* + *b-* "He made a denial in the matter of-, with respect to-". This usage of the preposition *Beth* is distinctive in *LH* and *LA* (Cf. Appendix II, n. 7, for this usage of prepositional *Beth* in the Punic tariffs). An extension of the legal context is the theological connotation: "to deny"-the basic belief in the deity *(kāpar be'iqqār)*, and similar characterizations. (Also cf. Syriac *kepar* in *Lex Syr*[2] 340 f.)

The question now is: What is the derivation of this set of connotations in *LH* and *LA*? It is likely that it represents a semantic development of earlier usage in *BH* and Aramaic. The sense: "to deny," etc. is derivative, indeed denominative of the substantive *kôper* "ransom, substitution, expiation payment," and by extension: "bribe." As we noted in Part II, chapter III, *BH* probably developed a *Pi''ēl* denominative, *kippēr*, from *kôper*, most notably expressed in the idiom: *kippēr 'al nepeš*" to serve as *kôper* for a life" (Cf. Part II, n. 36). In a parallel way, *LH* and *LA* developed a simple-stem denominative *kāpar/kepar* "to seek release from an obligation surreptitiously, by means of bribe or payoff; to conceal the fact of an obligation by deceit or bribery." The antonym, *hôdāh* "to avow, admit, acknowledge," is instructive, because in *BH hôdāh 'al* means "to confess, to admit the existence of," thus: "to expose, bring to light," etc. At this point, *kāpar* does not actually mean: "to cover," but only "to conceal," as a means of buying one's self off; of preventing others from knowing, etc. Talmudic usage does not attest the meaning "to cover" in any other context for the root *k-p-r*, any more than *hôdāh* can convey the nuance of "revealing" in any context except the exposing of facts, sins, obligations, etc. It is therefore our conclusion that *LH* and *LA kāpar/kepar* and related forms in the sense: "to deny," etc. represent a semantic development from *BH kôper*, and the comparable Aramaic form.

(3) Arabic attests a more complex situation. The following meanings are attested for what is generally taken to be a single root: a) *kafara*, II-form *kaffara*, and also V-form: "to cover, shroud, conceal." Thus: to place a cloak over a thing; to cover, as the clouds cover the sky, or as darkness shrouds the night with its blackness; to cover with one's arms. etc. (Cf. *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache*, Lief. 5, Wiesbaden, 1964, 261 f.s.v. *kafara*, meaning 1., and also cf. *ibid*. 264, s.v. *kafrun* "covering"). b) *kafara* "to be ungrateful,"—to a person,

etc. (*ibid.*, meaning 2). It occurs to us that this connotation in Arabic is a reflex of *LH* and *LA* usage, where *hôdāh*, the antonym of *kāpar*, has two aspects: "to admit, avow," etc., and "to be grateful, to offer thanks," etc. So, Arabic assigned the aspect of ingratitude to the antonym, *kafara*. Note that in Syriac *'âudî* generally means: "to confess, praise, thank" (Cf. *Lex. Syr*[2] 296, s.v.) .This connotation is also attested in III-form, and note the noun *kufrun* "ingratitude," and the adj. *kafurun* "ungrateful."

A sub-meaning of b) is: "to be, or become a disbeliever," a connotation already noted for *LH* and *LA*. In II-form the sense is: "to call a person a disbeliever, to accuse a person of disbelief." Cf. in *LH* the *Hip'îl* factitive: *hikpîr* (Levy, *Wörterbuch* II, 384, s.v.). Also note nominal *kufrun* "unbelief."

c) *Kaffara*, II-form: "to expiate, to atone," etc. Also: "to bow with reverence," an obvious extension of the notion of seeking atonement or forgiveness. Now, the lexica associate this meaning with the notion of covering, in line with accepted interpretations of *k-p-r* in Hebrew and Aramaic, to which this root is traced. Significantly, however, it is precisely in this meaning that ambiguities arise. Lane, for example, is undecided as to whether *kaffara* "to expiate," etc., means to cover the sins or to remove them, erase them (*Lane's Arabic-English Lexicon*, Book I, Part 7, 1885, 2620 s.v. *kafara*, meaning 2). In other words, we again encounter traditional etymology, just as we did in *LH* and *LA*, and in biblical exegesis, as well.

In the case of Arabic there is a difference, however. Whereas we can explain etymologies of *kafara* and *kaffara* which predicate the meaning "to cover" in contexts of expiation, etc., what can we say about the general sense "to cover" in contexts divorced from that set of ritual and religious notions? It is in Arabic that we first encounter what appears to be an emancipated connotation: "to cover," for the root *kafara*, and related forms. It is definitely possible that we have homonyms, and that *kafara* "to cover" bears no real relationship to *kafara* "to be ungrateful, to expiate," etc. After all, in Arabic, as in the other languages we have examined here, consonantal *k-p-r* admits of several unrelated roots.

If *kafara* "to cover" —with a cloak, with darkness, etc. is, indeed, related to *k-p-r/ kafara* "to expiate, disavow," etc. in Arabic and in Hebrew and Aramaic, it would represent a further semantic development from Hebrew *koper*, Aramaic *kupra* "ransom," hence: "bribe," and would be expressive of the notion of concealment, in legal and

religious contexts, then generalized to apply to "covering", whatever the context.

We cannot adequately account for all of the phenomena evident in Arabic, and our treatment of LH and *L*A also reveals some areas of uncertainty. It is clear to us, nonetheless, that the notion of "covering" whenever related to the same root which conveys the notion of expiation, represents a semantic development, and not the *Grundbedeutung* of a root, *k-p-r*.

NOTES ON CERTAIN TERMS FOR SACRIFICE

In this appendix, we have brought together detailed discussions of three terms: 'āšām, zebaḥ hayyāmîm, and zibḥê ṣedeq. Each is problematic in its own way, and we will attempt to propose new solutions to the problems which these terms evidence.

1) 'āšām "penalty, expiatory payment."

In Part II, ch. V, attention focused on the function of the 'āšām sacrifice as an ingredient in the Israelite cult. Here our interest is in the meaning of the term, itself; in etymology and semantic development. If we could identify the precise concept or concepts embodied in the root '-š-m we would be in a position to answer several relevant questions: a) On what basis was a specific cultic offering called 'āšām? b) On what basis was '-š-m meaningful as a theophorous element in West Semitic personal names and divine epithets (such as 'šmbyt'l)? c) What, if any connection obtains between forms of the root '-š-m and the name of the Phoenician-Punic deity 'šmn? (There is also the problem of biblical 'ašîmā' in II Kings 17:30).

The onomastic evidence is only of limited use in attacking the problems of etymology. Perhaps the best method would be to compare '-š-m with ḥ-r-m. Both attest the same position in West Semitic personal names ('šmbyt'l-ḥrmbyt'l), and in biblical literature both roots reflect a common frame of reference. This method was used to advantage by Michael Silverman in his study of the onomasticon of Elephantine (M. H. Silverman, *Jewish Personal Names in the Elephantine Documents*, University Microfilms, 1967, 195-201), and by Yehezkel Kaufmann in interpreting the problematic characterization 'ašmat šômrôn in Amos 8:14 (Kaufmann, *Tôledôt* III, 72-3). Kaufmann suggested that 'ašmat šômrôn was not a derogatory characterization, but an accepted manner of referring to divinities, to be compared with 'šmbyt'l and ḥrmbyt'l at Elephantine. He rendered be'ašmat šômrôn "by the divinity of Samaria," and proposed an original reading: be'ašam šômrôn. Kaufmann was "reaching." So as to avoid the conclusion that Northern Israelites were taking oaths by pagan deities, he posited a divine epithet instead of a distinct, divine name. On other grounds, Silverman (*op. cit.* 197 f.) arrived at a similar con-

clusion regarding the names *'šmbyt'l* and *ḥrmbyt'l* at Elephantine, a point to be discussed further on.

The comparison of *'ašām* and related forms with *ḥērem* and related forms in *BH* is instructive. The semantic development observable in the case of *ḥ-r-m* indicates that a term designating a class of personnel (Akkadian *ḥarīmtu* "prostitute", probable denominative *ḥarāmu* "to separate, cloister," in *CADḤ* 89, 101, s.v. *ḥarīmtu*) develops into a designation for devoted or proscribed materials, areas, and persons. (Cf. Arabic *ḥaram* "sacred enclosure"). This development is analogous to what we observe in the case of the root *q-d-š*, where a personnel classification (Akkadian *qadištu* "priestess, harlot" Ugaritic *qdšm* "priests" cf. Hebrew *qedēšāh, qādēš*) develops into a designation for sacred persons, places, materials (*BH qôdeš, qādôš*), and is even attested as a noun meaning "a deity" in *BH* and in Aramaic *qdšn* "deities" (B. A. Levine, *EJ* 10, 866-87, s.v. Kedushah). For *ḥ-r-m* also note the Nabatean evidence *apud* Jean-Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire* 96, s.v. *ḥrm* I and II. Some aspects of the *ḥērem* are discussed by A. Malamat, *Yeheẓkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume*, ed. M. Haran, 1960, 149-158.

In *BH* the term *ḥērem* can connote either that which was condemned to extinction or destruction under the terms of the holy war of conquest (Dt 7:26, 13:16-18, Jos 6:13, 17-18, 7:1-2, 13, 15, 22:20, I Sam 15:21, and possibly I Kings 20:42, and I Chron 2:7); or that which was proscribed for any use except what was duly ordained as proper cultic use (Lev 27:21, 28-9, Nu 18:14, Ezek 44:29). Denominative verbal forms in the *Hip'îl* and *Hop'al* also reflect the idiom of the holy war ideology (Dt 2:31-4, f., 3:1-6, 20:16-17, Jos 10:1, 37-9, Jud 1:17, 21:11, and also Nu 21:3, I Chron 4:41, in addition to sources already cited above). Also cf. in the *Mēša'* inscription, line 17 (*KAI/*I, 33, no. 181:17), where the *Hip'îl* of *ḥ-r-m* connotes destruction in the context of a war conducted under the aegis of *Kemôš*. It is noteworthy that the *Mēša'* inscription reveals other associations with the biblical holy war ideology. Thus, *Kemôš* becomes enraged at his people (*'ānap*, in lines 5-6), and delivers them into the hand of their enemies, just as Yahweh becomes enraged at the Israelites (*hit'annap* in Dt 9:8, II Kings 17:18) and hands them over to their enemies. In biblical literature, forms of the verb *ḥ-r-m* also appropriate more extended, though related contexts (Ex 22:19—idolatry; Isa 34:2, Jer 25:9, 50:26, 51:3, and for nominal *ḥērem*, Isa 34:5, 43:28, Zech 14:1, Mal 3:24). So, whereas there is a certain lack of clarity on the etymological level, there is enough to indicate

that *BH ḥērem*, connotes that which is devoted or proscribed, or condemned.

Although we lack sufficient data regarding the root *'-š-m*, it is reasonable to assume that *'āšām* is a term originally designating devoted objects, and that in a manner analogous to *ḥērem*, it was hypostasized, so that it came to connote a characteristic of divinity, "taboo, devotion, sanctity," or the like, and as such was appropriate as a divine epithet, and even as a divine name, as we shall see. To demonstrate this development, we must study various forms of *'-š-m* in *BH*, since this is really the only source of information available. Arabic *'aṭām* "guilt, sin, fine," is clearly derivative (See *HuAL* 92).

The *'āšām* was what the deity expected to be devoted to him if and when he was seriously offended, as when something belonging to him or under his protection was misappropriated. This is evident from the account of the Philistine *'āšām* (I Sam, ch. 6) already discussed in Part II, ch. v. That the noun *'āšām* could connote a devoted person or object is further indicated by a telling passage, II Chron. 28:9-16:

> For behold, only out of the wrath of Yahweh against Judah did he give them over into your hand, and you killed among them with a rage that reached the heavens! And now, you further intend to subjugate residents of Judah and Jerusalem for yourselves as male and female slaves, Verily, those whom you have with you are *devoted persons* (*'āšāmōt*) to Yahweh, your God. Now, then, obey me and restore the captives whom you have taken, for the wrath of Yahweh is against you!
>
> There arose men, of the chiefs of the Ephraimites ... and said to them: Do not bring the captives here, for you would (bring) against us the punishment of Yahweh (*'ašmat YHWH*), so as to add to our offenses and to our guilt (*'ašmātēnû*), for we have great guilt, and there is wrath against Israel!

These are the words of a prophet named *Oded* to the Northern Israelites after they had waged war against Judah, then ruled by Ahaz. The Ephraimites heeded his warning, and the Judean captives were released, and permitted to clothe themselves from the spoils, and feed themselves and their children.

The Judean captives are called *'āšāmōt* (pl. of masc. *'āšām*) because Yahweh had taken them under his protection, and their use was therefore proscribed. This passage also reveals the semantic transactions attendant upon the fem. noun *'ašmāh*.

The Qal of the root *'-š-m* with stative force, may operatively connote misfortune or ruin as forms of punishment and penalization. In effect,

'-*š-m* often means "to be in a state of misfortune", or: "ruin". This is clearly attested in Hos 4:15, 10:2, despite certain difficulties inherent in those passages. It is also indicated in Isa 24:6, Jer 2:3, Joel 1:18, Ps 5:11, 34:23. In Ezek 6:6, *ye'ešmû* is synonymous with *yeḥerbû* "they will be destroyed." In that verse, orthographic *tyšmnh*, pointed *tišāmnāh* probably represents *y-š-m* as a variant of '-*š-m*, yielding pausal *tiššāmnāh*. This is preferable to assuming a confusion with *š-m-m*, despite the recurrence of *š-m-m* in what appears to be a version of the same oracle in Lev 26:1-2.

There are, after all, instances of nominal forms which seem to connote misfortune and ruin. Thus, Ps 68:22: "For God will strike the heads of his enemies, the pate of the hair; He walks about among his (i.e. the enemy's) ruins *(ba'ašāmâu)*." Similarly, Jer 51:5: "For Israel is not a widower, nor is Judah, from its God, from Yahweh of Hosts; for their land (i.e. the land of the Babylonians) is full of ruin *('ašām)*, wrought by the God of Israel." Conceivably, *'ašmāh* may mean "misfortune", as in Lev 4:3: "If the annointed priest commit an offense *to the misfortune of the people(le'ašmat hā'ām)*." The notion is that errors by the cultic head of the people may result in misfortune, which, in turn, prompts an investigation into cultic procedures, disclosing the inadvertent offense.

Now we come to our second question: On what basis is '-*š-m* meaningful as a theophorous element in West Semitic personal names and divine epithets? Silverman pretty well covers the subject (*op. cit*, 198 f., 277, n. 35). He suggests that *ḥ-r-m* and '-*š-m* are "hypostases of concepts connected with divinity," whereby persons and objects have been "raised to divine status." The fact that the operative connotation of misfortune and destruction is associated with *ḥ-r-m* and '-*š-m* might indicate that deities so characterized were thought of as punitive, not in a negative sense, but in terms expressive of their power.

There remains the question of whether '-*š-m* ever became a distinct, divine name, going beyond the stage of hypostasis reflected in the divine epithet. Silverman thinks not (*op. cit.*, 197 f.), a conclusion he bases on a positional analysis of the names *ḥrmbyt'l* and *'šmbyt'l* at Elephantine. Since *byt'l* seems to be distinct, divine name and not a toponym, Silverman concludes that *ḥrm-* and *'šm-* must be epithets. He therefore dismisses any identification with the Phoenician-Punic deity *'šmn*, and also with the problematic biblical name *'ašimā'* (II Kings 17:30, and see Silverman, *op. cit.*, 196-7). As regards *'ašimā'* we admit

difficulties, and concede that the name may be a distortion. (See
H. Beinart, *EB* (Hebrew), I, 1955, 762, and J. Tigay, *EJ* 3, 711). As
regards Phoenician-Punic *'šmn* we must differ with Silverman.

The positional argument breaks down when we consider the name
'ntbyt'l (cf. *'ntyhw*). All of the proposed explanations of the component
'nt as anything other than a distinct, divine name seem to us faulty,
and indeed, Silverman himself doubts them (*op. cit.*, 142-3, s.v. *'nt*).
So, we are forced to conclude that the positional argument is not
compelling. Phoenician-Punic *'šmn* reflects *'šm* + the characterizing
afformative *-ān*, which shifted to *-ôn*, and later to *-ûn*, in Phoenician
and Punic. This is reflected in the transcriptions *Esmounos* and *Asmu-
nis*. (Cf. Z. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (*AOS* 8),
1936, 58, 82-3, and note the composite names *'šmnmlk̩rt*, *-'štrt*, *-m'rḫ*,
and cf. J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (*An. Or.* 46), 1970,
99, and Vincent, *Religion*, 658, and n. 7). It is unlikely that *'šmn*
derives from *šmn* "eight" with a prothetic *'Aleph*. The sense of *'šmn*
would be: "devoted, taboo, sacred." It is therefore possible that
Elephantine *'šmn* (cf. Silverman, *op. cit.*, 100, 110, 118) is identical
with Phoenician-Punic *'šmn*, but we cannot be certain. The same goes
for *ḥrmbyt'l* and *'šmbyt'l*. It is possible that Silverman is correct in
seeing them as sentence names: "*Bêt'el* is devoted, sacred," etc. On
the other hand, there is no reason why they cannot be taken as
composite names. This interpretation would be supported by the
occurrence of the name *'šmšlk* "*'šm* has saved," to be compared
with *šmšlk* "*Šamaš* has saved" (cf. Silverman, *op. cit.*, 156-7, and also
the names *'šmšzb*, *'šmrm*, *'šmkdry*, *ibid.* 118, 125, 132-3, 151-2). For
further treatment of these names see B. Porten, *Archives from Elephan-
tine*, 332, Vincent, *Religion*, 654-80, Grelot, *Documents*, 464, 471. Also
see J. Contineau, *Le Nabatéen* II, 1932, 46, and M. Lidzbarski, *Hand-
buch der Nord-semitische Epigraphik* I, 1962, 228-9, for possible relevance
of Nabatean *'tmw*. Also see M. Silverman, *JAOS* 89, 1969, 691 f.

However far we carry the hypostasis of Elephantine *'šm* as a com-
ponent in personal names, it can be assumed that there is an intrinsic
relationship between the term for sacrifice, *'ašām*, the theophorous
element in Elephantine names, and the name of the Phoenician-Punic
deity, *'šmn*.

2. *zebaḥ hayyāmîm* "the annual slain offering" (I Sam 1:21, 2:19, 20:6).

The most comprehensive recent study on this term is by M. Haran,
VT 19, 1969, 11-22, and now in the collection of his studies, *Ages*

and Institutions in the Bible (Hebrew), 1972, 91-7, and the *addendum, ibid.* 105-7, on the term *zbḥ ymm* in the Phoenician royal inscription from Karateppe. The relevant passage in the Karateppe text reads as follows:

> *wylk ⟨'nk⟩ zbḥ lkl hmskt zbḥ ymm 'lp wb't ḥrš š*
> *wb't qṣr š*

> I brought slain offerings to all of the images. As an annual slain offering-large cattle, and in the season of ploughing—small cattle, and in the season of reaping—small cattle (*KAI/*I, 6, no. 26, AII:19-III:2, C IV:2-5).

The king, in the course of recounting the accomplishments of his reign, boasts of his devotion to the pantheon. The immediate context, which speaks of seasonal sacrifices favors the interpretation of *ymm* as "annual", comparable to *zebaḥ hayyāmîm* in the biblical accounts of I Samuel. The singular forms, *'lp*, and *š*, are probably to be taken as collectives, and the same is true of sing. *zbḥ* in the beginning of the statement, and we have so translated these terms.

Haran had made no reference whatsoever to the Karateppe inscription in his earlier study, and now that he has taken notice of it, he virtually dismisses its comparative relevance through arguments which seem to us methodologically questionable and sophistic. The following observations are pertinent:

(1) Haran concludes that *zebaḥ hayyāmîm* did not represent technical usage, nor was it a precise term, but merely an incidental handle, applied to a family custom. As such, one would not expect to find it in a royal inscription (*op. cit. addendum*, 107). The fact is that *yāmîm* in the sense of "a year-full of days" represents technical usage in biblical Hebrew, and is not incidental at all. Thus, in Lev 25:29 *yāmîm* means "year", i.e. a lapse of one year since the date of a sale. The redundancy in that verse is explanatory: *'ad tôm šenat mimkārô* "until a year has elapsed since its sale" (*NJV, ad loc.*). Also cf. Gen 24:55: *yāmîm 'ô 'āśôr* "a year or ten months," *pace NJV*). In Mishnaic terminology one would say: *šānîm -miyyôm leyôm* "years-reckoned from day to day," i.e. from a certain date in one year until a full year later (*M. Bābā' Batrā'* III:1, etc.). This is one of several defintions given in the Mishnah to the term *šānāh*, which can connote a season, a crop yield, etc. The adverbial construction *miyyāmîm yāmîmāh* (Ex 13:10, Jud 11:40, 21:19, I Sam 1:3, 2:19) means: "each year," literally: from one year until the same time the following year. Cf. II Chron 21:19.

The Hebrew term *zebaḥ hayyāmîm* is a const. formation, and is

determinate. The indeterminate state would be *zebah yāmîm*, the very term which occurs in the Karatteppe text. The fact that the Hebrew term is determinate means that there was a specifically identified slain offering by that name. Contrast *zebah mišpāhāh* in 1 Sam 20:29, which is indeterminate (Cf. 20:6).

Now, determination of the second element in a const. formation is attested in the Phoenician of Karatteppe, after *kl* (A I:9: *kl hr'*, 19: *kl hmlkm*; A II:19-III:1: *lkl hmskt*, etc. As a whole, however, determination is used more sparingly in the Phoenician of Karatteppe than in normative biblical Hebrew. Thus, in A I:8: *b'br b'l w'lm* "for the benefit of Baal and the gods" would, in a Hebrew rendition yield: *wehā'ēlîm*. It is therefore difficult to ascertain whether formally indeterminate *zbh ymm* referred to a known annual offering, or whether the king is merely stating that he brought a slain offering every year. In any case, we must dispute Haran's relegation of the Hebrew term *zebah hayyāmîm* to incidental usage.

(2) Assuming, for the purpose of argument, that Haran is essentially correct in stressing the limited, family character of *zebah hayyā-mîm*, what is to prevent the operative notion of an annual offering from serving the ritual needs of a king, alongside those of individuals and private families? After all, Solomon offered *'ôlôt* and *šelāmîm* three times a year in the Jerusalem temple as an act of private devotion (I Kings 9:25), and yet we know that these two types of offerings had a wide range of functions both in private and public ritual. In the case of the *šelāmîm* we have gone to considerable lengths to demonstrate that it was a sacrifice particularly appropriate for royal and/or national celebrations, but also for private votives. So, Haran's discussion of *zebah hayyāmîm* (*op. cit.*, *addendum*, 100) turns out to be yet another instance where he begs the overworked distinction between "popular" and "folkloristic"; and royal, official, and priestly. (See Levine, *Prolegomenon*, xxxix, n. 11).

(3) As an aside, it is relevant to note that Haran misses the precise force of *wylk* in Karatteppe A II:19, which he takes as an elliptical 3rd person form (*op. cit.*, *addendum*, 105). Actually, *wylk*, the *Yip'il* inf. abs. with *Waw* consecutive conveys the 1st person annalistic style evident in A I:1-III:2, and the pronoun *'nk* is to be understood following *wylk*, consistent with the series of inf. abs, + *'nk*, beginning in A II:17. (See *KAI*/II, 42, for this interpretation). From A III:3, the text switches to the 3rd person chronistic style, a shift frequent in royal inscriptions, Assyrian as well as Phoenician.

In conclusion, we see no problem in acknowledging the relatedness of Karateppe *ẕbḥ ymm* to biblical *ẕebaḥ hayyāmîm*, allowing of course, for development, and for the multi-functional nature of sacrifices, generally.

3. *ẕibḥê ṣedeq* "slain offerings given as a rightful gift", i.e. offerings rightfully due the deity (Dt 33:19, Ps 4:6, 51:21)

For some time, we had interpreted *ẕibḥê ṣedeq* as "slain offerings of victory/deliverance." In Isa 51:5 *ṣedeq* is parallel to *yeša'* "deliverance." Cf. Isa 58:8. In Jer. 23:5-6, 33:15-16 we have the notion that the God of Israel will be proclaimed *YHWH ṣidqēnû* "Yahweh is our deliverance" (perhaps: *ṣadîqēnû* "our victor/deliverer"). From lecture notes of Prof. H. L. Ginsberg's seminar in Deutero-Isaiah we recall that he suggests reading *ṣadîq* instead of *ṣedeq* in Isa 41:2: "Who has aroused a *victor/deliverer* from the East?" (Cf. Isa 45:21: *ṣadîq||môšî'a* "deliverer", and also *ibid.* 49:24, and possibly Zech 9:9. Isa 24:16 requires further study to determine whether *ẕemîrôt* reflects Ugaritic *ḏmr*, a class of troops, guards, (*UT*, glossary, no. 727, and cf. N. Sarna, HTR 57, 1964, 347-52, and literature cited). Similarly, fem. *ṣedāqāh* means "victory, deliverance," in a number of contexts. Cf. Jud 5:11, I Sam 12:8, Isa 46:12, 54:17, Micah 6:8, and see Ben-Yehudah, *Dictionary*, VI, 5398-99, s.v. *ṣedāqāh* 4. In any event, *ẕibḥê ṣedeq* would mean offerings brought in celebration of victory or deliverance.

From a fresh reading of the *Têmā'* inscription, we are prepared to relinquish this definition, not because it is problematic, but simply because we have found one better!

Aramaic *ṣidqetā'* in the *Têmā'* inscription means "grant" (line 15). This text is usually dated to the fifth century BCE, or thereabouts, and speaks of the introduction of the worship of a new deity at *Têmā'*, on which occasion the gods of the city *made grants* (line 11, restored: *ṣ[dq]w, Pa'ēl,* 3rd perf. pl.) to the priest:

> *wh' ẕ' ṣdqt' ẕy y[hbw] ṣlm ẕy mḥrm wšngl' w'šyr' 'lhy tym' lṣlm*
> *ẕy hgm' [ ] mn ḥql' dqln 16 wmn šymt' ẕy mlk' dqln 5 . . .*

And this is the *grant* which *ṣlm ẕy mḥrm, šngl'* and *'šyr',* the gods of *Têmā'* gave to *ṣlm ẕy hgm*: From the field, 16 date palms, and from the king's treasury, 6 date palms, etc. (lines 15-19).

For a discussion of this passage see *KAI*/I. 46, no. 228, and *ibid.* II, 280, s.v. line 15 f. Also see the valuable study of F. Rosenthal, "Sedaka, Charity" in *HUCA* 23, 1950-51, Part I, 411-30. Rosenthal

accepts the restorations, and we follow him in his essential inter-
pretation (*ibid.* 425-7, but he needn't have been concerned about the
fact that the *Têmâ* inscription attests the only usage in Aramaic of the
sense of grant or gift. This sense is attested in biblical Hebrew, and
precisely from Achaemenid period. In Neh 2:20 the sense of "estate,
share" for Hebrew *ṣidqāh* is quite clear. In responding to the maligners
of the temple project, Nehemiah states: "It is the God of Heaven
who will grant us success, and we and his servants will proceed with
the construction. But, as for you—There is no share *(ḥēleq)* or rightful
estate *(ṣidqāh)*, or documented right *(zikkārôn)* in Jerusalem."

This passage is replete with significant terminology. *Zikkaron* here
has the Aramaic sense of "record", and *ṣidqāh* replaces *naḥalāh* "estate,
homestead", the usual parallel of *ḥēleq* or its synonym (Cf. Gen 31:14,
frequently in Dt II Sam 20:1, etc.). Thus, *ṣidqāh* and *zikkārôn* are
here Aramaisms. This was partially noted by A. Ehrlich, *Randglossen
zur hebräischen Bibel* VII, 1914, 188, and cf. *idem, Miqrā' Kifšûtô*, 1969,
I, 39-40, s.v. Gen 16:6). Ehrlich rendered *ṣidqāh* in Neh 2:20 as
"claim, title" (German: *Anspruch*). He made no reference to the
Têmâ inscription, but he did point to II Sam 19:29, where this
meaning may be conveyed by *ṣedāqāh*, although it is difficult to be
certain. In an exchange between Mephibosheth, son of Saul, and
David, the king, the former states:

> My father's household has been nothing but deathly men for my
> lord, the king, and yet you have designated your servant among
> those who eat at your table. What additional *grant* am I entitled to
> *(ûmah yeš lî 'ôd ṣedāqāh)* and what further basis for appealing to the
> king?
> The king said to him: Why do you continue to speak of affairs? I
> have ordered that you and *Ṣîbā'* shall divide the field.

Although it is certainly reasonable to take *ṣedāqāh* here as an act of
generosity, and to translate accordingly: "What additional generosity
can I expect?", the reference to a field apparently promised by David
to Saul's son allows us to speculate that *ṣedāqāh* may refer to a specific
piece of property, a fief.

It may also be worth mentioning that in Ps 24:5 *ṣedāqāh* is parallel
to *berākāh*. Both terms may here connote something more material
than "blessing" and "generosity." (See Part I, n. 39). All scholars
have pointed to Dan 4:25 where Aramaic *ṣidqāh* probably connotes a
gift to the poor.

Empire Aramaic also uses the adj. *ṣadîq* to mean: "rightfully en-

titled." (Cf. *AP* 44:6-7: *lm plgh zyly hw ṣdyq 'nh lhḥsnwth pmsy* "Namely, the half which is mine, I am rightfully entitled to transfer it to Pamisi." Cf. Vincent, *Religion*, 177, and B. Porten, *op. cit.*, 317-18, as restored by H. L. Ginsberg).[1]

It seems preferable, therefore, to relate the type of *zebaḥ* characterized as *zibḥê ṣedeq* to the concept of "grant," which develops from the notion that one should receive his rightful due, that to which he has a claim. The biblical contexts at least permit such an interpretation. *Zibḥê ṣedeq* are offered by those who have received or are about to receive the abundance, in material terms, that is God's blessing. Zebulun and Issachar offer such sacrifices "For they draw from the riches of the sea, and the hidden hoards of the sand." (NJV, Dt 33:19). In Ps 4:6 the context also relates to the goodness, in the form of grain and wine. In Ps 51:18-21 the context is particularly instructive: "For you don't desire slain offerings, else I would provide; holocausts you won't accept.... By your will, repair Zion, build the walls of Jerusalem! Then you will desire slain offerings rightfully due, holocausts entirely consumed; then bulls will ascend your altar!"

Zibḥē ṣedeq are offered to Yahweh because he has done something for his worshippers. They are his rightful part of their possessions, for the abundance he has given them. It is not that Yahweh desires sacrifices, *per se*. He will accept them in return for what he has given. Therefore, Hebrew *ṣedeq* in *zibḥê ṣedeq* relates to Aramaic-Hebrew *ṣidqāh*, and possibly even Hebrew *ṣedāqāh*.

---

[1] Related to this connotation is Ugaritic *ṣdq* (subst.), parallel to *yšr* in Keret, lines 11-12, where *aṭt ṣdqh* means: "his rightful/legitimate wife."

ADDENDUM

A propos the Phoenician term *zbḥ ymm* in the Karateppe inscription (above, 130-35): Prof. W. W. Hallo called my attention to P. Meriggi's treatment of the paralel hieroglyphic-Hittite phraseology, which, though problematic, seems clearly to convey the sense of "year", perhaps "year by year." See P. Meriggi, *Manuale di Eteo Geroglifico* II, (*Incunabula Graeca* 14), Rome, 1967 82-3, 94, s.v. phrase XLVIII.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Note: Sources noted, in general, in the list of abbreviations are not included again in the bibliography)

Albright, W. F. "The Oracles of Balaam," *JBL* 63, 1944, 209-33.

——, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, London, 1968.

Alt, A. *Essays in Old Testament History and Religion*, Oxford, 1966.

Artzi, P. *Kelāpim* (Hebrew), *EB* IV, 1962, 13-15.

——, "The First Stage in the Rise of the Middle-Assyrian Empire: *EA* 15" (Hebrew), *EI* 9, 1969, 22-8.

Baaren, Th. P. van, "Theoretical Speculations on Sacrifice," *Numen* 11, 1964, 1-12.

Baltzer, K. *The Covenant Formulary*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1971.

Beinart, H. *'Ašima'* (Hebrew), *EB* I, 1955, 762.

Ben-Yehudah, E., *Dictionary and Thesaurus of the Hebrew Language*, vols. I-VIII, New York, 1960.

Blau, J., Greenfield, J. C. "Ugaritic Glosses," *BASOR* 200, 1970, 11-17.

Blythin, Islwyn, "Magic and Methodology," *Numen* 17, 1970, 45-56.

Branden, A. van den, "Lévitique 1-7 et le Tariff de Marseille, *CIS* i, 165," *RSO* 40, 1965, 107-30.

Brichto, H. Ch., *The Problem of Curse in the Hebrew Bible*, (*JBL Monograph Series* 13), 1963.

Brinkman, J. A., "*Assyrian and Babylonian Chronology*," in A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* U. of Chicago, 1964.

Contineau, J. *Le Nabatéen* II, Paris, 1932, 46.

Cassuto, U., *The Goddess Anath*, trans. from the Hebrew by I. Abraham, Jerusalem, 1971.

Charbel, A. *Zebaḥ Šelāmim—Il Sacrificio Pacifico*, Jerusalem, 1967.

——, "Shelamim' nei Documenti di Elefantina," *Bibia e Oriente* 12, 1970, 91-4.

Dahood, M. "An Economic Text," in *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets*, ed. L. Fisher, (*An. Or.* 48), Rome, 1971, 31-4, and pl. VII.

Davies, G. Henton, "The Ark of the Covenant," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* V, 1967, 30-47.

Driel, G. van, *The Cult of Aššur*, (*Studia Semitica Neerlandica* 13), Assen, 1969, 52.

Driver, G. R., "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament," V, *JTS* 34, 1933, 33-44.

——, "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch," *JSS* I, 1956, 97-105.

Ebeling, E. *Tod und Leben*, Berlin, 1931, 74 f.

Ehrlich, A. B., *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, VII, Leipzig, 1908-14, 188.

——, *Hammiqrā' Kipšūṭô*, (Hebrew), with Prolegomenon by H. M. Orlinsky, *(The Library of Biblical Studies)*, New York, 1969, I, 39-40.

Eisenbeis, W., *Die Wurzel š-l-m im alten Testament* (*ZAW*, Beihefte 113), Berlin, 1969, 71-3, 222-96.

'Enṣiqlōpēdiāh Talmūdit (Hebrew), vols. I-XIV, Jerusalem, 1947.

Falkenstein, A. *Die Haupttypen der sumerischen Beschwörung*, (*Leipziger Semititische Studien*, N.F. I), Leipzig, 1968.

Finkelstein, J. J., "The Middle Assyrian *Šulmānu* Texts, "*JAOS* 72, 1952, 77-80.

Fisher, L. R., "An Ugaritic Ritual and Genesis I, 1-5," *Ugaritica* VI, Paris, 1969, 197-205.

Fisher, L. R., and Knutzon, F. B., "An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit," *JNES* 28, 1969, 157-67.

Frankena, R., *Tākultu, Die Sacrale Maaltijd in het Assyrische Ritueel*, Leiden, 1954.

Friedrich, J., *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, (*An. Or.* 46), 1970.

Gaster, Th. H., "Folklore Motifs in Canaanite Myth," *JRAS*, 1944, 51, n. 70.

——, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament*, New York, 1969,

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 2nd English ed., (E. Kautzsch, A. E. Cowley), Oxford, 1960.

Gill. D. "*Thysia* and *šelāmîm*: Questions to R. Schmid's, *Das Bundesopfer in Israel*," *Biblica* 47, 1966, 255-62.

Ginsberg, H. L., *The Legend of King Keret*, (*BASOR, Suppl. St.* 2-3), New Haven, 1946.

——, "The Regular Public Offerings," *EJ* 5, 1162.

——, "Hosea, Book of—" *EJ* 8, 1010-24.

Goetze, A. "Peace on Earth," *BASOR* 93, 1944, 17-20.

——, "Fifty Old Babylonian Letters from Harmal," *Sumer* 14, 1958, 3 f., and plates 1-24.

Gordon, C. H., *Ugaritic Literature*, Rome, 1949.

Gottwald, N., "Samuel, Book of —" *EJ* 14, 791-4.

Gray, J. I and II Kings, A Commentary (The Old Testament Library), rev. ed., Philadelphia, 1970.

Greenfield, J. C. (See Blau, J.).

——, "Some Aspects of Treaty Terminology in the Bible," *Proceedings, Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Jerusalem, 1967, 117-19.

Gurney, O. R., "Babylonian Prophylactic Figures and their Rituals," *AAA* 22, 1935, 31-96.

Guzzo-Amada i, Maria-Giuglia, *Le Iscrizione Feniche e Puniche dele Colone in Occidente*, (*Studie Semitiche* 28), U. of Rome, 1967.

Hallo, W. W., (See: Levine, B. A.).

Haran, M., "The Uses of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual," *VT* 10, 1960, 113-29.

——, *Mattenôt kehûnāh*," *EB* IV (Hebrew), 1962, 39-4.

——, "The Priestly Image of the Tabernacle," *HUCA* 36, 1965. 191-226.

——, "The Sacrifice of Gideon," (Hebrew), *'Iyyûnim Beseper Šôpeṭim*, Jerusalem, 1966, 235-41.

——, *Nehuštān* (Hebrew), *EB* V, 1968, 826-7.

——, "Holiness Code," *EJ* 8, 820-25.

——, *Ages and Institutions in the Bible* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1972.

——, "Studies in the Bible: The Idea of Centralization of the Cult in the Priestly Apprehension," (Hebrew), *Beer-Shera* 1, 1973, 114-21.

Harris, Z., *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, (*AOS* 8), 1936,

Hatch, E. and Redbath, H. A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, vols. I-III, Graz (Austria), 1954.

Hillers, D. R., *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*, Johns Hopkins, 1969, 166-7.

Japhet, S., "Chronicles, Book of —" *EJ* 5, 517-34.

Kallai, Z. "*Karmel, Har Hakkarmel*," *EB* IV, 1962, 324-29.

Kallai, Z., and Tadmor, H., "*Bit-Ninurta* = Beth Horon—On the History of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Amarna Period" (Hebrew), *EI* 9, 1969, 138-47.

Kaufmann, Y. *The Book of Judges* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1962.

Kraetzchmer, R., *Die Bundesverstellung im alten Testament in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Marburg, 1896, 40-41.

Kutsch, E., *Salbung als Rechtsart im alten Testament*, (*ZAW, Beihefte* 87), 1963.

Landsberger, B., *The Date Palm and Its Byproducts According to the Cuneiform Sources* (*AfO, Beiheft* 17), 1967.

Lane's Arabic-English Lexicon, Book I, Part 7, London, 1885.

Levine, B. A., "Ugaritic Descriptive Rituals," *JCS* 17, 1963, 105-11.

——, "The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch," *JAOS* 85, 1965, 307-18.

——, "Notes on Some Technical Terms of the Biblical Cult" (Hebrew), *Lešônēnû* 30, 1965-66, 3-11.

——, Review of: B. Mandelbaum, *Pesikta de Rav Kahana, Judaism* 16, 1967, 248-50.

——, "On the Presence of God in Biblical Religion," *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden, 1968, 71-87.

——, "Notes on a Hebrew Ostracon from Arad," *IEJ* 19, 1969, 49-51.

——, "*Kippûrîm*" (Hebrew), *EI* 9, 1969, 88-95.

——, "*Piggûl*" (Hebrew), *EB* VI, 1971, 435-6.

——, "Cult, Israelite," *EJ*

——, "First Fruits," *EJ*

——, "Kedushah," *EJ* 10, 866-87.

Levine, B. A., and Hallo, W. W., "Offerings to the Temple Gates at Ur," *HUCA* 38, 1967, 17-58.

L'Hour, J. "Les Interdits *Tô'ēbāh* dans le Deuteronome," *RB* 71, 1964, 481-503.

Lidzbarski, M., *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik* I, Hildesheim, 1962, 228-9.

Liver, J. "The Ransom of Half Shekel" (Hebrew), *Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume*, ed. M. Haran, Jerusalem, 1960, 54-67.

Malamat, A., "The Ban in Mari and the Bible" (Hebrew), *Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume*, ed. M. Haran, Jerusalem, 1960, 149-58.

McCarthy, D. J., "Three Covenants in Genesis," *CBQ* 26, 1964, 179-89.

——, "Covenant in the Old Testament," *CBQ* 27, 1965, 217-40.

——, "*Berît* and Covenant in the Deuteronomistic History," *VT, Suppl.* 23, 1972, 68-85.

——, "Further Notes on the Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice," *JBL* 92, 1973, 205-10.

Mekîltā', ed. Friedman, Vienna, 1870.

Mendenhall, G. E., *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, Pittsburgh, Biblical Colloquium, 1955.

Merriggi, P., *Manuale di Eteo Geroglifico II* (*Incunabula Graeca* 14), Rome, 1967.

Metzinger, A. "Die Substitutionstheorie und das alttestamentliche Opfer," *Biblica* 21, 1940, 159-87, 247-72, 353-77.

Midrash Haggadal, Leviticus, ed. Rabinowitz, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, 1932.

Milgrom, J., *Studies in Levitical Terminology* I, (*Near Eastern Studies* 14), U. of California, 1970.

——, "*Kippēr 'al/be'ad*" (Hebrew), *Lešônēnû* 35, 1970-71, 16017.

——, "The Function of the *Ḥaṭṭā't* Sacrifice," (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 40, 1970-71, 1-8.

——, "Sin Offering or Purification Offering?", *VT* 21, 1971, 237-8.

——, "The Alleged Wave Offering in Israel and in the Ancient Near East," *IEJ* 22, 1972, 33-8.

Montgomery, J. A., "The Dedication Feast in the Old Testament," *JBL* 29, 1910, 29-40.

Moor, J. C. de, "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra" I: *UF* I, 1969, 167-88; II: *UF* II, 1970, 303-27.

Mowinckel, S., "The Verb *šḥaṭ* and the Nouns *šḥaṭ, šiḥā*," *Studia Theologica* 15, 1962, 1-10.

——, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, trans. D.R.Ap-Thomas, vols. I-II, Oxford,1962.

——, *Psalmenstudien*, vols. I-II, Amsterdam, 1966.

Müller, Karl Fr., *Das Assyrische Ritual, Texte zum assyrischen Königsritual*, (*MVAG* 41/I), Leipzig, 1937.

Neusner, J., *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*, Leiden, 1973.

Noth, M., *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Eassays*,

——, *Leviticus (The Old Testament Library)*, Philadelphia, 1965.

Psalms, The Book of, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1972.

Oppenheim, A. L., *Ancient Mesopotamia*, U. of Chicago, 1964.

Porten, B., *Archives from Elephantine*, U. of California, 1968.

Rad, G. von, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, (*BWANT* 65), Stutthart-Berlin, 1934.

——, *Deuteronomy, A Commentary, (The Old Testament Library)*. Philadelphia, 1966, 164-69.

Rainey, A. F., "The Scribe at Ugarit, His Position and Influence," *Israel Academy of Arts and Sciences*, III/4, 1968, 1-22.

——, "The Order of Sacrifices in Old Testament Rituals," *Biblica* 51, 1970, 485-98.

——, "Gleanings from Ugarit," *Israel Oriental Series*, U. of Tel-Aviv, 1973.

Reiner, E., "The *Lipšur* Litanies, *JNES* 15, 1956, 129-49.

——, "Dead of Night," *Assyrian Studies* 16, 1965, 247-51.

Rendtorff, R., *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift*, Gottingen, 1963.

——, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel*, Neukirchen, 1967.

Ritter, E. "Magical Expert *(āšipu)* and Medical Expert *(asû)*," *Assyrian Studies* 16, 1965, 299.

Rofé, A., "The Strata of the Law About the Centralization of Worship Deutero-nomy, and the History of the Deuteronomic Movement," *VT, Suppl.* 22, 1971, 221-7.

Rosenthal, F., "Sedaka, Charity," *HUCA* 23, 1950-51, Part I, 411-30.

Ryckmans, G. "Le Sacrifice *DBḤ* dans les Inscriptions Safaitiques," *HUCA* 23, 1950-51, Part I, 431-8.

Saggs, H. W., *The Greatness that was Babylon*, Hawthorn Books, New York, 1966, 305-16.

Sarna, N. "Ezekiel 8:17, A Fresh Examination, "*HTR* 57, 1964, 347-52.

——, Prolegomenon, to M. Buttenweiser, *The Psalms (The Library of Biblical Studies)*, New York, 1969, xxii-xxxi.

——,"Psalms and the Cult", *EJ* 13, 1315-17.

Schoors, A. "Literary Phrases," *Ras Shamra Parallels* I, (An. Or. 49), ed. L. Fisher, Rome, 1974, 1-70 (ch. 1).

Schotz, P. S., *Schuld- und Sündopfer im alten Testament*, Breslau, 1930, 102-44.

Segal, M., *The Books of Samuel* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1956.

Sifra, ed. Weiss, Vienna, 1862. Also: ed. L. Finkelstein, New York, 5717.

Silverman, M. A., *Jewish Personal Names in the Elephantine Documents*, Brandeis U. PhD Dissertation, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1967.

——, "Aramean Name-Types in the Elephantine Documents," *JAOS* 89, 1969, 691-709.

Smith, W. Robertson, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, with a Prolegomenon by J. Muilenberg, *(The Library of Biblical Studies)*, New York, 1969, 269-388.

Snaith, N. "Sacrifices in the Old Testament," *VT* 7, 1957, 308-17.

——, "The Sin-Offering and the Guilt-Offering," *VT* 15, 1965, 73-80.

——, *Leviticus and Numbers, (The Century Bible)*, London, 1967.

Speiser, E. A., "Nuzi Marginalia," *Orientalia* N.S., 25, 9-15.

——, "Census and Ritual Expiation," *BASOR* 149, 1958, 17-25.

——, "Leviticus and the Critics," *Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume*, ed. M. Haran,

Jerusalem, 1960, 29-45.

——, *Genesis, (The Anchor Bible)*, Garden City, New York, 1964.

Stamm, J., *Erlösen und Vergeben im alten Testament*, Bern, 1940, 59-66 f.

Tadmor, H., (See Kallai, Z.).

Tigay, J. "Psalm 7:5 and Ancient Near Eastern Treaties," *JBL* 89, 1970, 178-86.

——, "Ashima", *EJ* 3, 711.

Thompson, R. Campbell, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, II, London, 1904, 31-9.

Thompson, R. J., *Penitence and Prayer in Early Israel Outside the Levitical Law*, Leiden, 1963.

Vaux, R. de, *Ancient Israel*, trans. J. McHugh, 2 vols., New York, 1961,

——, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, trans. D. McHugh, New York, 1971.

Virolleaud, Ch., "Les Nouveaux Textes Mythologique et Liturgiques de Ras Shamra (XXIVe Campagne, 1961)", in J. Nougayrol, *et al.*, *Ugaritica V (Mission de Ras Shamra* XVI), Paris, 1968, ch. 3, 545-606.

Weinfeld, M. "Covenant," *EJ* 5, 1011-22.

——, "Tithe," EJ 15, 1157-62.

——, "Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and its Influence on the West," *JAOS* 93, 1973, 190-99.

Wörterbuch der Klassischen Arabischen Sprache, Lieferung 5, Wiesbaden, 1964.

Zimmern, H., *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion*, Leipzig, 1901, 91-3, 123-37.

Zuckermandel, M., *Tosefta*, with *addendum* by Saul Lieberman, Jerusalem, 1937.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL AND OTHER SOURCES

OLD TESTAMENT

QUOTED SOURCES—AKKADIAN

INDEX OF WORDS

HEBREW

AKKADIAN

tākultu 30 f.
ṭēmu(amāru) 16n
uttukê limnūti 81n

ṣebû (v) 115
ṣibu, ṣibī taklime 115f.

ARABIC

'aṭām 130
ḥaram 129
kafara, kaffara (v) 125

kafrun 125
kafurun 126
kufrun 126

ARAMAIC AND SYRIAC

'âudi (v, perf.) 126
kepar, kappēr 61n, 125
kûprā' (2 meanings) 124, 126
kippûrā' 124
polḥān 7n
ṣ-d-q (v)
  ṣdqw 135

ṣdyq (adj) 136-37
ṣdqt' (ṣidgetā') 135
qdšn 129
qeyām 11n
qayyāmā' 11n
qeroyoyo' 12n

GREEK

eirenikos 3n
hilastērion
  (hilaskesthai) 63

sōtērion, to 3n f.
teleios 20n
teleiosis 3n

PHOENICIAN-PUNIC

'lp 133
'šmn (d.n.) 131-32
bll 116
h-l-k (v)
  ylk (Yip'il, inf. abs.) 133-4
zbḥ 115
  zbḥ ymm 133-4
  (b'l) bzbḥ 118f.
yslt 118f.
khnm 118f.
mnḥt 116
mskt 133

mš't 6n, 118f.
'rt 118f.
't brš/qsr 133
p'nm 118f.
ṣd 116
ṣw't 118f.
qṣrt 118f.
š⁰r 118f.
šlbm ('šlbm) 118f.
šlm kll 10n, 118f.
š 133

UGARITIC

arbdd 12
aṭm/iṭm 92n
aṭṭ 10
bt
  bt mlk 9n

lbbt 10
dbḥ (v) 10
dbḥ 12n, 20, 115
  dbḥ ṣpn 9n
  dbḥ šmn mr šmn rqḥ 116

OTHER WORDS